

**TABLE 4. Calculation of the effect of son preference on parity progression ratio among parous ever-married women aged 15–49 who had stopped childbearing, by parity**

Parity	No. of women	No son preference	Son preference	Effect (%)
1	276	0.952	0.961	0.9
2	1,004	0.806	0.826	2.5
3	1,322	0.711	0.769	8.2
4	1,120	0.672	0.697	3.7
5	765	0.643	0.661	2.8
6	490	0.602	0.615	2.2
7	304	0.570	0.582	2.1
8	200	0.516	0.532	3.1
9	119	0.445	0.400	-10.1
10	66	0.488	0.470	-3.7

**TABLE 5. Odds ratios from logistic regression analyses examining the association between various characteristics and stopping childbearing after the birth of a son**

Characteristic	Odds ratio	Characteristic	Odds ratio
<b>INDIVIDUAL</b>			
<b>Contraceptive use†</b>			
No (ref)	1.00	<b>Religion</b>	
Yes	1.36**	Hindu (ref)	1.00
<b>Previous son</b>		Buddhist	1.03
No (ref)	1.00	Muslim	0.62*
Yes	0.73**	Other	1.06
<b>Watches TV at least once a week</b>		<b>ETHNICITY OF SAMPLING UNIT‡</b>	
No (ref)	1.00	<b>Rai and Lim</b>	
Yes	0.73**	0.0 (ref)	1.00
<b>Education</b>		0.1–10.0	0.89
None (ref)	1.00	10.1–20.0	0.95
Incomplete primary	0.80	>20.0	0.74*
Complete primary	0.62*	<b>Hill groups other than Rai and Lim</b>	
Incomplete secondary	1.22	0.0 (ref)	1.00
≥complete secondary	0.92	0.1–10.0	0.75**
<b>Age at first marriage</b>		10.1–20.0	1.05
<10 (ref)	1.00	>20.0	1.16
11–15	0.71	<b>Yadav</b>	
16–20	0.69	0.0 (ref)	1.00
>21	0.68	0.1–10.0	0.99
<b>Parity</b>		10.1–20.0	1.77**
1 (ref)	1.00	>20.0	1.33*
2	1.20	<b>Tharu</b>	
3	1.05	0.0 (ref)	1.00
4	0.80	0.1–10.0	1.02
5	0.71	10.1–20.0	1.46*
6	0.65*	>20.0	0.93
≥7	0.68*	<b>Occupational caste</b>	
<b>Last birth interval</b>		0.0 (ref)	1.00
<19 mos. (ref)	1.00	0.1–10.0	1.10
19–60 mos.	0.83*	10.1–20.0	1.06
>60 mos.	0.62**	>20.0	1.24*
		<b>Constant</b>	1.433**
		$\chi^2$	147.9**
		df	30

\*p&lt;.05. \*\*p&lt;.01. †Current use of any modern method. ‡By percentage of each ethnicity present. Note: ref=reference category.