Inequality in Reform Era China: The Ethnic Question

Christopher Sullivan
Departments of Sociology and Demography
University of California, Berkeley

Paper prepared for the Population Association of America's Annual Conference, Session on Chinese Inequality
April 2006, Los Angeles, CA

Abstract

Scholarly works on inequality in China tend to focus on regional inequality, while studies of ethnic inequality receive far less attention. The few direct studies of ethnic inequality in China fail to reach a consensus over whether ethnic inequality is largely the result of ethnicity, or a consequence of well-documented regional inequalities. This study analyzes whether ethnic inequality is the result of ethnicity per se, or a combination of other factors, particularly region of residence. Drawing on two models from Michael Hechter's *Internal Colonialism*, I examine the complex relationship between ethnicity and regional inequalities in China using data at the individual level. While at first glance there may be inequality between the Han and non-Han among several indicators of inequality: total family income, occupation, commodity ownership and attitudes, using national survey data from 1996 I show that such differences can better be explained through regional inequalities and socio-economic indicators.

Please direct correspondence to: Christopher Sullivan, Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720-1980. E-mail: cbsully@berkeley.edu

Please direct correspondence to: Christopher Sullivan, Department of Sociology, 410 Barrows Hall, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley CA 94720-1980; e-mail: cbsully@berkeley.edu.

Inequality in Reform Era China: The Ethnic Question

Introduction

The process of national economic development increasingly generates inequalities within nations. While rural-urban and regional inequalities continue to widen in many countries, internal divisions along ethnic lines are less well understood. Historically and in the present, ethnic inequalities have grown alongside regional inequalities in many nations. Are such ethnic inequalities the result of ethnic discrimination, byproducts of regional inequality, or some combination of these and other factors?

One prominent approach to analyzing ethnic inequalities within the global system is outlined in Michael Hechter's book, *Internal Colonialism.* Hechter's internal colonialism model argues that the process of national development leads to divergence in economic, cultural and political integration among different ethnic groups located within a single nation. He states:

> The internal colonialism model posits altogether different consequences resulting from heightened core-periphery interaction. According to this model, structural inequalities between the regions should increase, as the periphery develops in a dependent mode. Individuals of the core culture are expected to dominate high prestige roles in the social structure of the peripheral regions, as is the situation in overseas colonies. The bulk of the peripheral population will be confined to subordinate positions in the social structure. In sum, a cultural division of labor will tend to arise. (Hechter, 344)

While this model predicts widening gaps in inequality between core and periphery areas along ethnic lines through a "cultural division of labor," it is not clear in this model whether such divergences are the result of growing regional inequalities or ethnic discrimination. Do ethnic groups experience divergence in economic, cultural and political measures because they live in structurally poorer regions, because of ethnic discrimination, or perhaps a combination of these and other factors?

One limitation to Hechter's model is that it cannot clearly differentiate between the underlying mechanisms driving ethnic inequality. The internal colonialism model asserts that members of the ethnic majority should dominate high-prestige positions within the ethnic minority dominated "periphery." Yet Hechter uses data at the county level rather than at the individual level, which obscures the relationship between these concepts. The goal of this paper is to examine the complex relationship between ethnicity and regional inequalities using data at the individual level. Such an examination using individual level data allows us to separate out the relationship between region, ethnicity and ethnic inequality.

Using a national sample of over 5800 residents in China from 1996, this study finds considerable surface inequalities among the Han and non-Han in three major areas: total family income, occupation and commodity ownership; but similar surface responses to whether respondents consider their families to be better or worse off compared with ten years before. I plan to examine the effects of ethnicity, region of residence and measures of socio-economic status on surface inequalities between the Han and non-Han in occupation, commodity ownership and total family income. Controlling for region of residence and several other socio-economic indicators, do the Han advantages persist?

I also plan to examine differences in responses to the question "Do you consider your family's situation to be better off, worse off, or about the same compared with ten years before." While this question does not directly measure levels of inequality, it contributes a more subjective understanding of how different ethnic groups view their own situation relative to ten years prior. In addition to more material measures of inequality, I argue that asking questions related to perceived mobility allows for a more abstract dimension of well-being than more numerical measures can provide.

Based on my analysis, I argue that ethnic inequality in China is largely the result of regional inequality and socio-economic indicators, and not ethnicity per se. Most of the differences between the Han and non-Han disappear or are reduced once controlling for region of residence and socio-economic status indicators, including education. At the theoretical level, this study can contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between regional and ethnic inequality in this era of rapid national development. While admittedly only based on a single point in time, the results may pave the way for analysis over longer periods of time.

Historical Background & Literature Review

In *Internal Colonialism*, Michael Hechter explores the "social origins of ethnic solidarity and change." (Hechter, 6) He seeks to develop a model that explains why in some nations ethnic groups assimilate, while in others ethnic identity remains strong. Employing the Wallersteinian concepts of "core" and "periphery," Hechter theorizes two models that account for varying levels of national economic development and ethnic integration: the diffusion model and the internal colonialism model. While Hechter is concerned with examining economic, cultural and political integration, his argument over economic integration is most relevant to this study.

Hechter argues that under the diffusion model, economic integration (or convergence in such measures as per capita GDP) occurs as the amount of exchange between the dominant "core" areas and the less-developed "periphery" areas increases. Under this model, one would expect to find similar levels of economic integration both within regions and between ethnic groups in China. However, the growing body of literature on regional inequality in China has cast doubt on the merits of this particular model. In fact, it has been well documented that regional inequalities persist and have in recent years widened. (Bian 2002; Harvie 2000; Khan 2001; Riskin 2001; Wang and Hu 1999; Wei 2000; World Bank 1998; Xie and Hannum 1996) Thus it seems that the diffusion model cannot explain levels of economic integration within China.

This leads us to Hechter's "internal colonialism" model. Under the internal colonialism model, Hechter argues that national development may in some cases lead to divergence in economic, cultural and political integration. On the surface, this model better corresponds with the large body of empirical work that has demonstrated growing regional inequality in China over the past 20+ years. In Hechter's analysis, the internal colonialism model predicts widening gaps in inequality between core and periphery areas along ethnic lines. Does such a prediction find empirical verification in the case of China? Does growing regional inequality imply growing ethnic inequality, or vice versa?

Before delving into these questions, it is necessary to briefly discuss the concept of "ethnicity" in China. Shortly after the establishment of the People's Republic of China in 1949, the national government set out to classify China's diverse ethnic minority population. The result was the assignment of all Chinese residents into one of 56 ethnic groups. Today, the largest ethnic group, the Han, comprises over 90 percent of China's population. Chinese identity is often conflated with Han identity, but in addition to the Han ethnic group China is home to 55 state-recognized ethnic minority groups that comprise nearly 10 percent of the population. The basis for this construction of ethnic identity was based on Stalin's four criteria: "language, territory, economy, and psychological nature manifested in common culture." (Harrell 2001, 39) While researchers have shown that ethnicity in China is not always a clearly defined concept, recent scholarship has pointed to a growing sense of ethnic identity among both ethnic minorities and the Han majority (Harrell 2001).

The amount of scholarly attention devoted to regional inequality in China continues to grow by leaps and bounds. Previous studies have confirmed that regional inequalities exist and continue to widen in China (for example: Bian 2002; Harvie 2000; Khan 2001; Riskin 2001; Wang and Hu 1999; Wei 2000; World Bank 1998; Xie and Hannum 1996), yet studies of ethnic inequality are only recently beginning to attract attention in the social sciences. These works have examined ethnic inequality in education (Hannum 2002), occupation (Hannum and Xie 1998), rural income (Gustafsson and Shi 2003), and representation in political leadership (Zang 1998), but have come to different conclusions regarding the role of ethnicity in explaining observed differences between the Han and non-Han along these measures of inequality. These studies have failed to reach a consensus over whether ethnic inequality is primarily the result of ethnicity, region of residence, differences in socio-economic status, or a combination of these factors.

Results to date have been mixed, and have fallen largely into two camps. On one side, scholars argue that ethnic inequality exists in some cases between the Han majority and several ethnic minority groups, based on small-scale surveys limited to specific regions in China (Hannum 2002; Hannum and Xie 1998). Other research contends that ethnic inequality does *not* exist between the Han majority and minority groups in terms of rural income, drawing upon a larger rural sample (Gustafsson and Shi 2003). While these studies do not share a definition or measurement of ethnic inequality, it is clear they argue for a fundamentally different understanding of the existence of ethnic inequality.

Yet, each of these previous studies suffers from major setbacks: either the scope of the data is limited, or the measures of inequality set forth are themselves limited. I will attempt to rectify these two positions by including a more comprehensive analysis of ethnic inequality in China using a national survey conducted in 1996 and several measures of inequality.

To date, studies of ethnicity in China have largely been conducted by anthropologists: recent works have examined changing ethnic identity (Gladney 1994, 1996; Kaup 2002; Yee 2003), ethnicity as a historical construction (DiKotter 1992; Harrell 1997, 2001), and ethnicity and consumption in contemporary China (Davis 2000; Gillette 2002). There is a general intuition in these works that the 55 ethnic minority groups within China's borders do not share the same levels or access to educational, social or occupational mobility as do their Han neighbors. Studies

of ethnicity in China are only beginning to attract the attention of scholars in other social science disciplines.

Before launching into an analysis of ethnic inequality in China, I will discuss how to measure patterns of inequality between the majority Han and ethnic minority populations in the broader context of national economic development.

How to measure inequality?

I propose to measure ethnic inequality along four dimensions: total family income, the respondent's primary occupational category, commodity ownership, and a question that asks whether respondents consider themselves to be better off compared to 10 years before. The measures of inequality that I employ attempt to pin point both material and abstract conceptions of inequality within Chinese society. These measures are useful proxies for measuring the distribution of economic change resulting from larger processes of economic growth. In contrast to previous scholarship, this study of ethnic inequality in China has both breadth and depth: a random stratified national sample and four measures of ethnic inequality.

Per capita GDP has increased at a dramatic rate in China from the initiation of market reforms in 1978 through today, but national economic growth or "development" should not be measured simply based on this one aggregate variable. While measures of income, occupation, commodity ownership, and attitudes towards growth cannot completely describe how individuals have experienced larger processes of economic change, they can serve as a proxy and facilitate understanding of how the benefits of economic growth are distributed within one country in the global South.

Data & Methodology

My dependent variables are total family income (1996), the respondent's primary occupation category (1996), ownership of 8 different commodities/commodity categories (1996), and whether respondents consider themselves to be better off in 1996 compared with 1986. The data used for this paper were obtained from a project entitled "Life Histories and Social Change in Contemporary China." The surveys were conducted between June and October 1996 in the People's Republic of China (PRC), and were sponsored by Donald Treiman and Ivan Szelenyi at UCLA, and Andrew Walder at Stanford University. Data were collected on 3,087 urban residents and 3,003 rural residents using the same survey questionnaire, for a total of 6,090 residents. (China 1996 Data Codebook) However, due to missing values for several of the

variables in question, my sample size was reduced to 5,858 respondents. (Composed of 2,906 rural residents and 2,952 urban residents) [See Table I]

Simply comparing mean levels of total family income between the majority Han Chinese and non-Han ethnic minorities finds a substantial difference (1900 RMB survey adjusted, where 1 USD ~ 8.26 RMB) in total family income levels in 1996. Comparing the respondents' primary occupational categories[1] finds that the non-Han are more likely to be engaged in agricultural occupations, and less likely to be engaged in each of the remaining five occupational categories. Comparing ownership of 8 different commodity categories[2] in 1996 finds larger percentages of Han ownership in all eight categories (survey adjusted). Finally, comparing the percentages of Han and non-Han responses to the question of whether individuals are better or worse off in 1996 as compared to 1986 finds no significant differences between Han and non-Han respondents. Each of these relationships becomes more complex with the addition of other variables, such as level of completed education and geographic residence. [See Tables II, III, IV and V]

My independent variables include: ethnicity—broken down into Han, Manchu, Mongolian, Hui, Zhuang, Dongxiang, Bai, and a combined category of Other; a respondent's sex, age, urban/rural status, and Communist Party affiliation; respondent's completed level of education—disaggregated into received no schooling, some primary, lower-middle, vocational/technical school or high school, and at least some college; region—26 provinces broken down into Cities (Beijing, Tianjin and Shanghai), Northeast (Heilongjiang, Jilin, Liaoning), Coastal (Shandong, Jiangsu, Zhejiang, Fujian, Guangdong), Central (Hebei, Henan, Anhui, Shanxi, Jiangxi, Hunan, Henan), and Western (Xinjiang, Gansu, Yunnan, Guizhou, Guangxi, Sichuan, Shaanxi, Inner Mongolia); family size, number of working members of the household, and number of Communist Party members in the household. [See Tables I, VI]

Additional dummy variables were created to measure the change in total family income between 1986 and 1996, grouped into 6 categories: whether individuals earned more in 1986 than in 1996 (reference category), earned the same amount in both years, 0-4,999 RMB more in

[1] Occupation is grouped into 6 categories: "not applicable," (consisting of those retired, waiting for work, keeping house, on maternity leave, disabled, in school, and other), agriculture, unskilled/skilled/other, ordinary office worker/manager/professional, service workers and entrepreneurs. [See Table III]

[2] 8 commodity categories include: B&W and/or color TV, refrigerator, electric rice cooker, ordinary clothes washing machine and/or automatic washing machine, electric fan, telephone, bicycle, and motorcycle/car/truck.

1996, 5,000-9,999 RMB more in 1996, 10,000-14,999 RMB more in 1996, or greater than 15,000 RMB more in 1996. A dummy variable for marital status (ever married) was also included in the ordered logistic regression equations. [See Table I]

Additional dummy variables were created to measure the change in commodity ownership between 1986 and 1996. Two indices were created: the first measures the number of commodities an individual owned in 1996, but did not own in 1986 (on a scale from 0-8); the second measures the number of commodities an individual owned in both 1996 and in 1986 (on a scale from 0-8). Both indices measure those individuals who reported they owned a particular commodity in 1996; the difference is that individuals in the first index did not own the particular commodity in 1986, while those in the second did own it in 1986.

For example, an individual who owned 3 commodities in 1996 that s/he did not own in 1986 would receive a score of 3 on the first measure. An individual who owned 4 commodities in both years would receive a score of 4 on the second index. I then grouped each into several dummy variables, with 0 commodities as the base category for each, followed by 1 commodity, 2 commodities, 3 commodities, 4-5 commodities, and 6-8 commodities. [See Table I]

Of the 5,858 respondents in this sample, 2,952 are classified as urban residents (50.4%) and 2,906 as rural residents (49.6%). 48.8% are female, and 51.2% are male. The Han make up 94.3% of my sample, followed by the Hui (1.4%), Dongxiang (0.9%), the category Other Non-Han (0.9%), the Manchu (0.8%), the Bai (0.7%), the Zhuang (0.6%), and Mongolian (0.4%). The category Other Non-Han consists of Tibetans, Koreans, Dai (Thai), Yi, Miao and a subcategory of other. However, adjusting for the design of the survey decreases both the number of Han and the number of urban residents. [See Tables I-1/2 vs. I-3/4]

The average total family income for the entire sample in 1996 was 11,029RMB (survey adjusted, 10,819RMB). In 1996, approximately 37.1% of the sample was engaged in agricultural occupations; 17.9% were engaged in either unskilled or unskilled labor, or other labor; 8.1% were engaged in service occupations; 13.7% were in ordinary office work, managerial positions or professional occupations; 2.9% were classified as entrepreneurs. Finally, 20.4 % of respondents were classified as "not applicable," indicating that they were not in the labor force, were retired, etc. (See Tables II and III for survey adjusted figures)

In terms of commodity ownership in 1996, over 85% of the total sample owned a B&W and/or color television in 1996; just over 32% owned a refrigerator; over 35% owned an electric

rice cooker; about 44% owned a regular and/or automatic washing machine; over 70% owned an electric fan; over 20% owned a telephone; over 82% owned a bicycle; and just over 11% owned a motorcycle and/or car/truck. [See Table IV for survey adjusted figures]

In response to the question of whether individuals are better or worse off compared to 10 years ago, 51.4% of the sample responded that they are "A lot better off," 34.9% responded they are "A little better off," 9.4% responded they are "About the same," 2.7% responded "A little worse off," and the remaining 1.6% responded they are "A lot worse off." Altogether, 86.4% of respondents indicated that they were either "A lot" or "A little" better off in 1996 than in 1986. The survey adjusted figures do not differ significantly. [See Table V for survey adjusted figures]

To examine this relationship between ethnicity and 1) total family income, 2) the respondent's occupational category, 3) ownership of commodities, and 4) perceptions of whether individuals are doing better off compared with 10 years before, I make use of multiple regression techniques, including: multiple linear regression (on family income), multinomial logistic regression (on occupational categories), binary logistic regression (on each of the eight commodity categories), and ordered logistic regression (on the variable change). Regression analysis is an appropriate technique for examining the relationship between total family income, commodity ownership and attitudes, and allows me to control for the effects of several independent variables on these dependent variables.

While I am careful not to assume that a correlation between these variables means that one variable causes another, nonetheless these relationships can tell us more about how these independent variables can predict levels of family income, occupational outcomes, commodity ownership, and whether certain individuals are more likely to respond that they are doing better off compared with 10 years before. Linear and logistic regression analyses allow me to control for the effects of several variables at once, and to tease out whether ethnicity, or some combination of other variables, can account for the discrepancy in family income, occupation, commodity ownership, and changing attitudes among Han and non-Han Chinese.

I will attempt to examine how income, occupation and ownership of commodities are distributed among different ethnic groups, educational categories, urban/rural and geographic regions, as well as several individual characteristics of the respondents. What can we learn about inequality in China from examining how income, commodity ownership, and how people view

themselves as better off varies among different ethnic groups in Chinese society? Do we find persistent patterns of inequality between the Han and ethnic minorities?

Limitations

Before embarking further into a discussion of the results and conclusions, it is necessary to discuss the limitations of the sample and research design. China is home to 55 state-recognized ethnic minority groups, yet the sample under investigation does not include all of these groups. Thus, I employ a category, "non-Han," that refers only to the non-Han respondents in my sample, and not all 55 ethnic minority groups in China.

For largely political reasons, the Tibetan autonomous region was excluded from the sampling frame. However, it is unlikely that Tibet would have been selected had it been included in the sampling frame because it is overwhelming rural, and comprises a small proportion of China's total population. Furthermore, while China itself was roughly 75% rural in 1996, the sampling frame was stratified so that the sample would contain roughly 50% rural and 50% urban respondents. In addition, county-level units (*xian*) were stratified by the percent of the population with a lower-middle school education (or junior high) to ensure a greater variety of responses from individuals of different educational backgrounds. Thus the sample is not a simple random sample, but was stratified by both education levels and urban/rural residence. I utilized the svyset commands in Stata 7 to account for the stratified survey design.

Results[3]

Comparison of Means (1996 & 1986)

Based on survey adjusted means, the average total family income in 1996 for non-Han ethnic minorities is 9,057RMB, while for Han it is 10,964RMB—a difference of 1,907 RMB. Substantial differences exist between the Han and Non-Han in occupational outcomes, with the Han dominating every category with the exception of agriculture. For the survey adjusted Han sample, 17.2% of respondents classify their occupations as "not applicable;" 50.1% are in agricultural occupations; 14.4% are in the skilled/unskilled/other category; 9.7% are in the office worker/manager/professional category; 6.1% are engaged in service occupations and 2.5% are entrepreneurs. For the collective non-Han, 10.0% of respondents classify their occupations as "not applicable;" 72.3% are in agricultural occupations; 8.3% are in the skilled/unskilled/other

[3] Results are interpreted using survey adjusted values unless otherwise indicated.

category; 5.2% are in the office worker/manager/professional category; 1.9% are in service occupations; and 2.4% are entrepreneurs. [See Tables II, III]

Han respondents report higher rates of ownership in all 8 of the 8 commodity categories in 1996. In the TV category, Han have an 22.3% advantage over the non-Han; an 11.1% higher rate of ownership of refrigerators; a 7.9% higher rate of ownership of electric rice cookers; a 5.9% higher percentage of ownership of washing machines; a 42.1% rate of ownership of electric fans; 7.5% higher ownership rate of telephones; a 18.8% higher percentage ownership of bicycles; and finally, 3.2% higher ownership of motorcycles, cars and/or trucks. [See Table IV]

Finally, for the variable change, in response to the question of whether individuals and their families are better off than 10 years prior, Han and non-Han see similar responses: 51.7% of Han report they are "A lot better off," compared with 49.9% of the non-Han respondents; 36.5% of Han say they are "A little better off," compared with 37.5% of the non-Han; 8.4% of the Han respond they are "About the same," as did 9.1% of the non-Han; 2.1% of the Han say they are "A little worse off," compared with 2.6% of the non-Han; and finally, 1.3% of the Han say they are "A lot worse off," compared with 0.9% of the non-Han respondents. [See Table V]

Total Family Income (1996)

There is a gap of over 1900 RMB in average total family income between the Han and non-Han in 1996. Once controlling for urban/rural residence, geographic location, party membership, education levels, occupation as well as several other variables, a more nuanced picture of income inequality emerges. Disaggregating ethnicity into several dummy variables likewise creates a complicated picture, yet the overall story is that income among ethnic minorities, with the exception of the Dongxiang and "Other category," is not significantly different from the Han. The Manchu and Bai each have a slightly higher income than do the Han, although the results are not significant. The seven models in Table VII treat ethnicity as a dichotomous variable broken down into Han and non-Han categories, with non-Han as the base. The six models in Table VIII further disaggregate ethnicity into 7 categories, with the Han as the reference category. [Please refer to Tables II, VII and VIII]

The models in Table VII treat ethnicity as a dichotomous variable. The results from model 1 indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in total family income between the Han and non-Han, controlling only for ethnicity. Models 2 and 3 also fail to show a significant difference between the Han and Non-Han in total family income, controlling for both

characteristics of the respondent and the respondent's education level. However, models 4-7 add additional independent variables, including region of residence, occupation, family characteristics, and several interaction terms. Here the effect of ethnicity changes.

Model 4 and 5 add the respondent's region of residence and occupation, and in both models, the Han earn less on average than the non-Han. However, this non-Han advantage disappears in models 6 and 7 with the addition of family characteristics and interaction terms. In model 6, there is no significant difference between the Han and non-Han in total family income, once controlling for other variables. However in model 7, there is a large significant difference between the two groups in favor of the Han. This large coefficient (11,131 RMB) is somewhat misleading, since once taking into consideration regional variables and interaction terms, this coefficient produces quite dissimilar results. The results show the Han appear to hold a large income advantage in the Cities and Coastal regions, a slight income advantage in the Central and Western regions, while the non-Han have a slightly higher income in the Northeast region. However, it is also worthy to note the lack of significance in the regional variables in model 7.

The results from Table VIII likewise create a complicated picture of ethnic differences in total family income. In models 8, 9 and 10 the Mongols report lower total family incomes than the Han, although this difference is not significant in models 11, 12 or 13. The Zhuang report significantly higher total family incomes than the Han in models 9, 10, 11 and 12, although this difference drops out in model 13. The Dongxiang report significantly lower total family income levels than the Han in models 8, 9, 10 and 13. The "Other" ethnic group also reports significantly lower total family income in models 8, 9 and 13. The Hui report significantly higher total family income in models 11 and 12; while the Bai report significantly higher family income in models 9, 10, 11 and 12. Finally, the Manchu consistently report higher levels of total family income than the Han, although the results are not significant in any of the six models.

The significant factors that do predict higher or lower income levels in both tables VII and VIII are the respondents' education levels, geographic residence, certain occupations, and family characteristics. Respondents in the Northeast and Western provinces consistently report significantly lower levels of total family income than residents in the Cities (Beijing, Shanghai, and Tianjin). Respondents in the Central region also report lower incomes than residents in the Cities in several of the models, while respondents living in the Coastal provinces do not report significant differences in total family income from respondents living in the Cities region. In

addition, urban residents have a higher level of total family income than do rural residents, although this result is not statistically significant in expanded models (although the trend across the models in tables VII and VIII indicates urban residents have between 5-7,000 RMB higher family income than rural residents).

In the models that control for the respondent's highest completed level of education (models 3-7 and 10-13), there is a general trend of increasing returns to total family income with higher completed levels of education. Respondents with more than 12 years of schooling, and respondents with 11-12 years of schooling report significantly higher levels of total family income relative to the other educational categories. Having between 1-8 years of schooling also carries a positive return to family income compared with having no schooling. Having completed 9 years of schooling, while indicating a positive return to total family income in each model—does not significantly differ from zero.

In the models that control for the respondent's primary occupation category (models 5-7, 12-13), individuals within the services and entrepreneur categories report significantly higher levels of total family income, controlling for other factors, relative to individuals engaged in agriculture. The remaining occupation categories do not differ significantly from agriculture. Finally, family size and the number of working members in the household both significantly add to the predicted amount of total family income of a given respondent, while the number of party members in the family does not significantly impact levels of total family income.

A more complex understanding of the initial difference in mean total family income between the Han and non-Han emerges once controlling for geographic variables and socio-economic indicators. It first emerges that the Han retain an advantage in the Cities, Coastal, Central and Western regions, and the non-Han have an income advantage in the Northeastern provinces. Yet further disaggregating ethnicity reveals that many of the ethnic groups exhibit no significant differences with Han. Ethnicity predicts differences in total family income only in some cases –as is the case with the Dongxiang and "Other" ethnic groups. However, the overall conclusion is that region/regional interactions, education and certain occupations better predict levels of total family income than ethnicity does across all the models.

Occupation Categories (1996)

A comparison of the mean percentages of Han and non-Han respondents in different occupation categories in 1996 finds that the Han are more likely to be engaged in all of the non-

agricultural occupations. While agriculture is the most common occupation reported among both Han and non-Han respondents in this sample, over 72.3% of non-Han respondents are engaged in agricultural occupations compared to only 50.1% of Han respondents. Using multinomial logistic regression, I examine whether the Han are significantly more likely to be engaged in the categories of "not applicable," unskilled/skilled/other, ordinary office work/manager/professional, services and entrepreneurs, relative to agriculture, after controlling for several additional independent variables.

Using multinomial logistic regression, I created two sets of models that attempt to separate the effects of several variables on occupational outcomes. The first set of models (Models 1-6: Table IX-1 through IX-5) treats ethnicity as a dichotomous variable, with categories Han and non-Han. The second set of models (Models 7-12: Table X-1 through X-5) disaggregates ethnicity into several categories: Manchu, Mongol, Hui, Zhuang, Dongxiang, Bai, and a category "other non-Han", with Han as the base category. All results are obtained using multinomial logistic regression, and to aid in interpretation and presentation, have been combined across models based on occupational category.

The findings indicate that while the Han are initially more likely to be engaged in each of the occupations relative to agriculture (with the exception of entrepreneur), once controlling for region of residence (model 5) and family characteristics (model 6) the Han advantage drops out for each of these occupations. Thus, once controlling for these variables, it appears the Han do not significantly differ from the non-Han in being more or less likely to engage in each of the occupations, relative to the base category agriculture.

Disaggregating ethnicity into several dummy variables produces more complex results. The results indicate that several of the ethnic groups are significantly less likely to be engaged in certain occupations relative to agriculture compared with the Han. However, in some cases, a few ethnic groups are more likely to be engaged in certain occupations than the Han. First, for the occupation category of "not applicable," the results indicate that the Mongols, Zhuang and Dongxiang ethnic groups are each less likely to engage in this activity relative to agriculture, as compared with the Han. In some models the Bai are also less likely to be engaged in this category, relative to agriculture, while in one model they are more likely to be engaged in the "not applicable" category. In model 12, however, they do not significantly differ from the Han. [See Table X-1]

Second, for the category unskilled/skilled/other occupations, the only consistent finding is that members of the Dongxiang ethnic group are significantly less likely to be engaged in this category, relative to agriculture, than are the Han. Several other ethnic groups initially appear to be less likely to be engaged in this category [models 7-10], but once controlling for region and family characteristics, do not significantly differ from the Han. [See Table X-2] Third, for the office worker/manager/professional category, the Zhuang and Bai ethnic groups are both significantly less likely to be engaged in this occupation category, relative to agriculture, than are the Han. The Dongxiang, however, are significantly more likely to be engaged in this occupation category, relative to agriculture, than are the Han. [See Table X-3]

Fourth, for the service occupational category, it appears that several of the ethnic groups, including the Mongols, Zhuang, Dongxiang and Bai are each significantly less likely to be engaged in this occupation, relative to agriculture, than are the Han. [See Table X-4] Finally, for the fifth category, entrepreneur, three ethnic groups are significantly less likely to be engaged in this occupation, relative to agriculture, than are the Han: the Manchu, Mongols, and the Dongxiang. However, the Bai report that they are significantly more likely to engage in this occupational category, relative to agriculture, than are the Han. [See Table X-5]

Variables that consistently predict significant differences in occupational outcomes include: urban/rural status, age, sex, marital status, party affiliation, respondent's education, parent's party affiliation, parent's occupation, and family characteristics. As would be expected, in all the models that contain urban/rural status, urban residents are more likely to be engaged in each of the occupations, relative to agriculture, than are rural residents. Respondents between the ages of 30-39 are significantly less likely to be engaged in the "not applicable," unskilled/skilled/other, and office/manager/professional categories, relative to agriculture, compared with respondents between the ages of 20-29 in both sets of models.

Men are significantly less likely to be engaged in the "not applicable" category, while they are significantly more likely to be engaged in both the unskilled/skilled/other category, and the entrepreneur category, relative to agriculture, in both sets of models. Individuals who have ever been married are significantly less likely to be engaged in the "not applicable" and the unskilled/skilled/other category, but more likely to be in the entrepreneur category, relative to agriculture, in both sets of models.

Party members are significantly more likely to be engaged in the "not applicable," and office/manager/professional categories, relative to agriculture, in both sets of models. As for education, higher levels of education correspond with an individual being more likely to be engaged in each of the occupational categories, relative to agriculture, in both sets of models.

For parent's party affiliation, having a mother who is a party member is only significant in one case: individuals are significantly less likely to be engaged in the "not applicable" category, relative to agriculture, in both sets of models, if their mother is a party member. Having a father who is a party member also makes an individual less likely to be engaged in the entrepreneur category, relative to agriculture, in both sets of models. In the remaining occupations, parental party affiliation does not appear to influence an individual's likelihood of being engaged in a particular occupation relative to agriculture.

As for parent's occupation when the respondent was 14, having a father engaged in agriculture is not a significant predictor of the respondent's occupational outcome. In only one case, "not applicable," does it indicate that individuals are less likely to engage in this occupational category. However, the results are not consistent across the models. In both sets of models, having a father engaged in the "unskilled/skilled/other" category indicates an increased likelihood that the respondent would be engaged in the unskilled/skilled/other, office/manager/professional, and services categories, relative to agriculture.

Having a father engaged in the office/professional category indicates that the respondent is more likely to be engaged in the unskilled/skilled/other, office/manager/professional, and services categories in both sets of models. Furthermore, having a father engaged in the sales/entrepreneur category only indicates that the respondent would be more likely to be engaged in the services occupation, relative to agriculture.

For mother's occupation, having a mother engaged in agriculture (relative to the "not applicable/don't know category") results in a decreased likelihood that the respondent would be engaged in all five occupations, relative to agriculture, in both models. However, having a mother engaged in a non-agricultural occupation results in an increased likelihood that the respondent would be engaged in the "not applicable," unskilled/skilled/other, office/manager/professional and services categories, relative to agriculture, in both sets of models.

Next, we turn to variables that control for family characteristics. The variable for family size indicates that an individual would be more likely to be engaged in the "not applicable" category relative to agriculture, in both models, the larger the family size. However, this is balanced by the number of working members of the family. The number of working family members proves significant in the "not applicable" category, relative to agriculture, with an individual being less likely to engage in this occupation the larger the number of working family members. These two variables are not significant predictors of occupational attainment in the remaining occupational categories.

The number of party members in the family proves significant in three occupational categories: "not applicable," office/manager/professional, and service. In each case, having more party members in the family indicates an increased likelihood of engaging in these three occupations, relative to agriculture, in both sets of models. In addition, this variable also indicates an increased likelihood of engaging in the unskilled/skilled/other category, relative to agriculture, in the models that disaggregate ethnicity (models 7 through 12).

To summarize, it appears that the Han advantage in each occupation (relative to agriculture) disappears once controlling for region of residence and family characteristics. While in Tables IX-1 through IX-5, the regional dummy variables are not significant, adding them into the models reduces the significance of Han ethnicity as a predictor of occupational attainment. The Han advantage drops out in all occupation categories once controlling for region and family characteristics.

However, once disaggregating ethnicity, tables X-1 through X-5 indicate that certain ethnic groups do not fare as well as the Han in occupational attainment. More specifically, the Manchu are significantly less likely to engage in entrepreneurial occupations; the Mongols significantly less likely to engage in "not applicable," services and entrepreneurial occupations; the Zhuang less likely to engage in 'not applicable," office/manager/professional, and service occupations; the Dongxiang significantly less likely to engage in "not applicable," unskilled/skilled/other, services and entrepreneurial occupations, but are more likely to engage in the office/manager/professional category, relative to agriculture, than the Han. Finally, the Bai are less likely to be engaged in office/manager/professional and services occupations, but are more likely to be engaged in entrepreneurial activities, relative to agriculture, than the Han. Both the Hui and "other non-Han" categories prove not to be significant in any of the models.

Commodity Ownership (1996)

The Han showed higher levels of ownership compared to the non-Han in 8 out of 8 commodity categories in 1996. Yet controlling for urban/rural residence, geographic location, party membership, education, occupation and several other variables, these advantages for the Han begin to drop out. Once taking into consideration these independent variables, the Han advantage remains in only one of the eight categories (electric fans). In the remaining commodity categories, there is no significant difference between the Han and non-Han in commodity ownership. [See Tables XI-1, XI-2]

In addition to ethnicity, several other variables predict a greater likelihood of owning different commodities. Levels of education, certain occupation categories, differences in income levels between 1986 and 1996, age, Party membership and family characteristics, urban/rural status and geographic residency all predict varying levels of commodity ownership. Almost across the board, higher levels of education correspond to a greater likelihood of owning a particular commodity. Respondents with more than 12 years of schooling had a greater likelihood of owning a particular commodity relative to those with no schooling in 7 out of the 8 categories, while respondents with 11-12 years of education follow closely behind.

Individuals who classified their occupation as entrepreneurs were more likely to own 7 out of the 8 commodities, while individuals engaged in services were more likely to own 6 out of the 8 commodities when compared to those in agriculture. Respondents in the office/managerial/professional occupation were more likely to own 5 out of the 8 commodities, while those in the skilled/unskilled/other category were more likely to own 6 out of the 8 commodities compared to those engaged in agriculture. Finally, those in the not applicable category were more likely to own all 8 of the commodities compared to respondents in agricultural occupations.

There appeared to be a somewhat positive linear relationship between the likelihood of owning a particular commodity and the difference in total family income levels between 1986 and 1996. Individuals whose total family income increased by more than 15,000RMB between the two years had the greatest likelihood of owning each of the 8 commodities, followed next by those who gained between 10,000-14,999RMB, and then by those who gained between 5,000-9,999RMB. Those who either reported the same income levels in both years, or who gained less

than 5,000RMB did not have a clear advantage in the likelihood of owning these commodities when compared with those who earned less in 1996 than they did in 1986 (the reference group).

Party members were more likely to own 4 out of 8 commodities compared with non-Party members, while each additional party member in the family positively impacted the odds of owning a particular commodity in 6 out of the 8 cases. Urban residents were significantly more likely to own 6 out of 8 commodities when compared to rural residents, while residents in the Western region were less likely to own 5 out of 8 commodities than residents in the Cities (Beijing, Shanghai, Tianjin). Respondents in the Northeast region were less likely to own 4 out of 8 commodities than those in the Cities, but at the same time more likely to own 4 commodities. Residents in the Coastal region were also split: more likely to own 2 commodities, but less likely to own 1 out of the 8 commodities compared with those in the Cities. Respondents in the Central region were less likely to own 1 out of the 8 categories. Finally, respondents between the ages 30-39 were more likely to own many of the commodity categories compared with respondents between the ages 20-29, as were respondents between the ages 40-49. Male respondents were less likely to own 8 out of the 8 commodities than female respondents.

In terms of the relationship between ethnicity and commodity ownership, we have seen that the Han are more likely to own only 1 out of the 8 commodities, while no significant difference in commodity ownership exists across the remaining commodity categories. It appears that urban/rural status and region, along with certain occupations and gains in income between 1986 and 1996 better predict ownership of these different commodities than ethnicity.

Are the Han More Likely to Report They are Better Off? (1996 vs. 1986)

Total family income, occupation and commodity ownership certainly can not capture a full snapshot of levels of inequality within China. One additional way to study levels of inequality is to examine variations in responses to the question "Compared with 10 years ago, do you feel that your own and your own family's current situation is: A lot better, a little better, about the same, a little worse, or a lot worse?" among different ethnic groups. The responses are coded on a scale from 1-5, with "1" being "A lot better" and "5" being "A lot worse." On the surface, Han and non-Han respond relatively equally to this question, but once controlling for a selection of variables, a more complex result emerges. [See Tables V, XII-1/2, XIII-1/2]

Using ordered logistic regression, I created two sets of models that attempt to tease out the effects of several variables on the respondent's attitudes towards their changing life situation.

The first set of models (Models 1-5: Table XII-1/2) treats ethnicity as a dichotomous variable, with categories Han and non-Han. The second set of models (Models 6-9: Table XIII-1/2) once again disaggregates ethnicity into seven categories, with Han as the base category.

In table XII, the Han ethnicity variable is not a significant predictor of whether an individual was doing "A lot better off" relative to the other choices. To understand if there might be additional effects for Han who live in urban areas and certain regions, I added five interaction effects to account for the potential effects of being both Han and living in a particular region in models 4 and 5. The results show that while Han ethnicity by itself is not significant, the Han living in the Central region (models 4 and 5) and living in the Western region (model 4) are significantly less likely to respond they are doing "a lot better off" relative to Han living in the Cities and the non-Han. There is no significant difference observed for the Han*Urban or the remaining regional interaction terms.

Breaking the non-Han category into seven dummy variables in table XIII reveals that the Hui are significantly more likely to respond they are doing "A lot better" when compared to the Han, controlling for other variables. In models 6 and 9 the Zhuang are significantly less likely to respond they are doing "A lot better off" compared to the Han, and in model 6 both the Dongxiang and Bai are less likely to respond they are doing "A lot better off." However, the remaining ethnic groups do not show any significant difference with the Han when controlling for additional variables.

The relationship between ethnicity and geography is complex. To summarize, it appears that the Han living in the Central and Western regions report they are slightly worse off than their non-Han counterparts, and the Han living in other areas. There appears to be no difference for the Han living in the Coastal and Northeastern regions, when compared to both the Han living in the Cities region and the collective non-Han. However, further disaggregating ethnicity reveals that many of the ethnic groups display no significant difference with the Han. The two exceptions are the Hui (more likely to give a favorable reply), and the Zhuang (less likely to give a favorable reply).

In addition to ethnicity, several other variables are significant predictors of whether an individual is more or less likely to respond they are doing "A lot better off." From Tables XII and XIII we see that males are significantly less likely to respond they are "A lot better off," while marital status is not a significant predictors of how individuals respond in any of the

models. Individuals above age 50 are significantly more likely to report they are "A lot better off," compared to individuals between the ages of 20-29. The remaining age groups do not show a significant difference. Party members are also significantly more likely to report they are doing "A lot better off" compared to 10 years ago.

Individuals in urban areas are significantly less likely to respond that they are "A lot better off" in each of the models compared to rural residents. With few exceptions, the regional variables do not produce significant results. In two of the models (2 and 7), individuals living in the Western provinces are less likely to say they are doing "A lot better off," relative to those in the Cities. Individuals in the Central region are more likely to respond they are "A lot better off" in model 4. The remaining regions do not report significant differences in responses compared to the Cities region.

As for education, those respondents who completed some college or more are most likely to respond they are better off in 1996 compared to 1986 in three of the models; respondents with some primary school education are also more likely to report they are doing "A lot better off" compared with respondents with no schooling. The other educational categories do not significantly predict whether one is "A lot better off." As for occupation, respondents in the not applicable and skilled/unskilled/other categories are less likely to respond they are "A lot better off" compared to those engaged in agriculture in two of the five models.

Entrepreneurs are more likely to report that they are better off in 1996 compared with the reference group, agriculture, in the majority of models. Those engaged in office/managerial/professional and service occupations are each more likely to respond they are doing "A lot better off" in two models relative to those engaged in agriculture. No significant differences exist among those in the services occupational category relative to agriculture.

The effect of gains in income between 1986 and 1996 prove slightly more complicated: individuals with the same income in both years are significantly less likely to respond they are better off in 1996, compared with the reference group (those who earned more in 1986 than 1996) in all the models. Beginning with individuals who gained between 5,000-9,999 RMB in total family income between 1986 and 1996, it appears that the larger the gain in income between those years, the more likely an individual responded that s/he is "A lot better off." Family size has a negative impact upon whether one is more likely to respond s/he is "A lot better off," while the number of working members of the family has a positive impact on

reported well-being. The results indicate that the more Communist Party members in the family, the more likely one is to respond s/he is better off.

Finally, in models 5 and 9 I include two sets of indicators that examine whether gains in commodity ownership between 1986 and 1996, and "maintaining" commodity ownership between those years influence an individuals response to the change question. In both models, the results prove statistically significant. In both models 5 and 9, the more commodities individuals gained between 1986 and 1996, the more likely respondents are to report that they are doing "A lot better off," relative to people who did not gain any commodities during that time. Furthermore, individuals who report commodity "maintenance" between those years (owned a particular commodity in both years), are each more likely to report they are "A lot better off" compared with those who did not "maintain" any commodities during those years. The more commodities one "maintained" between those years, the more likely they are to report they are "A lot better off."

Given that 1) only two of the seven ethnic minority groups report significant differences with the Han in total family income (both less than the Han), 2) that the Han advantage in non-agricultural occupations largely disappears once controlling for region and socio-economic indicators, admittedly with some exceptions, 3) that ownership of commodities is only slightly tilted in favor of the Han (1 out of 8 commodities), and 4) that region and other socio-economic indicators, rather than ethnicity, better determine who is more likely to respond that s/he is "better off," how can we make sense of these findings?

Discussion & Implications for Theory

Since the early 1950s, the Chinese government has directed resources into the "backward" provinces of Western and Central China. From campaigns such as the Great Leap Forward in the 1950s, to the "Great Development of the West" initiative issued by Jiang Zemin in 1999 (issued after the completion of the surveys), the PRC government has been well aware that significant inequalities exist between the wealthier Northern and Coastal provinces and China's interior. The findings presented here strongly support the persistence of such regional inequalities in 1996, both between urban and rural residents, and between macro-regions of China. Yet the relationship between geographic inequality and ethnicity requires a more detailed explanation.

In sum, the findings here do not support significant Han advantages along these four measures of inequality over the collective non-Han. It is clear that the greatest predictors of one's family income, occupational attainment, ownership of commodities and attitudes are socio-economic indicators and where one lives in China. Non-Han Chinese disproportionately live in rural areas, in poorer macro-regions of China, and have lower rates of educational attainment. In contrast, the Han majority is concentrated in the wealthier macro-regions of China, and is more likely to have completed levels of higher education and engage in higher paying jobs. Yet the findings here indicate that those Han living the poorer regions are just as "bad off" as the non-Han, controlling for other factors; while certain non-Han groups living in the wealthier regions are just as "well off" as their Han counterparts.

It is true that ethnic differences remain even after controlling for socio-economic indicators. Yet what is more striking is how these ethnic differences do not consistently remain significant across different models, and seem to be more the result of interaction with region of residence than the result of ethnicity alone. One exception appears to be the Dongxiang ethnic group. This group reports significantly lower rates of total family income than the Han, and is significantly less likely to be engaged in 4 out of the 5 occupation categories, relative to agriculture, than the Han. Several of the remaining ethnic groups do report significant differences in total family income (the "Other" ethnic group) and occupation (the Zhuang, Mongols and Bai) compared with the Han. Yet the results of this study indicate that in 1996, material measures of ethnic inequality are more the result of socio-economic indicators and geographic inequality, not ethnicity in and of itself.

Returning to Hechter's internal colonialism model, the results here suggest a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between ethnic and regional inequality. Growing differences in total family income and commodity ownership between the core and periphery may be occurring, but it is important to note that such growing disparity cannot be explained solely through the lens of ethnicity. The majority of both Han and non-Han are experiencing roughly the same uneven regional benefits of national economic development based on geographic residence and socio-economic background, not simply ethnicity. While the internal colonialism model does not separate out region and ethnicity at the individual level, the results here indicate that ethnic minorities do not *consistently* differ from the Han majority along these measures once controlling for region of residence and measures of SES at the individual level.

The preceding analysis presents a challenge to the internal colonialism model. While this model predicts that the Han would retain an advantage in heavily ethnic minority populated areas, the findings here paint a different story. The data offer little support to the predictions made by the internal colonialism model. The exception, of course, may be the Dongxiang ethnic group, but overall such a model does not accurately describe ethnic inequality in China.

The Chinese government has in the past been strongly committed to redistributive economic policies along regional and urban/rural lines. An important question is whether this commitment to egalitarianism is compatible with the constraints of the global marketplace, or whether China must accept growing inequality in order to satisfy its desire for continued economic growth. Whether China's continued economic growth will become increasingly polarized remains to be seen. Particularly as ethnic identity grows more salient, and ethnic insurgency becomes more frequent, ethnic inequality within Chinese society will likely emerge as a contentious issue.

China's adoption of market based reforms over the past twenty-five years has resulted in unprecedented economic growth. The growing economy has brought economic prosperity to many Chinese residents, and in recent scholarship significant attention has been paid to how this growth has been distributed both socially and geographically across Chinese society. The distribution of the benefits of economic growth within Chinese society has ramifications for economic, political and social stability. More specifically, the distribution of economic gains between the majority Han Chinese and 55 non-Han ethnic minority groups has implications for the government's ability to maintain such stability.

In conclusion, ethnic minorities in China appear to be worse off not as a simple result of ethnicity, but because they disproportionately live in poorer, rural regions of China, and do not share the same levels of education as the majority Han. On the issue of inequality in access to education and occupations, further research is clearly needed at the national level. A better understanding of ethnic inequality in China can be made through the lens of growing regional inequalities. The gaps between ethnic minorities and the majority Han in family income and commodity ownership will likely increase if regional inequalities are not addressed through the distribution of economic gains.

Bibliography

Bian, Yanjie. 2002. "Chinese Social Stratification and Social Mobility." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 28: 91-116.

Davis, Deborah S. 2000. *The Consumer Revolution in Urban China*. Berkeley: U. of California.

Dikotter, Frank. 1992. *The Discourse of Race in Modern China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Entwisle, Barbara and Henderson, Gail E, eds. 2000. *Re-Drawing Boundaries: Work, Households, and Gender in China.* Berkeley: University of California.

Gillette, Maris Boyd. 2000. *Between Mecca and Beijing: Modernization and Consumption Among Urban Chinese Muslims.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Gladney, Dru. 1996. *Muslim Chinese: Ethnic Nationalism in the People's Republic*. Cambridge: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University.

Gladney, Dru. 1994. "Representing Nationality in China: Refiguring Majority/Minority Identities." *Journal of Asian Studies* 53(1): 92-123.

Gustafsson, Björn and Shi, Li. 2003. "The Ethnic Minority-Majority Income Gap in Rural China during Transition." *Economic Development and Cultural Change*. 51(4): 805-822.

Hannum, Emily. 2002. "Educational Stratification by Ethnicity in China: Enrollment and Attainment in the Early Reform Years." *Demography* 39(1): 95-117.

Hannum, Emily and Yu Xie. 1998. "Ethnic Stratification in Northwest China: Occupational Differences between Han Chinese and National Minorities in Xinjiang, 1982-1990." *Demography* 35(3): 323-333.

Harrell, Stevan, ed. 1997. *Cultural Encounters on China's Ethnic Frontiers*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Harrell, Stevan. 2001. *Ways of Being Ethnic in Southwest China*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Harvie, Charles. 2000. *Contemporary Developments and Issues in China's Economic Transition.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Hechter, Michael. 1975. *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Kaup, Katherine Palmer. 2002. "Regionalism versus Ethnicnationalism in the People's Republic of China." *China Quarterly* 172:863-84.

Khan, Azizur Rahman and Riskin, Carl. 2001. *Inequality and Poverty in China in the Age of Globalization.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Poston, Dudley and Jing Shu. 1987. "The Demographic and Socioeconomic Composition of China's Ethnic Minorities." *Population and Development Review* 13(4): 703-22.

Riskin, Carl et al. 2001. *China's Retreat from Equality: Income Distribution and Economic Transition.* New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Wang, Shaoguang and Hu, Angang. 1999. *The Political Economy of Uneven Development: The Case of China*. New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Wei, Yehua Dennis. 2000. *Regional Development in China: States, Globalization, and Inequality*. New York: Routledge.

World Bank. 1998. *When Economic Reform is Faster than Statistical Reform: Measuring and Explaining Inequality in Rural China.* Policy Research Paper 1902. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Xie, Yu and Emily Hannum. 1996. "Regional Variation in Earnings Inequality and Reform-Era Urban China." *American Journal of Sociology* 101(4): 950-992.

Yee, Herbert S. 2003. "Ethnic Relations in Xinjiang: A Survey of Uygur-Han Relations in Urumqi." *Journal of Contemporary China* 12(36): 431-452.

Zang, Xiaowei. 1998. "Ethnic Representation in the Current Chinese Leadership." *The China Quarterly* 153 (Mar.): 107-127.

Zhou, Xueguang, Moen, Phyllis and Nancy Brandon Tuma. 1998. "Educational Stratification in Urban China: 1949-94." *Sociology of Education* 71(3): 199-222.

TABLE I - 1 **SUMMARY STATISTICS**

	Unadjusted Sample (N=5858)				Unadjusted Han Sample (N=5523)				Unadj. Non-Han Sample (N=335)			
	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max
Ethnicity												
Han	0.943	0.232	0	1	1.000	0.000	1	1	0.000	0.000	0	0
Manchu	0.008	0.091	0	1	0.000	0.000	0	0	0.146	0.354	0	1
Mongol	0.004	0.065	0	1	0.000	0.000	0	0	0.075	0.263	0	1
Hui	0.014	0.119	0	1	0.000	0.000	0	0	0.251	0.434	0	1
Zhuang	0.006	0.077	0	1	0.000	0.000	0	0	0.104	0.306	0	1
Dongxiang	0.009	0.095	0	1	0.000	0.000	0	0	0.158	0.365	0	1
Bai	0.006	0.080	0	1	0.000	0.000	0	0	0.113	0.318	0	1
Other Non-Han	0.009	0.093	0	1	0.000	0.000	0	0	0.152	0.360	0	1
Respondent												
Male	0.512	0.500	0	1	0.515	0.500	0	1	0.463	0.499	0	1
Age 20-29	0.199	0.399	0	1	0.194	0.396	0	1	0.281	0.450	0	1
Age 30-39	0.267	0.443	0	1	0.269	0.444	0	1	0.239	0.427	0	1
Age 40-49	0.256	0.437	0	1	0.256	0.436	0	1	0.266	0.442	0	1
Age 50+	0.277	0.448	0	1	0.281	0.449	0	1	0.215	0.411	0	1
Ever Married	0.907	0.291	0	1	0.908	0.289	0	1	0.884	0.321	0	1
Urban	0.504	0.500	0	1	0.513	0.500	0	1	0.346	0.476	0	1
Party Member	0.119	0.324	0	1	0.121	0.327	0	1	0.084	0.277	0	1
Respondent's Education												
No Schooling	0.164	0.370	0	1	0.155	0.362	0	1	0.299	0.458	0	1
1-8 years	0.300	0.458	0	1	0.302	0.459	0	1	0.272	0.445	0	1
9 years	0.321	0.467	0	1	0.325	0.468	0	1	0.257	0.437	0	1
11-12 years	0.162	0.369	0	1	0.163	0.369	0	1	0.149	0.357	0	1
More than 12 years	0.053	0.225	0	1	0.055	0.228	0	1	0.024	0.153	0	1
Parent's Occupation When Respondent Age 14												
Father Unemployed/DK	0.122	0.327	0	1	0.123	0.328	0	1	0.101	0.302	0	1
Father Agriculture	0.545	0.498	0	1	0.541	0.498	0	1	0.615	0.487	0	1
Father Skilled/Unskill/Other	0.150	0.357	0	1	0.152	0.359	0	1	0.116	0.321	0	1
Father Office/Professional	0.125	0.331	0	1	0.126	0.332	0	1	0.119	0.325	0	1
Father Sales/Entrepreneur	0.058	0.234	0	1	0.059	0.235	0	1	0.048	0.214	0	1
Mother Unemployed/DK	0.335	0.472	0	1	0.339	0.474	0	1	0.266	0.442	0	1
Mother Agriculture	0.539	0.499	0	1	0.534	0.499	0	1	0.624	0.485	0	1
Mother Non-Agr. Occup.	0.126	0.332	0	1	0.127	0.333	0	1	0.110	0.314	0	1

TABLE I - 2 **SUMMARY STATISTICS**

	Unadjusted Sample (N=5858)				Unadjusted Han Sample (N=5523)				Unadj. Non-Han Sample (N=335)			
	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max
Parent's Party Affiliation												
Mother Party Member	0.025	0.155	0	1	0.024	0.154	0	1	0.030	0.170	0	1
Father Party Member	0.161	0.368	0	1	0.163	0.370	0	1	0.125	0.332	0	1
Family												
Family Size	3.939	1.513	1	21	3.894	1.476	1	21	4.681	1.880	1	10
# Working Family	2.222	1.162	0	10	2.198	1.133	0	10	2.624	1.521	0	8
# Family Cadres	0.124	0.371	0	3	0.127	0.374	0	3	0.081	0.304	0	2
Family Income 86-96												
<0 RMB	0.047	0.213	0	1	0.048	0.214	0	1	0.036	0.186	0	1
Same	0.015	0.123	0	1	0.015	0.123	0	1	0.015	0.121	0	1
0<5,000 RMB	0.443	0.497	0	1	0.438	0.496	0	1	0.537	0.499	0	1
5<10,000 RMB	0.266	0.442	0	1	0.269	0.443	0	1	0.230	0.421	0	1
10<15,000 RMB	0.117	0.321	0	1	0.118	0.322	0	1	0.101	0.302	0	1
>15,000 RMB	0.110	0.313	0	1	0.112	0.316	0	1	0.081	0.273	0	1
Interactions												
Han * Urban	0.484	0.500	0	1	0.513	0.500	0	1				
Han * Northeast	0.130	0.337	0	1	0.138	0.345	0	1				
Han * Coastal	0.283	0.451	0	1	0.300	0.458	0	1				
Han * Central	0.309	0.462	0	1	0.327	0.469	0	1				
Han * West	0.164	0.371	0	1	0.174	0.379	0	1				
Commodities 86-96												
Gained 0	0.152	0.359	0	1	0.144	0.351	0	1	0.278	0.448	0	1
Gained 1	0.229	0.421	0	1	0.227	0.419	0	1	0.269	0.444	0	1
Gained 2	0.267	0.442	0	1	0.271	0.444	0	1	0.206	0.405	0	1
Gained 3	0.191	0.393	0	1	0.196	0.397	0	1	0.119	0.325	0	1
Gained 4-5	0.142	0.349	0	1	0.144	0.351	0	1	0.110	0.314	0	1
Gained 6-8	0.019	0.135	0	1	0.019	0.135	0	1	0.018	0.133	0	1
Owned 0 in both yrs	0.251	0.433	0	1	0.240	0.427	0	1	0.430	0.496	0	1
Owned 1 in both yrs	0.266	0.442	0	1	0.268	0.443	0	1	0.227	0.419	0	1
Owned 2 in both yrs	0.185	0.388	0	1	0.187	0.390	0	1	0.146	0.354	0	1
Owned 3 in both yrs	0.159	0.365	0	1	0.163	0.370	0	1	0.084	0.277	0	1
Owned 4-5 in both	0.124	0.330	0	1	0.125	0.331	0	1	0.107	0.310	0	1
Owned 6-8 in both	0.016	0.126	0	1	0.017	0.128	0	1	0.006	0.077	0	1

TABLE I -3 **SUMMARY STATISTICS**

	Survey Adjusted Sample (Total)					Survey Adjusted Sample (Han)					Survey Adjusted Sample (Non-Han)				
	Est.	Std. Err.	[95% Conf.	Int]	Deff	Est.	Std. Err.	[95% Conf.	Int]	Deff	Est.	Std. Err.	[95% Conf.	Int]	Deff
Ethnicity															
Han	0.924	0.019	0.885	0.963	31.716	1.000	0.000	1.000	1.000						
Manchu	0.006	0.002	0.002	0.009	2.919						0.076	0.028	0.020	0.132	4.890
Mongol	0.006	0.004	-0.003	0.015	18.272						0.084	0.058	-0.032	0.200	19.372
Hui	0.016	0.011	-0.005	0.038	40.803						0.215	0.119	-0.025	0.455	37.527
Zhuang	0.009	0.009	-0.008	0.027	49.607						0.121	0.106	-0.092	0.333	46.980
Dongxiang	0.016	0.016	-0.016	0.047	93.744						0.208	0.193	-0.180	0.595	100.64
Bai	0.011	0.011	-0.011	0.033	63.289						0.144	0.126	-0.110	0.397	57.445
Other Non-Han	0.012	0.008	-0.005	0.028	34.175						0.153	0.128	-0.104	0.410	56.321
Respondent															
Male	0.520	0.007	0.505	0.534	1.223	0.523	0.008	0.508	0.538	1.250	0.480	0.042	0.396	0.565	3.161
Age 20-29	0.229	0.007	0.216	0.242	1.457	0.219	0.007	0.205	0.233	1.568	0.348	0.029	0.289	0.407	1.690
Age 30-39	0.231	0.006	0.219	0.244	1.273	0.234	0.006	0.222	0.246	1.080	0.197	0.024	0.148	0.246	1.684
Age 40-49	0.254	0.007	0.239	0.268	1.607	0.255	0.008	0.239	0.270	1.670	0.242	0.026	0.190	0.293	1.597
Age 50+	0.287	0.009	0.269	0.304	2.213	0.293	0.009	0.274	0.311	2.119	0.213	0.023	0.167	0.259	1.419
Ever Married	0.888	0.008	0.873	0.903	3.349	0.891	0.007	0.876	0.905	2.887	0.860	0.050	0.759	0.960	9.209
Urban	0.288	0.004	0.280	0.296	0.459	0.300	0.007	0.286	0.313	1.170	0.152	0.049	0.053	0.251	8.405
Party Member	0.096	0.005	0.085	0.106	1.738	0.099	0.005	0.088	0.109	1.751	0.059	0.012	0.035	0.083	1.128
Respondent's Education															
No Schooling	0.194	0.013	0.168	0.221	6.704	0.181	0.010	0.161	0.201	3.752	0.357	0.100	0.156	0.559	19.539
1-8 years	0.344	0.014	0.316	0.371	4.861	0.346	0.013	0.321	0.372	3.910	0.314	0.065	0.183	0.444	8.703
9 years	0.305	0.010	0.284	0.325	2.863	0.311	0.010	0.291	0.330	2.349	0.234	0.047	0.140	0.327	5.397
11-12 years	0.123	0.006	0.110	0.135	2.101	0.126	0.007	0.113	0.139	2.172	0.085	0.017	0.051	0.119	1.651
More than 12 years	0.034	0.004	0.026	0.042	2.610	0.036	0.004	0.028	0.044	2.647	0.010	0.004	0.001	0.019	0.881
Parent's Occupation When Respondent Age 14															
Father Unemploy/DK	0.120	0.006	0.107	0.132	2.169	0.121	0.007	0.108	0.134	2.173	0.102	0.019	0.064	0.140	1.707
Father Agriculture	0.636	0.012	0.611	0.660	3.745	0.628	0.013	0.602	0.654	3.941	0.729	0.039	0.650	0.807	3.447
Father Skilled/Un/Oth	0.114	0.009	0.096	0.131	4.442	0.117	0.009	0.099	0.136	4.408	0.068	0.021	0.026	0.110	3.014
Father Office/Prof	0.090	0.006	0.079	0.102	2.268	0.091	0.006	0.080	0.102	2.026	0.079	0.025	0.029	0.129	3.782
Father Sales/Entrep	0.040	0.004	0.033	0.048	2.053	0.042	0.004	0.034	0.050	2.233	0.022	0.007	0.007	0.037	1.126
Mother Unemploy/DK	0.299	0.028	0.242	0.356	22.597	0.308	0.030	0.247	0.368	23.039	0.189	0.039	0.111	0.267	4.378
Mother Agriculture	0.618	0.029	0.559	0.677	21.413	0.607	0.031	0.545	0.670	22.161	0.751	0.051	0.649	0.853	6.138
Mother Non-Ag Occ	0.083	0.006	0.071	0.095	2.749	0.085	0.006	0.072	0.097	2.748	0.060	0.022	0.015	0.105	3.969

TABLE I -4 **SUMMARY STATISTICS**

	Survey Adjusted Sample (Total)					Survey Adjusted Sample (Han)					Survey Adjusted Sample (Non-Han)				
	Est.	Std. Err.	[95% Conf.	Int]	Deff	Est.	Std. Err.	[95% Conf.	Int]	Deff	Est.	Std. Err.	[95% Conf.	Int]	Deff
Parent's Party Affiliation															
Mother Party Member	0.019	0.002	0.014	0.024	1.846	0.018	0.002	0.013	0.023	1.771	0.025	0.008	0.009	0.042	1.188
Father Party Member	0.133	0.006	0.122	0.144	1.573	0.134	0.006	0.122	0.146	1.680	0.118	0.019	0.080	0.155	1.486
Family															
Family Size	4.450	0.070	4.310	4.591	10.243	4.363	0.068	4.227	4.500	9.450	5.509	0.173	5.161	5.857	3.755
# Working Family	2.662	0.047	2.569	2.756	7.161	2.606	0.045	2.516	2.696	6.592	3.345	0.100	3.144	3.546	1.659
# Family Cadres	0.090	0.007	0.077	0.103	2.369	0.094	0.007	0.080	0.107	2.224	0.040	0.013	0.014	0.066	1.604
Family Income 86-96															
<0 RMB	0.038	0.004	0.031	0.045	2.047	0.039	0.004	0.031	0.046	2.028	0.024	0.012	0.000	0.049	2.699
Same	0.014	0.002	0.010	0.017	1.497	0.014	0.002	0.010	0.018	1.421	0.010	0.005	0.000	0.020	1.126
0<5,000 RMB	0.475	0.020	0.434	0.516	9.796	0.468	0.022	0.425	0.512	10.196	0.556	0.066	0.423	0.689	7.871
5<10,000 RMB	0.252	0.009	0.234	0.270	2.472	0.256	0.009	0.237	0.274	2.384	0.213	0.055	0.103	0.323	7.924
10<15,000 RMB	0.110	0.008	0.093	0.127	4.295	0.109	0.008	0.093	0.126	3.883	0.113	0.030	0.053	0.173	3.935
>15,000 RMB	0.112	0.013	0.086	0.137	9.331	0.114	0.013	0.087	0.141	9.493	0.083	0.017	0.050	0.117	1.625
Interactions															
Han * Urban	0.277	0.005	0.267	0.287	0.688	0.300	0.007	0.286	0.313	1.170					
Han * Northeast	0.113	0.034	0.045	0.180	66.149	0.122	0.037	0.048	0.196	68.011					
Han * Coastal	0.302	0.056	0.189	0.416	88.522	0.327	0.059	0.209	0.445	84.653					
Han * Central	0.318	0.047	0.224	0.411	58.936	0.344	0.051	0.242	0.446	61.818					
Han * West	0.157	0.037	0.082	0.232	61.954	0.170	0.041	0.088	0.251	63.114					
Commodities 86-96															
Gained 0	0.166	0.017	0.131	0.201	12.685	0.154	0.018	0.118	0.191	13.765	0.310	0.038	0.233	0.387	3.050
Gained 1	0.229	0.011	0.207	0.252	4.072	0.226	0.012	0.202	0.249	4.117	0.275	0.025	0.225	0.325	1.385
Gained 2	0.278	0.011	0.257	0.300	3.341	0.283	0.011	0.261	0.305	3.208	0.223	0.041	0.139	0.306	4.417
Gained 3	0.188	0.011	0.167	0.210	4.493	0.195	0.011	0.172	0.218	4.501	0.112	0.028	0.055	0.169	3.581
Gained 4-5	0.121	0.010	0.100	0.142	5.839	0.125	0.011	0.103	0.148	6.021	0.066	0.014	0.039	0.094	1.342
Gained 6-8	0.017	0.003	0.011	0.023	3.235	0.017	0.003	0.011	0.024	3.393	0.014	0.007	-0.001	0.029	1.733
Owned 0 in both yrs	0.306	0.024	0.257	0.355	16.531	0.287	0.024	0.239	0.336	15.270	0.531	0.097	0.335	0.727	16.955
Owned 1 in both yrs	0.292	0.016	0.259	0.324	7.568	0.296	0.017	0.262	0.330	7.465	0.236	0.066	0.104	0.368	10.654
Owned 2 in both yrs	0.173	0.009	0.155	0.191	3.370	0.177	0.009	0.159	0.196	3.005	0.119	0.032	0.055	0.182	4.236
Owned 3 in both yrs	0.134	0.009	0.115	0.152	4.273	0.140	0.010	0.120	0.160	4.309	0.059	0.016	0.027	0.090	1.994
Owned 4-5 in both	0.085	0.008	0.069	0.100	4.405	0.087	0.008	0.070	0.104	4.721	0.053	0.017	0.019	0.087	2.499
Owned 6-8 in both	0.011	0.002	0.006	0.016	3.228	0.012	0.003	0.007	0.017	3.039	0.003	0.003	-0.002	0.008	0.894

TABLE II **TOTAL FAMILY INCOME (1996)**

Unadjusted Sample

	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Total	5858	11028.59	34702.27	0	2000000
Han	5523	11103.82	35180.95	0	2000000
Non-Han	335	9788.418	25557	0	450000
Manchu	49	20194.82	63980.85	0	450000
Mongol	25	5814.56	2987.277	2000	14000
Hui	84	11038.19	7127.827	1008	31000
Zhuang	35	9968.571	6864.477	2500	30000
Dongxiang	53	2441.623	1855.282	0	10000
Bai	38	8146.737	11013.08	1200	70000
Other	51	8414.118	6438.036	0	40000

Survey Adjusted Sample

	Estimate	Std. Err.	[95% Conf. Interval]		Deff
Total	10819.28	1042.23	8725.89	12912.66	5.15
Han	10963.98	1120.10	8714.20	13213.76	5.17
Non-Han	9056.81	1365.78	6313.57	11800.06	2.85
Manchu	18453.50	6398.28	5602.17	31304.83	0.49
Mongol	6283.83	823.23	4630.33	7937.34	2.11
Hui	11723.68	369.95	10980.62	12466.74	0.24
Zhuang	10844.19	104.00	10635.30	11053.08	0.01
Dongxiang	2553.46	0.00	2553.46	2553.46	0.00
Bai	10787.21	32.79	10721.34	10853.08	0.00
Other	7919.54	965.11	5981.06	9858.02	2.43

All figures are in RMB (8.26~1 U.S. $)

TABLE III **Respondent's Occupational Category (1996)**

Unadjusted Sample - Percentages and Counts by Ethnicity

	NA	Agricul	Skilled	Off/Prof	Service	Entrep.	Total
Total	20.38	37.06	17.91	13.69	8.11	2.85	100
	1194	*2171*	*1049*	*802*	*475*	*167*	*5858*
Han	20.7	35.89	18.23	13.89	8.42	2.88	100
	1143	*1982*	*1007*	*767*	*465*	*159*	*5523*
Non-Han	15.22	56.42	12.54	10.45	2.99	2.39	100
	51	*189*	*42*	*35*	*10*	*8*	*335*
Manchu	42.86	6.12	20.41	22.45	8.16	0	100
	21	*3*	*10*	*11*	*4*	*0*	*49*
Mongol	0	80	12	8	0	0	100
	0	*20*	*3*	*2*	*0*	*0*	*25*
Hui	23.81	36.9	19.05	11.9	5.95	2.38	100
	20	*31*	*16*	*10*	*5*	*2*	*84*
Zhuang	0	80	11.43	0	0	8.57	100
	0	*28*	*4*	*0*	*0*	*3*	*35*
Dongxiang	1.89	92.45	1.89	3.77	0	0	100
	1	*49*	*1*	*2*	*0*	*0*	*53*
Bai	5.26	86.84	2.63	0	0	5.26	100
	2	*33*	*1*	*0*	*0*	*2*	*38*
Other Non-Han	13.73	49.02	13.73	19.61	1.96	1.96	100
	7	*25*	*7*	*10*	*1*	*1*	*51*

Survey Adjusted Sample - Proportions by Ethnicity

ETHNIC	NA	Agricul	Skilled	Off/Prof	Service	Entrep.	Total
Total	0.167	0.518	0.139	0.094	0.058	0.025	1
Han	0.172	0.501	0.144	0.097	0.061	0.025	1
Non-Han	0.100	0.723	0.083	0.052	0.019	0.024	1
Manchu	0.372	0.117	0.240	0.188	0.084	0	1
Mongol	0	0.853	0.104	0.043	0	0	1
Hui	0.154	0.580	0.118	0.074	0.051	0.023	1
Zhuang	0	0.845	0.104	0	0	0.051	1
Dongxiang	0.025	0.926	0.018	0.031	0	0	1
Bai	0.089	0.824	0.008	0	0	0.080	1
Other Non-Han	0.137	0.691	0.084	0.074	0.007	0.007	1

TABLE IV **COMMODITY OWNERSHIP (1996)**

	Unadjusted Sample						Survey Adjusted Sample				
	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max		Estimate	Std. Err.	[95% Conf.	Interval]	Deff
			Color and/or Black & White Television						Color and/or Black & White Television		
Total	5858	0.854	0.353	0	1	Total	0.827	0.017	0.792	0.861	12.036
Han	5523	0.865	0.342	0	1	Han	0.844	0.018	0.807	0.880	13.538
Non-Han	335	0.681	0.467	0	1	Non-Han	0.621	0.086	0.448	0.794	14.032
			Refrigerator						Refrigerator		
Total	5858	0.323	0.468	0	1	Total	0.229	0.019	0.191	0.266	11.483
Han	5523	0.329	0.470	0	1	Han	0.237	0.020	0.196	0.278	12.351
Non-Han	335	0.224	0.417	0	1	Non-Han	0.126	0.028	0.070	0.182	3.103
			Rice Cooker						Rice Cooker		
Total	5858	0.353	0.478	0	1	Total	0.294	0.029	0.236	0.353	24.037
Han	5523	0.355	0.479	0	1	Han	0.300	0.031	0.238	0.362	24.542
Non-Han	335	0.325	0.469	0	1	Non-Han	0.221	0.061	0.099	0.343	9.557
			Regular and/or Automatic Washing Machine						Regular and/or Automatic Washing Machine		
Total	5858	0.440	0.496	0	1	Total	0.344	0.024	0.295	0.393	15.471
Han	5523	0.443	0.497	0	1	Han	0.348	0.025	0.297	0.399	15.298
Non-Han	335	0.379	0.486	0	1	Non-Han	0.289	0.062	0.164	0.413	8.295
			Electric Fan						Electric Fan		
Total	5858	0.701	0.458	0	1	Total	0.668	0.041	0.586	0.751	44.692
Han	5523	0.722	0.448	0	1	Han	0.700	0.039	0.621	0.779	39.909
Non-Han	335	0.367	0.483	0	1	Non-Han	0.279	0.092	0.094	0.465	18.760
			Telephone						Telephone		
Total	5858	0.206	0.404	0	1	Total	0.145	0.011	0.122	0.167	5.881
Han	5523	0.208	0.406	0	1	Han	0.150	0.012	0.127	0.174	5.862
Non-Han	335	0.158	0.365	0	1	Non-Han	0.075	0.021	0.033	0.117	2.800
			Bicycle						Bicycle		
Total	5858	0.823	0.382	0	1	Total	0.828	0.026	0.775	0.881	28.495
Han	5523	0.832	0.374	0	1	Han	0.842	0.026	0.790	0.894	27.110
Non-Han	335	0.678	0.468	0	1	Non-Han	0.654	0.092	0.469	0.840	16.740
			Motorcycle, Car and/or Truck						Motorcycle, Car and/or Truck		
Total	5858	0.112	0.316	0	1	Total	0.114	0.012	0.090	0.139	8.459
Han	5523	0.112	0.315	0	1	Han	0.117	0.013	0.091	0.143	8.848
Non-Han	335	0.113	0.318	0	1	Non-Han	0.085	0.016	0.052	0.117	1.496

TABLE V **CHANGE (1996)**

How well off is your family's situation compared to 10 years ago?

	Unadjusted Sample						Survey Adjusted Sample					
	Lot Better	Little Better	Same	Little Worse	Lot Worse	Total	Lot Better	Little Better	Same	Little Worse	Lot Worse	Total
Total	0.5143	0.3493	0.0939	0.0266	0.0159	1	0.5155	0.3661	0.0842	0.0211	0.0131	1
	3013	*2046*	*550*	*156*	*93*	*5858*						
Han	0.5162	0.3482	0.0938	0.0261	0.0158	1	0.5169	0.3654	0.0836	0.0207	0.0134	1
	2851	*1923*	*518*	*144*	*87*	*5523*						
Non-Han	0.4836	0.3672	0.0955	0.0358	0.0179	1	0.4988	0.3746	0.0910	0.0263	0.0092	1
	162	*123*	*32*	*12*	*6*	*335*						
Manchu	0.4898	0.2857	0.102	0.102	0.0204	1	0.4360	0.3193	0.1254	0.0982	0.0211	1
	24	*14*	*5*	*5*	*1*	*49*						
Mongol	0.52	0.32	0.16	0	0	1	0.5633	0.2388	0.1979	0	0	1
	13	*8*	*4*	*0*	*0*	*25*						
Hui	0.6548	0.1786	0.0952	0.0357	0.0357	1	0.7716	0.1443	0.0499	0.0150	0.0193	1
	55	*15*	*8*	*3*	*3*	*84*						
Zhuang	0.4	0.5714	0.0286	0	0	1	0.3891	0.5792	0	0.0317	0	1
	14	*20*	*1*	*0*	*0*	*35*						
Dongxiang	0.3585	0.4717	0.1321	0.0377	0	1	0.3374	0.4601	0.1534	0.0491	0	1
	19	*25*	*7*	*2*	*0*	*53*						
Bai	0.3684	0.5526	0.0526	0	0.0263	1	0.4417	0.5051	0.0443	0	0.0089	1
	14	*21*	*2*	*0*	*1*	*38*						
Other	0.451	0.3922	0.1176	0.0196	0.0196	1	0.4704	0.4007	0.1043	0.0105	0.0140	1
	23	*20*	*6*	*1*	*1*	*51*						

TABLE VI **Respondent's Region of Residence (1996)**

		Unadjusted Sample			Weighted Sample	
Province	**Region**	**N**	**% Total Pop**	**% Han**	**% Total Pop**	**% Han**
Beijing	Cities	181	0.031	0.945	0.017	0.937
Tianjin	Cities	67	0.011	100	0.006	100
Hebei	Central	126	0.022	0.984	0.020	0.988
Shanxi	Central	117	0.020	0.966	0.022	0.978
Neimenggu	Western	116	0.020	0.853	0.021	0.806
Liaoning	NE	371	0.063	0.900	0.054	0.895
Jilin	NE	229	0.039	0.913	0.037	0.932
Heilongjiang	NE	228	0.039	0.965	0.031	0.970
Shanghai	Cities	69	0.012	0.986	0.006	0.986
Jiangsu	Coastal	354	0.060	0.986	0.068	0.994
Zhejiang	Coastal	288	0.049	0.997	0.070	0.997
Anhui	Central	232	0.040	0.996	0.046	0.999
Fujian	Coastal	154	0.026	100	0.032	100
Jiangxi	Central	55	0.009	100	0.006	100
Shandong	Coastal	540	0.092	0.994	0.076	0.996
Henan	Central	419	0.072	0.976	0.072	0.976
Hubei	Central	703	0.120	0.997	0.118	0.998
Hunan	Central	175	0.030	100	0.036	100
Guangdong	Coastal	337	0.058	0.985	0.058	0.988
Guangxi	Western	119	0.020	0.731	0.022	0.590
Sichuan	Western	356	0.061	0.997	0.064	0.998
Guizhou	Western	114	0.019	0.868	0.020	0.926
Yunnan	Western	170	0.029	0.606	0.037	0.471
Shaanxi	Western	167	0.029	0.964	0.023	0.977
Gansu	Western	112	0.019	0.518	0.022	0.258
Xinjiang	Western	59	0.010	0.424	0.017	0.390

	Unadjusted Sample			Weighted Sample		
Region	**Total**	**Han**	**Non-Han**	**Total**	**Han**	**Non-Han**
Cities	0.054	0.055	0.033	0.029	0.030	0.016
Northeast	0.141	0.138	0.194	0.122	0.122	0.120
Coastal	0.286	0.300	0.042	0.304	0.327	0.021
Central	0.332	0.345	0.107	0.341	0.362	0.089
Western	0.187	0.161	0.624	0.204	0.159	0.753

TABLE VII **Survey Adjusted OLS Regression on Total Family Income From All Sources (1996)**

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Ethnicity														
Han	1907.2	1738.7	893.7	1643.7	243.1	1481.4	-2831.7 **	1220.0	-3005.0 **	1139.5	1014.0	1728.0	11131.2 ***	3573.7
Respondent														
Male			1226.4	996.7	477.9	1099.7	449.3	1033.2	-685.9	626.9	-5.2	767.7	-3.6	773.1
Age 30-39			-3504.0 *	1918.4	-3330.5 *	1954.6	-3324.2 *	1834.7	-3876.7 *	2235.1	-1799.2	1753.3	-1858.1	1772.0
Age 40-49			-3082.3 *	1611.3	-2188.7	1820.4	-2360.4	1740.3	-2246.3	1820.7	-2312.5	1810.4	-2417.5	1815.2
Age 50+			-3075.4 **	1293.4	-1501.0	1608.8	-1733.0	1503.9	-519.6	1162.0	317.8	895.4	280.2	891.2
Urban			7821.4 **	3079.6	6387.0 *	3515.0	6830.4	4167.8	4977.7	4629.9	6792.9	4919.5	6910.4	4939.1
Party Member			5458.1 **	2489.6	4540.1	2773.1	4807.8	3008.5	5664.6	3839.8	5032.9	3557.2	5070.9	3567.8
Education														
1-8 years					2727.7 ***	670.8	3236.7 ***	793.7	2841.8 ***	689.6	2313.5 ***	753.5	2299.8 ***	733.6
9 years					3347.9 ***	961.8	3496.3 ***	821.6	2491.7 ***	800.9	1264.8	1181.2	1195.2	1185.1
11-12 years					5052.2 ***	902.5	4662.0 ***	927.8	4483.5 ***	1290.2	3396.3 ***	1255.7	3349.5 ***	1231.1
More than 12 years					9090.3	6066.4	8513.1	5546.5	8877.8 **	4108.6	7808.2 *	4190.4	7744.1 *	4168.0
Region of Residence (1996)														
Northeast							-10278.9 *	5501.4	-10247.5 *	5469.4	-9471.5 *	5404.0	3121.7	8405.2
Coastal							-1117.0	7866.0	-2361.1	7490.4	-4013.0	6598.9	-4017.7	7670.7
Central							-8777.4	5829.4	-9204.4	5623.9	-10167.7 *	5328.9	-441.2	7603.0
West							-9715.0 *	5635.2	-10595.1 *	5419.5	-12004.7 **	5172.0	-2151.9	6755.1
Occupation														
Not Applicable									-1296.6	2801.6	-451.1	2791.5	-493.8	2817.2
Skilled/Unskilled/Other									1349.8	2531.9	1556.8	2450.2	1537.5	2443.2
Office/Manager/Prof.									1106.3	3777.8	514.9	3686.1	549.8	3694.4
Service									8539.1 **	3596.8	8671.4 **	3670.1	8766.0 **	3660.4
Entrepreneur									30002.5 **	12782.3	29340.6 **	12171.2	29489.2 **	12214.4
Family														
Family Size											3242.7 *	1783.4	3257.9 *	1787.8
# Working Family											1181.8 ***	319.3	1148.7 ***	321.4
# Cadres in Family											4033.2	2484.4	4076.2	2484.0
Interactions														
Han*Northeast													-13159.1 **	5109.4
Han*Coastal													-257.9	6111.9
Han*Central													-10009.1 ***	3613.9
Han*West													-10685.7 ***	3006.8
Cons.	9056.8 ***	1365.8	9050.9 ***	1514.0	6937.0 ***	1432.0	16165.5 **	6182.8	16954.1 ***	5897.6	-4575.6	11857.9	-14308.8	13755.7

Note: Reference category for education is received no schooling. Reference category for age is 20-29.

Reference category for occupation is agriculture. Reference category for region is Cities (Beijing, Shanghai, Tianjin).

* p<.10, **p<.05; ***p<.01

TABLE VIII **Survey Adjusted OLS Regression on Total Family Income From All Sources (1996)**

	Model 8		Model 9		Model 10		Model 11		Model 12		Model 13	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Ethnicity												
Manchu	7489.5	6434.1	3310.2	6682.8	3648.9	6728.0	6025.0	6076.1	6979.5	5900.5	6863.7	5997.2
Mongol	-4680.1 ***	1367.2	-2506.5 **	1008.1	-2436.8 **	1060.1	640.7	1725.4	1005.8	1758.4	-305.4	707.9
Hui	759.7	1171.0	688.7	1891.9	883.9	2017.8	3533.2 *	1795.5	3677.7 **	1523.1	240.7	1644.4
Zhuang	-119.8	1122.5	2071.9 **	798.6	1881.6 **	796.9	5012.4 ***	1410.8	4746.5 ***	1744.8	-1488.4	2568.1
Dongxiang	-8410.5 ***	1120.1	-6528.5 ***	843.8	-4689.5 ***	933.6	-1088.2	1354.0	-421.2	1530.7	-6878.7 ***	1849.1
Bai	-176.8	1120.8	2595.2 ***	797.3	3147.1 ***	783.9	6577.2 ***	1675.3	5115.8 ***	1187.5	428.4	1725.2
Other	-3044.4 **	1449.6	-2468.6 **	1036.1	-1924.4	1185.5	941.8	1115.2	1732.4	1283.6	-2495.4 *	1407.1
Respondent												
Male			1262.7	997.9	566.0	1098.8	523.0	1027.5	-624.6	621.4	130.4	786.1
Age 30-39			-3609.9 *	1926.8	-3432.9 *	1966.6	-3424.3 *	1847.9	-3945.7 *	2236.6	-1835.4	1744.4
Age 40-49			-3180.4 *	1613.0	-2336.4	1822.2	-2497.0	1740.6	-2360.9	1809.1	-2423.6	1795.0
Age 50+			-3119.5 **	1298.2	-1669.8	1614.5	-1889.5	1503.5	-644.9	1157.1	171.9	881.4
Urban			7702.6 **	3123.1	6335.7 *	3565.7	6806.8	4215.1	4946.8	4653.6	6723.9	4916.5
Party Member			5454.8 **	2482.6	4581.2	2764.9	4845.7	2998.8	5695.1	3829.9	5067.9	3546.9
Education												
1-8 years					2433.7 ***	619.8	2981.3 ***	771.4	2619.6 ***	685.3	1944.2 ***	666.9
9 years					2977.8 ***	910.4	3175.1 ***	757.4	2211.0 ***	750.9	818.9	1111.9
11-12 years					4722.8 ***	852.4	4376.6 ***	882.4	4217.5 ***	1295.2	2968.8 **	1194.4
More than 12 years					8801.3	6063.8	8254.3	5524.7	8635.8 **	4074.8	7436.1 *	4177.7
Region of Residence (1996)												
Northeast							-10295.3 *	5466.8	-10289.0 *	5408.1	-9651.7 *	5236.4
Coastal							-1092.9	7806.0	-2326.5	7423.9	-3956.3	6471.0
Central							-8730.6	5755.1	-9154.5	5539.9	-10126.1 *	5171.2
West							-9644.7 *	5509.0	-10477.1 *	5301.1	-11583.1 **	5005.2
Occupation												
Not Applicable									-1337.8	2790.8	-476.5	2781.8
Skilled/Unskilled/Other									1322.1	2524.9	1512.7	2449.3
Office/Manager/Prof.									1124.7	3773.3	507.5	3695.9
Service									8526.1 **	3604.4	8654.3 **	3676.2
Entrepreneur									29885.4 **	12796.2	29232.8 **	12192.6
Family												
Family Size											3260.1 *	1786.5
# Working Family											1215.5 ***	318.8
# Cadres in Family											4051.7	2492.1
Constant	10964.0 ***	1120.1	10024.2 ***	1047.1	7525.0 ***	1227.9	13602.0 **	6477.7	14181.6 **	6120.6	-3430.9	10768.1

Note: Reference category for education is received no schooling. Reference category for age is 20-29.

Reference category for occupation is agriculture. Reference category for region is Cities (Beijing, Shanghai, Tianjin).

* p<.10, **p<.05; ***p<.01

TABLE IX-1 **Multinomial Logistic Regression on Respondent's Occupational Category (1996), by Han**

Occupation Category: "Not Applicable" relative to Agriculture

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Ethnicity												
Han	0.905 ***	0.272	0.773 ***	0.223	0.643 ***	0.233	0.508 **	0.251	0.103	0.285	0.306	0.298
Respondent												
Male			-1.040 ***	0.162	-1.204 ***	0.159	-1.195 ***	0.155	-1.183 ***	0.165	-1.501 ***	0.180
Age 30-39			-0.713 ***	0.164	-0.780 ***	0.178	-0.796 ***	0.196	-0.935 ***	0.184	-1.227 ***	0.186
Age 40-49			-0.520 ***	0.191	-0.407 *	0.206	-0.517 **	0.224	-0.652 ***	0.215	-0.618 ***	0.228
Age 50+			0.908 ***	0.161	1.129 ***	0.193	0.985 ***	0.198	0.864 ***	0.198	1.313 ***	0.217
Ever Married			-0.956 ***	0.208	-0.843 ***	0.218	-0.934 ***	0.229	-0.809 ***	0.210	-1.445 ***	0.241
Urban			4.719 ***	0.339	4.537 ***	0.337	4.214 ***	0.317	4.333 ***	0.330	3.912 ***	0.325
Party			0.978 ***	0.213	0.915 ***	0.224	0.889 ***	0.238	0.999 ***	0.237	0.936 ***	0.263
Respondent's Education												
1-8 years					0.236	0.188	0.135	0.181	0.198	0.166	0.222	0.175
9 years					0.489 **	0.229	0.324	0.215	0.385 **	0.190	0.424 **	0.180
11-12 years					0.964 ***	0.295	0.862 ***	0.271	0.962 ***	0.249	1.032 ***	0.247
More than 12 years					2.583 ***	0.743	2.546 ***	0.808	2.461 ***	0.749	2.627 ***	0.777
Parent's Party Affiliation												
Mother Party Member							-1.589 **	0.695	-1.535 **	0.674	-1.149 *	0.628
Father Party Member							0.107	0.201	0.199	0.209	0.178	0.203
Parent's Occupation												
Father Agriculture							-0.297 *	0.171	-0.376 *	0.193	-0.332	0.199
Father Skilled/Unskill/Other							0.525 *	0.268	0.361	0.291	0.433	0.295
Father Office/Professional							0.383	0.315	0.214	0.358	0.273	0.325
Father Sales/Entrepreneur							0.407	0.374	0.308	0.376	0.216	0.345
Mother Agriculture							-1.373 ***	0.186	-1.239 ***	0.179	-1.060 ***	0.175
Mother Non-Agr. Occup.							0.620	0.373	0.805 **	0.357	0.929 **	0.363
Region of Residence (1996)												
Northeast									-0.315	0.977	-0.382	0.945
Coastal									0.008	0.995	0.003	0.968
Central									-1.090	0.961	-0.988	0.933
West									-1.090	0.992	-0.971	0.958
Family												
Family Size											0.494 ***	0.063
# Working Family											-1.080 ***	0.092
# Cadres in Family											0.893 **	0.353
Constant	-1.975 ***	0.254	-1.627 ***	0.233	-1.918 ***	0.295	-0.496	0.450	0.361	1.037	1.048	1.063

Note: Reference category for age is 20-29. Ref. category for respondent's education is 0 years. Ref. category for mother and father's occupation is not applicable/ don't know.
Ref. category for region is Cities (Beijing, Shanghai, Tianjin). * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

TABLE IX-2 **Multinomial Logistic Regression on Respondent's Occupational Category (1996), by Han**

Occupation Category: Unskilled/Skilled/Other relative to Agriculture

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Ethnicity												
Han	0.920 ***	0.316	0.986 ***	0.238	0.836 ***	0.232	0.732 ***	0.189	-0.046	0.233	0.000	0.233
Respondent												
Male			0.953 ***	0.136	0.771 ***	0.131	0.817 ***	0.138	0.881 ***	0.142	0.912 ***	0.147
Age 30-39			-0.194	0.138	-0.249 *	0.147	-0.247	0.159	-0.395 **	0.160	-0.393 **	0.183
Age 40-49			-0.692 ***	0.165	-0.518 ***	0.170	-0.529 ***	0.189	-0.723 ***	0.176	-0.754 ***	0.182
Age 50+			-1.562 ***	0.187	-1.153 ***	0.211	-1.154 ***	0.216	-1.402 ***	0.202	-1.414 ***	0.185
Ever Married			-0.719 ***	0.226	-0.697 ***	0.235	-0.778 ***	0.240	-0.551 **	0.235	-0.530 **	0.227
Urban			4.723 ***	0.337	4.539 ***	0.328	4.179 ***	0.327	4.519 ***	0.353	4.468 ***	0.349
Party			0.368 *	0.192	0.266	0.202	0.227	0.204	0.343	0.204	0.275	0.219
Respondent's Education												
1-8 years					0.364	0.274	0.275	0.275	0.377	0.254	0.328	0.254
9 years					1.100 ***	0.307	0.955 ***	0.305	1.069 ***	0.258	1.009 ***	0.252
11-12 years					1.174 ***	0.359	1.047 ***	0.345	1.086 ***	0.311	1.041 ***	0.309
More than 12 years					1.242	0.775	1.176	0.821	1.010	0.788	0.867	0.789
Parent's Party Affiliation												
Mother Party Member							-0.510	0.663	-0.350	0.657	-0.256	0.631
Father Party Member							-0.057	0.159	0.024	0.159	0.048	0.154
Parent's Occupation												
Father Agriculture							-0.063	0.244	-0.052	0.273	-0.054	0.270
Father Skilled/Unskill/Other							1.250 ***	0.330	1.226 ***	0.346	1.214 ***	0.343
Father Office/Professional							0.736 **	0.340	0.664 *	0.379	0.664 *	0.363
Father Sales/Entrepreneur							0.169	0.350	0.002	0.383	-0.051	0.387
Mother Agriculture							-1.014 ***	0.199	-1.035 ***	0.181	-1.065 ***	0.180
Mother Non-Agr. Occup.							0.708 *	0.354	0.764 **	0.326	0.748 **	0.330
Region of Residence (1996)												
Northeast									-1.308	1.008	-1.274	0.987
Coastal									0.343	1.014	0.428	0.998
Central									-1.096	0.986	-0.998	0.968
West									-1.477	1.007	-1.306	0.994
Family												
Family Size											-0.071	0.067
# Working Family											0.098	0.081
# Cadres in Family											0.701	0.296
Constant	-2.171 ***	0.305	-2.429 ***	0.308	-2.946 ***	0.373	-2.085 ***	0.503	-0.978	1.076	-1.047	1.103

Note: Reference category for age is 20-29. Ref. category for respondent's education is 0 years. Ref. category for mother and father's occupation is not applicable/ don't know.
Ref. category for region is Cities (Beijing, Shanghai, Tianjin). * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

TABLE IX-3 **Multinomial Logistic Regression on Respondent's Occupational Category (1996), by Han**

Occupation Category: Office Worker/Manager/Professional relative to Agriculture

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Ethnicity												
Han	0.998 ***	0.362	0.931 ***	0.260	0.691 **	0.302	0.576 *	0.287	0.035	0.244	0.048	0.249
Respondent												
Male			0.315 **	0.144	-0.152	0.145	-0.095	0.145	-0.078	0.157	0.046	0.162
Age 30-39			-0.293 *	0.159	-0.500 **	0.204	-0.445 **	0.216	-0.577 ***	0.214	-0.577 **	0.238
Age 40-49			-0.091	0.163	0.695 ***	0.199	0.787 ***	0.198	0.657 ***	0.210	0.574 **	0.221
Age 50+			-0.982 ***	0.170	0.165	0.190	0.323	0.213	0.152	0.233	0.065	0.262
Ever Married			-0.700 ***	0.248	-0.253	0.286	-0.298	0.286	-0.084	0.273	-0.114	0.303
Urban			5.500 ***	0.340	4.568 ***	0.319	4.227 ***	0.317	4.481 ***	0.324	4.229 ***	0.325
Party			2.148 ***	0.206	1.812 ***	0.228	1.782 ***	0.238	1.908 ***	0.231	1.635 ***	0.226
Respondent's Education												
1-8 years					1.271 ***	0.381	1.198 ***	0.385	1.275 ***	0.379	1.175 ***	0.383
9 years					2.871 ***	0.354	2.762 ***	0.362	2.873 ***	0.361	2.725 ***	0.372
11-12 years					4.651 ***	0.378	4.531 ***	0.381	4.626 ***	0.395	4.464 ***	0.406
More than 12 years					6.752 ***	0.876	6.638 ***	0.921	6.534 ***	0.893	6.252 ***	0.906
Parent's Party Affiliation												
Mother Party Member							-0.917	0.700	-0.719	0.675	-0.768	0.652
Father Party Member							0.185	0.190	0.279	0.190	0.218	0.202
Parent's Occupation												
Father Agriculture							-0.024	0.298	-0.050	0.310	-0.036	0.301
Father Skilled/Unskill/Other							0.853 **	0.325	0.796 **	0.337	0.794 **	0.339
Father Office/Professional							1.050 ***	0.352	0.944 **	0.375	0.903 **	0.378
Father Sales/Entrepreneur							0.581	0.358	0.440	0.385	0.461	0.368
Mother Agriculture							-0.653 ***	0.218	-0.702 ***	0.218	-0.729 ***	0.222
Mother Non-Agr. Occup.							1.028 ***	0.372	1.077 ***	0.349	0.997 ***	0.357
Region of Residence (1996)												
Northeast									-0.716	0.915	-0.548	0.883
Coastal									0.610	0.886	0.685	0.854
Central									-0.720	0.871	-0.565	0.842
West									-0.601	0.874	-0.306	0.848
Family												
Family Size											-0.121	0.102
# Working Family											0.090	0.081
# Cadres in Family											1.790 ***	0.297
Constant	-2.641 ***	0.346	-3.432 ***	0.322	-6.204 ***	0.464	-5.754 ***	0.674	-5.199 ***	1.003	-5.008 ***	1.101

Note: Reference category for age is 20-29. Ref. category for respondent's education is 0 years. Ref. category for mother and father's occupation is not applicable/ don't know.
Ref. category for region is Cities (Beijing, Shanghai, Tianjin). * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

TABLE IX-4 **Multinomial Logistic Regression on Respondent's Occupational Category (1996), by Han**

Occupation Category: Service relative to Agriculture

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Ethnicity												
Han	1.559 ***	0.441	1.558 ***	0.428	1.364 ***	0.432	1.267 ***	0.441	0.717	0.443	0.766	0.463
Respondent												
Male			0.275	0.172	0.061	0.159	0.084	0.161	0.122	0.173	0.159	0.174
Age 30-39			-0.153	0.217	-0.205	0.227	-0.214	0.238	-0.358	0.246	-0.336	0.273
Age 40-49			-0.626 ***	0.192	-0.436 **	0.191	-0.501 **	0.207	-0.651 ***	0.209	-0.677 ***	0.211
Age 50+			-1.352 ***	0.206	-0.907 ***	0.206	-1.007 ***	0.223	-1.189 ***	0.234	-1.192 ***	0.241
Ever Married			-0.360	0.262	-0.307	0.272	-0.351	0.272	-0.147	0.275	-0.120	0.268
Urban			5.140 ***	0.365	4.918 ***	0.369	4.628 ***	0.392	4.895 ***	0.417	4.840 ***	0.414
Party			0.025	0.321	-0.092	0.323	-0.076	0.315	0.025	0.305	-0.069	0.315
Respondent's Education												
1-8 years					0.632	0.456	0.554	0.443	0.657	0.423	0.585	0.427
9 years					1.274 ***	0.431	1.177 ***	0.421	1.293 ***	0.387	1.207 ***	0.388
11-12 years					1.383 ***	0.478	1.343 ***	0.467	1.449 ***	0.429	1.372 ***	0.427
More than 12 years					2.376 **	0.902	2.432 **	0.958	2.345 **	0.892	2.140 **	0.884
Parent's Party Affiliation												
Mother Party Member							-1.077	0.712	-0.947	0.709	-0.890	0.695
Father Party Member							-0.216	0.203	-0.133	0.208	-0.114	0.209
Parent's Occupation												
Father Agriculture							0.074	0.296	0.059	0.295	0.058	0.297
Father Skilled/Unskill/Other							0.785 **	0.296	0.703 **	0.310	0.689 **	0.314
Father Office/Professional							0.837 **	0.321	0.729 **	0.347	0.733 **	0.333
Father Sales/Entrepreneur							1.034 ***	0.355	0.899 **	0.373	0.842 **	0.370
Mother Agriculture							-0.855 ***	0.276	-0.817 ***	0.261	-0.839 ***	0.262
Mother Non-Agr. Occup.							0.900 **	0.392	1.003 **	0.382	0.996 **	0.391
Region of Residence (1996)												
Northeast									-0.644	1.265	-0.611	1.264
Coastal									0.440	1.244	0.509	1.238
Central									-0.925	1.222	-0.834	1.217
West									-0.971	1.233	-0.809	1.232
Family												
Family Size											-0.089	0.087
# Working Family											0.140	0.112
# Cadres in Family											0.756 **	0.330
Constant	-3.663 ***	0.420	-4.014 ***	0.499	-4.697 ***	0.645	-4.016 ***	0.718	-3.335 **	1.416	-3.426 **	1.483

Note: Reference category for age is 20-29. Ref. category for respondent's education is 0 years. Ref. category for mother and father's occupation is not applicable/ don't know.
Ref. category for region is Cities (Beijing, Shanghai, Tianjin). * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

TABLE IX-5 **Multinomial Logistic Regression on Respondent's Occupational Category (1996), by Han**

Occupation Category: Entrepreneurs relative to Agriculture

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Ethnicity												
Han	0.423	0.426	0.446	0.523	0.186	0.499	0.051	0.550	-0.346	0.493	-0.217	0.464
Respondent												
Male			1.409 ***	0.195	1.169 ***	0.188	1.193 ***	0.187	1.242 ***	0.197	1.253 ***	0.197
Age 30-39			-0.177	0.294	-0.192	0.296	-0.186	0.307	-0.319	0.291	-0.272	0.297
Age 40-49			-0.852 ***	0.299	-0.692 **	0.295	-0.750 **	0.300	-0.898 ***	0.321	-0.900 ***	0.324
Age 50+			-1.807 ***	0.375	-1.375 ***	0.402	-1.520 ***	0.413	-1.782 ***	0.459	-1.758 ***	0.475
Ever Married			0.763	0.491	0.802	0.492	0.728	0.490	0.962 *	0.494	1.007 *	0.506
Urban			4.380 ***	0.403	4.201 ***	0.411	3.997 ***	0.412	4.326 ***	0.433	4.348 ***	0.431
Party			-0.149	0.541	-0.278	0.527	-0.268	0.524	-0.132	0.524	-0.160	0.513
Respondent's Education												
1-8 years					1.555 ***	0.480	1.516 ***	0.482	1.577 ***	0.494	1.549 ***	0.504
9 years					2.037 ***	0.477	1.986 ***	0.477	2.160 ***	0.499	2.119 ***	0.507
11-12 years					1.786 ***	0.494	1.829 ***	0.490	1.944 ***	0.523	1.953 ***	0.533
More than 12 years					3.049 ***	0.943	3.250 ***	0.977	3.103 ***	1.001	3.041 ***	1.020
Parent's Party Affiliation												
Mother Party Member							-1.302	0.777	-1.040	0.753	-1.011	0.746
Father Party Member							-0.615 **	0.245	-0.554 **	0.245	-0.515 *	0.258
Parent's Occupation												
Father Agriculture							-0.424	0.333	-0.404	0.339	-0.411	0.352
Father Skilled/Unskill/Other							0.637	0.452	0.626	0.464	0.612	0.469
Father Office/Professional							0.683	0.477	0.631	0.496	0.659	0.495
Father Sales/Entrepreneur							0.501	0.434	0.316	0.437	0.270	0.429
Mother Agriculture							-0.570 *	0.309	-0.753 **	0.261	-0.800 ***	0.265
Mother Non-Agr. Occup.							0.616	0.458	0.483	0.452	0.430	0.463
Region of Residence (1996)												
Northeast									-1.263	0.914	-1.227	0.861
Coastal									0.940	0.663	1.005	0.638
Central									-0.491	0.558	-0.397	0.539
West									0.094	0.584	0.189	0.565
Family												
Family Size											0.058	0.085
# Working Family											0.077	0.102
# Cadres in Family											0.312	0.548
Constant	-3.423 ***	0.389	-5.013 ***	0.571	-6.352 ***	0.606	-5.408 ***	0.723	-5.302 ***	0.879	-6.001 ***	0.978

Note: Reference category for age is 20-29. Ref. category for respondent's education is 0 years. Ref. category for mother and father's occupation is not applicable/ don't know.
Ref. category for region is Cities (Beijing, Shanghai, Tianjin). * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

TABLE X-1 **Multinomial Logistic Regression on Respondent's Occupational Category (1996), by Non-Han**

Occupation Category: "Not Applicable" relative to Agriculture

	Model 7		Model 8		Model 9		Model 10		Model 11		Model 12	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Ethnicity												
Manchu	2.230 ***	0.730	0.886	0.633	0.768	0.682	0.154	0.803	0.027	0.809	-0.168	0.839
Mongol	-33.826 ***	0.755	-32.972 ***	0.842	-35.214 ***	0.829	-35.690 ***	0.787	-32.509 ***	0.776	-33.541 ***	1.045
Hui	-0.256	0.559	-0.369	0.235	-0.274	0.234	-0.050	0.212	0.500	0.325	0.355	0.298
Zhuang	-33.852 ***	0.993	-32.794 ***	0.948	-35.041 ***	0.946	-34.677 ***	0.943	-31.132 ***	0.706	-31.519 ***	0.697
Dongxiang	-2.560 ***	0.108	-1.572 ***	0.184	-1.373 ***	0.206	-1.239 ***	0.167	-0.597	0.379	-1.103 ***	0.360
Bai	-1.159 ***	0.108	-0.341 *	0.199	-0.275	0.202	0.230	0.160	0.812 **	0.375	0.587	0.361
Othr Non-Han	-0.547	0.781	-0.526	0.582	-0.327	0.608	0.017	0.640	0.509	0.618	0.810	0.555
Respondent												
Male			-1.034 ***	0.163	-1.196 ***	0.160	-1.191 ***	0.158	-1.178 ***	0.167	-1.495 ***	0.184
Age 30-39			-0.725 ***	0.162	-0.786 ***	0.176	-0.813 ***	0.193	-0.959 ***	0.178	-1.258 ***	0.173
Age 40-49			-0.534 ***	0.189	-0.422 **	0.204	-0.545 **	0.221	-0.685 ***	0.209	-0.654 ***	0.222
Age 50+			0.897 ***	0.159	1.116 ***	0.192	0.962 ***	0.196	0.836 ***	0.192	1.302 ***	0.209
Ever Married			-0.941 ***	0.211	-0.836 ***	0.220	-0.915 ***	0.232	-0.785 ***	0.214	-1.404 ***	0.252
Urban			4.668 ***	0.338	4.495 ***	0.334	4.194 ***	0.315	4.330 ***	0.332	3.900 ***	0.326
Party			0.972 ***	0.210	0.910 ***	0.221	0.887 ***	0.239	0.999 ***	0.239	0.944 ***	0.268
Respondent's Education												
1-8 years					0.225	0.190	0.129	0.181	0.194	0.166	0.215	0.178
9 years					0.475 **	0.232	0.317	0.220	0.388 *	0.193	0.446 **	0.187
11-12 years					0.948 ***	0.296	0.848 ***	0.272	0.954 ***	0.249	1.030 ***	0.250
More than 12 years					2.573 ***	0.741	2.541 ***	0.809	2.452 ***	0.750	2.638 ***	0.779
Parent's Party Affiliation												
Mother Party Member							-1.618 **	0.702	-1.579 **	0.680	-1.227 *	0.638
Father Party Member							0.108	0.203	0.207	0.211	0.209	0.207
Parent's Occupation												
Father Agriculture							-0.287	0.175	-0.367 *	0.196	-0.331	0.202
Father Skilled/Unskill/Other							0.531 *	0.272	0.370	0.295	0.434	0.300
Father Office/Professional							0.446	0.317	0.285	0.355	0.385	0.311
Father Sales/Entrepreneur							0.439	0.370	0.349	0.372	0.261	0.343
Mother Agriculture							-1.396 ***	0.187	-1.261 ***	0.177	-1.079 ***	0.173
Mother Non-Agr. Occup.							0.585	0.370	0.772 **	0.351	0.878 **	0.354
Region of Residence (1996)												
Northeast									-0.291	0.982	-0.341	0.951
Coastal									0.014	0.996	0.003	0.968
Central									-1.065	0.961	-0.974	0.932
West									-1.146	0.995	-1.030	0.961
Family												
Family Size											0.509 ***	0.066
# Working Family											-1.093 ***	0.094
# Cadres in Family											0.887 **	0.355
Constant	-1.071 ***	0.108	-0.854 ***	0.280	-1.257 ***	0.347	0.026	0.460	0.463	1.031	1.293	1.063

Note: Reference category for age is 20-29. Ref. category for respondent's education is 0 years. Ref. category for mother and father's occupation is not applicable/ don't know.

Ref. category for region is Cities (Beijing, Shanghai, Tianjin). * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

TABLE X-2 **Multinomial Logistic Regression on Respondent's Occupational Category (1996), by Non-Han**

Occupation Category: Unskilled/Skilled/Other relative to Agriculture

	Model 7		Model 8		Model 9		Model 10		Model 11		Model 12	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Ethnicity												
Manchu	1.970 **	0.734	0.494	0.696	0.268	0.717	-0.377	0.801	0.115	0.771	0.230	0.797
Mongol	-0.851 *	0.430	-0.316	0.400	-0.347	0.388	-0.771 ***	0.280	-0.157	0.268	-0.095	0.299
Hui	-0.346	0.832	-0.630	0.464	-0.539	0.432	-0.300	0.414	0.500	0.407	0.443	0.374
Zhuang	-0.844 ***	0.173	-0.581 **	0.260	-0.656 **	0.250	-0.313	0.212	0.591 *	0.298	0.512	0.322
Dongxiang	-2.668 ***	0.125	-2.085 ***	0.195	-1.488 ***	0.283	-1.332 ***	0.252	-0.359	0.259	-0.507 **	0.242
Bai	-3.453 **	1.410	-2.804 **	1.317	-2.737 **	1.324	-2.309 *	1.271	-1.355	1.252	-1.473	1.230
Othr Non-Han	-0.860	0.765	-1.175 *	0.585	-0.936	0.598	-0.846	0.575	-0.091	0.452	-0.147	0.488
Respondent												
Male			0.961 ***	0.136	0.781 ***	0.131	0.824 ***	0.138	0.888 ***	0.141	0.924 ***	0.148
Age 30-39			-0.212	0.137	-0.258 *	0.146	-0.257	0.159	-0.409 **	0.159	-0.408 **	0.180
Age 40-49			-0.709 ***	0.163	-0.534 ***	0.169	-0.546 ***	0.188	-0.745 ***	0.175	-0.775 ***	0.181
Age 50+			-1.576 ***	0.187	-1.172 ***	0.213	-1.172 ***	0.218	-1.424 ***	0.202	-1.436 ***	0.183
Ever Married			-0.688 ***	0.228	-0.683 ***	0.237	-0.762 ***	0.242	-0.534 **	0.240	-0.508 **	0.233
Urban			4.683 ***	0.341	4.512 ***	0.330	4.175 ***	0.329	4.530 ***	0.356	4.477 ***	0.351
Party			0.361 *	0.188	0.262	0.200	0.227	0.205	0.347	0.207	0.283	0.223
Respondent's Education												
1-8 years					0.330	0.275	0.243	0.278	0.354	0.256	0.298	0.256
9 years					1.057 ***	0.308	0.919 ***	0.307	1.042 ***	0.260	0.981 ***	0.253
11-12 years					1.139 ***	0.358	1.017 ***	0.346	1.065 ***	0.313	1.018 ***	0.310
More than 12 years					1.209	0.776	1.147	0.824	0.983	0.791	0.840	0.792
Parent's Party Affiliation												
Mother Party Member							-0.511	0.668	-0.356	0.663	-0.261	0.640
Father Party Member							-0.057	0.159	0.022	0.159	0.053	0.155
Parent's Occupation												
Father Agriculture							-0.061	0.245	-0.047	0.274	-0.051	0.270
Father Skilled/Unskill/Other							1.260 ***	0.330	1.238 ***	0.346	1.223 ***	0.343
Father Office/Professional							0.773 **	0.345	0.705 *	0.381	0.716 *	0.366
Father Sales/Entrepreneur							0.194	0.345	0.034	0.378	-0.020	0.384
Mother Agriculture							-1.023 ***	0.200	-1.045 ***	0.180	-1.075 ***	0.180
Mother Non-Agr. Occup.							0.690 *	0.355	0.753 **	0.324	0.731 **	0.325
Region of Residence (1996)												
Northeast									-1.291	1.013	-1.260	0.993
Coastal									0.351	1.016	0.435	1.000
Central									-1.086	0.986	-0.994	0.968
West									-1.499	1.012	-1.309	0.999
Family												
Family Size											-0.072	0.067
# Working Family											0.102	0.080
# Cadres in Family											0.688 **	0.295
Constant	-1.251 ***	0.125	-1.460 ***	0.398	-2.085 ***	0.480	-1.331 **	0.573	-1.016	1.084	-1.049	1.083

Note: Reference category for age is 20-29. Ref. category for respondent's education is 0 years. Ref. category for mother and father's occupation is not applicable/ don't know.

Ref. category for region is Cities (Beijing, Shanghai, Tianjin). * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

TABLE X-3 **Multinomial Logistic Regression on Respondent's Occupational Category (1996), by Non-Han**

Occupation Category: Office Worker/Manager/Professional relative to Agriculture

	Model 7		Model 8		Model 9		Model 10		Model 11		Model 12	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Ethnicity												
Manchu	2.119 ***	0.706	0.522	0.740	0.483	0.828	-0.036	0.985	0.411	0.979	0.534	1.056
Mongol	-1.338 *	0.776	-0.311	0.740	-0.406	0.733	-0.626	0.561	-0.134	0.546	0.052	0.548
Hui	-0.414	0.956	-0.748	0.483	-0.521	0.441	-0.291	0.462	0.317	0.474	0.202	0.483
Zhuang	-33.856 ***	1.004	-32.692 ***	0.866	-34.749 ***	0.968	-34.649 ***	0.968	-31.196 ***	0.808	-31.421 ***	0.758
Dongxiang	-1.765 ***	0.097	-0.376 **	0.166	0.630 ***	0.191	0.773 ***	0.196	1.223 ***	0.324	0.991 ***	0.367
Bai	-33.923 ***	1.015	-32.477 ***	0.956	-34.071 ***	1.017	-33.740 ***	0.969	-30.259 ***	1.080	-30.584 ***	1.191
Othr Non-Han	-0.596	1.195	-0.743	0.800	-0.500	0.713	-0.367	0.713	0.037	0.618	0.296	0.671
Respondent												
Male			0.321 **	0.144	-0.148	0.145	-0.094	0.145	-0.076	0.158	0.047	0.163
Age 30-39			-0.301 *	0.159	-0.506 **	0.203	-0.451 **	0.215	-0.581 ***	0.212	-0.587 **	0.233
Age 40-49			-0.093	0.162	0.680 ***	0.195	0.770 ***	0.193	0.640 ***	0.205	0.559 **	0.216
Age 50+			-0.984 ***	0.170	0.157	0.189	0.311	0.212	0.140	0.231	0.061	0.258
Ever Married			-0.695 ***	0.248	-0.253	0.287	-0.295	0.288	-0.079	0.276	-0.107	0.307
Urban			5.465 ***	0.341	4.539 ***	0.318	4.220 ***	0.314	4.482 ***	0.322	4.232 ***	0.321
Party			2.141 ***	0.205	1.800 ***	0.229	1.775 ***	0.240	1.907 ***	0.236	1.636 ***	0.232
Respondent's Education												
1-8 years					1.315 ***	0.389	1.258 ***	0.398	1.327 ***	0.390	1.212 ***	0.390
9 years					2.910 ***	0.363	2.821 ***	0.378	2.924 ***	0.374	2.769 ***	0.380
11-12 years					4.689 ***	0.383	4.586 ***	0.391	4.673 ***	0.401	4.501 ***	0.409
More than 12 years					6.790 ***	0.880	6.698 ***	0.931	6.582 ***	0.901	6.296 ***	0.913
Parent's Party Affiliation												
Mother Party Member							-0.927	0.706	-0.735	0.681	-0.792	0.661
Father Party Member							0.179	0.189	0.273	0.189	0.217	0.204
Parent's Occupation												
Father Agriculture							-0.026	0.300	-0.050	0.312	-0.041	0.303
Father Skilled/Unskill/Other							0.860 **	0.325	0.808 **	0.339	0.803 **	0.342
Father Office/Professional							1.095 ***	0.358	0.995 **	0.379	0.975 **	0.381
Father Sales/Entrepreneur							0.625 *	0.353	0.492	0.382	0.506	0.370
Mother Agriculture							-0.653 ***	0.220	-0.702 ***	0.220	-0.729 ***	0.221
Mother Non-Agr. Occup.							1.009 ***	0.371	1.065 ***	0.347	0.976 ***	0.353
Region of Residence (1996)												
Northeast									-0.698	0.921	-0.532	0.889
Coastal									0.628	0.886	0.704	0.853
Central									-0.698	0.871	-0.546	0.840
West									-0.612	0.875	-0.309	0.848
Family												
Family Size											-0.113	0.102
# Working Family											0.084	0.080
# Cadres in Family											1.782 ***	0.296
Constant	-1.643 ***	0.097	-2.509 ***	0.327	-5.548 ***	0.460	-5.232 ***	0.685	-5.229 ***	1.003	-5.033 ***	1.064

Note: Reference category for age is 20-29. Ref. category for respondent's education is 0 years. Ref. category for mother and father's occupation is not applicable/ don't know.

Ref. category for region is Cities (Beijing, Shanghai, Tianjin). * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

TABLE X-4 **Multinomial Logistic Regression on Respondent's Occupational Category (1996), by Non-Han**

Occupation Category: Service relative to Agriculture

	Model 7		Model 8		Model 9		Model 10		Model 11		Model 12	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Ethnicity												
Manchu	1.777 **	0.854	0.182	0.722	0.010	0.766	-0.557	0.876	-0.296	0.865	-0.184	0.900
Mongol	-33.848 ***	0.765	-33.228 ***	0.693	-35.486 ***	0.690	-35.877 ***	0.696	-32.458 ***	0.818	-32.633 ***	0.838
Hui	-0.320	0.552	-0.576	0.468	-0.441	0.446	-0.278	0.478	0.345	0.478	0.271	0.505
Zhuang	-33.874 ***	1.006	-33.175 ***	0.899	-35.494 ***	0.898	-35.320 ***	0.870	-31.712 ***	0.727	-32.055 ***	0.719
Dongxiang	-33.996 ***	1.021	-33.059 ***	1.033	-34.646 ***	1.067	-34.511 ***	1.060	-30.854 ***	1.100	-31.251 ***	1.114
Bai	-33.941 ***	1.012	-33.090 ***	0.943	-35.189 ***	0.946	-34.869 ***	0.908	-31.236 ***	0.955	-31.617 ***	0.959
Othr Non-Han	-2.488 *	1.363	-2.674 **	1.254	-2.373 *	1.260	-2.096	1.263	-1.579	1.222	-1.631	1.216
Respondent												
Male			0.283	0.172	0.072	0.158	0.091	0.162	0.132	0.173	0.173	0.174
Age 30-39			-0.167	0.215	-0.210	0.226	-0.223	0.235	-0.371	0.241	-0.350	0.266
Age 40-49			-0.644 ***	0.189	-0.453 **	0.189	-0.524 **	0.205	-0.678 ***	0.206	-0.705 ***	0.210
Age 50+			-1.366 ***	0.206	-0.926 ***	0.206	-1.026 ***	0.222	-1.215 ***	0.229	-1.214 ***	0.236
Ever Married			-0.338	0.261	-0.298	0.272	-0.336	0.274	-0.128	0.279	-0.100	0.273
Urban			5.084 ***	0.365	4.875 ***	0.368	4.607 ***	0.391	4.884 ***	0.416	4.829 ***	0.412
Party			0.019	0.319	-0.099	0.321	-0.078	0.316	0.028	0.306	-0.063	0.317
Respondent's Education												
1-8 years					0.601	0.458	0.527	0.445	0.632	0.425	0.558	0.429
9 years					1.235 ***	0.434	1.148 ***	0.424	1.266 ***	0.389	1.182 ***	0.392
11-12 years					1.345 ***	0.480	1.312 ***	0.469	1.420 ***	0.430	1.343 ***	0.428
More than 12 years					2.345 **	0.902	2.407 **	0.960	2.315 **	0.892	2.111 **	0.886
Parent's Party Affiliation												
Mother Party Member							-1.082	0.716	-0.958	0.713	-0.903	0.701
Father Party Member							-0.207	0.203	-0.125	0.208	-0.098	0.210
Parent's Occupation												
Father Agriculture							0.076	0.296	0.062	0.295	0.060	0.298
Father Skilled/Unskill/Other							0.791 **	0.296	0.712 **	0.312	0.695 **	0.316
Father Office/Professional							0.876 ***	0.324	0.776 **	0.348	0.793 **	0.335
Father Sales/Entrepreneur							1.052 ***	0.348	0.925 **	0.368	0.864 **	0.367
Mother Agriculture							-0.859 ***	0.278	-0.823 ***	0.261	-0.845 ***	0.261
Mother Non-Agr. Occup.							0.877 **	0.391	0.985 **	0.376	0.968 **	0.384
Region of Residence (1996)												
Northeast									-0.631	1.267	-0.605	1.266
Coastal									0.445	1.239	0.509	1.232
Central									-0.913	1.217	-0.831	1.212
West									-0.974	1.227	-0.800	1.224
Family												
Family Size											-0.085	0.088
# Working Family											0.140	0.112
# Cadres in Family											0.748 **	0.329
Constant	-2.103 ***	0.115	-2.458 ***	0.330	-3.296 ***	0.548	-2.720 ***	0.596	-2.600 *	1.308	-2.659 **	1.320

Note: Reference category for age is 20-29. Ref. category for respondent's education is 0 years. Ref. category for mother and father's occupation is not applicable/ don't know.

Ref. category for region is Cities (Beijing, Shanghai, Tianjin). * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

TABLE X-5 **Multinomial Logistic Regression on Respondent's Occupational Category (1996), by Non-Han**

Occupation Category: Entrepreneurs relative to Agriculture

	Model 7		Model 8		Model 9		Model 10		Model 11		Model 12	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Ethnicity												
Manchu	-31.940 ***	0.603	-33.191 ***	0.659	-35.545 ***	0.663	-36.055 ***	0.794	-32.119 ***	0.802	-32.255 ***	0.818
Mongol	-33.798 ***	0.754	-33.143 ***	0.657	-35.345 ***	0.643	-35.749 ***	0.672	-31.863 ***	0.845	-32.175 ***	0.863
Hui	-0.239	0.322	-0.357	0.427	-0.237	0.466	-0.016	0.471	0.449	0.394	0.359	0.391
Zhuang	0.195	0.760	0.650	0.754	0.542	0.746	0.701	0.699	0.863	0.660	0.699	0.692
Dongxiang	-33.946 ***	1.022	-33.468 ***	1.028	-34.649 ***	1.054	-34.512 ***	1.047	-31.367 ***	1.076	-31.838 ***	1.113
Bai	0.664 ***	0.179	1.168 ***	0.263	1.286 ***	0.276	1.624 ***	0.235	1.767 ***	0.345	1.520 ***	0.382
Othr Non-Han	-1.591	1.371	-1.743 *	1.036	-1.492	1.023	-1.094	1.130	-0.962	1.046	-1.115	1.055
Respondent												
Male			1.414 ***	0.194	1.170 ***	0.187	1.197 ***	0.187	1.256 ***	0.197	1.268 ***	0.198
Age 30-39			-0.258	0.286	-0.248	0.293	-0.246	0.302	-0.376	0.287	-0.342	0.287
Age 40-49			-0.906 ***	0.301	-0.727 **	0.300	-0.792 **	0.302	-0.945 ***	0.325	-0.953 ***	0.327
Age 50+			-1.860 ***	0.370	-1.415 ***	0.404	-1.567 ***	0.414	-1.832 ***	0.462	-1.809 ***	0.481
Ever Married			0.839 *	0.498	0.839	0.504	0.760	0.501	0.978 *	0.504	1.023 *	0.516
Urban			4.408 ***	0.409	4.244 ***	0.415	4.036 ***	0.414	4.363 ***	0.438	4.375 ***	0.436
Party			-0.187	0.516	-0.318	0.500	-0.318	0.495	-0.185	0.493	-0.222	0.475
Respondent's Education												
1-8 years					1.438 ***	0.465	1.402 ***	0.469	1.441 ***	0.475	1.381 ***	0.477
9 years					1.919 ***	0.459	1.877 ***	0.456	1.999 ***	0.470	1.933 ***	0.469
11-12 years					1.698 ***	0.482	1.741 ***	0.477	1.807 ***	0.504	1.784 ***	0.503
More than 12 years					2.933 ***	0.925	3.143 ***	0.963	2.956 ***	0.978	2.867 ***	0.995
Parent's Party Affiliation												
Mother Party Member							-1.293	0.782	-1.038	0.758	-1.009	0.752
Father Party Member							-0.646 **	0.245	-0.567 **	0.242	-0.512 **	0.250
Parent's Occupation												
Father Agriculture							-0.401	0.332	-0.386	0.338	-0.396	0.350
Father Skilled/Unskill/Other							0.695	0.449	0.670	0.465	0.656	0.469
Father Office/Professional							0.790 *	0.460	0.711	0.486	0.744	0.487
Father Sales/Entrepreneur							0.554	0.419	0.366	0.425	0.317	0.418
Mother Agriculture							-0.662 **	0.311	-0.802 ***	0.264	-0.842 ***	0.269
Mother Non-Agr. Occup.							0.551	0.458	0.468	0.445	0.416	0.452
Region of Residence (1996)												
Northeast									-1.194	0.931	-1.169	0.879
Coastal									0.902	0.674	0.970	0.649
Central									-0.525	0.570	-0.432	0.551
West									-0.045	0.601	0.073	0.586
Family												
Family Size											0.052	0.088
# Working Family											0.073	0.101
# Cadres in Family											0.315	0.544
Constant	-3.000 ***	0.179	-4.619 ***	0.415	-6.084 ***	0.528	-5.239 ***	0.561	-5.447 ***	0.789	-5.953 ***	0.866

Note: Reference category for age is 20-29. Ref. category for respondent's education is 0 years. Ref. category for mother and father's occupation is not applicable/ don't know.

Ref. category for region is Cities (Beijing, Shanghai, Tianjin). * p<.10, ** p<.05, *** p<.01

TABLE XI-1 **Survey Adjusted Logistic Regression - Commodity Categories (1996)**

	Color/B&W Television		Refrigerator		Rice Cooker		Automatic/Reg. Washer	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Ethnicity								
Han	0.553	0.497	-0.259	0.196	-0.062	0.345	-0.255	0.306
Respondent								
Male	-0.362 ***	0.106	-0.257 **	0.111	-0.123 *	0.072	-0.327 ***	0.113
Age 30-39	0.250 *	0.134	0.677 ***	0.127	0.273 **	0.122	0.074	0.120
Age 40-49	0.227 *	0.120	0.800 ***	0.154	0.191 *	0.104	0.172	0.138
Age 50+	-0.059	0.129	0.646 ***	0.167	0.019	0.125	0.245	0.193
Urban	1.384 ***	0.349	1.609 ***	0.279	0.505 *	0.282	1.660 ***	0.246
Party Member	0.529 **	0.240	0.144	0.144	0.166	0.117	0.080	0.145
Respondent's Education								
1-8 years	0.571 ***	0.134	0.536 ***	0.165	0.063	0.135	0.465 **	0.186
9 years	0.827 ***	0.156	0.948 ***	0.206	0.134	0.162	0.686 ***	0.187
11-12 years	1.311 ***	0.297	1.117 ***	0.230	0.184	0.189	1.009 ***	0.199
> 12 years	2.111 ***	0.522	1.739 ***	0.326	0.559 **	0.263	1.525 ***	0.407
Region of Residence (1996)								
Northeast	1.085 **	0.424	-1.640 ***	0.342	1.264 **	0.518	0.703 *	0.402
Coastal	-0.110	0.453	-0.921 **	0.407	0.982 *	0.543	-0.548	0.365
Central	-0.160	0.404	-1.290 ***	0.385	0.102	0.485	-0.478	0.353
West	-1.117 ***	0.402	-1.762 ***	0.344	0.490	0.541	-0.406	0.385
Occupation								
Not Applicable	0.502 **	0.197	1.416 ***	0.186	0.911 ***	0.189	0.643 ***	0.184
Skilled/Unskilled/Other	0.068	0.192	1.160 ***	0.199	0.920 ***	0.196	0.575 **	0.240
Office/Manager/Prof.	0.257	0.480	1.165 ***	0.196	1.117 ***	0.199	0.753 ***	0.176
Service	0.234	0.234	1.492 ***	0.200	1.109 ***	0.220	0.600 ***	0.186
Entrepreneur	0.821 **	0.404	1.896 ***	0.199	1.520 ***	0.250	1.137 ***	0.242
Family Income 86-96								
Same	-0.756 *	0.381	-0.202	0.416	0.160	0.367	-0.310	0.296
0<5,000 RMB	0.248	0.245	-0.293	0.179	-0.166	0.194	-0.362 **	0.152
5<10,000 RMB	0.997 ***	0.278	0.494 **	0.196	0.511 ***	0.166	0.475 ***	0.164
10<15,000 RMB	1.349 ***	0.316	1.027 ***	0.226	0.783 ***	0.177	0.865 ***	0.196
>15,000 RMB	2.149 ***	0.418	1.675 ***	0.300	1.358 ***	0.216	1.546 ***	0.252
Family								
Family Size	0.162 **	0.062	-0.041	0.043	0.039	0.037	0.054	0.044
# Working Family	0.041	0.078	-0.009	0.057	-0.090 **	0.044	0.017	0.055
# Cadres in Family	0.798 **	0.392	0.693 ***	0.138	0.439 ***	0.115	0.537 **	0.205
Constant	-0.860	0.678	-2.833 ***	0.459	-2.728 ***	0.640	-2.170 ***	0.552

Note: Reference category for education is received no schooling. Reference category for age is 20-29. Ref. category for occupation is Agriculture. Ref. category for region is Cities. Ref. category for Family Income 86-96 is earned more in 1986 than in 1996. *<.10, **<.05, ***p<.01

TABLE XI-2 **Survey Adjusted Logistic Regression - Commodity Categories (1996)**

	Electric Fan		Telephone		Bicycle		Motorcycle/Car/Truck	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Ethnicity								
Han	0.840 *	0.463	-0.169	0.226	-0.080	0.579	-0.130	0.294
Respondent								
Male	-0.157 *	0.092	-0.446 ***	0.096	-0.123 *	0.073	-0.239 **	0.110
Age 30-39	0.229 *	0.126	0.469 ***	0.151	0.344 **	0.145	0.538 ***	0.152
Age 40-49	0.184	0.119	0.710 ***	0.164	0.394 ***	0.139	0.095	0.182
Age 50+	0.157	0.155	0.447 **	0.177	0.111	0.145	0.088	0.183
Urban	1.162 ***	0.404	1.739 ***	0.259	-0.104	0.344	-0.272	0.283
Party Member	0.330 *	0.175	0.844 ***	0.162	0.375 **	0.185	-0.119	0.180
Respondent's Education								
1-8 years	0.436 **	0.179	0.432 **	0.188	0.457 ***	0.133	0.625 **	0.253
9 years	0.728 ***	0.203	0.831 ***	0.225	0.818 ***	0.160	0.564 **	0.279
11-12 years	1.142 ***	0.232	1.125 ***	0.249	1.017 ***	0.199	0.888 ***	0.285
> 12 years	0.931 ***	0.310	1.729 ***	0.337	1.353 ***	0.428	0.543	0.382
Region of Residence (1996)								
Northeast	-3.366 ***	0.476	-0.651 *	0.383	-0.777 *	0.412	1.075 **	0.462
Coastal	0.947	0.571	0.347	0.223	0.091	0.385	1.236 ***	0.452
Central	-0.430	0.624	-0.334	0.224	0.001	0.372	0.695	0.453
West	-1.859 ***	0.611	-0.755 ***	0.226	-2.148 ***	0.444	0.412	0.466
Occupation								
Not Applicable	0.319 *	0.182	1.183 ***	0.273	0.352 *	0.180	0.649 **	0.266
Skilled/Unskilled/Other	0.267 *	0.159	0.925 ***	0.310	0.687 ***	0.221	0.250	0.219
Office/Manager/Prof.	0.195	0.319	1.156 ***	0.302	0.334	0.317	0.619 **	0.243
Service	0.517 *	0.275	1.067 ***	0.282	0.115	0.296	0.904 ***	0.211
Entrepreneur	0.832 ***	0.279	2.001 ***	0.256	0.148	0.293	1.607 ***	0.342
Family Income 86-96								
Same	-0.261	0.343	-0.727	0.558	-0.234	0.375	0.132	0.572
0<5,000 RMB	-0.080	0.165	-0.273	0.278	0.441 **	0.205	-0.466 **	0.225
5<10,000 RMB	0.391 *	0.203	0.463 *	0.272	0.942 ***	0.239	0.338	0.219
10<15,000 RMB	0.906 ***	0.258	0.833 ***	0.293	1.421 ***	0.381	0.452 *	0.265
>15,000 RMB	1.439 ***	0.276	1.677 ***	0.376	1.649 ***	0.460	1.390 ***	0.259
Family								
Family Size	0.142 ***	0.052	0.118 **	0.045	0.183 **	0.086	0.108 *	0.055
# Working Family	-0.017	0.059	-0.102 *	0.057	0.084	0.060	-0.001	0.071
# Cadres in Family	0.049	0.259	0.789 ***	0.149	-0.084	0.143	0.291 **	0.127
Constant	-1.023	0.758	-5.075 ***	0.443	-0.104	0.672	-4.472 ***	0.608

Note: Reference category for education is received no schooling. Reference category for age is 20-29. Ref. category for occupation is Agriculture. Ref. category for region is Cities. Ref. category for Family Income 86-96 is earned more in 1986 than in 1996. *<.10, **<.05, ***p<.01

TABLE XII-1 **Survey Adjusted Ordered Logistic Regression - Change, by Han**

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Ethnicity										
Han	-0.073	0.278	0.232	0.221	0.196	0.206	-0.118	0.408	0.238	0.380
Respondent										
Male			0.284 ***	0.058	0.190 ***	0.063	0.188 ***	0.066	0.146 **	0.062
Age 30-39			0.128	0.080	0.028	0.079	0.039	0.080	0.044	0.082
Age 40-49			-0.012	0.094	0.045	0.097	0.048	0.099	0.044	0.096
Age 50+			-0.361 ***	0.107	-0.209 *	0.116	-0.214 *	0.118	-0.248 **	0.116
Ever Married			-0.025	0.117	-0.156	0.127	-0.164	0.127	-0.043	0.133
Urban			0.413 ***	0.143	0.530 ***	0.153	0.803 **	0.351	1.204 ***	0.381
Party Member			-0.604 ***	0.106	-0.498 ***	0.114	-0.500 ***	0.114	-0.473 ***	0.115
Respondent's Education										
1-8 years			-0.329 ***	0.093	-0.208 **	0.092	-0.208 **	0.095	-0.099	0.094
9 years			-0.337 ***	0.107	-0.177	0.109	-0.187 *	0.111	-0.026	0.105
11-12 years			-0.447 ***	0.154	-0.210	0.158	-0.225	0.159	-0.028	0.147
More than 12 years			-1.006 ***	0.211	-0.578 **	0.226	-0.584 **	0.228	-0.365	0.220
Region of Residence (1996)										
Northeast			0.067	0.254	-0.339	0.296	-0.032	0.539	0.237	0.565
Coastal			-0.030	0.232	-0.262	0.266	-0.058	0.937	0.250	0.898
Central			0.343	0.228	0.011	0.276	-0.849 **	0.371	-0.624	0.374
West			0.498 **	0.242	0.110	0.282	-0.307	0.304	-0.230	0.303
Occupation										
Not Applicable			0.140	0.124	0.105	0.130	0.114	0.130	0.258 *	0.132
Skilled/Unskilled/Other			-0.086	0.140	0.200	0.137	0.193	0.137	0.312 **	0.136
Office/Manager/Prof.			-0.555 ***	0.139	-0.229	0.141	-0.226	0.142	-0.074	0.138
Service			-0.306 *	0.174	-0.054	0.175	-0.045	0.175	0.113	0.165
Entrepreneur			-0.814 ***	0.241	-0.513 **	0.243	-0.521 **	0.245	-0.234	0.248
Family Income 86-96										
Same					0.572 **	0.249	0.569 **	0.248	0.487 *	0.266
0<5,000 RMB					-0.226	0.181	-0.222	0.180	-0.190	0.181
5<10,000 RMB					-0.835 ***	0.162	-0.828 ***	0.160	-0.661 ***	0.167
10<15,000 RMB					-1.377 ***	0.207	-1.368 ***	0.202	-1.127 ***	0.202
>15,000 RMB					-1.537 ***	0.175	-1.524 ***	0.170	-1.218 ***	0.177

TABLE XII-2 **Survey Adjusted Ordered Logistic Regression - Change, by Han**

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Family										
Family Size					0.129 ***	0.024	0.129 ***	0.025	0.156 ***	0.024
# Working Family					-0.116 ***	0.034	-0.115 ***	0.034	-0.120 ***	0.037
# Cadres in Family					-0.237 **	0.114	-0.234 **	0.113	-0.192 *	0.113
Interactions										
Han * Urban							-0.304	0.345	-0.466	0.354
Han * Northeast							-0.361	0.481	-0.632	0.481
Han * Coastal							-0.206	0.894	-0.368	0.828
Han * Central							0.892 **	0.332	0.695 **	0.319
Han * West							0.475 *	0.283	0.183	0.275
Commodites 86-96										
Gained 1									-0.303 ***	0.105
Gained 2									-0.595 ***	0.137
Gained 3									-0.786 ***	0.155
Gained 4-5									-1.054 ***	0.165
Gained 6-8									-1.830 ***	0.304
Owned 1 in both yrs									-0.474 ***	0.114
Owned 2 in both yrs									-0.702 ***	0.162
Owned 3 in both yrs									-0.835 ***	0.193
Owned 4-5 in both									-0.674 ***	0.203
Owned 6-8 in both									-0.687 **	0.321
Cut Point 1	-0.006	0.265	0.231	0.359	-0.362	0.428	-0.683	0.547	-0.735	0.525
Cut Point 2	1.940 ***	0.271	2.236 ***	0.369	1.718 ***	0.430	1.403 **	0.539	1.401 ***	0.518
Cut Point 3	3.274 ***	0.283	3.582 ***	0.380	3.086 ***	0.436	2.773 ***	0.538	2.788 ***	0.518
Cut Point 4	4.258 ***	0.296	4.569 ***	0.411	4.083 ***	0.465	3.770 ***	0.546	3.791 ***	0.530

Note: Reference category for education is received no schooling. Reference category for age is 20-29. Ref. category for occupation is Agricultur
Ref. category for region is Cities (Beijing, Shanghai, Tianjin). Ref. category for Family Income 86-96 is earned more in 1986 than in 1996.
Ref. categories for both sets of commodities are gained/owned 0.
*p<.10, **p<.05, ***p<.01

TABLE XIII-1 **Survey Adjusted Ordered Logistic Regression - Change, by Non-Han**

	Model 6		Model 7		Model 8		Model 9	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Ethnicity								
Manchu	0.543	0.341	0.547	0.333	0.532	0.321	0.461	0.308
Mongol	-0.035	0.468	-0.082	0.523	-0.076	0.584	-0.046	0.605
Hui	-1.090 **	0.494	-1.368 **	0.527	-1.204 **	0.516	-1.003 **	0.486
Zhuang	0.238 **	0.094	-0.055	0.171	-0.027	0.175	0.321 *	0.181
Dongxiang	0.692 ***	0.066	0.206	0.170	0.037	0.186	-0.207	0.217
Bai	0.116 *	0.069	-0.209	0.162	-0.028	0.158	-0.336	0.209
Other	0.163	0.327	-0.163	0.359	-0.150	0.329	-0.484	0.398
Respondent								
Male			0.274 ***	0.059	0.187 ***	0.065	0.147 **	0.061
Age 30-39			0.141 *	0.080	0.030	0.083	0.033	0.085
Age 40-49			0.007	0.091	0.050	0.096	0.045	0.097
Age 50+			-0.344 ***	0.103	-0.204 *	0.116	-0.244 **	0.117
Ever Married			-0.050	0.118	-0.174	0.126	-0.042	0.133
Urban			0.412 ***	0.143	0.528 ***	0.153	0.764 ***	0.177
Party Member			-0.605 ***	0.106	-0.499 ***	0.114	-0.473 ***	0.115
Respondent's Education								
1-8 years			-0.295 ***	0.089	-0.192 **	0.093	-0.102	0.093
9 years			-0.308 ***	0.105	-0.166	0.110	-0.026	0.107
11-12 years			-0.420 ***	0.152	-0.201	0.158	-0.023	0.148
More than 12 years			-0.975 ***	0.210	-0.569 **	0.227	-0.371	0.223
Region of Residence (1996)								
Northeast			0.063	0.246	-0.340	0.290	-0.327	0.300
Coastal			-0.008	0.228	-0.241	0.263	-0.089	0.276
Central			0.371	0.223	0.038	0.272	0.066	0.276
West			0.525 **	0.242	0.137	0.282	-0.048	0.289
Occupation								
Not Applicable			0.143	0.126	0.102	0.132	0.254 *	0.132
Skilled/Unskilled/Other			-0.078	0.141	0.200	0.137	0.320 **	0.135
Office/Manager/Prof.			-0.555 ***	0.138	-0.233	0.140	-0.075	0.136
Service			-0.299 *	0.173	-0.051	0.175	0.103	0.164
Entrepreneur			-0.805 ***	0.242	-0.514 **	0.244	-0.237	0.248

TABLE XIII-2 **Survey Adjusted Ordered Logistic Regression - Change, by Non-Han**

	Model 6		Model 7		Model 8		Model 9	
	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Family Income 86-96								
Same					0.579 **	0.250	0.492 *	0.272
0<5,000 RMB					-0.213	0.181	-0.181	0.182
5<10,000 RMB					-0.812 ***	0.163	-0.646 ***	0.166
10<15,000 RMB					-1.342 ***	0.202	-1.107 ***	0.201
>15,000 RMB					-1.512 ***	0.175	-1.212 ***	0.179
Family								
Family Size					0.130 ***	0.025	0.154 ***	0.024
# Working Family					-0.120 ***	0.034	-0.121 ***	0.035
# Cadres in Family					-0.237 **	0.114	-0.200 *	0.114
Commodites 86-96								
Gained 1							-0.297 ***	0.100
Gained 2							-0.586 ***	0.128
Gained 3							-0.757 ***	0.139
Gained 4-5							-1.028 ***	0.151
Gained 6-8							-1.805 ***	0.298
Owned 1 in both yrs							-0.483 ***	0.113
Owned 2 in both yrs							-0.726 ***	0.162
Owned 3 in both yrs							-0.837 ***	0.194
Owned 4-5 in both							-0.667 ***	0.207
Owned 6-8 in both							-0.676 **	0.325
Cut Point 1	0.066	0.072	0.030	0.293	-0.533	0.389	-0.933 **	0.404
Cut Point 2	2.021 ***	0.083	2.043 ***	0.305	1.553 ***	0.388	1.200 ***	0.401
Cut Point 3	3.356 ***	0.107	3.391 ***	0.314	2.922 ***	0.392	2.586 ***	0.402
Cut Point 4	4.340 ***	0.186	4.378 ***	0.352	3.919 ***	0.419	3.588 ***	0.422

Note: Reference category for education is received no schooling. Ref. category for age is 20-29. Ref. category for occupation is Agriculture. Ref. category for region is Cities (Beijing, Shanghai, Tianjin). Ref. category for Family Income 86-96 is earned more in 1986 than in 1996. Ref. categories for both sets of commodities are gained/owned 0.

*p<.10, **p<.05, ***p<.01