





、,2013; ,2013; ,2016)<sup>[3][11-13]</sup>; ( ,2011; (2019) , “ ” ( ,2011)<sup>[14]</sup>。 , (2019) , “ ” , ( ,2013; ,2014; ,2017; ,2020)<sup>[2][15-17]</sup>。 ( ,2013; ,2014; ,2017; ,2020)<sup>[2][15-17]</sup>。 ( Oswald,1996; Coulson et al,2009; Dujardin et al,2009; ,2013)<sup>[18-21]</sup>, ( Modestino et al,2013; Foote,2016)<sup>[22-23]</sup>, “ ”, “ ”, : ? , : “ ”( Davies et al,2011; ,2013)<sup>[24-25]</sup>。 , : “ ”( Munch et al, 2008; Modestino et al,2013; Foote,2016)<sup>[26][22-23]</sup>。 : 1: , 1a: ; 1b: 。 ( Poterba,2000; ,2009)<sup>[27-28]</sup>。 ,



，（）、  
。  
，（=1）、  
、（=1）、  
；  
GDP、（pm2.5）、  
1。

表1 主要变量说明及描述性统计

		62 912	1. 317 8	0. 806 3	0	3. 663 6
	( )=1, =0	62 912	0. 202 3	0. 401 7	0	1
	=1, =0	62 912	0. 569 7	0. 495 1	0	1
		62 912	34. 274 7	9. 532 5	15	60
		62 912	1 265. 62	700. 046 3	225	3 600
	=1, =0	62 912	0. 913 0	0. 281 9	0	1
	=1, =0	62 912	0. 038 4	0. 192 2	0	1
0	=1, =0	62 912	0. 756 2	0. 429 4	0	1
	=1, =0	62 912	0. 857 9	0. 349 1	0	1
		62 912	10. 156 5	3. 131 3	0	19
		62 912	112. 959 6	64. 633 9	0	361
	,ln( )	62 912	8. 132 1	0. 806 1	0	11. 512 9
	,ln( )	62 912	8. 680 4	0. 556 5	3. 912 0	12. 206 1
		62 912	2. 005 5	1. 249 5	0	9
0	=1, =0	62 912	0. 526 9	0. 499 3	0	1
	,ln( )	62 912	11. 269 5	0. 236 6	10. 563 9	11. 813 0
	, pm2. 5 (μg/m <sup>3</sup> )	62 912	44. 723 3	14. 479 3	14	116
GDP	,ln( GDP)	62 912	17. 370 3	1. 404 7	12. 764 34	19. 540 2
	,%	62 912	6. 394 3	5. 161 0	-10. 97	36. 06

#### 4. 住房类型与就业稳定性统计描述

， 2  
3  
；  
。

表2 住房类型与就业稳定性

	<3 (%)	≥3 (%)	
	0.3916	0.6084	12726
	0.5205	0.4795	36133
	0.5602	0.4398	11978
	0.5489	0.4511	2075
	0.5029	0.4971	62912

#### 四、实证研究:住房对农民工就业稳定性的影响

##### 1. 基准模型估计

OLS, 3。 (1), 1%。 ; 1。 ; 50、16, “U”; ; 。

表3 基准模型估计结果:住房产权对就业稳定性的影响

0.1323***(0.0084)		-0.0008***(0.0002)
0.1483***(0.0061)		0.0900***(0.0053)
0.0906***(0.0025)		-0.0380***(0.0077)
-0.0009***(0.00003)		0.0121***(0.0032)
0.0493***(0.0111)		0.0857***(0.0070)
0.0809***(0.0151)		-0.0583(0.0371)
0.0408***(0.0094)		0.0001(0.0005)
-0.0238***(0.0093)	GDP	0.0044(0.0052)
0.0254***(0.0044)		-0.0023**(0.0010)
62912		

\*\*\*、\*\*、\* 1%、5% 10% 0;

##### 2. 工具变量估计



，  
，  
，  
，  
，  
12  
；  
39  
1978  
5 (1)  
①，  
5 (2019) [6]，  
，  
5 (2)  
，  
5  
(3) (4)。

表 5 稳健性检验

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	1.0751 ***(0.1179)	0.0620 ***(0.0212)	0.1698 ***(0.0102)	0.1871 ***(0.0108)
	62 889	52 897	62 912	62 912
Wald	1 477.51 ***(0.000 0)	14 126.31 ***(0.000 0)	19 871.81 ***(0.000 0)	17 393.05 ***(0.000 0)

：\*\*\*、\*\*、\* 1%、5% 10% 0；

### 五、传导机制：房奴效应、锁定效应和财富效应

：、  
。  
：  
：  
 $\ln Y_i = ch_i + \gamma X_i + \chi C_i + \eta D_i + \varepsilon_i$  (2)  
 $M_i = ah_i + \gamma X_i + \chi C_i + \eta D_i + \varepsilon_i$  (3)  
 $\ln Y_i = c' h_i + bM_i + \gamma X_i + \chi C_i + \eta D_i + \varepsilon_i$  (4)  
， $M_i$ ， (1)  
， (3) (4) a b。

① ， ， 。

### 1. 房奴效应

①, , 。 (2)-(4)  
6 (1)-(3) , , , 1a  
Sobel ,  
23.55% ,

### 2. 锁定效应

3 1, 0 。  
6 (4)-(6) , , 1b  
9.55% ,

表6 中介效应检验:房奴效应和锁定效应

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	0.117 2 ***	0.978 5 ***	0.089 6 ***	0.137 8 ***	0.081 9 ***	0.124 7 ***
	(0.010 7)	(0.010 4)	(0.011 8)	(0.007 8)	(0.004 4)	(0.007 8)
			0.028 2 ***			
			(0.004 9)			
						0.160 7 ***
						(0.007 0)
F	496.06 ***	1 760.32 ***	472.02 ***	724.23 ***	207.56 ***	719.38 ***
Sobel		0.027 6 ***(0.004 8)		0.013 2 ***(0.000 9)		
/		23.55%		9.55%		

: 5。

### 3. 财富效应

①



9 (1) 。 , “ ” ; , , “ ” 。

表8 住房类型的异质性:租住私房、政府单位房和临时居所

	(1) VS	(2) VS	(3) VS
	0.045 9**(0.017 9)	0.030 0***(0.008 1)	0.001 6(0.032 6)
	38 208	48 111	11 978
F	197.4***(0.000 0)	258.75***(0.000 0)	76.24***(0.000 0)

: 5。

### 3. 代际差异

, , 、 、 , , 16-29 、30-45 、46-60 , “ ” “ ” “ ” 。 , “ 30 ” “ 46 ” , 16-45 30-60 , 9 (2) (3) , ; ①。

表9 异质性:就业身份和代际差异

	(1) VS	(2) VS	(3) VS
	0.114 9***(0.008 9)	0.156 3***(0.011 0)	0.180 0***(0.024 1)
×	0.064 5***(0.022 3)		
	0.183 9***(0.013 2)		
×(<30)		-0.106 3***(0.015 5)	
×(<46)			-0.027 1 (0.026 0)

①



- [2] 孟凡强,吴江.我国就业稳定性的变迁及其影响因素——基于中国综合社会调查数据的分析[J].人口与经济,2013(5):79-88.
- [3] 寇恩惠,刘柏惠.城镇化进程中农民工就业稳定性及工资差距——基于分位数回归的分析[J].数量经济技术经济研究,2013(7):3-19.
- [4] 谢勇.就业稳定性与新生代农民工的城市融合研究——以江苏省为例[J].农业经济问题,2015(9):54-62.
- [5] FARBER S. Is the company man an anachronism? Trends in long term employment in the U. S,1973-2006[R]. Princeton University Working Paper,2007, No. 518.
- [6] 邵敏,武鹏.出口贸易、人力资本与农民工的就业稳定性——兼议我国产业和贸易的升级[J].管理世界,2019(3):99-113.
- [7] BURGESS S, REES H. Jobtenure in Britain 1975-1992[J]. The Economic Journal,1996,106(435):334-344.
- [8] GOTTSCHALK P, MOFFIT R. Changes in job instability and insecurity using monthly survey data [J]. Journal of Labor Economics,1999,17:91-126.
- [9] BERGMANN A, MERTENS A. Job stability trends, lay-offs, and transitions to unemployment in west Germany [J]. Labour,2011,25(4):421-446.
- [10] JANSEN G, AKKERMAN A, VANDAELE K. Undermining mobilization? The effect of job flexibility and job instability on the willingness to strike [J]. Economic and Industrial Democracy,2017,38(1):99-117.
- [11] 张务伟,张福明,杨学成.农村劳动力就业状况的微观影响因素及其作用机理——基于入户调查数据的实证分析[J].中国农村经济,2011(11):62-73.
- [12] 刘万霞.职业教育对农民工就业的影响——基于对全国农民工调查的实证分析[J].管理世界,2013(5):64-75.
- [13] 杨雪,魏洪英.就业稳定性与收入差异:影响东北三省劳动力外流的动因分析[J].人口学刊,2016(6):87-98.
- [14] 张春泥.农民工为何频繁变换工作 户籍制度下农民工的工作流动研究[J].社会,2011(6):153-177.
- [15] 韩雪,张广胜.进城务工人员就业稳定性研究[J].人口学刊,2014(6):62-74.
- [16] 李中建,袁璐璐.务工距离对农民工就业质量的影响分析[J].中国农村经济,2017(6):70-83.
- [17] 罗恩立,方丹丹.家庭随迁、居留意愿与流动人口就业质量——基于2016年全国流动人口动态监测数据的分析[J].人口与发展,2020(3):117-128.
- [18] OSWALD A. A conjecture on the explanation for high unemployment in the industrialized nations: Part 1[R]. University of Warwick Economic Research Papers,1996, No. 475.
- [19] COULSON E, FISHER L. Housing tenure and labor market impacts; The search goes on [J]. Journal of Urban Economics, 2009,65(3):252-264.
- [20] DUJARDIN, GOFFETTE-NAGOT. Does public housing occupancy increase unemployment [J]. Journal of Economic Geography,2009,9:823-851.
- [21] 刘斌,幸强国.我国公共住房、失业与劳动力参与意愿——基于一个延伸的奥斯瓦尔德假说的经验证据[J].财经研究,2013(11):34-47.
- [22] MODESTINO A S, DENNETT J. Are American homeowners locked into their houses? The impact of housing market conditions on state-to-state migration [J]. Regional Science & Urban Economics,2013,43:322-337.
- [23] FOOTE A. The effects of negative house price changes on migration: Evidence across U. S. housing downturns. Regional Science and Urban Economics, 2016, 60:292-299.
- [24] DAVIES J B et al. The level and distribution of global household wealth [J]. Economic Journal,2011,121(551):223-254.
- [25] 颜色,朱国钟.“房奴效应”还是“财富效应”? ——房价上涨对国民消费影响的一个理论分析[J].管理世界,2013(3):34-47.
- [26] MUNCH J, ROSHOLM M, SVARER M. Homeownership, job duration and wages [J]. Journal of Urban Economics, 2008,63(1):130-145.
- [27] POTERBA J M. Stock market wealth and consumption [J]. Journal of Economic Perspectives. 2000,14(2):99-118.

- [28] 黄静,屠梅曾. 房地产财富与消费:来自于家庭微观调查数据的证据[J]. 管理世界,2009(7):35-45.
- [29] VAN LEUVENSTEIJN M, KONING P. The effect of home-ownership on labor mobility in the Netherlands [J]. Journal of Urban Economics,2004,55:580-596.
- [30] 李宝礼,邵帅,裴延峰. 住房状况、城市身份认同与迁移人口环境行为研究[J]. 中国人口·资源与环境,2019(11):90-99.
- [31] 刘斌,张安全. 有产者的就业焦虑:安居真的可以乐业吗——基于城市住房分层与工作满意度的观察[J]. 财经研究,2021(1):47-61.

## The Perseverance of Homeowners: Research on Housing Conditions and Employment Stability of Migrant Workers

LIU Bin<sup>1</sup>, ZHANG Xiang<sup>2</sup>

(1. *Research Center for Economy of Upper Reaches of the Yangtze River, Chongqing Technology and Business University, Chongqing 400067, China*; 2. *School of Accounting, Chongqing University of Technology, Chongqing 400054, China*)

**Abstract:** Using the dynamic monitoring data of China's migrant population and the data of prefecture-level cities, the impact of housing conditions on the employment stability of migrant workers and its mechanism were explored. Firstly, the results of the benchmark model and instrumental variable model show that the employment stability of migrant workers who have housing in the cities where they work is significantly higher. Secondly, by observing the possible mediating effect and moderating effect, we find that housing property rights improve the employment stability of migrant workers through the house slave effect and lock-in effect. In addition, the rise of housing prices will enhance the employment stability of migrant workers with houses. Finally, according to the heterogeneity of housing type, employment status and generational differences, it is found that the employment stability of migrant workers with self-owned housing property rights is the highest, the employment stability of those who live in public rental housing and employer's housing is higher than that of those who rent and live in private housing, and the employment stability of those who rent and live in temporary housing is the lowest. Housing property rights have a greater impact on the employment stability of employer-based migrant workers than on employee-based migrant workers, and it has a greater impact on the employment stability of middle- and old-generation migrant workers than on the new generation of migrant workers.

**Key words:** migrant workers; employment stability; housing property rights; housing slave effect; housing lock-in effect

**CLC number:** F240

**Document code:** A

**Article ID:** 1674-8131(2021)06-0067-14

(编辑:刘仁芳)