The consequences of parental labor migration in China for children's emotional wellbeing

Qiang Ren [a], *, Donald J. Treiman [b], **

[a] Peking University, China
[b] UCLA, USA

ABSTRACT

Using data from the 2010 wave of the China Family Panel Studies (CFPS), we study the effects of internal migration in China on the emotional wellbeing of children age 10–15. The 2010 CFPS, a national probability sample survey of the Chinese population, includes 3464 children within this age range. We compare five groups: rural children with local registration living with both parents; urban children with local registration living with both parents; children accompanying their migrant parent(s), children left behind with one parent when the other parent goes out to work; and children left behind or sent to live with others when both parents go out to work. We expect the last three groups to be at risk of increased emotional difficulties compared to children living with both parents. We test these expectations using both conventional regression models and community fixed-effects models. The evidence supporting our expectations is very weak and inconsistent, leading us to conclude that in the Chinese context family arrangements have little impact on the emotional wellbeing of children. We conclude by offering some conjectures as to why this is so.

© 2016 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Over the past 30 years, China has experienced massive internal migration, mostly by rural migrants moving to cities or to industrial areas near cities in search of work. The result is that as of 2010 about 260 million people—approximately 20% of the population—were living in places other than where they were registered ([Chinese] National Bureau of Statistics, 2012, Table 7-2). Unlike the U.S., where residence more or less automatically confers local rights for U.S. citizens, albeit sometimes after a waiting period, in China local registration, and concomitant rights and privileges, are not easy to obtain.

Labor migrants tend to be young and also disproportionately male. But many are married and have children. Because many social benefits require local registration, and because of the consequent difficulty of arranging adequate child care, housing, schooling, and health care, married migrants often leave their families behind when they "go out for work." However, it also is increasingly the case that married couples migrate together, taking their children with them or starting families in their new work locale. Duan et al. (2013a) estimated that as of 2010 44% of migrants lived in 2- or 3-generation families. But because

---

they often live in difficult circumstances—rented rooms, very small apartments, and sometimes even dormitories—and work very long hours, and also suffer the same institutional constraints as those migrating without their families, many migrant couples find it difficult to care for their children. For these reasons, many either leave their children behind or send them to live with other relatives. The most recent data, from 2010, reveal that about 70 million children—about 25% of all Chinese children—have been left behind by one or both parents; 88% of these are from rural areas (Duan et al., 2013b).[1] As of 2005 18 million children below age 15 had accompanied their migrant parents (Duan and Yang, 2008; Duan and Huang, 2012) and as of 2010 38 million children below age 18 had accompanied their migrant parents (Duan, 2012); clearly, part of the increase is due to the wider age range reported for 2010, but it also is probable that the proportion of Chinese children accompanying migrant parents increased over the 5-year period. In our data, about 30% of children age 10–15, the children we study, fall into these vulnerable groups—children left behind and children migrating with their parents.

The question we address in this paper is whether children affected by migration—both migrant children and children left behind—suffer emotional deficits relative to children living with both parents in non-migrant families. There is little firm evidence for China. With the exception of the present study, and a parallel study using different methods and investigating somewhat different outcomes but based on the same data (Xu and Xie, 2015), there has been, to our knowledge, no research on the consequences of migration for children's emotional wellbeing using national-level data. The existing work on this topic is based on samples restricted to one or several provinces or, usually, to more limited locales. Moreover, much previous research has used school-based samples, which are subject to various biases—particularly in China where many pupils above primary level attend schools located away from home and live in dormitories.

Still, this literature—reviewed in detail below—is suggestive and, together with findings from studies conducted in other nations, leads to several hypotheses. We begin with hypotheses regarding the emotional well-being of children left behind by one or both parents who have "gone out for work." We then turn to a review of the empirical literature focusing on these effects in Chinese settings and also review corresponding studies of the effect of being left behind on educational and cognitive outcomes and on physical health. We then consider the emotional consequences for children who migrate with their parents, which leads to one additional hypothesis; in this case we incorporate our review of the literature into the development of our additional hypothesis since the empirical literature for China is quite limited. (The bulk of studies compare migrant children to children living with both parents in destination locales, which is not the proper comparison.) In reviewing both literatures we ignore studies based on data collected only from migrant children or children left behind, which, because of the absence of a comparison group of non-migrant children, make it impossible to assess the effect of migration on children's lives (e.g. Li, 2004; Liang, 2004; Women's Federation of Meishan Municipality, 2004; Zhao, 2004; Liang et al., 2008; Liu et al., 2009; Wong et al., 2009; Yuan et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2015).

1.1. Left-behind children

Emotional well-being: **hypotheses**. It is well established in U.S. studies that the quality of parenting is one of the strongest predictors of children's emotional wellbeing. But the quality of parenting tends to be degraded in single-parent families relative to intact families. Single parents tend to be "less emotionally supportive of their children, have fewer rules, dispense harsher discipline, are more inconsistent in dispensing discipline, provide less supervision, and engage in more conflict with their children" (Amato, 2005, p. 83; see especially the references cited in note 46). Poorer parenting by single parents has been linked to a variety of negative outcomes among children, including emotional problems, conduct problems, low self-esteem, and problems forming and maintaining social relationships (Amato, 2005, p. 83, and the references cited in note 47). Single parenting also may lead to a greater risk of parental emotional difficulties and parental difficulties may in turn lead to a higher risk of child emotional difficulties. It follows from these points that the absence of one parent, and even more so the absence of both parents, is likely to be emotionally damaging to children. McLanahan and Sandefur (1994, p. 1), in a well-known U.S. study, summarize the existing evidence as "quite clear: *Children who grow up in a household with only one biological parent are worse off, on average, than children who grow up in a household with both of their biological parents, regardless of the parents' race or educational background, regardless of whether the parents are married when the child is born, and regardless of whether the resident parent remarries*" (emphasis in the original). More recent studies in the U.S (Carlson and Corcoran, 2001; Brown, 2004; Kim, 2011; Pearce et al., 2014) and also studies in a number of other nations (Australia: Perales et al., 2015; Canada: Freistadt and Strohschein, 2013; Gt. Britain: Dunn et al., 1998; Kiernan and Mensah, 2009; and Ireland: Hannan and Halpin, 2014) show results essentially similar to those summarized by McLanahan and Sandefur.

To be sure, the Chinese context is rather different from that in the U.S. and the other Western nations cited because most single parent households in these places result from divorce or non-marital childbearing, neither of which is common in China, where almost all—97%—children in single-parent (or neither-parent) households are due to the labor migration of one or both parents. However, the fundamental point holds—that in China as elsewhere single parents face greater stress, have more difficulty providing high quality parenting, and experience greater likelihood of depression (Lu et al., 2012), which

---

[1] Chan (2009, p. 8) reports data from the 2005 1% sample census showing that of left-behind children 47% lived with one parent, usually the mother; 26% with one or both grandparents; and 27% with others or alone.

should increase the risk of depression among their children. Moreover, living with neither parent likely results in a reduction in emotional support (Graham and Jordan, 2011), which can be devastating for children (Ye and Lu, 2011).

A final reason for expecting greater risk of emotional difficulties among those left behind in China is that the absence of a parent is likely to increase the burden of daily life for the remaining parent in single-parent households (Mu and van de Walle, 2011), especially when there are no remittances, reducing the time spent caring for children and the quality of childcare and increasing the stress felt by the left-behind parent. Moreover, left-behind children may face increased demands to contribute to the wellbeing of the household and increased difficulty in coping with everyday life (Chang et al., 2011; de Brauw and Mu, 2011; Ye and Lu, 2011; Guo, 2012 —but see the contradictory findings of Xu and Xie, 2015, Table 4).

These points lead us to hypothesize that

1. Children left behind should be at greater risk for emotional difficulties than children in intact families.
2. Emotional difficulties are particularly likely if left-behind children live with neither parent.

To be sure, the absence of parents, particularly the absence of both parents, may force greater self-sufficiency, resulting in a greater sense of self-efficacy. Still, because most children left behind continue to live in the same places as before, the demand for greater self-sufficiency may be limited. Thus, we expect the balance to favor a decline in emotional wellbeing.

Empirical evidence for China. There is a large literature on the effects of being left behind in China, but most of these studies are based on local samples, usually school-based; the outcomes studied are diverse; and the results are inconsistent. Most studies are based on rural samples although a few are based on urban samples. These studies vary widely in quality. Many report simple comparisons, leaving open the possibility that differences are spurious, reflecting unmeasured differences between the comparison groups. Others control for likely differences. And a few make rigorous attempts to establish causal relations through the use of instrumental variable or other econometric approaches. Also, some studies distinguish between children left behind by only one parent and those left behind by both parents. Some of these studied show deficits in emotional well-being among children left behind; others show no differences; and a few show benefits. There are three review studies showing deficits. Chan (2009, p.16) cites four Chinese language studies that found "that left-behind children were more likely than other rural children to feel depressed, emotional, anxious, fearful, become easily irritated and intransigent, and have lower self-esteem." Similarly, Wang et al. (2014, p. 346), in a review of 15 school-based studies, reported that, in general, the "… left-behind group had a lower score [on a measure of positive] self-concept and more psychological problems than the control group." A third review, by Wang and Mesman (2015), also reported that on the whole left-behind children show poorer emotional and social functioning than rural children residing with both parents. None of these summary reviews paid much attention to whether the effects they reported were net of likely confounders. Other studies that found negative effects of being left behind include Gao et al. (2010); Ye and Lu (2011); Su et al. (2012), especially when both parents were away; and Wu et al. (2015). Zhan et al. (2014) showed that, net of controls, middle school students with both parents out for work had significantly reduced self-esteem, and that this was particularly true of girls. There is one study that takes the estimation of causal effects seriously and finds negative effects of parental migration. Leng and Park (2010), using panel data from the Gansu Survey of Children and Families and an instrumental variable approach, show that father's migration negatively affects externalizing behavior (destructive behavior, impulsivity, aggression, and over-activity), but not internalizing behavior (anxiety, depression, and withdrawal).

By contrast Xiang (2007, p. 186), in a review of a substantial number of studies, concludes that "left-behind children face various problems, but they are not evidently worse off than those who live with their parents." Xu and Xie (2015), analyzing the same data we use here, come to a similar conclusion as Xiang. Not surprisingly, the conclusions of Xu and Xie generally agree with ours, despite differences in methods and the outcome variables analyzed. Using a propensity score matching procedure, and analyzing four emotional wellbeing variables that are measured somewhat differently from ours, Xu and Xie found no differences between rural children living with both parents and children left behind by one or both parents. Other, local, studies research similar conclusions. Fan et al. (2010) in a study of rural children in Hunan Province observed more behavioral problems among left-behind children but the effect of left-behind status entirely disappeared once SES and other controls were introduced. And Wen and Lin (2012, p. 129) in a separate study of rural Hunan children found no effect of left-behind status on satisfaction with life and studies, with or without controls. Similarly, Shen et al. (2015) found no association between parental migration and depression or anxiety. Finally, Wen et al. (2015) studied the association between parental migration status (neither, one, or both parents out for work) and a measure of Positive Youth Development, a manifestation of the latent concepts competence, confidence, caring, character, and (positive social) connection. They found no differences associated with parental migration status but found *positive* effects of being left behind with respect to problem behavior. Interestingly, the Wen study was based on the same data as the Su study cited previously, which focused on satisfaction and loneliness and found negative effects of being left behind. The contrast between these outcomes suggests that emotional wellbeing cannot be regarded as a unitary concept and that each outcome has to be studied in its own right.

There is some evidence from studies in other nations of negative effects of parental absence due to migration: in three African nations (Mazzucato et al., 2015); in several Southeast Asian nations (Suarez-Orozco et al., 2002; Asis, 2006; Graham and Jordan, 2011); and in Romania (Botezat and Pfeiffer, 2014). However, Gassmann et al. (2013), analyzing data from a large

national probability survey conducted in Moldova, found either no effects or positive effects of being left behind by migrating parents.

Evidence on the association between being left behind and educational and cognitive outcomes also is mixed. There are two national studies focusing on educational outcomes. An analysis by Hu (2012) of data from the 2006 Chinese General Social Survey showed that, net of a set of potential confounding variables, the more migrants there were in a household the less likely children, especially girls, were to attend high school; but this effect was partly mitigated by remittances sent home. However, the Xu and Xie study cited above showed no difference in educational performance. There are three review papers. Lee (2015, p. 2) concludes that "In the literature reviewed, parental migration has both positive and negative effects on children's educational attainment — these effects hinge upon several factors, such as whether both parents migrate or, if only one parent migrates, which parent it is." However, Wang and Mesman (2015, p. 822) report that seven of eight studies they reviewed showed that left-behind children performed more poorly on standardized tests than did children living with both parents. By contrast, Zhou et al. (2015), reviewing 27 school-based studies, conclude that those left behind by migrating parents do as well as those living in two-parent families with respect to school dropout and performance on standardized tests. Two high quality studies show negative effects on test scores: Li (2013) and Zhang et al. (2014). Wen and Lin (2012) show that left-behind children are less engaged in school. Finally, a number of studies show differential effects by gender: e. g. Leng and Park (2010); Wang (2014); Zhou et al. (2014).

Two studies in other nations show positive effects of parental labor migration on educational outcomes and one shows mixed effects. Macours and Vakis (2010) found a positive effect of labor migration of mothers in Nicaragua on early childhood cognitive development. Yang (2008) showed that the children of international migrants from the Philippines were more likely to be enrolled in school and were less likely to engage in paid labor, due to the positive effect of remittances. Finally, Lu and Treiman (2011, Table 2), using a random-effects model and propensity score adjustments, showed that among South African Blacks the absence of one or, especially, both parents reduced the likelihood of school enrollment but that this effect was entirely offset when remittances were sent back by migrating household members, due, among other reasons, to the effect of remittances in reducing child labor (Table 4).

Studies of the effect of being left behind on physical health outcomes also have mixed outcomes. There are studies showing a negative effect on nutrition (de Brauw and Mu, 2011; Ning and Chang, 2013); no effect (Guo, 2012; Xu and Xie, 2015; Zhou et al., 2015); or a positive effect (Mu and de Brauw, 2015; Zhang et al., 2015). There is, however some evidence of a greater likelihood of engaging in unhealthy behaviors (Gao et al., 2010; Lee, 2011). Being left behind has been shown to be associated with poorer health (Lee, 2011) and better health (Wen et al., 2015). Finally, Wen and Li (2016) showed that being left behind results in higher blood pressure.

1.2. Migrant children

Migrant children who live with a single parent are likely to experience greater emotional difficulties than migrant children living with both parents, for the reasons we have outlined above. In addition, regardless of whether they live with one or both parents, migrant children may face special difficulties in adapting to new environments, securing suitable education, enjoying adequate parental attention, and living in adequate housing.

Moving to a new place is known to be stressful (for a review and additional references see Stevens and Vollebergh, 2008, p. 276). One must establish new routines and learn the ins-and- outs of new environments, cope with the destruction of old friendship networks, and make new friends. It turns out that there is almost no evidence regarding the emotional costs of migration for Chinese children since the typical study compares migrant children with permanent residents at the destination place, which is not the proper counterfactual comparison. Only the analysis by Xu and Xie (2015), based on the same data as used here, compares migrant children with those living in non-migrant families rural families, and they find no differences between the two groups with respect to their emotional wellbeing. Of course, the difficulties associated with moving would be expected to diminish over time. Unfortunately, we have no information on how long children have been living at their current residence and how long they have been attending their current school. The best we can do is to distinguish between migrants and non-migrants.

In China, migrant children attending public schools in their destination locales sometimes suffer discrimination from teachers and local-resident classmates, leading to emotional difficulties. Although most claims of discrimination are journalistic, there is some scholarly evidence, mainly based on local studies (Lei, 2004; Pan, 2006; Chan, 2009, pp. 38–42). When large scale migration began in the 1980s, migrant children—that is, children lacking local registration—usually were denied admission to urban public schools. Later, under pressure from the central government, it became possible to gain admission by paying very high non-resident fees. Still later the central government mandated that all children be accepted by local public schools without "non-resident fees." However, this was met with large-scale resistance by local authorities since school funding is based on the number of locally *registered* children, not the number of locally *resident* children (Xiang, 2007, p. 181; Chan, 2009, pp. 34–38). As one device to discourage enrollment by migrant children, many primary schools imposed substantial special fees on migrants, e.g., a "temporary education fee," as well as miscellaneous fees paid by all students—uniform fees, extra-curricular activity fees, etc.—that were difficult for poor migrant parents to pay (Chan, 2009, p. 34). One result is that, at least in some times and places, school enrollments among migrant children were lower than those of their rural counterparts. For example, Liang and Chen (2007), using data from the 1995 1% sample census of China, showed that as of 1995 children residing in cities in Guangdong Province for at least six months but lacking local registration were less

likely to be enrolled in school than children residing in origin counties in Guangdong Province. Wu and Zhang (2015) extended this result to national data and to the period 1990–2005 and showed that migrant children were less likely to be enrolled in school than were both rural children living with both parents and children left behind in rural locales. Also, some migrant children eschew local public schools in favor of schools organized by migrants, which tend to be academically inferior although socially more comfortable. The proportion attending migrant schools is actually rather small[2] and includes almost no cases in our sample. Thus, we are restricted to investigating whether migrant children suffer an increased risk of emotional difficulties without regard to the type of school they attend. The educational difficulties facing migrant children are exacerbated by the fact that one can only take the university entrance examination (*gaokao*) in the locale where one is registered. Thus, children of migrants seeking tertiary education must return to their "home" villages—which they may never have seen if they were born in urban areas to long-term migrant parents.

Because their parents tend to work very long hours, often including involuntary or coerced overtime, migrant children may face reduced supervision relative to non-migrant children, which likely has deleterious consequences. On the other hand, being left to fend for themselves might have the opposite effect, increasing self-reliance, self-confidence, and initiative. Thus, here we have two competing hypotheses.

Finally, migrant children often experience difficult housing circumstances. Indeed, this is one of the reasons migrant couples leave their children behind or send them to live with other relatives. Often, migrant laborers have no place to live except for dormitories, which are almost always gender-segregated and are inappropriate for children—albeit children do sometimes live in such places (Yang et al., 2011). When parents do live together, it often is in single rooms or very small apartments. Living in cramped or unpleasant quarters where privacy and study space are limited is bound to increase stress and thus result in various emotional difficulties.

These points lead us to hypothesize that

3. Migrant children may or may not be at greater risk for emotional difficulties, since the disruptive aspects of migration may be offset by greater self-efficacy acquired because of the need and opportunity for greater independence.

Many of the U.S. studies that show a negative association between living in intact families and emotional difficulties are vulnerable to endogeneity problems—the fact that many of the factors that increase the likelihood of living with a single parent (primarily divorce and non–marital childbearing) or no parent (primarily extreme incompetence in parenting resulting from drug abuse and similar factors) also increase the risk of children's emotional difficulties independent of living arrangements. To be sure, this also may be an issue in China insofar as factors leading to migration, e.g., inadequate income, are also associated with negative emotional outcomes for children. When possible we will control for factors known to be associated with both living arrangements and children's emotional wellbeing. For reasons discussed in more detail in Section 2.4, "Analytic Strategy," it was not possible to estimate over-time fixed-effects models because of the lack of comparable dependent variables for successive waves of the survey.

2. Data, variables, and analytic strategy

2.1. Data

The data used in this analysis are from the 2010 wave of the *China Family Panel Studies*, a (nearly) national probability sample of Chinese families.[3] In the 2010 wave, 14,960 households were included in the sample and interviews were conducted with all family members age 10 or older, with information on younger children provided by the primary caregiver, resulting in a total sample of 57,115 individuals.

Details of the sample design are given in Xie et al. (2012). Here it suffices to note that six strata were initially specified: four provinces (Gansu, Guangdong, Henan, and Liaoning) and a provincial-level city (Shanghai) were each treated as separate strata and a sixth stratum consisted of the remaining 20 provinces sampled. Within each of the four single-province strata, 16 counties were chosen at random but with probability proportional to size (PPS); however, in Shanghai 32 townships or streets (*jiedao*) were chosen PPS as the first stage. Within the 20- province stratum, 80 counties were chosen PPS. Within each county four villages or neighborhoods were chosen PPS; for Shanghai, two villages or neighborhoods were chosen PPS within each township/*jiedao*. Within each village/neighborhood, 25 households were chosen at random. Because of the multistage design, it is necessary to take account of the resulting clustering of the sample; we specified the village/neighborhood as the cluster variable. In addition, we weighted the data using "post-stratification adjustment weights" for the child sample, which take account of the differential sampling rates implied by the sample design, a correction for differential non-response rates, and a final adjustment to replicate the age-by-sex distribution of the 2010 census (Lü and Xie, 2012).

---

[2] For example, in Beijing migrant schools are not officially recognized and often are closed down by the authorities. In principle, the central government requires all public schools to accept migrant children, although, as noted, many public schools find ways to minimize the proportion of migrant pupils.

[3] Tibet, Qinghai, Xinjiang, Ningxia, Inner Mongolia, and Hainan provinces were excluded from the sample to reduce costs, but together they make up only 5% of the population of China (Xie, 2012, p. 14).

Table 1
Distribution by residence type, Chinese children age 10–15 in 2010.

Residence type	Children age 10–15		Children age 10		Children age 13 or 15	
	% (wtd)	N (unwtd)	% (wtd)	N (unwtd)	% (wtd)	N (unwtd)
Rural intact family	40.9	1471	40.7	230	40.5	512
Urban intact family	32.2	931	28.3	156	32.4	313
Migrant child	7.3	227	8.5	47	5.8	68
Left-behind child, one parent	11.1	389	11.2	62	11.1	140
Left-behind child, neither parent	8.4	336	10.3	57	10.2	123
Total	99.9	3354	100.0	552	100.0	1156

Our sample is restricted to 3354 children age 10–15 who either were living with both parents or who were living with one or neither parent because one or both parents had "gone out" for work. We excluded 110 children who were in non-intact families because their parents had divorced or were separated for personal reasons or because one or both parents had died. For all but three variables we had complete data. We used multiple imputation procedures, as implemented in Stata 12 (StataCorp, 2011), carrying out 10 imputations to impute values for the log of per capita family income (227 values were imputed) and the average of mother's and father's years of schooling (52 values were imputed for father's schooling and 47 for mother's schooling).[4]

Certain questions analyzed here were asked only of subsets of children, with the subsets defined by age. Specifically, questions from which we constructed low and high self-esteem scales were asked only of children age 10 in 2010 and questions from which we constructed self-motivation and resignation scales were asked only of children age 13 or 15 in 2010. In both cases, we considered pooling data from the 2010 and 2011 waves in order to essentially double the sample sizes for these scales, e.g., adding the 2011 responses for those age nine in 2010 to the 2010 responses for those age 10 in 2010, and similarly for 13 and 15 year olds in 2010. However, it turns out that our attempt to match children in 2010 and 2011 produced many discrepancies. Given that when we conducted our analysis the 2011 data had not been completely cleaned, we decided that it was more prudent to stick to the 2010 data.[5] See Table 1 for a description of the various subsets of data used in the analysis.

2.2. Dependent variables

We study the determinants of nine aspects of emotional wellbeing, to determine whether residence type affects emotional wellbeing in the ways we have hypothesized. Descriptive statistics are shown in Table 2. The variables we study include.

Depression. We constructed a scale consisting of six items adapted from the widely used CES-D scale (Radloff, 1991), which has been validated for studies of Chinese adolescents (Chen et al., 2009). For each item, respondents were asked how often they felt this way during the past month: almost every day, two or three times a week, two or three times a month, once a month, or never. The response categories were scored from 1 ("never") to 5 ("almost every day"). Here are the six items, with the variable numbers in the section of the questionnaire for children age 10–15 shown in square brackets; this and the remaining items are translated from the Chinese and are shown in English in Institute of Social Science Survey (2010):

1. Feel depressed and cannot cheer up no matter what you were doing [N401]
2. Feel nervous [N402]
3. Feel upset and cannot remain calm [N403]
4. Feel hopeless about the future [N404]
5. Feel that everything is difficult [N405]
6. Think life is meaningless [N406]

The scale was constructed by standardizing each item, computing the mean[6] scale score for each child, and then linearly transforming the resulting distribution to have a range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating the highest level of depression. The resulting scale is reasonably reliable, with Cronbach's Alpha = .79.

---

[4] The legitimacy of multiple imputation turns on the plausibility of the assumption that missing values for the variables to be imputed are "missing at random" (Rubin, 1987; Little and Rubin, 2002)—that is, that net of predictors of these variables there is no correlation between the true value of the variable and the likelihood that the value is missing in the data set. This is a completely reasonable assumption regarding parental years of schooling, which usually is reported by the respondent or by another knowledgeable adult in the household. It is a bit less plausible with respect to family income since those in high income families might be concerned about information being shared with the tax authorities. But since the variable refers to family rather than individual income, this is unlikely to be an important concern on the part of respondents. Moreover, despite vivid newspaper accounts about the Chinese *nouveau riche*, they represent only a tiny fraction of China's population and are known to be resistant to being interviewed and hence are unlikely to be found in survey samples.

[5] As it happens, discrepancies such as we encountered were never fully resolved since the attention of the CFPS staff was diverted to the 2012 and subsequent waves.

[6] Means were computed for each child for whom we had non-missing data on at least three of the six items.

Table 2
Means for variables in the analysis, by residence type.

	Rural intact	Urban intact	Mig. child	Left, one parent	Left, no parent	Total mean	Total s.d.	Wtd. N
Outcome variables								
Happiness (1–5)	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.3	3.9	4.2	.87	3354
Depression (0–1)	.11	.12	.11	.13	.15	.12	.15	3354
Quarreled with parents in past month	.19	.28	.41	.22	.16	.24	.42	3354
Has any good friends (0–1)	.89	.95	.82	.90	.90	.90	.29	3354
Easy to get on w/others (1–5)	4.0	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.0	.85	3354
Low self-esteem (0–1)	.35	.29	.30	.38	.39	.33	.15	552
High self-esteem (0–1)	.57	.65	.60	.55	.59	.60	.15	552
Self-motivation (0–1)	.39	.41	.37	.32	.43	.39	.22	1156
Resignation (0–1)	.39	.41	.37	.36	.44	.40	.23	1156
Control variables								
Parents' mean yrs of schooling (0–20)	5.8	8.9	8.4	6.8	7.1	7.2[a]	3.8[b]	3354
ln(per capita household income)	8.1	8.8	8.8	8.4	8.0	8.4[a]	1.1[b]	3354
Received remittances in past yr (0–1)	.19	.08	.14	.57	.33	.20	.40	3354
Num. of children in household (1–4+)	2.0	1.5	1.5	1.9	1.9	1.8	.75	3354
Age (10–15)	12.3	12.3	12.0	12.1	12.3	12.2	1.70	3354
Male (0–1)	.54	.54	.43	.50	.57	.53	.50	3354
Substandard housing (0–1)	.26	.21	.19	.19	.25	.23	.42	3354
Urban residence at time of survey	0	1.00	.71	.28	.29	.43	.50	3354
Num. of people in household	4.4	3.9	3.7	4.2	5.2	4.2	1.3	3354

[a] Imputed value.
[b] From non-missing values of variable, since no standard deviation is computed for imputed data in Stata's –mi– commands.

We constructed two scales, for low and high self-esteem, by factor analyzing 14 items ([M101] − [M114]). These questions were asked only of 10 year olds. The stimulus for each item was a four point scale: "Totally agree," "Agree," "Disagree," and "Totally disagree." Volunteered responses "Neither agree nor disagree" were coded between "Agree" and "Disagree" as were "Do not know" responses.

Low Self-esteem. This scale was constructed from the five items with the highest rotated factor loadings on factor 1. The items are:

1. After all, I consider myself a loser [M103]
2. I indeed often feel I am useless [M109]
3. I often think I am good for nothing [M110]
4. I don't think I can solve the difficulties I am now facing by myself [M111]
5. Sometimes I think I am forced to do things due to my hard life [M112]

This scale, for which Chronbach's Alpha = .70, was constructed in the same way as the depression scale, by standardizing the five items, averaging their scores, and transforming the resulting scale to a 0–1 range, with 1 indicating the lowest self-esteem.

High Self-esteem. The seven items that had the highest rotated loadings on factor 2 (only the first two factors had Eignvalues > 1.0) were used to construct a High Self-Esteem scale; this scale, constructed in the same way as the Low Self-esteem Scale, except that 1 indicates the highest self-esteem, has Chronbach's Alpha = .62. The items are:

1. I feel I'm valuable, at least not worse than others [M101]
2. I feel that I have many valuable qualities [M102]
3. I can do things well like most people [M104]
4. I am positive about myself [M106]
5. Generally speaking, I am satisfied with myself [M107]
6. I hope to gain more respect for myself [M108]
7. I can control things that happen to me [M113]

Self-motivation and **Resignation.** These are two factor-based scales derived from a factor analysis of 11 items concerned with self-motivation, resignation, fatalism, etc., which were asked of 13 and 15 year olds. The stimulus for each item was the same as for the previous two scales. Two factors emerged with eigenvalues greater than 1.0. Three items had high loadings on the first factor:

1. I pursue my own goals rather than following others [N502]
2. I decide my own life goals [N504]
3. If I decide to do something, I will complete it no matter what [N505]

We constructed a Self-motivation scale from these three items in the same way as we constructed the depression scale, with 1 indicating the highest self-motivation. The resulting scale has Chronbach's Alpha = .64.

Two items had high loadings on the second factor:

1. Don't spend too much time striving since it will never prove effective [N507]
2. It is nearly impossible to correct a mistake once you make one [N508]

We constructed a Resignation scale in the same way as we constructed the depression scale, with 1 indicating the greatest resignation. The resulting scale has Chronbach's Alpha = .61.

In addition, we analyzed four single item outcome variables: **Happiness** -"Are you happy?" [M302], with response categories ranging from 1 (very unhappy) to 5 (very happy); **Easy to get on with others** – "Is it easy for you to get on well with others?" [M304], with response categories ranging from 1 (very hard) to 5 (very easy); **Has any good friends** – "Do you have [any] good friends?" [K3], with response categories "yes" and "no"; and **Quarreled with parents in past month** – "Last month, how many times did you quarrel with your parents?"[7] Since this variable [N2] has an extremely skewed distribution, with 76% reporting that they never quarreled with their parents in the previous month and small numbers of children reporting many quarrels, we dichotomized the variable into two categories: never (0) vs. ever (1) quarreled with parents in the past month to avoid undue influence of high leverage points; the mean of the untransformed variable was 1.01 and the standard deviation was 4.45.

2.3. Independent variables

Residential type. Our key independent variable is the living circumstances of the child, which we label "residential type." We distinguish five categories of children, based on where they live, with whom they live, and their registration status. To ease interpretation, we represent the coefficients associated with this variable, and each of the other sets of categorical variables, including dichotomies, as deviations from the grand mean—a parameterization sometimes known as Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) (Andrews et al., 1973; Treiman, 2009, pp.164–166).

1. *Rural children living with both parents* (hereafter, children living in intact rural families) are children who reside in rural areas, have local *hukou*, and live with both parents. We do not distinguish between those with agricultural and non-agricultural *hukou* on the ground that it is the place of residence rather than the place of registration that affects children's emotional wellbeing. Rural residents with non-agricultural *hukou* are relatively rare, consisting mainly of technical workers in power plants, health workers, etc. (Hu, 2001).

2. *Urban children living with both parents* (hereafter, children living in intact urban families) are children who reside in urban areas, have local *hukou*, and live with both parents. As with rural children living with both parents, we do not distinguish between those with agricultural and non-agricultural *hukou* on the ground that it is the place of residence rather than the type of registration that affects their emotional wellbeing even though the life chances of urban residents with local agricultural *hukou* are known to be intermediate between those of rural residents with local agricultural *hukou* and urban residents with local non-agricultural *hukou* (Treiman, 2012).

3. *Migrant children* are children who live with one or both parents but who lack local registration (*hukou*). Children who lack local *hukou* are not eligible for various benefits such as health care and, in some places still, free schooling and are likely to be marginalized in other ways discussed earlier. We explored the possibility of distinguishing between migrant children living with both parents and migrant children living with one parent, but the number living with only one parent is too small to sustain such a distinction, for some analyses resulting in fewer than 10 cases in the "migrant, living with one parent" category.

4. *Left-behind children* are those who live with neither parent and those with local *hukou* living with only one parent, where one or both parents have gone out for work. The first criterion is intended to identify children sent to live with other caregivers than their parents, typically their grandmothers but sometimes other relatives or even non-relatives. The second criterion is intended to identify children living in families where one parent (typically the father) has gone out for work. For reasons we have suggested above, the vulnerabilities faced by left-behind children living with neither parent are likely to be greater than those faced by left-behind children living with one parent. Thus, we distinguished the two groups.

Control variables. We estimated the association between residential type and each of the nine outcomes without and with controls for covariates. For the models with covariates, we included several variables possibly associated with both living arrangements and our measures of emotional well-being.

The child's socioeconomic circumstances, which should have a positive effect on emotional wellbeing, are represented by.

- The mean years of schooling of the child's parents.
- The natural log of the per capita annual family income (rmb).
- Substandard housing. The stimulus was "Does your family have any of the following difficulties in housing?" [D8 of Part 2 of the Family Questionnaire]:

---

[7] An explanatory note was provided interviewers: "A 'quarrel' means yelling at each other without making any concession due to disagreement."

1. Children over age 12 live in the same room with the parents.
2. Family members of three generations live in the same room.
3. Children of different genders over age 12 live in the same room.
4. Beds are laid out at night and folded up during the daytime.
5. Beds are laid out in the living room.

The respondent was allowed to mention up to three difficulties. Those mentioning three difficulties were scored 1; those mentioning fewer difficulties were scored 0.

- Whether any family member was "out for work" and remittances were received [U7 of the "Work Outside the Home" module]. This question was asked only in the case that a family member was out for work. The assumption is that the receipt of remittances mitigates the negative effects of having parents away (Lu et al., 2012). But this a weak variable since it combines having at least one family member out for work, which often but not always was the parent, and whether remittances were received.

Demographic covariates include:

- Gender, scored 1 for males and 0 for females.
- The child's age, represented by a set of dummy variables, one per year of age.
- The number of children in the household, represented by a set of dummy variables distinguishing households with one, two, three, and four or more children.

2.4. Analytic strategy

We first estimate two models predicting the scores of each of the nine dependent variables: Model 1 without controls and Model 2 with controls, introduced on the ground that differences associated with residential type may be at least partly spurious due to the presence of other correlated factors. For seven of the outcomes, we report OLS estimates. However, as noted, we transformed the number of quarrels with parents into a dichotomy, "never vs. ever quarreled with parents in the past month," which is appropriately modeled using binomial logistic regression as is whether the child has any good friends, also a dichotomous variable. All these models can be thought of as descriptive of the association between living arrangements and measures of emotional wellbeing (Model 1) and of this association net of possibly correlated covariates (Model 2).

Community fixed effects. A limitation of OLS and allied estimates is that even with controls they do not take account of differential distributions of the covariates across the residential type categories and, in particular, do not contrast children in different living circumstances who live in the same communities. But the nature of the community may be an important determinant of emotional wellbeing. Indeed, by now there is a burgeoning literature in the U.S. and elsewhere showing the importance of "neighborhood effects" on a number of measures of emotional wellbeing. For example, Luttmer (2005) showed that self-reported happiness decreases as average neighborhood income increases, net of one's own income, which suggests a negative envy effect that might also operate for children left behind relative to children in intact families. Sampson et al. (2002, p. 459) summarize a number of studies showing that "concentrated poverty, disorder, and low neighborhood cohesion are linked to greater mental distress … among adolescents." See in particular Ross et al. (2000), who showed that psychological distress is strongly related to neighborhood disorder, net of individual characteristics. Given this evidence, it is important to control for community differences when assessing the effect of living arrangements on emotional wellbeing. We thus repeat the analysis, separately for rural and urban children (defined by their residence at the time of the survey), estimating community fixed-effects models. Here we do not transform the coefficients to deviations from the mean but rather contrast them to children living in intact families with local *hukou*.

For left-behind children, community fixed-effects models bring us closer to an estimate of the causal effect of living arrangements. Consider first rural children left behind by one parent. These children are defined as those living with one parent and having local *hukou*. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that almost all such children previously lived in intact families in the same villages. By purging the analysis of all differences between villages, as well as of measured characteristics of families and individuals, we may plausibly infer that any observed differences in emotional wellbeing between children living in intact families and children in the same villages living with a single parent are likely to be in large part true effects of differences in living arrangements. Of course, there is still the possibility that children left behind with a single parent differ in unmeasured ways from children in the same village who live in intact families, and that such differences could account for differences in outcomes; unfortunately, there is no way to determine this. The same arguments regarding the contrast between children in intact and non-intact families hold with respect to children left behind by both parents, since fewer than 4% of such children lack local *hukou*.

With respect to migrant children living in villages, no causal inference is warranted since these children must in general have come from other villages (because they lack local *hukou*) and their emotional wellbeing might well have been influenced by their experiences in their home villages. Hence, this last contrast must be regarded as simply descriptive.

Exactly the same considerations pertain to urban residents. In addition to those living in intact families and migrant children, there also are non-trivial fractions of urban children living with one or neither parent because their parents have gone to work in other cities. The strongest inferences can be made for those left behind by one parent, since they have local *hukou* and hence are likely to have been born in the place they are living. But this is nearly as true of children left behind by both parents since only 11% of such children lack local *hukou*. Thus, the validity of causal inferences for children residing in urban areas varies with living arrangements in the same way as for children residing in rural areas.

What community fixed-effects models do operationally is to compare individuals within communities by subtracting the community mean from each observation. Given our data, we define rural communities by the administrative village in which the respondent resides. This is not entirely optimal since, although it might be argued that in rural areas "villages" are natural communities, this is not always the case because an administrative village may consist of several natural villages. Still, this definition of community clearly is superior to using the next highest geographical unit, townships, which are too large and too diverse to permit comparisons of children living in close proximity and therefore exposed to substantially similar environments. The same reasoning applies to children living in urban areas, where we define communities as the "neighborhood" (*jü*) in which the child resides. It may be that here we are understating the extent of the local community, since neighborhoods are not natural units, any more than are census tracts in the U.S., and children may attend schools located in different neighborhoods. Still, we thought it better to err on the side of increased homogeneity by utilizing the smallest geographic unit available to define communities.

Over-time fixed effects. Although this paper was initially prepared before the 2012 wave of the CFPS became available, these data had become available by the time of the most recent revision. Thus, we explored the possibility of carrying out an over-time fixed-effects analysis. However, this proved impossible due to changes in the questionnaire. Specifically, the items forming the depression scale were substantially changed and the items used to form the self-motivation and resignation scales were dropped. Thus, we would be left only with the items used to form the self-esteem scales, which were asked of only about one-sixth of the child sample; and even in this case one of the 2010 items was dropped in 2012, which necessarily rendered the factor structure in 2010 and 2012 not completely comparable.

3. Results

We first consider conventional regression models for the entire population of Chinese children (Tables 3a and b) and then turn to the fixed-effects analysis (Tables 4a–5b). We separately consider each outcome, in the order shown across the columns of Tables 3a and b.

3.1. Regression estimates for the entire sample

As noted earlier, the coefficients in Tables 3a and b associated with the dummy variables are all expressed as deviations from the means of the dependent variables, which are shown as the intercepts in the first line of each table. Thus, for example, in the first row and first column of Table 3a, the coefficient 4.219 indicates that the mean level of happiness, on a scale of 1–5, is 4.219. The coefficient −.010 indicates that the expected level of happiness for those living in intact rural families is −.010 less than the overall mean, or 4.209, when no covariates are controlled (Model 1), and is .046 greater than the overall mean, or 4.265, when the covariates shown in the third panel of the table are included (Model 2). The "joint significance" row shows the significance of the differences among the five living arrangement categories. Thus, it turns out that the living arrangement groups significantly differ in their level of happiness with and without controls. The second panel shows the significance of the difference between each pair of living arrangement categories. Thus, without controls (Model 1) those left behind by both parents (category 5) are significantly less happy than those living in intact rural families (category 1), those living in intact urban families (category 2), and those left behind by one parent (category 4). The coefficients for the control variables are also interpreted as deviations from the overall mean, except those for parental years of school and the log of per capita household income, which are interpreted in the usual way OLS coefficients are interpreted.

While for five of the nine outcomes the coefficients associated with living arrangements are jointly significant at beyond the .05 level,[8] the pattern of the coefficients and the significance of the differences between pairs of coefficients (shown in the panel labeled "Significance of contrasts") are not very orderly. While for the sake of completeness we show contrasts between each pair of living arrangements, the contrasts of major interest are those between children in intact rural families (Category 1) and,

---

[8] Although we highlight coefficients at or beyond the .05 level, we show the p-values for all coefficients. The argument could be made that by interpreting levels of significance for individual variables we are vulnerable to the multiple comparison problem—with many coefficients, some will be significant just by chance. However, the Bonferroni test and similar tests that adjust for multiple comparisons are known to be overly conservative when one's hypotheses (expected outcomes) are collinear, as they are in the present case. So we have foregone such adjustments. In addition, a countervailing argument is that for small samples it is desirable to relax the criterion for rejecting the null hypothesis, by setting the significance level at .1 or some such, in order to reduce the probability of type II errors—accepting the null hypothesis when it is false. Balancing the multiple comparison problem against the fact that for some of our analyses we have quite small samples, we settled on the conventional .05 2-tailed level of significance. Of course, were we to make Bonferroni adjustments, or other adjustments for multiple comparisons, e.g., the Sidak or Scheffe adjustments, even fewer of our coefficients would be statistically significant, reinforcing our overall conclusion—see below—of limited effects of type of living arrangement. We note that appropriate adjustments for multiple comparisons is an unsettled issue in statistics; see the discussion in the Stata 16 manual (StataCorp, 2015, pp. 554–555).

Table 3a

Coefficients of models of emotional outcomes (1), by type of living arrangement, children age 10–15 in 2010 (p-values in parentheses).[a]

Outcome variable	Happiness		Depression		Quarrels with parents[b]		Has good friend(s)[b]		Easy to get on well with others	
Model	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Intercept	4.219		.119		−1.203[b]	−1.218[b]	2.356[b]	2.562[b]	4.026	
Child's living arrangements										
1. Intact rural family	−.010	.046	−.009	−.012	−.270	−.192	−.258	−.065	−.032	.027
2. Intact urban family	.095	.039	.002	.008	.273	.184	.585	.367	.091	.006
3. Migrant family	−.093	−.156	−.010	−.003	.853	.761	−.835	−.943	−.109	−.176
4. Left-behind, 1 par.	.064	.038	.009	.004	−.044	−.023	−.110	−.170	.013	.053
5. Left-behind, no par.	−.318	−.288	.030	.024	−.417	−.401	−.109	−.043	−.115	−.073
Joint significance	**(.003)**	**(.005)**	(.221)	(.213)	**(.002)**	**(.014)**	**(.014)**	(.178)	(.211)	(.515)
Significance of contrasts (p-values)										
2 vs. 1	(.107)	(.923)	(.319)	(.074)	**(.000)**	**(.033)**	**(.022)**	(.189)	(.080)	(.741)
3 vs. 1	(.651)	(.315)	(.926)	(.547)	**(.005)**	**(.006)**	(.494)	(.148)	(.617)	(.229)
4 vs. 1	(.429)	(.939)	(.271)	(.321)	(.334)	(.524)	(.605)	(.735)	(.585)	(.751)
5 vs. 1	**(.001)**	**(.000)**	**(.035)**	**(.045)**	(.632)	(.500)	(.566)	(.939)	(.294)	(.212)
3 vs. 2	(.376)	(.377)	(.379)	(.488)	(.141)	(.127)	**(.036)**	**(.023)**	(.297)	(.341)
4 vs. 2	(.756)	(.991)	(.689)	(.822)	(.202)	(.465)	(.096)	(.197)	(.411)	(.610)
5 vs. 2	**(.000)**	**(.002)**	(.120)	(.354)	**(.041)**	(.090)	(.091)	(.310)	**(.024)**	(.392)
4 vs. 3	(.432)	(.364)	(.330)	(.750)	**(.042)**	**(.049)**	(.403)	(.249)	(.470)	(.208)
5 vs. 3	(.261)	(.536)	**(.046)**	(.204)	**(.011)**	**(.010)**	(.401)	(.196)	(.972)	(.564)
5 vs. 4	**(.005)**	**(.012)**	(.345)	(.358)	(.344)	(.334)	(.998)	(.663)	(.206)	(.223)
Parental yrs. of school		**.027**		−.001		.023		**.131**		**.022**
		(.008)		(.590)		(.286)		**(.000)**		**(.002)**
ln(per capita hh inc.)		.037		−.005		.090		.084		.028
		(.180)		(.353)		(.220)		(.398)		(.250)
Remittances? No		−.006		−.005		−.010		−.069		.019
Remittances? Yes		.022		.018		.038		.272		−.076
Joint significance		(.612)		**(.049)**		(.799)		(.176)		(.111)
Number of children in the household										
1		.035		.001		.070		.002		.072
2		−.000		−.004		−.068		.109		−.028
3		−.065		.009		.049		−.203		−.081
4+		−.252		.013		−.062		−1.057		−.259
Joint significance		(.096)		(.714)		(.862)		**(.012)**		**(.010)**
Child's age										
10		.054		−.020		.089		−.700		−.050
11		.135		−.013		−.253		.155		.066
12		−.060		.008		.025		.190		−.041
13		.016		−.011		−.010		.255		.017
14		−.133		.021		−.071		.384		−.009
15		−.067		.028		.258		−.075		.030
Joint significance		**(.008)**		**(.002)**		(.280)		**(.001)**		(.507)
Female		.071		−.001		.045		−.145		.047
Male		−.063		.001		−.040		.128		−.041
Significance		**(.015)**		(.867)		(.519)		(.378)		(.074)
Poor housing: no		.014		−.004		.027		−.092		.013
Poor housing: yes		−.045		.014		−.092		.307		−.042
Significance		(.313)		(.070)		(.476)		(.102)		(.314)
N	3354		3354		3354		3354		3354	

[a] P-values <.05 are shown in bold, together with corresponding coefficients. Recall that the p-values here and in subsequent tables are based on standard errors adjusted for clustering at the village/neighborhood level.

[b] These are means of the logits estimated using Stata 12's -mi estimate: xtlogit-command. The coefficients shown are logits centered around the mean logits.

respectively, children in migrant families (Category 3), left-behind children living with one parent (Category 4), and left-behind children living with neither parent (Category 5). Also of interest are contrasts among the three vulnerable groups.

Consider **happiness** first. Overall, Chinese children are quite happy, with an average score of 4.2 on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Those left behind with neither parent are significantly less happy than children living in intact rural families—the difference is .22 points, about a quarter of a standard deviation (see Table 2). They are also significantly less happy than those left behind with one parent, who are in fact slightly happier than children living in intact rural families. These differences continue to hold when adjusting for the covariates. Finally, migrant children do not differ significantly from rural children living in intact families.

Depression. In general, Chinese children are not very likely to exhibit depressive symptoms, with a mean of .12 on a scale ranging from 0 to 1. But children left behind with neither parent are likely to exhibit significantly more depressive symptoms than children living in intact rural families and also, in the absence of controls, migrant children. These effects are not large.

Table 3b
Coefficients of Models of Emotional Outcomes (2), by Type of Living Arrangement, Children Age 10–15 in 2010 (p-values in parentheses).[a]

Outcome variable	Low self-esteem[b]		High self-esteem[b]		Self-motivation[c]		Resignation[c]	
Model	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Intercept	.332		.598		.392		.396	
Child's living arrangements								
1. Intact rural family	.014	−.007	−.030	−.017	.002	−.006	−.011	−.017
2. Intact urban family	−.038	−.005	.055	.038	.014	.023	.017	.016
3. Migrant family	−.030	−.008	.001	−.010	−.020	−.011	−.031	−.025
4. Left-behind, 1 par.	.048	.023	−.044	−.036	−.078	−.071	−.032	−.017
5. Left-behind, no par.	.056	.035	−.011	−.006	.041	.035	.041	.052
Joint significance	**(.020)**	(.486)	(.155)	(.436)	**(.014)**	**(.020)**	(.504)	(.367)
Significance of contrasts (p-values)								
2 vs. 1	**(.037)**	(.944)	**(.020)**	(.082)	(.675)	(.291)	(.341)	(.267)
3 vs. 1	(.183)	(.959)	(.133)	(.777)	(.687)	(.931)	(.689)	(.885)
4 vs. 1	(.280)	(.342)	(.634)	(.540)	**(.008)**	**(.024)**	(.546)	(.979)
5 vs. 1	(.180)	(.118)	(.330)	(.593)	(.271)	(.281)	(.152)	057)
3 vs. 2	(.779)	(.915)	(.104)	(.176)	(.544)	(.533)	(.379)	(.455)
4 vs. 2	**(.012)**	(.415)	**(.026)**	(.085)	**(.012)**	**(.008)**	(.246)	(.468)
5 vs. 2	**(.004)**	(.182)	(.087)	(.219)	(.517)	(.791)	(.545)	(.378)
4 vs. 3	(.060)	(.432)	(.167)	(.497)	(.228)	(.214)	(.985)	(.888)
5 vs. 3	**(.031)**	(.239)	(.630)	(.887)	(.320)	(.462)	(.216)	(.197)
5 vs. 4	(.828)	(.762)	(.304)	(.356)	**(.003)**	**(.007)**	(.121)	(.154)
Parental yrs. of school		−.002		.002		−.005		−.003
		(.577)		(.421)		(.130)		(.350)
ln(per capita hh inc.)		−.012		.007		−.003		.008
		(.283)		(.651)		(.835)		(.558)
Remittances? No		−.004		−.001		.002		.014
Remittances? Yes		.022		.005		−.006		−.044
Joint significance		(.195)		(.783)		(.745)		**(.025)**
Number of children in the household								
1		−.046		.024		−.003		−.019
2		.039		−.022		.003		−.000
3		−.003		.004		.003		−.000
4		.110		−.044		−.011		.075
Joint significance		**(.000)**		(.147)		(.979)		(.132)
Child's age								
10		–		–	–		–	–
11		–		–	–		–	–
12		–		–	–		–	–
13		–		–		.025		.002
14		–		–	–		–	–
15		–		–		−.028		−.002
Joint significance		–		–		**(.010)**		(.150)
Female		.013		−.011		−.013		.015
Male		−.013		.011		.013		−.017
Significance		(.135)		(.296)		(.165)		(.840)
Poor housing: no		.000		.008		.003		.007
Poor housing: yes		−.001		−.031		−.010		−.026
Significance		(.965)		(.106)		(.547)		(.155)
N	552		552		1156		1156	

[a] P-values <.05 are shown in bold.
[b] 10 year olds.
[c] 13 and 15 year olds.

Quarrels with parents. Here the pattern is quite different from what we saw for the happiness and depression measures. Migrant children are significantly more likely to quarrel with their parents than are children living in intact rural families or children left behind by one or both parents. It also is the case that urban children in intact families are significantly more likely to quarrel than are rural children in intact families. Thus, it may be that urban life, rather than migrant status, provokes conflicts over such issues as the degree of independence permitted by parents. On the other hand, children left behind with neither parent are the least likely to quarrel with their parents, presumably because of the limited contact they have with them.[9]

Any good friends. With one exception, living arrangements have no impact on the likelihood of having any good friends. The only significant association is the substantially greater likelihood that migrant children—who are mostly urban—have no good friends than do those of children in intact urban families. This is not particularly surprising given that it is probable that a

---

[9] Unfortunately, we have no information about the frequency of contact with absent parents.

Table 4a

Coefficients of community fixed-effects models of emotional outcomes (1), by type of living arrangement, rural children age 10–15 in 2010 (p-values in parentheses).[a]

Outcome variable	Happiness		Depression		Quarrels with parents		Has good friend(s)		Easy to get on well with others	
Model	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Intercept	4.170	4.406	.113	.176	–	–	–	–	3.974	4.176
Child's living arrangements (intact rural family is the omitted category)										
3. Migrant family	−.025	−.044	.004	−.002	**1.136**	**1.059**	.183	.281	−.051	−.051
	(.899)	(.813)	(.895)	(.956)	**(.001)**	**(.004)**	(.795)	(.723)	(.778)	(.778)
4. Left-behind, 1 par.	.145	.088	.024	.022	.305	.371	.080	.129	.024	.008
	(.302)	(.535)	(.227)	(.263)	(.188)	(.132)	(.820)	(.735)	(.809)	(.932)
5. Left-behind, no par.	−.176	−.199	.012	.006	−.163	−.099	.546	.555	−.050	−.044
	(.119)	(. 061)	(.564)	(.776)	(.553)	(.730)	(.093)	(.113)	(.601)	(.649)
Joint significance	(.377)	(.273)	(.589)	(.695)	**(.006)**	**(.014)**	(.416)	(.167)	(.934)	(.960)
Parental yrs. of school		.006		−.002		−.016		**.143**		.014
		(.575)		(.248)		(.573)		**(.000)**		(.185)
ln(per capita hh inc.)		−.013		−.007		.183		.095		−.038
		(.681)		(.241)		(.057)		(.434)		(.231)
Remittances? Yes		.114		.014		−.112		−.269		.036
		(.078)		(.298)		(.570)		(.364)		(.626)
Number of children in the household (1 is the omitted category)										
2		−.015		−.012		−.324		**−.717**		−.058
		(.846)		(.375)		(.100)		**(.046)**		(.480)
3		−.015		−.015		.016		−.589		−.163
		(.888)		(.410)		(.956)		(.178)		(.134)
4+		−.066		.007		−.156		**−1.005**		−.201
		(.658)		(.786)		(.686)		**(.048)**		(.151)
Joint significance		(.975)		(.518)		(.259)		(.159)		(.366)
Child's age (10 is the omitted category for Depression, 13 for Self-motivation and Resignation)										
11		.046		−.010		−.356		**.742**		**.236**
		(.593)		(.459)		(.133)		**(.025)**		**(.032)**
12		−.096		.011		−.085		.488		.074
		(.363)		(.486)		(.719)		(.147)		(.479)
13		−.014		−.014		−.286		.673		.211
		(.898)		(.368)		(.251)		(.051)		**(.040)**
14		**−.216**		.013		.328		**.958**		.119
		(.016)		(.402)		(.156)		**(.007)**		(.196)
15		−.159		.016		.123		**1.146**		−.005
		(.064)		(.251)		(.583)		**(.001)**		(.962)
Joint significance		**(.031)**		(.109)		(.062)		**(.020)**		**(.040)**
Child's gender (male)		**−.134**		.007		−.254		−.307		−.042
		(.025)		(.473)		(.081)		(.180)		(.412)
Substandard housing		−.137		.009		−.155		−.027		−.003
		(.086)		(.420)		(.417)		(.928)		(.967)
N	2100		2100		1442[b]		830[b]		2100	

[a] P-values <.05 are shown in bold, together with corresponding coefficients.

[b] The N's are reduced because communities with no variance in the dependent variable were dropped by Stata, i.e., communities in which no child reported quarreling with his/her parents in the month prior to the survey and communities in which no child lacked even a single good friend.

substantial fraction of migrant children were recent migrants to their current place of residence, in contrast to urban children in intact families.[10]

---

[10] Although there is a question about how many months each absent member of the household has been away, for migrant children the amount of missing data on this variable for their mothers and fathers is too large—more than 90%–to warrant multiple imputation. However, we know from other data that most migrants have recently arrived in their destination places at the time of the survey. Computations from the 2008 survey of "Internal Migration and Health in China" (http://www.ccpr.ucla.edu/IM-China) reveal that of those out to work at the time of the survey, the average length of residence at their current locale was about 2.4 months. More generally, the only available evidence in the data set used here provides little basis for investigating the effect of length of absence from permanent residences on children's emotional wellbeing. When children are left behind by both parents there is too much missing data (more than half on the "months away" variable) to warrant multiple imputation. However, for children left behind by one parent we have responses in 87% of cases. For these children, the median number of months away is three for fathers and four for mothers. Moreover, 90% of fathers (who constitute 82% of away parents) have been away for eight months or less and 90% of mothers (the remaining 18% of away parents) have been away for 14 months or less. In sum, for the category for which adequate information is available there is not enough variation in the length of time a parent has been away, and, in particular, there are not enough parents who have been away for an extended period, to enable us to investigate the effect of duration away on children's emotional wellbeing. We know of only one other study that considers the effect of length of parental absence on any child outcome—Wang's (2014) analysis of school enrollments. She shows (Table 4) that when fathers are away for two years or longer, children are less likely to be enrolled in school, but finds no effect of absences of less than two years. In our data, only 4% of left-behind children for whom we have data have fathers who have been away that long. Of course, emotional deficits may occur after shorter absences but, given the amount of missing data on duration of absence and the short durations where we do have data, such an analysis is not feasible in the current paper.

Table 4b

Coefficients of community fixed-effects models of emotional outcomes (2), by type of living arrangement, rural children age 10–15 in 2010 (p-values in parentheses).[a]

Outcome variable	Low self-esteem[b]		High self-esteem[b]		Self-motivation[c]		Resignation[c]	
Model	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Intercept	.361	.314	.572	.468	.390	.629	.396	.607
Child's living arrangements (intact rural family is the omitted category)								
3. Migrant family	.044	.017	−.001	.015	**.287**	**.273**	.072	.035
	(.182)	(.708)	(.978)	(.711)	**(.021)**	**(.023)**	(.379)	(.596)
4. Left-behind, 1 par.	−.018	−.031	−.006	−.006	−.039	−.038	−.025	−.009
	(.759)	(.448)	(.836)	(.827)	(.079)	(.148)	(.482)	(.779)
5. Left-behind, no par.	.035	.032	.015	.034	.033	.039	−.022	−.004
	(.670)	(.564)	(.650)	(.334)	(.359)	(.293)	(.510)	(.907)
Joint significance	(.481)	(.537)	(.961)	(.750)	**(.007)**	**(.018)**	(.592)	(.941)
Parental yrs. of school		−.008		−.004		−.001		.001
		(.135)		(.421)		(.743)		(.792)
ln(per capita hh inc.)		.012		.019		−.028		−.022
		(.446)		(.259)		(.068)		(.132)
Remittances? Yes		.028		−.028		−.003		−.039
		(.395)		(.461)		(.896)		(.219)
Number of children in the household (1 is the omitted category)								
2		.044		−.004		.035		−.006
		(.076)		(.932)		(.237)		(.827)
3		−.075		−.014		−.014		−.072
		(.196)		(.755)		(.738)		(.175)
4+		.031		−.035		−.039		−.034
		(.662)		(.562)		(.544)		(.540)
Joint significance		**(.042)**		(.903)		(.350)		(.522)
Child's age (13 is the omitted category)								
11		–		–		–		–
12		–		–		–		–
13		–		–		–		–
14		–		–		–		–
15		–		–		−.022		.006
						(.240)		(.766)
Joint significance		–		–		–		–
Child's gender (male)		**−.079**		−.015		.004		−.015
		(.015)		(.511)		(.861)		(.578)
Substandard housing		.074		−.026		−.046		−.016
		(.078)		(.324)		(.071)		(.611)
N	342		342		744		744	

[a] P-values <.05 are shown in bold, together with corresponding coefficients.
[b] 10 year olds.
[c] 13 and 15 year olds.

Finds it easy to get along well with others. Here the only significant contrast is between urban children from intact families and children left behind with neither parent, who find it significantly more difficult to get along well with others, and this contrast becomes non-significant once covariates are introduced.

Remaining coefficients: **low self-esteem**, **high self-esteem**, **self-motivation**, **and resignation**. Although 9 of the 40 coefficients that pertain to living arrangements for Model 1 (without controls) and 3 of the 40 coefficients for Model 2 (with covariate controls) are significant at the .05 level, their pattern is hardly coherent with respect to either sign or magnitude, leading us to conclude that living arrangements have no serious impact on these four outcomes.

3.2. Fixed-effect regressions for the rural sample

Tables 4a and b show results from fixed-effects models of the nine outcomes for children residing in rural areas, estimated using Stata 12's -mi estimate: xtreg- and -mi estimate: xtlogit-commands. In each case we contrast children living in intact rural families with migrant and left-behind children living in the same villages. Here is how to interpret the coefficients in the table. Consider the first column. The intercept in column 1 (4.170) is the mean across rural communities of the average happiness level of children in each community living in intact families. The coefficient in the second row (−.025) is the mean across communities of the difference between the happiness level of those living in migrant families and those in the same community living in intact families. And so on. The coefficients in parentheses are the p-values associated with each coefficient. As before, coefficients with p-values ≤ .05 are highlighted.

As noted above, the contrasts of greatest interest are between children from intact rural families and children left behind. In general, the effects of living arrangements within communities are quite weak. Specifically, none of the nine comparisons

Table 5a

Coefficients of community fixed-effects models of emotional outcomes (1), by type of living arrangement, urban children age 10–15 in 2010 (p-values in parentheses).[a]

Outcome variable	Happiness		Depression		Quarrels with parents		Has good friend(s)		Easy to get on well with others	
Model	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Intercept	4.326	3.713	.129	.131	—	—	—	—	4.146	3.645
Child's living arrangements (intact urban family is the omitted category)										
3. Migrant family	−.327	−.287	**−.047**	**−.039**	**.609**	**.660**	**−.966**	−.337	−.352	−.318
	(.350)	(.366)	**(.001)**	**(.010)**	**(.027)**	**(.020)**	**(.009)**	(.500)	(.307)	(.307)
4. Left-behind, 1 par.	.096	.090	.001	.012	−.559	−.508	−1.029	−1.285	−.013	−.024
	(.452)	(.504)	(.949)	(.594)	(.053)	(.062)	(.059)	(.096)	(.939)	(.873)
5. Left-behind, no par.	−.021	−.004	−.034	.024	−.069	.055	−.740	−1.070	.010	.008
	(.898)	(.982)	(.219)	(.360)	(.821)	(.865)	(.214)	(.101)	(.918)	(.930)
Joint significance	(.539)	(.626)	**(.005)**	(.071)	**(.019)**	**(.018)**	**(.017)**	(.179)	(.773)	(.770)
Parental yrs. of school		**.027**		.001		.053		.115		.008
		(.023)		(.543)		(.053)		(.064)		(.472)
ln(per capita hh inc.)		.036		−.005		.079		.103		.042
		(.550)		(.610)		(.447)		(.740)		(.219)
Remittances? Yes		−.051		**.035**		.038		.896		−.067
		(.633)		**(.037)**		(.882)		(.236)		(.510)
Number of children in the household (1 is the omitted category)										
2		.037		−.029		−.074		.314		.153
		(.712)		(.058)		(.721)		(.552)		(.100)
3		.085		−.007		.302		.063		.196
		(.551)		(.760)		(.398)		(.923)		(.193)
4+		−.163		.009		−1.114		−.536		−.408
		(.603)		(.822)		(.288)		(.683)		(.099)
Joint significance		(.756)		(.243)		(.423)		(.862)		**(.045)**
Child's age (10 is the omitted category for Depression)										
11		.173		.026		.101		.643		.007
		(.118)		(.272)		(.692)		(.219)		(.950)
12		−.035		.028		.220		.401		−.032
		(.766)		(.150)		(.348)		(.441)		(.808)
13		.069		.020		.178		.706		−.072
		(.571)		(.358)		(.503)		(.222)		(.586)
14		−.061		**.051**		**−.558**		.820		−.025
		(.636)		**(.035)**		**(.046)**		(.161)		(.812)
15		.038		**.105**		−.053		−266		.214
		(.759)		**(.039)**		(.831)		(.570)		(.057)
Joint significance		(.301)		(.068)		(.080)		(.459)		**(.021)**
Child's gender (male)		.003		−.016		−.228		**1.306**		.000
		(.982)		(.429)		(.114)		**(.000)**		(.998)
Substandard housing		.038		.023		.126		.053		−.071
		(.707)		(.128)		(.543)		(.918)		(.461)
N	1254		1254		924[b]		258[b]		1254	

[a] P-values <.05 are shown in bold, together with corresponding coefficients.

[b] The N's are reduced because communities with no variance in the dependent variable were dropped by Stata, i.e., communities in which no child reported quarreling with his/her parents in the month prior to the survey and communities in which no child lacked even a single good friend.

Table 5b

Coefficients of community fixed-effects models of emotional outcomes (2), by type of living arrangement, urban children age 10−15 in 2010 (p-values in parentheses).[a]

Outcome variable	Low self-esteem[b]		High self-esteem[b]		Self-motivation[c]		Resignation[c]	
Model	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Intercept	.281	.228	.684	.115	.417	.277	.432	.018
Child's living arrangements (intact urban family is the omitted category)								
3. Migrant family	.044	.013	**−.300**	**−.280**	−.054	−.046	−.098	−.112
	(.395)	(.784)	**(.000)**	**(.000)**	(.348)	(.343)	(.428)	(.414)
4. Left-behind, 1 par.	.189	.213	.014	.016	**−.160**	**−.115**	−.102	−.122
	(.239)	(.221)	(.882)	(.888)	**(.002)**	**(.029)**	(.222)	(.182)
5. Left-behind, no par.	**.107**	**.116**	−.056	−.079	**−.298**	**−.243**	−.064	−.077
	(.022)	**(.012)**	(.140)	(.144)	**(.000)**	**(.000)**	(.221)	(.247)
Joint significance	(.070)	**(.012)**	(.001)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.330)	(.322)
Parental yrs. of school		.010		−.004		.004		−.010
		(.278)		(.767)		(.488)		(.134)
ln(per capita hh inc.)		−.002		.065		.018		.055
		(.930)		(.061)		(.505)		(.060)
Remittances?		−.049		−.062		.013		.047
Yes		(.343)		(.412)		(.693)		(.344)
Number of children in the household (1 is the omitted category)								
2		.085		.031		−.055		.049
		(.226)		(.650)		(.216)		(.409)
3		.092		.025		−.106		.055
		(.128)		(.805)		(.062)		(.547)
4+		**.264**		.124		−.070		.218
		(.000)		(.245)		(.294)		(.079)
Joint significance		**(.000)**		(.675)		(.278)		(.335)
Child's age (13 is the omitted category)								
11		−		−		−		−
12		−		−		−		−
13		−		−		−		−
14		−		−		−		−
15		−		−		−.091		−.027
						(.003)		(.572)
Joint significance		−		−		−		−
Child's gender (male)		−.060		.047		.024		−.019
		(.128)		(.297)		(.415)		(.651)
Substandard housing		−.047		.042		.027		−.010
		(.235)		(.672)		(.497)		(.786)
N	210		210		412		412	

[a] P-values <.05 are shown in bold, together with corresponding coefficients.

[b] 10 year olds.

[c] 13 and 15 year olds.

between children living in intact families and children left behind with one parent is significant; but only one of the contrasts between children in rural intact families and children left behind with one parent was significant in Tables 3a and b—the greater propensity for self-motivation among those left behind with one parent. In sum, being left behind with one parent does not appear to affect emotional wellbeing.

Consider now those left behind with neither parent, almost all of whom continue to live in their communities of origin. In the overall analysis—Tables 3a and b—such children were less happy and more depressed than children living in intact rural families. But in the fixed-effects analysis these differences disappear, which suggests that the differences observed in Tables 3a and b should be attributed to community differences rather than to differences in the living arrangements of children living in the same communities.

Finally, consider the small number of migrant children living in villages; there are only 71 such children. These children quarrel with their parents significantly more than do rural children living in the same villages but in intact families. This suggests that our previous interpretation of quarreling as an urban phenomenon is not correct. Rather, it appears that the fact of migration itself increases the propensity to quarrel with parents. Migrant children also have significantly greater self-motivation than do rural children living in intact families in the same villages. Interestingly, this difference is not revealed in the overall analysis reported in Table 3b, but only in the fixed-effects analysis. It could well be the case that self-motivation clashes with parental expectations, generating the conflicts that lead to quarrels.

3.3. Fixed-effect regressions for the urban sample

Here the contrasts, shown in Tables 5a and b, are with urban children living in intact families. With only two exceptions, there are no significant effects of being left behind; the exceptions are (1) that children left behind by one or both parents have less self-motivation than do those in intact urban families, and (2) that those left behind by both parents suffer low-esteem. Thus, we conclude that in general being left behind does no emotional damage to urban children, just as it does no emotional damage to rural children.

There are, however, differences between migrant children, most of whom have come from rural villages, and children in intact urban families. Migrant children are more likely to quarrel with their parents than are urban children from intact families living in the same neighborhoods who in turn, as we saw in Table 3a, are more likely overall to quarrel with their parents than are children from intact rural families. So perhaps there is an urban effect exacerbated by a migration effect. Urban migrant children are also less likely than their neighbors in intact families to have any good friends, although this effect is much reduced and becomes insignificant when controls are introduced. Such children also are less likely to have high self-esteem. Given the fact that we have only cross-sectional data and not cross-temporal data, we cannot adjudicate between the effect of previous rural vs. urban experiences and the effect of migration *per se*.

In contrast to the comparisons just reviewed, which show migrant children at greater risk of quarreling with parents and (without controls) of having no good friends than the urban children in the places to which they have moved, migrant children are significantly *less likely* to be depressed than are their neighbors living in intact families. Why this is so is unclear, but it may reflect either (or both) the resilience of migrants or the improvement in their material circumstances—note from Table 2 that the mean (logged) income of migrant families is equal to that of urban intact families and higher than that of any other group.

The results of all three sets of analysis are summarized in Table 6. As is evident from inspection of the table, the conventional regression analysis and the fixed-effects analysis yield somewhat different results. This suggests that part of the associations of living arrangements with children's emotional outcomes revealed by the conventional regression analysis reflect differences in the emotional wellbeing of children living in different communities. The fixed-effects analysis controls for all community characteristics and thus in this sense provides a better estimate of the true effect of living arrangements on our outcome indicators. However, from a descriptive point of view the conventional equations give a better picture of differences in emotional wellbeing associated with living arrangements of Chinese children taken as an entire population.

3.4. The effects of covariates

Thus far we have said little about the effects of covariates. Here our summary can be fairly brief. First, net of all else parental education has positive associations in the conventional regression analysis with happiness, the likelihood of having at least one good friend, and the ease of getting along with others; in the rural fixed-effects analysis parental education has a positive association with the likelihood of having at least one good friend; and in the urban fixed-effects analysis parental education has a positive association with happiness. These results are consistent with the worldwide finding that education is either neutral or has positive effects on almost all subjective outcome measures as well, of course, on almost all objective measures. Education consistently has been shown to be a stronger predictor of positive subjective and objective outcomes than are most other measures of socioeconomic status (Mirowsky and Ross, 2003, Chapter 2; Gakidou et al., 2010). However, the results reported here must be regarded as quite weak because there is little consistency across the three analyses.

Second, per capita family income has no net impact on our outcome measures and neither does our other measure of material wellbeing, living in substandard housing. This is in contrast to the negative effects of poverty in the U.S. referred to earlier. The receipt of remittances is significant in only 3 of 27 coefficients and the effects are inconsistent in sign. These we are inclined to discount these.

Table 6
Summary of findings from Tables 3a–5b

| Contrast | Child in intact rural family vs. | | | | | |
| | Migrant child | | Left behind, 1 parent | | Left behind, no parent | |
Model	1	2	1	2	1	2
Regression models for all children						
Happiness					−	−
Depression					+	+
Quarrels w/parents	+	+				
Good friends						
Gets on with others						
Low self-esteem						
High self-esteem						
Self-motivation			−	−		
Resignation						
Fixed-effects models for rural children; contrast is with rural children living in intact families						
Happiness						
Depression						
Quarrels w/parents	+	+				
Good friends						
Gets on with others						
Low self-esteem						
High self-esteem						
Self-motivation	+	+				
Resignation						
Fixed-effects models for urban children; contrast is with urban children living in intact families						
Happiness						
Depression	−	−				
Quarrels w/parents	+	+				
Good friends	−					
Gets on with others						
Low self-esteem					+	+
High self-esteem	−	−				
Self-motivation			−	−	−	−
Resignation						

+ = significantly greater than reference group; − = significantly more negative than reference group.

The demographic variables, age and sex, have effects that are only occasionally significant and are not very coherent. The same is true of the number of children in the household, with one exception—there is some evidence suggesting that the likelihood of having any good friends declines as the number of children in the household increases. Specifically, this is true of the overall analysis (Table 3a), although only the effect of having four or more children in the household is strong; and it also is true of the rural fixed-effects analysis (Table 4a) but not the urban fixed-effects analysis, probably because very few urban families include as many as four children. More generally, households with many children are quite uncommon in China given that the 1 1/2 child policy has been in effect since the early 1980s (in only 4% of rural households and less than 1% of urban households are there four children or more) and such households may be unusually poor or unusually isolated. It also is the case that children not living with other children have a greater incentive to acquire friends.

4. Summary and conclusions

We started with a set of hypotheses regarding the effects of single parenthood on children's emotional wellbeing. Our analytic review led us to hypothesize that children left behind by a parent or parents who have gone out for work suffer emotionally relative to children living in intact families. Expectations regarding the experience of children who migrate with their family were less clear because of the possibility that life disruptions are offset by life experiences that lead to greater self-esteem. Our primary comparison was with children living in intact rural families, since it is from such families that most migrant children and children left behind originate. We carried out the analysis by comparing all Chinese children using conventional OLS and logistic regression models. In addition, to take account of the possibility that emotional outcomes vary across locales due to factors not included among our covariates, we estimated community fixed-effects models, separately for rural villages and urban neighborhoods.

If we had to summarize our overall conclusion in a single sentence, it would be that being left behind by one or both parents or migrating with one or both parents has little effect on emotional health. The evidence for emotional vulnerabilities among migrant and left-behind children is equivocal at best. The findings are not very consistent and the effect sizes generally are small.

The strongest evidence pertains to the effects of being left behind with neither parent (or being sent to live with someone other than at least one parent). From the conventional analysis we can conclude that such children are less happy and more

depressed. But neither happiness nor depression is significant in the fixed-effects models, which suggests that it is something about the village or neighborhood environment, and not a child's living circumstances within a community, that creates variability in happiness and depression.

The other consistent finding is that migrant children are more prone to quarrel with their parents than are other children. We suspect that this is due to the stress on family life that stems from trying to cope with a new environment—which, of course, assumes that migration is a relatively recent event in the life of the child, an assumption justified by the relatively short length of migration stints (see note 10).

Regarding the hypothesis that migrant children have higher self-esteem there is no support. Indeed, the urban fixed-effects comparison suggests that migrant children are less likely to have high self-esteem than are locally registered children living in intact families. However, the rural fixed-effects analysis shows that rural migrant children have higher self-motivation than do rural children from the same villages who live in intact families.

For the reasons discussed earlier, we were unable to estimate over-time fixed-effects models, which potentially leaves us vulnerable to the claim that both living arrangements and emotional outcomes depend on other, unmeasured, factors (the endogeneity problem). Assessing this possibility will only become feasible once national panel data with exactly comparable variables for successive waves become available.

Why are our effects for left-behind children so small and so inconsistent? This may well be the consequence of the circumstances under which Chinese families are separated, which are quite different from the circumstances prevalent in the U.S. and other Western nations. Whereas in these places family disruption is largely the consequence of divorce and one-parent families often are the result of non-marital childbearing, both such determinants are still rare in China. As we noted at the outset, the overwhelming majority of children who do not live with both parents do so because one or both of their parents are out to work—and, indeed, we restricted our analysis to such children, excluding the 3% (=110/3464) who lived in non-intact families for other reasons. Thus, although they are deprived of the immediate emotional support provided by parents, they nonetheless typically have socially intact families, are secure regarding the long term commitment of their parents to the children and to each other, and know that the fact that their parents are away working indicates stronger rather than weaker commitment to the welfare of their children. This simple fact may go a long way toward mitigating the impact of physical separation. Moreover, when many children share the experience of being left behind—which in some villages may be a majority (Zhou, 2006)—or of having migrated from elsewhere, they may find ways of adapting and providing mutual support, thus minimizing the emotional trauma of their circumstances.

Still, although the literature is quite inconsistent, many studies have shown deleterious effects of being left behind by one or both parents. Why is this so? It is difficult to pin down systematic differences between studies that show negative effects on emotional wellbeing and those that do not. However, in future research it would be well worth paying attention to the length of absence of parent(s); the frequency of contact, either via visits or through phone conversations or messaging; the content of contact, e.g., how supportive of the child it is; the extent and frequency of remittances; the perception of migration in the communities of children left behind—is it regarded in a positive way, as a means of enhancing the material wellbeing of those left behind; in a neutral way, as a necessary sacrifice; or in a negative way, as indicating a failure at home? Also, does the age or gender of the child left behind matter? The local studies reviewed in this paper vary widely in their design, but almost never include the kinds of comparisons just suggested. It would be worth the investment in future waves of national and regional surveys to collect the sort of data that would permit such comparisons. In addition, despite the expense involved, sample designs that permit comparisons of child migrants with their counterparts from origin places whose families did not migrate or who did not migrate with their families would go a long way toward correcting this much understudied aspect of the migration story for Chinese children.

Acknowledgments

References

Amato, Paul R., 2005. The impact of family formation change on the cognitive, social, and emotional wellbeing of the next generation. Future Child. 15 (2), 75–96.

Andrews, Frank M., Morgan, James N., Sonquist, John A., Klem, Laura, 1973. Multiple Classification Analysis: a Report on a Computer Program for Multiple Regression Using Categorical Predictors, second ed. Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Detroit.

Asis, M., 2006. Living with migration: experiences of children left-behind in the Philippines. Asian Popul. Stud. 1, 45–67. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1744173060700556.

Botezat, Alina, Pfeiffer, Friedhelm, 2014. The Impact of Parents Migration on the Wellbeing of Children Left Behind: Initial Evidence from Romania. IZA Discussion Paper No. 8225. Institute for the Study of Labor, Bonn.

De Brauw, Alan, Mu, Ren, 2011. Migration and the overweight and underweight status of children in rural China. Food Policy 36, 88–100. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2010.08.001.

Brown, Susan, 2004. Family structure and child wellbeing: the significance of parental cohabitation. J. Marriage Fam. 66 (2), 351–367.

Carlson, M., Corcoran, M., 2001. Family structure and children's behavioral and cognitive outcomes. J. Marriage Fam. 63 (3), 779–792.

Chan, Aris, 2009. Paying the Price for Economic Development: the Children of Migrant Workers in China. China Labour Bulletin, Hong Kong.

Chang, Hongqin, Dong, Xiao-Yuan, MacPhail, Fiona, 2011. Labor migration and time use patterns of the left-behind children and elderly in rural China. World Dev. 39 (12), 2199–2210. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2011.05.021.

Chen, Zhiyan, Yang, Xiaodong, Li, Xinying, 2009. Psychometric features of CES-D in Chinese adolescents. Chin. J. Clin. Psychol. 17 (4), 443–448 (In Chinese).

[Chinese] National Bureau of Statistics, 2012. Tabulation of the 2010 Population Census of the People's Republic of China. China Statistics Press, Beijing.

Duan, Chengrong, 2012. Issues of compulsory education for migrant children. China Soc. Sci. Today B01. January 4, 2012 (In Chinese).

Duan, Chengrong, Huang, Ying, 2012. Schooling and employment: study on schooling- age migrant children. China Youth Study 1, 91–96 (In Chinese).

Duan, Chengrong, Yang, Ge, 2008. Study on the latest situation of floating children in China. Popul. J. 6, 23–31 (In Chinese).

Duan, Chengrong, Lü, Lidan, Zou, Xiangjiang, 2013a. Major challenges for China's floating population and policy suggestions: an analysis of the 2010 population census data. Popul. Res. 37 (2), 17–24 (In Chinese).

Duan, Chengrong, Lü, Lidan, Guo, Jing, Wang, Zongping, 2013b. Survival and development of left behind children in rural China. J. Popul. 35 (3), 37–49 (In Chinese).

Dunn, J., Deater-Deckard, K., Pickering, K., O'Connor, T.G., Golding, J., 1998. Children's adjustment and prosocial behaviour in step-, single-parent, and non-stepfamily settings: findings from a community study. J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry 39 (8), 1083–1095.

Fan, Fang, Su, Linyan, Kay Gill, Mary, Birmaher, Boris, 2010. Emotional and behavioral problems of Chinese left-behind children: a preliminary study. Soc. Psychiatry Psychiatric Epidemiol. 45, 655–664. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00127-009-0107-4.

Freistadt, Joshua, Strohschein, Lisa, 2013. Family structure differences in family functioning: interactive effects of social capital and family structure. J. Fam. Issues 34 (7), 952–974. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X12447054.

Gakidou, Emmanuela, Cowling, Krycia, Lozano, Rafael, Murray, Christopher J.L., 2010. Increased educational attainment and its effect on child mortality in 175 countries between 1970 and 2009: a systematic analysis. Lancet 376 (9745), 959–974. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61257-3.

Gao, Yang, Ping, Li, Kim, Jean Hee, Congdon, Nathan, Lau, Joseph, Griffiths, Sian, 2010. The impact of parental migration on health status and health behaviours among left behind adolescent school children in China. BMC Public Health 10 (56), 1–10.

Gassmann, F., Siegel, M., Vanore, M., Waidler, J., 2013. The Impact of Migration on Children Left Behind in Moldova. Technical report. United Nations University, Maastricht Economic and Social Research and Training Center on Innovation and Technology.

Graham, Elspeth, Jordan, Lucy P., 2011. Migrant parents and the psychological well- being of left-behind children in southeast Asia. J. Marriage Fam. 73 (4), 763–787. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00844.x.

Guo, Lin, 2012. Migration and the Well-Being of Left-Behind Children in China. University at Albany, State University of New York, Department of Sociology, Albany, NY. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.

Hannan, Carmel, Halpin, Brendan, 2014. The influence of family structure on child outcomes: evidence for Ireland. Econ. Soc. Rev. 45 (1), 1–24.

Hu, Ying, 2001. Characteristics of migrants from rural to urban. Popul. Res. 25 (6), 9–15 (In Chinese).

Hu, Feng, 2012. Migration, remittances, and children's high school attendance: the case of rural China. Int. J. Educ. Dev. 32, 401–411. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2011.08.001.

Institute of Social Science Survey, 2010. Chinese Family Panel Study: 2010 Questionnaire. Translated by Cindy Glovinsky, Jingwei Hu, Ryan Monarch, Ni Sha, and Hongwei Xu. Peking University, Institute of Social Science Survey, Beijing.

Ye, Jingzhong, Lu, Pan, 2011. Differentiated childhoods: impacts of rural labor migration on left-behind children in China. J. Peasant Stud. 38 (2), 355–377. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.559012.

Kiernan, K.E., Mensah, F.K., 2009. Poverty, maternal depression, family status and children's cognitive and behavioural development in early childhood: a longitudinal study. J. Soc. Policy 38 (4), 569–588. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0047279409003250.

Kim, Hyun Sik, 2011. Consequences of parental divorce for child development. Am. Sociol. Rev. 76 (3), 487–511. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0003122411407748.

Lee, Ming-Hsuan, 2011. Migration and children's welfare in China: the schooling and health of children left behind. J. Dev. Areas 44 (2), 165–182. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jda.0.0104.

Lee, Grace, 2015. Effects of Parental Migration on Educational Progress of Left-behind Children in Rural China (Literature Review). Available at: http://works.bepress.com/gracelee/1.

Lei, Youguang, 2004. The world through the eyes of urban villagers. An investigative study into the social cognition of migrant children in the cities. Educ. Sci. Res. 6, 27–31 (In Chinese).

Leng, Lee, Park, Albert, 2010. Parental Migration and Child Development in China. University of Pennsylvania Scholarly Commons (Gansu Survey of Children and Family Working Papers).

Li, Quanmian, 2004. Focus on the '386199' phenomena and care for left-behind families in the countryside: contribution to a synthesized report of various research projects. Popul. Res. 128 (14), 25–36 (In Chinese).

Li, Yunsen, 2013. Self-selection, migration, and children educational performance: evidence from an underdeveloped province in rural China. China Econ. Q. 12 (3), 1027–1049 (In Chinese).

Liang, S., 2004. Pay attention to the 'left-behind symptoms'. Rural. Perspect. 8, 26 (In Chinese).

Liang, Zai, Chen, Yui Por, 2007. The educational consequences of migration for children in China. Soc. Sci. Res. 36, 28–47. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2005.09.003.

Liang, Zai, Guo, Lin, Duan, Charles Chengrong, 2008. Migration and the well-being of children in China. Yale-China Health J. 6, 25–46.

Little, Roderick J.A., Rubin, Donald B., 2002. Statistical Analysis with Missing Data, second ed. Wiley, New York.

Liu, Zengkui, Li, Xinying, Ge, Xiaojia, 2009. Left too early: the effects of age at separation from parents on Chinese rural children's symptoms of anxiety and depression. Am. J. Public Health 99 (11), 2049–2054.

Lu, Yao, Treiman, Donald J., 2011. Migration, remittances and educational stratification among blacks in apartheid and post-apartheid South Africa. Soc. Forces 89 (4), 1119–1143. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/sf/89.4.1119.

Lü, Ping, Xie, Yu, 2012. China Family Panel Studies, Calculation of Weights in the 2010 Baseline Survey. Technical Report Series: CFPS-17. Institute of Social Science Survey, Beijing. Dec. 20. (In Chinese).

Lu, Yao, Hu, Peifeng, Treiman, Donald J., 2012. Migration and depressive symptoms in migrant-sending areas: findings from the survey of internal migration and health in China. Int. J. Public Health 57 (4), 691–698. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00038-011-0314-0.

Luttmer, Erzo F.P., 2005. Neighbors as negatives: relative earnings and wellbeing. Q. J. Econ. 120 (3), 963–1002.

Macours, K., Vakis, R., 2010. Seasonal migration and early childhood development. World Dev. 38 (6), 857–869. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2010.02.012.

Mazzucato, Valentina, Cebotari, Victor, Veale, Angela, White, Allen, Grassi, Marzia, Vivet, Jeanne, 2015. International parental migration and the psychological wellbeing of children in Ghana, Nigeria, and Angola. Soc. Sci. Med. 132, 215–224.

McLanahan, Sara, Sandefur, Gary, 1994. Growing up with a Single Parent: What Hurts, What Helps. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Mirowsky, John, Ross, Catherine E., 2003. Education, Social Status, and Health. Aldine de Gruyter, New York.

Mu, Ren, Brauw, Alan de, 2015. Migration and young child nutrition: evidence from rural China. J. Popul. Econ. 28, 631–657. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00148-015-0550-3.

Mu, Ren, Walle, Dominique van de, 2011. Left behind to farm? Women's labor re-allocation in rural China. Labour Econ. 18, 583–597. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2011.01.009.

Ning, Manxiu, Chang, Hung-Hao, 2013. Migration decisions of parents and the nutrition intakes of children left at home in rural China. Agric. Econ. Czech 59 (10), 467–477.

Pan, Fang, 2006. A Survey on the Current Circumstances of Compulsory Education for Migrant Children: a Case Study of Changzhou. East China Normal University, Department of Educational Administration, Shanghai (Unpublished master's thesis. (In Chinese)).

Pearce, Anna, Hope, Steven, Lewis, Hannah, Law, Catherine, 2014. Family structure and socio-emotional wellbeing in the early years: a life course approach. Longitud. Life Course Stud. 5 (3), 263–282.

Perales, Francisco, O'Flaherty, Martin, Baxter, Janeen, 2015. Early Life Course Family Structure and Children's Socio-emotional and Behaviour Functioning: a View from Australia. University of Queensland, ARC Centre for Children and Families over the Life Course, Brisbane, Australia, pp. 2015–2112. Life Course Centre Working Paper.

Radloff, Lenore Sawyer, 1991. The use of the center for epidemiologic studies depression scale in adolescent and young adults. J. Youth Adolesc. 20 (2), 149–166.

Ross, Catherine E., Reynolds, John R., Geis, Karlyn J., 2000. The contingent meaning of neighborhood stability for residents' psychological wellbeing. Am. Sociol. Rev. 65 (4), 581–597.

Rubin, Donald B., 1987. Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys. Wiley, New York.

Sampson, Robert J., Morenoff, Jeffrey D., Gannon-Rowley, Thomas, 2002. Assessing 'neighborhood effects': social processes and new directors for research. Annu. Rev. Sociol. 28, 443–478. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.28.110601.141114.

Shen, Min, Gao, Jing, Liang, Zenzen, Wang, Youjie, Du, Yukai, Stallones, Lorann, 2015. Parental migration patterns and risk of depression and anxiety disorder among rural children aged 10–18 years in China: a cross-sectional study. BMJ Open 5 (ee07802), 1–8. http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-007802.

StataCorp, 2011. Stata: Release 12. Statistical Software. StataCorp, College Station, TX.

StataCorp, 2015. Stata Multivariate Statistics Manual: Release 14. Stata Press, College Station, TX.

Stevens, Gonneke W.J.M., Vollebergh, Wilma A.M., 2008. Mental health in migrant children. Child Psychol. Psychiatry 49 (3). http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01848.x, 276.294.

Su, S., Li, X., Lin, D., Xu, X., Zhu, M., 2012. Psychological adjustment among left-behind children in rural China: the role of parental migration and parent–child communication. Child Care Health Dev. 39 (2), 162–170. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2214.2012.01400.x.

Suarez-Orozco, C., Todorova, I.L.G., Louie, J., 2002. Making up for lost time: the experience of separation and reunification among immigrant families. Fam. Process 41, 625–643.

Treiman, Donald J., 2009. Quantitative Data Analysis: Doing Social Research to Test Ideas. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Treiman, Donald J., 2012. The 'difference between heaven and earth': urban-rural disparities in wellbeing in China. Res. Soc. Stratif. Mobil. Special Issue Inequal. Across Globe 30 (1), 33–47. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2011.10.001 [An earlier, more comprehensive, version is available as Los Angeles: UCLA, California Center for Population Research, Population Working Paper PWP-CCPR-2011-006.].

Wang, Sophie Xuefei, 2014. The effect of parental migration on the educational attainment of their left-behind children in rural China. B.E. J. Econ. Analysis Policy 14 (3), 1037–1080. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/bejeap-2013-0067.

Wang, Lamei, Mesman, Judi, 2015. Child development in the face of rural-to-urban migration in China: a meta-analytic review. Perspect. Psychol. Sci. 10 (6), 813–831. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1745691615600145.

Wang, X., Ling, L., Su, H., Cheng, J., Jin, L., Sun, Y.-H., 2014. Self-concept of left-behind children in China: a systematic review of the literature. Child Care Health Dev. 41 (3), 346–355. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cch.12172.

Wang, Yun, Hesketh, Therese, Zhou, Xu-Dong, 2015. Behavioural and emotional problems in children affected by parental migration in rural China: a cross-sectional survey. Lancet 386 (Suppl. 1), S82.

Wen, Ming, Li, Kelin, 2016. Parental and sibling migration and high blood pressure among rural children in China. J. Biosoc. Sci. 48 (1), 129–142. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S002193201500005X.

Wen, Ming, Lin, Danhua, 2012. Child development in rural China: children left behind by their migrant parents and children of nonmigrant families. Child. Dev. 83 (1), 120–136. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01698.x.

Wen, Ming, Su, Shaobing, Li, Xiaoming, Lin, Danhua, 2015. Positive youth development in rural China: the role of parental migration. Soc. Sci. Med. 132, 261–269.

Women's Federation of Meishan Municipality, Sichuan Province, and Office of the Committee for the Work of Women and Children of Meishan Municipality, Sichuan Province, 2004. Investigation and analysis on rural left-behind students. Chin. Women's Mov. 10, 35–36 (In Chinese).

Wong, Fu Keung Daniel, Li Chang, Ying, He, Xue Song, 2009. Correlates of psychological wellbeing of children of migrant workers in Shanghai, China. Soc. Psychiatry Psychiatric Epidemiol. 44, 815–824. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00127-009-0003-y.

Wu, Xiaogang, Zhang, Zhuoni, 2015. Population migration and children's school enrollments in China, 1990–2005. Soc. Sci. Res. 53, 177–190. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2015.05.007.

Wu, Qiaobing, Lu, Deping, Kang, Mi, 2015. Social capital and the mental health of children in rural China with different experiences of parental migration. Soc. Sci. Med. 132, 270–277.

Xiang, Biao, 2007. How far are the left-behind left behind? A preliminary study in rural China, Popul. Space Place 13, 179–191. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/psp.437.

Xie, Yu, 2012. China Family Panel Studies, Users Manual for the 2010 Baseline Survey. Institute of Social Science Survey, Beijing. Dec. 20. [In Chinese.].

Xie, Yu, Qiu, Zeqi, Lü, Ping, 2012. China Family Panel Studies, Sample Design for the 2010 Baseline Survey. Technical Report Series: CFPS-1. Institute of Social Science Survey, Beijing. Dec. 20. [In Chinese.].

Xu, Hongwei, Xie, Yu, 2015. The causal effects of rural-to-urban migration on children's wellbeing in China. Eur. Sociol. Rev. 31 (4), 502–519. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcv009.

Yang, Dean, 2008. International migration, remittances and household investment: evidence from Philippine migrants' exchange rate shocks. Econ. J. 118 (528), 591–630.

Yang, Ge, Duan, Chengrong, Wang, Zongping, 2011. Migrant or left-behind: behavioral selectivity and impact factors of children living with the migrant population. China Agric. Univ. J. Soc. Sci. Ed. 28 (3), 85–96 (In Chinese).

Yuan, Xiaojiao, Fang, Xiaoyi, Liu, Yang, Hou, Shumeng, Lin, Xiuyun, 2013. Development of urban adaptation and social identity of migrant children in China: a longitudinal study. Int. J. Intercult. Relat. 37 (3), 354–365.

Zhan, Xuefeng, Li, Shaoping, Liu, Chengfang, Zhang, Linxiu, 2014. Effect of migration on children's self-esteem in rural China. China World Econ. 22 (4), 83–101. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-124X.2014.12076.x.

Zhang, Hongliang, Behrman, Jere R., Simon Fan, C., Wei, Xiangdong, Zhanga, Junsen, 2014. Does parental absence reduce cognitive achievements? Evidence from rural China. J. Dev. Econ. 111, 181–195.

Zhang, Nan, Bécares, Laia, Chandola, Tarani, 2015. Does the timing of parental migration matter for child growth? A life course study on left-behind children in rural China. BMC Public Health 15 (966), 1–12. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12889-015-2296-y.

Zhao, H., 2004. Pay Attention to the Left-behind Children in the Countryside. People's Daily, 4 February.

Zhou, Hao, 2006. Discussion and policy implication of psychological status of migrant children. Popul. Econ. 1, 48–54 (In Chinese).

Zhou, Minhui, Murphy, Rachel, Tao, Ran, 2014. Effects of parents' migration on the education of children left behind in rural China. Popul. Dev. Rev. 40 (2), 273—292.
Zhou, Chengchao, Sylvia, Sean, Zhang, Linxiu, Luo, Renfu, Yi, Hongmei, Liu, Chengfang, Shi, Yaojiang, Loyalka, Prashant, Chu, James, Medina, Alexis, Rozelle, Scott, 2015. China's left-behind children: impact of parental migration on health, nutrition, and educational outcomes. Health Aff. 34 (11), 1964—1971. http://dx.doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2015.0150.

Qiang Ren is Associate Professor at the Center for Social Research and Associate Director of the Institute of Social Science Survey, Peking University. His research interests include environment and health, population issues on fertility, mortality, labor force, housing, and sex ratio at birth. He is currently working on the China Family Panel Studies as a co-PI. In 2003 he received an award from the American Academy of Pediatrics for outstanding achievement in child health, with particular recognition for iodine deficiency control.

Donald J. Treiman is Distinguished Professor of Sociology Emeritus at the University of California at Los Angeles and is currently Distinguished Research Professor and a Faculty Affiliate of the California Center for Population Research at UCLA. He received a B.A. from Reed College (1962) and an M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Chicago (1967), all in sociology. His research interests include social demography and cross-national and cross-temporal comparisons of systems of social inequality. For some years, he has been studying aspects of social inequality in China and more recently has focused on the determinants, dynamics, and consequences of internal migration. With colleagues, he has carried out two national probability sample surveys in China: a 1996 survey focused on inequality and social mobility over the life course and across generations (N = 6090) and a 2008 survey focused on internal migration (N = 3000). For additional information, see his website: http://www.ccpr.ucla.edu/dtreiman.