Appendix A. Summary of Differences between Fuzhou Emigration to the U.S. and Mingxi Emigration to Europe

| Comparative features | Fuzhou to the U.S. | Mingxi to Europe |
|---|---|---|
| **Macro-level contexts** | | |
| Geo-political dimensions of destination | *Greater distance from China<br>*Elaborate and circuitous routes<br>*Low permeability of the border | *Proximity (overland) to China<br>*Political transitions provide easy entryway<br>*Lack of natural barriers and EU integration increase mobility of immigrants |
| Immigration policies of destination | *Emphasis on family reunification<br>*Asylum policies that draw illegal immigration | *Diverse immigration regimes across Europe<br>*Regular amnesty and legalization programs (i.e. Italy)<br>*Lifted visa requirements (i.e., Hungary) |
| Labor market conditions of destination | *Opportunities for low- and semi-skilled workers in Chinese labor market<br>*Occupational niche: service (i.e., restaurant) | *Opportunities for low- and semi-skilled workers in Chinese labor market<br>*Occupational niche: manufacturing (i.e., garment) and import/export |
| Socioeconomic environment of origin | *Coastal area<br>*Economically developed | *Interior area<br>*Undeveloped |
| Political context of origin | *Official condemnation of smuggling<br>*Tightening control against illegal migration over time | *Highly supportive of emigration<br>*Proactive and open role |
| **Mode of emigration** | *Mostly clandestine channels<br>*Very high barriers (high cost and risks) | *Mostly legal entry<br>*Low barriers (low costs and risks)<br>*Evolving process (overstaying visa or migrating to other European countries, sometimes illegally) |
| **Migration process (hypotheses)** | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Social capital | *Stronger roles of social capital<br>(*Village migration networks important) | *Weaker roles of social capital<br>(*Village migration networks important) |
| Political capital | *Strong role of political capital in circumventing formal institutions and enforcing illicit emigration<br>(*Cadres have fewer incentives to emigrate) | *Attenuated role of political capital<br>(*Cadres have fewer incentives to emigrate) |
| Human capital | *More strategizing and more selective on human capital | *Less selective on human capital |
| General pattern | *Stabilizing<br>*Barriers remain high; continued importance of social capital, political capital and human capital | *Fast growing |

Appendix B. Basic Statistics in Fuzhou Area and Mingxi County, 2003

| | Population size (thousand) | Per capita income (yuan) | GDP (billion yuan) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fuzhou city | 1,576.5 | 5,394 | 53.3 |
| Fuzhou Changle city | 665.1 | 5,090 | 9.7 |
| Fuzhou Liangjiang county | 616.3 | 4,048 | 7.9 |
| Mingxi county | 115.6 | 3,413 | 0.99 |

Source: Fujian Yearbook, 2003.

Note: yuan is the currency in China. In 2003, 1 yuan is approximately 0.12 US dollar.

Given variations within the Fuzhou region, we present statistics for the three sub-sampling areas separately. On average, the Fuzhou area had a much larger population than the Mingxi county. Despite noticeable variability within Fuzhou, it enjoyed a much higher level of economic development than Mingxi, as reflected in per capita income and GDP. The per capita income for the three Fuzhou migrant-sending counties/cities was 4,000–5,400 yuan, among the highest in Fujian Province. To put these numbers in perspective, in 2003, the average income in Fujian was 3,538 yuan and for China as a whole was 2,475 yuan (National Bureau of Statistics 2003). In clear contrast, Mingxi had lagged behind many other places in Fujian, with an average income of 3,413 yuan.

Appendix C. Description of Fuzhou and Mingxi Data

In Fuzhou, eight towns known to send large numbers of migrants to the U.S. were selected. This ensured a reasonable number of international migrants in the sample. Specifically, the survey was carried out between October 2002 and March 2003 in one district of Fuzhou city, as well as selected towns in Changle city and Lianjiang county within the Fuzhou prefecture. Similar to the design of the MMP, a stratified random sample was drawn from each town/district. Within each town four villages were selected using a systematic sampling scheme, and then within each village 50 households were selected via systematic sampling. The nonresponse rate was 5%–15% depending on the communities surveyed. This ultimately yielded a sample of 1,339 households. For each household, one individual (household head or household head's spouse) was interviewed to collect information about the entire household. A small number of households missing important information were excluded from the analysis, which resulted in a sample of 1,312 households and 6,632 individuals. The sampling procedure in Mingxi county followed closely that used in Fuzhou. The survey was carried out in early 2003. Within the Mingxi county, three towns were chosen and two villages in each town were selected using probability sampling. In each selected village, 50 interviews were targeted. The Mingxi survey resulted in a sample of 297 households and 1,516 individuals for analysis.

Given the low rate of return migration, we interviewed family members who remained in the community and asked them to report on migrants' information. This is a reasonably satisfactory strategy, because international migration is such a major event in the household that non-migrant members could report with relative accuracy basic information on the timing, cost, and so on.