

要旨 (Migration, Self-selection and Earnings: Evidence from Rural China)

This paper addresses the question of self-selection in migration and how it affects migratory earning results. Using data from a rural household survey conducted by the Ministry of Agriculture of China in the Sichuan and Anhui provinces, and employing the two-stage selection bias correction method developed by Dubin and Mcfadden (1984) and Bourguignon, Fournier and Gurgand (2007), we explore the link between employment choice (non-working, local farm work, local non-farm work and migratory work) and migration earnings. We find that migrants in rural China do not make up a random sample of the population from the villages of origin and earning results are substantively distorted by the selectivity. Simple ordinary least squares (OLS) underestimate the return to experience and overestimate the effects of education and gender. Unlike most literature on this topic, this study identifies not only the direction of wage bias resulting from the allocation of individuals with unobserved characteristics in a specific sector (here migration work) as related to average populations, but it also identifies which choice among any two alternative sectors this bias stems from. We find positive selection in the migration sector as related to local farm work and non-working sector, and negative selection as related to local non-farm work. In average, the wages of migration workers are upward biased due to the allocation of individuals with worse unobserved characteristics out of migration into non-working and local farm sectors. And as related to local non-farm work, there is a downward bias of migratory earnings due to the reallocation of individuals with better unobserved characteristics out of the migration sector into local non-farm sector. More interestingly, we find that the selectivity in migration is significantly tied to other household members' migration experiences. For migrants from households that other members had not moved in the past three years (thus we view these individuals as pioneer migrants), there is no significant selectivity as related to non-working persons but negative selection as related to local non-farm workers. On the other hand for migrants belonging to households that other members had moved, the estimation results show a significant positive selectivity as related to non-working persons, and positive, but insignificant selectivity as related to local non-farm workers. The selection bias as related to local farm work is positive in each subgroup.