From the Culture of Migration to the Culture of Remittances: Evidence from Immigrant-sending Communities in China*

(Preliminary Draft)

Zai Liang and Qian Jasmine Song

Department of Sociology

State University of New York

Albany, NY 12222

Phone: 518-442-4676

Fax: 518-442-4936

E-mail: zliang@albany.edu

ABSTRACT

Extending the notion of "the culture of migration", we propose and elaborate the concept of "the culture of remittances" to examine flows of remittances in immigrant-sending province Fujian, China. We argue that the culture of remittances influences two important variables in the study of remittances: amount of remittances and whether remittances are used for public projects for the community. Careful statistical analysis using data from Fujian province support our two major predictions. We also find that elite immigrants are also more likely to use remittances for public projects in immigrant-sending communities. Our policy discussion calls for more strategies and services to deal with major concerns with left behind family members (i.e. the elderly) in communities and increasingly land use issue as well as more proactive strategies to cultivate elite immigrants who are increasingly transnational and are likely to become catalysts for economic transformations in these communities.

Introduction

Many field researchers of migration have noticed the phenomenon of "the culture of migration". In these migrant-sending communities, migration is a household strategy to improve socio-economic standing in the community. Overtime, migration increasingly becomes a normative behavior and young people are expected to migrate as a rite of passage. The culture of migration helps sustain the flow of international migration from one generation to another (Kandel and Massey, 2002).

In this paper, we extend the discussion of the culture of migration to include the behavior of remittances and use the case of migrant-sending communities in China's Fujian province to empirically test main ideas from the culture of remittances thesis. Building on the literature on the culture of migration, we argue that in many migrant-sending communities in China, there emerges a culture of remittances. The culture of remittances refers to norms and expectations of remittances in a migrant-sending community. These norms and expectations affect and govern patterns of remittances behavior. These norms at the village level have implications about who is expected to remit, expected amount of remittances, and how remittances are used. This is important for several reasons. One is that we shift attention from typical remittances research that focuses on individual and household level characteristics to the village level norms, a direction that has not been fully explored by students of migration. Second, to the extent that portion of the remittances is used for local infrastructure and educational facilities, our attention to village level culture of remittances identifies new avenue of research where by remittances can be channeled by village level characteristics for development in migrant-sending communities. Finally, we argue that culture of remittances hold important promise to stimulate economic development immigrant-sending communities. Our empirical analysis relies on a survey of households in migrant-sending communities in Fujian province, located in southeast China (see Map 1).

From the Culture of Migration to the Culture of Remittances

Many scholars have contributed to the literature on remittances in the context of both internal and international migration (Locus, 2005; Taylor and Rozzel, 2004). Most previous studies on remittances tend to theorize remittances as determined by individual behavior responding to household needs. With few exceptions (Durand et al., 1996), village level factors are often not taken into account. In this paper, we place village level factors at the center stage. One important factor is a set of norms of remittances, or the culture of remittances. This refers to expectations and amount of remittances that are

perceived to be appropriate and adequate in each village. Students of international migration from Mexico to the U.S. have long recognized the "culture of migration" that characterizes many Mexican communities. In these communities, international migration is prevalent, foreign remittances are part of economics resources that support household living as well as potential for investment. Migration is perceived as a means, if not the only means, towards socioeconomic mobility. The culture of migration especially has a major impact on young people, because in these communities migration is becoming "normative" so that migration is "a rite of passage for these people (Kandel and Massey, 2002; Mines, 1981). In many ways, the culture of migration is a responsible transmission of international migration across generations. Previous studies by migration researchers have identified a "culture of migration."

Just as in the case of the culture of migration, we argue in many migrant-sending villages in China there is a culture of remittances, which reflects the history and current trend of international migration in these villages. The culture of remittances sets the norm of remittances in terms of the appropriate amount to remit, and how remittances are used. The culture of remittances is formed through at least three mechanisms. One is consumption patterns by migrant households in migrant sending communities. The consumption patterns may include purchase of TV, other appliances, home improvement, or building new houses. It should be noted that consumption pattern and norm in a village can only be sustained by a corresponding pattern of remittances. Thus we suggest a strong connection between the culture of remittances and consumption patterns in migrant-sending communities. Another factor is village discussion/gossip networks. Parents are often proud of the fact that their children and family members are migrating out and are likely to share the information on remittances to boost their sense of pride. These discussion networks help to diffuse information on remittance behavior at the village level. Third, the nature of migration networks determines that migrants from the same village often settle in same destinations. Although migrants may not necessarily share the information on the exact amount of remittances, they often share information on the ballpark figure of what is considered to be the appropriate amount of remittances as well as on how to send remittances (through post office, bank) and service charge associated with each service. For immigrants in New York City, for example, they have plenty of opportunities to exchange such information. A typical scene during Chinese New Year and other holidays is long line of Chinese immigrants to wire money home. Given the large demand for this service, many banks in New York City provide this service in both Chinese and English.

Norms that govern people's behavior must be reinforced by sanction and reward systems. For example, migrant households that do not have modern appliances or good quality housing are perceived by others as a sign that a particular immigrant from this household must not be doing well. On the other hand, immigrants who meet and exceed

the village norms of remittances, household social status is elevated and immigrants are praised and sometimes are offered positions that are important to village affairs. In contrast, if households do not receive adequate amount of remittances often avoid discussing matters of remittances in pubic for fear of losing face. This is also true and perhaps especially true for remittances that contributed to the welfare of the village such as remittances that support location education and public projects. In these instances, village officials made great efforts to ensure that names of these contributors are recognized by the public in the village. (We will present more evidence on this in revised version of this paper). During our fieldwork in Fujian in 2006, we observed a newly built theater in a well-known migrant-sending village. Nearby there is a big stone stature in which all donors' names are inscribed. In fact almost every migrant village that we went, there are always some projects contributed by migrants whose names are recognized in some way. This could be a big village entrance decoration that bears the name of an immigrant in the U.S., a school that bears the name of another immigrant, or other public projects such as roads, dams, and Buddhist temples and Christian churches. This culture is also being promoted by villages, towns, as well as provincial government in Fujian province. [1]

Based on this discussion, we hypothesize that village level norms of remittances play an important role in immigrant remittances behavior: whether or not to remit, how much to remit, and whether to remit money to support education and public projects. Specifically, households in villages with a larger amount of remittances are likely to remit larger amount as well. In addition, households in communities with large proportion of immigrants contributed to community's public projects are likely to be doing the same. Following previous studies, we also consider other variables: cost of emigration, duration of residence in the US, total number of immigrants from each household. We expect the cost of emigration is positively related to amount of remittances because immigrants who paid larger amount of money are likely to remit more. In general, we also expect that for most immigrants, the first priority for remittances is to support the family. However, elite immigrants (defined as having income above the median among immigrants in the U.S. are more likely to contribute to education and public projects for the community. The current literature also suggests that the longer time immigrants spend in the U.S. the less attachment immigrants will have with origin community, which leads to decreased amount of remittances (Massey et al., 1987). Our statistical models also control other important socio-demographic variables.

---

[1] We note that the thesis is the culture of remittances is likely to work better in rural areas than in urban areas. In rural areas where strong family and village networks norms and systems of sanctions and rewards are more likely to be effective. Our survey is mainly carried out in rural areas.

Data and Methods

Data for this paper are collected by the senior author in 2002. We adopted the ethnosurvey approach used in the MMP and LAMP (Massey, 1987). From February to June 2002, we were engaged in designing three questionnaires to be used in the ethnosurvey: a household questionnaire used in China, a household questionnaire used in the United States and a community-level questionnaire for migrant-sending communities in China. We used the questionnaires for MMP and LAMP as a model and naturally modified the questionnaires to take into account the Chinese context. The household-level questionnaire contains basic information on the socio-demographic characteristics of each member of the household (including those who are abroad), and basic information on the internal and international migration history for all household members. Because of the importance of religion, as illustrated from the work of Guest (2003), we include information on religion for each person. For household heads and spouses, we gathered marriage history, fertility history, labor history, and consumption patterns. At the household level, we have information on remittances in the year of the survey and cumulative amount of remittances, business formation, land ownership and other property ownership, and housing conditions and tenure status. We made some modifications to the questionnaire used in the Mexican Migration Project. For example, unlike the case of Mexico, we included questionnaire items on cadre status (ever been a cadre and year of acquiring that position) in order to test our hypotheses derived from the market transition theory.

We also made another modification in gathering information on migration trip characteristics. Because undocumented migration is still a relatively sensitive topic in migrant-sending communities in China, we decided to ask more detailed questions on the actual migration trip for the U.S. sample, but not for the Fujian sample. Thus, for the U.S. sample, we asked about the date of travel/migration, duration of the trip, number and names of each country stayed in on the way to the U.S., smuggling fees paid, knowledge of snakehead, and number of people on the trip. There is another reason for asking these detailed questions on trip characteristics for the U.S. sample. Because of the low rate of return migration, more often than not, we interviewed household members who remain in China (not the immigrants themselves) in the survey. Household members usually know the basic information about their migrant members, but not detailed information about the migration trip itself. Thus, we believe our strategy is likely to increase the quality of data on trip characteristics. Finally, our sampling strategy is somewhat different from the case of MMP. Because of the low rate of return migration, we have increased the sample size of immigrants in the United States.

Our community (at the village level) questionnaire covers a wide spectrum of information: demographic background (such as population figures for major census years, immigration history), agriculture sown, industrial infrastructure, educational infrastructure, public services, financial infrastructure, transportation infrastructure, and medical infrastructure.

After some modifications, we finalized the questionnaires in late summer 2002. Within northeastern Fujian province, we selected 8 towns that are known to send large numbers of migrants to the United States, the New York City region in particular. In choosing these particular towns for our survey, we first interviewed people with some major Fujianese immigrant organizations in New York City.[2] The idea was to find out these towns that Fujianese migrants in New York City came from. This would ensure that the surveys in China would identify reasonable number of international migrants. Similar to the design of Mexican Migration Project, for each town, we have a target sample of 200 households.

The first dependent variable is amount of remittances sent the year prior to our survey of 2002 for each household. This is reported as household level information, as much the information contains remittances from all immigrants who are from this household. Note that because this variable on remittances includes total amount of remittances from all household members who are immigrants, we need to create some household level variables based on immigrant characteristics. Because we are not able to include information on each immigrant from the same household, we calculate a mean variable that takes each immigrant's characteristics into account. For example mean education for immigrants from each household refers to the mean level of education of all immigrants from the same household. The second major dependent variable is how remittances used: coded 1 if for education and public projects in the community, 0 otherwise.

The key independent variable is mean level of cumulative household remittances in each village. This is a village level variable that intends to capture the village level "normative" amount of remittances, following the argument of "the culture of remittances" thesis. We use two variables in the survey to calculate this variable: one is the amount of remittances sent by each household the year prior to the survey and the other is the cumulative amount of remittances that each household received by the time of survey. We use household level cumulative amount of remittances minus the amount of remittances one year before the survey to get the cumulative amount of remittances up to two years prior to the survey year. We then calculate mean of cumulative amount of

---

[2] It is usually the case that towns that send a lot of immigrants to the United States often establish their town-based hometown association once the number of immigrants reaches a certain threshold level.

remittances up to two years prior the survey year and this is our independent variable of mean remittances at the village level.

Compared to previous studies, we use a multilevel modeling approach (Guo and Zhao, 2000; Rundenbush and Bryk, 2002). Most previous studies use regular OLS regression models to study the impact of community level variables on remittances behavior, which has the potential bias of under-estimating standard errors. Multi-level modeling approach, which we are adopting in this paper, is superior and increasingly accepted as the standard way to modeling community level (village level) variables on household or individual behavior. Given the amount of remittances is truncated for households that have not received any amount of remittances, we use multi-level Tobit model to mode this process (Long, 1997). For our second dependent variable, namely whether remittances are used for education and public projects, we estimate a multilevel logistic regression model. Both models are estimated using Stata.

Preliminary Results

Table 1 compares households with remittances and households without remittances on major characteristics of immigrants. Overall, remittances rate is very high with 95% of household received some amount of remittances. We should note that this is higher than the case of Mexican immigrants in the United States (about 47% according to Durand et al. (1996)). Clearly sending remittances is nearly universal in these communities. One factor explaining the difference in the rate of remittances between Chinese and Mexican immigrants is that Chinese immigrants paid a much higher amount of fees for coming to the United States. In general, we do not detect a major difference in socio-demographic characteristics between immigrants who remit and immigrants who did not remit. It appears that migration experiences are related to propensity to remit. The more immigrants a household has the more likely the household receives remittances. There also seems to be an association between cost of immigration and remittances.

To take advantage of information on how remittances are used, Table 2 shows how the patterns of remittance use change over time. Consistent with the current literature on remittances, immigrant households use remittances to support for family living, paying cost of migration, supporting elderly, and building new houses. Table 2 also reveals an important piece of information, over time, immigrant household are more and more likely to use remittances to support location education and other pubic projects.

To the extent that supporting local education and public projects is one of the most important ways to link migration with development in migrant-sending communities, we further explore this issue with our culture of remittances thesis. We

8

expect that immigrant households which reside in villages with large amount of remittances are more likely to use remittances to support local education and public projects. Likewise, immigrant households which reside in villages with large mean level of remittances are more likely to use remittances for the purpose of location education and public projects.

Table 3 tabulates how the use of remittances by the amount of remittances at the village level. It appears that the proportion of households which use remittances to support local educational and public project is sizable, it does not seem to be associated with size of remittances at the village level. However, Table 4 shows that, with slight fluctuation, the proportion of households which use remittances to support location education and public project is rising with mean level of village remittances (our measure of culture of remittances within each village). This initial evidence clearly supports our culture of remittances thesis.

In Table 5, we estimated both OLS and multi-level Tobit model of amount of remittances received last year at the household level. The first one uses only socio-demographic characteristics of immigrants and all results are consistent with our expectations (although some are not statistically significant). Models 2 and 4 both use some other village level characteristics. Model 3 includes a key variable of our interests: mean amount of remittances at the village level one year before the survey. Model 3 provides the most convincing evidence so far to support our thesis of the culture of remittances. We observe that immigrant households in villages with higher level of mean remittances are also contributing larger amount of remittances to their households. Thus patterns of remittances are not only determined by migration characteristics (immigration cost and number of emigrants in a household), but also are influenced by village level norms of remittances (i.e. expected amount of remittances for household with emigrants abroad).

Table 6 addresses the question of how "the culture of remittances" affects household decision to use the remittances, specifically use the remittances for public projects (education, roads etc). Here we are estimating the impact of village level characteristics (the culture of remittances) on the propensity for migrant households to use the remittances for support of public projects. Model 4 uses the village level variable "proportion of remittances used in public projects in a village" to predict whether migrant households use the remittances to support public projects. The results are consistent with our expectation: households from villages with higher proportion of remittances used for public projects are also more likely to use remittances for public projects.

Conclusion and Policy Discussion

In this paper, extending the idea of "the culture of migration", we advocate a new perspective, "the culture of remittances" to study the flow of remittances from international migrants in the U.S. to households in rural Fuijan province, China. The culture of remittances aims to capture the norms in the village regarding the decision to send remittances and how remittances are used (for family use or for public projects in the village). The work is motivated by many years of field observation in immigrant-sending villages in China where many villages built different statures to recognize migrant households that contributed to the village public projects. Our approach is a significant departure from previous studies in the literature on remittances which focus mainly on individual and household characteristics. To the extent there are studies (Durand et a., 1996) that do pay attention to community characteristics, they tend to be characteristics such as community level population and other infrastructure variables. We argue that culture of remittances at the village level should be another variable in our study of flow of remittances.

Our efforts have clearly born some fruits. We measure "culture of remittances" using two variables at the village level: one is the mean amount of remittances for each village and the second is the proportion of household that contributed to public projects in each village. We find that immigrant households in villages with high level of remittances (in the previous year) are more likely to receive higher amount of remittances controlling for other major household level characteristics and migration related variables. We suggest in this case, village level norms (or the culture of remittances) determine the flow of remittances for each household. Likewise, we find households in villages with high proportion of immigrants household contributing to public projects are also more likely to use financial capital from remittances to contribute to pubic projects for the village.

Let us also explore some policy implications. For a long time, the literature on migration and development tends to be quite permissive. In one scenario, remittances, though may be large, are pretty much used for private consumption instead of used for starting a new business or contributing to community development. In the worst scenario, remittances are said to produce a cycle of dependence or "migration syndrome" that leads to very little development in the community. Our paper suggests there is lot more a community can do to increase the flow of remittances and encourage immigrant households to use remittances for community level development. From our field observations, these immigrant communities are doing a great job in terms of giving these immigrants household that contributing to community level projects due credit and leave permanent symbols of recognition. They decorate a village entrance with a major donor's name, build stone stature with all donors' names inscribed (which is also done in a local temple or church), and a red color paper with all donor's names. Such steps, may seem to

be modest by some, can actually go a long way to encourage and promote other immigrant households to follow suit.

In essence, community leaders can be more proactive in nurturing a village environment that is donor friendly and more can be done in this direction. For example, one major concern with many immigrant households is the left behind family members, especially the elderly. Community leader can play more active role in providing needed service (such as helping getting someone to do the cleaning and transportation to local clinic for medical care). This work can be a good foundation to encourage immigrant household to contribute building a senior citizen center. Likewise, community leaders can help resolve other issues such as land use and sometimes land use that involves relocation of tombs of immigrants' ancestors (World Journal, 2007). As China continues to develop, land use is becoming a major contested issue. Very often decisions made at the village level are not in the interest of peasants. Village leaders should have a long vision for the community's future.

Such steps are also productive ways towards a more business friendly environment that could introduce other business opportunities. One should not underestimate the value of such opportunities in the context of China. In fact, we should note that there is an immigration story in China's economic development and miracle during the past 30 years or so. The overseas Chinese's initial investment in China boosted the confidence of many other multinational companies to get into the Chinese market which set the stage for China's transition to a market-oriented economy. Another finding worth attention is the fact that immigrants who are doing well are more likely to send remittances for public projects for the community. Thus it is important for community leaders to cultivate relationships with these immigrant elites who are increasingly becoming more translational and may very well be catalysts for local economic development in the future.

References

Kandel, William. 2002. "The Culture of Mexican Migration: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis." Social Forces 80(3):981-1004.

Li, Minghuang. 2005. Research on Overseas Chinese Communities in Fujian. Xiamen, Fujian: Xiamen University Press.

Liang, Zai. 2001. "Demography of Illicit Emigration from China: A Sending Country's Perspective." Sociological Forum 16(4):677-701.

Liang, Zai, Miao David Chunyu, Guotu Zhuang, and Wenzhen Ye. 2008. "Cumulative Causation, Market Transition, and Emigration from China." American Journal of Sociology. 114:706-737

Long, Scott J. 1997. Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables. Sage Publications.

Massey et al. 1987. Return to Aztlan. University of California Press.

Raudenbush, Stephen W. and Anthony S. Bryk. 2002. Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data Analysis Methods. Thousand Oaks, CA.

Sun, Yongming. 2007. Fujianese Business Men. Haixia Wenyi Publishing House.

Table1. Characteristics of Emigrants Who Have Remitted and Who Have Never Remitted

Independent Variables	Remitted	Never Remitted
Socio-Demographic Characteristics		
Age at migration		
15-19	18.98	16.9
20-24	28.53	28.17
25-29	19.92	18.31
30-34	15.56	16.9
35-39	10.18	11.27
40-44	4.49	1.41
45-49	0.89	5.63
50-54	0.57	1.41
55-60	0.51	0
60+	0.38	0
Education		
No formal education	2.53	1.41
Elementary School	25.46	25.35
Junior high school	53.51	47.89
Senior high school	14.44	18.31
Vocational high school	2.03	0
College or above		
	2.03	7.04
Household Characteristics		
Average Dependency ratio	0.25	0.25
Home ownership		
	0.94	0.9
Migration-Economic Characteristics		
Average emigrants in a household	2.24	1.87
Average duration of stay overseas in years	6.6	5.59
Average emigration cost (RMB)	37096.1	28333.33
Average previous year remittances (US dollars)	7654.33	--
Average cumulative years' remittances(US dollars)		
	48969.44	--
Village Context		
Average population size in a village	2374	2582
Number of emigrants	1655	78

Table2: Spending Patterns of Overseas Remittances by Duration of Stay Overseas (Percent)

Remittances were spent on:	Overall	<1 year	1-2 years	3-5 years	6-9 years	10+years
			Duration of Stay			
Paying for family's living	83.76	59.72	72.30	83.97	89.32	91.43
Paying off emigration cost	48.09	70.83	67.14	59.09	35.39	21.01
Supporting the elderly	38.19	23.94	27.64	34.42	44.85	46.28
Building or purchasing housing	25.63	9.72	9.09	17.90	36.66	38.75
Helping to raise children born overseas but sent back to China	23.32	19.72	17.09	24.89	27.37	19.25
Supporting local education and other public projects	10.08	4.23	4.36	7.22	13.03	17.08
Other purposes	4.22	5.48	2.50	4.26	4.77	4.45
Building ancestry grave	3.53	2.82	1.82	1.54	4.04	8.40
Doing business	2.71	2.82	2.91	2.41	2.75	2.94
Total number of emigrants	1635	73	280	469	566	247

Table3: Spending Patterns by Remittances Villages Received Overall Last year in Thousands (Percent)

Remittances were spent on: (in U.S. dollars)	Overall	<100	101-200	201-300	301-400	401-500	>501
Paying for family's living	83.76	75.63	85.54	91.82	83.30	82.42	82.29
Paying off emigration cost	48.09	72.50	48.95	36.45	41.80	43.65	57.89
Supporting the elderly	38.19	35.85	42.13	32.86	36.01	45.00	40.23
Building or purchasing housing	25.63	12.58	23.08	31.46	30.22	27.37	20.38
Helping to raise children born overseas but sent back to China	23.32	42.50	26.50	16.98	22.69	31.28	9.85
Supporting local education and other public projects	10.08	1.89	12.02	8.06	11.60	12.29	10.27
Other purposes	4.22	2.48	4.94	5.88	3.78	4.95	3.66
Building ancestry grave	3.53	2.52	3.45	2.84	4.07	3.91	3.42
Doing business	2.71	3.77	4.29	2.84	1.48	3.91	2.28
Number of households	1,635	161	243	221	555	182	273
Number of villages	56	20	11	5	11	4	5

Table4: Spending Patterns by mean Remittances Received Last year (Percent)

Remittances were spent on:	Overall	<3,000	3,001-6,000	6,001-9,000	9,001-12,000	>12,001
Paying for family's living	83.76	68.75	88.79	84.36	74.92	83.45
Paying off emigration cost	48.09	77.08	35.04	44.47	68.81	63.45
Supporting the elderly	38.19	43.75	37.36	40.40	33.76	42.76
Building or purchasing housing	25.63	14.58	28.48	24.78	23.62	23.45
Helping to raise children born overseas but sent back to China	23.32	45.83	26.79	23.66	12.99	21.38
Supporting local education and other public projects	10.08	0	9.69	9.40	12.34	12.41
Other purposes	4.22	4.17	4.52	3.94	4.05	4.14
Building ancestry grave	3.53	4.17	3.44	3.14	3.26	5.52
Doing business	2.71	2.08	2.66	2.69	2.28	4.14
Number of households	1,635	48	664	457	321	145
Number of villages	56	6	18	15	9	8

Table 5. Single-Level and Multi-Level Tobit Models Predicting Amount of Remittances Received Last Year

Independent Variables	Model1 B	Model1 S.E.	Model2 B	Model2 S.E.	Model3 B	Model3 S.E.	Model4 B	Model4 S.E.
Socio-Demographic Characteristics								
Age	-10.40	63.50	-26.37	67.55	-23.97	67.28	-24.26	67.53
Years of Schooling	-93.93	169.62	-68.41	179.31	-41.78	178.67	-77.21	179.34
Household Characteristics								
Number of Emigrants in a Family	302.96 +	281.22	192.85	297.46	256.64	296.70	188.88	297.72
Dependency Ratio	96.05	1298.92	53.39	1322.96	35.12	1319.35	49.34	1323.48
Home Ownership	2219.57	1747.71	674.61	1834.10	552.10	1826.29	702.02	1834.82
Migration-Economic Characteristics								
Duration of Stay Overseas	-281.11 *	133.02	-18.95	144.18	-5.52	143.55	-20.86	144.33
Income after Emigration	-1.82E-03	1.74E-03	-8.00E-04	1.95E-03	-8.18E-04	1.93E-03	-7.58E-04	1.96E-03
Emigration Cost	0.06 *	0.02	0.10 ***	0.03	0.10 ***	0.03	0.10 ***	0.03
Village Context								
Total Population in a Village			0.81 *	0.41	1.07	0.35	0.71 +	0.42
Overall Remittances a Village Received			4.93E-04	5.78E-04 **				
Mean Remittances per Household Received in a Village					0.12 **	0.04		*
Proportion of Remittances used in Public Project in a Village							-802.04	10026.44
Intercept	6655.34 *	3283.58	2735.80	4034.06	-2550.73	4309.90	4268.54	3724.23
Log likelihood	-13802.32		-9213.44		-9210.15		-9213.80	
Number of Emigrants	1337		874		874		874	

Table6. Single-Level and Multi-Level Logistic Models Predicting Whether Remittances Used in Public Project

Independent Variables	Model1 B		S.E.	Model2 B		S.E.	Model3 B		S.E.	Model4 B		S.E.
Socio-Demographic Characteristics												
Age	-0.03	+	0.02	-0.04	+	0.02	-0.04	+	0.02	-0.04	+	0.02147
Years of Schooling	0.03		0.04	0.07		0.05	0.07		0.05			
Household Characteristics												
Number of Emigrants in a Family	0.25	***	0.06	0.35	***	0.07	0.35	***	0.07	0.10	+	0.05
Dependency Ratio	-0.77	*	0.37	-1.07	*	0.49	-1.07	*	0.49	0.34	***	0.08
Home Ownership	0.53		0.48	0.69		0.64	0.69		0.64	-1.06	*	0.50
Migration-Economic Characteristics												
Duration of Stay Overseas	0.07	*	0.03	0.12	**	0.04	0.12	**	0.04	0.63		0.64
Income after Emigration	3.07E-07		2.90E-07	5.95E-07	+	3.40E-07	5.91E-07	+	3.40E-07	1.22E-01	**	3.72E-02
Emigration Cost	-1.52E-05	*	6.46E-06	-2.26E-05	*	8.96E-06	-2.27E-05	*	8.98E-06	4.29E-07		3.52E-07
Village Context												
Total Population in a Village				3.06E-04	**	8.91E-05	3.00E-04	**	9.04E-05	-2.16E-05	*	9.04E-06
Overall Remittances a Village Received				-1.35E-08		1.23E-07				1.57E-04	+	9.17E-05
Mean Remittances per Household Received in a Village							-2.88E-06		1.10E-05			
Proportion of Remittances used in Public Project in a Village										9.49	***	2.43
Intercept	-2.84	**	0.83	-4.42	***	1.17	-4.29	**	1.28	-5.38	***	1.16
Log likelihood	-440.19			-275.25			-275.22			-267.13		
Number of Emigrants	1325			862			862			862		

Map 1. Location of Fujian Province in China