Please forgive my poor English.

Thank you for your patience.

Quality of Life of Migrant Workers:

Labor Rights, Working Conditions and Social Security

Bi Xianjin

Department of sociology, Nanjing University

E-MAIL: dpu2002@163.com

Quality of Life of Migrant Workers:

Labor Rights, Working Conditions and Social Security

Bi Xianjin

Department of sociology, Nanjing University

ABSTRACT

The quality of life (QOL) is an important topic in many social science researches, but studies rarely focus on QOL of migrant workers. Using data on migrant workers of the Yangtze River Delta (YRD) and the Pearl River Delta (PRD) in 2010, this study examined the effects of labor rights, working conditions, and social security on QOL of migrant workers. The results are showed that labor rights, working conditions and industrial injury insurance have significant effects on QOL of migrant workers. The use of social security to QOL of migrant workers needs further evaluation. Furthermore, QOL of migrant workers in the Yangtze River Deltas is better than the Pearl River Delta.

INTRODUCTION

The total amount of migrant workers was 262.61 million in 2012 (National Bureau of Statistics of the People's Republic of China, 2013). A large number of migrant workers have made important contributions to economic and social development in China. It is obvious that their quality of life (QOL) is not good in fact. From a macro perspective, there are three reasons on improving migrant workers' QOL: first, migrant workers are main force of urbanization, their QOL is directly related to urbanization; second, the improvement of QOL is useful for expanding domestic demand and boosting Chinese economy (Li Peilin & Tian feng, 2012); third, good QOL of migrant workers is useful for Social stability.

QOL is an important topic in many different social sciences. Studies in the west are better, but its applicability to China still needs to examine. Most of the researches in China are statistical descriptions, less of them focus on influencing factors about QOL. Studies in the west lack

Chinese experiences and studies pay less attention to migrant workers in China.

I argue that we must considerthese characteristics of migrant workers when we study QOL of them. Labor rights of migrant workers are vulnerable, working conditions are relatively bad, and the coverage of social security is low. As a result, I think we should study QOL of migrant workers from these three perspectives. Based on Survey of Migrant Workers in the Pearl River Delta(PRD) and the Yangtze River Delta(YRD) in 2010, I use statistical model to examine influencing factors about QOL of migrant workers and this is exactly my aim in this paper.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

RESEARCH ON QOL AND CHINESE MIGRANT WORKERS IN THE WEST

In the 1960s, the research on quality of life was isolated as a specialized field, whose importance has drawn attention of many subjects, such as economics, psychology and sociology (Schuessler & Fisher, 1985). In the Quality of Life Research and Sociology coauthored by Schuessler and Fisher, the authors made a thorough review of the basic state of the research on quality of life in the US and Canada, which involved the definition, the measure, the empirical research, the theoretical points and the impact on the public policies of the quality of life, and made a brave prediction on the future of the research on quality of life in the field of sociology.

Mark Schneider (1975) has ever pointed out in his research on the construction of the quality of life index of American metropolis that the concept of quality of life could serve as the tool to make a research on the comparison between different social indexes, and he proposed that the quality of life could be evaluated from two aspects, the subjective and the objective point of view, both of which should be attached great importance in the research of social index of the future. Through the analysis of the relevant statistics, there is no relationship between the objective social index on social welfare and the subjective quality of life closely connected with one's personal experience on the city level. However, someone could not share his point of view. Ira M.Wasserman and Lily Aurora Chua (1980) have carried out a test of the research results of Mark Schineider by making use of the data from the survey in 1972 and 1973 and them expressed their criticism of Schneider's research. Both of them hold the idea that the subject and object elements on quality of life under certain circumstances are related to each other and essence of the relationship requires

to be further explored.

Ed Diener and Eunkook Suh (1997) have made a discussion of the three methods of evaluating quality of life: social indicators, subjective well-being measures and economic indices, and they also reviewed the merits and shortcomings of each one and pointed out that each of the methods has embraced some information that could not be entirely contained in another one. Through the comparative study of 43 countries in the early 1990s, Ruut Veenhoven (1999) found out that the level of individualism of the country was positively correlated with the quality of life of each individual, but this positive correlation depends on the educational level and economic prosperity. Later on, Ruut Veenhoven (2000) has established four categories of quality of life: livability of the environment, life-ability of the individual, external utility of life and inner appreciation of life. However, Ruut pointed out that the overall evaluation of quality of life was unreal.

Sirgy et al. have reviewed these studies on QOL comprehensively. This paper included concepts, philosophical foundations, sociological origins, contributions of economics, subjective well-being, health-related studies, and studies from industrial and organizational psychology of QOL. Finally, the authors forecasted the future of researches on QOL. The authors argued that researches on QOL would make substantial progress. Among them, many scholars focused on the relationship between self-reported health and QOL (Michalos, Zumbo & Hubley, 2000;Taillefer, Dupuis, Roberge & Le May, 2003; Maite Solans et al.,2008; Petersen-Ewert, Erhart & Ravens-Sieberer, 2011; Noyes & Edwards, 2011).

From the above analysis, we may draw the conclusion that there are five features of the research esmade by scholars in the west. First, they have attached great importance to the construction of quality of life index. Second, they emphasized empirical study. Third, they pay more attention to make theoretical conclusion from the empirical researches. Fourth, the nature of the research is interdisciplinary. Fifth, specific trends in QOL appear, such as subjective well-being, job satisfaction, and so on. But it cannot be denied that studies in the west pay less attention to the QOL of the vulnerable groups.

Relatively speaking, studies on Chinese migrant workers in the west are less. The exiting literature mainly focuses on four aspects: institutional factors about migrant workers and professional features (Zhao, 1999a; Zhao, 1999b; Rozelle et al., 1999; Roberts, 2001), industrial relations (Zhu, 2004; Ngai et al., 2009; Chan &Pun, 2009; Becker, 2012), shortage of migrant

labor and unemployment of migrant workers(Shao et al., 2007; Chan, 2010), psychological state of migrant workers in urban city (Wong et al., 2007), and so on. From these studies, we can draw a conclusion that studies in the west pay no attention to QOL of migrant workers.

RESEARCH ON QOL IN CHINA: FROM DESCRIPTION TO STATISTICAL TEST

Before 2005, studies on QOL in China mainly focused on urban residents and constructed the index of QOL(Lin Nan et al., 1987; Lin Nan & Lu Hanlong, 1989; Lu Shuhua & Wei Luying, 1992; Feng Xiaotian & Yi Songguo, 2000), rarely payed attention to other groups, especially migrant workers.

After 2005, scholars began to focus on QOL of migrant workers. Studies in China can be divided into two categories: first, statistical descriptions of migrant workers' QOL based on survey data; second, construction of index of migrant workers' QOL by using factor analysis.

STATISTICAL DESCRIPTION

Using the World Health Organization Quality Of Life With 100questions (WHOQOL-100), Liu Jinhong et al. (2006) conducted a survey of 80 migrant workers in a large electronics factory in Shenzhen. They found those migrant workers' physiological states, psychological states, and social relations were worse than norm, the QOL of men were worse than women. This study may have three questions: first, its sample size was small; second, they did not analyze influencing factors which led into bad QOL of migrant workers; third, they did not consider the applicability of WHOQOL-100 in China.

Zong Chengfeng and Zhu Qizhen (2007) took 897 migrant workers in Nanchang as samples and made a survey from 12 perspectives, the sex, the age, educational background, industries engaged, time period of migrant working experience, income, stability of the work, safety of the work, residence, medical treatment, spiritual life and the satisfaction of his living conditions by questionnaire survey and deep interview. Song Zhishen, Tanjie and Wang Xiangyong(2007) have also made a survey on the living conditions of migrant workers and found that there is great gap between the migrant workers and city dwellers from the perspective of income, the ability of consumption, residence, health and medical care, working hours, social security and the protection of their benefits. A national survey made by the research group of State Statistics Bureau(2007a) for the quality of life of migrant workers in August 2006 has demonstrated the poor living

conditions of migrant workers, the prolonged working hours, the high spending of living, the poor educational background, the low social securities, the bad working and living environment and the fewer training and entertainment. The above researches are helpful to get to know the quality of life of migrant workers, but they are short of the deep analysis and statistical test of the elements that affect the living conditions of migrant workers.

CONSTRUCTION OF INDEX

Based on the previous survey, the research group of State Statistics Bureau（2007b；2007c）constructed "the index of quality of life of migrant workers", which embrace income and consumption, residence, health, medical treatment, working hours, social security and the protection of benefits. By means of no-dimension analysis, principal component analysis and consultation to experts, they confirmed the weight of each index and eventually drew the conclusion that the index of quality of life of migrant workers in 2006 is 0.532, which means the quality of life of migrant workers is equal to 53.2% of that of the city dwellers. Later, they used the index of quality of life as dependent variable, and analysis the influence of population characteristics variable, human capital and census register variable, household characteristics variable, working characteristics variable and regional variable to quality of life by regression analysis. It is necessary to point out the three problems of the above two research. First, it is very difficult to standardize the affirmation of the weight of those indexes and the comparative study would be hard to implement. Second, since quality of life index which serves as the dependent variable has involved the income of migrant workers, there should not be income variable in independent variables. It is impossible for a variable to be equipped with both of the two identities in serious statistical analysis. Third, the value of the index is hard to remain neutral. In the research, the analysis of the index should be attached more importance than the measurement (Cob, ,2001).

Liu Yulin and Liu Ming (2009) made a research on the quality of life of migrant workers in Chongqing province by the usage of factorial analysis and regression analysis and he proposed that the elements like employment, material life, social security, protection of benefits, mental and physical health, spiritual life are the primary influential elements to the quality of life of migrant workers.

Based on the above mentioned, I think we should focus on three questions: first, how to

measure QOL of migrant workers? second, empirical descriptions without statistical test cannot find influencing mechanism of migrant workers' QOL; third, we should consider the special features of migrant workers when we analyze QOL of them.

HYPOTHESIS

Previous studies showed migrant workers' occupations, living conditions, and social relations were different from citizens and peasants, they belonged to a marginal group. So, researches on QOL of migrant workers not only cannot copy western studies, also cannot fully use urban residents' index of QOL.

QOL of migrant workers reflects their living conditions. Labor rights are vulnerable because of their informal employment; therefore their QOL may be affected. Whether have opinions to labor rights or not, it can be an important indicator to measure their labor rights. The longer they work, they must have less time to enjoy their life, and QOL will be lower. Forced labor can affect migrant workers' subjective feeling of work. So, I propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: labor rights affect QOL of migrant workers.

1a: QOL of migrant workers who have opinions of labor rights to companies is worse;

1b: the longer they work, the worse their QOL is;

1c: QOL of migrant workers who are forced to work is worse.

Because of their relatively bad human capital, most of migrant workers' occupations are more likely dangerous. This may lead into bad evaluation, thus affect their subjective cognition to their QOL. So, I put forward another hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: working conditions affect QOL of migrant workers.

2a: QOL of migrant workers who work in danger is worse;

2b: QOL of migrant workers who work in poisonous environment is worse.

Many studies in the west pointed that social welfare affect QOL; many researches in China consider that conditions of social security affect QOL. But the author found that migrant workers did not want to buy social security. The author argues that we should study impacts of social security on QOL closely. Therefore, I develop the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: social security conditions of migrant workers affect QOL.

3a: QOL of migrant workers who have endowment insurance is better;

3b: QOL of migrant workers who have medical insurance is better;

3c: QOL of migrant workers who have industrial injury insurance is better;

3d: QOL of migrant workers who have unemployment insurance is better;

Many factors can affect QOL, it is hard to study comprehensively in a paper. It is reasonable we study QOL of migrant workers from perspectives of labor rights, working conditions, and social security.

DATA AND VARIABLES

DATA

The data used in this paper were mainly from the questionnaire survey in 2010 to the Pearl River Delta (PRD) and Yangtze river Delta migrant workers. PRD cities include Guangzhou, Shenzhen, Zhuhai, Foshan, Zhaoqing, Dongguan, Huizhou, Zhongshan and Jiangmen, the Yangtze River Delta (YRD) cities include Shanghai, Nanjing, Suzhou, Wuxi, Changzhou, Nantong, Hangzhou, Ningbo, Jiaxing and Shaoxing. Specific sampling plan can be referenced from Liu Linping, Zheng Guanghuai, Sun Zhongwei (2011). A total of 4254 copies of questionnaires, among which 4152 are valid questionnaires, the effective rate were 97.6% (Liu Linping, Yong Xin, Shu Binbin, 2011).

VARIABLES

DEPENDENT VARIABLE

The dependent variable of this research is QOL of migrant workers, we measure it by 12 items in the questionnaire (see table 1). Reliability coefficient of Cronbach's Alpha is 0.8999. Based on principal component analysis (pca), I use factor analysis to deal with these 12 items on QOL. After Variation of compaction, I draw two factors (see table 2). These two factors represent one of the main features of the 12 variables; the variance contribution rate reached 58.2%, KMO value of 0.9290. According to the load factor, the two factors respectively named "factor of environmental quality of life" and "factor of working quality of life". "Factor of environmental quality of life" includes: public security, traffic conditions, educational quality of children, government management, public service, social justice, and ecological environment. "Factor of working quality of life" includes: employment opportunities, wage level, welfare, work environment, and

quality of life. In order to integrate into a variable, I put the two factors of value multiplied by its variance contribution rate respectively, and then added, as the quality of life of migrant workers factor score, that is: factor score of QOL of migrant workers=factor1×0.3344+factor2×0.2481. In order to facilitate analysis, the formula is used to change the quality of life factor score from 1 to 100. After transformation, the mean of migrant workers' QOL 56.17 (standard deviation is 16.64).

Table 1. Measurement of QOL of Migrant Workers

Items	Score	Frequency	Percentage
Employment opportunities	0-4	0:58; 1:422; 2:1462; 3:1567; 4:632	0:1.40; 1:10.19; 2:35.31; 3:37.84; 4:15.26
Wage level,	0-4	0:89; 1:723; 2:2083; 3:1093; 4:159	0:2.15; 1:17.43; 2:50.23; 3:26.36; 4:3.83
Welfare	0-4	0:419; 1:1031; 2:1731; 3:795; 4:165	0:10.12; 1:24.90; 2:41.80; 3:19.20; 4:3.98
Working conditions	0-4	0:163; 1:725; 2:1717; 3:1255; 4:284	0:3.93; 1:17.50; 2:41.43; 3:30.28; 4:6.85
QOL	0-4	0:120; 1:764; 2:1766; 3:1244; 4:245	0:2.90; 1:18.46; 2:42.67; 3:30.06; 4:5.92
Public security	0-4	0:205; 1:688; 2:1239; 3:1499; 4:512	0:4.95; 1:16.61; 2:29.91; 3:36.18; 4:12.36
Traffic conditions	0-4	0:130; 1:571; 2:1217; 3:1624; 4:600	0:3.14; 1:13.79; 2:29.38; 3:39.21; 4:14.49
Educational quality of children	0-4	0:169; 1:523; 2:1533; 3:1216; 4:388	0:4.41; 1:13.66; 2:40.04; 3:31.76; 4:10.13
Government management	0-4	0: 226; 1:710; 2:1610; 3:1254; 4:270	0:5.55; 1:17.44; 2:39.56; 3:30.81; 4:6.63
Public service	0-4	0:226; 1:735; 2:1573; 3:1274; 4:301	0:5.50; 1:17.89; 2:38.28; 3:31.01; 4:7.33
Social justice	0-4	0:314; 1:864; 2:1669; 3:1023; 4:224	0:7.67; 1:21.10; 2:40.77; 3:24.99; 4:5.47
Ecological environment	0-4	0:199; 1:642; 2:1414; 3:1430; 4:458	0:4.80; 1:15.50; 2:34.13; 3:34.52; 4:11.05

Note: The higher scores show that the conditions are good.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

This part introduces these independent variables simply. Control variables include: age, sex, years of education, marital status, self-reported health conditions, income balance, per-capita living space, and region. Explanatory variables include three sets: labor rights, working conditions, and social security.

Table 2. Factor Analysis of Migrant Workers' QOL

Items	Factor of Environmental QOL	Factor of Working QOL	Uniqueness
Employment opportunities	0.1636	**0.6481**	0.5532
Wage level,	0.2187	**0.7887**	0.3301
Welfare	0.2243	**0.7779**	0.3446
Work environment	0.3706	**0.6773**	0.4040
QOL	0.4430	**0.6284**	0.4088
Public security	**0.7154**	0.2456	0.4278
Traffic conditions	**0.6959**	0.1627	0.4892
Educational quality of children	**0.6367**	0.2538	0.5302
Government management	**0.7875**	0.2622	0.3111
Public service	**0.7546**	0.3003	0.3405
Social justice	**0.7191**	0.3105	0.3865
Ecological environment	**0.6675**	0.2645	0.4844
Eigenvalues	5.81910	1.17050	
Mean-variance(%)	48.4925	9.7542	58.25

I use three variables to measure labor rights: whether have opinions to labor rights or not, working time, and forced labor. Migrant workers who have opinions of labor rights to companies are 22.26%. Working time is working hours every week. Migrant workers who have to work more than 8 hours every day is 47.30%, 75.56% of migrant workers have to work six or seven days every week. 4.97% of the migrant workers in the enterprise faced forced labor.

Measurements of working conditions include: working in dangerous conditions without safety instruments and working in poisonous or noisy environment. Migrant workers who work in dangerous conditions without safety instruments are 4.24%, those who work in poisonous or noisy environment are one fifth.

Measurements of social security include: endowment insurance (44.07%), medical insurance (50.06%), industrial injury insurance (52.07%), and unemployment insurance (25.55%). Among them, the low proportion of unemployment insurance is less than thirty percent.

Statistical descriptions of main independent variables are shown in table 3.

Table 3. Statistical Description of Main Independent Variables（N=4152）

Variables	Variable description	Mean	S.D	Percentage
Age	age of respondents	30.43	9.51	
Sex	female=0，male=1			0:45.76；1:54.24
Years of education	years of education	10.20	2.74	
Marital status	unmarried=0, married=1			0:40.83；1:59.17
Self-reported health	unhealthy=0，healthy=1			0:37.08；1:62.92
Income balance	no=0，yes=1			0:27.17；1:72.83
Per-capita living space	per-capita living space (㎡/person)	13.05	12.50	
YRD	PRD=0，YRD=1			0:49.28；1:50.72
Opinions to labor rights	no=0，yes=1			0:77.74；1:22.26
Working time	working time every week(hours/week)	56.34	15.19	
Forced labor	no=0，yes=1			0:95.03；1:4.97
Adventure work	no=0，yes=1			0: 95.76；1:4.24
Environmental hazards	no=0，yes=1			0:80.90；1:19.10
Endowment insurance	no=0，yes=1			0:55.93；1:44.07
Medical insurance	no=0，yes=1			0:49.94；1:50.06
Industrial injury insurance	no=0，yes=1			0:47.93；1: 52.07
Unemployment insurance	no=0，yes=1			0:74.45；1:25.55

RESULTS

QOL of migrant workers is dependent variable in this paper. After dealing with it, it is a continuous variable, so I use OLS regression model. In order to examine effects (labor rights, working conditions, and social security), I use nested model. To be specific, there are control variables in model 1. I add variables of labor rights in model 2, then variables of working conditions in model 3, variables of social security in model 4. Three sets of variables are added step by step, explanatory power increased from mode1 1 to model 4.The results of models are shown in table 4.

Results in table 4 are shown that age, physical health, balance income, per-capita living space, and region are significant factors to QOL of migrant workers. The sex variable has a significant effect in model 3 only, but does not have a significant effect when the social security variables are added in model 4. This probably means that the effect of sex is affected by social security. Years of education are significant in model 1-3, but are not significant as social security added in model 4. This probably means that education (human capital) does not have significant effects on QOL of

migrant workers. Health status has significant effects on QOL and studies in the west on relations between health and QOL are verified.

Table 4. OLS Regression Estimates of Influencing Factors of QOL

	model1	model2	model3	model4
	coef. (S.E.)	coef. (S.E.)	coef. (S.E.)	coef. (S.E.)
Control variables				
Age	0.258*** (0.038)	0.255***(0.037)	0.244***(0.037)	0.245***(0.037)
Male(female=0)	0.092(0.530)	0.538(0.526)	0.930*(0.532)	0.856 (0.534)
Years of education	0.440***(0.103)	0.286***(0.105)	0.249**(0.105)	0.161(0.109)
Married (unmarried=0)	-0.691(0.724)	-0.867(0.717)	-0.873(0.714)	-1.060 (0.716)
Self-reported health (unhealthy=0)	4.534***(0.536)	3.835***(0.536)	3.602***(0.537)	3.527***(0.537)
Income balance (no=0)	3.054***(0.582)	3.053***(0.577)	3.006***(0.575)	2.930***(0.576)
Per-capita living space	0.069***(0.021)	0.059***(0.021)	0.055***(0.021)	0.050**(0.021)
YRD (PRD=0)	11.38***(0.524)	10.85***(0.521)	10.85***(0.520)	10.84***(0.532)
Labor rights				
Opinions to labor rights (no=0)		-3.834***(0.630)	-3.372***(0.634)	-3.314***(0.634)
Working time		-0.090***(0.018)	-0.088***(0.018)	-0.077***(0.018)
Forced labor (no=0)		-3.318***(1.196)	-2.322*(1.218)	-2.347*(1.218)
Working conditions				
Adventure work (no=0)			-2.620**(1.333)	-2.420*(1.335)
Environmental hazards (no=0)			-2.820***(0.692)	-2.845***(0.693)
Social security				
Endowment insurance (no=0)				-0.000364(0.826)
Medical insurance(no=0)				-0.179(0.828)
Industrial injury insurance(no=0)				1.243*(0.689)
Unemployment insurance(no=0)				1.145(0.780)
Constant	32.10***(1.644)	40.52***(2.068)	41.65***(2.074)	41.44***(2.099)
N	3,484	3484	3,484	3484
R-squared	0.185	0.204	0.210	0.212

Note: * $p<0.1$，** $p<0.05$，*** $p<0.01$

Ceteris paribus, three results are shown: first, hypothesis 1a, 1b, and 1c are confirmed; second, hypothesis 2a and 2b are confirmed; third, hypothesis 3c is confirmed, hypothesis 3a, 3b, and 3d

have not been confirmed.

In summary, I argue: firstly, the labor rights have a significant effect on QOL of migrant workers; secondly, adventure work and environmental hazards have negative effects on QOL of migrant workers; finally, industrial injury insurance has significant effects.

CONCLUSION

LABOR RIGNTS AND QOL

OPINIONS ON LABOR RIGHTS

Measurements about the labor rights are very complex. The author argues that opinions on labor rights affect the subjective feeling. I use the question "do you have opinions on labor rights to the enterprises since August 2009?" as an indicator for measuring status of labor rights. Migrant workers who have opinions are worse than those who have no opinions in QOL. Labor rights affect QOL of migrant workers directly.

WORKING HOURS PER WEEK

Leisure is of importance in life. Veblen (2009) discussed it carefully. Empirical studies showed that positive leisure activitieswere helpful in promoting economic growth (Yu Changlin, 2006) and improving the subjective well-being (Wei Xiang, Chen Qian, 2012). The mean of migrant workers' working hours is 56.34 hours per week. Long time to work no leisure time, this must lead to bad QOL. The results of OLS regression show that our points of view are verified.

FORCED LABOR

Forced labor has significant effects on QOL in model 2-4. The percentage of migrant workers who are forced to work is about 5% in sample. Although this is low, laborers are forced to work against their wishes. This will lead to bad QOL of migrant workers.

WORKING CONDITIONS AND QOL

Studies have found that working at risk had no significant effects on migrant workers' mental health (Liu Linping, Zheng Guanghuai & Sun Zhongwei, 2011). Most of relevant studies suggested that migrant workers were accustomed to working at risk. But ceteris paribus, QOL of migrant workers who work at risk is worse than others in my paper. Working in hazardous

environment has a negative effect on QOL.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND QOL

Studies have found that social security level affected QOL of migrant workers. But in my study, I find that industrial injury insurance has a significant effect on QOL of migrant workers and other insurance (e.g., endowment insurance, medical insurance, and unemployment insurance) has no significant effects on migrant workers' QOL. Considering the mean of age in the sample (only 30-year-old), these effects will gradually emerge. Because of the high occupational mobility of migrant workers, unemployment insurance has no effect on their QOL. In field studies, we found that migrant workers did not realize the importance of social security. Existing data also proves this point of view (see table 5).

Table 5.   The Proportion of Migrant Workers Who Participate in Social Security(%)

Year	Endowment insurance	Medical insurance	Industrial injury insurance	Unemployment insurance
2009	7.6	12.2	21.8	3.9
2010	9.5	14.3	24.1	4.9
2011	13.9	16.7	23.6	8.0

Note：according to *China's migrant workers survey monitoring report* by National Bureau of Statistics of the People's Republic of China from 2009 to 2011.

In view of migrant workers' characteristics, I argue that we should not copy western theories blindly and should not use studies of urban residents' QOL to understand migrant workers'.

DISCUSSION

We should discuss four questions also: human capital, self-reported health, housing, and regional differences.

First, level of education is important to QOL. But according to my study, I find years of education have no significant effect on QOL of migrant workers. One possible reason is generally lower level of education of migrant workers. Hence, we should improve migrant workers' QOL by professional skills training instead of regular education.

Second, self-reported health status is an important factor to QOL. Self-reported health status is a subjective indicator and it is always a significant dimension (Bryant & Veroff, 1984). As a result, we should study the relation between self-reported health status and QOL.

Third, per capita residential area and living facilities are important indicators (Lin Nan et. al., 1987; Lin Nan & Lu Hanlong, 1989; Lu Shuhua & Wei Luying, 1992). For migrant workers' living facilities are simple, so the number of living facilities as an indicator of QOL is not suitable.

Fourth, QOL of migrant workers in YRD scored an average of nearly 11 points above in PRD. Liu Linping et al. (2011) found YRD in wage level, signing labor contracts, buying social security, and working condition, is better than PRD. To some extent, QOL of migrant workers in YRD is better than PRD because of labor rights, working conditions, and social security. Regional differences between YRD and PRD should be studied further in future.

Finally, I argue that policies on improving QOL of migrant workers should be made from the perspective of migrant workers instead of states. If we want to improve migrant workers' QOL, we should protect their labor rights, improve their working conditions, and help them to realize the use of social security.

REFERENCES

边燕杰、李煜，2000，《中国城市家庭的社会网络资本》，载清华大学社会学系主编，《清华社会学评论》（第二辑），厦门：鹭江出版社。

凡勃伦著，2009，《有闲阶级论——关于制度的经济研究》，蔡受百译，北京：商务印书馆。

风笑天、易松国，2000，《城市居民家庭生活质量：指标及其结构》，《社会学研究》第 4 期。

国家统计局课题组，2007，《城市农民工生活质量状况调查报告》，《调研世界》第 1 期。

国家统计局课题组，2007，《中国农民工生活质量指数评价研究》，《统计研究》第 2 期。

国家统计局课题组，2007《中国农民工生活质量影响因素分析统计研究》，《统计研究》第 3 期。

克利福德·科布、克雷格·里克斯福德，2011，《社会指标的历史教训》， 宾建成编译，《经济社会体制比较》第 5 期。

李培林、田丰，2012，《中国农民工社会融入的代际比较》，《社会》第 5 期。

林南、卢汉龙，1989，《社会指标与生活质量的结构模型探讨——关于上海城市居民生活的一项研究》，《中国社会科学》第 4 期。

林南、王玲、潘允康、袁国华，1987，《生活质量的结构与指标》，《社会学研究》第 6 期。

刘晋洪、张泉水、陈家建、张秀芬、黄晓宇、夏莉，2006，《深圳市外来工生活质量调查与分析》，《中国行为医学科学》第 12 期。

刘林平、雍昕、舒玢玢，2011，《劳动权益的地区差异——基于对长三角和珠三角农民工的问卷调查》，《中国社会科学》第 2 期。

刘林平、郑广怀、孙中伟，2011，《劳动权益与精神健康——基于对长三角和珠三角农民工的问卷调查》，《社会学研究》第 4 期。

刘瑜林、刘明，2009，《重庆市农民工生活质量现状及影响因素分析》，《中国人口科学》第 2 期。

卢淑华、韦鲁英，1992，《生活质量主客观指标作用机制研究》，《中国社会科学》第 1 期。

宋志申、谭杰、王象永，2007，《山东省农民工就业与生活状况调查》，《调研世界》第 7 期。

魏翔、陈倩，2012，《闲暇如何影响经济增长——幸福感与经济效率关系的理论研究与仿真模拟》，《财经研究》第 4 期。

余长林，2006，《教育、闲暇与经济增长——理论模型与经验分析》，《南开经济研究》第 1 期。

詹姆斯·C.斯科特，2012，《国家的视角——那些试图改善人类状况的项目是如何失败的》，王晓毅译，北京：社会科学文献出版社。

中华人民共和国国家统计局，2013，《中华人民共和国 2012 年国民经济和社会发展统计公报》，http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjgb/ndtjgb/qgndtjgb/t20130221_402874525.htm。

宗成峰、朱启臻，2007，《农民工生存状况实证分析——对南昌市 897 位样本农民工的调查与分析》，《中国农村观察》第 1 期。

Becker J(2012). The Knowledge to Act Chinese Migrant Labor Protests in Comparative Perspective. Comparative Political Studies. 45(11): pp.1379-1404.

Bryant FB, Veroff J(1984). Dimensions of subjective mental health in American men and women. Journal of Health and Social Behavior. pp.116-135.

Chan CKC, Pun N(2009). The making of a new working class? A study of collective actions of migrant workers in South China. The China Quarterly. 198(1):pp.287-303.

Chan KW(2010). The global financial crisis and migrant workers in China: here is no future as a labourer; returning to the village has no meaning. International journal of urban and regional research. 34(3):pp.659-677.

Diener E, Suh E(1997). Measuring quality of life: Economic, social, and subjective indicators. Social indicators research. 40(1-2): pp.189-216.

Idler EL, Benyamini Y(1997). Self-rated health and mortality: a review of twenty-seven community studies. Journal of health and social behavior.38(1):pp.21-37.

Michalos AC, Zumbo BD, Hubley A(2000).Health And The Quality Of Life. Social Indicators Research.51: pp.245-286.

Ngai P, Chi Chan CK, Chan J(2009). The Role of the State, Labour Policy and Migrant Workers' Struggles in Globalized China. Global Labour Journal.1(1): pp.132-151.

Noyes J, Edwards RT(2011). EQ-5D for the assessment of health-related quality of life and resource allocation in children: a systematic methodological review. Value in Health.14(8): pp.1117-1129.

Petersen-Ewert C, Erhart M, Ravens-Sieberer U(2011). Assessing health-related quality of life in European children and adolescents. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews.35(8): pp.1752-1756.

Qi, Yaqiang, W. M. Mason, & P. Hu. 2009."A Comparative Analysis of Self-Rated General Health in Three Developing Countries."Paper presented at the annual meeting of Population Association of America, Detroit, Michigan.

Roberts KD(2001). The determinants of job choice by rural labor migrants in Shanghai. China Economic Review.12(1): pp. 15-39.

Rozelle S, Guo L, Shen M, Hughart A., Giles J(1999). Leaving China's farms: survey results of new paths and remaining hurdles to rural migration. The China Quarterly. 158: pp367-393.

Schneider M (1975). The quality of life in large American cities: Objective and subjective social indicators. Social Indicators Research.1(4):pp. 495-509.

Schuessler KF, Fisher GA(1985). Quality of life research and sociology. Annual Review of Sociology.11:pp.129-149.

Shao S, Nielsen I, Nyland C, Smyth R, Zhang M, Zhu CJ(2007). Migrants as Homo Economicus Explaining the Emerging Phenomenon of a Shortage of Migrant Labor in China's Coastal Provinces. China Information.21(1):pp.7-41.

Sirgy MJ, Michalos AC, Ferriss AL, Easterlin RA, Patrick D, Pavot W(2006). The Qualityity-of-Life (QOL) Research Movement: Past, Present, and Future. Social Indicators Research. 76(3):pp.343-466.

Solans M, Pane S, Estrada MD, Serra-Sutton V, Berra S, Herdman M, Rajmil L(2008). Health-related quality of life measurement in children and adolescents: a systematic review of generic and disease-specific instruments. Value in Health. 11(4):pp.742-764.

Taillefer MC, Dupuis G, Roberge MA, LeMay S(2003). Health-related quality of life models: Systematic review of the literature. Social Indicators Research. 64(2):pp.293-323.

Veenhoven R(1999). Quality-of-life in individualistic society. Social Indicators Research.48(2): pp.157-186.

Veenhoven R(2000). The four qualities of life. Journal of happiness studies.1(1):pp. 1-39.

Wasserman I M, Chua LA(1980). Objective and subjective social indicators of the quality of life in American SMSA's: A reanalysis. Social Indicators Research.8(3):pp. 365-381.

Wong KFuD, Li CY, Song HX(2007). Rural migrant workers in urban China: living a marginalised life. International Journal of Social Welfare. 16(1):pp.32-40.

Woronov TE(2011). Learning to serve: Urban youth, vocational schools and new class formations in China. The China Journal. (66):pp.77-99.

Zhao Y(1999). Labor migration and earnings differences: the case of rural China. Economic Development and Cultural Change.47(4):pp.767-782.

Zhao Y(1999). Leaving the countryside: rural-to-urban migration decisions in China. The American Economic Review.89(2):pp.281-286.

Zhu Y(2004). Workers, Unions and the State: Migrant Workers in China's Labour‐intensive Foreign Enterprises. Development and change.35(5):pp.1011-1036.