Labor Mobility in Urban China

-Evidence from 2010 CULS3

John Gile & Qu Yue

Job changes reflect both decisions of employers and employee. During the whole career, employees seek for and move to better opportunities. To some extent, employee moving is also a result of lost job of failed self-owned enterprise. It should be said that mobility across industries reflects both the short-term labor market response to GFC and long-term structural change in economy. In this paper, we want to describe the labor mobility in urban China base on the China Urban Labor Survey in 2010 (CULS23). Furthermore, according to the basic description we want to analysis how much mobility is toward more secure employment. Specifically, we need to investigate whether the mobility has the trend from informal to formal employment, how does mobility differ across man and woman, whether there is some difference between characteristics of the mobility before and after the financial crisis in 2008, and what the determinant affecting the mobility.

1. Description

It should be noted that it needs the information of work history to describe the work mobility between the formal / informal sector during 2006-2010. So we can only use the limited information from work history to definite the formal / informal employment by making relatively simple division. The specific definition and criteria of informal employment are followed:

I Self -employed or Own Account Workers

II Family Helpers

III Noncontract Workers

1.1 Informal employment distribution

Table 1 shows the description on the formal / informal employment of local workers and migrant workers in three time points of 2010, Oct 2008 and 2006. We notice that the proportion of local workers engaged in formal employment is far greater than its level of migrant workers. For example, there are 73.76% of local workers but only half of the migrant workers engaged in the formal employment in 2010. Meanwhile, there is no obvious change on the ratio of the informal employment

/ formal employment to the total employment for the local workers. The proportion of informal employment has decreased a little for the migrant workers (from 52.4% to 49.01%). Furthermore, the main part of the informal employment for local workers is the non-contract workers, and a little part is self-employed or own account workers. For the migrant workers, the informal employment is mainly composed of self-employed or own account workers and non-contract workers.

Table 1 Summarizations on the formal/informal employment in 2010, Oct 2008 & 2010 (%)

	2010		Oct. 2008		2006	
	Local	**Migrant**	**Local**	**Migrant**	**Local**	**Migrant**
Formal employment	73.76	50.99	75.06	50.39	73.34	47.60
Informal employment	26.24	49.01	24.94	49.61	26.66	52.40
Inf 1	7.63	22.9	7.83	25.10	7.75	24.79
Inf 2	1.21	3.13	1.11	3.31	1.18	3.78
Inf 3	17.39	22.99	16.00	21.2	17.73	23.83
Total Number	**5490**	**5671**	**4560**	**3992**	**4839**	**4548**

Note: **Inf 1**-Self-employed or Own Account Workers; **Inf 2**-Family Helpers; **Inf 3**- Non-contract Workers.

Source: Author's calculation based on CULS3.

Table 2 shows the formal / informal employment distribution in 6 different cities. We can see that there are some differences among the situation in different cities. For example, Shanghai has the highest proportion of informal employment. The proportion of informal employment for local and migrant workers is 91.14% and 61.56% respectively. For the local workers, more than half of all the employment in Shenyang is informal employment, which is the highest one in 6 cities. And the biggest disparity between local workers and migrant workers appeared in Wuhan, with 69% of the local workers and only 13.86% of migrant workers engaged in formal employment. At the same time, Wuhan is also the city has the lowest proportion of formal employment for migrant workers among 6 cities.

Table 2 Summarization on the formal/informal employment in 2010 (by city, %)

	6 cities	**Shanghai**	**Wuhan**	**Local Shenyang**	**Fuzhou**	**Xian**	**Guangzhou**
Formal employment	73.76	91.14	69.34	48.74	70.38	66.85	70.93
Informal employment	26.24	8.86	30.66	51.26	29.62	33.15	29.07
Inf 1	7.63	2.06	9.92	10.94	8.74	10.11	11.46
Inf 2	1.21	0.71	2.21	1.39	2.10	0.50	1.07
Inf 3	17.39	6.09	18.52	38.94	18.78	22.54	16.55
Total Number	5490	753	1128	804	979	884	942

				Migrant			
	6 cities	Shanghai	Wuhan	Shenyang	Fuzhou	Xian	Guangzhou
Formal employment	50.99	61.56	13.86	29.26	41.95	34.04	56.4
Informal employment	49.01	38.44	86.14	70.74	58.05	65.96	43.60
Inf 1	22.9	16.96	60.29	33.52	21.45	29.19	18.94
Inf 2	3.13	3.55	11.57	1.75	3.29	5.62	1.32
Inf 3	22.99	17.92	14.28	35.48	33.32	31.15	23.35
Total Number	5671	976	1028	851	820	1008	988

Note: **Inf 1**-Self-employed or Own Account Workers; **Inf 2**-Family Helpers; **Inf 3**- Non-contract Workers.

Source: Author's calculation based on CULS3.

1.2 Distribution of Employment across Industries

Table 3 and Table 4 offer us the description of local workers and migrant workers engaged in different industries. Take the situation in 2010 for example, about a quarter of local workers engaged in the primary or secondary industry, 3 quarters engaged in the tertiary industry. As for migrant workers, there are more than 80% engaged in the tertiary industry, and less than 20% engaged in the primary & secondary Industry. The proportion of workers engaged in tertiary industry has the trends of rising up to some extent for both the local workers and the migrant workers. Furthermore, table 4 gives us the industrial distribution of local and migrant workers in 6 cities. It can be seen that there are no obvious difference in the employment distribution of industry among various cities. For local workers, the proportion engaged in tertiary industry is about 70-80% in different cities, among them Guangzhou has a higher level of 82.05%, Xi'an has a lower level of 69.23%. For the migrant workers, there are still some disparities of the industrial distribution among different cities. In Shenyang, there are more than 90% of migrant workers engaged in tertiary industry, while the proportion is only 75.96% in Shanghai, it's level in the other four cities are in the range between 80% -90%.

Table 3 Summarization on the working industry in 2010, Oct. 2008 & 2006(%)

	2010		Oct 2008		2006	
	Local	Migrant	Local	Migrant	Local	Migrant
Primary & Secondary Industry	24.74	18.66	27.12	20.6	27.27	23.80
Tertiary Industry	75.26	81.34	72.88	79.4	72.73	76.20
Total Number	5490	5671	4560	3992	4827	4540

Source: Author's calculation based on CULS3.

Table 4 Summarization on the working industry in 2010 (%)

	Local

	Shanghai	Wuhan	Shenyang	Fuzhou	Xian	Guangzhou
Primary & Secondary Industry	27.40	23.56	23.63	20.39	30.77	17.95
Tertiary Industry	72.60	76.44	76.37	79.61	69.23	82.05
Total Number	753	1128	804	979	884	942
			Migrant			
Primary & Secondary Industry	24.04	10.06	9.59	14.49	19.04	18.48
Tertiary Industry	75.96	89.94	90.41	85.51	80.96	81.52
Total Number	976	1028	851	820	1008	988

Source: Author's calculation based on CULS3.

1.3 Distribution of employment in ownership

In table 5 & table 6 we descript the distribution of the labor force in different kind of ownerships. It can be shown that, most of the local work forces were engaged in two main kinds of enterprises, 36.86% in individual or private enterprises and 23.08% in government of party. But for the migrant workers, most of them were engaged in individual or private enterprises, the proportion is 77.16%, and the proportion is rising up during 2006-2010. It also can be seen from Table 6 that there's some difference among cities of the distribution of work forces among ownerships. Such as, more of the local workers in Fuzhou and Wuhan were engaged in government of party (about 30%), which were about 20% in other four cities. At the same time, more of the work forces were engaged in individual or private enterprises in Shenyang, Fuzhou and Guangzhou with its level of about 45%, and the level are 30% in other cities. For the migrant workers, the proportion of workers in government or party is higher in Fuzhou, Xi'an and Guangzhou. There's more workers engaged in individual or private enterprises in Wuhan and Shenyang.

Table 5 Summarization on the ownership in 2010, Oct. 2008 & 2006(%)

	2010		Oct 2008		2006	
	Local	Migrant	Local	Migrant	Local	Migrant
Government or Party	23.08	5.26	23.80	4.78	22.90	4.89
Wholly-State-Owned	15.91	3.22	17.79	3.39	17.67	3.34
Majority-State-Owned	10.62	2.28	11.05	2.49	11.05	2.46
Collective Enterprise	5.39	2.77	5.28	2.75	5.34	2.90
Foreign Invested Enterprise	5.22	4.52	4.41	3.14	4.68	3.34
Individual or Private	36.86	77.16	34.97	76.88	35.43	73.80

Other	2.91	4.78	2.71	6.57	2.94	9.27
OBS	5346	5600	4442	3935	4716	4484

Source: Author's calculation based on CULS3.

Table 6 Summarization on the ownership in 2010 (%)

	Local					
	Shanghai	Wuhan	Shenyang	Fuzhou	Xian	Guangzhou
Government or Party	19.52	28.47	20.63	30.99	22.12	22.83
Wholly-State-Owned	17.99	13.9	12.75	4.51	30.74	9.06
Majority-State-Owned	13.88	13.37	10.66	8.31	5.2	6.44
Collective Enterprise	8.24	3.47	4.13	3.56	5.01	3.85
Foreign Invested Enterprise	8.45	2.9	3.53	3.32	0.96	7.58
Individual or Private	31.06	32.91	45.14	45.04	33.93	45.38
Other	0.86	4.98	3.15	4.25	2.04	4.87
OBS	734	1077	788	947	875	925
	Migrant					
	Shanghai	Wuhan	Shenyang	Fuzhou	Xian	Guangzhou
Government or Party	4.92	2.34	3.50	6.90	7.39	7.97
Wholly-State-Owned	4.01	0.39	2.61	1.11	5.94	2.79
Majority-State-Owned	3.24	0.75	1.05	2.57	2.61	1.86
Collective Enterprise	3.96	1.02	0.86	2.93	3.35	2.40
Foreign Invested Enterprise	7.78	0.46	2.43	4.27	0.43	6.12
Individual or Private	72.92	85.97	81.91	75.55	76.93	76.21
Other	3.18	9.05	7.64	6.67	3.35	2.65
OBS	958	1015	845	800	1004	978

Source: Author's calculation based on CULS3.

2. Labor Mobility

Furthermore, we should take a look on the work mobility of the labor force. Table 7 & Table 8 show the transition matrix of the worker's mobility between formal / informal sectors and also the mobility between the industries.

2.1 Mobility between Formal and Informal Sector

First of all, we can learn from Table 7 that the mobility of migrant workers is much higher than it of the local workers. The mobility of the workers engaged in informal employment is also higher than the labor group engaged in formal employment. The total rate of mobility is 12.73% for all the workers, and is 8.12% and 22.6% for formal employment and informal employment respectively. For the local work force of formal

employment in 2006, 6.89% of them have changed their job in 2006 until 2010. The ratio is 15.8% for the migrant work force. For the local labor force of informal employment in 2006, 18.77% of them have changed their job in 2006 until 2010. The ratio is 30.48% for the migrant work force. The overall results show the trend of mobility from formal employment to informal employment, and the trend is more obvious for the local workers then for migrant workers (which is manifested by the fact of 24.83% of job changing from formal employment to informal employment and 40.84% of job changing from informal employment to formal employment from 2006 to 2010 for local workers; 25.59% of job changing from formal employment to informal employment and 32.3% of job changing from informal employment to formal employment from 2006 to 2010 for migrant workers).

Table 7 Mobility Across Formal/Informal Sectors (2006 to 2010)
All Individuals Changing Jobs After 2006

				Working status in 2010 (As a Percent of Individuals in Sector Changing a Job since2006)		
			Percent of Leaving Job Held in 2006	Formal employment	Informal employment	Unemployed or Not in Labour Force
Working status in 2006	Formal employment	L&M	8.12	74.17	25.04	0.8
		Local	6.89	74.45	24.83	0.72
		Migrant	15.80	73.40	25.59	1.02
	Informal employment	L&M	22.61	37.06	60.53	2.41
		Local	18.77	40.84	55.89	3.27
		Migrant	30.48	32.30	66.38	1.32
	Total	L&M	12.73	53.22	45.08	1.71
		Local	10.05	57.72	40.29	1.99
		Migrant	23.49	45.46	53.32	1.22

Note: This transition matrix summarizes mobility across formal/informal sectors for individuals experiencing job changing between 2006 and 2010.

Source: Author's calculation based on CULS3.

2.2 Mobility among industries

We can also learn that the mobility of the migrant workers is much higher than the local workers from the result of mobility across industries showed by Table 8. Furthermore, it manifest that the work force in primary or secondary industry have higher mobility then those in tertiary industry. For the work force in primary or secondary industry in 2006, 15.41% of all the workers, 38% of the migrant workers and

10.5% of the local workers have changed their job in 2006 until 2010. Among them, about 60% turn to the job in tertiary industry. For the work force in tertiary industry in 2006, only 11.76% of all the workers, 18.94% of the migrant workers and 9.89% of the local workers change their job in 2006 until 2010, but among them, more than 90% of the mobility occurred within the tertiary. Therefore the overall trend of the work mobility among industries shows the movement from primary or secondary industry to the tertiary industry.

Table 8 Mobility Across Primary / Secondary Industry & Tertiary Industry (2006 to 2010)
All Individuals Changing Jobs After 2006

				Working status in 2010 (As a Percent of Individuals in Sector Changing a Job since2006)		
			Percent of Leaving Job Held in 2006	Primary & Secondary Industry	Tertiary Industry	Unemployed or Not in Labour Force
Working status in 2006	Primary & Secondary Industry	L&M	15.41	38.02	61.25	0.72
		Local	10.50	38.54	60.83	0.63
		Migrant	38.05	37.36	61.79	0.84
	Tertiary Industry	L&M	11.76	7.29	90.54	2.17
		Local	9.89	7.30	90.17	2.52
		Migrant	18.94	7.25	91.29	1.46
	Total	L&M	12.73	17.17	81.12	1.71
		Local	10.05	16.19	81.83	1.99
		Migrant	23.49	18.86	79.92	1.22

Note: This transition matrix summarizes mobility across formal/informal sectors for individuals experiencing job changing between 2006 and 2010.

Source: Author's calculation based on CULS3.

2.3 Mobility among Ownerships

The results of Table 9 show the mobility across ownerships. It can be seen that for the local workers, the higher mobility rate occurs in the labor force in other enterprises (16.81%), the lower one occurs in workers in government or party (4.84%). At the same time, there's more mobility for the migrant workers. For the migrant workers, the workers in other enterprises have the highest level of mobility, the proportion is 55.51%.

Table 9 Mobility Across Sectors from 2006 to November 2010 Among Job Changers

				Ownership Sector of Employer in 2010 (As a Percent of Individuals Leaving Jobs Held in January 1996))							
			Leaving Job Held in 2006 %	Government or Party	Wholly-State-Owned	Majority-State-Owned	Collective Enterprise	Foreign Invested	Individual or Private	Other	Unemp or Not in L F
Ownership Sector of Employer in 2006	Government or Party	Local	4.84	41.90	3.46	0.00	8.29	3.68	37.61	3.49	1.57
		Migrant	24.34	29.26	1.69	0.00	0.00	7.32	61.72	0.00	0.00
	Wholly-State-Owned Enterprise	Local	8.44	15.98	12.32	3.50	0.00	5.63	57.21	2.67	2.68
		Migrant	18.60	6.12	19.01	0.00	2.86	0.00	65.85	6.17	0.00
	Majority-State-Owned Enterprise	Local	8.44	27.04	4.48	31.30	7.50	8.42	21.26	0.00	0.00
		Migrant	23.84	9.50	3.40	14.83	0.00	4.13	68.15	0.00	0.00
	Collective Enterprise	Local	12.41	12.59	0.00	0.57	19.63	9.55	50.08	7.58	0.00
		Migrant	27.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.76	2.85	77.87	1.52	0.00
	Foreign Invested Enterprise	Local	13.95	22.29	5.65	3.09	3.67	38.42	23.49	3.40	0.00
		Migrant	23.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	54.73	40.61	4.66	0.00
	Individual or Private Enterprise	Local	13.30	11.35	2.74	4.77	4.80	6.71	65.08	1.52	3.04
		Migrant	16.96	3.41	1.48	1.13	2.67	4.22	84.18	2.00	0.92
	Other	Local	16.81	12.68	0.00	5.80	0.00	5.80	55.13	19.01	1.58
		Migrant	55.51	6.25	2.26	1.03	6.06	2.17	74.72	7.51	0.00
	Total	Local	10.05	17.45	4.11	5.95	6.43	8.11	52.60	3.30	2.05
		Migrant	21.75	5.42	2.08	1.27	3.65	5.68	77.95	3.42	0.52

3. Mobility after crisis

In order to understand the impact of financial crisis on employment, we need to describe the work mobility occurred before the crisis and after the crisis respectively. We set the Oct 2008 as the crisis point and analysis the work mobility occurred during 2006 to Oct 2008 and during Oct 2008 to 2010 seperately. We learn an interesting story through the description of the work mobility from 2006 to Oct 2008. It manifests that most the mobility occurred before Oct 2008 resulted in unemployment or exiting the labor market. For both the local workers and migrant workers, both the formal employment and the informal workers, and also both the workers in primary or secondary industry and tertiary industry, 80-90% of the mobility before crisis resulted in unemployment or exiting the labor market.

Table 10 Mobility before and after Crisis

		Percent of Leaving Job Held in 2006/Oct 2008	Employed (as % of column 1)	Unemployed or Not in Labour Force (as % of column 1)
Mobility Before Crisis	Local	8.26	13.50	86.50
	Migrant	19.23	17.82	82.18
Mobility After Crisis	Local	3.93	88.08	11.92
	Migrant	10.97	96.28	3.72

Source: Author's calculation based on CULS3.

Furthermore, through the description we learn that compared to the work mobility occurred before the crisis, the mobility after the crisis is much less. Only 3.93% of local workers and 10.97% of migrant workers change their job after the crisis, and the proportion of job changing before crisis for local workers and migrant workers are 8.26% and 19.23% respectively. If we take a look at the flow direction of the work mobility, it's can be noticed that the most the job changing before the financial crisis resulted in unemployment or exiting the labor market, the proportion is 86.5% and 82.18% for local workers and for migrant workers respectively. However, most the labor force with job changing after the financial crisis transfer their job within sectors, very rare part of them exited the labor market or got being unemployed. Through such sub-periods description, we can see the impact of the crisis on the employment more clearly.

4. Mobility(by gender)

Now we pay some attention to the differences on work mobility between men and women. From the distribution of the employment status showed by Table 11, we learn that higher proportion of women engaged in informal employment and also in tertiary industry.

Table 11 Summarizes on the employment status in 2010 (by sex, %)

		Local		Migrant	
		Male	**Female**	**Male**	**Female**
Formal/ Informal	Formal employment	75.32	71.68	53.16	48.38
	Informal employment	24.68	28.32	46.84	51.62
	Inf 1	7.56	7.73	23.98	21.61
	Inf 2	0.52	2.14	0.82	5.88
	Inf 3	16.60	18.45	22.04	24.13
Industry	Primary & Secondary Industry	28.82	19.28	22.10	14.53
	Tertiary Industry	71.18	80.72	77.90	85.47
	Total Number	3110	2380	3049	2620

Note: **Inf 1**-Self-employed or Own Account Workers; **Inf 2**-Family Helpers; **Inf 3**- Non-contract Workers

Source: Author's calculation based on CULS3.

Then Table 12 & Table 13 shows the labor mobility for man and woman. The results show that all kinds of employment groups (formal employment / informal employment, the primary or secondary industry / tertiary industry) have shown a higher mobility for women. Generally speaking, the work mobility of woman is higher than that of man for nearly 3 percentages for local workers (that is 11.65%-8.91%), and 4 percentages for migrant workers (25.89%-21.6%). Among all groups classified by different criterion, we observed that the female migrant workers engaged in primary or secondary industry have the highest mobility, the proportion is 44.68%, and it's also the situation for male that the migrant workers in primary or secondary have the highest mobility with the ratio of 33.9%. Among all groups, we observed that the female migrant workers engaged in primary or secondary has the highest mobility, the proportion is 44.68%, and it's also the fact for male that the migrant workers in primary or secondary has the highest mobility with the ratio of 33.9%. On the contrary, the male local workers of formal employment has the lowest mobility among all the groups, the proportion is 5.93%, and the same groups has the lowest mobility for female workers, with the ratio of 8.29%.

Table 12 Mobility Across Formal/Informal Sectors (2006 to 2010)
All Individuals Changing Jobs After 2006

					Working status in 2010 (As a Percent of Individuals in Sector Changing a Job since2006)		
				Percent of Leaving Job Held in 2006	Formal employment	Informal employment	Unemployed or Not in the Labour Force
Working Status in 2006	Formal employment	Local	Male	5.93	82.46	16.88	0.66
			Female	8.29	66.04	33.18	0.78
		Migrant	Male	14.67	74.41	25.21	0.38
			Female	17.46	72.15	26.05	1.80
	Informal employment	Local	Male	17.74	45.59	52.44	1.97
			Female	20.04	35.64	59.68	4.69
		Migrant	Male	28.68	33.49	65.74	0.77
			Female	32.48	31.12	67.02	1.86
	Total	Local	Male	8.91	63.92	34.76	1.32
			Female	11.65	51.07	46.23	2.70
		Migrant	Male	21.60	47.53	51.83	0.63
			Female	25.89	43.26	54.90	1.84

Note: This transition matrix summarizes mobility across formal/informal sectors for individuals experiencing job changing between 2006 and 2010.

Source: Author's calculation based on CULS3.

Table 13 Mobility Across Formal/Informal Sectors (2006 to 2010)
All Individuals Changing Jobs After 2006

					Working status in 2010 (As a Percent of Individuals in Sector Changing a Job since2006)		
				Percent of Leaving Job Held in 2006	Primary & Secondary Industry	Tertiary Industry	Unemployed or Not in the Labour Force
Working Status in 2006	Primary & Secondary Industry	Local	Male	9.31	44.15	55.85	0.00
			Female	12.69	30.93	67.58	1.49
		Migrant	Male	33.90	43.21	55.24	1.54

		Female	44.68	30.34	69.66	0.00
Tertiary Industry	Local	Male	8.74	9.16	88.91	1.93
		Female	11.34	5.49	91.40	3.11
	Migrant	Male	17.26	8.16	91.84	0.00
		Female	20.92	6.35	90.76	2.88
Total	Local	Male	8.91	20.23	78.45	1.32
		Female	11.65	11.85	85.45	2.70
	Migrant	Male	21.60	22.51	76.86	0.63
		Female	25.89	15.00	83.15	1.84

Note: This transition matrix summarizes mobility across formal/informal sectors for individuals experiencing job changing between 2006 and 2010.

Source: Author's calculation based on CULS3.

5. Determinant of Mobility and Informality

Finally, we should analysis the determinants of work mobility. Table 14 shows estimated results of Probit model on the work mobility. We see that the age is a significant variable on deciding the work mobility. The older ones are, the less mobility would happen on them. In addition, marital status is also a significant variable of mobility determining. Also there's no obvious effect of marital status on the work mobility for local worker, but for migrant workers the labor force with spouse has a lower mobility than the labor force without spouse. In addition, we notice that the effect of education on the work mobility is not very significant for both the local workers and migrant workers, which shows the very limited impact of education on the work mobility.

Table 14 The Probit Model on Mobility（2006-2010）

	Local		Migrant	
	dF/dX	**P value**	**dF/dX**	**P value**
Age	-0.0022	0.0000	-0.0071	0.0000
Male	0.0052	0.5940	0.0211	0.2440
Married	-0.0222	0.0970	-0.0824	0.0010
Illiterate & Primary school	-0.0579	0.0900	0.0609	0.0430
Junior high school				
Senior high school	-0.0255	0.0250	-0.0402	0.0580
College and above	-0.0309	0.0190	-0.0399	0.1480
City 2	-0.0649	0.0000	-0.0807	0.0010

City 3	-0.0263	0.0370	0.0580	0.0290
City 4	-0.0624	0.0000	-0.1185	0.0000
City 5	-0.0093	0.4780	-0.0157	0.4880
City 6	0.0462	0.0020	0.0424	0.0470
Industry	Yes		Yes	
OBS	4767		4500	
Pseudo R2	0.0905		0.0561	

Source: Author's calculation based on CULS3.

Table 15 show estimation results of the Probit model on whether engage in the informal employment. We see, for the informal employment, the most significant factors are undoubtedly the education. A higher education level can significantly reduce the possibilities of a person engaged in informal employment. In addition, for the migrant workers, the impact of education is especially obvious, which is manifested by the fact that workers with the junior high school level of education can greatly reduce probability of informal employment.

Table 15 The Probit Model on informality in 2010

	Local		**Migrant**	
	dF/dX	**P value**	**dF/dX**	**P value**
Age	0.0019	0.0200	0.0002	0.8630
Male	0.0130	0.3350	0.0181	0.3840
Married	-0.0807	0.0000	-0.0599	0.0310
Illiterate & Primary school	0.0464	0.1980	0.1627	0.0000
Junior high school				
Senior high school	-0.1161	0.0000	-0.1085	0.0000
College and above	-0.2367	0.0000	-0.3224	0.0000
City 2	0.3470	0.0000	0.4140	0.0000
City 3	0.5159	0.0000	0.3036	0.0000
City 4	0.3565	0.0000	0.2324	0.0000
City 5	0.3903	0.0000	0.2429	0.0000
City 6	0.2995	0.0000	0.0703	0.0060
Industry	Yes		Yes	
OBS	5437		5612	
Pseudo R2	0.2410		0.1674	

Source: Author's calculation based on CULS3.

From the calculation and the analysis before, we find that the migrant workers are more mobile, the employment relationships of migrant workers have the feature of short-term and vulnerable relatively. Workers fall into informal category are mobile. Women are more likely to move to informal sector. The current feature of work mobility feature mainly reflects the instability and the vulnerability of the employment. They are more likely to seeking for better opportunity during the whole

career. For the policy-maker, reforming the *Hukou* system and improving the education level helps to the work quality of the employments.