Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research, volume 82

International Conference on Management, Education Technology and Economics (ICMETE 2019)

Analysis of the Influence of Family Endowment and Employment Quality on Migrant Workers' Willingness to Return

Li Peng[1], Tang Zixuan[2*], Li Wanhua

International Business School, Shaanxi Normal University
Xi'an 710119, China

***Abstract*—This paper uses the Chinese Labor Dynamics Survey Data (CLDS) to construct a logit model, which introduces family endowment and employment quality into the individual utility equation of labor's returning will, and analyzes the influence of family endowment factors and personal characteristics of employment quality factors on migrant workers' willingness to return. The empirical results show that family economic capital and family human capital have a significant impact on the returning will of migrant workers in the family endowment; those who engage in non-physical labor in the city and have higher evaluation of the work they are doing have lower willingness to return; and gender, age, and health also have different degrees of influence on the return of migrant workers.**

Keywords—Family endowment; Employment quality; Logit model; Reflow migration

I. INTRODUCTION

Under the dual background of innovation-driven development strategy and industrial structure optimization and upgrading, population migration shows a downward trend in the number of floating population and the growth rate of floating population. The migrant workers group plays a major role in the floating population. In 2010, the growth rate of migrant workers was 5.4%, while the growth rate of migrant workers in 2016 was 1.5%.With the support of national policies, the trend of returning farmer workers has gradually warmed up. The characteristics of migrant workers returning to the group, the key factors of returning, and the influence of the endowment and employment quality of migrant workers on the willingness to return have become hot spots.

II. THEORETICAL BASIS AND LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Theoretical basis

The most representative theories about the internal mechanism of labor mobility are the push-pull theory of the 1950s, the new migration theory that emerged in the 1980s, the later social network theory, the theory of human capital, and the institutional theory of labor mobility. The theory authors propose the following seven hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1: The higher the personal income earned in the inflow, the less likely the migrant workers are to return to their hometowns.

Hypothesis 2: The higher the overall satisfaction with the work in the inflow, the less likely the migrant workers are to return to their hometowns.

Hypothesis 3: The older the age, the higher the level of education, and the more migrant workers who are engaged in manual labor in the inflowing areas, the stronger their willingness to return.

Hypothesis 4: The richer the human capital of migrant workers' families, the more likely migrant workers may not return to fully exert their human capital advantages.

Hypothesis 5: The richer the economic capital of migrant workers' families, the labor may be directly employed locally or after returning to employment. The income after income deducting the cost of living may not meet its expectations. Therefore, the migrant workers with rich family economic capital are more Easy to choose to reflow.

Hypothesis 6: The richer the social capital of migrant workers' families, the more likely the labor force will be employed locally. Therefore, the migrant workers of families with rich social capital may choose to return to their hometowns.

Hypothesis 7: Migrant workers' families have more land resources in their hometowns, so they are more likely to choose to return to their hometowns.

B. Literature review

Foreign scholars have long had relevant theories and models of labor mobility, and are closely related to the development trend of international immigration. Massey (1987) found that immigration experience has a significant impact on immigration relocation decisions by studying Mexican-American immigration [1]. DaVanzo (1983) used the income dynamic survey data (PSID) to investigate the migration of immigrants in the United States and found that the educational level has a significant impact on the return. The higher the education level, the easier it is to return [2].LeeSangLim's (2010) study of national youth tracking data shows that ethnicity varies and the form of migration varies widely. The older the age, the higher the reflow rate and the lower the remobilization rate [3].

At present, there are many researches on the migration of rural labor migration in China. The existing research has summarized and found out that early scholars mainly studied factors such as personal characteristics, wage level and social integration (Bai Nansheng, He Yupeng (2002); Cheng Aihua (2007); Luo Mingzhong (2008)) [4-6] The impact on the return of migrant workers. Wang Zicheng (2013) used the

survey data of labor mobility in China's urban and rural areas to explore the migration mode of migrant workers. The results of the study show that age and return decision-making are inversely related. The higher the degree of migrant workers, the more likely they are to settle in the city, the lower the possibility of returning. .Compared with men, the probability of women returning to migrant workers is greater, but it is not statistically significant [7].Family factors have always been the focus of attention in population economics. Li Guangming and Pan Mingming (2013) conducted a questionnaire survey on the Uyghur rural labor force and conducted empirical research. The results showed that the family attitude and family income of the Uighur rural labor force working outside the country were both There is a significant impact, and the level of religious activities and education is not statistically significant [8].There are also some scholars who have analyzed the return of migrant workers from the institutional level. Yu Yunjiang (2014) based on the empirical analysis of Shanghai survey data, finally found that social security factors have a robust and significant impact on the willingness of migrant workers to return [9].

Scholars have a richer discussion on the factors affecting the return of migrant workers, but few studies have focused on the return of migrant workers to the family endowment and the quality of employment at the individual level. The author introduces the family utility and employment quality into the individual utility equation of labor return intention, and analyzes the internal mechanism that affects the return migration of migrant workers. It has very important theoretical and practical significance.

III. METHODS AND DATA

A. Data source

The data comes from the 2016 China Labor Force Dynamic Survey (clds) 2016 cross-sectional data, including 21086 individual labor questionnaires for 15-64 years old and 14226 household questionnaires. According to the research needs, the individual questionnaire was connected with the family questionnaire, and the preliminary data processing was carried out. The “the nature of the account at birth of the respondent” was selected as “agricultural household registration”, the current household registration was still “agricultural household registration” and “there was a migrant worker experience. For the sample (more than 6 months), 1846 valid individual sample data were selected.

B. Model setting and variable definition

According to the research content, the dependent variable is the willingness of migrant workers to return, and the independent variables include family endowment variables, employment quality variables and personal characteristic variables.

The return of labor is measured by the willingness of the labor force to return. Since the willingness of migrant workers to return is a binary variable, the use of traditional linear regression analysis tends to bias the results. Therefore, this paper constructs a logistic regression model of the binary response variable, and the model is written as $\log\left[\frac{p(y=1)}{1-p(y=1)}\right] = \alpha + \beta x$, the formula uses the logarithm of the probability, $\log[P(y=1)/(1-P(y=1))]$ It is called Logistic Transformation, or Logit for short.The model that affects the willingness of migrant workers to return is set as follows:

$$\text{logit}[P(y=1)] = \alpha_0 + \beta_i X_i + \gamma_i F_i + \eta_i J_i + \varepsilon$$

In the above formula α_0 Is a constant term.XIs a personal characteristic control variable; j is an employment quality variable,FFor family endowment variables.

Among the 1846 households surveyed, male respondents accounted for 61.10%, women accounted for 38.90%, and 77.32% of female respondents said they would not go out to work again, hoping to stay in their hometown. Among all the respondents, there were 395 respondents in the 16-30 age group; 948 respondents in the 31-50 age group; and 503 respondents in the 51-64 age group. Among the 722 respondents who were 31- to 50-year-old in the young and middle-aged, they said that they would not go out to work again, accounting for 76.16%.According to the education level, there were 536 respondents with primary school education and below, 950 with junior high school education, and 360 with high school and upper education.36.9% of the respondents with high education and above want to return to their hometowns, and 72.5% of the respondents in junior high school and below want to return to their hometowns. It can be seen that with the education level of the respondents The improvement of the return will be gradually reduced (see Table 1).

TABLE I VARIABLE DEFINITION

Variable name		Variable description	Sample size	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum value	Maximum
Willingness to return		Are you still ready to go out to work (1=No, 0=Yes)	1847	0.75	0.43	0	1
Personal characteristics	gender	Respondent gender 1 = male, 0 = female	1847	0.61	0.49	0	1
	age	Respondent's age (years)	1847	42.20	11.76	17	64
	marital status	1 = have a spouse, 0 = no spouse	1847	0.85	0.35	0	1
	Educational level	Respondents' years of education (0=not attended, 6=primary/private, 9=junior, 12=Pugao/technical/vocational, 16=undergraduate and above)	1847	8.34	2.81	0	16
	Health status	Ordered categorical variables, from 1 to 5, indicating that the health status is increasing	1847	2.45	1.01	1	5

Table I, cont

Family endowment	Family human capital						
	Family education	The average educational level of the family labor force, the greater the value, the higher the educational level	1847	6.95	1.51	0	12
	Family health	The average health status of the family labor force, the greater the value, the better the health status	1847	2.22	0.72	1	5
	Family economic capital						
	car	Is there a car at home (1=Yes, 0=None)	1847	0.17	0.38	0	1
	There is a room in the village	Whether to buy a house or build a house in the village (1=Yes, 0=None)	1847	0.58	0.49	0	1
	Total household income	Household currency annual total income (yuan)	1847	48006.26	61704.17	0	702300
	Family social capital						
	Gift money	Total family gifts and gift money (yuan)	1847	3279.76	4581.42	0	40000
	Family natural capital						
	Land area	Number of cultivated land owned by the family (mu)	1847	11.09	16.21	0	217
Employment quality	Medical insurance participation	1=Participate in any one or more including medical insurance, 0=not participating in any medical insurance	1847	0.87	0.34	0	1
	Pension insurance participation	1=Participate in any one or more including pension insurance, 0=not participating in any pension insurance	1847	0.54	0.50	0	1
	Job Satisfaction	Ordered categorical variables, from 1 to 5, indicate an increase in satisfaction	1847	3.43	0.78	1	5
	personal income	Total personal income (yuan)	1847	22310.68	38668.27	0	1000000
	Out of employment professional level	1= Engage in manual labor such as “agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry and vice-fishing”, 0=other	1847	0.95	0.22	0	1

IV. Empirical Results Analysis

In the regression equation with family endowment as the core variable, model 1 represents the net effect of family endowment. From the regression results, it can be seen that family economic capital has a significant impact on the return of migrant workers. In the village, the proportion of migrant workers who buy houses or build houses is 58.5% higher than that of those who do not have fixed houses in the village. The migrant workers who own cars in the family are more inclined to return than the car-free migrant workers. This also verifies the hypothesis 5 presented above. In the family human capital, the average educational level of the family members and the average educational level have a weak influence on the return of migrant workers, but the statistical significance is not significant. This is inconsistent with expectations and hypothesis 3. However, since the total amount of gifts and gift money measures the social network at the household level, it does not reflect the family social capital more completely, and there may be cases where the impact is not significant. The area of cultivated land has no significant impact on the return of migrant workers, which is consistent with the conclusion of Zhao Yaohui (2002).

In Model 2, after controlling the individual factors, from the regression results, the indicator of “buying houses or building houses in the village” in the family economic capital is no longer significant, and the level of “family-owned cars” is improved. The “family average health level” representing household human capital is significant at the level of 1%.The large difference in family endowment status of migrant workers is an important factor leading to this phenomenon. In terms of personal characteristics, age, gender, and health all have a significant impact on the willingness of migrant workers to return, and marital status and education have no significant impact on return. As we grow older, migrant workers tend to return to their hometowns. Age growth is accompanied by a decline in vital function, while most migrant workers are working in labor-intensive jobs, and older migrant workers may not be able to do their jobs effectively to get enough compensation. Because female migrant workers are more likely to return to the family, women have a higher probability of returning. The lower education level and the willingness of married migrant workers to return are higher than the high education level and the unwillingness of the unmarried people, respectively, 3.8%, 8.5%, but failed to pass the significance test. The reason may be that the migrant workers are not very educated. High requirements, but a certain skill required for employment.

In Model 3, the personal characteristic variables were removed and the employment quality variables were added. The regression results showed that the impact of household economic capital on the return of migrant workers was stable. Job satisfaction is significantly under the confidence of 1%, that is, the higher the overall satisfaction with the work, the lower the return probability; the “whether or not to participate

in medical insurance" is significant at the level of 10%, and the migrant workers participating in medical insurance are less than the participants. The willingness to return is 26.8%. The coverage and reimbursement rate of the local NCMS and the scope of reimbursement have great appeal to migrant workers. Once they have major diseases, they cannot get the medical insurance they need and the new rural cooperatives The new policy for reimbursement for medical treatment was implemented in 2018; and whether or not to participate in endowment insurance has no significant impact on the return of migrant workers, which is too low for the level of rural endowment insurance, and has no obvious appeal to the return of migrant workers. At the same time, migrant workers cannot work for local residents. Factors such as equal participation in pension insurance are inseparable. The willingness to return manual workers is 39.9% higher than that of non-physical workers; the higher the personal income, the lower the willingness to return.

In Model 4, the family endowment, employment quality, and personal characteristics that affect the return of migrant workers are all introduced into the equation. The regression results show that gender, age, and health in the personal characteristics have a stable impact on the return of migrant workers, still at the level of 1%. The next is significant. Comparing model 2, model 3, and model 4, after adding personal characteristics and quality of employment, the significance of family health and participation in medical insurance has changed. The reason may be that the family endowment of migrant workers is different. There is a relationship between the individual's health and its participation in health insurance, which leads to significant changes. Comparing the four models, the impact of family economic capital on the willingness of migrant workers to return is still significant, indicating that the impact is stable and will not change due to changes in personal factors and employment.

TABLE II LOGIT REGRESSION RESULTS WITH FAMILY ENDOWMENT AS THE CORE VARIABLE

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
Family endowment variable								
Family education	0.001	0.002	0.005	0.003			0.005	0.003
Family health	-0.036	-0.246***	-0.02	-0.254***			-0.020	-0.254***
car	0.372**	0.555***	0.381**	0.534***			0.381**	0.534***
There is a room in the village	0.585***	0.197	0.566***	0.196			0.566***	0.196
Total household income	1.49E-07	4.68E-07	4.57E-07	3.52E-07			4.57E-07	3.52E-07
Gift money	-1.5E-05	-1.4E-05	-1.3E-05	-1.3E-05			-1.29E-05	-1.27E-05
Land area	-5.1E-07	-4.2E-07	-5.1E-07	-5.6E-07			-5.09E-07	-5.58E-07
Employment quality variable								
Whether to participate in medical insurance			0.268*	0.163	0.292*	0.154	0.268*	0.163
Whether to participate in pension insurance			0.073	-0.162	0.12	-0.120	0.073	-0.162
Job Satisfaction			-0.204***	-0.182***	0.213***	-0.200***	-0.204***	-0.182***
personal income			-2.54E-06 *	2.21E-07	1.53E-06	1.29E-06	-2.54E-06 *	2.21E-07
Out of employment professional level			0.399*	0.424*	0.500**	0.392	0.399*	0.424*
Personal characteristics								
gender		-0.611***		-0.648***		-0.631***		-0.648***
age		0.046***		0.044***		0.047***		0.044***
marital status		0.055		0.085		0.187		0.085
Educational level		-0.038		-0.038		-0.026		-0.038
Health status		0.284***		0.304***		0.197***		0.304***
Constant term	0.847	0.382	0.702	0.353	0.893	0.742	0.702	0.353
r side	0.017	0.09	0.026	0.096	0.017	0.084	0.026	0.096
Observations	1846	1846	1846	1846	1846	1846	1846	1846

In the regression equation with employment quality as the core variable, model 5 represents the net effect of employment quality. From the regression results, it can be seen that job satisfaction is significant at 1%, and medical insurance

participation and outbound employment occupation level are 10 The level of % is significant, while the participation of pension insurance and personal income is not statistically significant. The lower the evaluation of job satisfaction is, the farmers' unions who participate in medical insurance and engage in manual labor are more willing to choose to return to their hometowns.

Model 6 has added personal characteristic variables. After controlling for personal factors such as age and gender, the job satisfaction index is still significant. For each level of evaluation of the overall satisfaction of the work, the willingness to return is reduced by 21.3%. Comparing model 5, model 6, model 7, and model 8, it can be found that the job satisfaction is significant at the level of 1%, and the coefficient fluctuation is not large, indicating that the impact of job satisfaction on the return of migrant workers is stable, not due to family. Changes with changes at the individual level also validate the proposed hypothesis 2.

V. Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

A. Research conclusions

This paper uses the Chinese labor force dynamic survey data to construct a logit model, and analyzes the impact of family endowment factors and employment quality factors on the willingness of migrant workers to return to their homes. The empirical results show that:

(1)In terms of family endowment, family economic capital and family human capital are important factors leading to the willingness of rural migrant workers to return. Migrant workers' work abroad is only one of the means to increase income. With the increase of family economic capital, local employment can also meet the original living standards, and more "invisible value" can be obtained, such as family reunion. , convenient life and so on. The impact of human capital on the return of migrant workers is mainly reflected in the average health status of the family. For every unit of the average health of the family, the probability of migrant workers choosing to return will increase by a quarter. In this model, family social capital and family natural capital are not statistically significant, but it is not straightforward to draw a conclusion that the two have no significant impact on the return of migrant workers. The impact mechanism remains to be investigated.

(2)In terms of employment quality, job satisfaction and personal development in employment quality have a significant impact on the return of migrant workers. Those who engage in non-manual labor in cities and who have a higher evaluation of the work they do are less willing to return. In terms of social security in the quality of employment, the basic endowment insurance provided by the units or companies provided by migrant workers, and the provision of supplementary medical insurance can help to reduce the willingness to return rural migrant workers to a certain extent, but the farmers interviewed in the questionnaire Most of the workers are employed in the informal sector and cannot participate in the urban social security system. Their impact on the willingness to return rural migrant workers is not significant.

(3)In terms of personal characteristics, gender, age, and health in personal characteristics have a strong impact on the return of migrant workers, and both are significant at the level of 1%.There is a clear gender bias in return, and female migrant workers have stronger family dependence than men.

Based on the above research results, it can be seen that the return of migrant workers is the result of the decision-making of comprehensive personal, family and environmental factors. The theory of thrust-tension theory and other related population migration still has a good explanatory power for the return, and the theory of new migration economy The hypothesis that "family is the main body of labor migration decision-making" has certain enlightenment significance for studying the return of rural labor migration in China. In this paper, the evidence supporting the influence of family endowment on returning will be slightly supported by factors such as personal ability and data processing. Thin, will be improved in subsequent studies. Furthermore, the findings are contrary to the conclusion that migrant workers in mainstream economic research are reluctant to return. This has a certain relationship with the data selection in this paper. The data in this paper is selected from 2016. The state has already started the project of poverty alleviation and hard work. The support for the rural areas is relatively large. Both the economic aspect and the infrastructure have undergone major changes, thus attracting a large number of migrant workers.

B. Policy recommendations

(1)Going out to work is an important way to develop rural labor capacity. Laborers with experience in working abroad can make better use of rural family endowments. Governments at all levels should provide a more relaxed institutional environment for the free movement of rural labor between urban and rural areas, provide targeted assistance and support for returning migrant workers, and allow labor mobility to drive capital flows, so that returning migrant workers can truly It's good to come back. Specifically, it can be divided into three categories:

Migrant workers who return due to personal physical problems, family care, etc., have relatively weak family endowments. After returning, they need to rely on family channels to obtain the necessary resources, such as job opportunities, and the personal capital accumulated outside. In response to the lack of channels for display and revitalization, the government should play a communication role in the return of such migrant workers, and build an information platform between the local employers and workers, so that returning migrant workers can use the migrant workers. The acquired technology, knowledge and funds, revitalize the existing capital stock, improve the individual's income ability and family wealth level, and obtain a higher return on investment than the rural labor without the experience of going out to work.

(2) For a small number of active returnees, migrant workers who believe that they can get better income from their hometowns should do a good job in supporting the work, build a sound social support system, and build a platform for migrant workers to return to their hometowns. Migrant workers with willingness and entrepreneurial ability support in terms of

credit, taxation, land use, market entry and entrepreneurship skills training.

(3) For those migrant workers who choose to stay in the construction site, the inflowing place should pay attention to the provision and maintenance of long-term protection of the migrant labor force, and actively improve the employment security system and social security system, for example, in key industries and key areas where migrant workers are concentrated. The group of migrant workers establish a mobile, population-oriented, multi-purpose pension and medical security system that allows migrant workers to enjoy the city's public welfare equally while working and living in the inflow.

REFERENCES

[1] Shi Zhilei, Yang Yunyan's family endowment, family decision-making and rural migrant labor return [j]. Sociological Research, 2012 (03): 157-181. (In Chinese)

[2] Massey D S, Understanding Mexican Migration to the United States[J]. American Journal of Sociology, 1987, 92(6):1372-1403.

[3] Davanzo J, Repeat Migration in the United States: Who Moves Back and Who Moves On?[J]. Review of Economics & Statistics, 1983, 65(4):552-559.

[4] Lee,Sanglim,2010,Effects on Migration Schedule by Migration Type: Primary, Repeat and Return Migration,http://paa2010.princeton.edu/download.aspx?Submit-ssionld=101435.

[5] Bai Nansheng, He Yupeng. Returning to the hometown, or going out?——Research on the return of rural migrant workers in the two provinces of Anhui Province [J]. Sociological Research, 2002(03): 64-78. (In Chinese)

[6] Cheng Aihua. Research on the dynamic mechanism of Chinese migrant workers returning [j]. Anhui Agricultural Sciences, 2007, 35(02): 570-571. (In Chinese)

[7] Luo Mingzhong. Reasons for the return of rural labor after the transfer: logical deduction and empirical test [j]. Economics, 2008 (01): 51-54. (In Chinese)

[8] Wang Zicheng, Zhao Zhong. Dynamic selection of migration mode of migrant workers: going out, reflowing or re-migrating [j]. Management World, 2013 (01): 78-88. (In Chinese)

[9] Li Guangming, Pan Mingming. The influence of personal characteristics, family characteristics and employment environment on the willingness of Uighur rural laborers to go out to work [j]. Journal of Statistics and Information, 2013, 28(8): 91-97. (In Chinese)

[10] Yu Yunjiang, Sun Bindong, Sun Xu. Does social security have an impact on the willingness of migrant workers to return?——An empirical analysis based on Shanghai survey data [j]. Population and Economy, 2014(06): 102-108. (In Chinese)