多民

消费行为让较研究

潘建伟◎著

JUMIN XIAOFEIXINGWEI BIJIAO YANJIU



居民消费行为比较研究

潘建伟 著



图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

居民消费行为比较研究/潘建伟著.-北京:中国经济出版 社,2009.7

ISBN 978 -7 -5017 -9008 -1

I. 居… II. 潘… III. 居民 - 消费者行为论 - 研究 - 中国 IV. F126. 1

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2008) 第 208902 号

出版发行:中国经济出版社(100037·北京市西城区百万庄北街3号)

网 址: www. economyph. com

责任编辑: 许秀江 (电话: 010 - 68355415)

责任印制: 张江虹 封面设计: 白长江

经 销:各地新华书店

承 印:北京东光印刷厂

开 本: 880×1230 32 开 印张: 7.375 字数: 200 千字

版 次: 2009 年 7 月第 1 版 印次: 2009 年 7 月第 1 次印刷

印 数: 3000 册

书 号: ISBN 978 - 7 - 5017 - 9008 - 1/F・7990 定价: 20.00 元

本书如有缺页、倒页、脱页等质量问题,由我社发行部门负责调换,电话:68330607

版权所有 盗版必究

举报电话: 68359418 68319282 国家版权局反盗版举报中心电话: 12390

服务热线: 68344225 68341878

内容摘要

本研究以当代消费经济理论、农户经济学、比较经济学等为基础,并利用扩展线性支出系统(ELES)模型,对内蒙古牧户与农户的消费行为进行了系统的比较研究。在对国内外相关理论与实践研究进行述评的基础上,重点对以下四个方面的问题进行了创新性探索:

一是对内蒙古牧户与农户的收入水平、收入结构、收入来源及现金收入进行了全面系统的比较分析。收入水平是影响消费行为的最重要的因素,为此,从绝对收入水平进行了比较。内蒙古牧户与农户实际人均纯收入差别显著,多数年份二者的比值即牧民的实际人均纯收入比农民高0.5~1倍之间。内蒙古牧民与农民名义人均纯收入之比1980年为1.46:1;2000年为1.79:1;2005年为1.54:1。从发展的角度比较,1980~2005年内蒙古牧户收入水平的年均增长率为11.83%,与同期农户收入水平的年均增长率为11.83%,与同期农户收入水平的年均增长率为11.83%,与同期农户收入水平的增长速度相差不大。无论是牧户还是农户,收入来源均高度依赖家庭经营,牧户收入的90%以上来自其从事的主导产业畜牧业,农户收入的75%以上来自其从事的主导产业种植业,说明牧户更加依赖其从事的主导产业种植业,说明牧户更加依赖其从事的主导产业

- 二是对牧户与农户的总体消费水平、消费结构进行了系统的比较研究。结合收入水平分析,在内蒙古牧户与农户消费演变分析基础上,采用 2005 年截面数据,利用扩展线性支出系统(ELES)模型,比较分析了牧户与农户的基本消费需求及消费结构、边际消费倾向、价格需求弹性和收入需求弹性,探讨了价格、收入等因素对牧户与农户的消费影响程度及其消费趋势。研究发现:
- 1. 从绝对水平比较,牧户的实际人均生活消费支出额明显高于农户。1980~2005年,牧户的实际人均生活消费支出额是农户的1.3~2.3倍,比农户平均高出80%。从发展的角度分析,内蒙古牧户消费水平的年均增长率为12.71%,同期农户消费水平的年均增长率为11.2%,相差1.51百分点。从近几年观察,牧户与农户的消费水平差距呈扩大的趋势,这一趋势在短期内难以改变。
- 2. 食品、住房、交通通信、文教娱乐在牧户及农户的基本需求支出中占重要位置,消费结构仍停留在较低的层次。食品支出居于最重要、最基础的层次,但牧户享受型、发展型支出的比例高一些,表明牧户需求结构层次高于农户。不过,从各消费类型的明细支出项目观察,牧户和农户文教娱乐及服务的支出更多的是文化教育方面的硬性开支,服务项目的支出很少,娱乐支出更少,更确切地说,是一种低收入约束下的强制性开支;医疗保健支出,主要是药费和医疗费,服务项目的支出也很少,保健支出甚微,亦是一种低收入约束下的被迫性开支;对于家庭设备的支出较少。由此判断,现阶段内蒙古农区和牧区居民(尤其

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com

是农区居民)的消费水平仍然比较低,消费结构仍停留在 较低的层次上。

三是对不同消费类型的消费水平、消费结构及前景进行比较研究。分别在内蒙古牧户与农户食品消费、居住消费、耐用品消费、服务消费等不同消费类型演变、特征、趋势分析基础上,结合消费影响因素进行了分析,研究发现内蒙古牧户食品、居住、耐用品、服务消费水平均高于农户的消费水平,从另一方面验证了牧户的消费层次高于农户。

四是提出实现农村牧区消费增长、推进农村牧区实现和谐消费的政策建议:持续增加牧户与农户收入,增强牧户与农户的消费信心;逐步建立与完善社会保障体系,为农牧民提供现代意义上的社会保障制度;进一步发展和完善农村牧区消费信贷;改善农村牧区消费环境;牧户与农户消费行为的某些不合理的选择需要政府和媒体的引导。

这项研究虽然作了大胆的尝试,进行了系统的比较研究,但有些问题仍然值得今后进一步探讨:如研究方法可继续探讨设计综合计量模型进行分析;对蒙古民族历史、文化、宗教等进行深入研究;对不同区域、不同收入水平、不同文化程度农户与牧户消费行为进行比较研究。

oragest of transactamilies was 1. tog4 to 1980; up 2000 do

Abstract

Based on the modern theories of consumption economy, farmer household economics and comparative economics, this research makes use of the ELES model to have a comparative study, in a systematic way, of the consumption behaviors of farmer families and herdsman families in Inner Mongolia. Grounded on reviewing the theories and practices concerned at home and abroad, the research conducts an innovative study in the following 4 parts:

The first part comparatively analyses in a comprehensive and systematic way of the income level, income structure and income sources of farmer families and herdsman families in Inner Mongolia. The income level is the most important element that influences the consumption behavior. Therefore, in this part a comparison is conducted of the absolute income levels of farmer families and herdsman families. In Inner Mongolia, there is a great difference between the actual net incomes per capita of herdsman families and farmer families. In most of the past years, the actual net income per capita of herdsman families is 0.5 to 1 times more than that of farmer families in Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region. The proportion of the nominal net income per capita of herdsman families to that of farmer families was 1.46:1 in 1980; in 2000 the proportion was 1.79:1 and in 2005 1.54:1. From the per-

spective of development, the income of herdsman families increased by 11.83% every year from 1980 to 2005; while that of farmer families in the same period increased by 11.59% every year. The difference was only 0.24%. So their increase rates did not greatly differ from each other. And both the income of herdsman families and that of farmer families highly depend on their family management. More than 90% of the income of herdsman families was from their main industry: animal husbandry and over 75% of the income of farmer families from their main industry: planting industry. This indicates that the herdsmen are more dependent on their main industry and their income sources are not diversified.

The second part systematically and comparatively studies the general consumption level of herdsman families and farmer families and their consumption structure. On the basis of the analysis of income levels of herdsman families and farmer families in Inner Mongolia and the evolvement of their consumption patterns, according to the cross section data in 2005, this part, with ELES model, compares and analyses the basic consumption demands and consumption structure of herdsman families and farmer families, their marginal consumption propensity, price elasticity of demand and income elasticity of demand. This part also discusses the influence of price and income on the consumption of herdsman families and farmer families, and their inclination for consumption.

- 1. The actual average consumption expense of herdsman families is remarkably higher than that of farmer families in terms of the absolute consumption level. From 1980 to 2005 the actual per capita consumption for life expenses of herdsman families is 1.3 to 2.3 times as much as that of farmer families, on average over 80% more than that of farmer families. From the perspective of development the consumption of herdsman families in Inner Mongolia increases 12.7% every year. In the same period that of farmer families is 11.2%. The difference is 1.51%. According to the recent years observation, the gap between the herdsman families income level and that of farmer families is widening, which is hard to be changed in the near future.
- 2. The expenses on food, housing, traffic, communications, education and entertainment consist of a great part of the expenses of herdsman families and farmer families which meet their basic demand. Food expenses are the most important and basic expenses of herdsman families and farmer families. However, the expenses of herdsman families on entertainment and improvement are a bit higher than those of farmer families, which shows that the demand of herdsman families is at a higher level than that of farmer families. As far as the expenses of herdsman families and farmer families on the classifying items of their various consumptions are concerned, their expenses on education, entertainment and service are

obligatory. And they spend little on service and much less on entertainment. To be more exact, it is the kind of forced expenses confined by low income; their expenses on medical care are mainly focused on medicines and medical treatment. A little is expended on service and there are almost no money pored into health care. The expenses on service and health care are also the forced expenditure confined by their low income. Besides, the herdsman families and farmer families expend a little on household appliances. Based on what is analyzed above, it is clear that the expenditure of the residents in rural and pastoral areas especially those in rural areas is still low, and the consumption structure is still at a low level.

The third part is a comparative study of the consumption level and consumption structure of different consumptions of herdsman families and farmer families and these different consumptions future. This study is done according to the analysis of the evolvement, characteristics and tendency of such different consumptions of herdsman families and farmer families in Inner Mongolia as food, housing, durable consuming goods and service. The study shows that the consumption level of herdsman families on food, housing, durable consuming goods and service is higher than that of farmer families, which also proves that the consumption of herdsman families is at a higher level than that of farmer families.

In the fourth part some suggestions to increase the con-

sumption and actualize the harmonious consumption in rural and pastoral areas are put forward as follows: continuously increase the income of herdsman families and farmer families and build up the confidence of herdsman families and farmer families in consumption; take gradual steps to establish a better social security system to provide herdsman families and farmer families with modern social security system; further develop and improve the consumption loans in rural and pastoral areas: better the consumption situation in rural and pastoral areas: steer and correct the unreasonable consumption of herdsman families and farmer families by media and government Although some new attempts are made in this research while the comparative study is systematically conducted, there still exist some problems which are worth being further studied, that is, the design of a comprehensive measurement model; further study of the history, culture and religion in Inner Mongolia: the comparative study of the consumption behaviors of herdsman families and farmer families in different regions, at different levels and with different degree of litera-'Uhe study shows that the consumption level .vo

Key words: consumption behavior consumption inclination demand flexibility herdsmen families and farmer families

er level from that of farmer families

In the footh, in some suggestions to invest the over-

CONTENTS

1	导 论 /-1	
	1.1 研究背景与意义	. 3
	1.1.1 研究背景	. 3
	1.1.2 研究目的和意义	. 6
	1.2 研究内容和研究框架	. 9
	1.2.1 研究内容	. 9
	1.2.2 研究框架	11
	1.3 研究方法与资料运用的说明	11
	1.3.1 研究方法	11
	1.3.2 资料运用说明	12
	1.4 研究创新和有待进一步研究的问题	13
	1.4.1 研究的创新	13
	1.4.2 有待进一步研究的问题	14
2	理论回顾与相关研究述评 / 15	
	2.1 西方消费经济理论	17
	2.1.1 西方古典消费经济理论	17
	2.1.2 当代西方消费经济理论	18
	2.2 马克思主义消费理论	22

居民消费行为比较研究 ◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆

	2. 3	国内消费理论	与实践的	研究		23
		2.3.1 中国	消费问题	研究的沿	革	23
		2.3.2 中国	消费经济	理论研究	述评	25
3	牧户	与农户收入2	K平比较	/ 33		
	3. 1	牧民与农民人	均纯收入	比较		35
		3.1.1 牧民	人均纯收	入增长变	动趋势	35
		3.1.2 农民	人均纯收	入增长变	动趋势	38
		3.1.3 牧民	与农民人	均纯收入	比较	42
	3.2	牧民与农民纯	收入结构	比较	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	43
		3.2.1 工资	性纯收入	差异		44
		3.2.2 家庭	经营纯收	入差异 …		45
		3.2.3 财产	性纯收入	差异		46
		3.2.4 转移	性纯收入	差异	W	47
	3.3	牧民与农民家	庭经营纯	收入来源	比较	47
		3.3.1 来自	第一产业	纯收入的!	七 較	48
		3.3.2 来自	第二产业	纯收入的1	七 较	50
		3.3.3 来自	第三产业	纯收入的L	七 较	51
	3.4	牧民与农民人	均现金纯	收人比较		52
		3.4.1 牧民	人均现金	纯收入变动	动	52
		3.4.2 农民	人均现金	纯收入变动	动	53
		3.4.3 牧民	与农民人	均现金纯中	收入比较	54
4	牧户.	与农户消费小	平及消	费结构比	较 / 55	
	4. 1	消费水平比较			Y.O. H.M.M.	57
		4.1.1 牧户	消费水平	变动分析		57
		4.1.2 农户	消费水平	变动分析		62
	4. 2	平均消费倾向	及储蓄倾	向的比较		66
		4 2 1 平均	消费倾向	和油际消费	事倾向的比较。	67

		4. 2. 2	引致消费倾向差异的原因	70
		4. 2. 3	平均储蓄倾向比较	72
	4. 3	消费结构	匈比较	73
		4. 3. 1	食品消费比较	74
		4.3.2	衣着消费比较	76
		4. 3. 3	居住消费比较	76
		4. 3. 4	家庭设备消费比较	77
		4. 3. 5	文化教育、娱乐消费比较	78
		4. 3. 6	医疗保健消费比较	79
		4. 3. 7	交通和通信消费比较	80
		4. 3. 8	其他用品和服务消费比较	81
5	利用	扩展线性	生支出系统对牧户与农户消费	
		行为的	比较 / 83	
	5. 1	扩展线性	t支出系统(ELES)模型的建立和参数估计 …	85
		5. 1. 1	ELES 模型的建立 ·····	85
		5. 1. 2	ELES 模型的参数的估计 ······	87
	5. 2	牧户与农	尺户消费需求比较	88
		5. 2. 1	基本消费需求	88
		5. 2. 2	消费结构	90
		5. 2. 3	边际消费倾向及边际预算份额	91
	5.3	牧户与农	飞户需求弹性比较	94
		5. 3. 1	收入弹性	94
		5. 3. 2	需求的价格弹性	95
		5. 3. 3		
	5.4	小结 …		01
6	牧户	与农户食	記消费行为比较 / 103	
	6. 1	食品消费	的相关概念 1	05

居民消费行为比较研究 ◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆

		6. 1. 1	食品及包	洪求关:	系		105
		6. 1. 2	食品消费	费结构			106
		6. 1. 3	食品供习	 结构			107
	6. 2	牧户与农	户食品》	肖费的泡	寅进与变法	£	108
		6. 2. 1	牧户食品	品消费的	的演进·		108
		6. 2. 2	农户食品	品消费的	的变迁 ·		113
	6.3	牧户与农	户食品》	肖费量的	的比较·		115
		6. 3. 1	肉蛋奶剂	当费量	北较		115
		6.3.2	粮食、蔬	莱及瓜	果类消费	量比较	119
		6. 3. 3	酒消费量	量比较			121
	6.4	牧户与农	户食品》	肖费结构	构的比较	,	122
		6. 4. 1	牧户食品	品消费组	结构的变动	动	122
		6. 4. 2	农户食品	品消费组	结构的变动	d	125
	6.5	牧户与农	户食品剂	肖费影响	响因素分析	折	128
		6. 5. 1	农业结村	匈的不 [司是食品》	肖费差异的	
			主要根》	原 …			129
		6. 5. 2	经济水平	下对食:	品消费的是	影响	130
		6. 5. 3	社会文化	比对食	品消费的是	影响	130
	6.6	小结 …				• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	132
7	牧户.	与农户住	房消费	行为比	比较 / 135		
	7. 1	牧户与农	户住房沿	肖费的	寅变与变计	£	137
		7. 1. 1	牧户住房	房变迁			137
		7. 1. 2	农户居住	主的演	变		139
	7.2	牧户与农	户居住习	支出 比	皎		140
		7. 2. 1	牧户与农	2户住/	房支出的组	绝对值比较	140
		7. 2. 2	牧户与农	2户居1	住消费支出	出占生活消费	
			支出的比	上重比 3	较		141

	7.3	牧户与农户人均居住面积比较	141
	7. 4	牧户与农户住房质量比较	142
		7.4.1 牧户与农户住房结构比较	142
		7.4.2 牧户与农户新建住房情况比较	144
		7.4.3 牧户与农户住房消费资金来源比较	145
	7.5	牧户与农户住房消费倾向比较	147
	7. 6	小结	149
8	牧户	9与农户耐用品消费行为比较 / 151	
	8. 1	牧户与农户耐用品消费特征与演变的比较	153
		8.1.1 牧户与农户耐用品消费的特征	153
		8.1.2 牧户与农户耐用品消费的演变	155
	8. 2	牧户与农户耐用品消费存在的问题	161
	8.3	牧户与农户耐用品消费的制约因素	163
		8.3.1 收入水平与耐用消费品消费	163
		8.3.2 价格水平与耐用消费品消费	64
		8.3.3 商品供应与耐用消费品消费 1	65
		8.3.4 消费环境和消费条件与耐用消费品消费 …]	166
	8.4	小结	66
9	牧户	与农户服务消费行为比较 / 167	
	9. 1	牧户与农户服务消费与实物消费结构比较 1	71
		9.1.1 牧户服务消费与实物消费结构分析 1	71
		9.1.2 农户服务消费与实物消费结构分析 1	73
		9.1.3 牧户与农户服务消费的消费结构1	76
	9. 2	牧户与农户文化教育、娱乐服务消费比较1	79
		9.2.1 文化、体育、娱乐服务消费水平	79
		9.2.2 文化教育、娱乐服务消费结构	80
	9.3	牧户与农户的交通和通信服务消费比较 18	83

9.3.1 交通和通信服务消费水平
9.3.2 交通和通信服务消费结构 18
9.4 牧户与农户医疗保健服务消费比较
9.4.1 医疗保健服务消费水平
9.4.2 医疗保健服务消费结构
9.5 小结 19
10 研究结论与政策建议 / 191
10.1 研究结论 19
10.1.1 牧户与农户收入水平差距显著 19
10.1.2 受收入等因素影响,牧户与农户消费水平
差距波动式拉大 19
10.1.3 牧户与农户消费结构差异明显,牧户的
消费层次高于农户 19
10.1.4 消费主体的不同导致消费行为的差异 19
10.1.5 农户家庭消费的向后性和牧户家庭
消费的向前性 19
10.1.6 由于农业结构、经济发展水平、社会文化
等影响使牧户与农户的食品消费结构有
明显的差异 19
10.1.7 从住房消费情况看,内蒙古牧户及农户
与小康生活标准还有一定差距 19
10.1.8 牧户与农户耐用品消费呈现出明显的
层次性、多功能性和外延性等特征 19
10.1.9 牧户与农户的服务消费中,以生存型
消费为主,发展型消费为辅,享受型
081 消费微乎其微 19
10.2 政策建议