

Research on the Impact of Family Capital on Individual Employment Quality—Empirical Analysis Based on CFPS Data

Yingjie Huang, Peiyi He *

School of Management, University of Science & Engineering, Zigong, 643000, Sichuan, China

*Corresponding Author: py18283143119@163.com

ABSTRACT

Based on the data of China Family Panel Studies (CFPS) in 2020, this paper uses OLS and Logit regression models to explore the impact and mechanism of family capital and education acquisition on individual employment quality. The study found that family capital has a significant positive impact on the quality of personal employment; the effect of family capital on the improvement of objective employment quality is greater than that of subjective employment quality. Family capital can have a positive impact on the quality of individual employment through education acquisition, and education acquisition shows a significant mediating effect. Through heterogeneity analysis, it is found that the employment quality of eastern provinces in China is significantly higher than that of central and western provinces. There are significant differences in the quality of employment between urban and rural individuals. Individuals in rural low-education and low-income families have significant disadvantages in the quality of employment compared with urban high-education and high-income families. The promotion effect of family capital on the employment quality of middle-educated workers is significantly higher than that of low-educated groups, and the phenomenon of "degree inversion" in the employment of high-educated people is more prominent. Therefore, China should improve the relevant employment quality assurance system, strengthen employment guidance, increase investment in education funds in economically lagging areas, and improve education to promote high-quality employment.

KEYWORDS

Family capital; Education acquisition; Employment quality; Mediating effect; CFPS

1. INTRODUCTION

Employment is the most basic livelihood of the people, which is related to the vital interests of the people, the healthy development of the economy and society and the long-term stability of the country [1]. According to the data of China Labor Statistical Yearbook, at the end of 2023, the number of employed people in China was 740.41 million, an increase of 6.9 million (0.93%), but only 32.9% and 40.7% of the employed people participated in unemployment and industrial injury insurance, and the proportion of provident fund payment was less than a quarter. High-quality employment is not only related to the future and development of workers, but also closely related to the high-quality development of the national economy. Exploring ways to improve the quality of labor employment has important practical significance for promoting the sustainable development of new quality productivity, and is also an important measure to actively implement the spirit of the 20th National Congress of the Communist Party of China.

The academic research on the quality of employment can be traced back to the end of the 20th century. Since the International Labour Organization (ILO) put forward the concept of "decent work," more

and more scholars began to pay attention to this problem, and began to carry out systematic measurement and evaluation around the quality of employment. By combing the relevant literature, it is found that the current academic circles mainly explore the influencing factors of employment quality from the macro, meso and micro perspectives [2]. From a macro perspective, this paper mainly explores the impact of employment quality from the perspectives of digital economy development level, employment environment, government policy and regulation [3-5]; the meso perspective mainly involves the operation of the labor market and the efficiency of resource allocation [6]; the research from the micro perspective mainly focuses on work experience, personal education and school ' level ' in human capital [2, 7], family economic status and social relations in social capital [8], as well as individual factors such as gender, age, household registration and health status. However, there are few studies on the relationship between family capital and individual employment quality from the perspective of family micro level. This paper attempts to explore the relationship between family capital and individual employment quality, and tries to answer the following questions: Does household capital affect the quality of individual employment? What is the influence mechanism of family capital on individual employment quality? Is there regional heterogeneity and group heterogeneity in the impact of family capital on individual employment quality?

Therefore, based on the data of China Family Panel Studies (CFPS) in 2020, this paper constructs a multi-dimensional employment quality evaluation system with job satisfaction, occupational status, salary and welfare, job stability, working hours and social security as employment indicators. Through the overall employment quality index formed by subjective job satisfaction and objective employment quality, this paper explores the impact of family capital on individual employment quality, and analyzes the differences in the impact of family social, economic and cultural capital on individual employment quality. It is of great practical significance to explore the influence mechanism of family capital on individual employment quality, to better understand the role of family capital in shaping individual employment trajectory and career, and to improve social security policies and promote individual high-quality employment.

The rest of this paper is arranged as follows: the second part is the literature review and research hypothesis, the third part is the data, variables and models, the fourth part is the empirical analysis, and the fifth part is the research conclusion and policy suggestion.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

The concept of family capital is derived from the theory of social capital. James S. Coleman, an American sociologist, in his book " The Foundation of Social Theory, " holds that family capital is a part of social capital, including economic structure, social status and individual education acquisition. It is an invisible social structure resource owned by individuals and manifested as the relationship between people [9, 10]. At present, the research on family capital is mainly based on the concept of capital proposed by French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu in his book "The Form of Capital" in the 1980s [11]. Bourdieu defined the concept of capital as "the accumulation of human labor" and divided it into four types: social capital, economic capital, cultural capital and symbolic capital [11, 12]. The concept of " quality of employment " originated from the concept of " decent work " proposed by Juan Somavia, Director General of the International Labour Office, in his " decent work " report in 1999. It aims to promote decent, efficient and sustainable work opportunities for workers under conditions of safety, freedom, equality and dignity [13]. The quality of employment is a multi-dimensional and multi-level comprehensive concept, which reflects the degree of merit of the combination of the employed and the generated data and the remuneration [14]. The evaluation index of employment quality can be divided into two dimensions: objective index and subjective index. Objective indicator dimensions often use working hours, labor remuneration, job stability, working environment, social security and other indicators. The subjective evaluation index reflects the degree

of satisfaction of the individual's subjective psychological needs for work, and often uses indicators such as job satisfaction, career prestige and career development [3, 16].

2.1. Research on the Relationship Between Family Capital and Employment Quality

Through keyword search, it is found that many current studies mainly stay at the micro level, and there are few studies on the correlation between the two. Scholars such as Zheng Maoxiong (2012), Yang Zhihai (2023) and Liu Xinhua (2013) studied the impact of family social capital on employment satisfaction, income and security, and employment prospects of employees, respectively. Similar conclusions have been drawn, and it is believed that family capital significantly affects the above dimensions [17-19]. Yang Shengli (2021) and others believe that family economic income is closely related to socioeconomic status. Rich family economic capital can increase investment in human capital of offspring, affect the acquisition of occupational status of offspring and achieve high-quality employment. Zhang Wenhong and Su Di (2018) found that family cultural capital and economic capital play a decisive role in the process of habit formation and class reproduction. Individuals with rich family cultural capital and rich economic capital have a greater possibility to flow to the dominant position, and economic capital works through cultural capital. Socio-economic status transfers the resources of the dominant class to their children through the important mechanism of education, thus completing the reproduction of the class [20]. Han Lingmei and Li Hesong (2022) found that there is a positive correlation between family cultural capital and the employment quality of college graduates. The richer the family cultural capital stock, the higher the employment quality of college graduates, and the higher the employment satisfaction [21]. Based on this, this paper puts forward the hypothesis that family capital has a direct impact on individual employment quality:

Hypothesis1: There is a positive correlation between family capital and individual employment quality. Individuals with high family capital are more likely to obtain higher employment quality.

Hypothesis2: There is heterogeneity in the impact of family capital on individual employment quality.

2.2. Research on Family Capital and Educational Attainment

Family capital has a significant impact on the acquisition of education. Jiang Shuai and Long Jing (2022) believe that educational attainment is a process of continuous accumulation, and family capital is an important 'resource indicator' for shaping individual educational achievement, which plays a key role in explaining educational attainment [22]. Xue Haiping, Zhao Yang (2023), based on CFPS 2010-2018 tracking data, found that family capital can affect the results of the college entrance examination through school education and shadow education, and expand the inequality of educational opportunities for children of different classes [23]. Marrero's (2013) results show that the likelihood of individuals achieving 'gifted' value is subject to family background and social environment [24].

First of all, in terms of family economic capital, Hou Jingyi and Zhang Jianping (2023) found that high-income families are more likely to maintain their offspring's dominant position in education through the transfer of family capital stock than economically disadvantaged families [25]. Qin Changcai (2019) and others showed that economic capital variables such as household income have an impact on individual education access through empirical analysis: the higher the per capita household income, total cash and deposits, and wage income, the higher the individual's highest education [26].

Secondly, at the level of family social capital, Dong Yunchuan and Zhang Jianxin (2008) showed in the book "Higher Education Opportunities and Social Classes" that social class significantly affects the distribution of children's higher education opportunities, which is manifested in the fact that children in the upper class are more likely to obtain high-quality educational resources, while children in the lower class generally enter lower-level higher education institutions [27]. Luo Shichao (2023) believes that upper-class families with abundant social capital can escort the education of their

offspring by horizontally linking resources and networks, so as to commit to the upward mobility of their offspring or maintain a considerable level of educational achievement, and realize the intergenerational transmission of advantages [28].

Finally, at the level of family cultural capital, Xiao Rikui (2016) believes that cultural capital is an important variable to deepen the research on family background affecting education access. Cultural capital has a direct impact on education access. The higher the family cultural capital, the longer the years of education [29]. Qiu Liping and Xiao Sunkui (2011) also found that cultural capital is an important factor affecting personal education and an effective means for the lower class to achieve upward mobility. The higher the parents' cultural capital stock, the longer the children's education years, and the more likely they are to enter a higher class [30]. Zhang Yizhong and Huang Lihong (2018) conducted a survey of 3050 parents of students and found that the gap in family economic capital will lead to significant differences in the regional, hierarchical and professional needs of urban and rural families in receiving higher education. In summary, this study proposes the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis3: Family economic capital, cultural capital and social capital will directly affect the educational attainment of children.

2.3. Research on the Relationship Between Education Attainment and Employment Quality

On the way to achieve high-quality and full employment, education plays a basic, persistent and leading role, and is an important way to realize human capital accumulation and improve labor productivity. At the same time, the degree of education acquisition, as an important part of workers' human capital, has a profound impact on the quality of personal employment. Wang Shengjin and Liu Mo (2023) found through empirical research that the increase in education level not only shows a decrease in working hours, but also has a positive impact on employment quality indicators such as work income, employment stability and social security participation rate [32]. Xiao Xiaoyong and Huang Jing (2019) have reached a similar conclusion when examining the impact of education on the quality of employment of migrant workers. They believe that the higher the education level of migrant workers, the higher the quality of employment. Compared with the older generation of migrant workers, education can significantly improve the quality of employment of the new generation of migrant workers [33]. Yang Shengli and Yao Jian (2021) empirically studied the impact of family capital on the occupational status of offspring, and used education as an intermediary variable. The results showed that family capital would affect the acquisition of occupational status of offspring through education [34]. Therefore, this paper argues that educational attainment can be used as a potential mediating variable. Based on this, the following research hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis4: Educational attainment may play an intermediary role between family capital and employment quality. Family capital indirectly affects employment opportunities and employment quality by affecting individuals' educational attainment.

3. DATA, VARIABLES AND MODELS

3.1. Data Sources

This paper uses the data of China Family Panel Studies (CFPS) in 2020. The survey was designed and implemented by the Chinese Social Survey Center for Science (ISSS) of Peking University in 2008. The survey covers three levels: individual, family and community. The data has the characteristics of good reliability, strong representativeness and wide coverage, which provides a high-quality data basis for the smooth progress of this study.

The data of this study were matched by the questionnaire data of family members, family economic questionnaire data and personal self-answering questionnaire data of the survey, and a total of 27,649 original observation data were obtained. After eliminating outliers and missing values in stata17, in order to avoid the influence of extreme values, continuous variables were Winsorize at the levels of 1% and 99%, and finally 5758 valid samples were obtained.

3.2. Variable Design

3.2.1. Explained variables

Employment quality is a multi-dimensional and multi-level comprehensive concept, which is a comprehensive evaluation of individual employment. This paper comprehensively reflects the quality of individual employment from six dimensions: job satisfaction, occupational status, salary and welfare, job stability, working hours and social security. Among them, the objective employment quality is measured by five dimensions: occupational status, salary and welfare, work contract, working hours and social security, and the subjective employment quality is measured by job satisfaction.

Among them, the professional status is measured by the International Socio-Economic Index (ISEI), which quantifies the individual's socioeconomic status. The higher the score, the higher the individual's comprehensive socioeconomic status; salary benefits include all wages, bonuses, cash benefits, and in-kind subsidies, and the total annual work income after deducting taxes and five insurances and one deposit, and take the logarithm of the data; the stability of the work is expressed by whether the employment labor contract is signed with the worker. The value of the labor contract is 1, and the value of the non-signed value is 0; the working hours are measured by using weekly working hours. Social security is measured by whether the respondents participate in endowment insurance, medical insurance, unemployment insurance, industrial injury insurance, maternity insurance and housing provident fund. At least one of the values is 1, otherwise the value is 0; Job satisfaction According to the question 'How satisfied are you with this job in general?' The satisfaction of work income, safety, environment, time and promotion was comprehensively measured. The data were divided into 'very dissatisfied', 'less satisfied', 'general', 'relatively satisfied' and 'very satisfied' five levels by Likert five-level scale, corresponding to 1 ~ 5 points respectively. The higher the value, the more satisfied.

The first step is to construct the 'employment quality index' to characterize the level of employment quality by comprehensively measuring the six indicators of employment quality and referring to the mainstream methods of the academic community. The specific formula is as follows:

Forward index standardization processing formula:

$$X_{ij} = \frac{X_{ij} - \text{Min}\{X_{ij}\}}{\text{Max}\{X_{ij}\} - \text{Min}\{X_{ij}\}} \quad (1)$$

Negative index standardization processing formula:

$$X_{ij} = \frac{\text{Max}\{X_{ij}\} - X_{ij}}{\text{Max}\{X_{ij}\} - \text{Min}\{X_{ij}\}} \quad (2)$$

Among them, for the standardized indicators, i represents the sample individual, $j = \{ 1,2,3,4,5,6 \}$ respectively represent the six dimensions of indicators to measure the quality of employment (occupational status, salary and welfare, work contract, working hours, social security, job satisfaction), and respectively represent the maximum and minimum values of j indicators. In order to study the comprehensive study of family capital on objective employment quality and subjective

job satisfaction, the job satisfaction is standardized and multiplied by 100, and the job satisfaction evaluation is expanded to 0 ~ 100, so as to calculate the overall employment quality index.

The second step is to use the equal weight average method to calculate the objective employment quality index and the overall employment quality index based on the standardization of five objective dimensions and one subjective dimension index:

$$OEQ_i = \frac{1}{5} \sum_{j=1}^5 X_i \times 100 \quad (3)$$

$$TEQ = \frac{1}{2} (OEQ + SEQ) \quad (4)$$

3.2.2. Explanatory variables

Bourdieu 's social capital theory holds that family capital exists in the specific field of family. In this study, family capital refers to the valuable materialized property and hidden assets derived from the family, that is, family resources that help individuals to form advantages in the process of obtaining educational opportunities and employment opportunities. According to Bourdieu 's (1986) classification of capital in the book " The Form of Capital, " this paper divides family capital into three dimensions : family economic capital, family cultural capital and family social capital. Family economic capital is mainly measured by family favor expenditure, family population size and family communication cost. Household economic capital is mainly measured by three indicators : annual household income, household net assets, cash and deposit amount. Family cultural capital is measured by three indicators : father 's years of education, mother 's years of education, and family collection.

3.2.3. Intermediary variables

Educational attainment refers to the observed educational output-the years of education of the respondents, which is used as an intermediary variable in the theoretical model of this paper. According to the CFPS questionnaire' You have completed the highest degree? In order to facilitate empirical research, the number of years of education is used instead of academic qualifications. The illiteracy and semi-illiteracy are assigned 0, the primary school is assigned 6, the junior high school is assigned 9, the high school, the secondary school, the technical school and the vocational school are assigned 12, the junior college is assigned 15, the undergraduate is assigned 16, and the graduate student and above is assigned 19.

3.2.4. Control variables

In addition to family capital and educational attainment, the quality of individual employment may also be affected by factors such as individual characteristics, family level, and regional level. In order to study the impact of family capital on the quality of individual employment more accurately and avoid the bias of estimation results caused by missing variables, the relevant influencing variables are controlled as much as possible on the basis of data availability. This paper takes into account the factors of individual characteristics, including gender, age, age square, health status, party members; family level factors: type of residents, household registration, marital status; and regional factors: western, central and eastern. Among them, at the level of individual characteristics: 'gender' is assigned to 1 for men and 0 for women; 'Age' considers that it may have a non-linear impact on the individual's sense of employment quality, so this paper also controls the square term of age. 'Health status' According to the CFPS questionnaire question 'What do you think of your health status ? Measured by the answer of', according to the 'unhealthy', 'general', 'relatively healthy', 'very healthy' and 'very healthy' options selected by the respondents, the corresponding assignments are 1 to 5, respectively. The higher the value, the better the health status. When the political appearance of the interviewee is a Communist Party member, the value is assigned to 1, otherwise it is assigned to 0. The control variables at the family level are: 'type of household registration' If the current household registration status of the respondents is a non-agricultural household registration or a resident

household registration, it is uniformly regarded as a urban household registration, with an assignment of 1, and other situations are regarded as rural household registration, with an assignment of 0; 'Marital status' According to the questionnaire question 'What is your current marital status? If the answer selected by the interviewee is 'have a spouse (remarriage)', the value of 1 is assigned, and the other options are assigned to 0; regional level: when the region is western, eastern and central, the assignment is 1, otherwise the assignment is 0.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of main variables

	Variables	Obs.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Min	Max
Dependent variable	Overall employment quality	5758	59.59	14.34	9.729	89.73
	Subjective employment quality	5758	66.49	21.7	0	100
	Objective employment quality	5758	47.13	21.02	1.386	85.55
	Occupational status	5758	42.29	15.94	19	88
	Salary benefits	5758	10.4	1.212	4.382	13.82
	Working stability	5758	0.554	0.497	0	1
	Working hours	5758	52.07	18.56	0.1	168
	Social security	5758	0.518	0.5	0	1
Independent variable	Family favor expenditure	5758	7.996	0.951	3.912	11.29
	Family population size	5758	5.279	0.853	1.609	8.517
	Household communication costs	5758	4.111	2.063	1	15
	Total annual household income	5758	8.717	3.757	2.303	15.42
	Net household assets	5758	11.71	3.633	1.386	17.94
	Family cash and deposit amount	5758	10.84	1.926	1.792	15.42
	Father 's years of education	5758	6.697	4.298	0	19
	Years of mother 's education	5758	4.576	4.471	0	16
	Household book collection	5758	69.88	293.4	0	10000
Mediator variable	education acquisition	5758	11.4	4.034	0	19
Control variable	Gender	5758	0.62	0.485	0	1
	Age	5758	35.6	10.12	16	73
	Age squared	5758	13.7	7.761	2.56	53.29
	Health status	5758	3.335	1.05	1	5
	Party members	5758	0.117	0.322	0	1
	Type of residence	5758	0.57	0.495	0	1
	Type of household registration	5758	0.33	0.47	0	1
	Marital status	5758	0.688	0.463	0	1
	Western region	2761	0.48	0.499	0	1
	Central region	1415	0.246	0.431	0	1
	Eastern region	1582	0.275	0.446	0	1

3.3. Model Setting

3.3.1. OLS model

When the dependent variables of the baseline regression are the overall quality of employment, objective quality of employment, occupational status, salary and benefits, and working hours, considering that these variables are continuous variables, the least squares method (OLS) is used for analysis. The regression model is as shown in (5):

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 E_{coi} + \beta_2 S_{oci} + \beta_3 C_{uli} + \beta_4 Z_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (5)$$

Among them, it indicates the employment quality index or work income (logarithmic) or labor intensity or employment satisfaction of individual i . Indicates the family economic capital of individual i ; denotes the family social capital of individual i ; indicates the family cultural capital of individual i ; is a related control variable, a random disturbance term, and a constant term.

3.3.2. Logit model

When the dependent variables of the baseline regression are social security and job stability (whether to sign a labor contract), considering that both variables are binary categorical variables, the binary Logit regression model is used for analysis. The regression model is as shown in (6):

$$\text{Logit}(P_i) = \ln \frac{P_i}{1-P_i} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Eco}_i + \beta_2 \text{Soc}_i + \beta_3 \text{Cul}_i + \beta_4 Z_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (6)$$

Among them, the subjective employment quality (job satisfaction) is an ordered hierarchical variable, so an ordered Logit regression model is used:

$$\text{Logit}(P_i) = P(y \leq |x_i) = F(x_i, \beta) = \frac{\exp(x'_i \beta + \varepsilon_i)}{1 + \exp(x'_i \beta + \varepsilon_i)} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Eco}_i + \beta_2 \text{Soc}_i + \beta_3 \text{Cul}_i + \beta_4 Z_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (7)$$

3.3.3. Mediating effect model

Usually, the mediating effect test is divided into three steps. The first step is the benchmark regression analysis, such as Formula (5) (6) (7). The second step is the regression analysis of the mediating variable education acquisition, and the model is as follows (8). The third step is the regression analysis after adding intermediary variables to the benchmark model. The model is as follows (9):

$$M_{edu} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Eco}_i + \beta_2 \text{Soc}_i + \beta_3 \text{Cul}_i + \beta_4 Z_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (8)$$

$$Y = \beta'_0 + \beta'_1 \text{Eco}_i + \beta'_2 \text{Soc}_i + \beta'_3 \text{Cul}_i + b \text{Medu} + \varepsilon_i \quad (9)$$

Among them, represents the mediating variable. If the regression coefficient of each measurement index of family capital in Model (8) is significant, and the regression coefficient of Internet use and intermediary variable education in Model (9) is also significant, it is proved that the mediating effect exists. However, there is a big controversy in the academic circle about the validity of the regression test of Model (9). Therefore, the mechanism test part behind this paper does not do this step of regression.

4. EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

4.1. Benchmark Regression Analysis

According to the variable system constructed above, OLS regression is used to examine the impact of family social, economic and cultural capital on the overall employment quality of individuals. In order to verify the robustness of the estimation results, various variables are gradually added to the empirical test for regression, and all models pass the VIF multicollinearity test.

As shown in Table 2, Models 1 ~ 4 successively report the regression results of gradually adding family social capital, economic capital and cultural capital. This study adds three variables to measure family social capital in model 1. The regression results show that family social capital has a significant effect on the overall quality of employment, but the family population size shows a significant negative correlation, that is, too much family population will reduce the quality of individual

employment. Model2 analyzes the impact of household economic capital on the overall employment quality of individuals. The results show that household funds and deposits, household net assets, and total household income will significantly positively affect the overall employment quality of individuals. The higher the household economic capital, the greater the opportunity for individuals to obtain high-quality employment. In model 3, the relationship between family cultural capital and individual overall employment quality is analyzed. Specifically, the highest education level of parents and the amount of family books have a significant positive relationship with the overall employment quality of individuals. In Model4, the benchmark regression of family social capital, economic level and cultural capital with the overall employment quality of individuals is carried out. It is found that all variables of family capital are significantly correlated at the level of 5% and above, indicating that the higher the share of family capital is, the better the overall employment quality of individuals is. The above conclusions better verify the hypothesis 1.

Table 2. Benchmark regression of the impact of family capital on overall employment quality

Variable	Overall employment quality			
	Model1	Model2	Model3	Model4
Family favor expenditure	0.870*** (-0.190)			0.715*** (-0.189)
Monthly communication costs	1.179*** (-0.216)			0.681*** (-0.218)
Family populationsize	-0.556*** (-0.094)			-0.478*** (-0.094)
Family cash and deposits		0.326*** (-0.049)		0.291*** (-0.049)
Net household assets		0.141*** (-0.051)		0.129** (-0.051)
Total household income		0.650*** (-0.095)		0.460*** (-0.096)
Father 's highest education			0.264*** (-0.047)	0.228*** (-0.046)
Mother 's highest education			0.240*** (-0.047)	0.197*** (-0.046)
Household book collection			0.002*** (-0.001)	0.002*** (-0.001)
Constant term	36.779*** (-3.016)	38.059*** (-2.653)	45.581*** (-2.485)	29.430*** (-3.057)
Control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Regional characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs.	5758	5758	5758	5758
R-squared	0.149	0.156	0.152	0.175

Note : * * *, * * and * are significant at the 1 %, 5 % and 10 % levels, respectively. The values in parentheses are standard errors, and the following table is the same.

Based on OLS model and Logit model, the influence of family capital on subjective and objective employment quality and its dimensions is investigated. The regression results are shown in 3. Among them, occupational status, work income, working hours and objective employment quality adopt multivariate OLS method, employment stability and social security are Logit regression, and subjective employment quality is ordered Logit regression.

Table 3. Individual subjective and objective employment quality and five-dimensional regression analysis

variable	Occupatio nal status	work income	working hours	employm ent stability	social security	objective employ ment quality	subjective employ ment quality
	OLS	OLS	OLS	Logit	Logit	OLS	Logit
Family favor expenditure	0.614***	0.062***	-0.445*	0.080**	0.180***	1.340***	0.002
	(0.204)	(0.016)	(0.261)	(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.266)	(0.029)
Monthly communication costs	0.752***	0.032*	-0.197	0.031	0.102***	0.841***	0.065**
	(0.235)	(0.019)	(0.301)	(0.036)	(0.038)	(0.307)	(0.033)
Family populationsize	-0.485***	-0.035***	-0.000	-0.083***	-0.101***	-1.005***	0.002
	(0.101)	(0.008)	(0.129)	(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.132)	(0.013)
Family cash and deposits	0.270***	0.024***	-0.108	0.047***	0.053***	0.546***	0.002
	(0.053)	(0.004)	(0.068)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.069)	(0.007)
Net household assets	0.037	0.002	-0.203***	0.007	0.035***	0.157**	0.014*
	(0.055)	(0.004)	(0.070)	(0.008)	(0.009)	(0.072)	(0.008)
Total household income	0.348***	0.066***	0.018	0.030*	0.061***	0.637***	0.027*
	(0.104)	(0.008)	(0.133)	(0.016)	(0.017)	(0.136)	(0.016)
Father 's highest education	0.290***	0.011***	-0.162**	0.035***	0.042***	0.404***	0.007
	(0.050)	(0.004)	(0.064)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.065)	(0.007)
Mother 's highest education	0.196***	0.006	-0.171***	0.026***	0.036***	0.296***	0.013*
	(0.050)	(0.004)	(0.064)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.065)	(0.007)
Household book collection	0.004***	0.000*	-0.002**	0.000*	0.001***	0.003***	-0.000
	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)
Gender	-3.267***	0.472***	4.613***	-0.044	0.175***	1.247**	-0.233***
	(0.388)	(0.031)	(0.497)	(0.059)	(0.063)	(0.507)	(0.053)
Age	0.273*	0.136***	0.263	0.068***	0.186***	1.387***	-0.058***
	(0.140)	(0.011)	(0.180)	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.183)	(0.020)
Age squared	-0.781***	-0.185***	-0.491**	-0.128***	-0.282***	-2.287***	0.085***
	(0.176)	(0.014)	(0.226)	(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.230)	(0.025)
Health status	-0.086	0.023	0.309	-0.031	-0.034	-0.195	0.349***
	(0.181)	(0.014)	(0.231)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.236)	(0.029)
Party members	8.183***	0.336***	-3.537***	0.337***	1.026***	7.765***	0.282***
	(0.593)	(0.047)	(0.760)	(0.095)	(0.106)	(0.775)	(0.083)
Type of residence	2.144***	0.150***	-1.164**	0.249***	0.344***	3.522***	0.008
	(0.411)	(0.032)	(0.527)	(0.062)	(0.064)	(0.537)	(0.057)
Type of household registration	5.115***	0.192***	-3.744***	0.640***	0.894***	7.907***	0.045
	(0.451)	(0.036)	(0.578)	(0.069)	(0.072)	(0.590)	(0.061)
Marital status	-0.841	-0.010	0.339	-0.113	-0.171**	-1.325*	0.040
	(0.539)	(0.043)	(0.690)	(0.083)	(0.087)	(0.704)	(0.071)
Western region	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs.	5758	5758	5758	5758	5758	5758	5758
R ² / PseudoR ²	0.224	0.164	0.061	0.0962	0.1722	0.252	0.0193

Note: The OLS regression model uses R2, and the Logit regression model and the ordered Logit regression model use Pseudo R2.

The regression results show that family favor expenditure and family monthly communication cost in family social capital have a significant positive impact on occupational status, work income and social security, and have a negative impact on working hours. They increase the objective

employment quality index by 1.34 and 0.84 units respectively, and are significant at the 1 % level. The family population has a significant negative effect on the relevant employment quality dimension, indicating that the more the family population is, the heavier the family burden may be, resulting in the worse the individual's objective employment quality. Household cash and deposits, household net assets, and household annual income in household economic capital have a significant positive impact on subjective and objective employment quality, indicating that individuals with more household economic capital have higher employment quality. In family cultural capital, parents' years of education and family collection have a significant impact on occupational status, work income, employment stability, social security and working hours. Compared with mothers, fathers' years of education have a greater impact on objective employment quality. The above results show that family capital has an impact on the objective employment quality and subjective employment quality of a question, and the impact on the objective employment quality is greater than the subjective employment satisfaction. The objective employment quality of non-agricultural household registration and urban residents is higher, and marriage, household registration and other factors have no significant impact on the subjective employment quality.

Among the control variables, gender has a significant positive effect on the quality of individual employment, indicating that men have higher quality of employment than women, but lower than women in subjective quality of employment. It may be that men have higher expectations for subjective job satisfaction. There is a significant negative correlation between age and employment quality, indicating that in the labor market, with the increase of workers' age, their employment advantages will be weakened, which is not conducive to the improvement of employment quality. The overall employment quality of healthy people is relatively high. Party membership has a positive effect on both objective and subjective employment quality. Non-agricultural household registration and urban residents have higher objective employment quality, while marriage, household registration and other factors have no significant impact on subjective employment quality. The above conclusions further verify hypothesis 1.

4.2. Mechanism Testing

To a certain extent, family capital will have an impact on the individual's education acquisition, which is embodied in the support of family social capital, economic capital and cultural capital to individual education acquisition, and through education acquisition to affect the quality of individual employment. According to the benchmark regression results of Table 4 (1) ~ (4), in addition to the family population size variable in the family social capital, the family social capital, economic capital and cultural capital have a significant negative impact on education access. Family social capital, economic capital and cultural capital have a significant positive impact on education access at the level of 5 % and above. In Column (5) of Table 4, it can be seen that educational attainment has a significant positive impact on employment quality at the 1 % level. Specifically, among the family social capital, economic capital and education capital, family human expenditure, total household income and father's highest education level have the greatest impact on education access, with regression coefficients of 0.186, 0.160 and 0.125, respectively, and passed the significance test at the 1% level. Therefore, the difference in the stock of family capital will directly lead to the differentiation of individual education access, thus affecting the opportunity and quality of individual employment. Based on the above analysis, hypothesis 3 and hypothesis 4 are verified.

Table 4. Mechanism analysis of the impact of family capital on overall employment quality

Variable	education acquisition (1)	education acquisition (2)	education acquisition (3)	education acquisition (4)	individual employment quality (5)
Family favor expenditure	0.186*** (0.046)			0.133*** (0.044)	
Monthly communication costs	0.176*** (0.052)			0.022 (0.050)	
Family populationsize	-0.170*** (0.023)			-0.139*** (0.022)	
Family cash and deposits		0.097*** (0.012)		0.083*** (0.012)	
Net household assets		0.030** (0.013)		0.026** (0.012)	
Total household income		0.160*** (0.024)		0.106*** (0.023)	
Father's highest education			0.134*** (0.011)	0.125*** (0.011)	
Mother 'shighest education			0.110*** (0.011)	0.100*** (0.010)	
Household book collection			0.001*** (0.000)	0.001*** (0.000)	
Highest personal education					1.668*** (0.060)
Constant term	11.214*** (0.756)	10.505*** (0.671)	11.688*** (0.614)	8.945*** (0.737)	29.963*** (2.671)
Control variables	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Regional characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs.	5758	5758	5758	5758	5758
R-squared	0.371	0.380	0.410	0.426	0.257

4.3. Heterogeneity Analysis

Considering that different regions, living types and educational levels may lead to differences in individual employment quality, this part analyzes the heterogeneity of the above factors that may affect individual employment quality. In addition, this paper uses the equal weight average method to generate family social capital, economic capital and cultural capital variables by standardizing the relevant variables of each part, so as to facilitate the intuitive analysis of the heterogeneity of its impact on the quality of individual employment (see table 5).

From the statistical results of regional heterogeneity, it is found that family social, economic and cultural capital has significantly improved the quality of individual employment at the level of 1 % in the eastern and central regions, and the quality of employment in the eastern region is significantly higher than that in the central and western regions. This may be because the eastern region has developed economy, more employment opportunities, perfect labor market development, and the stock of social, economic and cultural capital within the family in this region is larger than that in the central and western provinces, and individuals are more likely to obtain high-quality employment. For the western region, due to the lack of economic development and the low stock of family social capital, its impact on the quality of employment is not significant, but family economic capital and cultural capital have a significant impact on the quality of employment, and the impact of family

cultural capital on the quality of employment is more effective than that of the eastern and central regions. Therefore, improving the access to education in the west has a significant effect on increasing the quality of employment in the region.

According to the analysis of urban and rural heterogeneity, whether it is urban or rural employees, their family social, economic and cultural capital have a significant impact on the quality of individual employment at the level of 1 %. Specifically, the effect of family capital on the employment quality of urban individuals is significantly higher than that of rural individuals. This may be due to the fact that urban individuals have higher levels of education than rural individuals, resulting in differences in human capital levels. In addition, urban employment resources are more abundant, and urban individual family capital can play a more important role, making it more likely to be in a favorable position in employment, so as to obtain more high-quality employment opportunities.

Considering that the influence of individual education level on the quality of employment may be different, the samples of junior high school and below are regarded as low-educated employees, ordinary high school, secondary school, technical school and vocational high school are regarded as middle-educated employees, and college and above are regarded as high-educated employees. Regression estimation is carried out according to the benchmark model. The results of Table 5 show that family capital passes the significance test of 10 % and above, indicating that family capital has a promoting effect on the overall employment quality of employees with different educational backgrounds. Through comparison, it is found that the promotion effect of family capital on the employment quality of middle-educated workers is significantly higher than that of low-educated groups, but the promotion effect of family capital on the employment quality of high-educated groups is lower than the former two. Specifically, the phenomenon of " degree inversion " in the employment of highly educated people is more prominent. According to the survey data of college fresh students from March to April 2024 released by Zhilian Recruitment, the offer acquisition rate of ordinary undergraduate and master graduates is 33.2 %, which is 17 percentage points lower than that of last year, while the acquisition rate of ordinary undergraduates is 43.9 %. The reason may be that the expectation of employment quality of highly educated people is significantly higher than that of middle and low educated people, but there is a huge gap between the actual employment market situation and the expectation, which leads to the decline of employment initiative and the decrease of individual subjective employment satisfaction, thus affecting the overall employment quality. Based on the above analysis, hypothesis 2 is verified.

Table 5. Heterogeneity analysis of the impact of family capital on overall employment quality

Variable	Eastern (1)	Central (2)	West (3)	Towns (4)	Rural (5)	Low degree (6)	Middle degree (7)	High degree (8)
Family social capital	11.527* ** (2.640)	9.189** * (3.327)	4.702 (3.499)	10.717* ** (2.323)	7.453*** (2.749)	9.129* (5.137)	10.523*** (2.425)	5.830** (2.734)
Family economic capital	14.227* ** (1.793)	10.508* ** (2.374)	4.093* (2.409)	13.699* ** (1.590)	8.765*** (1.895)	5.959* (3.402)	9.928*** (1.711)	7.342*** (1.783)
Family cultural capital	11.278* ** (1.871)	11.149* ** (2.725)	12.360* ** (2.630)	12.307* ** (1.602)	11.620** * (2.252)	7.749* (4.379)	9.369*** (1.946)	3.282* (1.786)
Control	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Obs.	2761	1415	1582	3281	2477	761	2913	2084
R-square	0.178	0.159	0.141	0.158	0.109	0.053	0.073	0.062

5. RESEARCH CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Family capital has an important impact on the quality of individual employment. However, most of the existing studies focus on the single aspect of the relationship between work income or satisfaction of employees, lacking comprehensive consideration of the quality of employment, and rarely study the impact of individual employment quality from the micro level of family capital. Therefore, this paper constructs a comprehensive employment quality system from the perspective of family capital from six aspects: job satisfaction, occupational status, salary and welfare, work contract, working hours and social security, and uses CFPS data in 2020 to explore the impact mechanism of family capital on individual employment quality. The research conclusions show that: (1) Family capital has a significant impact on individual employment quality. The subjective and objective regression analysis of employment quality by using OLS and Logit methods shows that family social capital, economic capital and cultural capital have a significant impact on individual occupational status, work income, employment stability, social security, working hours and job satisfaction. (2) Family capital will affect the quality of individual employment through individual education acquisition, and education acquisition has a mediating effect between family capital and employment quality. (3) Through heterogeneity analysis, it is found that the quality of employment in the eastern region is higher than that in the central and western regions ; the quality of employment in urban areas is higher than that in rural areas. The impact of family capital on the quality of employment with secondary education is greater than that of low-educated and high-educated people. After analysis, it is found that the phenomenon of "education inversion" in the employment of high-educated groups is more prominent.

Based on the research conclusions, the following policy recommendations are proposed: First, strengthen the construction of family capital and promote the improvement of employment quality. The government should be committed to building a diversified support system, especially for low socio-economic status families, through tax incentives, financial subsidies and other measures to increase their economic capital; at the same time, promote community service projects, enhance family social networks, and enrich their social capital; in addition, family education investment should be encouraged, and cultural and educational resources and skills training should be provided to enhance family cultural capital. Through the above measures, we can comprehensively improve the level of family capital, so as to indirectly promote the employment quality of individuals in terms of occupational status, work income and employment stability.

Second, optimize the allocation of educational resources and play the role of educational intermediary. In view of the mediating effect of education between family capital and employment quality, the government should further optimize the allocation of educational resources to ensure educational equity. In particular, we should increase investment in education in rural and remote areas, improve the quality of education, and narrow the educational gap between urban and rural areas. At the same time, we will promote the concept of lifelong learning, provide vocational training and re-education opportunities for labor forces of different academic levels, especially strengthen the employment guidance for highly educated groups but facing 'degree inversion' groups, and guide them to adapt to market demand and achieve high-quality employment.

Third, implement regional differentiated employment policies to improve the overall quality of employment. In view of the differences in employment quality between the eastern, central and western regions and between urban and rural areas, the government should formulate differentiated employment promotion policies. In the eastern region, continue to optimize the industrial structure and create more high-quality jobs; in the central and western regions, we will strengthen infrastructure construction, develop characteristic industries, attract talent return, and improve the quality of local employment. At the same time, we will increase policy support for rural areas, develop modern agriculture and rural industries, improve the rural employment environment, and narrow the gap

between urban and rural employment quality. Through these measures, it is possible to achieve an overall improvement in the quality of employment nationwide.

REFERENCES

- [1] Promote high-quality full employment and continuously enhance the sense of happiness and security of the majority of workers [N]. People 's Daily, 2024-05-29 (001).
- [2] Guan Yuting, Cai Yulan, Zheng Yixin, etc. Research on the impact of school 's ' level ' on the employment quality of college graduates-An empirical analysis based on the survey of the employment status of college graduates in China in 2019 [J]. Educational Economic Review, 2024, 9(2):39-61.
- [3] Jiang Qi, Shan Yaoying. Digital economy development and employment quality improvement: promotion or inhibition? [J]. Economic and Management Review, 2024, 40(04):123-135.
- [4] Wang Zhixuan, Deng Qiuyun, Chen Li. Tax reduction and fee reduction and promotion of high-quality employment-Research based on PVAR model [J]. Tax Research, 2018, (06):102-108.
- [5] Qin Guangqiang, Lin Yunyuan. Analysis of the employment quality of emerging youth groups and its influencing factors [J]. China Youth Research, 2024 (1):111-119.
- [6] Mincer J. Investment in Human Capital and Personal Income Distribution [J]. Journal of Political Economy, 1958, 66(4):281-302.
- [7] Shi Hongmei, Ding Yu. Human capital, social capital and employment quality of college graduates [J]. Population and economy, 2017, (03):90-97.
- [8] Qiao Zhihong, Su Di, Zhan Shiyuan, et al. Research on the impact of human capital and family socioeconomic status on the employment destination and outcome of college students [J]. China Youth Study, 2014, (08):92-97.
- [9] Coleman J S. The foundations of social theory [M]. MA:Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1990:302
- [10] [Coleman J S. Social capital in the creation of human capital [J]. American journal of sociology, 1988:95-120.
- [11] Bourdieu P, The forms of capital [M]. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986
- [12] Bourdieu, Walter Kant, Practice and Reflection [M]. Li Meng, Li Kang, Translation, Beijing : Central Compiled and Translated Press, 1998 : 326-327
- [13] ILO, Report of the Director-General: Decent Work, <https://www.ilo.org/public/english/standards/relm/ilc/ilc87/rep-i.htm>, visited on 26 March 2024.
- [14] Liu Suhua. Employment quality : concept, content and its impact on the number of jobs [J]. Population and family planning, 2005, (07):29-31.
- [15] Liu Yunyun, Ye Yinghua. Research on the influencing factors of employment quality of ' new generation returnees '-Empirical analysis based on ordered Logistic-ISM model [J]. Journal of East China Normal University (Education Science Edition), 2021(12).
- [16] Shen Shijie. An analysis of the influencing factors of the ' employment quality ' of the new generation of migrant workers in Northeast China-centered on ' human capital ' and ' social capital ' [J]. Jianghai Journal, 2018, (02):229-237.
- [17] Zheng Maoxiong. Research on the relationship between family social capital and college students ' job satisfaction [J]. Higher education exploration, 2012, (02):131-13
- [18] Yang Zhihai, Zhang Yifan, Gu Xiangqun. Internet use, social capital and employment quality improvement of migrant workers-based on the perspective of information acquisition [J]. Northwest population, 2023, 44(5):70-83.
- [19] Liu Xinhua, Yang Yan. Family Social Capital and College Students' Differential Employment-Research on the Influence of Family Social Capital on College Students' Employment Quality [J]. Education Academic Monthly, 2013(5):66-68.
- [20] Zhang Wenhong, Su Di. Cultural Capital, Economic Capital and Class Reproduction [J]. Jiang Hai Journal, 2018, (03):102-112.
- [21] Han Lingmei, Li Hesong, Xue Keke, et al.. Study on the impact of family cultural capital on the employment of college graduates [J]. Statistical theory and practice, 2022(7):14-18.
- [22] Jiang Shuai, Long Jing. The effect of family cultural and economic capital on educational attainment [J]. Academic Journal of Education, 2022, (01):51-57.
- [23] Xue Haiping, Zhao Yang. Will shadow education also affect education diversion -An empirical analysis based on CFPS 2010-2018 tracking data [J]. Journal of Education, 2023, 19(04):156-170.
- [24] Marrero G A, JG Rodríguez. Inequality of opportunity and growth [J]. Journal of Development Economics, 2013, 104:107-122.

- [25] Hou Jingyi, Zhang Jianping, Ge Yang et al. Research on the impact of family capital and education investment on children's education acquisition [J]. University education management, 2023, 17(05):110-124.
- [26] Qin Changcai, Guo Siyu, Liu Yicong. The impact of family economic capital on children 's education [J]. Journal of Fujian Jiangxia University, 2019, 9(5):16-23.
- [27] Shaw Sunflower. Family background, cultural capital and educational attainment [J]. Education Monthly, 2016, (02):12-20+41.
- [28] Dong Yunchuan, Zhang Jianxin. Higher education opportunity and social class [M]. Beijing : Science Press, 2008:89.
- [29] Shi Chao. Advantage transfer: family capital and educational achievement-foreign educational stratification research and its enlightenment [J]. World Education Information, 2023, 36(8):13-23.
- [30] Qiu Liping, Xiao Sunflower. Cultural capital and social status attainment - An empirical study based on Shanghai [J]. Social Sciences in China, 2011, (06):121-135+223.
- [31] Zhang Yizhong, Huang Lihong. Empirical analysis of the relationship between urban and rural household economic capital and higher education demand [J]. Modern education management, 2018, (05):30-35.
- [32] Wang Shengjin, Liu Mo. The impact of education level on the employment quality of floating population [J]. Population Journal, 2023, 45(3):49-62.
- [33] Xiao Xiaoyong, Huang Jing, Guo Huiying. Can education improve the employment quality of migrant workers? Empirical analysis based on CHIP migrant household survey data [J]. Journal of Huazhong Agricultural University (Social Science Edition), 2019(2):135-143.
- [34] Yang Shengli, Yao Jian, Su Hanyun. Family capital and occupational status attainment of offspring : analysis of the mediating effect of education [J]. Northwest population, 2021, 42(1):70-84.