Part I: You must answer all questions. As there are 35 points allocated to this part, you should spend 35 minutes on answering the question.

- 1. What are the two different approaches to measure gender inequality? What are the merits and disadvantages of each? (6)
- 2. Why may parents consider it to be economically efficient to educate their son but not their daughter? (5)
- 3. Why is it important to value non-market activities and unpaid work? (4)
- 4. What is meant by feminization and what causes it? (6)
- 5. What is meant by the 'threat point' in bargaining models and which factors influence it? How can we empirically test whether bargaining power affects household decisions? (8)
- 6. What are the main theoretical reasons why gender inequality in education might reduce economic growth? (6)

## Part II

1. What does the following table say about the empirical relationship between female education and gender gaps in education and measures of economic development? How can we explain these findings?

## Effects of Female Education and the Gender Gap in Education on Social Indicators (regression

coefficients)

Education variable	Female life expectancy (vears)	Male life expectancy (vears)	Infant mortality (deaths per 1 000 births)	Maternal mortality (deaths per 100,000 births)	Total fertility (number of children)		
	(youro)	(Joard)	1,000 Sintiloj	Sirtiloj	ormarony		
Female primary	0.40	0.00	0.44	0.04	0.04		
enrollment	0,10	0,09	-0,41	-3,31	-0,01		
Female secondary							
enrollment	0,12	0,11	-0,56	3,02 <sup>ns</sup>	-0,03		
Female/male enrollment ratio							
<0.42	-4,80	-3,85	21,16	99,82 <sup>ns</sup>	0,72		
0.42-0.75	-3,41	-2,75	11,37	111,84 <sup>ns</sup>	0,73		
0.75-0.95	-0,69 <sup>ns</sup>	-0,52 <sup>ns</sup>	1,88 <sup>ns</sup>	82,56 <sup>ns</sup>	0,26 <sup>ns</sup>		

ns Not statistically significant at a 90 percent or greater level *Source:* Table 1-14 in the appendix to this chapter

Source: King and Hill (1993).

2. What does the attached table say about determinants of gender bias in mortality in India? How can we explain these findings?

		,
(1)	(2)	(3)
1971-1991	1971-2001	1961-2001
117.42	111.99	115.43
(7.69)***	(2.36)***	(2.14)***
-0.21	-0.19	
$(0.06)^{***}$	(0.06)***	
-0.17	-0.16	-0.20
(0.10)*	(0.03)***	(0.04)***
-0.06		
(0.10)		
0.20		
(0.96)		
	$\begin{array}{c} (1) \\ 1971-1991 \\ 117.42 \\ (7.69)^{***} \\ -0.21 \\ (0.06)^{***} \\ -0.17 \\ (0.10)^{*} \\ -0.06 \\ (0.10) \\ 0.20 \\ (0.96) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c ccccc} (1) & (2) \\ \hline 1971-1991 & 1971-2001 \\ \hline 117.42 & 111.99 \\ (7.69)^{***} & (2.36)^{***} \\ -0.21 & -0.19 \\ (0.06)^{***} & (0.06)^{***} \\ -0.17 & -0.16 \\ (0.10)^{*} & (0.03)^{***} \\ -0.06 \\ (0.10) \\ 0.20 \\ (0.96) \end{array}$

## Table 5: Determinants of the State-Specific Sex Ratios in India, 1961-2001

ns

ns ns

ns

ns

ns

ns

ns

Infant Mortality Rate	-0.03 (0.02)*		
Urbanization Rate	0.26	0.31	
	(0.07)***	(0.05)***	
Population Density	0.007	0.005	0.014
	(0.004)**	(0.002)**	(0.003)***
South Dummy	-6.81	-7.99	-8.14
-	(1.30)***	$(1.11)^{***}$	(1.07)***
East Dummy	-5.57	-4.90	-7.24
	(1.42)***	(0.93)***	$(1.18)^{***}$
West Dummy	-2.66	-4.35	-0.65
	(1.60)*	(1.34)***	(1.30)
1961 dummy			-5.26
-			(2.01)***
1971 dummy	-3.15	-2.83	-4.03
	(1.57)**	(1.43)**	(1.83)**
1981 dummy	-3.12	-3.25	-4.11
	(1.11)***	(1.20)***	(1.65)***
1991 dummy		-0.86	-1.40
		(0.89)	(1.40)
Adj. R-Squared	0.872	0.822	0.606
Ν	43	60	75

Note: standard errors in parenthesis. \*\*\* refers to 99%, \*\* to 95%, and \* to 90% significance levels. The states included are grouped into four regions: North consisting of Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Punjab, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, and Uttar Pradesh, East consisting of Bihar, Orissa, and West Bengal, South consisting of Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, and Tamil Nadu, and West consisting of Gujarat and Maharashtra. In 2001, data for new additional states that were carved out of the existing states of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, and Madhya Pradesh, are reported. We add the figures for these new states (Jharkhand, Chhatisgarh, and Uttaranchal) to the figures for the remaining (but now smaller) states of UP, MP, and Bihar to make them comparable with the previous state figures.

Source: Klasen and Wink (2003).

Part III: Choose one of the three questions. As there are 30 points to be earned, you should spend about 30 minutes on answering it. Please note that it is more important to present a coherent argument with supporting facts and evidence in response to the question than to list all possibly relevant facts you know about the topic.

- 1. Why do we (should we) care about gender inequality?
- 2. "Gender equality in all economic or social indicators should be the explicit goal for policymakers." Critically this statement with reference to at least two economic or social indicators.
- 3. "In some contexts, it is economically efficient for parents to invest more in sons than in daughters. Therefore the state should not interfere with these efficiency considerations, even if they might cause gender bias in mortality, health, or education." Critically discuss this statement.