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Abstract

This study investigates planning strategies regarding low-rent housing for Chinese rural-to-urban migrants (Nongmin gong) through an examination of the intermediary spaces combined with functions shared among such Chinese migrants in their urban settlements. Such functions are to help rural migrants with the process of managing their spatial transition from the rural setting to the urban setting. Chinese migrants gradually transfer from their home rural settlements to establish city lives and engage in urban occupations, but their sense of identity and family network remain grounded in a village culture. The high level of communal activities found in the spontaneous urban settlements of Nongmin gong, can be understood as one aspect of the adherence to the lifestyle of their rural settlements.

As a result, the main focus of this study is to show that the sharing of certain functions situated in the transitional spaces, namely, in front of the rental room, in front of the rental house and between the rental houses, always provides opportunities for communal activities to take place. This research reveals that low-rent neighborhoods spontaneously-developed by migrants incorporates close-knit communal activities that take place in these transitional spaces. Under the same physical conditions, by contrast, communal activities have been disappearing in modern low-rent high-rise neighborhoods. Based on the analyses of the physical characteristics of the activities carried out by migrant residents and of the interviews of migrants regarding the significance of communal activities, I defend the thesis that the role played by the transitional spaces must be joined with functions that residents can share or must share with each other. The shared functions situated in the transitional spaces actually allow communal activities to take root.

In my dissertation, communal activities taking place in the transitional spaces are investigated based on three typical low-rent migrant neighborhoods: Yimuyuan stands as a spontaneously-developed neighborhood of Nongmin Gong or rural-to-urban migrants in
Beijing city; Minxin Jiayuan is a government-subsidized low-rent neighborhood in Chongqing city; and Vanke Tulou is an example of private developer-built low-rent housing, in Guangzhou city. For each case study, communal activities are assessed by examining the spatial characteristics of three transitional spaces and through a survey of a sample of forty-five rural-to-urban migrant residents. While questionnaire surveys were also used for data gathering, we could identify descriptive statistics used for comparative analyses of the three low-rent neighborhoods.

Analysis of the migrants’ spontaneously-developed housing in the Yimuyuan case suggests two points. Firstly, the high level of communal activities occurring in the three transitional spaces mostly appertains to residents using the shared functions. These functions become a given condition that residents can share with other residents. Secondly, all these shared functions provide a medium by which communal activities are actualized. The available shared functions help to build up the relationship of residents to the functions of their choice, and also make it possible to generate communal activities among residents.

Therefore, the results of this study lead to the following finding about low-rent neighborhoods for rural-to-urban migrants: Housing typology (low-rise or high-rise) is not fundamental in influencing relations between neighbors and certainly not the real cause of a high or low level of communal activities. If low-rent neighborhoods are rich in communal activities, this is not because they are crowded or are more suitable places, but because they have sufficient functions to allow that sharing to take place. The same can be applied to places which have few communal activities, it is not resulting from a lack of people or open places, but it is caused by the absence of functions that can be shared, thereby preventing the occurrence of communal activities.

Finally, this research proposes strategies using shared functions for planning rural-to-urban migrants’ low-rent housing in China. Regarding the strategies using shared functions, the following shared functions comprise the basis for designing low-rent housing for rural-to-urban migrants in China: hygiene and sanitary functions; cooking and dining functions; storage and rest functions; social service and education functions; and recreation and
hobby functions. This kind of low-rent housing model, based on a cooperative network or fictive kinship in the community, could facilitate migrant self-support and produce a more humane residential environment. For the migrants’ low-rent housing in their destination city, retrieving the ethics of communal activities can be an alternative to controlling individualism and collectivism.

**Keyword:** Rural-to-urban Chinese migrants (*Nongmin gong*), the extended family, low-rent housing, communal activities, transitional spaces, shared functions

**Student Number:** 2011-30782
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Chapter 1. Introduction

The main concern of my study is the question of how to describe in precise terms the communal activities that involve through the relationship between residents and their local spaces. This study presumes that the communal activities are spatially embodied in low-rent houses and that the people-place relationship is an essential process in the formation of a ‘fitting’ residential environment. The method of this study is grounded on the awareness that an imagined comprehension of communal activities is the finest way to plan appropriate physical environments for rural-to-urban migrant residents.

1.1 Concerns, problems and objectives of the study

This study tries to understand the functions combined with transitional spaces in the rural-to-urban migrants’ settlement in their destination cities of China during their adaptation to the rural migrant community. Rural migrants’ spontaneously-developed neighborhoods can virtually be considered as Chinese rural cultural territories. One example of this is the Yimuyuan community which is one of my main case studies in this study, and it is one of the biggest migrants’ spontaneously-developed housing areas in the city of Beijing. Yimuyuan appears to be the location for a significant number of new residences, which include both accommodation and service organizations that are heavily made use of by rural migrants. These surroundings assist and support new arrivals and other rural migrants with their effective adaptation to rural-to-urban migration. The migrants’ spontaneously-developed neighborhoods have all the functions or functions of a city for members of a rural migrant community. They function as residential, financial, and social hubs of activity.
The spatial configuration is mostly understood as the main factor influencing the communal activities. Limited buildable land resources have inevitably changed the low-rent housing growth pattern from outward horizontal spread (naturally-developed migrants’ housing) to vertical growth (modern high-rise low-rent housing). A high-rise neighborhood as the main housing typology of low-rent housing presents a clear view of the misunderstandings around residential communal activities and provides a chance to address the demands of the wilder rural-to-urban migrant residents.

The current trends of residential living in low-rent high-rise neighborhoods reveal that migrant tenants hold a different perspective on high-rise living. They expect a vibrant urban setting and close-knit communal activities with their neighbors. Rural-to-urban move are moving to modern low-rent high-rise apartments to update their living situation but this results in the loss of communal life that they had before. Moreover, the loss of communal life, more precisely, the lack of communal activities among residents reflects humans' withdrawal from traditional social structures.

Researchers emphasize that this has happened with the diminishment of open spaces in which children can play and adults can interact. Thus Beld (2012) said, the invasion of electronic social networking enables relaxation and work from home but is making residents less social in the physical world.¹ A shortage of communal care, reduced exposure to divergent views, the absence of ability to consider opposite standpoints and the growth of distrust or common detachment from the community are all results of nonexistence of physical communal activities.

---

Founded on the research findings of Wang and Chien (1999), 51.67% of the residents of high-rise towers are not satisfied with their residential situation in urban areas. Among the nine comments, ‘the absence of open space’ was the most common complaints. Furthermore, 50.3% of the residents consider outdoor space to be as vital as indoor space. A strategy popular in contemporary discourse is building the communal activities though the open spaces. What is seldom examined in this relationship between spaces and residents, however, is the function combined with the places itself.

Regarding the communal activities in residential areas, most research has concentrated on city inhabitants in middle-class housing estates, but rarely on the rural-to-urban migrants in low-rent neighborhoods. Given these facts, a number of observers have suggested that these migrant gathering informal low-rent neighborhoods are actually slums or squatter areas. Migrants’ spontaneously-developed spaces (naturally-developed low-rent neighborhoods) had been understood as ‘have not’ slum areas—Chengzhongcun, thereafter CZC, is one example of this and like Yimuyuan neighborhood is one of the case study in this studies. One serious issue is the lack of supply of formal accommodation for rural-to-urban migrants. Inadequate housing can directly or indirectly lead to serious

---

problems for cities, such as the development of slums and ghettos,\textsuperscript{5} which suffer from poor housing quality,\textsuperscript{6} poor basic services and high crime rates.\textsuperscript{7}

The social position of CZCs and low-rent neighborhood units is clarified in various ways, most of them negatively, depending on the observers’ perspective. For the rural-to-urban migrants as for the majority of residents, it is their place of residence, where their residence is intertwined with sharing functions with other people in the same situation in their destination cities. The provided functions are the functions or services that are transformed to produce a benefit while meeting human needs. In my study, functions, such as cooking, storage, water, airing laundry, restroom, bathing, or migrant-caring functions are obtained or combined with the 3 transitional spaces (in front of the rental room, rental house, and between the houses.

It seems that most respondents in the naturally-developed Yimuyuan case in this study had active relations with their neighbors, as other cases with the modern low-rent neighborhood have suggested, the modern high-rise building is the barrier to neighborly ties, and the spatial construction is the cause of lack of communal activities.

The spatial distinction among the three transitional spaces is placed as an important physical fact, however, the function combined with these spaces is the quality of the space. It is worth mentioning that my personal life experience in the


Yimuyuan neighborhood enabled me to observe the communal activities of residents within this area. The communal activities that occur in the Yimuyuan case mostly concern residents use of these functions. These functions are converted to be a given new functions that residents can share or have to share with each other. In this regard, each function that is used acts as an intermediary for sharing. This is the reason why the same spatial situation shows a different level of communal activities among residents. The sharing of available functions is the root of residents’ communal activities, so the sharing of experiences among residents is one of the most characteristic aspects of the migrants’ spontaneously-developed housing.

An emphasis throughout this study is placed on low-rent neighborhoods which are rich in communal activities. This is not a result of there being crowds of people or plenty of suitable places, but because they have sufficient functions to allow for shared activities. It is the same with places which have few communal activities, the reason for this is not due to a lack of people or open places, but because there are no functions provided or functions that allow for active sharing between residents.

The polis, properly speaking, is not the city-state in its physical location; it is the organization of the people as it arises out of acting and speaking together, and its true space lies between people living together for this purpose, no matter where they happen to be.\(^8\)

Arendt’s polis is one portrayal of her understanding of ‘co-habitation’ in 1958. Her study focused on the relationship that takes place among people around ‘housing’ in the visible contemporary architecture, through illustrations and parameters that are in no way interested in those facets, but are more thoroughly linked to coexistence or co-habitation. The constitutive core of the housing lies in the set of complex relationships that arise, as said by Arendt ‘from the doing and talking together’ and occur in authentic, real residences: transitional people lodging together.

---

The main idea highlighted is that since functions and communal activities are connected, any understanding of the functions of the spatial environment cannot be avoided without understanding that the function is both a physical quality and a quality of the transitional residents. The same holds true for understanding the neighborly meaning to the specific group. Therefore, the most important knowledge requisite for low-rent housing neighborhood design contains identifying what patterns or dimensions of meaning are significant for providing a physical organization which are behaviorally ‘fitting’ to the rural-to-urban migrant residents.

According to this viewpoint, this study takes a steady locus that comprehends the close relationship of residents’ communal activities with their sharing of a provided function combined with the local physical places. Here, the local places can provide the planning researchers with an inclusive viewpoint for low-rent neighborhood design. Understanding functions serve as the quality of space and define the degree of communal activities between the residents.

The goals of my study are two-fold: one, examine the functions of ‘migrants’ spontaneous-developed neighborhood’ in the adjustment of a rural migrant population; two, to explore the functions combined with the places that make the same transitional spaces places where close-knit communal activities occur in naturally-developed migrant low-rent housing and others conversely absent of communal activities. The spatial function as a function establishes the communal sharing as a foundation for communal activities. From the planning and policy perspectives, however, there is little understanding of why most migrant residents experience close-knit communal activities from living in the CZC of China, what do their communal activities derive from? The planning researchers and professionals failed to consider the function combined with the three transitional spaces as a function that forms the basis of the communal activities. For rural-to-urban migrant residents, they require more thoughtful consideration in locating migrants’ demands for these communal activities that are congruent to migrants’ collective lifestyle in
the low-rent housing neighborhood. Supposedly for this reason, any neighborhood that ignores its inherent lifestyle cannot in fact lead to a satisfactory residential experience. Modern low-rent housing standards are compared to the migrants’ spontaneous low-rent neighborhoods and they mirror the value pattern of these professionals. This is instead of using rural-to-urban migrants’ way of life to assist them in improving their accommodation problems.

Accordingly, this study explores 3 different low-rent housing projects in China to concentrate on how communal activities are presented in the spatial forms of the transitional space. Following the findings of a migrants’ spontaneous low-rent neighborhood, this study elucidates two major elements to establish communal activities as a physical basis. To be precise, this study elucidates the nature of the sharing of the available functions as the real reason why spatial characteristics of the three spaces merge with the high level of communal activities. The function combined with the spaces acts as a basis for the formation of the communal activities.

By reference to a modern low-rent neighborhood, the intention is to show that if a place fails in communal activities in the 3 same transitional spaces, it is not due to a lack of people or lack or open places, but because the transitional spaces do not serve a provided function for residents to establish the foundation for communal activities. The provided functions, such as cooking, storage, water, airing-laundry, restroom, bathing, laundry, education, employment agency, concern not only the relationship of residents to the respective spaces, but also establish a relationship between resident and resident. Accordingly, the essence of the communal activities is the sharing of ‘function’ among residents.

1.2 Organization of the dissertation

The main argument of this study is this: the rural-to-urban migrants living in
low-rent housing lead a place-attached neighborhood-centered life. With this in mind, when considered, migrant preferences for a given neighborhood should be consistent with their own ‘collective shared community’ lifestyle. The concepts of ‘in front of the rental room’, ‘in front of the rental house’ and ‘between the rental houses’ provide a clear pattern that helps to highlight the people-place communal activities style. The three places are defined as physical settings which are representatively owned by individuals or migrant groups and used habitually for their communal activities.

Accordingly, the method of this research is founded on the idea that a consciousness of rural migrants’ own lifestyle is a useful way to understand the need for reciprocal communal activities which can lead to the design of appropriate migrant low-rent housing environments. The 1st chapter gives an overview of rural-to-urban Chinese migrants’ neighboring and neighborhood sentiments in their low-rent housing. The essence of the argument in the 1st chapter is that migrant neighborhoods are more than a gathering of low-rent houses, and that migrants’ rich communal activities in their neighborhood are essential and noteworthy by themselves. With earlier studies concentrating on making methods for a functioning place with rich communal activities, it is discussed here why reciprocal neighboring relationships are important to construction in low-rent housing areas. Moreover, there is a review of the literature, and the theories of space and place which deliver and help to comprehend many methods of describing and investigating migrants’ low-rent neighborhoods.

In the 2nd chapter, methodological approaches are presented and used to assemble and examine data in this study. This research follows a case study approach to form an information collection framework to find practical comprehension of communal activities in Chinese low-rent housing neighborhoods. The research method is based on field observations, semi-group surveys and questionnaire interviews and was developed to allow practical study to be done in a clear and
replicable manner. These data assortment methods come together to allow us to examine diverse features of physical qualities, activities, and the connotations of the recent low-rent situation.

Chapters 3 and 4 discusses how migrants’ low-rent housing neighborhoods have emerged, been built and their residents have settled down in China. Comparing low-rent housing spatial characteristics with their evolution from traditional village-based neighborhoods (CZCs) to contemporary high-rise housing neighborhood (Lianzufang) typology, I find that the CZC neighborhoods in China are characterized by the expressed reciprocal shared communication in physical settings. I also find that the high-rise apartment neighborhoods in China are becoming the dominant low-rent type, and a study of sustaining the communal activities is currently important in China. Also according to the findings, such communal activities in China have gradually faded from the village-based CZCs to the high-rise low-rent neighborhoods.

With this as a context, the 5th, 6th and 7th chapters are devoted to the presentation of three case studies of social production in low-rent migrants’ habitat (Yimuyuan neighborhoods of Beijing, low-rent housing in Chongqing and the Vanke Tulou in Guangzhou). These cases are not narrowed down to simplify the house cases, but they comprise also their neighborhoods in a complete community scale. In the Yimuyuan neighborhood in Beijing city, residents indicate that they perceive communal activities among residents when they visit and do exchanges of help with neighbors, or observe and come across ordinary daily activities in everyday destinations in their neighborhoods. But indeed the informal and sharing of communication, specifically high-rise neighborhood based, provides less support for migrant groups as shown in the low-rent housing case in Chongqing city. In addition, migrant tenants’ awareness of the degree (high/low) of communal activities is demonstrated through spatiality and regular visits.
In the eighth chapter, we conduct a comparative study of the spatial configuration in the three case studies and the results illustrate that communal activities are expressed in different degrees through an accumulation of daily life events in the 3 typical low-rent housing structures. This chapter claims that satisfactory low-rent housing for migrants is supposed to be consistent with the rural-to-urban migrants’ lifestyle and their own relationship with the communities around them. Furthermore, the way in which these places with communal activities have roles in migrants’ daily lives is shown. Finally, a general conclusion is presented showing the communal activities that are significant for migrants, and communal activities emerge through the tenants’ daily lives and effective arrangements of spatial elements in those everyday activities.

Therefore, the chief objective of this dissertation is to study the factors and spatial planning influencing rural-to-urban migrant residents’ communal activities in low-rent housing neighborhoods and how the lessons learned from the case studies pave the way for a future pattern for low-rent housing. It describes how low-rent migrants’ rental housing construction ought to preserve communal activities in a residential place for rural-to-urban migrants.

1.3 Research questions

A wide variety of ‘city beauty’ activities is unceasingly practiced and the national gentrification concern is also covered in the low-rent neighborhoods. The main topic of my discussion focuses on the factors and spatial patterns influencing rural-to-urban migrant residents’ communal activities in low-rent housing neighborhoods, at the neighborhood level. It also shows how the lessons learned from the three case studies provide grounds for a recommended new pattern for low-rent neighborhoods. To add value to an earlier study on social concerns in low-rent
housing development, planning issues relevant to architectural and urban design are included as one research subject on low-rent housing development in China.

Migrants’ low-rent residential areas in China have experienced large scale recent redevelopment. From the demolition of CZCs to the new construction of low-rent apartments, few studies of low-rent migrants’ neighborhood development have been proposed to create migrant lodging areas with a rich variety of communal activities. The term community sense here is defined as various forms of social interaction (neighboring and neighborhood sentiment). In the Chinese migrants’ background, the neighborhood mainly refers to a small residential compound or taller and denser apartment estates in China. It goes with the daily life on streets in neighborhoods, for instance visiting and the exchange of help beyond one’s immediate neighborhood.

In China, low-rent housing forms have moved from urban village-based to high-rise units. The two different housing conditions draw attention and interest to a discussion concerning migrant residents’ preferences in their low-rent housing neighborhoods. Nevertheless, whether the current low-rent housing developments are in keeping with residential preferences has been rarely researched. Meanwhile, the current low-rent neighborhood designs propose the standard notions for accommodating migrants. As a matter of fact, among the housing and services that the government has been providing is the mere provision of housing founded on specialists’ know-how, low-rent community planning and its physical arrangement which require balance with migrants’ awareness regarding the community sense in their neighborhood from their own perspectives.

As life in a neighborhood involves dialogue between migrants (users) and their environment, migrants are essentially the real users in the abodes that experts plan for. My discussion identifies the ‘fitting’ design methods of low-rent housing development, which are behaviorally and cognitively ‘fitting’ to a group of rural-to-
urban migrants. The data for this research has come from a survey and self-observation, my discussion examines the current Chinese migrant and migration situation, and compiles features of low-rent housing and finally equates it to what has been argued by architects and researchers.

This main concern is discussed through three questions in my study:

1. **What are the causes of high levels of communal activity in migrants’ spontaneously-developed low-rent housing compared with the other two modern low-rent forms of housing?**

2. **What is the spatial pattern that generates the formation of communal activities?**

3. **How do the lessons learned from the three case studies provide grounds for the future pattern of low-rent housing?**

The major and minor areas outlined above have been used to understand the features of Chinese migrants’ low-rent neighborhoods and to learn about the development of the migrant housing process. Finally, I seek to find the relevant responses that can suggest a valid form of low-rent neighborhood design and place communal activities in migrant rental housing.

### 1.4 Research methodology

According to Jacobs, the most significant constituent of community sense is a rich street life. Neighborhoods that are planned to inspire people to use the streets, or to look out at what goes on in them, make desired lodgings for habitation, work, and provide fun. This part argues how to make migrants’ residential places rich with communal activities.
Referring to Canter’s place model, to achieve a livable and meaningful place, three dimensional experiences of places are emphasized. They are: (1) spatial structure, (2) activities and (3) perception. Those three components, then, are not separate features in a place, but inter-connected elements that help to generate a place. By means of this connection of three components in a place, Canter clarifies how this place model can arise in an examination of urban redevelopment. When urban redevelopment causes major changes in spatial characteristics and those changes can be identified, meanings in relation to those spatial alterations can be recognized and people’s activities can be tied to the spatial changes and in doing so various meanings in the place can be identified.

The three spatial experiences which are reflected are of different theories that are vital to residents’ communal activities in their residential environment and can be extracted from the analysis. These three components can also be understood as general guidelines to energize a place with residents’ communal activities.

This study uses Canter’s place model for forming data collection framework to understand physical characteristics and to find practical evidence for comprehending the residents’ communal activities in rural-to-urban migrants’ low-rent housing neighborhoods. To triangulate this study of transitional places in the low-rent housing, each component in Canter’s place model can be used to support elucidation of the level of communal activities and the awareness of place vitalization in these migrants’ low-rent neighborhoods. Moreover, Montgomery (1998) uses the same three components to define how activities and places are formed at the city level. Punter’s (1991) work is more supportive than Canter, as he delivers more detail on

---
both the components of the built form (townscape, landscape, structure, permeability) and for meaning or imageability (legibility, cultural associations, perceived functions and qualitative assessments); but even these need to be unpacked further to be of practical benefit.\(^\text{12}\)

The study attempts to examine migrants’ communal activities through questionnaires and interviews. There are three samples, migrants from the urban-village-based neighborhood and migrants from prevailing high-rise low-rent housing and ones from Vanke Tulou made by private real estate developers. Also, in the context of migrants’ low-rent neighborhood development, this research of migrants’ regular gatherings seeks to learn people’s perceptions based on the environmental settings. The migrants’ views were gathered by conducting a survey which comprised a qualitative method and some quantitative methodology. In a succeeding survey, questions about communal activities and neighboring were involved in closed and open-ended answers.

Such settings and the characteristics of the three different migrant housing and neighborhoods are the chief subjects for comprehending how migrant users observe communal activities and why the different perceptions emerge in their neighborhoods. This research uses three important levels of man-environment relationship which are essential components for comprehending the communal activities in migrants’ low-rent housing neighborhoods. They are:

1. **Spatial structure:** what the physical parameters of that setting are

2. **Activities:** what behavior is associated with, or it is anticipated will be housed in, a given locus

3. **Peoples’ perception**: the descriptions, or conception, which people hold of that behavior in that physical environment

As a built neighborhood, Chinese low-rent housing comprises three elements. Each element model can be used to support interpretation of the perception of communal activities in migrants’ neighborhoods.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 1.1.** Revitalization of place as the convergence of spatial structure, activities, and perceptions

Figure 1.2. Research method and information collection approaches within Canter’s place model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Research Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do emotions impact the level of comfort and perceived control for long-term housing?</td>
<td>1. Focus on spatial practices in long-term house in relation to comfort and control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why is the spatial form of housing in the form of communal apartments more preferred?</td>
<td>2. Explore the reasons for the preference for communal apartments among long-term housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do the emotional and social aspects of communal apartments influence comfort and perceived control?</td>
<td>3. Identify the emotional and social factors that contribute to comfort and control in communal apartments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Methodology**

- **Components**
  - Percents
  - Methods
  - General

**Components of the Method**

- **Data Analysis**
  - Descriptive
  - Inferential
  - Qualitative

The above components in Canter’s place model can be understood as general methodologies to analyze the research questions related to comfort and control in long-term housing.
1. **Spatial structure:** This means physical components of the residence, accordingly, how a person or a group of persons display attachment in relation to a physical environment. ¹³ Simply speaking, what the characteristic of environment is.

Regular living repetition and usual movement is encompassed in the everyday life in a given area. Everyday life is a part of the behaviors of a place and ought to be comprised so as to create a place. ¹⁴ Bakker and Bakker-Rabdau (1976), define a territory as ‘different approaches to create a place, actually, in terms of architectural design issues, daily activities and experiences are rarely connected, despite these experiences being usually discussed within psychological and geographic fields. Such research could shed light on considerations for low-rent housing, which involve designing a migrants’ residential place and planning a spatial area, to cultivating activities and communal activities in a place. Housing design and study needs to take into account daily performances and activities from and in a place of constituents for themselves. Daily life is present whether people select to observe it or not.

Correspondingly, life on the street, and life between buildings are crucial elements of everyday life that are required to increase the communal activities in an urban place. For example, the street life in Jacobs’ understanding pays attention to how streets are planned within houses and streets to present how communal activity emerge in a neighborhood or in an area. ¹⁵ One observation in Jacobs’ book, is in a neighborhood, street life shows that people do not normally follow the direction of activities that designers and administrative planners predicted. It would be

---


particularly interesting to enquire into the relationships between migrants and migrants’ neighborhoods. Mostly, migrant neighborhoods have different current built-up backgrounds, and they are able to generate different forms of experiences. Regarding present settings and activities, different neighborhoods or different areas would naturally produce diverse street life, activities on the street and they can produce crucial descriptive references according to the degree of a community sense and can reflect its appearance in daily life outside in the streets.

Furthermore, a neighborhood with a community sense can be re-formed and experienced through everyday life. As formulated by Gans (1961), events in daily life are witnessed as signs of communal and spatial settings in a place. In the sense of Certeau’s (1988) arguments, daily experience can be self-governing within an intended and proposed physical place. Therefore, such research of community sense can bring forth proposals for migrants’ residential space, daily life can be an optimistic re-generator of a neighborhood and a characteristic of inhabitants.

Spatial examinations in migrants’ low-rent housing developments are founded on records from my own observation and drawing. Site plans of the three housing neighborhoods were established from web-based public media and construction company websites. Aerial photos were from Google Map images (http://maps.google.com). Data collection approaches are: drawn arrangements of migrants’ spatial housing in the 3 low-rent neighborhoods from collected plans and photos (collected plans, visual field maps, and building pattern maps).

Through such strategies, migrants’ spatial housing features are examined concerning their socio-cultural characteristics. In particular, this research attempts to

---

figure out the bond between spatial facets and migrant tenants’ actions and awareness in the progress of Chinese low-rent housing neighborhoods.

Documenting of assortment methods for physical characteristics is summarized as follows:

- *Drawing layouts of spatial characteristics that are in the three residential spaces in each low-rent neighborhood from collected plans and pictures*
- *Drawing schematic diagrams of the spatial elements from my own living experience and daily field-observations*

2. **Activities:** This signifies what activities are associated with, or it is anticipated will be housed in a given environment. Simply speaking, what behavior will happen in a certain place or how it will be perceived in residents’ communal activities in general. That is, what behavior will happen in a certain place or how it is perceived.

   Jacobs clarified that, social communications in daily life frequently nurture peoples’ reciprocal relationships and communal activities. The time spent in a neighborhood thus can be observed in a certain piece of the environment which houses diverse social interactions or activities. Individual migrants and their groups feel their way through their residential neighborhood in activity orbits, (such as, talking, resting, moving around, shopping, cooking and meeting). These daily activities create emotional connection with certain places, directions, and nodes, so in general, migrant residents’ movement circles and accessibility to expected social and amenity destinations are other aspects of residents’ community sense.

---

Gehl (1996) identifies the integrative strategies of outdoor activities in public neighborhoods that include necessary activities, optional activities and social activities. According to Gehl’s explanation, a person’s availability to public contact, whether intended or needed (going to school or to work, shopping, waiting for traffic, running errands) or unintentional/elective (taking a walk, staying outside for fresh air, standing around enjoying life) or social activities (greeting and conversations, communal activities among friends and relatives), organizes a set of consistent catalogues between his/her socially defined aspirations and manifest behavior. Individuals establish affective relationships with particular urban places through the spatial activity patterns generated by communication with their communal references. The nature or person’s social relationships prompts him/her to attach different significances to the routes taken, to the nodes at which communication happens, and to the areas related to specific occasions and situations.

The three activity patterns represent the combination of a physical setting and its level of ‘availability’ for social interaction. More clearly, the physical distance implies a place of human association. According to Forrest and Yip (2007), the physical distance in a certain environment can influence the social and task interactions among the people in it. Primarily this influence involves the relative accessibility of interaction and the psychological and social interpretation of such interactions. Neighborhood design seeks to create opportunities so that residents can have communal activities in this area, and meanwhile the physical availability to the function in the certain environment can restrict the frequency and quality of the communal activities.

I observe migrants’ activity and lifestyle and conducted a survey of the selected 3 low-rent housing neighborhoods. Outlining migrants’ activities during the interview, the daily events in these communities and photo-taking are the main information assortment methods for understanding migrants’ lifestyle and their movement.

The information about their activities, and a cognitive map of their neighboring were included in interviews with migrants. Concerning areas with communal activities in their cognitive maps, migrants’ everyday regular paths were analysed closely. Their communal activities refer to the respondents’ own interactions with neighbors: visiting (Chuanmen in Chinese) and reciprocal relationships (Lishang wanglai). For example, ‘visiting’ regards unplanned or intended communications, officially speaking, to drop by neighbors’ houses. A reciprocal relationship is explained simply as mutual support in daily contacts. Both of the normal phenomena are often seen in traditional neighborhoods where neighbors’ contact proceeds under exceptional circumstances.

Documenting assortment methods for communal activities is summarized as follows:

- Mapping the kinds of daily residential activities
- Observing residents’ communal activities in the corresponding spatial environment

3. **People’s perception:** this presents users’ perceptions of their physical living area and it has a clear relationship with the other significant dimensions of their environment. In short, how users think about activities and physical components in this area.
Some visual involvements from the environment construct a simple order, easily comprehensible, while other visual involvements lead to a more complex order, according to the diversity and surprise requirements of the observer. Both visual involvements are complementary and have to be united in the same environment. The combined or prevailing things afford various representative concepts to the members of the neighborhood. These cultivate communal activities in a given area.

A home, a neighborhood, a landscape, or a city can all be gifted with a representative meaning which exceeds their features as physical objects. Such representation always has two central properties. First, by description, a concept generally has an unseen and an obvious implication. For example, a corner in a street means a spatial node, and an unseen definition of a meeting point for people, or a spatial area where people can stop to see and hear the people walking. The representative concept is considered as the design value that has different environmental consciousness from the research of Groat (2000).

A place with a community sense includes an accumulation of daily experiences and involvements in everyday life. A neighborhood presents a diverse set of conceptions that summarize the perspectives of earlier practice, current attitudes, or forthcoming objectives of a people. As follows, the value of a neighborhood can be defined as converting residents’ unclear sentiments, incoherent impulses and consciousness into a collective-symbolic ownership, a habitual use for social interaction, a consistently shared perception and cooperative activities. Especially

---

for rural-to-urban migrants, there is an indispensable portion of the endurance of subcultures and the need for habitation use for social bonds about which the outsider has little mentioning.

In representative spatial formation, the spatial range is another aspect in a low-rent urban neighborhood. The connection or route in spatially shaped areas is significant to express a spatial range. Cullen (1961), has instinctively seized and labeled the meaning of these qualities. The groups and terms which he has paid attention to have turned out to be recognized plan tools for meeting the urban setting needs visually, aurally, and emotionally, so, even though neighborhoods and neighborhoods design are alike, neighborhoods show an objective and neighborhood design that presents an instrument to accomplish that aim. In the same way that Cullen’s ‘visual complexity, contrast’, and above all, sequential image delivers the new graphic sequence to nurture communal activities. This opinion is likewise maintained by Rapoport and Kantor (1967).

The inherent representation of the neighborhood needs the clear perception of periphery. Their detailed characters, their illustrative landscapes, their references to the activity arrangement—all establish imperative rudiments of the representative perception of the neighborhood. The emotional and behavior distinction in the permeability of the sequences of borders from the private lodging part to the communal lane influence residents’ communal activities to the local area. The communal activities are expected to be rich and diverse when the permeability of the sequences of local boundaries is high, hence the observing degree of the whole boundary of a neighborhood and its character is stronger.

---

For the migrants’ communal activities under the physical neighborhoods of form and space, evidence facts assemblage methods comprise of a questionnaire of in-depth and open-ended meetings. Migrant tenants were asked to draw cognitive maps and interviews were carried out with migrant tenants in Chinese low-rent housing communities.

Documenting assortment methods for residents’ perception is summarized as follows:

- Drawing cognitive images from residents
- Filling out questionnaires and the interviewing of residents

This questionnaire set is made up of the explanation of this study, and migrant respondents’ simple personal information forms. For their cognitive maps, residents are required to draft a chart of their neighborhood, i.e. their rental house, key areas and spaces where they visit mostly and to draw their typical-day path in their neighborhood.

The data acquisition process was through both field observations and a questionnaire survey. 16 questions were included in the questionnaire (see Appendix 4). Four types of statistics were required. First, three questions were put to elicit publically-acknowledged and private information (Q1). Questions regarding interviewees’ length of habitation (Q2) and their former residences before the current neighborhood (Q3).

Second, 5 questions were conceived to gather the information concerning interviewees’ awareness of their current neighborhoods, specifically concentrating on interviewees’ ‘communal activities’ and attachment to their neighborhood area, as follows:
- Reasons to move into this neighborhood (Q4)
- First impressions of hearing about living in this neighborhood (Q5)
- Sequence of places where you meet your neighbors and friends (Q6)
- Neighborly relationship in this neighborhood (Q7)
- Degree of attention to community involvement (Q8)

Third, 3 questions were asked to collect information regarding migrant tenants’ sense of belonging to their community. Question 9 (Q9) regarding the tenants’ feeling for the area as a ‘home to live in’. Another question (Q10) asked the reasons for staying in this neighborhood. And question 11 (Q11) refered to their consciousness of the significance of this neighborhood for them.

Finally, 5 questions focused on the kinds of spatial behavior perceived by tenants through knowing, visiting, and helping their neighbors.

- From what perspective is your rental area an ideal place to continue living in for you (Q12)
- Neighborhood quality according to detail (Q13)
- Level of acquaintance with neighbors (Q14)
- Frequency of visiting neighbors (Q15)
- Frequency of helping neighbors (Q16)

A comparative analysis was designed with the intention of answering the research questions. A three inner-city low-rent neighborhood in three of China’s largest cities were selected for this purpose. The study areas were exclusive in their own character and there were three separate but independent comparisons: (1) a comparison of spatial characteristics in the three spatial forms; (2) corresponding communal activities taking place in the same places and (3) a comparison of migrants’
residential perceptions in the three low-rent neighborhoods. The three comparisons made it possible to conduct an accurate corresponding result about the communal activities in Chinese current low-rent housing neighborhoods.

The research method was based on my own living experiences, field observation and questionnaire survey and was developed to allow the empirical study to be done in a clear, objective, and replicable manner. The results of the analyses in relation to the spatial pattern of the three spaces and the corresponding communal activities are shown.

1.5 Three case studies of low-rent neighborhoods in China

Migrants’neighborhoods are chosen according to the different residential categories in the low-rent housing context (Figure 1.3). The collection strategies for selecting typical samples in the low-rent housing are:

1. Site—big city where most migrants concentrate in China and there’s usually one such neighborhood per city

2. Scale—287-17700 units (number of rental room units)

3. Neighborhood environment—low-rises and high-rise apartments and single apartment neighborhoods

4. Regional type—down town-pattern, suburb-pattern, and urban fringe-pattern

Three low-rent housing neighborhoods are studied as migrants’settlement developments in China: Yimuyuan low-rent neighborhood in Beijing, Minxin Jiayuan low-rent neighborhood in Chongqing, and Vanke Tulou low-rent neighborhood in Guangdong City. Yimuyuan neighborhood is based on the villages located close to the center of the city, from single or low-rise (2-5 floors) housing,
Minxin Jiayuan low-rent projects form a government subsidized high-rises apartment estate built on the periphery of the city, and the last case study Vanke Tulou project comprises 6-storied circular housing located on the margins of the town.

Furthermore, Yimuyuan and Minxin jiayuan neighborhoods have a large number of rental residential units: correspondingly, approximately 1000 and 17700. Comparably, the Vanke Tulou apartment estate have a relatively smaller number of accommodation units: 287 exactly.

The three cases are clearly distributed into three regional categories: down town-pattern, suburb-pattern, and urban fringe-pattern. The Beijing Yimuyuan case belongs to the down town-type CZC as it is situated adjacent to the central district of

Figure 1.3. Three cases of low-rent housing in China
Beijing and is one of the largest and naturally-developed rural-to-urban migrants’ spontaneously-developed housing in Beijing. The Minxin Jiayuan high-rise project is located in a district on the city margins, and it is the first Chinese government subsidized low-rent high-rise project (Lianzufang). The Vanke Tulou house is located quite far from city area that this project has fewer maigrant comparatively and was built by private developers.

The migrants’ perceptions were collected through field observation and face-to-face interviews. The total sample included a total of 100 heads of households, who were asked about items in neighboring and communal activities. Accordingly, the results omitted contain inadequate constituents and the refusal proportion was roughly 10%. In total, 50 surveys of each case study were conducted.

Yimuyuan CZC, as one of the most important and most common migrants’settlements in China, is situated in the central region of Haidian district (between 4th and 5th northwest beltways) in Beijing city where the biggest migrants-accepting city is located. There is a big wholesale market and the biggest electronic market (plaza) around it, so a large number of migrant workers are centralized and live in their rental houses in this neighborhood. A big bus terminal is located beside Yimuyuan CZC, which offers convenient transit to those lodging there but who work in other places.

The Minxin Jiayuan low-rent project in Chongqing city is much bigger in size than Yimuyuan CZC. It is located on the urban fringe of JiangBei district, North of Chongqing. The Chongqing international airport is 10 minutes driving distance from this neighborhood. The design of this project was carried out in 2010, and it was finished by developers after 2 years (2012). Minxin Jiayuan project is a typical low-rent housing neighborhood in China in terms of scale, architecture pattern and design of service supply.
Vanke Tulou is a representative low-rent low-rise apartment block designed and built by private real estate developer. Its location is absolutely on the outskirts and outside of the main area of the large city of Guangzhou in the Guangdong province of China. The units are occupied by rural-to-urban migrants. The project is located next to a major highway, approached by a dirt road on land that lies at one end of the entire housing scheme.

In the analysis of these case studies I will examine usage of the transitional spaces. Transitional spaces in this study include: in front of the rental room, in front of the rental house and between the rental houses.
Chapter 2. Overview of Rural-to-Urban Migrant Community (Nongmin gong) and Migrants’ Low-Rent Housing History

This study tries to categorize the functions generated by the spatial composition of rural-to-urban migrants’ collective settlements in their destination cities in China, as adaptations of the rural migrants’ hometown communities. The spatial arrangements and inner functions of migrants’ settlements development in China follows three phases: the entry of rural migrants, the formation of migrants’ spontaneously-developed neighborhood, and the demolition of

Table 2.1. Rural-to-urban migrant populations in China, 1990-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rural-to-urban migrant worker population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The red column refer to all rural migrants without local ‘hukou’ where they are living

migrants’ neighborhood with the emergence of high-rise low-rent apartments in cities.

2.1 Rural-to-urban migrant community (*Nongmin gong*)

This chapter traces how the classification ‘floating population’ was formed and analyzes its cultural meanings. Turning migrants into ‘internal strangers’ in the cities is not a one-way process completely controlled by the state. Much of the studies on Chinese rural-to-urban migration reduce members of the rural community to stereotypes grounded on generation in the procedure of adjustment, like the first and second generations.

This suggests the process of transformation relates to the different migrating stages of rural migrant residents. The second generation of migrants is seen as more capable of assimilating than others while the first generation of the rural migrant community brings the stereotype of an ethnically homogeneous community which is strongly dedicated to rural and Chinese traditional lifestyles, opinions, morals and values, and is resistant to adjustment during migration.

The majority of rural migrant interviewees perceive themselves as ‘internal aliens’ or ‘strangers’ in the cities, generating an off-farm community. For Chinese rural-to-urban migration, it is not a physical transition from one geographical rural area to another urban area.

2.1.1 From rural to urban area

Population movement is not new, however the rural-to-urban migration in China has reached unheard-of levels (Table 2.1). ‘All the world seems to be on the
move’, as stated by Sheller and Urry (2006). However, this migration also has a vibrant element in China, especially since most fast-paced urbanized cities face similar issues of people’s fluidity. The word ‘relocation’ originally referred to human movement. Rossi (1980) describes a ‘human move’ as:

![Figure 2.1. Volumes of inter-provincial migration within and among regions, 1990](image)

Note: The figures clearly reveal the volume of inter-provincial migrants amid South, Central, North and West China. All flows have increased in volume, with the most pronounced flows within the eastern district and those from the central and western regions to the eastern region.
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[...] a shift in address [...] involving a shift in location through space that can vary from a few feet in the case of a shift from one apartment or room to another within a structure to thousands of miles to another country or from one end of the country to the other. 29

The massive movement of people, especially migration from rural to urban areas, has been part and parcel of the tremendous economic and social transformation within China over the past three decades (Figure 2.1 and 2.2).

Figure 2.2. In-migrant and out-migrant population rate by inter/intra-provincial place, China, 2012

Source: Chinese Census report (2012)

According to the sixth national census conducted in 2010, China had a mainland population of 1.34 billion, 73.9 million more than 2000, and more than 260 million were on the move, living away from the place of their hukou. The number of residents in the capital who have come from other regions of China has doubled to 7.045 million, accounting for 35.9 per cent of the city’s total residents. Gu Yanzhou, deputy director of the Beijing municipal bureau of statistics said 10 years ago (2001), one in five Beijing residents was a migrant. Today (2011) it is estimated that one third of those living in the capital are of non-Beijing origin, that is, almost 7.74 million are classified as outsiders. Among these flow-in inhabitants, 22.1 per cent (1.56 million) are of Hubei origin; 13.9 per cent (0.98 million) hail from Henan province; 8.5 per cent (0.60 million) come from the Shandong area, and Anhui, Heilongjiang, Hubei and Sichuan migrants occupy 0.43, 0.40, 0.34 and 0.33 million people respectively. What this means in terms of sending and receiving places is, the localized Beijing citizens have become ‘natives’ in the receiving places and, hosts to the floating population flooding in from the sending areas of China.

In fact, there are two main causes for the increase in mobility in China, the first is the Chinese government’s policy of relaxing controls on population movement from rural provincial areas to quicken urbanization; the second is the attraction of employment, education, business opportunities and a higher standard of living in the cities. Since the early 1980s more than 15 percent of the country’s population has lived in places other than their home settlements, towns, or cities. However, the massively diverse destinations among such migrants characterize the awkwardness of their internal transitional experiences.

Our research provides an examination of the migrant worker community through three phases they undergo for survival, namely: confrontation, transformation and assimilation. A number of factors make China’s rural-urban migrants more like immigrants from developing to developed counties than internal migrants within a developing country. For example, there is a large gap in income, and distinctly different cultural values, and living standards exist between the areas of origin and destination. More importantly, there are restrictions preventing or obstructing migrant settlements in terms of selecting destinations, ranging from labor market discrimination to China’s household registration (hukou) system—a de facto internal passport system.\(^{32}\)

In fact, the hukou system segregating migrants from the urban population may be a much more significant factor than cultural barriers in accounting for migrant marginality and denial of their citizenship rights. In the case of China’s inner migration, Hukou ‘identity’ (the household registration system) places people spatially with a rigid institutional hierarchy.\(^{33}\) Stonequist, for instance, believes that being within the orbit of double hierarchal cultural milieus can result in inner strain and malaise, a feeling of isolation, of not quite belonging.\(^{34}\) Hence, the term ‘psychological marginality’ has been coined to define such awkwardness in their new urban environments. Chinese migrants can be depicted in the following way: ‘they come in peasants and leave marginalized people’ due to their constantly drifting life.\(^{35}\)

\(^{32}\) Because of its entrenchment of social strata, especially as between rural and urban residency status, the Hukou system is often regarded as a caste system of China.


It is contended here at the outset, as proposed in the abstract, that China’s internal migrants experience hardship akin to those undergone by overseas immigrants. Migration is not ‘ready-made’ but instead it is a part of one’s life that endures and has relevance for years and generations to come. Another understanding could define rural-to-urban migrants as a socio-economically marginal group, accompanied with restricted entitlements to all kinds of Chinese urban public services. For example, the majority of rural-to-urban migrants are concentrated spatially in the city’s suburbs—CZCs. These CZCs are occupied by both permanent suburban inhabitants and migrants who rent rooms from such suburban inhabitants. On the one hand, the city seems to supply negative prospects for their integration into urban neighborhood life, and migrants use their own way to form their separate enclaves which vary to a certain extent according to different CZCs. On the other hand, certainly informal and mutual assistance, mostly neighborhood-based, can be a significant sustenance for these vulnerable social communities.

In Chinese cities, one key to successful integration could be their social relationships with local destination cities, but little is known about this facet of their lives. The normal awareness is that they are extremely floating and normally they are less committed to local neighborhood life in their destination cities. The actual impression of ‘mobile community’ depicts how rural migrants have long been thought of, and logically we consider them to have a low level of sociability and community involvement.

2.1.2 From farmers (Nongmin) to rural migrants (Nongmin gong)

At the regional level, the rural/urban division is highly confronted by the deep-seated assumptions of the pattern of urbanization, as Jones (1997) claims,\(^{39}\) namely that urbanization has essentially to do with the psychological detachment of rural and urban existence and daily routines, and the spatial location of the proletariat. Earlier, in evoking a precise understanding of urbanization, Wirth (1938)\(^{40}\) also captured the challenges of such a change—it no longer signifies simply the process by which persons are involved in a place entitled ‘metropolitan’ and assimilated into its system of life. It denotes also the collective highlighting of the features characteristic of the manner of life which accompany the growth of cities, and lastly the varieties in the life patterns accepted in a city.

Adapting to such a shift toward urbanization is also reflected in Chinese migrants’ own situations. Owing to the strengthening of exterior and interior sensual stimuli in the city, in contrast to a rural environment, the city nurtures a condition where one must buffer him or herself from a continually varying atmosphere. Namely, lives turn out to be matter-of-fact, with little attention to emotional concerns. That sense of adherence to community of origin can be regarded as contributing to the floating population and its long-standing safekeeping may be maintained in exchange for cash remittances.\(^{41}\)

Due to their geographical movement, individuals encounter their own identities both combining and clashing with other identities that are significant to the self. Deaux (2009) claims that issues like individual choices, interpersonal encounters,
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and reconstruction of cognitive and passionate anchors are indispensable for accepting how floating populations become accustomed to a new destination and are composed of separate identities. These adaptive procedures are demonstrated by migrants themselves in terms of a series of strategies by which they mainly rely on to facilitate the transformation from being a local to being an outsider at the level of encounters between migrants and natives. Nevertheless, the so-called alternative strategies which are naturally engaged in to cope with the transition of self-definition can be classified into four groups: (1) from floating to permanent migration; (2) from leaving the land but not the countryside to leaving the land first and then the countryside; (3) from the first generation of migrants to the neo or second generation of migrants; (4) from temporary dweller to permanent resident.

2.1.2.1 ‘From leaving the field but not the village’ to ‘leaving completely both the field and the village’

The real life of a rural place is related to the farm work undertaken by peasants, but the truth is that many people defined as peasants have little experience of or have spent little time on agricultural activities. For example, in the rural areas of Jiangsu province, 55 per cent of the occupations of local peasants is in non-agricultural employment but they continue to dwell in villages, known as *litu bu lixiang*—leave the field but not the village. Such temporary migration or repeated migration by China’s first rural-urban workers was common because on one hand, the working area was close to the countryside, and on the other hand, they provided a significant contribution to household labor during the farming seasons.

This pattern of transitory labor flowing in-and-out, we might note, is concentrated in the Eastern part of China, the prosperous coastal regions. And labor migration is likely to be of the ‘leave completely the field and village’ pattern, *litu you lixiang*. This describes the rural migrants’ status as leaving behind their attachment to rural homesteads for their new lives in their host cities. The first condition gives rise to the maintaining of strong bonds with their community of
origin while the other type contributes heavily to their individualistic development, or to creating barriers to their long-term return home. The larger a migrant’s network of urban kinsmen becomes, the longer he remains away, and the higher tendency there is to permanent unreturning. As a result, due to the large number of the rural population who continue to flow into the steadily developing urban areas, despite the geographical distance, the urban employment structure has given way to a patchwork of variously labor-intensive areas in the city which appear like paddy fields of activity from a rural setting.

2.1.2.2 From first-generation migrant to second-generation migrant

In terms of age selection, the first migrants in our study are defined as people who experienced rural-urban migration in their 30s, starting in the 1980s with their hunt for labor work in the city. The second group of migrants was born after the 1980s. At present, the second rural-urban migrant generation occupies 58.4 per cent of the total rural-urban migrant population. This community, is now known as the ‘Second-generation migrants (Xinshengdai Nongmin gong) in China, in recognition of their reluctance to stay in rural areas and desire to start their own ‘gold rush’ after a basic education. Unlike the older generation of migrant workers, the majority of them experienced their passage into adulthood in the cities and hoped to become urbanites someday. The generation born in the 1980s who started their city migration journey just after finishing junior high school has followed a difficult pathway into adult life, experiencing a more unsteady labor-market casualization, and worsening housing-market circumstances. Certainly, their presence has been traced from initially being fortune seekers, and it has been argued that many of them are entering
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the social order through an in-between manner and have become more individualized in realizing their own happiness.

2.1.2.3 From floating to permanent settlement

In China, few scholars or policy makers recognize that Chinese rural migrant workers, *nonmingong*, have in fact predominantly formed permanent settled groups, *yimin*, within urban centers. This distinction designates the floating population as individuals who have never been categorized as neo urban settlers, *xinyimin*, remaining instead rural-to-urban transients, *zanzhuzhe*.

Within this description, the movement of people across rural or provincial borders has been assumed as a temporary relocation. However, during the past three decades, and especially nowadays, the second-generation migrants, *xinshengdai*, have shown their strong will and intention to become real urbanites permanently. From this perspective, the past decades witnessed the transformation of their definition of self – floating to permanent settlements. Solinger (1999)\textsuperscript{44} points out that for a Chinese conception, the ‘floating’ has been a matter of geographical temporary mobility (flowing in and out), rather than seeing themselves as ‘migrated’, *qianyi*, (they are not, and will not become, an eternally settled community). In contrast to the process of migration worldwide, purely moving from place of origin to a new destination and settling down there for a specific period is not regarded as migration in Chinese terminology.

2.1.2.4 From temporary dweller to permanent migrant

Throughout the period covered, almost 3.38 million migrants with their entire families have moved their residence away from their home areas and migrated to the

\textsuperscript{44} Solinger, D. J. (1999), ‘*Contesting Citizenship in Urban China: Peasant Migrants, the State, and the Logic of the Market*’. University of California Press, p. 251.
Substantial attention has been devoted to this family-based movement, while referring to seasonal migration as the ‘leave the field but remains in the rural area’ pattern. This presents strong evidence that the longer migrants stay in one city, the more likely they are to be reluctant to leave, and the more eager they are to become permanent migrants. In this case, permanent migration has in fact already occurred on the part of family migrants.

A migration decision-making process is also considered a family project; for men, this typically meant acquiring more financial assistance with an urban job; for women it meant emancipation in terms of traditional restrictions and household status. This does not mean that family migrants have lost interest in their original community, a great pool of research presents proof that social networks evolve around the triple sphere of ‘blood, kinship and geography’ even though there is a large geographical distance. Rural migrants rely on this triple-based relationship throughout their motive lives despite the geographical separation.

The proportion of permanent rural migrants in cities has been progressively growing, age, heredity membership, sibling order, rights to traditional titles, and so on have all been cited as significant determinants of who is most likely to stay at home; who leads the chain migration; and who will finally finish the household migration and the whole process of rural-to-urban movement. Likewise, other scholars have found that migrants mainly came from part of a limited-resource and dissatisfied stratification system, and their absence has in turn strengthened the semi or completely undeveloped village structure. Put starkly, the floating dwellers will

leave their rural community forever and finally evolve to be permanent migrants in their host urban areas.

I will now introduce and apply the term ‘invisible periphery’ to this study. This expression stems from what Michel Foucault proposes as the ‘techniques of the self’ concerning how people are perceived as ‘selves’ by ‘others’ (individuals) and ‘themselves’ (in society), and finally how they allow a separate ‘self’ to regulate their behavior, their attitudes to the mainstream. Thus, through this awareness, the community is projected within ourselves and shows who we are to ourselves and to other people. Individuals behave and act according to their day-to-day experiences within such guidelines. Following this, ‘invisible periphery’ can also be considered as a part of the emotional conflict through which rural migrants find their identity and self-esteem are weakened socially and psychologically by trying to blend easily into a new urban community.

From a migrants’ standpoint, working with one’s group in some form of collective action is more likely to be a choice. More specifically, ‘invisible periphery’ can be considered as a community that is experienced differently by locals and nonlocals. With perceivable differences, both locals and non-locals will locate their selves and others in their separate urban environments. Finally, this ‘invisible periphery’ influences their subsequent behavior physically and mentally. As an outsider, the invisible periphery reinforces emotional conflict and, in turn, rural migrants are further weakened by attempting to identify themselves as part of the existing urban fabric.

Reception in the majority of rural migrant destinations in China is reflected in widely different ways, ranging from willing acceptance from some local
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49 ibid.
governments to absolute refusal by certain local residents. Researchers have suggested that the source of the difficulty lies essentially with the government’s attitude to ‘non-natives’, particularly rural strangers, who are always treated with jaundiced eyes.

Correspondingly, rural migrant workers are vulnerable in the urban environment of China due to institution-based segregation regarding housing and because of the fact that they can be allocated by the government *Hukou* system to the poorest clusters or residential areas for living. Such conditions involve a low level of physical housing facilities, more restricted opportunities for residents, fewer opportunities at achieving financial success in society and a higher level of mental vulnerability as Plummer found in her study of poverty in Vientiane (2001).\(^{50}\)

The local population’s exclusive attitude and discriminatory segregation cannot merely be attributed to a lack of local facilities and resources, but also to the concern for security. The root cause for the difficulties that migrants face can be traced to one sole policy which was first introduced in the late 1950s, and which was intended to restrict the mobility of China’s population, namely, the household registration system, *Hukou*.\(^{51}\) However, its most weighty consequence is the creation of a potential hereditary system that has divided China’s agricultural and non-agricultural populations and effectively bound the peasantry to the land they tilled. The constraints of the *Hukou* system have in their own way caused a rural/urban segregation pattern to emerge. This segregation of residency status significantly disadvantages most migrants and relegates them to a second-tier ‘temporary’ civic status.


Even though the Chinese government emphasizes social harmony as a legal status leads to their vulnerability and social exclusion, such as having no right to social welfare or educational opportunities. Local governments tend to set stringent entrance conditions (credentials regarding their residence, employment, social insurance enrollment, birth planning policy compliance, and health conditions) to discourage rural migrants from accessing most welfare functions, such as the Minimum Living Security Scheme (zui di shenghuo baozhang jizhi), which can provide relief to poor residents, and housing support functions like Economic and Comfortable Housing (jingji shiyong fang) and Low-Rent Housing (lian zu fang), which can provide housing subsidies to individuals facing housing difficulties.\(^5\) The realization of local non-rural residential identity is accordingly a vital stage for the citizens considered migrants towards escaping the vulnerability they are confronted with and towards achieving a better living standard.

Furthermore, such discriminatory institutions in essence intensify geographical duality in China and have deepened the conflict between the city and the countryside.\(^3\) Such a reality, at the same time, toughens and shapes the identities of the outsiders. In addition, most migrants fail to seek assurance of their own worth from their host community. The social categorization of migrants as outsiders stems from these institutional obstacles which by extension entail exclusion from their place of origin.

This exclusion includes urban society’s rejection of specific groups of migrants, particularly off-farm migrants (which are most rural to urban migrants). Such


discrimination against migrant groups is mirrored in terms of urbanites’ attitude of exclusion, disparate treatment and refusal to build equivalent social relationships with the outsiders. What is more, the urban community bestows little social worth, recognition or sense of belonging on migrants. Therefore, for the floating migrants, their social links and community participation as well as their subjective awareness of social belonging are likewise discouraged or dampened due to being part of the invisible periphery.

2.2 Accommodating rural migrants (Nongmin gong) in China

The tenants (Nongmin gong) ‘migrating’ and ‘migrant’ signify the condition of mobility, and unstable inhabitation. Due to their unstable and changeable occupations, a large number of rural-to-urban migrants in China circulates and settles down between the city and their home village. Meanwhile, this creates a challenge for the destination cities to provide them with accommodation. Some of the concerns over housing these migrants have tended to be the chief motivation for the demand for new housing in China during recent years. The masses of young migrants flocking to the cities have created a more severe situation in the supply of low-rent housing. Admittedly, the number of second-generation migrants commonly outstrips that of their parent-generation migrants, earning enough money for their own use.

For such migrants, low-rent housing is the most common way to lower living costs. Therefore, one of the greatest methods is to look for low-cost lodging which makes the CZC in each city so attractive to both rural migrants and the urban poor. This is due to weak urban governance; for one thing, the local government lacks the ability to cope efficiently with the overwhelming demand for housing in the cities. Another fact is CZCs facilitate the livelihood of the present land-lost peasants, and the introduction of self-financed accommodation has been the most effective method to serve both the needs of migrants and the local government.
China is going through large-scale urbanization, specifically in the urban construction of housing estates. Currently, high-rise housing is the most common residential pattern in China. Furthermore, extension flourishing of low-rent housing (e.g. CZCs, public affordable housing, private-invested low-rent housing) might aid to fill the need for the availability of affordable housing in cities. That is to say, before the arrival of major reforms in urban comfortable housing functions, the presence of CZCs alludes to the complement of an innovative affordable answer to urban housing difficulties. With regard to the market for housing alternatives in China, since the late 1990s, the ‘Comfortable Housing Project’ (anju gongcheng) was launched in China; within 20 years, 5 million units of retitled ‘Economic and Affordable housing’ had been constructed (jingji shiyong fang).54 After one further year had passed, the government added another 5.9 million units; so in 2011, 10 million more units were built. Ultimately, the government seeks to provide affordable housing for 20% of China’s urban population by 2017, as reported as part of the 12th Five-Year (2012-2017) plan.55

In figure 2.3, it signifies the evolution stages of the low-rent housing neighborhood prototype in China. Figure 2.3 includes four parts in vertical order. The first figure clarifies that rural migrants’ spontaneous gather in neighborhoods, such as CZCs, was started from farming houses, or even before that from the cultivated land. The second photo illustrates that those farmland-based areas were developed by local farmers who lost their lands due to nation-wide urbanization, and then they changed from planting crops to building rental housing.

The cumulative rental building verticality, from one-story house upwards, surpasses the 4 to 6-story houses in the 1970s. The third figure represents the ripeness period of so-called migrants’ gathering in CZC neighborhoods and that the low-rises and high-dense apartments have become the main residential types of migrants’ rental housing in the majority of cities in China. The last right figure explains that the linking of the provisions of public rental housing with the destruction of CZCs has been made. Because the majority of CZCs are facing demolition due to a Chinese social movement, I call ‘demolishment for city beauty’. The Chinese government seeks redevelopment through a highly nationalist scripting of the gentrification process and practises thoroughly national CZC destructive actions. The official
media depict the migrant CZC enclaves as ‘chaotic dilapidated places’, and the government policy is to eliminate them through village redevelopment and slum clearance.

Clearly, existing CZC low-rent housing neighborhoods are going to be damaged and replaced by new, less dense, high-rise apartment stocks through redevelopment. Normally, such redevelopment is considered a promotion in dwelling conditions for rural-to-urban migrant tenants in China. In China, despite a number of migrants having benefited from housing policies that were introduced almost 10 years ago, it has often been reported that well-equipped and low-rent apartments built for migrants in many cities have encountered a chilly welcome from rural workers. Why is this? In terms of communal activities, first, the new living environment and neighborly relationship is quite different from the earlier residences constructed with the intention of meeting the rising request for low-cost housing for rural-to-urban migrants. Second, migrant tenants need time to adapt to the lessening community sense, although significant to traditional Chinese values, and it reduces the most popular residential verticality, and forms the inwardness of the contemporary-looking buildings.

The arising focus in this study centers on the communal activities supplied by the migrants’ low-rent housing. The key subject of my argument is to what degree have communal activities (visiting and reciprocal relationship with neighbors and place-attached neighborhood) been achieved by a different arrangement of migrants’ low-rental houses.

56 The People’s Daily and Xinhua Daily Telegraph. (2006), reported on the situations of two ‘migrant workers’ apartments’. According to the reports, the Changsha city government in Hunan Province made an investment to build 618 ‘migrant workers’ apartments’ in January 2005, but only 26 apartments have since been rented out. In late 2004, 4,800 apartments were built for migrant workers in Tianjin by Tianjin Port Development Holdings Ltd, but up to now they have attracted only 1,800 rural migrant workers.
2.3 Migrants’ spontaneously-developed neighborhood in China

Rural migrants enjoyed rich lives within their low-rent neighborhoods. Within these migrants established territorial claims—spontaneously-developed neighborhoods in China formed reciprocated benefit and fraternal societies that offer assistance to each other. These neighborhoods moderate the culture shock of migration and prepare the rural migrants to merge into the urban environment in China. It is presumed that the non-local or migrants’ enclaves (CZC) have been formed since non-local populations left other areas of China after 1978. From the 1970s to the 2010s, CZCs established themselves through three stages: commencement, expansion, and redevelopment. Each phase followed the expansion of China’s urbanization with the outcome that non-locals swarmed towards their city destinations in order to make their nest and live their Chinese dream.

The period of commencement occurred with the era of economic reform between the end of the 1970s and the middle of the 1990s. The period of maturity occurred from 1995 to 2010, and this is when the so-called CZC became in every sense a migrant community. However, simultaneously the cumulative negative side of the CZC as a source of the dark side of the city caused the government to be determined to eradicate and regenerate these areas starting in 2005 lasting up to the present.

2.3.1 Commencement (1970-1990)

Beijing is one of the major magnets for rural-to-urban migration in China. The first generation of rural migrants came into the Beijing area from the nearby surrounding areas. Rural workers in the provinces of Hebei and Henan constituted the majority of the earliest generation of rural migration population. Most of them
lived on the edge of the Beijing areas which were often inhabited by both permanent suburban residents and migrants who rented rooms from the locals.

They were generally seen by the urban public as temporarily displaced outsiders who would soon return to their rural origins. These new rural transients knew little about the power struggles in the surrounding environment. Most of them were married, only a few could speak standard mandarin due to their low educational background. When rural migrants first arrived in the suburban part of the Beijing area to search for a house to rent, they encountered a great deal of discrimination and rejection from local inhabitants. A number of migrants were eventually able to find a rental room, but the landlords could have them turned out or forced to return to the countryside by the police whenever they make any trouble for unexpected reasons. Rural migrants lived in the shadow of the law that defined them as an illegal floating population.
The traditional *Beijing* residential housing, called *siheyuan*, includes a courtyard with main room (*zhengfang*) and side rooms (*xiangfang*) (Figure 2.4). When they were asked to rent out their house to the rural migrants, at first, it was common for the locals to rent out only the side rooms to migrants while keeping the main rooms for themselves. Such spatial arrangements were representatively significant because they described and established the hierarchical relationship between the locals as the owners of the space and migrants, strangers as subordinate dwellers. Since then, the rural migrants have lived under the roofs of local farmers in the destination city.

*Beijing* Municipality encompasses 3,985 villages with 12,936 settlements (one village can be comprised of 2 or more settlements). The existing situation of rural settlements in *Beijing* is identified by the small size, scattered location and large

![Distribution of villages in Beijing](image-url)
differences in geographical conditions and economic development (Figure 2.5).\textsuperscript{57} China initiated its ‘Reform and Opening up’ (\textit{Gaige kaifang}) in December 1978. During the 1980s it is estimated that the total of the rural population was between one-tenth and one-third of the total of local population in the largest cities of China.\textsuperscript{58}

Apparently, this was a subtle indication of a completely novel feature of the financial growth in addition to the human capital structure of China. Development policies were expected, given the growing improvement of progress of transformation from central planning to a market-driven economy, to lessen the constraints on floating among the national people. A strong upsurge was perceived in the size of the inter-provincial migrant population who abandoned the soil and ventured into the megalopolises (Figure 2.6).

\textit{Different from the previously systematized movement of population and enforcement of job assignments from their local labor bureaus that characterized the first 30 years, now it is self-selected and motivated by the state’s economic growth strategy [...] People go where there are employment openings and high earnings.}\textsuperscript{59}

Furthermore, in the 1980s, bumper harvests and the need for urban construction formed the initial foundation of internal migration at inter-city and inter-provincial levels. Increased employment opportunities with higher incomes offered better living standards in the urban places compared to those in rural areas and became attractive to rural-urban migrants. In 1988 the State Council and the Ministry of labor put a stamp of approval on the outflow from the rural areas, this time with the

\textsuperscript{57} Zhao, Z. F. (2009), ‘Research on the \textit{Beijing} rural villages’ classification & development under urbanization’, \textit{The 4th International Conference of the International Forum on Urbanism (IFoU)}, Amsterdam.


national recommendation that provinces with disadvantaged populations ‘send’ their people\textsuperscript{60} and facilitated the movement nationally. The positive portrait inclined to migrants is relegated to fill in a narrow section of industries in frontline production that city residents distained to engage in, for example they were involved in construction as haulage men, and cleaners. In major in-migrant cities such as Beijing, Shanghai, Tianjin, Wuhan, Guangzhou, Shenyang, and Chengdu within just a few years, the aggregate quantity of the arrival population went from 12.6 per cent in 1984 to 22.5 per cent in 1987, to 25.4 per cent in 1994 on average.\textsuperscript{61}

\begin{figure}
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\caption{Rural-urban migration}
\flushleft{Note: total inward and outward migration by province, share of total inter-provincial outward migration. (2001-2005)}
\end{figure}


According to a *Beijing* census investigation,\(^\text{62}\) in 1978 approximately 218 thousand migrants came from outside of *Beijing* and elsewhere; a half a decade later, a study from early 1987 concluded that the large in-pouring of the floating population was up to 1.15 million, and in 1994, the floating population rose further to 3 million, reaching approximately one-third of the whole of *Beijing*’s inhabitants (10.63 million) with local household registration, increasing 3 million, 15 times compared to 1980;\(^\text{63}\) in 1997, it decreased to 2.85 million and 3.08 million increasing continuously in 2000.

However, continuing severe control over spatial movement and refusal to grant migrants the status of city dwellers, this together with the urban *hukou* discouraged them to adapt to their new locations. Due to these facts, the elongated high inflow of rural-*Beijing* migrants from their homeland to city destinations attracted discernible attention not only in terms of their new status (from peasants to low-skilled workers), but also even on their lodging claims.

In 1985, the Ministry of Public Security issued those migrants who stayed in a selected town for more than three months, a specific documentation, called Jizhu Zheng in Chinese, that is, a card for inhabitants accommodating with others. Severe control regulations toward outsiders had deterred rural migrants from acquiring permanent housing. Owning good accommodation was beyond the reach of these non-*Beijing* migrants and their peasant background in turn worsened their low status.

Following this, a greater number settled in the human beehive of places akin to,
and known colloquially as *Dixia shi* (basements), *Sushi* (boarding houses) and *Pengwu* (barracks) freely provided by their employers, and for construction workers in on-site vinyl houses. Moreover, the privately owned housing constructed by suburban farmers in the *chengxiang jiehe bu* rural-urban transitional precincts attributed to the sources of migrant accommodation as well.

In terms of the formation of migrant worker enclaves, non-local migrants experienced a dramatic variation in residents from scattered communities (*sanju*) to the relatively concentrated migrant neighborhoods (*jiju*), such as, *CZCs*. The relationship between the landlords of *sifang* and migrants has changed significantly over time. When migrants first arrived in *Beijing* to seek a domicile, they encountered all sorts of adversity. Their problems derived from the large amount of discrimination and rejection from local residents—*Beijing* outlying landlords. Subsequently, I select quotations that capture the characteristic sentiments recalled by the interviewed migrants in the book of *Strangers in the City* (2002). 64

 [...] Many local households thus refused to lease rooms to migrants they considered undependable, dangerous, and uncivilized. [...] when these (migrants) first arrived here, Beijing locals treated them like dogs. Many times when strangers knocked on their doors to ask if there was any space available for rent, they looked at them through a slightly open door as if they were a thief or beggar, then yelled: “Hey! You outsiders, get out of here”.

During this time, the *Beijing* housing market portrayed an ‘unwelcomed’ attitude to isolate outsiders from the non-locals. The majority of *Beijing* inhabitants considered engaging in private business (leasing for instance) as a rare and hazardous deed that could subject them to social criticism and pecuniary forfeits. While most farming households in suburban areas were still eking out a livelihood through agricultural production, renting housing to outsiders was still done, although in a

typically restrained way. It was merely for a few bold and profit-minded Beijing country-dwellers to make some side-income.

Finally, some migrants were able to find a shelter to rent, but they could be kicked out by their landlords or they could be forced out to return to the place of origin by the police at any time. An unstable domicile and frequent movement resulted in sub-standard living criteria. While migrants scattered to find dwellings, these challenges had been a reason in postponing the modeling of the geographical community of a CZC. The presence of CZCs provides distinct social distance which shows that the psychological distance between the urban locals and the rural outsiders does not merely exist within a physical distance.

2.3.2 Growth (1990-2000)

During the period between 1990 and 2000, the changing social relationship between landlord families and rural migrant dwellers was articulated in their shifting spatial relationships. The majority of the landlords rented out their main rooms to gain their maximum rent. Gradually, living under the same roofs with local farmers became sharing house with other rural migrants in the local farmers’ house. In Beijing, local farmers increasingly recognized that renting was really profitable, and government authorities did not clearly forbid it. By renting out one or two small rooms, a household could live a very comfortable life without working in the vegetable fields or taking a second job.

At first, most local farmers rented out existing rooms in their living houses. To make more money, some of them added two or three small rooms in the middle of their courtyards, and others put up narrow rooms against the outer courtyard walls, which made streets in the villages extremely narrow. Gradually, more than 90 percent of the local suburban families rented two or four rooms per household. A
few families even moved out of the community completely so as to rent their entire homes to the rural migrants.

Initially, the floating population lived dispersed on the fringes of Beijing (4-5th ring road of Beijing); then, sporadically several villages grew up according to the migrants of origin. For example, Anhui village, Henan village, Xinjiang village and by the South-four-Ring was situated Zhejiang Village—the biggest migrant settlement in China. Dorothy’s research concerning China’s floating population, states:

Figure 2.7. The map of urbanization in Beijing from 1984 to 2002

Note: in this image, the different directions with an urbanization rate are above 50%, where the red curves are the six rings and highways of the city.


---

65 Zhejiang Village originated from six migrant families into 1984 and by 1998 had expanded beyond 100,000 migrants.

Non-Beijing newcomers settled in a shadowy world of fridge rentals in Beijing, in rentals generally starting at approximately 50 Yuan RMB in 1990. In succeeding years, in these suburban areas incoming peasants—to varying extents in different communities—fashioned worlds of their own, where they made an accommodation outside the rules and restrictions thrown up by the registration system. [...] The Chinese named these settlements after the provincial homelands of their dwellers.

By contrast, the region of rural settlements in Beijing was identified by its small scope, scattered location and large differences in geographical conditions and economic development. Around 72.3 per cent of villages have less than 400 families. Out of these villages, 26 per cent of them have 100-200 families and 13.5 per cent of villages only have less than 100 families. The average population of the villages is 834 people. The village with the smallest population is Dongshuiyu village, with only 10 households, 17 people.67 And similar to migrants’ community around the

![Figure 2.8. The total quantity of floating population in 4 functional districts of Beijing (2005-2007) (Unit: 10,000 people)](image)
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Beijing city, it makes sense that stranger residents would constantly outnumber natives.\(^{68}\)

Although all these settlements for migrants were labeled Cun, or village, actually, they existed in two different spatial place-transformational processing aspects by the mid-1990s. The most dramatic fundamentals regarding structure and organization were ones that involved good locations and being simply located within the urban district of Beijing, that is, inside of the 5th ring road boundary (wu huan nei), as a domiciliary area. This CZC pattern is universally the product of migration concentration analogous to what are called ‘ethnic enclaves’ elsewhere. To my understanding, the influx of migrants is viewed as fast in proportion with the swift development of China’s urbanization.

Beijing’s urbanization is growing by leaps and bounds with its urban area expanding by 20 per cent in the past 10 years; as shown by the statistics from Beijing Statistical Bureau. According to the survey on Beijing urbanization in the past 18 years gathered by Ma Keming, et al (2005), results by the landscape metrics in Figures 3.6 and 3.7 showed that from 1984 to 1991, Beijing city expanded greatly in all directions, and the main urbanization took place in the East-West course. In the 1990s, it was mainly urbanized in a North-South direction.\(^{69}\)

As the urbanization expanded with migrant arrivals in great numbers, housing compounds were in high demand, consequently, CZCs extended rapidly both

---

\(^{68}\) In this regard, Turner’s analysis (1968) can be a good reference. He suggested a two-stage accommodation procedure for rural-urban migrants in urban-processing countries. 1. Entrance stage: Inner-city shantytowns are the main receiving areas for new migrants who view propinquity to employment with the uppermost precedence. 2. Expansion: As migrants improve their income level, they move to build peripheral informal shanties for residential stability or ownership and then upgrade shanty dwellings over time into more substantial houses.


In terms of the total number of floating population of \textit{Beijing}, a prolonged high influx of potential workers concentrated in the urban function expanding districts and inner development district zone, has occurred while the inward and outward fluidity of people in the capital function core district and ecological district stayed
stable. Moreover, between 2005-2007, as can be seen from the figure that 2nd-5th ring road was the main port of settlement for floating population (2,092,000 people in 2005, 2,220,000 in 2006 and 2,250,000 in 2007). This total number of floating population preference has already occupied 58.8 per cent of the whole floating population in Beijing.\textsuperscript{71}

Within the urban district of Beijing, squatter settlements grace 211 areas, including Dongcheng (4 CZCs), Xicheng (3 CZCs), Chongwen (7 CZCs), Haidian (70 CZCs), Chaoyang (57 CZCs), Fengtai (51 CZCs), Shijingshan (20 CZCs) and Xuanwu (19 CZCs). The large number of CZCs occupies an area of 1092 hectares and floorage of 2735,000 m\textsuperscript{2}.

The second, sophisticated form entailed the concentration of natural rural villages along the urban and rural connecting areas (chengxiang jiehe bu). As cities expand, their governments have to rely on the transformation of the rural land into urban land in order to make sufficient room available for urbanization. In this process, many rural villages have been encompassed or annexed by newly developed urban territory, forming approximately 112 CZCs in Beijing. The large number of CZCs occupies an area of 18,000 hectares and a floorage of 72,210,000 m\textsuperscript{2}.

Later, until the 2000s, in merely a couple of decades, as stated by Beijing Municipal Administration Commission, Beijing had already created 346 CZCs. Outsiders were mostly concentrated within these CZCs, which were predominantly scattered in the Chaoyang, Haidian and Fengtai districts. The biggest CZCs tract neighborhoods: are Chaoyang district—Guanzhuang village, Shibali dian village; Haidian district—Tangjialing village, Yimuyuan village, Zhengbaiqi village; and Fengtai districts—Fenzhongsi nizhuang, Nanyuan village and Shiliuzhuang village

\textsuperscript{71} Xie, L, L and Song Z, G. (2009), ‘Study on the total number of the floating population and the characteristics of the structure on spatial distribution in Beijing’, (Beijingshi liudong rnekou zongliang he fenbu jiegou tezheng yanjiu). Data magazine.
each had over 40,000 in their floating populations (Figure 2.10). These areas were correspondingly concentrated along the third to fifth ring road which may be said to have been the core area of this high concentration of outsiders, which comprises migrant workers (dagong zai), businessmen, students and graduates. These settlements, as CZCs, voice the physical evidence of people’s relocation, a system function both in informing ruralites of the location of pockets of urban opportunity and in placing them in accommodation and work upon arrival in town.\(^{72}\)

Among these early migrants, often people arrived in groups of seven or eight, man/woman bachelor or family, bringing heavy plastic bags of personal belongings. Some of them recognized the essential goal was to locate to the low-cost areas and were happy to first live with familiar hometown migrants. During the 1990s, here was a stage when these migrant-concentrated areas or later dubbed CZCs stretched geographically rapidly and began to take shape for all groups of the floating population of China. During this decade, the population of CZC residents went on to increase due to massive migration from outside of Beijing, and the financial situation of the landlords thrived through renting out their private houses.

Like other migrants around the world, most Chinese migrants faced an unstable and uncertain job market and thus fluctuating incomes; as a result, they perceived themselves as only temporarily in town. Mobility in the work area produces fluidity in accommodation. Accordingly, CZCs took on the visage of fluidity—not only because of the floating character of the majority of their population, but also because of its lack of stability, as it could be cleared out by city authorities overnight.\(^{73}\)

---


Given a larger background, it can be observed that migrants presented different settling behaviors in geographical concentrations not only in different cities but also by different areas within the same city. There are clear signs that higher education expansion augmented the probability of receiving migrants with highly skilled and better educational attainment.\textsuperscript{74} Despite having a challenging choice in education and work, the increasing drift to Beijing has largely resulted in brain collaboration rather than simply a contest of strength. An example of contrast is in the south of China in Guangdong and Shenzhen, where the flowing-in migrants are sorted to fill in the manufacture section: labor-intensive industries.

![Figure 2.10. The sampled locations in the Beijing CZC during the period of 1980s-2000s](image)

\textsuperscript{74} There are at least 74 establishments of higher education in the Beijing capital. It can be the city with most number of universities around China.
by different areas within the same city. There is a significant implication that higher education expansion augmented the probability of receiving-migrants with highly skilled and better educational attainment. Despite having a challenging choice in education and work, the increasing drift to Beijing has largely resulted in brain collaboration rather than simply a contest of strength. An example of contrast is in the south of China in Guangdong and Shenzhen, where the flowing-in migrants are sorted to fill in the manufacture section: labor-intensive industries.

Compared to outside of Beijing, elsewhere within large migrant-in cities, one of the major differences is that Beijing migrant communities are occupied by many graduates who are filled with Beijing dreams. According to Svetlana (2010): this background and character make Beijing’s CZCs unique, correspondingly, Beijing migrant communities are more homogenous in terms of place of origin and occupation of their residents, they are more self-sufficient and collaborate more intimately, while CZCs in Guangzhou and Shenzhen are heterogeneous migrant settlements, characterized by a variety of professions and native lands.75

However, CZCs in Beijing are normally more homogenous in terms of place of origin and occupation of their residents, they are more self-sufficient and cooperate more closely.76 Furthermore, in Shanghai, for example, the temporary population is more spread out than in Beijing, where the majority is concentrated in migrant enclaves—working complexes and nearby schools. Moreover, migrant enclaves in Beijing officially belong to the urban area with all the regulatory and administrative consequences, even though they are called ‘villages’.

When arable lands through which people earn their living vanish under the rapid process of urbanization, this clearance categorizes previous countryside villagers


76 Ibid.
differently; one, the house renter’s livelihood is altered from ‘growing grain’ to ‘growing house’.$^{77}$ Farmer-transformed landlords stopped being peasants and started earning their living by developing lucrative rental properties collectively and individually.$^{78}$ Because of money-spinning enticement, indigenous villagers had long felt that their own area was ripe for higher rent or demolishing lower rent buildings to construct new higher layers—in exchange for more profitable use. The erected unauthorized constructions had most levels, a typical residence housed just one floor in its housing for leasing. Renting out housing to migrants at affordable rates is quite a common income-generating business for indigenous villagers.$^{79}$

At this time, the physical zones of CZC distended and became associated with progressively more private housing and became transformed into quite sizable concentrations of outsiders. Furthermore, CZCs possess a great paradox characterized ethnically by their floaters breathing in such collectivities. This made them effective in drawing attention from the migrant community as well as Beijing households, so a speedy rise in their outsider populations made CZCs the shelters/communities with the highest non-local congregation in Beijing.

After migrants from Anhui, Shanxi, Hebei and Henan steadily entered the CZCs, they tended to open small businesses in the service sector along the public spaces of CZCs where they were residing. Such businesses included: street vendors, canteens, grocery stores, internet cafés, hairdressers and restaurants under neon signs; other migrants did odd jobs, or collected scrap. They sold merchandise to the thousands of residents. In this way, because they were self-employed, the CZCs function to meet

---


both their accommodation needs and provide a labor market. The migrants made ends meet through creating self-employment and on the other hand, satisfying the daily requirements of other migrant residents in a CZC area. Native residents looked down on these service zones for their nauseating appearance and sickening lack of hygiene; but transients set up their own markets, and service centers there.\textsuperscript{80}

Dramatic changes in CZCs were owing to the achievement of the inhabitants’ independent, self-reliant derivative organization related to their accommodation and daily exchange. CZCs were overwhelmed with resident-serviced businesses and a high incidence of unstable residents. Much of this was attributable to the circumstances where CZCs shaped a distinctive commercial setting with their high density, akin to an overcrowded concentration of dwellers. This squeezed density of self-contained businesses caused an uneven distribution within CZCs compared to the other neighborhoods of Beijing. However, the spreading of migrant-operated

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Pattern of CZC & Agricultural activity & Renting / income & Leaseholders / local residents \\
\hline
Central Urban (Built-up area $>70\%$) & None & $>80\%$ & 4 – 10 times \\
\hline
Peri-urban (Built-up area 40-70\%) & Few & 40 - 80\% & 2 – 4 times \\
\hline
Urban-fringe (Built-up area $<30\%$) & Some & $<50\%$ & $<1$ \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Characteristics of three categories of CZC}
\end{table}


businesses is in keeping with their potential consumers, particularly local migrants from the same origin and residents.

Regularly, for reasons of expediency, or deficiency of selection, these CZC business makers’ living quarters were merged with their working sectors, in which living quarters were placed above or behind the shop; thus, they received more favors from a physical gathering of both labor and lodging quarters. As the businesses flourished, out-of-town stores and restaurants continued to increase in CZCs. Signboards outside places, (such as Shanxi Noodle shop and Sichuan restaurant), hung by the service centers and they endowed character and uniqueness to CZCs differing them from other neighborhoods in Beijing.

I did some early research on the informal housing for low-income graduates in Tangjialing where the village is 20 kilometers (12.4 miles) northwest of Beijing. It came to the attention of the general public in the 2000s, because it had been entitled a graduates’ enclave, in which the biggest desirability was the low charge of

Figure 2.11. The Tangjialing CZC neighborhood before decomposition
accommodation and consumption. As previously mentioned, rustic settlements in Beijing existed within a small number of households, and an overwhelming number of outsiders occupied their villages in a disproportional ratio. Among this first-coming population, was an identifiable community of migrants who had no other options, particularly those who had less earning capacity as single renters in the early 2000s. Numerically, when Tangjialing accommodated 50,000 employee residents, it was at its height with different social groups around 2003 due to many points of interest, comprised of flourishing, good locations to adjacent work complexes and convenience for circulation.

Before 2000, Tangjialing was initiated to be a student-concentrated community aged 20-29 with the buildings of a private software administrative college, thus, the students of this college were the first tenants of Tangjialing. The long-range lodger population growth could be attributed to the in-pouring population dimension among employees and students from the neighboring clusters, and also due to the gradual upsurge in lodging sites as the unauthorized storied bunkhouses became jam-packed, and as the illegitimate community/space expanded its facilities and heightened in stories. Between 2003 and 2010, many residents were constant, even though moving-in and moving-out was frequent, but at any rate equal in overall quantity. In the Tangjialing community, a proportion that constantly stayed steadily high in absolute numbers: 17:1—3,000 locals were accommodated with 50,000 outsiders, including having more than one third, or 18,000, as graduate students.

After 2000, a new wave of occupants—Yizu, ‘Ant tribe’ who worked in Zhongguancun Science and Technology Park and Shangdi Software Park (China’s Silicon Valley), comprised the majority of the tenant population who preferred to live in the nearby neighborhood, Tangjialing. At that moment, Tangjialing had become the most well-known CZC in Beijing, and was once ‘a massive junk dump’ dotted by pingfang (bungalows) a few years ago, but at one moment it gave the impression of a boom town. As the top choice, the Zhongguancun and Shangdi areas,
and *Tangjialing* delivered significant amenities for these Ant tribes with the added convenience of being low cost for diverse products. Once being the biggest outsider domicile community in *Beijing*, *Tangjialing*, provided an informal but legally complete neighborhood environment in which low-earning inhabitants could find a wide variety of products and services. This was the reason that 5.8 per cent of the regular customers in *Tangjialing*’s business formations were *Beijing* residents. In this community, 31 per cent were graduate students, and 63.2 per cent were migrant employees.

In comparison to *CZCs* in 1990, *CZCs* in 2005 were much larger in area and had shifted from the suburban (5th ring road) to central urban destinations (Such as, *Xiaozuta yuan cun* on the 2nd ring road), however, they are called ‘villages’. This dramatic increase in the *CZCs* population of *Beijing* city demonstrates that *CZCs* have turned out to be not only a great aid to lower living expenses, but also function as a network for human relationships by shaping networks among different groups to connect migrants and host a society together from the perspective of the sojourners’ mentality.

Before long, central city was surrounded by the quickly-expanding *CZCs* of all shapes and sizes. Also, the fact is that these *CZCs* generated strong pressure on the municipal government,81 which was very sensitive to the social consequences of neighborhood disorder (e.g. heavy use of land-dwelling, poor waste dumping and ‘handshake buildings’ 82 and the communal problems (e.g. violence, drug abuse,
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81 People from outside, especially rural parts in the inner-city had been neglected socially and economically in the past. Urban citizens and authorities in general commonly associate migrants with ignorance, crime and poverty. The non-urban administrative system results in the weak governance of *CZCs* from the beginning. In that case, the design and construction of buildings and the plans for the whole neighborhoods are only subject to the approval of a village committee rather than the city planning authorities.

82 Handshake buildings—described in close terms as houses that are just one hand distance away, or houses that kiss each other, framed by illegally constructed apartment buildings. They are separated
gambling, prostitution, and criminal activity). In the long term, crime has unceasingly impacted the image of CZC communities. Citizens often attempt to avoid CZCs physically due to their unkempt residents and rising problems. Thus, by only a meter or so, hence nicknamed ‘handshake buildings’—residents of neighboring blocks can reach out from their windows and high-five.

CZC life in Beijing is isolated from urban citizens to a large extent. As a consequence, CZC residents have had to tolerate the burden of contempt and strange or discriminating glances from outsiders because the residents, are mostly rural-urban migrants, or have no other alternatives but to locate their homes within such poor serviced quarters.

According to Zhang (2009), these problem-infested, proscribed communities/spaces do generate the arrival of a horizontal socioeconomic stratification or spatial segregation that develops between formal and informal sectors/groups/space.84 Being placed on the edge of authorized strategies and state governors, both municipal governments and urban residents see CZCs as monstrosities, as areas of backwardness and delinquency that imperatively require transformation.85

The enlargement of CZCs has drawn the attention of society gradually, especially owing to their informal and illicit characteristics. At the end of the 2000s, the other CZCs correspondingly fell into a social crisis due to their escalating negative reputation—chaotic land use, dilapidated housing construction, severe infrastructural deficiencies, social disorder, and deterioration of the neighboring city’s image. The tension between the CZC community and municipal governments looked as if was far beyond merely individual conflicts of residents of CZCs and city residents. The CZC-government conflicts were society gradually, especially owing to their informal and illicit characteristics. At the end of the 2000s, the other CZCs correspondingly fell into a social crisis due to their escalating negative reputation—chaotic land use, dilapidated housing construction, severe infrastructural deficiencies,

---

84 ibid, p. 206.
social disorder, and deterioration of the neighboring city’s image. The tension between the CZC community and municipal governments looked as if was far beyond merely individual conflicts of residents of CZCs and city residents. The CZC and government conflicts were progressively amplified and they launched successive redevelopment functions that involved demolishing CZCs by 2005 as a contribution to the 2008 Summer Olympic Games preparation.

Initially, I thought that true urbanization encompasses the entire population’s full integration into the city community. This contains the progress of both living conditions and perception of cultural fusion. Nevertheless, the essence of ‘improvement’ is widened to include people and things that can afford the dimension of a satisfaction (or alteration), in addition, dwelling in comfort came to connote manageable or adequate living. Still, the migrants learned otherwise.

2.3.3 Decomposition (2004-to present)

When I began this study, the CZCs, including my first case study, were facing destruction as slums under the urban redevelopment function. The government used to simply deport rural migrants from CZCs under the slogan of ‘maintaining social order and cracking down on crime’, while keeping the housing in CZCs basically unchanged.86 In the past few decades, however, the development of CZCs in Beijing has been carried out according to a ‘demolition-replacement model’. Cheap villagers’ housing has been replaced by expensive construction. The majority of low-income migrants have been forced to leave the CZCs. The migrant resident community is definitely a major victim of the urban renewal and redevelopment (hereafter URR) functions (destroy the old structures and build modern housing or luxury buildings).

---

CZC tenants—mostly migrant workers, Yizu face the clearance of their settled neighborhoods under the URR functions. The idea for revitalizing the CZCs of Beijing dates back to the beginning of 2004, when CZCs were declared densely occupied low-income poverty-stricken migrant enclaves. The function of CZC clearance (penghuqu gaizao) was then embarked upon with two paths: the actual clearance schedule (urging recent migrant dwellers to move out and arrange the resettlement of the relocates with a local Hukou) and the national low-rent high-rises plan at the same time.

In China, the national manufacture of low-rent apartment housing comprises the majority of housing patterns. New, denser and higher apartment buildings have been constructed through both building on far-away lands and the redevelopment of existing old apartment estates, to improve low-income residents’ accommodation conditions. Until 2010, low-rent housing was a comparatively new term in China regardless of its long history of providing low-rent housing informally. The beginning of the development of high-rise pattern housing in China is a period the Chinese government chose to call ‘baozhang xing anju gongcheng’ (indemnity and comfortable accommodation function) to create an affordable housing supply. And the government endeavored to plan, design, and construct government-funded housing for low-income and lower-middle income families.

Chinese low-rent neighborhood units mainly follow the normal framework for the current planning of apartment models that includes a fixed housing size, a neighborhood size and a separation of vehicle and pedestrian activities. It is important to remind ourselves that the Chinese government has insisted on the social

---

87 Although preparation for the Olympics was not the main inducement for CZC clearance, the idea of redeveloping the CZC program since 2004 did lead to the urbanization process in Beijing. In late 2005, as a result of making our cities physically viable and possessing pleasant views for Olympics hosting, Beijing municipal government suggested that the entire area be vacated and replaced with an organized plan—an opportunity for a massive physical and image make-over.
low-rent housing policy from its beneficiaries’ perspectives. This is based on and aims at the low-income or poorest sectors subsistence, their access to accommodation and amenities. In this sense, there are certain physical conditions that dwellings for the poor should include: a). the location of the low-rent housing is not close enough to allow the residents to make use of the public conveniences; b). the kinds of housing size are planned according to the most common family structures; c). the most important thing about the housing and neighborhood is it has the lowest standards set down for design due to the limited financial guarantee. Therefore, obviously, high-rises apartments have grown into the most common—prevailing and natural kind of low-rent accommodation in China.

2.4 Development of contemporary low-rent high-rise apartments for rural migrants

As presented by Aldo Rossi: the breaking up of the slums has caused a simultaneous breakup of communities which had traditionally lived in high-density
areas and which, without undergoing substantial changes, were unable to establish new roots automatically in the low-density, suburban areas to which they were reassigned.  

The Chinese government has implemented several functions to provide more affordable housing, one of them is usually called low-rent housing. The pattern of this accommodation is it is owned and preserved by local governments and leased to tenants at a minimal charge. As we mentioned earlier, under low-rent housing policy restrictions, this type of public low-rent housing is available only to people who are very low-income local inhabitants. Migrant workers, unendorsed city occupants, are being edged out by the public low-rent housing.

The China national survey of migrant workers in 31 provinces in 2014 shows that about 36.9% of migrants settle down in rental housing, and 28.3% of migrants live in shared dormitories combined with private companies, while 78% are employed in labor intensive firms. Other choices of lodging include those containing self-built shelters and provisional housing on construction sites merely housing a small of quantity of migrants. In the above housing choices, tenants just have the right of use. The proportion of migrants who have purchased ownership rights to their housing in urban or small towns is minimal, about 1%. The income level, in line with government constraints, is probable the main influence for migrants to get access to housing.

The informal features of one facility include: low-rent housing represented by the CZC in each city of China, which is very attractive to both rural migrants and the urban poor as the first and also biggest settlement option. The issue of social justice also commands attention since housing is a basic need. For migrant workers, low-
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rent housing is the most common way to lower living costs. A migrant-concentrated neighborhood is a term that has come to be divided into the two characteristic community patterns. This is explicit in Marcuse’s (1997) spatial developments, where the excluded shantytown is ‘a spatially concentrated area in which tenants’ activities are excluded from the economic life of the surrounding society’ and ‘the restraint of their inhabitants to the shantytown is anticipated by the dominant interests out of fear that their activities, not controlled, may risk the dominant social peace.’

As in one of my case studies, in Beijing city, a dilapidated central city district may provide the necessary environment and facilities for migrants, actually also generating the actual central shantytown. For the next several years, the former villagers in a CZC will continue to maximize the housing units for the constantly arriving migrants. However, being well-received enclaves for migrants, CZCs normally bear a resemblance to slums in several of their nastiest features, lacking unifying arrangements or state intervention. The CZCs have suffered from widespread destruction since 2005. A growing influx of rural migrants has created a high demand for extensive low-rent housing designs. Many of the shared structures have been demolished over time, usually to be replaced by high-rise apartment towers. The latter were considered more hygienic and permit more efficient private use of lots. However, the changed living and housing conditions of the residents, who were often new to the city, mean that very different kinds of relationships between neighbors evolved, and the communal environment that had been linked to the specific district in which homes had originally been rooted vanished.

The second case in my study is: a small amount of government subsidized low-rent housing is open to the nonlocal rural migrants in Chongqing city. The low-rent

---

housing facility was initiated in 1998, and by the end of 2010, more than six hundred Chinese cities had joined the function. As of November 2009, the function included 5.65 million households (3.28 percent of all urban-registered households), of which, the government provided 2.73 million apartments and cash subsidies for 2.92 million households.

Being evident in Marcuse’s (1997) description, the government subsidized housing is characterized as ‘an exclusionary enclave’, an area where ‘residents, transitional and insecure in their economic, and political, wish to ‘protect’themselves from a perceived danger from below’. With regard to the market of housing alternatives in China, since the middle of 2001, the new social housing security system for low-rent housing (lian zu fang) was launched in China. The government granted financial support or private sectors seized the opportunities/challenges to promote the accommodation conditions for the migrant workers, for instance—Chongqing low-rent housing function.

The final option of migrants’settlement is the first affordable housing development to be initiated, constructed, and subsidized by a private developer—China Vanke Tulou house. An original design, high criteria for quality, and a range of facilities further distinguish Vanke Tulou houses from China’s other low-income housing. Moreover, it continues to promote a rational philosophy on the accommodation problem of migrant workers. Vanke Tulou examines a potential solution to a critical problem and sustainable design standard of China’s affordable housing. An understanding of China Vanke project will reveal whether this case represents a remarkable model or a replicable prototype that could give us a model for a low-rent housing design for the migrating community suffering under an urgent housing crisis in China’s cities.

The following analysis mainly focuses on the accommodation situation of the three low-rent neighborhoods in China: Yimuyuan neighborhood in Beijing, a
government-built *Minxin jiayuan* low-rent neighborhood, and collective *Vanke Tulou* houses provided by private developer, respectively.

### 2.5 Conclusion

This chapter starts with reviews of the concepts of neighborhood design for the rural-to-urban migrants. Reviewing the theories, the passage of this chapter is this: for a growing number of migrants who reside in low-rent housing in urban areas, in contrast with other groups who desire more physical separation from neighbors and places in their life style, the communal activities and place-based neighborly experiences are critical factors for a healthy and satisfying urban life. Three elements of physical involvement (spatial structure, activities and perception) are the most significant environmental influences for cultivating migrant residents’ communal activities.

‘Exchangeable neighboring’, communal activities and ‘reciprocal life’ are critical aspects for nourishing migrants’ low-rent housing life. In this case, the research also suggests that, low-rent neighborhood design comprises sharing and fundamental elements to make a place livable and fitting to its users, instead of merely being a gathering of houses. It is argued that vitality in a neighborhood is significant for nurturing communal activities because it is needed together with integrated elements to form and built an atmosphere concerning migrants’ everyday lives.
Chapter 3. Strengthening the Extended Family—
Implications for the Need to have Communal
Activities for Rural-to-Urban Migrants

3.1 Traditional extended families in rural areas of China

In China, rural families may normally be considered as extended families
including those not living under the same roof, but it is common for several nuclear
families to share a house. In today’s urban life, rural migrants face a social change
away from the traditional rural family structure and lifestyle. This means holistic
emotional development for the single rural migrant, their split household and a new
sense of belonging are all needed.

3.1.1 Traditional extended families and collective lifestyle

Referring to Wirth, whose description of influential urbanism as a way of life
depicts how urbanism is a form of social organization that is harmful to culture, and
who characterizes the city as a ‘substitution of secondary for primary contacts, the
fading of ties of kinship, and the waning social meaning of the family, the vanishing
of the neighborhood, and the discouragement of the traditional foundation of social
unity’.90 To emphasize this, it is important to note that the countryside and the city
are the specific sites where the cultural differences between rural Chinese and urban
Chinese are most clear-cut. At this point, it is pertinent to revisit an image of the
family in the eyes of the Chinese.

---

Family, *Jia* for Chinese people, is more like a symbolic place of kinship. The ideal family is in fact an extended family living under one protecting roof. In the Chinese countryside, until now this family type stands for the permanence of a family’s full lineage. It is generally well maintained by a populous, extended family, often with more than a dozen members, or may include all inhabitants in a hamlet who have the same surname. 91 People in the countryside grow up and live surrounded by the group; they do not prefer to be alone. In terms of the village encircled by the city I am concerned with the rural home of China as an archetype. The extended families are characterized by traditional family values, devoted mothers and fathers, and warm cooperative bonds with siblings, grandparents, other relatives, and the broader community.

The rural represents the kinship (clan) family-based social structure while the city mirrors the inclination of a relatively individual-dominating social order; so to speak, the rural and the urban of China translate into I-location, that is, ‘who we (kinship family) are’ and ‘who I am’. One great challenge that newly-urbanized rural people face is understanding the notion of the individual (or rich self-image) and entering into the spirit of the city. However, on the basis of this comprehension we understand the individual as someone who does something from the ‘me’, and someone who focuses on the problem he or she finds themselves in, however, rural people also seem to lack a strong self-identity or central self. Individualism in the context of Chinese history and culture is a deviation from the behavioral norm expected of most Chinese. 92 To a certain extent, the traditional Chinese concept of a person is not presenting the self as an individual person but as one who is

inescapably immersed in a group—the family. In that sense, the rural and urban parts control a number of differently respective dimensions.

To shed further light on some of the mental states undergone by migrants, and to apply I-location to our case study, we can say that the ‘I’ is formed out of the self-consciousness of one’s activities and this leads to the formation of a clear self-entity. In turn, although a CZC, as, a village encompassed by the city boundaries, is well-received by both rural migrants and the urban poor, its dwellers have a tendency to consider themselves as an isolated group and fail to interact successfully with locally-born residents. Such a solo I-oriented city lifestyle, does not exist in the society of the countryside. For people living in a CZC, social life takes place in migrant groups there and does not involve those outside the CZC. This fact is illustrated by the comments that settlement house dwellers made about their lack of expectations of having affection for this area—which can be identified as signifying ‘an absence of a self-belonged group’.

Barriers in observing the actions and attitudes of others generate encumbrances in making contact with individuals who are not fully acquainted, and this results in CZC dwellers restraining their interaction to peer groups93 in which the daily risks can be minimized to a degree. Passive or negative, the CZC dwellers have considerable problems in feeling organized in cooperative group activities. Perhaps he or she can see, observe, and describe this action; but he or she cannot see themselves in such a circle. Standards, for instance, equivalence, reliance, and mutuality are considered as they only apply to their origin-based community relationship instead of outside of these peer groups. For the migrants, the peer group

93 The base of migrants’ lives in a host city is peer group sociability. The peer group may be defined as a group of people who, through homophily, share similarities such as age, background, and social position.
is a routinized congregation of a community covering a small number of common aspects: similar kin-relatives, physical origin.

This narrow living circle, of course, impedes cooperative activity. Functions are not shared within a framework of reciprocity norms which necessitate migrants to contribute his/her to swell the adaptive potential of the group as a whole. CZC dwellers, for instance, pursue a minimal number of improvements in their community where they are housed, or they are not interested in being outside of the peer group, because they want to make money and save their energy for their own family-oriented behavior within the peer group.

Such a living circle constitutes the typical adaptive mode of many cooperative, kin-based rural communities and contrasts with the individualistic strategies more common within the urban community. It can be argued that these different dimensions we see now do not just bring inevitable emotional conflicts; this definition of self-cognition, together with migrants’ role and location in work and at home, makes the CZC seem like a new beginning. In this sense, the CZC in China is doomed to be a physical entity that witnesses the assimilation and hybrid of going-between, in which a modern urban identity and a traditional rural identity coexist in the process of urbanization.

The picture we saw in a CZC in China is familiar to those who have read The Urban Villagers by Gans, published in 1962. It is a neighborhood that suggests an ideal type of cultural adaptation to city life that reproduces distrust of authority and self-protection. In this sense, the CZC in China is doomed to be a physical entity that witnesses the assimilation and hybrid of going-between, in which a modern urban identity and a traditional rural identity coexist in the process of urbanization.
As Simmel (1903) wrote more than a hundred years ago, life in the city compared poorly with the individual connections characteristic of smaller settings.\textsuperscript{94} In other words, superficially Chinese migrants gradually transfer from their home rural settlements to establish city lives and engage in urban occupations, but their elemental identity and family network remains grounded in village culture. Migration, put more broadly, involves relocation or a transfer procedure that bridges individual(s) and spaces—not only for persons who migrate but also for their family relation network.

3.1.2 Group-oriented versus individualistic culture

What distinguishes China’s recent mobility change is not only the large size of the ‘tidal wave of rural migrant labor’ (mingong chao), but the type of rural-urban migrations accompanying the transformations of rural life, the large gap in wages and standards of living, and the restrictions preventing the settlement of migrants.\textsuperscript{95} At the administrative operational level in China, migrants can thus be identified as being of two types,\textsuperscript{96} hukou migrants—migration with ‘local’ residency rights (bendi hukou), usually open only to a very select group (currently, the rich or the highly educated) and immediate family members of residents with local hukou;\textsuperscript{97} non-hukou migrants - migration without hukou residency rights. Some scholars are concerned with exploring experiences as ‘outsiders’ and differentiate them further

\textsuperscript{94} Simmel, G. (1903), \textit{The Metropolis and Mental Life}. Free Press, New York.
into permanent migrants and temporary migrants according to different resident statuses.  

Rural-to-urban migrants have a group-oriented culture which encourages them to take care of each other in their group, which could be their family, village and preferred contacts with neighbors, and also they are involved in diverse communal activities. The way we live our lives define us as individuals. Lifestyle and class are two significant variables elucidating difference in a neighboring among city inhabitants. An earlier study, by Greer (1962) found that active communal activities in a neighborhood would then be found mainly in ‘familistic’ areas, usually in the suburbs, and in inner-city working-class neighborhoods. Similarly, active communal activities and collective lifestyle are also found in Chinese rural-to-urban migrant areas. Rural-to-urban migrants have a lifestyle which encourages place-based social ties, and preferred contacts with neighbors and communal activities alike. 

The communal activities and the value of communal activities are features that have been documented in studies of Chinese rural neighborhoods. In China, communal activities originate from the sense of community, group-oriented culture. They carry features that might be different from those of a highly individualistic culture. Historically, community in the past in China used to be based on a patrilineal kinship network, 

---

where an extended family lived locally within a close geographic area and they cared for each other in times of need.

Communal activities, as defined by Frohlich and Potvin (1999)\textsuperscript{102}, are ‘group attributes that result from the interaction between social conditions and behavior’. Communal activities are the effect of one’s social environment on an individual-level lifestyle and regards lifestyle concurrently within the milieu in which lifestyles are articulated. People gradually transfer from their rural settlement to form city lives and engage in urban occupations, but their elemental identity—family network—remains village culture grounded. Migration (relocation), if put more broadly, is a transfer procedure that bridges individual(s) and spaces—it is not only a person who migrates, but his/her family relation network.

Affiliation within the migrant group is founded principally on kinship—with brothers, sisters, and relatives from the migrants’ origin at the core. It is a basis from which we can demonstrate that family life in our culture is crucial to the development of social relations. In addition, scholars working in the field of Chinese rural-to-urban migrants have explored the emotional and community experience of migrants in urbanized spaces, probing into how their community sentiments are built upon the axis of differences and transformations.\textsuperscript{103} However, the above mentioned works concentrate on documenting migrants’ emotional experience in given situations rather than considering the different social formation as the key factor underlying the inevitable intergroup conflict.


When individuals relocate, it is not a simple concern for oneself or selves. As migrants, they experience the act of mobility in a spatial dimension, with those incoming establishing contact with the unknown which in turn compels individuals to build new identities\(^{104}\) and participate in the compromising of their individuality over time. For many older (first)-and neo (second)-generation rural migrants in China, the dialogs regarding identity are frequently manifested by a push-and-pull phenomenon (a financial push towards the city to find employment and earn money, and an emotional pull to return to their home communities and loved ones), with binary opposites, such as barbarous versus etiquette, rural versus urban, fail versus succeed,\(^ {105}\) leave versus carry on, and custom versus innovation. These paradoxes are an essential part of their self-formation.

### 3.2 Need to have communal activities

3.2.1 Communal activities

Communal activities, or neighbor relationships can be described on two levels: acquaintance with neighbors and interaction with them. Familiarity with neighbors means he/she recognizes their neighbors both on the same floor and in other parts of the building. Interaction with neighbors specifies the activities that depend on the presence of others in public spaces to various degrees and in different ways.\(^ {106}\) Gans (1959) point out that, communal activities are affected by the place location and the architectural plans—strengthening the proposition that architects can influence the


communal activities that occur under corresponding spaces.\textsuperscript{107} As Mumford (1954) proclaims that, neighborhoods are comprised of people who enter, by the very fact of birth, or by chosen residence into common life, therefore, ‘neighborhoods, in some primitive, incoherent fashion exist wherever human beings congregate.’\textsuperscript{108} It is fair to say that the neighborhood appears wherever people reside together, because ‘neighbors are simply people who live near one another’, and ‘neighborhoods can be present wherever people gather together, in permanent family dwellings. In this sight, as Norberg-Schulz (1971) suggests, greater spatial mobility like Chinese rural-to-urban migrants on whom this study focuses, will create a reciprocal necessity for a home-based neighborhood\textsuperscript{109} and develop neighboring among localized residents who have more opportunities to interact.\textsuperscript{110}

The view of ‘low-rent neighborhood design’ founded on the notion of a place-attached neighborhood life has been a controversial issue among urban designers and social planners. Research and observation have maintained that individuals have structured their local space and place by means of collecting around ‘central areas’ where the majority of their routine requirements can be gratified and communal activities are built up. Modern architecture and planning efforts have observed that neighborhoods are significantly transitional for building the span between the single house and the entire city,\textsuperscript{111} with the widespread conclusion that there is an inverse relationship between propinquity and the frequency and intensity of communal activities.

\textsuperscript{108} Mumford, L. (1954), 'The neighborhood and the neighborhood unit'. \textit{Town Planning Review}, 24, 250-270.
Correspondingly, a working-class neighborhood has been distinguished in studies by how it is characterized by its self-help, sociability, and having a degree of self-containment. Furthermore, the residential unit, as it is supposed, can engender communal activities and neighborly relations and it can encourage satisfactory human associations, accompanied by the delivery of comfort and convenience. Also, opponents of the concept of a place-attached neighborhood deliberate that, although it was valid in the past as a general design solution, it has very little relevance for the present and the future, for as people become more mobile, they tend to identify with broader and more flexible community networks. They consider that territorial organizations at a neighborhood level, no matter how carefully they are planned, are bound to be ignored. The earliest formal expression of communal activities at neighborhood level may be found in the writings of McClenahan.  

Although recognizing that individual life in communities needs to have some common basis, McClenahan argued that this did not necessarily imply proximity, for greater mobility made it possible to maintain interaction over increasing distances without in any way impairing these relationships. McClenahan argued that a new social grouping was coming into being—a communality, which would be an urban substitute for traditional communities. For Chinese rural-to-urban migrants, high mobility was an integral part of life. Their professional communities might be far-flung spatially, but they were close-knit and intimate, held together by shared interests and values.

Similar improvement was pictured by other researchers. In the writing of Durkheim (1972) and Tonnies (1955), as a proposed cure for these urban deficiencies, the neighborhood introduces clear physical definitions, organized local institutions,

and a communal pattern of activities.\textsuperscript{113} The neighborhood often functions as an elementary that mediates the spatial approach between the neighborhood as a manifestation of human activity and thus the planning of the neighborhoods as a moral requirement which is a proper response to basic human needs.

The neighborhood thus becomes a planning tool, an instrument to organize the city according to social measures of personal and communal wellbeing. Furthermore it maintains this advancement, through spatial definition, of the welfare of the individual, the community, and society at large. Accordingly, the size of the urban subunit (in terms of area and of population) is determined by the f of the neighborhood as a social unit. It is based primarily on its capacity to provide face-to-face encounters and to foster meaningful communal activities.\textsuperscript{114}

Likewise, in contradiction of the disorder and structural complexity of the city as a whole, the residential unit can supply controllable surroundings. Its small-scale scope delivers a well-organized regulator whereas also preserving certain communal assistance. Consequently, the neighborhood turns out to be a convenient and easily described residential area; a clearly circumscribed territory, a collection of streets, and a service area, which breeds an integral communal network. Actually, the perception of the neighborhood as a communal unit regularly legitimizes its community-based action.\textsuperscript{115} Accordingly, a place-attached neighborhood is nurtured by daily encounters with the environment and neighbors, seasonal celebrations, continued physical personalization and upkeep, and affective feelings toward and beliefs about the home and neighborhood.\textsuperscript{116} Sherman’s worksheet of ‘urban success


\textsuperscript{115} Ibid.

indicators’ suggests that a good place has a structure and inherent self-motivated activities.\(^{117}\)

3.2.2 Allowing the continuation of rural migrants’ lifestyle

It is contended in this part that enhancing migrants’ communal activities and fitting rural-to-urban migrants’ lifestyle in their destination city is an essential objective for low-rent neighborhood design, if improving the quality of migrants’

Table 3.1. Directory of effective places fit to live in

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning will be invisible and the results will look natural, as though they happened of their own accord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There will be interesting and stimulating shapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The ‘familiarity’ of streets and street communal activities will be celebrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There will be secret places which once discovered grow on you, making you look deeper to find more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There will be surprises, to keep residents awake, provide topics of conversation, prevent ennui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Experiment will be encouraged, and there will be exciting things to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>There will be areas and opportunities for informal, casual meetings to take place, including warm and friendly bars and pubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Food and drink will be a treat, and residents will be able to purchase and consume it at varying prices and degrees of leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>There will be a variety of comfortable places to sit and wait—a place worth living in has to be a city worth sitting in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>There will be a good balance between the needs to prevent loneliness and to preserve anonymity and privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Changing seasons will not draw attention away from the sterner pursuits of daily life but rather will be an integral part of a continually changing city, and celebrated as such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The senses will be heightened: affection/friendliness/hospitality; a sense of belonging; historical and cultural continuity; a sense of fun/humor; opportunities for gossip; open-mindedness; vitality; fantasy; flamboyance; color; beauty/aesthetic stimulus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


life is an objective. The process of migrants’ transformation is progressive and complex. One role of a ‘rural migrants’ settlement’ is to provide connection between migrants’ rural background and their new urban background for generations of rural-to-urban migrants, and to have an influence on the transformation in their lifestyles.

Many scholars question the positive assessment of the pattern of migrant settlements if national-manufacturing low-rent high-rise projects are to be viewed as a great contribution. They argue that the government-subsidized low-rent neighborhood design for a common good does essentially suggest that ‘people living with dignity’ is to assume that a satisfied life is a shielded life. The notion of low-rent neighborhood design based on the idea of communal activities has been a controversial issue among urban designers and social planners.

Some scholarly works have recently been devoted to the basic understanding of various aspects of migrant settlements. Most of them have been dedicated to the procedures of the radical social change taking place in such accommodation while studies of Chinese low-rent housing rarely focus on the aspect of communal activities and its value for this specific residential group. I experienced living in the biggest migrants’ gathering settlement in Beijing for a few short months, just before the beginning of its gentrification. My chief observations were placed on the study of the communal activities of these rural-to-urban migrant populations.

---


It is important to distinguish between migrants’ low-rent neighborhoods and common neighborhood design. Even though low-rent neighborhood design and community planning for rural-to-urban migrants are not amongst designers’ tasks yet, or included in conventional approaches to planning and architectural design, they have little to do with serving the social and psychological needs of the Chinese migrant community. The Chinese cities look as if they deliver poor prospects for rural-to-urban migrants’ integration into local neighborhood life, except to the extent that they form a controversial migrant shelter/community or gather in a CZC as an adaptive feedback to discrimination. Certainly casual and mutual assistance, mainly residing in neighborhoods might be a significant sustenance for vulnerable social groups as shown in Western market economies.

Rural-to-urban migrants need to fit in to a certain residential area that is reflective of a sub-culture, which would seem to gratify their need for identity. Meanwhile, migrant neighborhoods have many rich functions and meanings for migrant tenants. Migrants need to belong to a certain communal group in order for their individuality and self-esteem to be acknowledged. Though this necessity for a community sense does not have to be founded spatially on a confined region, a neighborhood is an indispensable component of the communal activities for many migrants.

In the sense of Guest et al (1999), it would be particularly interesting to look into the relationships between migrants, mostly segregated into separate residential enclaves, and local inhabitants. Such research could shed light on the reasons for

---


migrant concentration, which to some extent may reflect self-choice and the predilection for a co-ethnic living environment. Such self-selection, while reinforcing residential segregation, might simultaneously be a foundation of greater social integration and communal activities within the neighborhood.

There are also questions concerning the communal relations among long-time inhabitants in a residence where the character of the urban place is being considerably converted. Scholars, like Whyte and Parish (1984) inspected communal relations, when urban residents spent their whole careers in a single work unit and residing in a work-unit compound. That scheme, and exactly work-unit based accommodation delivery, is being demolished with inferences to the communal activities.

Some academic research, (such as Xiang, 1993; Piante and Zhu, 1995; Su, 1996; Chen and Zhao, 1998; Wu, 2002) have recently contributed to the basic comprehension of several features of migrant accommodation. Most of them have concentrated on the progression of fundamental social changes happening in

migrants’ dwelling. Fan and Taubmann (2002), and Gu and Liu (2002) made a case study of migrant areas in Beijing and Shanghai, which centered on the aspects of social inequality and spatial isolation.

However, few researchers have observed CZCs as the migrants’ first spontaneous settlements in urban areas with close knit communal activities. Despite this, some recent studies into communal activities have focused on urban residents in both middle-class housing estates, and (more rarely) in rural-to-urban migrant communities. My explanation for the observed communal activities in the rural-to-urban migrants’ settlements is their preference for more collective and reciprocal inhabited settings such as the first case study (Yimuyuan neighborhood) in this paper. In spite of this, the government has tried to dismantle Yimuyuan neighborhood as a means to improve the quality of low-rent housing service provision and local-level governance.

In an earlier investigation, King et al.’s (2000) true subject is the retirement from migration or migration for pursuing a better life, and Lipman (1971) showed us his

---

consideration of architects’ philosophy on community. 134 Well-organized or suitably-sustained city neighborhoods (no matter if they are for locals or for rural-to-urban migrants) which match the life-styles of their residents and deliver communal activities for their inhabitants are able to nurture the emotional sense of togetherness that is decisive to mental well-being. 135

Closer inspection of the migrants’ life and their neighborhoods, reveals that lifestyle migration is the spatial movement for different individuals of all backgrounds, moving either from rural to urban places or from rural to rural places that are practical, for many reasons, migrants ought to face the ‘must’ of alteration or negotiation to the new lifestyle. The diverse lifestyles required and negotiated in the researched case studies in the chapters expose migrants’ diverse lifestyle adjustments. These are repeatedly echoed in the rural tenants’ normal lives in their low-rent settlements. To be more precise, lifestyles following migration contain the (re)negotiation of the work–life balance, a quest for urban life and freedom from prior restraints. However, urban life is beginning to cause separation from customary morals and some put themselves first over the community.

In China, current low-rent apartments being constructed have characteristics different from the old low-rent neighborhoods. Old low-rent neighborhoods were typically assembled in suburban areas, such as CZCs, and existed in ready-made residential areas within the city; but Chinese national low-rent apartment developments were built and are being planned on the fringe of cities. Chinese current apartment developments seek to improve the existing quality of migrating life by sustaining the existing urban context. Existing apartment developments have

sometimes created urban residential problems, such as segregation between nearby neighborhoods and a lack of sustainability to maintain apartment estates.

Gusfield (1975) identified two dimensions of community: territorial and relational. The territorial dimension of community is defined primarily according to territory, as in the case of neighborhoods, but even in such cases, proximity or shared territory cannot by itself constitute a community; the relational dimension is also essential. Other communities may seem to have a relational dimension, regarding nature and quality of relationships in that community.\footnote{Gusfield, J. R. (1975). ‘The Community: A Critical Response’. New York: Harper Colophon.}

Issues of residential development have moved from social renewal to the sustenance of everyday life. Furthermore, the notion of ‘low-rent neighborhood design’ is based on the idea of communal activities and improving migrants’ urban life quality has been an issue that has been ignored among architects and urban planners. According to a study by Kallus and Law-Yone about the theories of neighborhood design, the concepts of neighborhood design (or planning) have moved from a ‘humanistic approach’ to an ‘instrumental’ and then to a ‘phenomenological approach’.\footnote{Kallus, R and Law-Yone, H. (2000), ‘What is a neighborhood? The structure and function of an idea’. Environment and planning B, planning & design, 27, 815-826.} The first and second approaches followed the idea that neighborhood design could improve and/or renovate a place for human living, by using physical configurations. However, these approaches are based on physical determinants.

In the above quoted research findings on suggesting models for low-rent housing for migrants, it may well emerge that more frequent spatial movement forms a reciprocal necessity for a stable home base, thus solidifying the communal activities, particularly for the rural populations on whom this study focuses. As Harvey (1973) proposed, a partial reimbursement for the social deprivation probably
occurs through the communal activities in city life. In that sense, the migrants’ gatherings in low-rent housing neighborhoods can function as a source of communal traditions which individuals value and want to protect or as a ‘roof’ in an unfamiliar surrounding.\footnote{Harvey, D. W. (1973). ‘Social Justice and the City’. Baltimore: John Hopkins press.}

In low-rent neighborhood life, the community sense shows its notable importance for such rural-to-urban migrants of different family structure as family-accompanied, single migrant tenants and couple migrant tenants who are rarely considered in low-rent architecture design and planning. The family-accompanied migrants, who have heavy family burdens, live in low-rent housing areas and, have restricted local resources. Consequently, they follow rural social networks and experience simple participation in the host urban community. Single migrant tenants live in low-rent housing areas, but social relationships are greatly restricted to the rental community and its migrants’ gathering neighborhoods. For a lower number of migrant tenants, low-rent housing is a transitional community for them to adjust themselves to the destination city through their neighborhoods.

As seen in the studies of Whyte (1943), Gans (1961), and Jacobs (1961), many low-income and working class people are content to live in so-called shantytown spaces as they have strong communal activities linked to their neighborhood areas.\footnote{Whyte, W. F. (1943), ‘Street Corner Society: the Social Structure of an Italian Slum,’ Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press; Gans, H. J. (1961), ‘Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans,’ The Free Press (Macmillan Co., Inc.); Jacobs, J. (1961), ‘The Death and Life of Great American Cities’ (Modern Library (hardcover) ed.). New York: Random House.} Take the migrants’ spontaneously-developed housing for instance, the physically dilapidated neighborhood nurtures or fosters its individual sub-culture and a recognized ‘lifestyle’ which are shared by migrant residents. These offer satisfaction and sustenance which balance any difficulties supplied in the ruined urban fabric. This is clearly demonstrated by my interviewers’ opinions in the Beijing case from
which they have been forced to move out due to the national CZC clearance arrangements in China.

Gans, (1961)\textsuperscript{140}, for instance, demonstrates this when the families he did his field-observation on were forced to find substitute accommodation when their area in inner city Boston, a neighborhood called the West End, was going to become gentrified. He argued that the urban village is both rich in an insular kind of social capital and economically disadvantaged. Bonded to each other by blood and lifelong friendship, the members of the peer group society, Gans argued that a move to better lodging in another neighborhood, would isolate them from the warm comfort of their friends and family. Even worse, the persons who moved into this area would be considered communally ‘numb’.

Accordingly, this migrant community drew satisfaction from its collective spatial character and from the reciprocal friendliness of the local communal connections. Taken into consideration, as Fried and Gleicher (1961) said, the locality was in effect an extension of an area with which people personally identified.\textsuperscript{141} When this was destroyed there was a collective feeling of misery, which Fried compared to that which individuals feel pain at the loss of a respected one, resulting in some cases in severe dejection and mental disease. In rural settings where the individualistic effect is negligible or even absent, people still hold onto traditional values and put the family, village, farm and/or community in front of the individual.

Firstly, dwellings in urban areas give the impression of having no neighborly spirit or community identity. Whether urban residents have come from the working class or not, they are usually very person-oriented. Their living preference and their


choice of inhabited space generally depend more on how well they can protect their privacy at home, create a sphere of privacy, and live in an environment that shields residents from multiple stresses and disturbances. However, for migrants, mainly of rural background, their living strategies are based on a close network within the family circle, and even though they have settled down in cities their geographical location is a kinship or peer-group membership-gathering space. As a result, their living space is not that separate from other public areas, but most rural tenants think of their community as a special place. When they are accommodated closely together, they are expected to form social and emotional bonds.

Secondly, the planning standards which are applied to the public low-rent housing imitate the value pattern of middle class specialists. These expectations, belonging to designers and planners, allocate an autonomy or privacy-based value to housing and place greater emphasis on ‘living in the housing’ than ‘living in the neighborhood’. Designers’ evaluation of low-rent housing is based on their urban-defined standards and provides services founded on their values. For example, the existing physical standards of low-rent housing fail to make a distinction between and offer a specific contribution to housing for migrants and low-cost districts, or low-rent housing and slum housing, community facilities, and street patterns. These differences are key points to differentiating between low-rent dwellings and slum housing. Low-rent accommodation, specifically speaking, provides affordable housing and the necessary migrant-support facilities which rural migrant residents want to maintain and respect their own culture from which they have come.

The emphasis in this research is on the prevailing attitude towards rural migrants as permanent, second-tier sojourners or ‘others’ in urban society. The portrait drawn of them is as outsiders and most are relegated to focusing on a narrow

section of industries in frontline production, involved in menial work, restaurants, and low-skilled enterprises.\textsuperscript{143} As a result of their cohesion being grounded in the lower levels of society and in the long absence of stable support or protection from the government, rural migrant dwellers have naturally formed themselves into self-sufficient groups in their living environments.\textsuperscript{144}

Yefu Zhen (2001) finds that a rural area supports a network of familiar communities, and people live within their well-defined territory.\textsuperscript{145} Conversely, a city is a society revolving around the integration of uncertain elements. In Chinese society, the neighborhood has always been considered as the second layer of social cohesion just next to kinship ties. Before urbanization, a market-driven economic society initiated the influence on and change in loosening relations in traditional neighborhoods. Nevertheless, the effect has been minimal and even though the degree of mutual support has decreased, being an outsider is still often looked down upon by the locals. In addition, the absence of social and psychological support\textsuperscript{146} in the newly adopted city is likely to make it more difficult to engender a positive impression of the new and unknown, particularly since community sentiments are supposed to be built upon shared equal status and contact.\textsuperscript{147} The majority of migrants, however, develop their relationship to the world from simply dealing with the land to making a livelihood without the land. They are not familiar with their

host destination, nor do they have intimate local kin ties or friendship networks, nor do they make a complete transformation to living a life full of unfamiliar people and new things.

Instead of depending on kinship ties as before, rural migrants rely on the migrant associations established from the same circumstances or place of origin as their emotional source and social connections. Migrant networks are more likely to engender a community that connects migrants, former migrants, and non-migrants in origin and destination areas through ties of ‘kinship, friendship, and shared community origins’. However, migrant networks are more prone to be narrowed down within groups of geographical origin due to their low-level trust of each other in the urban area.

Furthermore, another predicament arises, especially for young migrants, since on the one hand, they encounter exclusion from the host society, and on the other hand, their identification with rural society becomes weaker and weaker. This ambiguity involves a double negation, that of non-identity with urbanity and rural life which occurs with the majority of migrants. Finally, the migrants face the dilemma of ‘non-survival in a city or ‘non-return’to the countryside’ both of which are unfeasible.

Since the start of such difficulties during migrants’ mingling in urban areas, my study continues to show what the migrants’ basic household survival strategies have been (such as, the separation of home and work duties and self-help on lodging) and how they work in reality. If we can understand the migrants’ experiences in their
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community and the dreams that motivate them to leave their place of origin, we can better see the hidden cultural resonances and gaps. Through these realizations we suggest practical proposals for housing such ‘floaters’, building a harmonious community and creating a convenient urban landscape.

3.3 Spatial structure for residents’ communal activities

The character of communal activities varies, contingent on the context in which they take place, where spatial structure does have an influence to different degrees on communal activity patterns, constructive relationships with neighbors and the more concentrated forms of communal contacts. Such types of communal activities have been examined by Gehl (1987).\textsuperscript{150} He proposes necessary activity, optional activity, and social activity as human dimensions for his examination and he measures the achievement of the environs by quantifying the degree of pedestrian flow, level and length of stationary activity—comprising communal activities and neighborly contacts.

Referring to my study, among the three types of activities, necessary activities and social activities largely direct the communications that people participate in.\textsuperscript{151} Gehl defines out the spatial contents of necessary activity, believing that it is related to those that are comparatively unavoidable and obligatory, namely, all activities in which those involved are to a greater or lesser level have need to take part in. Because the activities are necessary and unavoidable, their occurrence and frequency are less affected by the subjective will, and take place only when external environments are inviting.

The social activities in his book ‘between the houses’ are all activities that depend on the presence of others in public spaces. They occur as various kinds of communal activities, for example playing games with other people, greetings, and making conversations with others. They also include passive contact—eye contact and nodding, seeing and hearing a great number of unknown people and watching events. The common areas outside of the house and between the houses have been found to be a significant characteristic that delivers communal activities within neighborhoods. The outdoor spaces to be energetic and positive they need to have a combination of both moving and stationary activities. As for outdoor spaces for stationary resident, Gehl emphases static activities and the spatial elements that will make people not only drop by but also spend time with the space. Consequently, well-organized outdoor spaces can turn out to be effective activity nodes that facilitate residents’ day-to-day informally communal interactions.

The design of necessary activities in corresponding spaces and their details, down to the minimum component, are defining influences on the quality of the communal activities. Along with the spatial elements, issues such as shared spaces, mixed use, usability, levels of pedestrian comfort, and the patterns of space use demonstrate what revives communal activities and makes neighborly outdoor spaces thrive. The existence of certain spatial elements in outdoor spaces facilitates residents’ communal activities through informal contact. Therefore, the manipulation of the elements in the detail design of outdoor spaces of high-rise housing becomes important in the creation of socially favorable living environments.
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Chapter 4. First Case Study—Yimuyuan Neighborhood in Beijing

I take Beijing Yimuyuan neighborhood as an example to show the staging of the transforming from a traditional village to a CZC by year (Figure 4.1). In the process of forming a CZC, few locals or major migrants make up the actual dwellers there. For these so-called urban villages, some are geographically located in the city in a

Figure 4.1. Typical plot viewing the staging of increasing over-compacted buildings by year in Beijing Yimuyuan neighborhood (Drawing by author)
built up area, some are near the city and finally some are swallowed by the extension of the urban space. Therefore, a number of rural villages has been encompassed or annexed by newly advancing urban territories, forming a unique outcome—the CZC. Although land for agriculture no longer exists, the villages where local peasants reside still remain. Nevertheless, many CZCs have been developed as informal migrants’ settlements in conditions that contravene the regulations of the municipal government.154

4.1 Migrants’ spontaneously-developed housing in the Yimuyuan

A greater proportion of residents in the Yimuyuan neighborhood have kin-based relations or origin-based friend connections. Some Yimuyuan residents’ respond is that the reason for preferring Yimuyuan for residence is the influence of their relatives who brought them to this city. This is because the ‘resource’ who introduced the dweller to the Yimuyuan area is his/her relative.

If I analyze the rural-to-urban migrant group more closely, I see the close-fitting mode as a choice when the migrant’s network structure is only connected via a small number of bridging ties—total and remaining traditional. A number of observers have been led to suggest that the pattern of the majority of migrant residents residing in their destination cities is observed solely as a ‘maladapted community’.155

Having relations (kinship or friendship) is a favorable factor for their migration

and settlement in the destination city. The newcomer from the rural areas get accustomed to the city situation with the assistance from his/her resource persons and fellow migrants. Close friends and relatives provide some financial support during the waiting period to find employment. This group is made up of the routine-seekers who are grounded on the hunt for a routine life. At the group level, it involves the community of elderly rural migrants (first generation) and first-coming rural migrants (second-generation). The former related to the seclusion can be described as spontaneous-inclined and the latter is disposed to be unwilling. At the group level, it involves the community of elderly rural migrants restricting itself with a closed network, consisting of closely linked members who are inclined to endorse the norms, morals, faith, and social sustenance within the migrant group.

Most Yimuyuan dwellers have significant ties within this area they are living in. Neighborhood relationships are important for most of the rural-to-urban migrants. There are 907 households, approximately 1907 locals; the total quantity of migrant workers living in the Yimuyuan is estimated to be 3452 people. Residents are

![Diagram](http://example.com/diagram.png)

Figure 4.2. Member’s classification in Yimuyuan neighborhood (Drawing by author)
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basically divided into two groups: migrant workers and local rural residents. At the time of study, then, the population of the Yimuyuan neighborhood is made up of the subsequent major groups. In Figure 4.2, it shows that two groups that make up the residents of the Yimuyuan neighborhood.

The total number of rural-to-urban migrant workers in 2000 is around 300. From 2000 to 2012, its annual average growth rate is 87%, showing a rapid increase in rural-urban migration. The number of rural migrant workers is about 1.8 times that of local rural residents. It can be also seen that the number of rural-to-urban migrant tenants has a fast progressive growth, and approximately two thirds of them came with kin-based family members and had been introduced to rented rooms from locals by friends or other migrant relatives. According to the survey by the National Bureau of Statistics in 2012, the number of male workers accounted for 66.4% and female workers accounted for 33.6%, it is thus clear that male workers are the main part in the group of migrant workers. In my survey, most migrants in urban villages are young men, who have low levels of educational attainment and low income; they work in the tertiary sector, hold rural hukou, and are from adjacent or poor provinces. In the Yimuyuan area, based on the record of the local community office, men accounted for 56.8 percent of migrants residing in this neighborhood.

I compare the age distribution of the surveyed rural-to-urban migrant residents in 2013 (Table 4.1. Migrants are highly concentrated in the 21–31 age cohort, with a mean age of 26. Concerning the educational attainment of migrants in my survey, 68.3 percent have junior high school or lower levels of educational attainment. A low level of educational attainment is among the features explaining the migrants’ low earnings and their concentrated employment in low-skilled sectors. Moreover, the shared living conditions in the Yimuyuan neighborhood also reflect migrants’ negotiating housing choices.

The vast majority of the Yimuyuan neighborhood is made up of young migrants.
Due to their young age, three clear groups naturally emerged and we examined the most salient differences with reference to their differing household structures: parent-accompanied migrants, single migrants and couple-only migrants of trans-provincial families. A local urban hukou continues to be an important qualification for accessing several types of urban housing, particularly for those that are more affordable and have better conditions. A large number of young rural-to-urban migrant residents belong to a group known as ‘floating laborers’, occupied by off-farm workers (Nongmin gong) at the bottom of the labor market.\textsuperscript{157} In the Yimuyuan area, the majority of migrant worker tenants come from the Zhejiang and Sichuan regions. Joining friends/relatives and uniting family are the leading reasons for their rural-to-urban migration.\textsuperscript{158} Kinship ties and native-place networks played a significant role in sustaining their migratory flows and in the early foundation of the migrant community living in this area. Most of them live with their family,\textsuperscript{159} friends and relatives of their origin, suggesting a stronger socio-cultural relationship.

Migrant worker tenants’ lives in the Yimuyuan area are characterized by struggle and hard work. A third of migrant tenants works in the Yimuyuan and lives there. It is common for a household to share a room that serves as a combined residence and production site. A family’s living quarters can be located above or behind the shop; thus the workplace and home are physically joined.

This family-or countrymen-based life of this group is not simply a part of their current life style, it is also determined by other causes. Work-centered family life is common among the migrant workers. In fact, the close-knit small-business family in


the *Yimuyuan* and other CZC areas has been portrayed in many research studies. As suggested by Zhong (2012), migrant workers support their urban life by means of starting small businesses in *CZC* areas. The enterprises are confined to laundries, grocery stores, restaurants, and various small kinds of service outlets. This is an economic incentive to bring across their own families; besides offering friendship and affection, relatives and countrymen are a source of trustful labor for the business.

4.2 Examining the spatial structure of the *Yimuyuan* neighbourhood

I lived in the *Yimuyuan* low-rent neighborhood during the summer of 2013. Modern urban architects and planners used their professional skills, philosophies and values to help rural-to-urban migrants resolve their difficulties and impose their values on refining migrants’ living conditions. As my aim of this research is to know what low-rent housing for migrants was like, how it felt to live as a rental resident, because planners presented the *CZC* neighborhood as characterized by an unhealthy environment and incompatible with the harmonious life of a normal neighborhood. My study developed into an extensive analysis of the low-rent physical environment and interpersonal environment. At the end, I concluded that by and large, I concluded that by and large, the designers were wrong. The *Yimuyuan* neighborhood is not really a slum, and although many of its inhabitants did have problems and the objective situation is unpleasant to a certain degree.

The *Yimuyuan* neighborhood has a distinctive character as a case study for our research. First, economically, because it has already been designated as a migrant enclave, in which the biggest desirability included the low cost of accommodation
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and consumption. Second, spatially, *Yimuyuan* forms, with clear margins, a 0.62 square kilometer (620,000 m²) area with an overwhelming number of tenants occupying their villages in a disproportional ratio. Third, it is a convenient place to stay for the neo migrant generation due to the easy commute to their workplace, proximity to public transportation, and the convenience of services. *Yimuyuan* is just one of numerous areas with CZCs in *Beijing*, and it is situated in the northwest section of downtown *Beijing* (Figure 4.3). The region of *Yimuyuan* is an outsiders-and-locals mixed piece of the central city where varied communities have been shaped. *Yimuyuan* is a residential neighborhood located in the *Haidian* District of *Beijing*, 1.5km south of the 5th ring road and 5.5km north of the 4th ring road, at the
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Figure 4.3. Location of *Yimuyuan* neighborhood in *Beijing* (Drawing by author)
southwest corner of the Summer Palace Ruins Park (Yuanmingyuan yizhi gongyuan). *Yimuyuan* occupies the southern entrance of the *Xiyuan* area which is located between *Yiheyuan* Road and the *Yuanmingyuan* Ruins Park. The *Xiyuan* area has a commercial development center, which is based around the *Xiyuan* shopping mall, and lies alone on the *Yiheyuan* Road which operated the biggest bus terminal in the

![Yimuyuan neighborhood in 1990](image1)

![Yimuyuan neighborhood in 2013](image2)

Figure 4.4. Changes in pattern maps from 1990 to 2013 in *Yimuyuan* in *Xiyuan* area, Haidian district of *Beijing* (Drawing by author)
northwest region in 2010. *Yimuyuan* is located spatially neighboring two areas with historical ruins, *Yuanmingyuan* to the North and the *Summer Palace* to the West.

The formation of the *Yimuyuan* migrant neighborhood took place with two unique characteristics. The first is its vicinity to two historical parks and two of China’s most famous universities (*Tsinghua* University and *Beijing* University).
second feature is its geographical setting. *Yimuyuan* has easy access to transportation facilities: *Xiyuan* bus terminal and *Xiyuan* subway station. The area spreads east to *Dayuan* Motel, west beside the Summer Palace, south adjacent to *Guajiatun* and *Fuyuan* village, the north reaches the southern part of the *Yuanmingyuan* Ruins Park. With a population of approximately 80,000 in the *Xiyuan* area, *Yimuyuan* is

![Figure 4.6. Main facilities in Yimuyuan neighborhood area (Drawing by author)](image-url)
considered to be the residential community with the greatest size in this area. The area of Yimuyuan is 0.12 km².

4.2.1 Migrants’ rental room

Representative features of Yimuyuan life and the impression of the area can best be explained by an informal drawing (Figure 4.7, 4.8). To begin with, the houses of the Yimuyuan area as a common village neighborhood, private low-rise houses are scattered. Largely developments or extensions to a building (for example, rearranging the rooms) are majorly undertaken by the house owner before they decide to transform their normal houses into the rental rooms. The most major transformation other than the physical rearrangement made by the house owner was the maximum simplification of functions in the housing. Private housing has a family room, bedroom, kitchen and other spaces with different functions. However, the other functions have been completely taken away and replaced by a collection of bedrooms of different size as self-governed rental rooms in the houses. They have become smaller, more important, and there is no hierarchy between the primary and secondary perception of spaces.

House structure in the Yimuyuan, shows a considerable similarly in style and arrangement. The marked simplification in style and largely shared quality of facilities and services are two of the clearest indicators of communal life. From the point of view of the developmental cycle of the domestic group, perhaps the most significant feature of the type of Yimuyuan rental house is that the boundaries among private and public spaces are ad hoc, and it is flexible from place to place. These features of the space arrangement permit spatial continuousness and mobility in the residence patterns by their occupants.
Figure 4.7. Comparison drawing of the before and after rearrangement of rental rooms by local landowners in Yimuyuan neighborhood (Drawing by author)
Figure 4.8. Comparison drawing of the before and after rearrangement of rental rooms by local landowners in Yimuyuan neighborhood (Drawing by author)
During my field-observation, it was evident that the majority of tenants initially stay with their relatives upon their arrival in Beijing. My interviewees living in the Yimuyuan neighborhood emphasize that they chose their particular community of destination precisely because their relatives were already living there. In terms of the pattern of the rental housing, I drew out 8 typical housing patterns (Figure 4.9, 4.10, 4.11) according to 3 different groups of migrant residents, they are, single, family-accompanied and couple migrant residents. Tenants’ rental houses were full of family members, much more so than the urban housing environment and privacy was scarce. Moreover, in most cases, a rental room was not equipped with specified utilities; functions or functions were all mixed according to the tenants’ needs. During the daytime, what in the evening served as a bedroom became the living room, while at night, what was the parlor turned into a bedchamber.

As a result of the rearrangement, the rooms inside this housing became the same in terms of a single function, for example, the entrance which constituted of the main entry and the adjacent area was proximately between the outdoor and indoor. And the family room functioned as an access point to the house unit as a whole, not as an entrance element from the external to the internal of the house. However, inside of the housing, the corridor served as a spatially distinctive entry place to the interior spaces. In the Yimuyuan neighborhood, a corridor can be found in each rental house, and it functions as an entry element from outside to inside spaces.

Compared to the previous houses, the function of the corridor inside of the house is expanded unconsciously in terms of its location (being integrated to the main body of the building) in addition to its function (as an access point connecting inside and outside directly) the actual physical and activity opportunities. The other characteristic of the latter houses in Yimuyuan neighborhood is that, due to the lack of space in the units, the front area, exactly the physical space in front of the rental room in a communal corridor extended as an individual property area for private living-related use. Between the rental rooms, the front of the rental room might have
enabled the migrant residents to use the front of the rental room as another major living space to make up the lack of private space. Like the door or entrance of room in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood, the door of each single rental room divides the space between the private space and the public space into a space between the private spaces to semi-private space. It seems that the rental room and corridor shared the function of being transitional spaces or the latter is more expected to be used as the

Figure 4.9. A room layout of single tenants in *Yimuyuan* neighborhood (Drawing by author)

Note: My drawing is based on the description by migrants and photos taken by myself. A typical rented room of migrants in *Yimuyuan* functions very basically. A single rental room is the most common rental room pattern in this neighborhood. Normally small single room can merely house only one person and a dormitory-like rental room can be shared by more than 4 people. There is very little in the way of furniture and it is without a toilet or bathroom.
transitional space. While the amount of building activity going on in the Yimuyuan is striking, the majority of it involves the construction of new houses, instead old ones may be refurbished, extended and improved, forming the impression that the Yimuyuan neighborhood is under continuous reconstruction.

Figure 4.10. A room layout of parent-accompanied migrants in Yimuyuan neighborhood (Drawing by author)

Note: A typical rented room of migrants in Yimuyuan, functions very basically. Normally it houses more than three (a couple and children) people, in double metal bunk beds. There is very little in the way of furniture and it is without a toilet or bathroom.
Within our expectations, couple migrant residents are inclined more to the functionality of their living quarters than single migrant residents, for instance, having a kitchen and a lavatory. A typical rental room consists of one living room with an adjoining separated small space for cooking fuel. However, these service quarters

Figure 4.11. Typical room layout of sampled couple-only tenants in *Yimuyuan* neighborhood (Drawing by author)
were not planned as a necessary part within a rental room, in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood, a single room with a separate kitchen is not a major trend. Even now, the kitchen is considered as to be the most significant part of a house, and through our observations, more than half of the rental rooms in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood had simple access to a cooking stove, including a poorly maintained cooking facility in front of their rental room or at best a shared cooking facility on the bottom floor of the whole building. There is not a wide enough corridor (less than 1.2 meters, typically 1-meter-wide) connecting to each household directly; but the emptiness of the corridor is always crammed with cooking utensils, shelves and a drying rack.

### 4.2.2 Migrants’ rental house

As for the settling process of migrant enclaves and environment evaluation, the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood in 1987 was purely an indigenous living quarter, and the local residents (local farmers) never actually thought they could earn money through renting their home to outsiders or were reluctant to engage in private business (leasing for instance) due to it being an uncommon and hazardous practice. However, gradually they recognized that renting was enormously money-spinning while cultivating the land was less of a harvest in a comparative sense. Moreover, an increasing number of families got used to living under the same roof with outsiders. One perceptible feature inside this boundary includes the many regional restaurants with customers using their different dialects. The *Yimuyuan* neighborhood is also physically notable by its heavily paddling nonlocal façade. The rental house is therefore a regional area which occupies the rental rooms (Figure 4.12). The rental house is a space that is exclusive concerning the modes of occupancy, but is visually exposed and legally communal. In the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood, the spatial settings
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Figure 4.12. The schematic diagram of changes of house plan in *Yimuyuan* neighborhood (Drawing by author)
for the rental houses are of limited size and located immediately close to the other rental houses, such as hand-shake buildings.

The house pattern where the local land owner constructed housing is what is truly attractive (Figure 4.13). The policy governing rural land local land owners allowed them to just improve their domestic households. However, during the years of growth these building grew and were extended vertically turning out to be 3-5 layer
high inhabited towers divided by narrow alleyways. The height of these little buildings is being capped at around 5 floors because of the simple fact that elevators did not serve them. This generated an exclusive architectural shape of the ‘hand-shaking building’. This name originated from the short interactional distance and the type of interpersonal experiences.

Rental houses have a high level of sense of possession compared to the rental rooms inside of the rental houses. In the Yimuyuan neighborhood, front stoops, sidewalks and many other forms of transitional spaces, between the house and the communal alleyway or lane, are characteristic surroundings around the rental house. Whereas the inside of the rental room looks like being a space into which private activities overflowed from inside the house, the space at the front of the house logically has formed a barricade between the privacy of the room and the completely communal feature of the adjacent houses in the neighborhood, as well as a connection between the small social group of different person/families and the larger social group of the communit.

4.2.3 Between the rental houses

Personal, regular household work, daily-used shared infrastructure and leisure/social entertainment are the main focuses of the communal activities in this area (Figure 4.14). In the Yimuyuan area, the front of the house and the areas between the rental houses are dominant in the process of the forming of communal activities. Because the rental rooms have extremely simple functions or functions, so the people need to depend on the outside spaces and public facilities to take care of themselves. The facility place is detached from the main body of the rental house, and served as a part of the neighborhood instead of as a part of inside of the rental house. Activities include children playing, household work by housewives, interaction activities by teenagers and adults are occurred on the way to the public facilities.
Thus it can be said that the space between the rental houses supports important migrant-support functions of the normal house, and so becomes an integrated part of the house. The whole neighborhood becomes an intertwining set of 2 forms of function categories. They are labeled as ‘necessary function’, and ‘migrants-support functions’. I stress how residence becomes part of the interweaving of functions. The functions help to build up the relationship of residents to the function of their choice, and also enable a relationship to form between residents. Consequently, functions of sharing create communal activities, for instance, the bathing, laundry as necessary

Figure 4.14. Schematic diagram of set of functional network in *Yimuyuan* neighborhood
(Drawing by author)
provided functions are shared by the whole residents. This characterizes the role of the public alleyways between the rental houses in fostering communal sharing.

In the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood, the width of the windy streets can be quite narrow, making it very difficult for two cars to pass without a scratch. Migrant residents do come out of their small room to play around and sit on the steps or platform outside and talk to the neighbors. A group of houses make an ‘alleyway bunch’. The alleyways between the rental buildings turn out to be relatively significant and produce a fairly good quantity of communal activities. These streets can be defined as micro-neighborhoods and normally comprise one community group.

The propinquity from rental buildings is an important condition for shaping the transitional space. A series of narrow streets flanked on both sides by columns or three and five-story small buildings. The buildings are poorly maintained structures, some of them are fully occupied, some facing on alleyways covered with different public facilities, such as public restroom, bathroom and laundry rooms, many grocery stores and restaurants.

The five-story tenement becomes the main building type. The structures built are intended, like those migrants, for rural-to-urban migrant tenants. These buildings are small and several houses had to share bathroom and toilet facilities. The buildings constructed in this neighborhood, were intended for locals. Instead of merely rental room buildings, there were common function ones, each with family room, bedroom, kitchens, the new and the old buildings were built at high densities. Land coverage are high, majority percent of the land being covered with rental houses, and in a quarter of the blocks, buildings comprises the whole land. Some of the streets are equipped with public restrooms and some of the streets are shopping blocks with small restaurants and stores on the ground floor of the tenements.
Residential streets, the corners and sidewalks, and small scale open spaces such as play grounds, courtyard are major physical environment for the space between the rental houses in the Yimuyuan neighborhood. Computer rooms around the corner, front of the corner stores, restaurant and other social places with the Yimuyuan neighborhood are the other situations between the houses.

The Yimuyuan neighborhood is the primary area of big settlement for rural-to-urban migrants around China. Walking through the neighborhood, a group of ‘anchorless’ people go about their day-to-day routine while spending time at a street corner, the stores and using their daily-used shared functions and communally used services as functions (migrant federation, migrants’ training school and migrant employment agencies etc.). The phenomenon of using these public functions as an individual’s extended home ground can be named as the ‘domestic territory function’. These places are used as if they are not public places, but rather as private gatherings for different specific migrant groups.

In the Yimuyuan, Wanquanhe market place is my important interview place where the majority of migrants conduct their fruit wholesale or retail businesses. Because the majority of migrants living in the Yimuyuan neighborhood are engaged in the fruit trade, marketplaces offer me with the chance to chat with migrants who specialized in trading as well. Consequently, the food street inside of the Yimuyuan neighborhood is a popular major node between the buildings. According to the residents’ daily routes, they go out of the rental house to use public restroom/bathroom out of daily necessity, and they use the grocery shops, retail shops and restaurants, market for their intentional visits. The following diagram demonstrates the compositions of their housing, their facilities and setting in the Yimuyuan neighborhood.

The Yimuyuan area is essentially a CZC, and as such it belongs to the area connecting urban and rural domains. During the early 1990s, the Yimuyuan-situated
Xiyuan area was an isolated rural area; however, with the increasing number of non-Beijing locals arriving, several streets were cut through by crowded rental houses and developed with one-story single houses. Following the influx of migrants, other hidden paths were formed between three- to five-story apartment blocks, and until now, the narrow paths serve as the chief streets in the local road network.

The four major recognized elements of the outsiders’ enclave are paths of different widths, commercial zones with retail shops, public toilets and bathrooms, and the residential areas of crowded houses. An amalgamation of small streets, scattered shops with non-Beijing name displays, and crowded rental houses with 4 floors can be an elementary model which forms the outline of the Yimuyuan neighborhood. This pattern has been extended along a series of narrow winding paths that has created the structure of Yimuyuan. For instance, the core of the Yimuyuan neighborhood is a laddered network which constitutes four main boundary streets. The chief outsider-run shops are along the Yimuyuan East Road. These shops are financially strong enough to create a significant presence which is in demand in this required wide district. Outsider-operated stores support their own residential areas in their shops, and so normally their living and business sections are physically joined.

The Yimuyuan neighborhood is formed chiefly of various paths. Yimuyuan East road and West road are the major streets shaping the border of this community. And both streets are important streets for residents to get access to the areas outside their neighborhood. As the streets in the Yimuyuan cross each other, the streets silhouette points where various stranger-operated businesses and signs are concentrated. The high flow of customers is seen most in the East end with an abundance of symbolic non-Beijing tastes. At the present time, the neighborhood emerges as a space which is characterized by high levels of communication among its residents. To some degree, for the local residents, Yimuyuan neighborhood does have a portal point at
the beginning of the *Yimuyuan* East Road and *Wanquanhe* market instead of the entrance in the west (Figure 4.7).

The two main streets have many identifiable characteristics. From the entry point along the *Yimuyuan* East road we can access the chief business region which is filled with restaurants and grocery stores selling food, sweets, magazines, and many other stores catering to the needs of both the resident community and those curious about it. You can find vendors selling many types of food and products. Outsiders and *Beijing* locals from this area like to visit this market to buy food at a cheap price. This business street started in 1990 and now normally 200 shops operate here. For the residents, after work, many gather to enjoy food from their hometown, and the truth is that although we refer to convenience and city in speaking about this area, the streetscape has little connection with its urban surroundings and the view leaves much to be desired. Such images strengthen the practical functions of the *Yimuyuan* area which has been characterized as a somewhat poor community.

Along the *Yimuyuan* East street, there are stores and buildings extending to the end of the whole neighborhood. Several restaurants such as *Yixiang Qingyuan* restaurant, *Shaxian* refreshment center and *Chengdu* restaurant are situated along this street. Also, some traditional *Beijing* shops and, *Donglaishun* restaurant are still located on this street. Most single stores are small and in order to attract more customers, the restaurant owners normally extend their stands onto the street. At the beginning of the right side of the street, there is *Shiji jia jiafu* chain supermarket, a *Shanxi* noodle restaurant, a play area, a kindergarten and an exchange or re-cycling center. Almost every 4 buildings, there is a small path connecting to the residential area behind. These informal shortcuts have become the chief transport byways for the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood. These streets are generally densely-organized with the signs of small-scale vendors. A small playground, which is located inside of the *Yimuyuan* East street and *Wanquanhe* commercial market, forms the small open
formal gathering place as well as functioning as a branch path for the commercial market.

It is difficult to get a good sense of direction through crossing the small alleys here. Houses are not numbered logically; and the strategies that govern the orientation of the through roads and buildings rely on road signs—kiosks, clinics, and public toilets alike. *Yimuyuan* East road is a mixed function zone, and on its streets basic commercial functions are performed on one side and there is the chief sidewalk for pedestrians that can be crossed to lead to the residential area.

Now let me turn to two distinguished features of the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood. First, the community has fixed geographic boundaries and is spread over a large suburban neighborhood in the *Haidian* district in the northwestern part of *Beijing* city. People disagree about where *Yimuyuan* begins as a naturally-developed migrants’ spontaneous gathering settlement. Some consider that it originates from a preexisting local village now densely populated by rural-to-urban migrants, as a result *Yimuyuan* neighborhood has been transformed into a migrants’ gathering place from a preexistent community.

Second, this community has a diverse social composition. It is not homogeneous with respect to residents and spatial configuration. Several social groups reside together, mainly including migrants and local *Beijing* residents. Since the rural-to-urban migrants constitute the majority, as a whole, therefore, this place is portrayed as a little kingdom.

### 4.3 Examining the migrant residents’ activities

This section describes 3 patterns of migrants group’s community experience observed and interviewed in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood. This is essential for gaining elementary evidence regarding the outlines of ‘place-creating’ for migrants
in low-rent neighborhoods. In the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood, several patterns of spatial environment serve migrants’ social activities, or simply speaking, in the two spatial situations, this group conducts their social communication with neighbors. They are: (inside of their house) the sharing space and (outside of their house) the open space front of their rental house and their neighboring small blocks.

Based on the field observations, the 3 spaces facilitate residents’ several according activities occurrence. There are mainly three types of activities, such as a necessary activity, a transitional activity and a social activity. Accordingly, the three activities needed for different types of physical environments are significantly different from each other. Among them, each one refers to the communal activities that residents engage in, such as cooking, washing, and arranging. These looks for individual daily activities are unintentionally enabling the occurrence of communal activities in the outdoor spaces. The shared common functions in outdoor areas (in front of the rental rooms, rental houses and between the rental houses) have been found to be an important feature that affords different levels of communal activity in neighborhoods. As Archea (1977) said, the existence of activity nodes in outdoor spaces provides the greatest opportunity for access and exposure,¹⁶² and can increase the residents’ informal communal activities.¹⁶³

The subsequent research findings have revealed that the existence of certain spatial elements in three public outdoor spaces facilitate residents’ casual interaction and then nurtures communal activities. Therefore, the manipulation of the elements in the outdoor spaces of the migrants’ spontaneous-developed *Yimuyuan* neighborhood becomes important in the creation of socially favorable living environments.

4.3.1 Front of migrants’ rental room

The most dominant function in front of migrants’ rental room in the Yimuyuan neighborhood is to serve as a cooking/storage activities (Figure 4.15, 4.16, 4.17). The narrow size of rental room enables the migrant residents to use the space in front of their room as a supplementary living space (for cooking, cleaning, stuff-gathering). Supposedly for this reason, the extension of private space in the location and function indicate actually the communal and behavioral activities. Between the rental rooms, the corridor or passage have enabled the residents to use it as kitchen. Because the rental room is very small, it is normally occupied by one bed and a space for transportation, and residents normally put their small cooking utensils in front of their rental room. In this case, the corridor becomes a shared cooking space to make up for the lack of necessary space inside of their room. Under these conditions, the neighborly communication for residents starts from in front of their room.

The rental room in the Yimuyuan, strictly speaking, is a public home, not a private residence. Important as concrete kinship ties used to be, however, it is easy to overestimate their significance and the relevance of kinship contacts for positive feelings about the Yimuyuan residential area. The core of the most active kinship ties looks as if it includes the nuclear relatives (parents, siblings, and children) of both spouses. The following data from my survey show that the more far-reaching these available kinship bonds are within the local area, the greater the percentage of those who show strong encouraging communal feelings toward the Yimuyuan neighborhood.

This kind of connection point leads to the same observation: the more frequent the contact with siblings or the more frequent the contact with parents or the greater the desire to move near relatives, the greater the percentage of those who like Yimuyuan very much. The local people say that members of Yimuyuan live in each other’s pockets, and are mutually well-acquainted. As for the rooms, the inside is
defined by the division between the house and the alleyway, or the division between rental houses, but not the division between one rental room and another.

The seemingly diverse purposes of each room come together inside of the rental house due to the willingness for communication. When preparing daily things, the corridor is used for meals or household chores, as well as other constant daily usage. As a result, there is no effort to stress the need for private living compartments. The adjacent corridor, presents a clue as to how the communal activities have achieved a balance between the public and the private.

Physical evidence of the typical forms of rental room environment—heavy use of private space and extended private space in the public corridor. The corridor immediately adjacent to each rental room is functionally a part of their interior. When the inside space gets busy or stuffy, family members use their public corridor often to satisfy the spatial inadequacy, and carry on their activities near their rental room door. Under these conditions, the connecting corridor space of each floor turns out to be a truly operative extension of the individual migrant’s or household’s inside.

A characteristic building is of 4-5 stories built by local Beijing residents; 10-12 rooms are housed on each floor; every room is simply furnished for single tenants or tenants with few family members. Migrant children may sleep near their parents, grandparents or other migrant resident adults when they are young. Generally, their space is restrictively delineated as a sleeping area. Individual domestic members do not have daytime space of their own; at night, types of spatial division typically comprise a light mosquito net. The unity of the household is most plainly articulated in cooking and eating arrangements.

I have already referred to the fact that inside of the rental rooms there is only ever a simple resting area, but where most day-to-day activities continue, and this involves the culinary stove, the kitchen, and the main living area outside of the rental
Figure 4.15. Schematic diagram of arrangement of migrant tenants’ public corridor as kitchen in front of their room (Drawing by author)
Figure 4.16. Schematic diagram of arrangement of migrant tenants’ public corridor as kitchen or storage space in front of their room (Drawing by author)
room. Many members, nuclear families, generations living within rental room(s), their natural activity level regarding cooking housework actually happens in the corridor, in front of their rental room. This is the most significant of household activities from the perspective of the attention it receives and where the communal activities take place. When the cooking activities do happen outside of their rental rooms, that is, the activities connected to the regular life of the migrant inhabitants, it encourages neighborly communication because the number of users in the kitchen is increased, and casual communication is unavoidable.

As such, migrants, living in these buildings akin to capsule containers with one bed and one desk, have been surveyed. More than 10 tenants (a minimum of 8 to a maximum of 20 rooms) on each floor share one basin at the corner of a layer or on the between-floor area on the stairs. The integration of living public spaces and the gradual transformation of the private into semi-public areas foster a great deal of socializing among inhabitants, especially those in the narrow interior private spaces. Such socializing activities casually and unavoidably occur in front of their rental room.

A simple kitchen in the public corridor is not in a minority option. A corridor of 1.5m wide, is composed of minimal cooking furnishings, and only those with functionality. One stove and one table are set for meeting the minimum requirements of simple cooking. Within the whole Yimuyuan neighborhood, private kitchens or bathrooms are not adequately supplied, and most individual tenants have to sacrifice their semi-private space. As single renters living alone or in shared rooms with others in the Yimuyuan area, these dwellers have to rely increasingly on public space for accomplishing their daily necessities. These types of activity are generally performed in the public corridor in each rental house. One tenant who shared the corridor as a kitchen with other unfamiliar bachelors says how he feels about this environment:

*The highest possibility of meeting my neighbors often happens during the cooking time. We cook almost at the same time every*
Figure 4.17. Schematic diagram of arrangement of how migrant tenants’ public corridor as storage space in front of their room (Drawing by author)
day in the public corner. Gradually, a person I often meet casually becomes a person I am acquainted with.

Similarly, the value of the many small likelihoods of people’s casual gathering attracts other people’s communication. Three schematic diagrams show three representative plans where migrant tenants’ communication occurs through using the corridor between homes as a simple cooking area in front of their room.

The simple kitchen and storage space present the migrants’ activities in the corresponding space. This space becomes a private place in a public situation. Residents dominate the place in front of the room with their presence. They walk freely to and fro as they go about their tasks: the corridor is more than just for transportation use, but also serves as a cooking, gathering and entertainment area with neighbors. They utilize the corridor area in front of the room and sometimes the margins too. There is no sense of confinement or control in their movements or use of space.

The location of food preparation could be considered as being at the very core of the house and its functions. In the Yimuyuan neighborhood, this core location is seldom placed inside of a private rental room, but it cultivates a shared feeling that allows for communal activities among next-door neighbors. Cooking and housework are not just solitary activities performed by a person or family members together, but they are also performed in a cooperative way. This is what gives force to the sharing in corridors or preparing of meals in front of the rental rooms.

Under these conditions, the neighborly communication for residents starts from in front of their room. The pictures I took in the Yimuyuan neighborhood were in winter and in summer. The cooking function combined with a corridor during a day is shared by the group of people who reside in the same floor. The cooking, and storage functions serve as the character that describes the relationship between residents and space, the relationship between the sharers. As shown previously,
cooking and storage have both a spatial character and a character of the inter-residents. The same applies for the other characteristics such as storage.

4.3.2 Front of migrants’ rental house

In the Yimuyuan neighborhood, the residential housing includes the most traditional form of Beijing residential housing—the Pingfang (bungalow) and low-rise houses (Figure 4.18, 4.19). The Pingfang houses are normally equipped with more adjacent rooms on all four sides around the courtyard. Our field observation also showed that in the Yimuyuan Niangniang miao dayuan (big courtyard) 34 households were accommodated. 6 out of 15 parent-accompanied migrants’ families lived in this yard) for three main reasons: one, compared to other single rooms built recently by local residents in this neighborhood, the rooms in the courtyard may be spacious enough for housing big households; two, the big yard is equivalent to an extended private space for a family or families’ housework and an additional facility place.

The strong association between the place in front of the rental house and the residents is simply expressed in two activity patterns that are dominant in the process of forming the intimate communal spaces. They are: use of water facilities by residents and drying clothes on ropes and bamboo pipes in the narrow alley front. The individual activities conducted by the residents are mostly daily activities according to their needs, such as housekeeping as well as events which support their survival. These individual activities are conducted routinely.

On entering the in front place, perhaps the most striking impression for the visitor is the residents staying outside of the house and the presence of line-drying laundry. Particularly during the day, residents are mostly present in front of the house, engaged in housework, using tap water, hanging laundry, taking a rest after conducting their daily activities, or selling food and drinks. Those that are present,
Figure 4.18. Schematic diagram of arrangement of migrants’ use space in front of rental house (Drawing by author)

Note: narrow alleyway frontages mean short distances between entrances—and entrances are where the majority of events nearly always take place
are often females, and they seem confined to its furthest regions: they sit in a group, together, huddled in a faraway line along the alleyway. Appropriately, they occupy the narrow alleys of the in front house space: perching on door stoops or porches, half in and half out of the house, watching the comings and goings of the neighborhood.

The preparation of housework by residents and their gathering by members of houses take up much attention and time and these activities are highly enjoyed. The dominant part of housework and meeting activities is washing clothes, preparing for food and taking a rest after conducting their daily activities. Normally in their daily context in front of residents’ rental houses, activities are rarely done by one person on their own. When this does come about the resident will all the time invite others present to be with him/her. This invitation is an emblem of hospitality and inclusion. It is significant that the working on laundry, sitting, taking of foods or drinks, spending time in front of the rental house are a normal part of daily visiting for residents living in the Yimuyuan.

The sitting positions are mostly unnoticed: people may sit cross-legged, with legs stretched out in front of them, or even lie about on the floor. This lack of restraint in the way they behave themselves in the space is also echoed in other aspects of residents’ actions within the neighborhood. Within the neighborhood it is frequent to see physical contact between neighbors in all respects when they behave towards each other in a casual and relaxed manner. Women do not modify their movements, sitting positions or dress when male members of the household are present. Men and women of the house eat together and converse rather freely in each other’s presence.

Residents in the Yimuyuan minimize the connection between specific areas of the neighborhood and men or women, saying ‘it is not calculated’, strictly followed. It is difficult to ascertain whether such integration is more observed in the Yimuyuan
than elsewhere—partly because observers have tended to concentrate on formal contexts where such integration is constantly marked.

Although relations between household members have a tendency to be informal and relaxed, a facility-based hierarchy operates among spaces, despite having a weaker form. This spatial hierarchy is particularly clear in the relations between in front of the rental rooms and in front of the rental houses, but between the houses most communal facilities and services are shared.

The facility place is detached from the main body of the rental house, and serves as a part of the neighborhood instead of as a part of the inside of the rental house. The feeling of ‘front of the house’ is proximity in terms of the function both the interactional distance and the type of interpersonal arrangement, migrant residents uses the front of their house in many situations habitually on an everyday basis. Here are the most important neighborhood spaces for adults. A great deal of communication and spending of free time among young migrants, especially juvenile population, take place in the front public space of their rental room—public courtyard, stoops. It should be noted that due to the narrow size of inside of the room and no access to the facilities inside of the house, such as water, residents also use front of the rental house as the physical place for cleaning and housework and receiving guests.

In the *Yimuyuan* houses, most of the water comes from a public pump in the street, normally outside of the house, residents fetch water, do minor laundry (for major clothes washing they use a public laundry room nearby), and perform other chores. Food preparation occupies a lot of time, like migrant residents, because of the location of their water they spend a great deal of time outside of their house. Interestingly, most of the migrant residents living activities take place outside of their room or outside of their house.
Figure 4.19. Some phrases as ‘close friends’ and ‘keeping an arm’s distance from someone’

Note: it indicates the degree of intimacy achieved in front of rental house. Small spaces tend to be perceived as warm and personal. The small dimensions make it possible to see and hear other residents, and in small spaces, the details as well as the whole can be enjoyed. A typical *Yimuyuan* branch alleyway in front of the rental house, all types of activities ranging from drying clothes to community gathering are normally taking place.
Migrants usually have a habit of sitting on the doorsill of their room. Their friends and relatives might also join him/her, and finally a crowd sits at the front of the rental room. And an unexpected passerby who stops to chat stands in a peripheral position around this open space. A typical drawing of migrant tenants occupying of a rental room stoop in the Yimuyuan neighborhood is shown in Figure 4.19.

When guests come to the neighborhood the spatial arrangement comes to be more noticeable. These guests are received by residents in front of the rental house while members of the household stay outside of their rental room or house. Local landowners say that the in front of the rental house is for visitors. Moreover, due to this, they refer to casual everyday visits from neighbors, kin and friends who usually sit in front of the house. Older women residents take part in entertaining and, actually gather together to play cards or mahjong. When residents are at home, they spend a lot of time outdoors—in front of the room, in front of the house and between the houses, for these are places that the main activities of communal life are performed.

While different areas of the house and neighborhood are tightly associated with residents’ daily necessities, and the communal activities obtain strength by the spatial combination and separation from the neighborhood. Residents’ own perception of communal activities is that they are rather occasional and habitual. For example, because running water is provided outside of the house, women need to collect the water from outside to wash clothes, cook and clean the house. All these activities can be detected by walking through the street, not only by looking through doors and windows that show what is going on inside but also because most of them are performed in the outside space.

In the Yimuyuan neighborhood, this is one aspect of a more overall lack of sufficient interior family space. Different areas of the rental neighborhood have a tendency to not be strongly associated with particular people but linked with specific spatial utilities. Co-resident nuclear families have an extended area existing in front
of the house for their household use. Household members do, however, have their customary household space either in the corridor or the street in front of their rental house, where these are all functionally a part of its interior.

As far as the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood is concerned, the small blocks (street corners) are the main places for teenager’s activities. For the family-accompanied migrants, the interiors of their houses appear cramped with so many family members. Since there is an absence of enough personal private space, family members like to spend more time outside of their narrow house. It seems common for these groups to restrict their outdoor activities to a single front of the house, and then to have a number of nearby blocks in the neighborhood.

A few parent-accompanied migrant children mentioned that they liked the coziness and enjoyment of living in this neighborhood. In the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood, the front of migrants’ housing is always occupied by people, especially by the elderly and housewives. The rental houses and front of the houses are important as locales where migrant tenants can add individuality to their rental rooms and maintain status in their own and their neighbor’s eyes. Consequently, migrant tenants perform just as significant a psychological and social function as do the carefully tended front space of rental housing.

Activities in front of migrants’ rental houses have an exactly continuous flow between the rental house and alleyway or street. Migrant children are sent in to the path to play for fun, housewives sit outside the building to watch other people and events. Single migrant residents stay on the street and make occasional conversation with people they know.

Most particularly, the door of each single rental room extends to the interior space, the entrance of the related housing functions as division between inside and outside. The residents of the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood are ‘at home’ inside of the
house instead of just inside of their own room. Inside of the *Yimuyuan* area, once migrant residents are on the street, they are on a wholly communal path, an alleyway to or from someplace instead of on a bounded space defined by a subjective sense of community.

### 4.3.3 Between the rental houses

The space between the rental houses supports the common facilities which are provided in Silver Housing for the elderly who live in the neighborhood. They provide activities such as simple gymnastic, karaoke, games, making origami, and playing music, as well as support the migrants. In this facility, the migrant residents create companionship between each other. These activities are not a responsibility to be followed by the migrant residents who dwell in the neighborhood, rather they are provided for those who want and need activities. The residents form their own activities based on their needs and pastimes.

The alleyway in front of the rental house is likely to be more public than corridor in front of the rental room, and communal activities occur in the corridor within relations of next-door neighbors. Nevertheless, between the houses friendliness maybe presented by male and female residents residing in the adjacent rental houses or even in the whole *Yimuyuan* area. Neighborly ties may be less close than the corresponding ones among family residents, but the atmosphere is welcoming, relaxed and informal, and this is mirrored in residents’ body posture.

Between the rental houses, the space refers to a neighborhood place which is not legally owned by specific people, but under certain circumstances, is occupied and used exclusively to produce a collective-symbolic ownership for a certain group of people (Figure 4.20, 4.21, 4.23). Of our sampled 45 migrants, because the extent and character of indoor activities are restricted by physical arrangement to a certain degree, migrant tenants make use of a great deal of local public facility space to go
Figure 4.20 Schematic diagram of arrangement of space of between the rental houses (Drawing by author)

Note: meaningful contact on the way to public restroom is possible
Figure 4.21. Schematic diagram of arrangement of space between the houses
(Drawing by author)

Note: Narrow alleyways and narrow street frontages bring the inhabitants together, in the streets
about their daily life. Corner grocery stores, markets, public restroom, public bathroom are the main settings for meeting tenants’ everyday necessities. Meanwhile, these facilities become the main settings for migrant tenants’ social interaction except the frontal areas of their home. In other words, the activities in which those involved are to a greater or lesser degree required to participate. Between the houses, the public facility places are important in making residents walk outside of their rental room or house.

In terms of Table 4.3, as many surveyed households in the Yimuyuan area support grocery stores, residents stop by these grocery stores frequently. The migrant customers often meet each other in the stores and other sharing facilities and have conversations. Small lane spaces nearby these facility spaces offer social places for such occasions. In our interviews, two migrant couples said that it is not rare for them to come across their neighbors on the way to the public facility places. They added:

*On the way to a public restroom, it is not rare to meet several women who are gossiping.*

*Tenants, like me, do not have a private toilet in our rental house, we use the public restroom around the corner every day; I need the public bathroom at least twice a week and I use the public laundry room to wash at least once a week. So I meet my neighbors often when I go to these three places. Because our daily activities are closely connected to these facilities in this neighborhood.*

It shows the diagram of a typical situation of tenants’ social interaction around the public facilities (public restroom) in the Yimuyuan neighborhood (Figure 4.20). Except the shared spaces in front of their room and front of their house, and the local public facility space, the one other outdoor place where migrant tenants congregate or come across each other is in small scale open places. In the Yimuyuan neighborhood, among the small lanes, small spaces, and courtyards they exist in scattered fashion. An observation of small lanes in this neighborhood shows that the
most communication occur along the intersection of small lanes. They are frequently used by migrant tenants when they walk by every day (Figure 4.22).

Both personal and regular group gatherings are the main focus of *Yimuyuan* communal activities. The frequent gossip-filled fieldwork is usually a source of much concentration and enjoyment when residents join in excited activities and partying. In the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood, the main social center is the community center or office as they call it. The other social interactions involve various gambling pursuits (particularly Chinese *Mahjong*).

In the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood, the basic layout is quite simple. From the map, there is a cleared small open space which is more or less surrounded by rental houses. The *Yimuyuan* neighborhood has developed its own businesses along *Yimuyuan* East Street. Gradually, more and more migrants reside in this area while doing their own business as well. Since the first *Wanquanne* wholesale vegetable/fruit market was located on the street, the number of migrant residents running restaurants, shops and businesses has continuously increased on this street. Now, this street is the most popular area in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood.

Figure 4.22. Community office in *Yimuyuan* neighborhood
The East Street expands from South to North in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood. *Wanquanhe* wholesale market is the starting place of East street and is the representative street of *Yimuyuan*. Along this street, both sides are surrounded by rental rooms and buildings. This street is used for supplying largely communally used services (including an employment agency, a real estate agency, restaurants, motels, computer cafes etc.) for the local residents.

Restaurants and shops have been opened in the *Yimuyuan*. Residents living here can also find entertainment and sports facilities taked away deeper in the neighborhood. In *Yimuyuan*, residence is not the only function. You can find all kinds of shops of service industries in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood.

The beginning point of *Yimuyuan* is the *Wanquanhe* wholesale market. A small open space, is located around the wholesale market. This small space supplies the
people in the area where men congregate to chat and women gather make simple conversation. As one approaches the north along *Yimuyuan* East Street, *Wanshifa* market is along the street side. Opposite the *Wanshifa* market, the node of an employment agency and a real estate office is an important point in the *Yimuyuan* with the majority of job information and rental house resources posted on the front wall of these agencies.

The *Yimuyuan* east street connects several small winding alleyways spreading inside of this neighborhood. The attraction of these narrow paths is the intimate life performed by residents.

*Due to the high density, between the houses is not far at all. We usually sit in the street to chat and play with neighbors. It is so hot that we can not fall asleep. We take fans with us and sit in the street. In the *Yimuyuan*, most rental rooms have no air conditioners, just electric fans. Although we do anything at that time, we also feel happy. Men need vests and short pants. Women of course wear more. We all sit together.*

*Yimuyuan* does not have many open spaces. (Figure 4.24) *Niangniang miao*, is a courtyard in the northern part of *Yimuyuan*. This courtyard is composed of a number of lines of flat rental bungalows. This is the one of few open spaces in the

![Figure 4.24. *Niangniang miao* in north part of *Yimuyuan* as one of the biggest open spaces](image)
Yimuyuan, where the migrant resident elderly has morning exercises and youths play games. The courtyard is used as a gathering place of Yimuyuan community activities.

Here, we can do leisurely sun bathing, or play chess or cards with neighbors, and have a sing song. Even pets can find their friends here. You know mostly the people you see outside here are old people who enjoy themselves, but that’s because their children who are the migrant workers of the family have gone off to work.

Figure 4.25. Outdoor activities and contacts between neighbors and acquaintances in different spaces in north part of Yimuyuan neighborhood (Drawing by author)

The winding streets supply the main residents’ gathering places scattered in the whole neighborhood. Vegetable, breakfast vender usually has a clear and resounding voice (Figure 4.26). In this way all people in the residential space can hear him when he peddles. His grocery covers his ears and uses a special gesture when peddling. He puts the names of dozens of vegetables together.
Coriander, hot chili, scallion, celery, hyacinth beans, eggplant, cucumber, wax gourd, turnip, carrot, Chinese toon, Chinese chives…. Please take a look. I’ve got everything you want.

Yimuyuan is an alley way or a lane that becomes popular amongst the elder dwellers to find leisure with their friends from the same age group or from next door. However, when I asked some residents the street name or the name of one restaurant, they answered: that they didn’t know exactly, here there is no exact name for each small alleyway or corner. People use their own ways to recognize places. For example, somebody’s house.

Figure 4.26. In the morning, the breakfast vendor in Yimuyuan neighborhood. Most of them are also residents living in Yimuyuan.

In residents’ minds, they associate Yimuyuan with the people there instead of the place itself. For example, I was told a story about a housewife who lives this neighborhood with her relatives. Although she has lived in here for almost 5 years, she always says, Yin’s house or Min’s rental room instead of using the exact name of the alley. Because people recognize this neighborhood through the people they know. They go to these places to meet them.

In the Yimuyuan, radios and stereo players are listened to at a very high volume, and television sets are always located near the window. Both forms of leisure are
shared with neighbors. Radio and television and gossip are the main source of recreation and information about what is happening around the city (especially for a migrant’s wife). Walking through the Yimuyuan area, it is common to see groups of residents sitting together playing cards, or mahjong.

Figure 4.28. Registration of frequency of occurrence of outdoor activities and contacts between neighbors and acquaintances in different spaces in middle part of Yimuyuan neighborhood (Drawing by author)
The streets are not calm in the morning either. Most migrant residents are also running small business, morning is their busiest time for preparing. Also important to *Yimuyuan* life is the traditional food being sold in carts or small stalls. These change according to the season, from flavored ice in the summer to long kebabs of crab apples covered in sugar in the autumn and winter.

Most woman wash clothes in front of the house and hang them around the rental house on the lines. The street is a continuation of the house and the women usually sweep the street in addition to the floor of the house. On a hot summer day, they take good care of the space in front of their rental house or between the houses by sprinkling water to settle the dust.

At evening, the street looks like a busy line of communication, with women chatting or simply sitting in front of their rental houses, talking about recent happenings, gossiping, exchanging information, or conversing about TV soap operas.

![Outdoor activities and contacts between neighbors and acquaintances in different spaces in south part of *Yimuyuan* neighborhood (Drawing by author)](image-url)
The children are everywhere—the streets in fact belong to them as their playground, dinner place and so on.

Considerable interest was observed in both the ordinary, daily events that go on the small open places—tenants pass side by side the small lanes, children are at play—and in the more usual instances—people simply walk by. Although the rental room in the Yimuyuan leads to minimizing privacy. This may in turn, foster an atmosphere that boosts the desire to dedicate dwellers’ time to being spent with others. Since the ground floor serves as the best communal gathering place for amusement and handling business, all dwellers spend the majority of their time on these public activities, nevertheless intimacy under such conditions is barely achieved even within private spaces. Individual pursuits are customarily disregarded or deemphasized in contrast to the welcome given to public spaces, but both of them are filled with the soul of impartiality and community.

Finally, the four patterns of migrants’ residential experience in the Yimuyuan area have shown that neighborly activities are the greatest object of ‘need’ and interest. Even the modest form of contact of merely seeing and hearing or being near to others is apparently more rewarding and more in demand than the majority of other attractions offered in the public spaces of residential areas.164

Frequently the street and the street outside the house are used as an integrated local space, not simply as a path, which points to the high level of penetrability of the division between the residential units and the immediate environment area. The use of all networks between rental housing units and their surroundings from a bond between indoor and outdoor: open doors and close doors, alleyways, even walls and floors all function to show this. Regularly, even the sense of contiguous human beings that emerges through the sounds and odors deliver a sense of community.

4.4 Examining the migrants’ residential perception

There are not many formal open spaces in this neighborhood. The main gathering spaces here are fragmented, so the residents have a different level of communal activities and experiences according to their daily necessities. This section investigates migrants’ different communal activities and experiences in the Yimuyuan neighborhood.

From a cognitive point of view, their cognitive image becomes an index of their communal activities. The simple fact of living in the Yimuyuan area supports the daily needs of rural-to-urban migrants in various ways. Its practical meaning becomes an important perspective to the moment of exploring migrant residents’ perceptions. The following involves the migrant residents’ cognitive maps drawn from interviewrs to examine spatial perception in their residential neighborhoods. Cognitive elements in this survey are analyzed to discern how residents perceive their neighborhoods. Along with analyses of spatial character based on the objective information in the previous section, this section focuses on analyses of interview sources that comprise migrant residents’ perception of physical features.

These studies emphasize the relationship between physical characteristics and perspective components. The method employed involves in-depth interviews with migrant tenants representing the residential meaning of communal activities in the Yimuyuan neighborhood. Studies enable the interpretation of perceptions of communal activities to comprise a detailed narrative of residential meaning. Migrant residents were asked first to list places that they considered to be related to their daily life in the Yimuyuan area. I seek to discern how residents perceive their communal activities in relation to their everyday experiences.
4.4.1 Cognitive image of rural-to-urban migrants

In drawing their cognitive images, they use as a focal point the house in which they are living (Figure 4.30). Among my interviews and conversations is, Xu who is one of the Yimuyuan migrant tenants who lives in and works in this area. Xu’s cognitive image shows Yimuyuan is an integrated part of his life, with respect to his communal activities.

Xu came to Beijing from Anhui in 2008 when he was 20 years old. He worked in a clothes factory for eight months until his wife came to join him from Anhui. When his wife just arrived in Beijing they rented a small room in the Yimuyuan area.

Figure 4.30. Cognitive image of Yimuyuan neighborhood by a rural-to-urban migrant, Xu (Drawing by author)
In the Yimuyuan neighborhood most of the residents are rural-to-urban migrants, with a similar migration background. Some of them are running a small business inside of this neighborhood. In 2010, because of their low education, city life was hard for them. At the time, Xu and his wife thought this would be a good opportunity to improve their daily lives and run a small Anhui restaurant near the main street of this area.

Since then, Xu and his wife rented another big room on the first floor in the Yimuyuan as their business place. They worked together every day, opening their restaurant at 5:00am and closing it at 6:00pm. Customers are almost all from the Yimuyuan neighborhood. Some of them are their countryman. Most of them know each other very well because of frequent meeting.

When Xu and his wife think of their life since they came to Beijing, they find that they still live in a small environment, living in the Yimuyuan area, working in this area, meeting most of the migrants. They have contact with Beijing locals or the local society only occasionally. The majority of time I met Xu for this survey and they informal talk was conducted either in their rental houses or at their stalls while they worked. They are very satisfied with living in the Yimuyuan neighborhood. For them, it is convenient and they have a sense of belonging to this place. They don’t feel negative about the dense living situation nor do they need to adapt themselves to the locals.

As far as their communal activities, they feel a strong connection in their community. They are very happy and comfortable at living in the Yimuyuan neighborhood.

Xu’s cognitive image concerning communal activities is composed by his normal life within the Yimuyuan area. Xu’s image map presents he understands his (his family) communal activities in relation to supporting their lives of working and
living. During our interview, they showed they have an image of the *Yimuyuan* area based on the composite elements in the built-up environment near their rental room, the business they make, people they met and the daily sources they use. Businesses and neighborhoods in the *Yimuyuan* area support their life and collective life style.

Xu and his cousin’s family never develop an overall understanding of *Yimuyuan* area as a district. They focus on these elements of the living environment which marks it as a close knit web of communal activities.

The second cognitive image is from family-accompanied migrant resident (Figure 4.31). After migrating to *Beijing* city, the woman and her extended family (3 generations) live together in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood. The woman and her

---

*Figure 4.31. Cognitive image of part of *Yimuyuan* neighborhood, Qian*  
(Drawing by author)
husband stay in their rental room all day to take care of their grandson and granddaughter. It is striking that her understanding of communal activities is on an inter-personal level. Her image is an example of the perceptions of communal activities by communication through face to face within small physical boundaries.

They come from Gansu province, migrating to Beijing city later than their children. Initially, when they arrived they tried to find low-level employment, but their working life is not simple or easy. Then, they stay at home all day lacking social support and they live with their children and other relatives in rental rooms. They just help with the housework and take care of grandchildren. Now their children are usually too busy working and stay at home less and less time.

*Yimuyuan* area offers a social base for many of the migrant elderly. Those who live there express a high level of gratification. Despite not having many skills, they do not face many problems as long as they are in the *Yimuyuan* area. They purchase goods and obtain necessary facilities or services such as visits to nearby clinics, or daily services.

Qian said she makes friendship networks through informal encounters and introduction through countrymen living in the same area. The dense occupancy of low-rent housing in this area also increases the possibilities of neighborly communication. She feels that very close to his local community because she knows many neighbors who share a similar social background. She feels the neighborly harmony and active relationship is very good and important in her community.

She draws major activities among their daily life. In particular, she locates her activities within her adjacent environment. Moreover, her everyday life is not spent alone, but is accompanied with the locals, family members, and neighbors. She emphasizes 2 areas, the courtyard and the small alleyway as the major district for her living. She explains that her daily life in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood looks like the
previous life she lived in her hometown, with many relatives and people living in nearby houses who use public spaces frequently outside of their houses. Her image does not have a private life that she spends alone, representing her collective understanding of *Yimuyuan* life and her sharing lifestyle. Qian’s image map shows that she understands her (her family) communal activities in relation to the domain of her daily life with families and neighbors.

During my interview, single migrants occupied the greatest ratio of residents living in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood (Figure 4.32). They mentioned they started their migration life before they finished their high-school education. I was impressed by several young boys in this neighborhood.

*Yimuyuan* neighborhood is good to live in especially when you are a newcomer. I knew this neighborhood through my brother who was living here. Half of my neighbors are of my age, young, have low education and lack family support. It is good to live with other bachelors in the same floor or on the same building since I don’t need to feel lonely. We meet each other and exchange telephone numbers.

Actually, dense accommodation and sharing places provide emotional support to one another. A migrant tenant said that he does not feel lonely living in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood.

*I am an emotional sensitive person. I don’t like lonely feeling. Then, Yimuyuan is a good place to live. Local people are all cold treating outsiders, especially migrant workers. Yimuyuan neighborhood is a collective space which gathers majority of migrants.*

On the contrary, within this busy, high density physical environment, there is a true sensation of intimacy. A 17-year-old girl tenant surveyed said:

*My life is fulfilled within this neighborhood. I got employment information through my kinship and the job agency and live in the Yimuyuan. I settled in here. Everything needed can be found in here, especially for new migrants.*
In the following, we select other quotes that capture the typical sentiments expressed by the migrant tenants interviewed in our survey. A 15-year-old tenant describes his life in the CZC as follows:

*I am completely fulfilled with my life here (Yimuyuan CZC). I sell breakfast in the morning and set up the fruit stall with my parents. I reside in the CZC and do all my activities here. I and my other relatives live here, I always hang out with my cousin, or sisters.*

He is joined by a young girl from Hunan who stays at home to take care of her 2-year-old younger brother:

*Half of my playmates, and my neighbors are from my hometown. We play when my parents are out of home in the daytime.*

Despite the extensive details, their knowledge of *Yimuyuan* life is rooted in personal necessities and daily life. Landmarks on his image are as self-contained
community of practical use such as the real estate, education services and employment agencies. Then, their image map presents how they understand their communal activities as is the result of migrant-support facilities.

In terms of their cognitive image, the neighborhood is a small world in which has a full range of everyday activaies that can be conducted without dependence in the outside environment. The intertwined set of various forms of spatial categories is an important element in the setting of the Yimuyuan neighborhood which reflects a pattern of place-based attachments important to the process of communal activities.

The Yimuyuan neighborhood for migrants’ functions with ‘zones of transition’ for individuals or families who are migrating from the countryside to the city. If I analyze the rural-to-urban migrant group more closely, I see each place has a certain value. Residents’ listing for self-related space is an important reference to their embodied communal activities in the Yimuyuan neighborhood. The relationship between spatial cognition and residents’ activities in the Yimuyuan, and between the spatial elements and communal activities present residents’ communal activities as not isolated with places, but being closely related to their daily necessities. In other words, residents’ daily needs are established as a basis of the various forms of communal activities through the spatial environment.

4.4.2 Survey

The data acquisition process was through both analyses of residents’ cognitive maps and a questionnaire survey. I surveyed rural-to-urban migrant residents who live in the Yimuyuan CZC in three steps from June to July 2013. In the first step, I selected 100 neo migrants randomly to be our sampled subjects. For simplification and direction, our qualified subjects premise was they needed to have non-local or non-urban resident status—no matter if they were Beijing-born or not; a migrant worker who was born in the 1980s or the 1990s. Finally, a total of 100 tenants were
asked to fill out the questionnaire. According to our survey, as Table 4.2 shows, from the randomly selected 100 interviewees, 17 per cent of residents were living with their parents (including single-parent headed families) and their siblings; compared with 47 per cent of adult-aged single migrants who had settled down in the host city. The vast majority of migrants (more exactly married couples and cohabiting couples) 36 per cent, dwelled in the Yimuyuan neighborhood. Of those, 13 results were regarded as abstentions due to their unqualified status or inappropriate answers. Of the leftover 87 questionnaires of the second-generation migrant tenants, I followed the subsequent filtering procedures for our case studies.

For the second step, I sorted out the remaining 87 questionnaires that all belong to the neo migrant generation into three forms. 32 (36.8 per cent) migrants have accompanying family (a single parent, dual parents or siblings) and live with them in the Yimuyuan CZC. Of these school-age children, most of them are receiving compulsory education in a nearby school; although some have already suspended

Table 4.1. Age distribution of each group

Source: Yimuyuan community survey by 2013
their schooling due to poor economic conditions and do business with their parents. 45.8 per cent (39) of interviewees, who are all unmarried, involve more intricate conditions: some work in a narrow section of industries; some are vagrants without a stable job while learning technical skills; and some of them are unemployed. The leftover 17.4 per cent (16) of migrants have already entered into married life and live as couples.

In the final step, I removed the results of 42 migrants who were in the following situations: one, interviewees of below 12 years old; second, the settling period in the Yimuyuan is less than half a year. Finally, an inquiry form survey with 45 migrant residents constituted our investigation in 2013. Although they are not representative of all second-generation migrant generations’ perceptions of a community sense within their living situations, the location provides insights into migrants’ social networks within the community.

Table 4.2. Forms of different household structure in Yimuyuan community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division of Household structure</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent-accompanied migrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-parent headed family</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual-parent accompanied family</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (unmarried) migrants</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple-only migrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting couple</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couple</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Yimuyuan community survey by 2013
In my questionnaire, they were asked to fill in their current housing situation briefly (such as, single room, shared room and dormitory-like room, etc.). In Table 4.3, it provides brief measurements for each group on ‘what necessary factors migrants consider as indicators of increasing/decreasing their perception on community sense to their neighborhood?’ It informs us of the general statistics of the three communities of migrants. The questionnaire, consequently, was made in such a way that the responses could elucidate migrant tenants’ perceptions of their neighborhood in addition to supplying information regarding their forms of neighborhood area usage. These result reflect the community condition is referred by the accessibility of open spaces—balcony, sharing kitchen, sharing environment and facilities.

The Table 4.3 shows that younger migrants have generally more friends or relatives in their rental neighborhood than teenage migrants, no matter whether single (unmarried) migrants or couple migrants. The gradual sequence of places where migrants meet their friends living in this neighborhood, three forms of physical setting serve as areas for this casual or formal meeting, they are: front area of rental room, front street of rental house and their adjacent sidewalks. Surveyed migrants who display a high frequency of neighborly communication say this takes place in shared public space. Some forms of activities are general in the public space while meeting neighbors casually: staying activities and communication activities.

In the ‘sequence of place where migrants meet their friends and relatives’ column in Table 4.3, migrants’ interaction with each other in public was reported. The results show that except the spatial accessibility areas, migrants-support facility space in their neighborhood increases the chance of frequent casual visiting or meeting among neighbors. In other words, rural migrants tend to interact with neighbors frequently, not just because casual gathering time to time encourages neighborly communication and mutual trust. It reminds us of the fact that they are
rural-to-urban migrants, and individuals are more inclined to the ‘lively (even noisy) and intensified social interaction’ lifestyle.

In terms of community perception, both the awareness of neighborly relationships and attention to community involvement were measured. The three categories of migrants display a more vigorous neighboring communication (contacts) when visiting neighbors and assisting neighbors. Three groups of surveyed migrants agreed that there is some attachment to their place of low-rent accommodation in the *Yimuyuan* area. More than 65% of single migrants and 62% of couple migrants said they agreed with the statement that migrant residents living in this neighborhood had a sense of neighborhood attachment or communal activities.

In fact, in the migrant sample all items, for the community belongingness index, a majority of sampled migrants strongly agreed that their rental house in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood could be their real home in this destination city, instead of purely being a temporary room. Migrants’ attitudes towards community involvement is neutral (pay a little attention). ‘Pay a little attention to community involvement’ has an average score of 62%. Through interviews, migrants’ evaluations of items gauging neighborly relations are quite positive, regarding sociability, with the grand mean being 61%, as associated with neighborhood acquaintance’s having an average value of 58%, mutual trust’s average value being 55%.

I asked: “is *Yimuyuan* an area to which you belong, or simply a place to live for a moment”, 55.6% of respondents answered that they feel a sense of *Yimuyuan* neighborhood can be their real home where they feel belonging and community satisfaction. In respect to the attitudes towards ‘reason to stay in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood’, a great deal of economic advantage (cheap rent) and intimate neighborhood with kinship and friends, especially those in the areas of the working migrant class population, becomes the main consideration factor of continuing to stay in this neighborhood. Consequently, while migrants in the *Yimuyuan*
neighborhood live a humble life, they consider the neighborhood they dwell in to be a comparatively welcoming or intimate one. Among the five dimensions of neighborly relation examined, the findings disclose that migrants in the main respond that neighbors are approachable to each other; and visiting neighbors happens frequently in daily life, finally building reciprocal relationships among neighbors is an undoubtedly logical experience.

As expected, great varieties in community sense patterns were found. The survey data collected from my survey indicated that public shared space accounted for the highest welcoming place for migrants’ reciprocal social life, especially for single migrant tenants. And interviews within the survey revealed that, while all groups except the single migrant community may have expectations of privacy and quality of social life, many single migrants like to experience or are willing to share a room for cost-effective, social or practical reasons.

Thus, while migrants in the *Yimuyuan* CZC live a humble life, they consider the neighborhood they live in to be a relatively friendly one. In Table 4.4, it provides information about migrants’social life details. It shows that neighborhood quality demonstrates migrants who live in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood have diverse communal activities. On average, 49% surveyed migrants they were sociably active in this neighborhood. Surprisingly, compared with 37% of the average value regarding interaction with urban citizens in a neighborhood, the average value regarding frequency of interaction among migrants of the same migration background occupies 59%.

Compared with more casual meetings, two questions were designed to draw out information on spatial factors for forming residents’ communication. One question regards the resulting reason of respondents’ communication experiences as an
Table 4.3. General statistics related to community experience of the three groups (source: Yimuyuan community survey in 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement value of sense of community</th>
<th>Migrant type (15 people in each group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent-accompanied migrants (above 15 old)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of friends and/or relatives in this neighborhood (Number of interviewer, present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobody</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence of place where migrants meet their neighbors and relatives living in this area (present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your rental room</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the front area of your room</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the public kitchen</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the public bathing room</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front street of your house</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a local market or restaurant</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks or other facilities within neighborhood</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some streets within few blocks</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborly Relationship (present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common assistance</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual trust</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention to the Community Involvement (Number of interviewer, present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not pay attention</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay a little attention</td>
<td>8 (53.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay much attention</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Belongingness (Number of interviewer, present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merely provisional dwelling</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to tell</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a real home (a place where I/we belong to)</td>
<td>8 (53.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason to stay in this neighborhood (present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheap rental room</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinship (friend)-based neighborhood</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to say</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: in a random sample of 15 parent-accompanied migrants, our survey selected people above 15 years old who were asked to give detailed information on their sense of community in their neighborhood. Among the 15 interviewees of each group, we also excluded those migrants who provided inconsistent or untrue information.
‘encouraging place to social life’. Frequent meeting in a space of living necessities every day remains a vital step on nurturing daily communicating experiences among neighbors (65.3%). The other question asked was whether the pleasant physical setting encourages daily greeting, the average value is 63%.

Table 4.4. General statistics for social networks and experience of the three groups
(source: Yimuyuan community survey in 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement value of expectation</th>
<th>Migrant type (15 people in each group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent-accompanied migrants (above 15 old)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In which perspective of housing is meaningful for you to live in this neighborhood (Number of interviewer, present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decent look</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility to daily facilities</td>
<td>7 (46.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of attachment (sense of community)</td>
<td>13 (86.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good community relations</td>
<td>14 (93.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting neighbors (Number of interviewer, present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping neighbors (Number of interviewer, present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>7 (46.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason of rich communicating experiences among neighbors (percent %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent meet in space of life necessities (public kitchen, laundry, bathroom, aisle)</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming physical settings (old-style front stoops of rental house or adjacent sidewalks)</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The traditional communal activities are fading in modern apartments. For migrants, moving from the countryside to the city, their continued communal activities are preserved by developing a set of attachments to place elements in the new host environment which substitute for the place elements of their traditional home environment to which they belonged to. For the majority of migrants, this object attachment serves as a transitional function.

4.5 Finding: low living standard but high level of communal activities

In the first case, the finding indicated that migrants’ spontaneously-developed housing has high level of communal activities. (Figure 4.33, 4.34, 4.35) There was a considerable overlap in the kinds of ties which were obtained: kin were often neighbors; there were many interrelated friendship networks; mutual help in household activities was both possible and frequent; many of these relationships had a long and continuous history; and the various ties often became further intertwined through many activities within a common community.

This chapter examines migrants’ residential responses in physical characteristics, function-based activities and in-depth interviews, and reveals how migrants’ communal activities are essentially related to how they behave in spaces in their neighborhood. The findings on the pattern of communal activities mainly concern the functions that are combined with the residential environment.

(1) Shared functions lead to increased communal activities: the space in front of the rental room is only a physical fact, however, the functions combined with the space determine the true character of the space. Making use of functions or sharing functions are the real reasons for residents to contribute to communal activities. The communal activities
occurring in the three transitional spaces mostly concern how residents use these functions. These functions become a given service that residents can share or have to share with each other.

For example, the space in front of the rental room and in front of the rental house are only public places, the function 1 (kitchen, storage) and function 2 (water, airing-laundry line, household work) combined with the space form the characteristic of the spaces. Residents use the space immediately adjacent to their rental room for its provided functions. Functions serve as the quality that defines the relationship between residents. This is the reason why the functions of space combine with the functions of the communal activities.

Table 4.5. Mean values of the level of communal activities in Yimuyuan case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. 7</th>
<th>Q. 9</th>
<th>Q. 12</th>
<th>Q. 15</th>
<th>Q. 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, what do you think your neighborly relationship means in terms of sociability (Q.7)
How do you feel about living in this neighborhood now in terms of as a real home? (Q. 9)
Is your rental area an ideal place to continue living in in terms of having a feeling of attachment? (Q. 12)
High frequency of visiting neighbors (Q. 15)
High frequency of helping neighbors (Q. 16)
The corridor is a function extension of part of its interior. When it gets crowded, smellily inside, or a family needs to clean the houses or wash clothes, the residents go out of their rental house to continue their activities. In that case, the adjoining alleyway (in front of the rental house) also becomes an extremely effective extension of the interior of the rental house. The public alleyways (between the houses) are also an intertwined set of forms of function that are integrated in the whole neighborhood. The function categories contain ‘restroom, bathing, laundry as a necessary daily-used function, and ‘migrants’ federation, training school, employment agency’ as migrant-support functions. All these activities can be detected by walking along the street in which a lot of socializing takes place naturally.

(2) The communal activities mostly concern using these functions: all these functions, provide a medium by which communal activities are actualized. The sharing of available function is the root of residents’ communal activities. The available functions help to build up the relationship of residents to the functions of their choice, and also make it possible to build relationships between residents.

(3) Communal activities are closely related to the three categories of shared functions: they are: functions for necessary daily uses; functions for commercial uses; and functions for social service and recreation uses. Therefore, each of the shared functions result in very different communal activities happened in the different spaces, respectively: necessary daily activities (in front of the rental room); commercial activities (in front of the rental house); and social service activities (between the rental houses).

The cooking and storage shown in the corridor; water source, airing-laundry line and household work like working in the alleys in front of the house; daily-used shared facilities and communal used services performed in the space between the rental houses—all these functions or facilities and services, provide a medium by
Figure 4.33. Graphic representation of spatial changes in terms of in front of rental room and rental house in the Yinuyuan neighborhood (Drawing by author)
Figure 4.34. Graphic representation of residential space as interweaving forms of functions in terms of between the rental houses (Drawing by author)
which communal activities are actualized. Because of the incorporation of two more functions (function 3: restroom, bathing, laundry and function 4: migrant-support facilities, training school and other communally used services) by the streets, the functions need to be shared by residents united by these shared experiences that serve as the quality that defines the relationship of residents and fosters communal activities.

Accordingly, the Yimuyuan neighborhood, in essence is intertwined with sharing spatial functions. These shared experiences make communal activities happen as daily events. A provided function for sharing brings residents to specific places and therefore acts as residents’ attractors. The transitional spaces are shown in the order of the front-intimate-transactional spaces. This causes people to make the place-based behavioral responses to others in the environment. Accordingly, functions are the quality of spaces and also they become the provided functions that can be shared by residents.

(4) **Shared experiences develop three types of relationships:** A communal activity is not formed by the relationship between residents and space; it is a matter of the shared experience of a group of people and of how their inter-personal relationships can be generated. Therefore, shared experiences develop three types of relationships, namely, the relationship between residents and the space, the relationship of residents to the function of their choice, and the inter-personal relationship among residents.

(5) **Continuity of migrants’ ‘way of life’:** Rural-to-urban migrant residents are physically living in a decayed neighborhood, but they are satisfied to live in so-called shantytown areas as they feel a strong ‘sense of belonging’ to their low-rent neighborhood area.
Their physical decayed neighborhood generates its learned ‘way of life’ which is shared by residents. And this subculture matches their inherent lifestyle, and it receives their appreciation and energy which both offset the difficulties presented in the decayed accommodation.

The communal activities of *Yimuyuan* are close knit—the extent to which all the various forms of functions are localized within the residential area (Figure 4.36). Local physical space seems to have provided a framework within which some of the most important social relationships are embedded. There is considerable connection in the kinds of ties which are obtained: relatives are often neighbors; mutual help in household activities is both possible and frequent; and the various ties become intertwined through many activities within the neighborhood.

In the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood, tenants identify their housing and neighborhood as an area of integrated space, instead of a compound of built-up essentials comprising rental rooms, housing, streets, corners and alleys. The relative-based
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**Figure 4.35.** Graphic representation of residential space as interweaving forms of functions in terms of between the rental houses (Drawing by author)
feature of the neighborhood acts as a production and consumption element for sharing. All members contribute to shared experiences and domestic care. This understanding of the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood as a home and an interweaving set of integrated spaces is so deeply consistent with migrant residents’ own communal activities style and the intensity of communal activities is closely involved in the residential neighborhood.

The street itself, shared areas with residents’ basic necessities, open spaces, residents’ running small businesses in the area and the settlement houses all serve as points of contact for overlapping social networks. Thus the most unique features of this rural-to-urban migrant residential area are: the interlocking and overlapping of many different types of interpersonal contacts and role relationships. The association and physical appearance of these relationships is localized within a relatively bounded spatial region. It is these characteristics which seem to have given a special

Figure 4.36. Spatial elements in horizontal and vertical format in *Yimuyuan* neighborhood (Drawing by author)
character and meaning both to the quality of communal activities and to the area within which these interpersonal relationships are concretized.

These three findings provide a background to which the inhabited space may be shared through extensive, multiple activities determined by communal activities. It is clear that there are variations both in the importance of various influences to different individuals and in the entire perception that people have of the local area. However, the largest number of rural-to-urban migrant residents show fairly normal collective experiences and close similarities in the usage of their low-rent housing area (CZCs).

To reiterate, the spatial functions are more than a physical, environmental issue; it is the concern of the sharing of experiences among rural-to-urban migrant residents and by which their communal activities can be located. Concretizing the argument, this following chapter investigates 2 other contemporary low-rent residential neighborhoods concerning the two findings to locate communal activities.
Chapter 5. Second Case Study—Minxin jiayuan Neighborhood in Chongqing

5.1 Government-subsidized Minxin Jiayuan low-rent neighborhood

The ‘Chongqing model’ concerns a series of social and economic policies implemented in the Chinese megalopolis of Chongqing in 2007 towards housing particular migrant workers. This model involved a major social upheaval seeking to balance inequalities in society and especially those regarding accommodation. The Chinese term Lianzu fang literally means ‘low-rent housing’, but it has also been translated as ‘social rental housing’, ‘affordable-rent housing’. This concept, which was also first proposed in China in 2009, has since become a model for other cities to follow in the steps of Chongqing’s ‘brave exploration’ and pioneering example. Over time, this model has been widely commended and, as stated, emulated by many other cities in China.165

To date, the Chongqing city government has accelerated its construction of low-rent housing for specific low income classes, and an objective assessment conveys the idea that an increasing number of communities are already being affordably accommodated.166 Although at the outset, the Chongqing model has contributed to the construction of more houses; its quantitative approach belies its qualitative aspects and even results in segregation through type of accommodation.

The first stage of the ‘Chongqing model’ function involves constructing more than 40 million m$^2$ of public housing over a ten-year period (2010-2020), with 30 million m$^2$ to be constructed in the first three years.\textsuperscript{167} A number of other similar commentators have discussed and publicized the Chongqing low-rent housing model in the sense that it provides a way out for those at the bottom of the social hierarchy and guarantees them a separate safe area as its goal.\textsuperscript{168}

These records create an optimistic impression of the scale and ambition of the function regarding the Chongqing housing projects. However, after making a first-hand investigation of low-rent housing in Chongqing, and the categorization of rooms in the new housing stock, the main challenge of this case study is to analyze the perception of communal activities in the Chongqing low-rent high-rises apartment neighborhood.

The subsequent case represents a ‘typical-type’ in low-rent housing patterns and aims at summarizing the theoretical background argued earlier in this chapter. The case study focuses on the compounds of estates built through the Chongqing governmental subsidized accommodation function ‘Lianzu fang’. The fact is that the general intention of the new housing projects is for them to be collective structures, and to create an economic, low-rent tenement community housing the ‘urban poor’. With this in mind, it is important to note that the property company responsible for the housing of the two low-rent communities categorizes its residents into 5 broad groups: approximately 52% tenants are rural migrant workers; 36-37% are local.


Figure 5.1. Bird’s eye view of Minxin jiayuan community in Chongqing city
(www.image.baidu.com)

Figure 5.2. Aerial photo of Minxin jiayuan community in Chongqing city
(www.map.baidu.com)
residents, of which more than 5% are supported by an allowance for the lowest living standards; 8.6% are college graduates and then the remainder.

Socially and physically, the plan for the low-rent housing project follows a typical standard process—the rental housing pattern is decided by the number of family members. Therefore, the household types directly decide the design of the low-rent housing and the type of construction. Due to the strong need to provide low-rent dwellings for residents, the government has planned and developed its residential community with clear functions, including underground car parking and landscaped gardens. Although construction, maintenance, and the facilities of the housing are intended to be those of a low-cost tenement, what distinguishes both functions is a minimum provision of comfort.

For the inhabitants, the quality of an environment is generated through a sort of ‘feel’ from themselves. Nowadays, physical psychological and social sustainability seem to be interwoven ‘feels’ as measures of affluence, efficiency and quality of community life.

Situation

*MinXin Jiayuan* is a very famous low-rent housing project in *Chongqing* (Figure 5.1, 5.2). It is also the *Chongqing*’s first public rental housing scheme. It is a residential area containing 54 buildings of between 20-33-storeys, each with a gross construction area of 1 million sq metres. Construction started in 2010 and finished in 2012 and the project now accommodates over 17,500 families. In this apartment estate are 54 high-rise buildings. The quantity of housing units is 17700 units and encompasses 1,080,000 m².

The project of *Minxin jiayuan* represents a low-rent housing project case similar to that or majority others projects in *Chongqing* city, all are located around the periphery of the downtown of *Chongqing*. This apartment estate was built in
2012. Minxin jiayuan is located in the Beibu xinqu district of Chongqing, in the vicinity of the airport expressway and Yuyi high-pass road. It is also Chongqing’s first public rental housing scheme.

5.2 Examining the spatial structure of Minxin Jiayuan neighbourhood and residents’ activities

In terms of two elements forming the physical configurations in the Yimuyuan neighborhood, Minxin jiayuan neighborhood presents changes in the relationship to the neighboring areas.

5.2.1 Front of migrants’ rental room

The most fundamental change other than the structural change made is the elimination of the shared facility space in the Minxin jiayuan low-rent high-rise neighborhood. From this simple level, contacts can fall to other levels. In the Yimuyuan case, the public corridor is functionally a part of migrant residents’ interior, cooking/storage functions combined with the corridor are also absent in the same place.

The corridor, in front of the rental room, and narrow passages that only permit access to elevator and disjointed separated rental rooms are maximized (Figure 5.3, 5.4). The front of migrants’ rental room in high-rises project is separated from other areas by physical boundaries. In the majority of the present low-rent housing units, a path similar to other community facilities is referred to as being convenient because it functions merely as a means of conveyance in a highly generalized way. The corridor does not represent living spaces closely related to the social customs of salutation and receiving guests, it is just an element of access or environmental control.
The public corridor functions as temporary kitchen or storage space that has completely disappeared and been replaced by the mono-function of carrying transportation in front of rental rooms. As a result of the replacement of the function of the public corridor in the high-rise house, the entrance to these rental housing units turns out to be relatively the same in terms of its relative purpose. Compared to the Yimuyuan case, the corridor functions as the extension of the individual home, in the Minxin jiayuan case, the home only included inside of the door, most particularly, the residents of the Minxin jiayuan are ‘at home’ only inside of the door. In the Minxin jiayuan case, the house does not signify the continuity of the family’s household work from indoor to outdoor.

Doors on the public corridor are clear-cut fences between the indoor of the housing unit and the outdoor environment. Corridors in front of their rental room rarely serve any reciprocity relationship between migrants’ home inside of the door

Figure 5.3. Two patterns of low-rent high-rise buildings in Minxin jiayuan,

Note: two patterns include 8 types of rental room plans
and the outside surroundings. The *Minxin jiayuan* neighborhood emphasizes the value of delivering migrants’ autonomy, or control over how they live their lives that they lost in migrating experiences. Moreover, the significance of the privacy of the home is consistent with the original intention of government-subsidized low-rent housing projects.

Figure 5.4. Schematic diagram of arrangement of the public corridor in front of rental rooms of *Minxin jiayuan* neighborhood (Drawing by author)

Note: The corridor and elevator connects rental room to the entrance of the rental house.
What is equally remarkable about the housing considerations given to the social planning itself is that they have been pushed into the background. Character is lacking and the façade is represented by hard materials such as concrete, and nonporous brick. Being fully enclosed by erected walls, with a long corridor on each layer means there are deficiencies in natural light, ventilation and semi-private space.

These elements of living habitats present different spaces that need to be improved. In summary it can be said that the design of the details plays an important role with regard to communal activities. In this way, residents’ communal activities and the corresponding perception of a community sense involves various consultations to make the connection between the physical arrangement, intensity and distance of sensory effects.

In order to find a practical solution to contribute to tenants’ inclusion with their neighbors, it doesn’t matter whether the groups have gatherings or not, but if there is little freedom or equal occasion to select where individuals and groups desire to live—a lack of choice and exclusion concerns the tenants. While the economic design sacrifices voluntarily more communication, and in turn conveys less reliability and responsibility.

In the Minxin jiayuan case, the public corridor is enclosed with rental rooms. For the residents, it is not enjoyable to stay and chat with their neighbors in the corridor, even though it should be emphasized, that neighbors in the Yimuyuan low-rent residences use the public corridor in front of their room as one part of a migrant’s home. However, on the contrary, in the Minxin jiayuan, the same space outside the dwelling unit is barely theirs.

If we extremely narrow the definition of home as the physical space within the door and the related walls, the first elements we found in the Yimuyuan case, an attachment to local places as extension of private space are absent between the door
of migrants’ rental room and public corridor in the high-rises of Minxin jiayuan neighborhood. For the residents living in the high-rises, the function-based communal activities in a residential unit may stay in the region of a lawn or a ground garden.

5.2.2 Front of migrants’ rental house

Residents recognize that streets around their apartment neighborhoods do not have much recreational place, which means that these streets function more as a transportation network than a place containing activities (Figure 5.5, 5.6). Thus it might be inferred that, while being an actual connection between two spaces, the front of the rental house in the Minxin jiayuan serves only as a bridge between interior and exterior spaces. The entrance carries representative meaning, for example, getting into the high-rises through the entrance, closely relates to the social ritual of greeting and receiving neighbors and visitors. In other words, reception and communal activities from outside and a transition to other spaces which is executed in a separate space in the Yimuyuan neighborhood are diminished in the entrance place of Minxin jiayuan neighborhood.

For example, one enters the high-rises through an entrance in the Minxin jiayuan, but there are no significant differences in the concerning spatial difference between the inside of the entrance and the outside of the entrance, except in the entrance of the rental house in the Yimuyuan neighborhood. In this case, however, the entrance of the high-rises in the Minxin jiayuan neighborhood is meaningless. It seems that the interior and exterior spaces divided by the entrance share the equivalent purpose of transitional spaces or the former is more inclined to serve as a transitional space.

Outside of the entrance of a rental house in the Minxin jiayuan there includes a street and a ground garden. The Minxin jiayuan case does not incorporate a ground
garden for more entertainment activities or more participation and engagement in more emotional exchanges among neighbors. In the long run, the core value is that which could cultivate neighborly trust and show mutual respect and this is also low. Actually, inhabitants in outside deprived (less well-off) regions are more sensitive to aloofness and delinquency. In meeting personal demands for a private, peaceful, and secure neighborhood, we fault the Minxin jiayuan case for concentrating on the physical characteristics of lodging and ignoring the social, cultural and psychological influences that contribute to communal activities.

Figure 5.5. Schematic diagram of arrangement of the space in front of building of Minxin jiayuan neighborhood

Note: the typical frontage of high-rises is the zone of lawn or garden.
The basic composition of the site is concrete building shells with a simple landscaped-garden. On general observation, we saw a series of vacant concrete paths flanked on both sides by columns of 33-story apartment buildings. A high percentage of residents interviewed expressed their belief that the low-cost settlements were

Figure 5.6. Schematic diagram of arrangement of the space in front of the rental buildings of Minxin jiayuan neighborhood

Note: the control of constructing cost makes Minxin jiayuan neighborhood with minimal pleasing quality of outdoor environment (Drawing by author)
built specifically for poor tenants; they didn’t expect much from the interior design or the environmental planning.

For local tenants, to have their own house is a special privilege and family privacy is mistakenly taken as a synonym for anonymity and a means to be segregated from anyone other than a select group of friends and family. And, relaxation time provides satisfaction and creates a more tolerant attitude to the growing crowded housing situation. In this neighborhood, the ground level is the favorite place to rest and entertain among residents. The first floor of such buildings is planned with a commercial function in mind which provides facilities with respect to entertainment and convenient living.

In interviews, the ground garden functions as both residents’ main path and area of communication. Those surveyed chose the words ‘tolerable’ and ‘necessary’ to describe both the spatial construction and the community (refer to the survey of community experience). The level of social relationship between tenants in neighboring buildings, providing appropriate climatic responsive conditions, and having a sense of collectivity (belonging) and community spirit among neighborhoods, all these areas in which residents expect less than satisfaction provide us scope for my research.

Therefore, despite people in the Minxin jiayuan low-rent housing area living a decent life; they consider the community they inhabit to be a moderately secluded one. Amongst the four scopes of communal activities observed, the feedback disclosed that tenants generally looked forward to more social lives; yet, they were somewhat less prepared to participate in this due to the unsuitable conditions.

Pertaining to community contributions, surveyed tenants showed an interest in communal activities, but showed that there was a lack of opportunity to enter into this. The outcomes show agreement with Erving Goffmann’s observation and
remarks: as a general rule, that acquainted persons in a social situation require a reason not to enter into a face engagement with each other, while unacquainted persons require a reason to do so.\textsuperscript{169} In comparison, tenants’ subjective requirements for self-involvement in neighborly affairs weigh more than the architects’ evaluation. In conclusion, the majority of the migrant residents’ need for a sense of community is clearly underestimated.

As for function quality and, whether the public environment invites or repels it, a high proportion of tenants expressed the view that site density (site coverage) constrains their degree of physical and emotional comfort. With respect to the hazardous conditions and enduring nuisances of the site and environment, ‘noise, radiation, and exhaust fumes’ are defined as the principal nuisance items, and these are most likely produced by airports, commuter traffic routes, industrial processing plants, or biochemical plants. Most of these hard-to-measure effects or hidden obstacles to residents’ wellbeing are facilities and functions necessary to the life of a community and, however well managed, they will still create undesirable if not harmful conditions. The chronic absence of these fundamental services is usually exacerbated by the fact that low-rent houses are located in marginalized areas, and have duty preference items.

5.2.3 Between the rental houses

Therefore, the main goal proves that the type and spatial distribution of this social low-rent housing stock evidence negative housing and community effects that probably convey on some difficulties both for inhabitants and for the future of the social housing (Figure 5.7, 5.8). Looking at the estates tenants’ experience through questionnaires, negative feedback is shown. First, by focusing on visible comfort, I

examine the residents’ experience, the problems they have to go through consist of interior crowding conditions, limited facilities and services, and poor ventilation inside the housing. Second, our findings also underline the need to problematize the notion of an invisible comfort.

From public spaces, community interactions, annoyances, the interviewees distrust their neighbors and believe they live in makeshift housing instead of a home with emotional support. The low-levels of self-esteem in solving key aspects of shelter present themselves in most of the interviews as yet another signal of what some writers desirable as what—in the words of Turner (1976)—is what ‘a housing does to the people’.

Figure 5.8. Schematic diagram of arrangement of the space between the rental buildings of Minxin jiayuan neighborhood (Drawing by author)

I also have evidence of the likely effects on social outcomes, and the findings of both the proximity of housing complexes to existing urban areas and, how social interaction and community spirit are closely connected with contentment in low-rent neighborhoods. Also, the sustainability of the neighborhood can be assessed best as I have recorded in this paper through observations of interference, area-planning, supply of facilities and the rate of crime which by necessity limits construction in two clear ways: locality (the cheapest land is far from the city limits) and quality of destination (tenement blocks are built with minimal consideration for residents’ affective needs).

My analysis of the *Minxin jiayuan* low-rent housing project in China has directed the planning trend towards weakening considerations in terms of these hybrid spaces. In regard to the merits and drawbacks of the collective planning of housing, major participants have also pointed out that designers fail to offer places for meeting and socializing in this neighboring community. The controversial point

![Figure 5.7. Schematic diagram of arrangement of the space between the rental buildings of Minxin jiayuan neighborhood (Drawing by author)](image)
I raised is whether to create a vigorous, public-spirited atmosphere that makes the community stronger, instead of a cloistered existence with little interaction with anyone except friends and family. As reflected in the survey, residents desire a more collective community, instead of being isolated from each other.

Simultaneously, there is a geographically bigger disparity between commercial housing and low-rent (affordable) housing. ‘Low-rent housing’ by definition has gradually come to mean ‘cheap equipped space’, and ‘people living with dignity’ has turned out to be a Chinese pipe-dream as well. If this trend were to continue, it seems that in less than a generation such affordable housing could become much less desirable.

In the Yimuyuan house, the cooking, storage and household work related space are all placed outside of the rental room. The neighborhood is one single area rather than a composite of an intertwined set of spatial elements and related various forms of spatial categories. The function combined with the public corridor (individual private kitchen or other household place), is taken away as well. As compared to the Yimuyuan corridor, in the Minxin jiayuan, the household work spaces are all included inside of the house. As a result of the specific use of each room, independent of the others, the functions that can be shared by residents are nonexistent in the Minxin jiayuan case or all relocated to the inside of the rental room.

In reference to the Yimuyuan neighborhood, the destination of necessary visits is absent. The daily-used shared living functions are taken away and replaced by shifting everything to the inside of the room. Outside of residents’ room, places with communal activities are related to residents’ voluntary visits or intentional visits rather than necessary visit. The corridor hardly forms a space for communal activities other than as a transitional space between the inside and the outside of the rental room.
As for the value of the ‘privacy of the home’, the dwelling unit may extend into a zone of lawn or gardens. However, apart from this, the space outside the dwelling unit is barely connected to an interchange between the inside of the dwelling unit and the outside environment. In addition to the visible physical and architectural appearance also the social context of the different housing prototypes is changing. In the Minxin jiayuan high-rise buildings, the units are located on different floors of the towers, they are developed in order to ensure maximum privacy and autonomy.

Each room in the residential town has specific use, independent of the others, which does not encourage interaction between residents or social activities. The only common space is located on the compound ground floor. It consists of a circulation area, a pedestrian, vehicular and a recreation space. Differently in the Yimuyuan neighborhood, the lack of space in the units mean several activities are moved into the neighborhood alleys, since outside there are many functions for residents to share. In the Minxin jiayuan case, communal activities do not exist exactly.

5.3 Examining the migrants’ residential perception

5.3.1 Survey

To be consistent with the first case study, the survey conducted provided the same questionnaire and contained 18 questions, except for the removal of some differences in physical environment, for example, in the Minxin jiayuan neighborhood, they don’t supply the public restroom or public bathroom, so I removed the answer of public restroom and bathroom from the question of listing the sequence of places where migrants meet their neighbors and relatives living in this area. 3 migrants’ categories of interviewees were divided as the first case study. More penetrating feedback toward houses is from their neighbors, and toward the low, socially-emotional relations in the given spaces. Our survey explores the main thrust of the discussion above concerning the low-rent housing’s private, mutual
character. In the eyes of the majority of tenants, the two public rental projects have offered little to foster communal interaction so far as to provide nourishing circumstances for the growth and improvement of family life and, particularly, of the whole community.

The survey conducted by the authors provided more penetrating feedback towards houses from their neighbors, and towards the low, socially-emotional relations in the given spaces. Table 5.2 explores the main thrust of the discussion above concerning the low-rent housing’s private, mutual character.

According to my interviewed tenants, the results showed that most of them experienced social mobility, with travel to recently improved accommodation from a shantytown to a low-rent neighborhood; however, the situation still denies them the intimate comfort of a long-existing community. Most of them point out that the ‘old neighborhood’ where everyone knew each other’s business has disappeared here. ‘Knowing nobody, having no acquaintance’ establishes resounding proof for the link between a poor experience of community and the low-frequency use of the neighborhood. Medium or low satisfaction may reflect their concern about the neighborhood environment. It may be due to the fact that individuals expect more about depending on the outside environment function, particularly migrants might need a support network in neighborhoods to better adapt to the new environment. In fact, among the tenants surveyed, both the perception of neighborhood quality and neighborly relations are assessed as significantly low, but neighborhood safety and maintaining privacy reach the majority’s expectations. This is partly due to the designers’ wish to shelter them with as much privacy as possible to adapt to their unfamiliar environment. Therefore, despite people in this low-rent housing area

living a decent life; they consider the community they inhabit to be a moderately secluded one.

According to my interviewed tenants, the results showed that most of them experienced social mobility, with travel to recently improved accommodation from a shantytown to a low-rent neighborhood; however, the situation still denies them the intimate comfort of a long-existing community. Most of them point out that the ‘old neighborhood’ where everyone knew each other’s business has disappeared here. ‘Knowing nobody, having no acquaintance’ establishes resounding proof for the link between a poor experience of community and the low-frequency use of the neighborhood. Medium or low satisfaction may reflect their concern about the neighborhood environment. It may be due to the fact that individuals expect more about depending on the outside environment function, particularly migrants might need a support network in neighborhoods to better adapt to the new environment.

In fact, among the tenants surveyed, both the perception of neighborhood quality and neighborly relations are assessed as significantly low, but neighborhood safety and maintaining privacy reach the majority’s expectations. This is partly due to the designers’ wish to shelter them with as much privacy as possible to adapt to their unfamiliar environment. Therefore, despite people in this low-rent housing area living a decent life; they consider the community they inhabit to be a moderately secluded one.

Amongst the four scopes of communal activities observed, the feedback disclosed showed that tenants generally looked forward to having more of a social life; yet, they were somewhat less prepared to participate in this due to the unsuitable conditions. Pertaining to community contributions, surveyed tenants showed an

---

Table 5.1. General statistics related to community experience of the three groups  
(source: Minxin Jiayuan community survey in 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement value of sense of community</th>
<th>Migrant type (15 people in each group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent-accompanied migrants (above 15 old)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of friends and/or relatives in this neighborhood (Number of interviewer, present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobody</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>8 (53.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence of place where migrants meet their neighbors and relatives living in this area (present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your rental room</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the front area of your room (corridor)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space in the corner</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public facility room (gym, TV room, computer room) on the ground floor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market or restaurant on the ground floor</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof open space</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other, specify</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborly Relationship (present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common assistance</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual trust</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention to the Community Involvement (Number of interviewer, present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not pay attention</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay a little attention</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay much attention</td>
<td>7 (46.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Belongingness (Number of interviewer, present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merely provisional dwelling</td>
<td>8 (53.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to tell</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a real home (a place where I/we belong to)</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason to stay in this neighborhood (present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheap rental room</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinship (friend)-based neighborhood</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to say</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: in a random sample of 15 parent-accompanied migrants, our survey selected people above 15 years old who were asked to give detailed information on their sense of community in their neighborhood. Among the 15 interviewees of each group, we also excluded those migrants who provided inconsistent or untrue information.
interest in communal activities, but showed that there was a lack of opportunity to enter into these.

Sociologists found evidence suggesting that as neighborhood units take their places within the community, from a society of acquaintances to the unfamiliar environment, they become acquaintances again. This transformation has led to a hardening of the social gap and recommendations to organize residents for the sake of mutual voluntary help to demonstrate cooperation, respect and concern for others.
among neighbors. A harmonious community can be cultivated better by neighborly interaction.

Although there are always some residents who value complete privacy and perhaps have antipathy toward exchanging reduced privacy for frequent social acquaintances, would architects and planners seek any improvements in encouraging direct and open neighborly communication? How can sustainable considerations combine with ethical responsibility, and in a concrete space reestablish the essential connection between surroundings and human activity, and in turn later unite individuals with each other? Would an inclination be bred where people are more approachable, companionable and less anonymous? If the above ideas are practical, what are the boundaries of the private exposure people generally accept to strangers in terms of a space plan?

One key phenomenon is at the back of the process of low-rent housing—physical marginalization—starting from early spatial location along the suburbs of the city, gradually, moving to the more and more isolated margins of the city. Numerous and consistent societal influences have exacerbated the loss of a meaningful collective life.¹⁷³ This reveals itself in the hidden chain of worsening social surroundings and the few life chances in the shady districts of the low-rent housing projects: the people who get the opportunity to enjoy the social housing are actually being marginalized physically.¹⁷⁴

The surveyed tenants were previously more pleased with their traditional lives, and at present they feel lonelier and more socially isolated. This could be due, in part, to the low-income population depending more on communal functions. Predictably,

the conditions of the low-rent housing lag behind those of other communities by a great margin.

5.4 Finding: absence of communal activities

In the second case, the finding specified that the contemporary low-rent apartments show the absence or low-level of communal activities. Compared to the Yimuyuan neighborhood, this case study turns out to be more spatially isolated due to the supplies of complete facilities; It is conflicts between (unintentional) voluntary incorporated with the others and separated physical background.

Differences in the three transitional spaces in reference to the Yimuyuan neighborhood are listed.

(1) **Shared functions are absent:** as for the functions supplied in the corridor in front of the room and the street in front of the house, they are incorporated into the inside of the rental house. Compared to case 1, the two functions are absent. Since the public corridor is not used with the function of cooking/storage, residents living on the same floor do not need to make use of outdoor functions to take care of themselves.

(2) **Shared functions are all relocated into the inside of the rental room for individual use:** in terms of the space between the houses, compared to the Yimuyuan case, in the Minxin jiayuan case, function 3 (restroom, bathing, laundry) in the Yimuyuan case is also moved to the inside of the rental room, and function 4 (migrant-support facilities, training school, residents-related employment agency and other migrants-focusing services) in the Minxin jiayuan case, has all been relocated entirely and relocated inside, leaving just open space.
Shared functions are all relocated into the inside of the rental room for individual use: in terms of the space between the houses, compared to the *Yimuyuan* case, in the *Minxin jiayuan* case, function 3 (restroom, bathing, laundry) in the *Yimuyuan* case is also moved to the inside of the rental room, and function 4 (migrant-support facilities, training school, residents-related employment agency and other migrants-focusing services) in the *Minxin jiayuan* case, has all been relocated entirely and relocated inside, leaving just open space.

In reference to case 1, the functions combined with the spaces feed the communal activities. This fact explains why the same environment cannot bring out the same level of communal activities among residents. To reiterate, the space in the transitional spaces is only a physical fact, the functions combined with such spaces

Table 5.3. Mean values of the level of communal activities in *Minxin jiayuan* case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, what do you think your neighborly relationship means in terms of sociability (Q.7)
How do you feel about living in this neighborhood now in terms of as a real home? (Q. 9)
Is your rental area an ideal place to continue living in in terms of having a feeling of attachment? (Q. 12)
High frequency of visiting neighbors (Q. 15)
High frequency of helping neighbors (Q. 16)
Figure 5.9. Graphic representation of function comparison combined with space in front of the rental rooms and in front of the rental house between Yimuyuan and Minxin jiayuan neighborhood (Drawing by author)
Figure 5.10. Graphic representation of function comparison combined with by space between the rental houses between *Yimuyuan* and *Minxin jiayuan* neighborhood (Drawing by author)
determine the migrants’ contribution to communal activities. Simply, a ground garden and open spaces can form recurring visual contacts, but they cannot by themselves be enough motivation to encourage communal activities.

(4) **No sharing experiences:** The loss of functions that are combined with the spaces cannot be a means through which everybody can be seen to share. Residents have no shared experiences to make the spaces become established as the basis for communal activities even though they are under the same physical conditions. As we observe in the *Minxin jiayuan* case, the communal activities simply refer to residents’ voluntary visits or intentional visits rather than communal shared experiences.

(5) **The three categories of shared functions are mostly lost:** the only functions of recreational use are kept in the form of a ground garden and open spaces.

The level of communal activities is not decided by the rented high-rise apartment or spontaneous-developed low-rise house, but by the functions combined with the places. In the *Minxin jiayuan* case, the opinion that high-rise neighboring is making communal activities difficult is probably wrong. Similarly, open spaces and a ground garden that are regarded as suitable for the arising of neighborly life is also false. Apartment buildings, including high-rises, do not prevent active communal activities. Loss of functions by which residents can be seen to share and a lack of shared experiences do stop communal activities from occurring.

(6) **Residents have no share experiences to develop the three types of relationships:** in reference to the *Yimuyuan* case, the communal activities concern not only the relationship of the residents to a space, but the relationship of residents to available functions and the relationship between residents. In the modern high-rises, the three transitional spaces merely
introduce the relationship between residents and space, and the relationship of residents to the functions available is lost. Accordingly, the interpersonal relationship among residents cannot be generated in modern high-rise life.
Chapter 6. Third Case Study—Vanke Tulou
Collective Housing in Guangzhou

6.1 Private developer-built Vanke Tulou collective housing

Another dwelling migrants’ only neighborhood in the Guangzhou city—one of the biggest in-migrants city in China, is chosen as the second contemporary low-rent study area from the perspective of functions embedded in the Yimuyuan case (Figure 6.1, 6.2). Based on the Yimuyuan case, we found the communal activities derived from 2 important physical elements. Admitting this fact, the negative level of communal activities can be explained properly with considering the non-existence of provided functions in the Minxin jiayuan high-rise neighborhood.

The third case, Vanke Tulou collective housing. The residential unit is also small, but rooms are equipped with complete option. Residents do not need to go outside of the house to take care of themselves. How do people have communal activities? It confirms that the functions concerning residents needs establish the motivation for communal activities.

The Vanke Tulou house project is located in Guangzhou city, the third largest Chinese city. On this chapter, its collective housing project could be considered as a relatively small-scale case of low-rent housing in the area compared to the former 2 cases. On the other hand, it is still possible to discover cases in modern Chinese low-rent neighborhood that validate functions at least to a certain degree and its correlate communal activities.

Due to the Vanke Tulou is only open to the rural-to-urban migrants, this in turn induce designers to give first priority to the requirement tenants wished to move. A
Figure 6.1. Bird’s eye view of Vanke Tulou collective housing in Guangzhou city
(http://jianzhu.pingxiaow.com)

![Bird’s eye view of Vanke Tulou collective housing in Guangzhou city](http://jianzhu.pingxiaow.com)

Figure 6.2. Aerial photo of Vanke Tulou collective housing in Guangzhou city
(www.map.baidu.com)

![Aerial photo of Vanke Tulou collective housing in Guangzhou city](www.map.baidu.com)
challenge to the mentioned terms will be to preserve the communal activities of the rural resident population by means of creating group moral-based shared connection with respecting individual satisfaction and without sacrificing the absolutely necessary privacy.

One typical positive effect on public communal activities is proven by the case of the Tulou collective housing project. Here it is quoted as a pattern of a design which refines particular collective elements to generate communal activities in the progressively privatized living context of low-rent high-rises of China. The architects have borrowed features from an original Tulou house, such as the circle frame, a surrounded corridor, and equal living conditions in a collective lodging space; then incorporated them into a modern form of collective accommodation in a high-rise apartment block for rural-to-urban migrants. In turn, with the ideal of ‘a housing does to the people’, the prototype Tulou house formalized the vision of ‘communitarianism’—helping to preserve communal activities and give shape to a community. All the architects involved in Tulou collective housing made an effort to yield different degree of outdoor activities to contribute to creating recognizable and valued environment disciplines among neighbors. Such a community is extensively visualized to offer a setting for communal activity and reciprocity relationship that is impartial, comprehensive and maintainable in the comprehensive perceptions: sustainably and ecologically as well as communally.

The designers, Urbanus Architects, stated that the low-rent project—Tulou collective housing (2008) and the original Hakka Tulou have analogous titles and the inspiration for design came from the traditional, circular, fortress-like, multi-family Tulou houses found in the rural areas of Fujian province. They refer to the concept that the dwelling experience among lower-to-middle groups encourages architects to

---

have more consideration for a rich communal living environment—a constant interaction between the relaxed friendly atmosphere, strong communal activities and security found in this setting. There is a close relationship between the idea of people being closely knitted together and the modern city which needs a lively, street life.

With this in mind, we endorse the idea that the local government should take the chief role in overcoming attitudinal and practical barriers to the rolling-out of new housing models such as Vanke Tulou collective housing, which strengthen people’s communal activities. We also argue that housing associations and construction companies must explore alternative models for low-rent housing that actively support the lower-to-middle class to remain embedded in the wider community, rather than low-rent exclusion (exclusion through low rent housing).

### 6.2 Examining the spatial structure of the Vanke Tulou collective housing and residents’ activities

This estate was built in 2008. Part of a larger housing complex, it has 287 units, of which 245 are apartments for rent of 40m²; 24 are used as dormitories; and 18 are hotel rooms.

#### 6.2.1 Front of migrants’ rental room

The front of the rental room, corridor is an attachment to local places as extension of migrant residents’ private home. The boundary between the rental rooms is articulated through a circular form of corridor. Its’ one side is enclosed by the rental rooms while the other side is facing the courtyard garden. Appropriate to the current setting, the building is circular since architects have inherited the circular shape of the traditional Hakka Tulou.
The appearance of round in the context of adopting the loop shape is more than balancing and refinement; in fact, a greater increase quantitatively of the circular Tulou is palpable compared to the rectangular forms shown previously in expanded courtyard size, lighting and airing that are due to modern practices. The architects proposed that the development of the exterior and interior arrangements should strictly conform to the rules.

The normal form of corridor which connects of the entrance of each single room and the nearby space is adjacent to courtyard. And one side of the corridor led into the interior of the house. Thus the entrance is closer to the public domain than to the actual interior of the house. The entrance separates the chief body of the rental room

Figure 6.4. Access circular corridor in front of the narrow rental dwelling units
and corridor, and functioned as an accessing point to the room unit as division between inside and outside.

Apartments inhabit the circumference, since in Tulou collective housing, each unit is shaped like a pie section with the point cut off. Consequently, each unit is divided from the one next to it by a wall (sharing side walls with neighbors) from the outer wall toward the center. The wall penetrates the vertical volume of space, and it categorizes the space through its continuousness of usage and shape. In fact, the rental rooms are enclosed on three sides (Figure 6.5): the front door and two walls perpendicular to it. However, for example, on the first floor, the front door has a direct connection with the courtyard while the other floor, the door does not face any

Figure 6.5. Schematic diagram of arrangement of public circular corridor in front of the rental room in Vanke Tulou collective housing (Drawing by author)
rental rooms, except being adjacent to it. In other words, the entrance and the adjacent corridor of the Vanke Tulou house visually connects to the whole neighborhood instead of merely connecting one rental rooms to another. The space front of the rental room contributes to the overall appearance of the building.

Unlike the entrance place in the Yimuyuan houses which functions as one additional private space connecting the home, the place front of the rental room in Vanke Tulou serves merely as a visual connection, instead of as the extension of function utility and integral part of their home place (Figure 6.6). In such a unit, two elementary spaces are distinctly evident—a place for lodging and a place for passage. Hence, a radius clearly shows the partitions that issue from the circumference

Figure 6.6. Corridors and stairs in Vanke Tulou collective housing (Drawing by author)
towards the center. The outer ring of each unit, the one along the surface edge of the new Tulou collective housing building, has a balcony to prevent the bothersome interference of both voices and light, and it is functionally optimized for the residents’ use. The cells are placed along the circumference of the building, and the public place for social life should occupy the center and the roof of the round building (inn, central courtyard, corner public space, and roof terrace). Architects also mentioned that, the social relations that residents (or a family) could have may exceed the constricted physical boundaries, so as in the original Hakka Tulou, some level of privacy would have to be traded off to exchanges between indispensable acquaintances and therefore create social trust.

They suggested that the high degree of visual connectivity of residents in their entrance porch spaces contributes to high levels of social collaboration and familiarity, resulting in the close knit communal activities. Hence the Tulou is experienced in the manner that dwellers distance ‘us’ from ‘them’ while strangers should be respectful and show self-control—any visitor would be identified immediately as a stranger.

Tenants in Vanke Tulou housing have longed for a circular form of accommodation due to the increase in area supplied. And there is no doubt that the cross-through corridors with an inner circular courtyard in a mountainous district creates a great sense of opening and fresh air. Not only do round buildings become more intimate, but in the process, they reinforce an exclusive domain, or at least a place under the control of the residents. This control is all the more productive because it was not the work of individual exertion. It likewise brings something to the house which did not exist before in China: communal activities—dozens of households dwell in perfect equality while being sheltered from the external world.

In Tulou collective housing, each apartment unit is accessed from the circular ring corridor or entrance porch. The semi-open porch is well shaded and ventilated
to encourage social activities similar to the case of the semi-open spaces at the front of the traditional *Hakka Tulou*. As a point of departure for analysis, *Tulou* collective housing stands comparison to the *Hakka Tulou* and allows insights into what lies concealed in the spherical form. I can investigate what bestows a dwelling with its original identity: collectivity of equals, since it is true that each dweller, is given equal opportunity to share and fraternize with others in a civil manner.\(^{176}\)

At the floor level the ring corridor forms one of the most binding features between the public and the private world. It is an individual unit where the façade and corridor separate the public from the private. Entry is defined as integral or applied to each unit. The sum of the collective character of the *Tulou* creates the *Tulou* collective housing—an edge between the private and the public worlds. The differentiated façade and entry distinguishes each unit within the collective edge. The collective edge depends upon the sum of articulated facades to maintain its continuity. Despite this fact, *Tulou* collective housing has been investigating new relationships between the concepts of private and collective space as a means to accustom ‘individuals who are seeking to reduce the cost of cooperating with each other’ to the idea of a low-rent neighborhood.\(^{177}\)

The importance of the *Tulou* to the pattern of the semi-open ring corridor is due largely to the pioneering endeavors to apply rich communal activities to the perspective of home life. Such attempts have not completely solved the matter of encouraging interaction, however, as is suggested by the continued emphasis for a suitable transitional space design—the concern given to the sharing of the interpersonal, or collectivity, fosters the nature of intermediary individuals around the neighborhood. During a visit to the *Tulou* collective housing, it was seen that the


architects had maintained a series of degrees in the transitional space to ensure the tendency of *Tulou* as a more elaborate and formal entertaining space. The result not only gives an open and airy feeling, but also provides comfort and ease in communication—to relax/greet and to receive visitors.

6.2.2 Between the rental rooms

Unlike a traditional Chinese house, or any records on the spatial arrangements of a household, the Tulou housing does not foster a hierarchy, but establishes an evening out of the distribution of comfortable spaces; not with a focus on the appearance of a residence, but with how it serves the tenants. The truth is that although dwellers of a *Tulou* frequently speak of ‘practicability’ and ‘facility’ in referring to their residences, these terms are concerned as much with security and

![Diagram of Tulou dwelling unit](http://pro-unit.org/2012/05/15/tulou#sthash.YZdEjxrq.dpf)

**Figure 6.7.** Dwelling unit: Area compartmentalization in terms of privacy and community of *Tulou*

Source: http://pro-unit.org/2012/05/15/tulou#sthash.YZdEjxrq.dpf
parity, as with diverse community and a spirit of belonging that was the consequence of the focus on social equality in this area. Correspondingly, since the lifestyle of the Tulou dwellers was communal-spirited, there was no reason for them to put emphasis on self-control over how they live their lives to make lifecycle out of sight, and focus the mind on higher matters—discouraging inequality on every layer.

In Vanke Tulou, the units are designed for salaried groups, many of whom are migrant workers. Traditional units in the Tulou are evenly laid out along its perimeter, like modern slab-style dormitory buildings, but with a sense of visual connectivity to the maximum degree. A diameter of 72 meters admits 245 units (10,104m²) which are appointed as rental apartments 24 units (1,088m²) are designated as dormitories, and 18 units (558m²) are kept intended as a day-pay hotel/inn. The residential area of tenants should seem spacious enough, although the room for each person is by no means luxurious, it is purely compact and function. The architects researched the minimum standards and based their design on them. When architects referred to ‘standards’, they also stressed the changeable interior arrangements to house different household types. For example, single families, would choose a configuration with one, two, or three bedrooms.

Young single people may decide to double up in an apartment, while still others may form groups of four to share a dormitory-style design. The overall size is 40m² and the maximum number of tenants permitted per unit is five. It is the atmosphere of sharing that permeates the Hakka Tulou. Not only does the interior follow the standardized plan—explicitly, the layout and dimensions are treated with no exception, but the design character has obviously echoed the manner of life controlled around the dynamic pursuit of equal individuals. This motivation, we are led to believe, has brought on or precipitated a comfortable cohesiveness.

The erected walls divide up space into areas with compact functions. Dwelling, entertaining and, sharing space, become not only part of the whole, but also a means
to approach each other, reacting on and within one another, continuity in all. When architects eliminated the background to the spatial system of ornamentation in favor of an integral sense of the whole they drew this ‘equal’ concept from the Tulou collective housing.

To speak of a community of equals in physical ways is to define a set of shared characters: sharing concerns with people, functions, affection, and a devotion to the surrounding group. Cognizance of a community of equals focusing on cohesion has made the Tulou collective housing unique. Also the layout of the Tulou demonstrates

Figure 6.8. Schematic diagram of arrangement of public open spaces between migrant residents’ rental rooms on the 1st and 2nd floor (Drawing by author)
how convenience concerning household activities was planned in a vertical way (Figure 6.8, 6.9). When Huang hanmin (2010) wrote about domestic scheduling, he accentuated that what was equally extraordinary in the housing was the manner through which space was managed.\footnote{Huang, H. M. (2010), ‘A Treasure of Chinese Traditional Civilian Residence’. SDX Joint Publishing Company, China.}

“The house plan, involves all rooms being built as small and compact with the same dimensions and decoration. The purpose of this plan can be understood, one,
to make more rooms to accommodate extended families; two, to enable secure comforts to be accessible to each dweller. A *Tulou* is compartmentalized vertically by different families. A perpendicular set (from ground to top floor) is a cell for a small family while a larger family would inhabit more vertical sets.”

Indeed, the situation in the *Tulou* collective housing is distinctly different from the *Tulou* prototype. Striking is the fact that the generous provision of ventilation installations and the space for community life constitute a big improvement in natural airing, illumination, and in the quality of social activities. One reason for the small quantity of tetragonal *Tulou* was the original intention where people used their homes as a redoubt.

*The members of a clan in a Tulou enjoy the basic living conditions, at the same time, they have pride in the happiness of all families being under one roof. Within the Tulou, each household’s door and windows only open inward, each person is harmoniously housed. In this situation, quarrels rarely occur. Any indecent conduct is definitely condemned by all dwellers in one Tulou—households of up to a few hundred people were not unusual.*

Each unit has in its outward circumference, a window large enough not only to bring light into the living area of the unit, but so that there is sufficient light for the corresponding lodging area. The window is a remarkable example of how designers demonstrate their effective perfection of the model of the *Tulou*. Its windows were not able to be opened due to forming a defense against the outside. Fresh air was fed in from the central courtyard. There are ring corridors that mediated between the central courtyard and each unit. The ring passageway permits relaxed access and a continuous flow of people, passing from one situation and area to another (Figure 6.10).

---

Each household can be accessed simultaneously by inward and outward opening windows. The outer circumference of the apartment unit is formed by a wooden lattice (screen), so the lattice openings reduce the feeling of aloofness. It is imagined that in the central opening courtyard, illumination entering through the dwelling units and across the transitional area is sufficient for the dwellers of the central lodge. Equally important, as a form of response to the climate and people’s desire for privacy, the units cut off from each stranger the view of everyone else and allow sunlight in. Builders used reflective glass coated with silver mirror film to achieve this, and the function is only to let light in, not to allow outsiders to look through it. In tropical regions the heat-insulation effect reduces the glare as well as the heat gain and this is achieved in the organization of partitions.

![Diagram of roof terrace](image)

**Figure 6.10.** Sitting down on the bench on the roof terrace (Drawing by author)

The site environment, human intentions, cultural and social constructs influence house design because the architecture is intended to harmonize with the outdoor environment. *Tulou* collective housing responds to the physical restrictions and tenants’ requirements to modify the transformation of the *Hakka Tulou*, to complement its insufficiencies. Architects wrote in terms of the physical constraints as follows.
General symmetry results in reiterations, completed together with each room and open spaces having paralleled counterparts on the other half of the circle. Major spaces within the *Tulou* are symmetrically compartmentalized. On one hand, uniformity is circumscribed to the parts where it could be comprehended as a oneness. On the other hand, it was an endeavor to be loyal to create an impartial solution for satisfaction. The *Tulou* is characterized with a multi-ring character and integrated in a strict plot that housed a group of various rooms of the same scope as obligated by utility and necessity. Its four centripetal rings and enclosed ancestral hall, the regularly settled corridors, and the windows and doors opening inward of the same size are all typical of the *Tulou*. At the same time, the internal semblance is expressed in a characteristically constrained mode to deliver the unbroken or uniform nature of its hosts.

A comparison of *Yimuyuan* and *Minxin jiayuan* neighborhood patterns suggest changes in patterns that show that *Vanke Tukou* neighborhood has comprised more open space. The qualities of community and environment are strongly interconnected in a sustainable cycle, where residents are faced with the choice of immersion in sociability rather than anonymity—sharing much or nothing. How can the controlled activity be transformed into a voluntary choice? It is important to note that architects recognize the necessity for establishing communal and social intercourse in an open environment.

Chiefly, a link between the corner public space and the ground courtyard should not be simply a visual merger, but should differentiate between the equilibrium of dwellers’ desires for differing levels of interaction from the people around. The architects point out that a sense of a tight-knit-community, interaction, and a socially comfortable atmosphere, are all etched into the *Hakka Tulou*. It weaves together the meanings of house and household, dwelling and refuge, ownership and affection—into a fabric in which we appreciate the social life of groups. Consequently, the architects named it the *Tulou* collective housing project, and this term (*Tulou*) is
plainly something more than a collective subject. What draws attention is the sense of intimacy and frequent interaction that is created by the transition spaces within the circular edifice. The transition spaces are characteristic of interiors that are not related with functionality, but with the way that the space conveys the character of the occupier.

The Hakka Tulou and the Tulou collective housing provide information on how communal activities are preserved in the modern middle-rises and how the interpersonal, or collectivity is shared, and also the nature of intermediary individuals in this space. That is, how individuals gather together by different degrees toward communal living. The characteristics of privacy and community are echoed by alterations in the architecture of the houses. When the home changes, it ceases to be a workplace, and it becomes smaller and more significant, less public. With the family comes isolation, but also the specialization of rooms—between a chamber, or a room used for sleeping, and a salle, which was used for visitors or for dining, and this allowed a space for private life within the family.\(^\text{180}\)

Conceptually, immersion in sociability is afforded a measure of interaction from greeting and receiving visitors, and the quality of community life comes to signify cooperation, and an active and public-spirited citizenry. Generally speaking, however, the current average resident has the choice of being anonymous and invisible to his/her neighbors. In line with this, architects and urban planners are seeking to stress the role of spatial composition and architectural narrative in an individual’s sense of a neighborhood.

This domain of Tulou collective housing design practice suggests that the building environment could create ‘a rich experience of a close-knit-community’,

which has recently been lost in the design strategies of low-rent neighborhoods proposed by architectural designers and planners. In the case of the Hakka Tulou, in the past, people in traditional communities enjoyed a high quality of community life, a good neighborhood encouraged interaction, and neighbors were friendly and quick to say greetings to each other.

The traditional Hakka Tulou house invariably incorporated a semi-open front porch that was closely related to the social rituals of greeting and receiving neighbors and visitors. With its steps, chairs and benches (Figure 6.11), it was a favorite place to rest and chat. The ring corridor is highly visible from the circulation paths of the village where neighbors could see and greet each other as they moved around the neighborhood. This bred high levels of familiarity, which led in turn to a strong sense of immersion in this community and a sense of security.

The insular nature of the Tulou fostered a tight knit community within its thick walls. Families not only shared the use of public facilities and an ancestral hall in the

![Figure 6.11. Corner public space on the each floor](image)
center of the courtyard, since the typical functions of a home were divided across different floors, they also had to use the public open-air passageways to move from one room in their homes to another. Much like in Bentham’s Panopticon, residents of the Tulou were in constant view of each other, and this helped reinforce their lifestyles as resembling that of one large unified family.

The endeavor of socializing in a sustainable community site is analogous to the premises that the Japanese philosopher Watsuji Tetsuro proposed in his *Climate and Culture*. His emphasis on ‘return to the warm community’ represents a set of reciprocal activities where one individual is capable of relating with another. Architects and theorists have contributed substantial weight to the archetypal meanings of these terms. Understanding architecture breeds a sense of dwelling, that is, the physical catalyst for linking people with, or separating them from one another. While this proposition is welcoming in architecture, most understandings have established the strategy basically as purely philosophical, instead of endeavoring to highlight the struggle in the practice of privacy and community in a real setting. Furthermore, one has to confess that Watsuji’s idea of community is not a fixed phenomenon but a struggle for appropriate equilibrium between the individual and society.

Architects, urban designers, and sociologists frequently propose the idea that the relevant degree of a person in relation to another defines the content of a vitalized (static) place. By far, the collective space facilitated by the transitional space (passageway, shared balcony) is still a testing ground, and has not received enough attention in housing design. Unlike modern urban housing in which people settle for a lack of contact, the enclosed, inward-looking shape of the Hakka Tulou, offered

---

181 Thus, from the point of view of sustaining this quality, it is people in relation to people which are the resources that must not be depleted. To be more exact, what has to be sustained is the potential for contact and encountering other people.
the opportunity to introduce a form of ‘togetherness’, public acquaintanceship and cross-connection. The Tulou collective housing has been a pioneering model neighborhood for investigating the spatial relevance of one person in relation to another facilitated by a continuity of the physiological relationship from the interior to the outer landscape.

The Tulou collective housing clung to the native model of the circular corridor as the main thoroughfare for tenants, and it consists of an outer circular block, with a rectangular block within it which has a courtyard and it is connected to the outer ring by bridges. Both the circular and rectangular blocks contain apartment units, and the spaces in between are for movement and community use. The inner circle corridor is situated with good natural illumination/ventilation and to encourage social activities similar to the case of the corridor in the Hakka Tulou house.

We have observed how the Hakka people were careful to plan their big collective housing and, spatially speaking, it brought about a strengthening power of the center and family control. Together with the closed level, the concept of power

Figure 6.12. Hanging quilt around the roof terrace of rectangle-shaped dwelling units
(isolation and confrontational gestures) breeds another social effect—the centripedal organization encourages more effective social interaction as its strength. Jane Jacobs (1961) identified the social quality of a place in terms of the quality of human interactions within it. In this case ‘people’ is not a question of number, and quality depends on the relevance of one person in relation to another.\(^{182}\)

In the circulation route, the arrangement of transportation spaces in the apartments, the relationship to open spaces and the location of common facilities are all very prudently measured. As Alexander Tzonis (2006) indicated, relevance can be defined by means of short-term purpose: direct services for immediate requirements. Alternatively, it can also be demarcated concerning the lasting potential of people to interact with each other in order to understand new phenomena, to create new knowledge, and to carry on acclimatizing to new challenges. Our observation reminds us that residents with more occasional (if we arrange places deliberately and planned for constructive community social intercourse) meeting chances to come together and meet other people they do not know in an intimate way.

And yet nobody can keep their door open in modern neighborhoods. However, it is interesting, that the useful and significant contacts among neighbors in the same community are confined to acquaintanceships. In speaking about the increasing chance for contact, a short word for this aspect of contact is ‘trust’. This trust in the neighborhood is fashioned over time from many, many little public contacts.\(^{183}\) Connecting our case study, this trust might grow out of people stopping by at the corner of the up-down stairs for a foot rest, out of the activity of gardening on verandas, from drying their clothes on the roof terrace, hearing job information from


\(^{183}\) ibid.
communication with other migrant residents in a club, a library, fitness room or computer area. As a result, community acquaintances are accumulated by a number of spontaneous, relaxed public contacts in the community—convenient daily connections to these service facilities make it easier for residents to use and build a human network with public esteem and reliance on others. This could also be considered as a function in time of personal or neighborhood need. The people who

Figure 6.13. Distribution of public space on each floor (Drawing by author)

Source: the design plan referred to is by Urbanus Architecture & Design Company, materials sorted by author
live in the *Tulou* collective community normally give the impression of having a more varied social life than other groups.

In my own field observation, I witnessed the full attendance of public space in the *Tulou* collective housing, and the composition of ring corridors, platforms, and terraces that had apparently both site-specific and site-typical aspects which illustrate an architect’s site interpretation in both public-spirited environmental and symbolic ways. An examination of design decisions made on spatial arrangement for the *Tulou* collective housing follows less from aesthetic awareness than from arising public life. In studying *Tulou* collective housing there are two salient features: one, public spaces are mostly situated in the central square site with an interesting view into a circular unit and the central courtyard; two, the units in the circle and square on the upper second floor are detached and combined through a bridge.

Architects arranged the public space of each level clarifying their proposition as, ‘public contact embedded in the environment in which architects intended to create a spatial combination of the socializing space in the passageway. This persistence to intentionally construct spaces for socializing underlines the transforming concept of the *Hakka Tulou* for the recent low-rent *Tulou* collective housing.

*Tulou* collective housing is emphasized as a design solution, as opposed to maintaining privacy in some house cases; architects have mentioned that the *Tulou* collective project has built up numerous institutions for socializing. How can neighborhoods generate enough variety in its uses—enough diversity to maintain people’s socializing? With regard to inhabiting private areas and community spatially, I suggest that an accumulation of learned experience through site observation is one way to approach Watsuji’s sense of climate and community. Altogether, the circular structure, the design, the construction, and the balance develop as follows: the setting around the public spaces fosters a more formal,
organizational neighborly interaction; the community square makes the whole block work as an intermediary component between the city and the country; the transition from the city to a home is carried out by means of a rich sequence that brings the occupants from one situation to the other gradually, softening the limits between public and private spaces; in reconfiguring the transitional elements, these small, sensitively managed details build up a balance of indispensable privacy and volunteer different levels of interaction.

The opportunities for approaching tenants’ togetherness in 
Tulou collective housing is greatly enlarged by its constructive methods. Residents’ experiences of merits ‘from anonymous at first’to acquaintance echo the trust network built into their neighborhood. To exemplify this, I use selected in-depth interviews from a 2014 field-observation of 45 tenants in Vanke Tulou collective housing. When questioned in detail with regard to how the trust grows out of this community. Where is the public space they use habitually? Several of the participants who are living in the Vanke Tulou collective housing, explained that they are very involved in their community. In the following, I select quotations that capture the typical sentiments expressed by the interviewed tenants. Residents’ response concerned places of their day-by-day lives, such as ping-pong court. A Zhanjiang resident who worked as an advertising salesman in a TV broadcasting company in Guangdong told us about his social life:

*I could be the first tenant of this rental housing, I feel I am very involved in this community in different ways, stopping by the corner public space to relax or for a short conversation, I know my neighbors on the same floor or even or different floors through playing ping-pong in the public gym. Most of us are young people, graduates; we are sociable, afraid to be anonymous, so sitting on the balcony is another important unconscious communication space...get your face out there.*

He is joined by another occupant from Sichuan who works as an interior-designer:
From what base arises the mutual trust among neighbors if we don’t know each other and don’t even talk? Perhaps if I grew up in a town, everyone would know each other’s pockets, and privacy would not be so appreciated. In a city, the most recent neighborhood makes residents anonymous and cages people at home.

Later, his girlfriend who is employed in the same corporation as a financial accounting says:

I feel that despite the living conditions here being crowded, in one respect, it creates a familiar environment for us, we can meet our neighbors very easily and make friends. It is enjoyable to go out of our room, relax and chat in the corridor or sit around the corner after work with those whom we might know or even with new faces.

These three instances exemplify how content tenants are with their neighborhood life and the place of communal activities is where they use frequently and come across people often. In addition, there exists a network of belonging—mutual trust, reverence and concern are cultivated through a number of occasional, public contacts on a daily level.

In fact, the most appreciated urban open spaces are exactly the intimate and acquainted ones which play a part in residents’ daily lives, instead of the large gardens and significant landscapes distant from home. Although many social aspects dominate, design certainly correspondingly affects neighborliness. What do we mean by a good (reasonable) distance or a satisfactory distance for a public space that renders tenants’ residential places conducive to initiating communication? Communication does not travel about where public charms and conveniences are lacking. The utilization of public spaces weakens drastically if too much encumbrance is put upon residents. Simply considered, the distance can be a key factor, for example, a long distance isolates people from using facilities and getting to know people who live directly across from them. Intimate across-the-street neighborliness may be as frequent as side-to-side neighborliness—however, it could
also segregate residents to a restricted home scope. A special landscape feature, such as a porch in the courtyard or a bridge connecting two buildings, brings the residents in a neighborhood together because they share something unique and this makes it easier to use such services. Architects’ deep commitment to this physiological and environmental awareness in the designing of a gathering space is apparent in the Tulou collective housing.

The observations of the study are summarized as a set of design guidelines. On the chart, the ‘dark zone’ indicates a space with completely private qualities. On the right of the chart, the ‘bright zone’ indicates that the gradual sequence from privacy to public-exposure can be measured from a rental room (privacy) to the corridor, then to the corner public space, next to the public library, and café, and finally to the courtyard, and roof terrace (public).

In Tulou collective housing, windows, transportation plans, and spare places express not only the answer to climate, but also deal well with the physical distance manipulating neighborly relations (immediacy and connections). We have noticed that the neighborly activity also exists despite the physical distance or time spent

Figure 6.14. Ground courtyard
approaching public facilities. At this juncture, I would like to pose a question regarding one specific subsection of the wide-ranging survey of our tenants: under the conditions of Tulou collective housing, does any environmental content take on an easy or stressful value for neighborly communication?

The focus group with residents mostly revealed that they had a lot of contact with a mixed-age group in the community in their daily lives. For example, a single young man working in an insurance company in Guangzhou comments:

*This neighborhood includes a great supply of common entertainments and relationships in close proximity, such as a public library, and an internet café, as well as restaurants, convenient stores, and other services. Unlike other rental houses, the public space is not overlooked. Here I feel like I am surrounded by these facilities; it is easy to talk with neighbors.*

The sufficient supply and easy approach to public space is the interesting feature of Tulou collective housing—an open interior for the whole building. By putting everything in the central moon-shaped courtyard, natural lighting even

Table 6.1. Range of distances between Tulou collective housing and necessary services and facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service or Facility</th>
<th>Range of Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corner public place of each level</td>
<td>15 meters by 42 meters, within 13 rooms internal in space,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>7.5 meters, but 9 meters preferable as maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof terrace</td>
<td>Same floor: 7.5 meters to 8.1 meters through bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 meters from ground floor to roof terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtyard</td>
<td>On the 1st floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6 stories in ring Tulou and 5 stories in square Tulou)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience store</td>
<td>14 shops out of 57 rooms on the 1st floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public gym, library and similar facilities</td>
<td>1st floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation to outside places</td>
<td>642 meters to bus stop on foot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Design formation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undesirable design diagram</th>
<th>Satisfactory design diagram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Respectable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spatial portrayal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>26113 mm x 9407 mm</td>
<td>17281 mm x 9407 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arrangement</strong></td>
<td>A single room in the corner</td>
<td>A rental room has to be given up to gain a corner public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-tropical climate response</strong></td>
<td>Completely exposed to solar radiation; A absence of complexity in the progression from one place to another does not exist</td>
<td>Corridor public space with sufficient depth relieves the direct solar radiation and driving rain, and at the same time the air flow is desirable for comfort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social-climate perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tenants' reflection</strong></th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move as quickly as possible; The long straight path makes a boring environment; Lack of sufficient talking space reduces the desire to communicate</td>
<td>Cane chairs and sofas are favorite places to stop and relax; Good view of the opposite curved passageway; Convenient as well as inevitable due to being close to the stairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Conceivable communal interaction</strong></th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard to meet neighbors; Even if neighbors meet, it is not a pleasant place for any conversation</td>
<td>Convenient transportation passageway Conversation space Meeting space Good view A friendly place, people gossiping and resting their feet Neighbors on their way somewhere always stop by A long spatial construct without disrupting spatial and visual continuity Safe community and settle for sharing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.15. Summary of the guidelines concerning the compartment of arrangement conforming to social-climate assistances
In the Hakka Tulou, there is a sunken courtyard bordered by kitchen clusters. A sense of security in this area is more than merely sensory, for there is an emotional aspect as well. “The only entrance to a Tulou, is normally a small skylight where people have access to the most intimate space—the courtyard. This takes up the middle of the Tulou, and also draws the attention of the residents’ gaze”. Community pleasantness within Tulou entails looking. But beyond looking, it includes arising and engagement. One place where dwellers often sit and gather is around the courtyard. During mealtimes, people enjoy sitting in front of the kitchen while eating with neighbors. This is the way in which the inhabitants manage their meal place. In the most prosperous time of Tulou, people didn’t use their dining room so much, instead they just sat behind the kitchen. This explains why so many low stools are placed around the edges of the courtyard or in front of the kitchen clusters when not in use.

The typical functions of a home are split by level. Similarly, they influence the arrangement of furniture: a private descent by stages—the living quarters on the upper levels; the second floor for storage and utility rooms; the ground floor for the kitchen and the family room.

Figure 6.16. Diagram, plan and section, Traditional *Hakka Tulou* housing structure
### Layer arrangement

**The arrangement of inner function**

The public space becomes connected to the house, no longer a separate component. These places maintain visual and spatial continuousness. The previously detached external space turns out to be integral to the building.

**Penetrating the vertical order of space**

The two loops of 245 rooms (10,104m²) are six stories high, the first layer ring serves as a community area. The second to sixth layers are for rental housing, 24 units (1.088m²) for dormitories, and keeping 18 units (558m²) intended for a day-pay hotel/inn.

---

**Figure 6.17.** Diagram, plan and section, Traditional *Hakka Tulou* housing structure
reaches down to the ground entertainment spaces, to welcome neighbors when they enter the neighborhood.

The sufficient supply and easy approach to public space is the interesting feature of Tulou collective housing—an open interior for the whole building. By putting everything in the central moon-shaped courtyard, natural lighting even reaches down to the ground entertainment spaces, to welcome neighbors when they enter the neighborhood.

The transition from public to semi-public then to private is carried out by means of a rich succession that brings the tenants from one situation to the other progressively, softening the boundaries between public and private spaces. Visual contact and blending is created through the corridors and the doorways to other apartments. In accordance with human requirements, communication and safety aspects are guaranteed in the transitional planning. One resident made the link between easily accessible public areas and having more positive participation towards neighborly activities:

*One of the things I love more than anything is having the children running around in the safe place nearby, I live directly opposite the corner public space, and I prepare to cook any meals in the corridor while I look after my children playing with the other kids.*

*I am very involved in the public community, in various ways, in a corridor, corner place, underground gym or library; I socialize with different people in various pockets associated with my activities.*

A female tenant agreed that:

*I must say that I love the opportunity to meet people occasionally and effortlessly. The corner public spaces on each floor are highly visible from the circulation paths where neighbors can see and greet each other as they enter their own room. The public spaces of this community are so convenient that we can use them every day.*
It is also notable that some of the residents of the Tulou collective housing expressed higher frequency of using these public spaces than when they lived in other communities. “Easy, convenient, being nearby, and quiet” can all characterize the reasons why they use these spaces more often. Easy use in the view of the occupants exactly encourages them to participate. This is an endeavor to cultivate high levels of acquaintance and encourage residents to be more gregarious. As Jane (1961) points out, when an area of a city lacks a sidewalk life, the people of that place must enlarge their private lives if they are to have anything approaching the equivalent contact with their neighbors. This forced requirement and the need for an intentional community encourage people to be more anonymous or cause total estrangement.

A longing for greater privacy is characterized by the recent community developments, but for Tulou collective housing, the motive for the migrant tenants to manage their daily life in an introvert building is causing a widening towards shared semi-private and public spaces. This point raises the question as well—of whether the community reduces privacy or not. The architects of the Tulou collective housing wrote: “the balconies facing inwards have wooden screens and allow privacy. The balconies facing outside have a concrete screen which doesn’t allow people to see in, but at the same time it allows in light and air.”

An interview conducted by the author on the human aspects relating to the loss of privacy in Tulou collective housing produced several optimistic answers:

We don’t feel we don’t have enough privacy or we have lost sufficient private space. Actually, privacy doesn’t mean that so much for migrants like us, ‘strangers’ of this city. We just need a safe home in which to keep ourselves and our family. Tulou collective housing does not allow access without registration. The gate guard will take notice of any visitors and those who might be identified immediately as newcomers. We get our

---

privacy in terms of windows, doors, and rental rooms. We feel comfortable enough within our rental room.

Another woman, who rented a room alone there, clarified that as she lived alone, she needed to make a conscious effort to meet new people. A high percentage of interviewed residents nominated the bridge and moon-shaped courtyard as the most desirable space compared to the interior of their apartment. Most communities have gates, which in addition to providing security also symbolize that privacy is paramount and guaranteed between the residents and the world outside the community. A male migrant tenant sitting on the roof terrace describes:

I seldom feel our privacy is undermined, contrary to this, I feel we are a big family like in the houses in our countryside area, we can easily tell how much we know about each other. Behind closed doors, we enjoy our own privacy. On opening the door, we appreciate our neighborly acquaintances and the sense of trust.

An understanding develops of the idea of necessary familiarity and trust interpreted by the indispensable sacrifice of some degree of privacy. Testing this sacrifice through spatial conditions furthers the understanding of making space efficient, where one living space is worth having. Environmental and social aspect

On the first floor, empty rooms with shared facilities were added to the designs of Vanke Tulou house. On the ground floor, it is common to find facilities such as a table tennis table, a computer room, stone benches and round tables.

A public library and gym, for instance, can increasingly bring tenants close together in a rich and colorful after-work life, and allow them to make new contacts, both of which are practically very useful. Proof of this can be seen in an interview at a convenience store in this community. These comments from tenants elucidated their attitudes with respect to the useful content of the community facilities support.

I lived in a Chengzhongcun before I moved here, we did not have such community facilities. After work, I stayed outside until late, I came home just to sleep. When I moved here, we were supplied
with a computer room, a gym, and especially, we got to know each other very quickly because it is a small neighborhood. We have a similar background which is conducive to making friends—most of us are migrant workers.

Our neighborly relationships are formed from many, many little relations, formed in the convenience store, the gym, or the computer room. First we were unknown to each other as neighbors, then we became ping-pong friends, basketball buddies, and finally we got to know each other well.

The greatest number of tenants is young non-locals, they focus more on how these facilities can be really practical for them rather than just as graceful playthings. As one graduate student in Guangdong comments:

> Useful facilities are those we can use frequently. Every evening, you will find residents playing badminton or using the public computer downstairs, there is also a good study place there like a dormitory at university.

Although the original and eventual intention of a building is to provide places for people’s shared activities, in order for this to happen in an involuntarily habit-breeding manner, both the arrangement of spaces and unified integral styles need to be acceptable. A number of participants also explained that they also valued space for solitude.

During my field observations, I paid attention to the practicality by observing how dwellers conduct their daily activities between housing units and public spaces, plus additionally between semi-open spaces and the ground floor garden. The majority of occupants appreciated the opportunity for daily social intercourse with people in-common, however a number of tenants explained that they were concerned with the quality of their private life. One man, a vendor for a garment corporation, and a tenant of a single room on the third floor, gave details about his life:

> Every day I am worn-out after work, I really don’t want to be in a community that centers on a neighborhood. You see my room is exactly on the cross way of the ring and square building. It’s noisy and attracts attention. I need my individual seclusion.
Another young man, a freelance worker who lived near the vendor described the set-up as being like ‘a student house’:

_I came to this low-rent community with a good and safe environment. I don’t put much concern on whether or not I socialize with my neighbors. Finding a quiet place for living, reading and surfing the internet is valuable for me in this city._

Although there will always be some people who demand total privacy, there seem to be a large number of people who are willing to trade off reduced privacy for a strong sense of community and chance to do communal activities. In fact, the *Tulou* collective housing could reverse the strategies of the *Hakka Tulou*, because the residents have access to more physical openings and intimacy instead of succumbing to reclusion into a home as a buffer to social communication. It may be that people are willing to express themselves freely or forge ties with strangers only if they are anonymous at first, and once trust is built the strangers may unite in constructive ways. Instead of founding a policy on the assumption that privacy is valuable only to criminals, we need to recognize the contribution privacy may make to community.

---

_Figure 6.18. View of the public gym and the computer room_

Note: while the *Vanke Tulou* housing let some rooms empty to operate sharing activities, the likes of provision convenience shops, barbers, hair salons, clinics and computer rooms are allocated on the ground floors. These shops provide great convenience to the residents.
6.3 Examining the migrants’ residential perception

6.3.1 Survey

Following the designed survey methodology, surveyed migrant residents are basically grouped among three types. Despite the fact that the different physical setting resulted in the changes of questions, almost the same questionnaire was used for the all groups targeted in the survey process.
Table 6.2. General statistics related to community experience of the three groups  
(source: Vanke Tuolou collective housing survey in 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement value of sense of community</th>
<th>Migrant type (15 people in each group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent-accompanied migrants (above 15 old)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of friends and/or relatives in this neighborhood (Number of interviewer, present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobody</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4 (26.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>7 (46.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>4 (26.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence of place where migrants meet their neighbors and relatives living in this area (present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your rental room</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the front area of your room (corridor)</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space in the corner</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public facility room (gym, TV room, computer room) on the ground floor</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market or restaurant on the ground floor</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof open space</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other, specify</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborly Relationship (present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common assistance</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual trust</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention to the Community Involvement (Number of interviewer, present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not pay attention</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay a little attention</td>
<td>10 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay much attention</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Belongingness (Number of interviewer, present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merely provisional dwelling</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to tell</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a real home (a place where I/we belong to)</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason to stay in this neighborhood (present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheap rental room</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinship neighborhood (friend)-based</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to say</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: in a random sample of 15 parent-accompanied migrants, our survey selected people above 15 years old who were asked to give detailed information on their sense of community in their neighborhood. Among the 15 interviewees of each group, we also excluded those migrants who provided inconsistent or untrue information.
6.4 Finding: increased, but limited communal activities

In the third case, the finding indicated that this kind of low-rent apartments show the level of communal activities increases even though the level is not as high as the migrants’ spontaneous-developed housing.

The reason explaining the level of the communal activities is also in relation to the functions combined with the places. How do tenants perceive their Tulou housing?

Table 6.3. General statistics for social networks and experience of the three groups (source: Vanke Tulou collective housing survey in 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement value of expectation</th>
<th>Migrant type (15 people in each group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In which perspective of housing is meaningful for you to live (Number of interviewer, present %)</td>
<td>Parent-accompanied migrants (above 15 old)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decent look</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility to daily facilities</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of attachment (sense of community)</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good community relations</td>
<td>11 (73.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting neighbors (Number of interviewer, present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>7 (46.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping neighbors (Number of interviewer, present %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>7 (46.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do tenants experience the communal activities through their daily route and spatial environment? The findings in this chapter are summarized as follows:

**1. Shared functions are all relocated into the inside of the rental room for individual use:** In the Vanke Tulou case, the space inside of the rental room also covers the 2 functions that exist outside of the rental room (in front of the room and in front of the house) in the Yimuyuan case. In this regard, the majority of communal activities that occur in front of their rental room (corridor) are not presented in the Vanke Tulou case.

The long and circular corridor in the Vanke Tulou house is a necessary transitional connection between a rental room and the main gate of this collective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. 7</th>
<th>Q. 9</th>
<th>Q. 12</th>
<th>Q. 15</th>
<th>Q. 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4. Mean values of the level of communal activities in Vanke Tulou case

In sum, what do you think your neighborly relationship means in terms of sociability (Q. 7)?
How do you feel about living in this neighborhood now in terms of as a real home? (Q. 9)
Is your rental area an ideal place to continue living in in terms of having a feeling of attachment? (Q. 12)
High frequency of visiting neighbors (Q. 15)
High frequency of helping neighbors (Q. 16)
Figure 6.19. Graphic representation of function comparison supplied by space in front of the rental rooms and in front of the rental house between Yimuyuan and Vanke Tulou neighborhood (Drawing by author)
Figure 6.20. Graphic representation of function comparison supplied by space between the rental houses between Yimuyuan and Vanke Tulou neighborhood (Drawing by author)
house resulting in a certain degree of visual connectivity of residents. Thus it seems that residents do not need a corridor for sharing the cooking and storage functions as in the *Yimuyuan* case, but the communal activities in the corridor are mostly related to relaxation and curiosity out of seeing what is going on.

However, some points about what distinguishes *Vanke Tulou* is:

(2) *Functions for commercial uses and functions for social service and recreation uses are preserved*: *Vanke Tulou* is low-rent housing on a small scale, and it has few of the functions of the *Yimuyuan* area. However, the other major change in overall spatial arrangement that happens in the *Vanke Tulou* is that a great number of semi-open transitional spaces are transferred in a vertical format and the roof terrace (most residents use it to air their laundry) is introduced on the corner of each floor. The function

![Figure 6.21. Functions preserved and non-existent in reference to *Yimuyuan* neighborhood in *Vanke Tulou* neighborhood (Drawing by author)](image)
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4 (computer room, gym, migrant-support facilities) is planned on the ground floor and the semi-open spaces are on a vertical level instead of being removed.

Tall buildings have smaller footprints. The continuity of semi-open spaces is in a vertical format for the extra floor space, accommodating popular activities and maintaining the continuity of communal spaces, as a street does in a horizontally formatted development. This helps in creating vertical counterparts to a horizontal courtyard.

**(3)** The generous provision of semi-open spaces at upper levels, but in terms of space with shared functions, except recreation, these semi-open spaces have no other shared functions for residents: ‘life between buildings’ as street life not merely on the street level, but including the possibility of creating ‘street life’ at upper levels in high-rise apartment developments. We should also mention similar findings between the Yimuyuan case and the Vanke Tulou case, whereby the absence of a provided function in the 3 transitional spaces also leads to a low level of communal activities. Moreover, the space between houses leads us to conclude that when certain forms of a provided function are preserved in the vertical format, the communal activities of residents increase even though their level is not as high as in the Yimuyuan case.

Even though the round shape might not be good shape for living inside, communal activities occur in the three places. In the Vanke Tulou, many more communal activities take place on the ground floor, where residents use the functions. For example, the roof terrace is used for its laundry airing functions, the courtyard is used for its computer and gym facility functions.
Three different shared situations are included in the *Vanke Tulou* pattern. The ground floor covers the majority of shared facilities and ground courtyard. From the second floor to the fourth floor, each floor fills the triangular corner with open spaces. The fifth floor covers the whole rooftop as the terrace for residents’ housework and leisure. In view of our findings on the experiences in *Vanke Tulou* collective housing, it should be emphasized that, the migrant residents’ consensus of close communal activities in *Vanke Tulou* did not nurture the same experiences as in *Yimuyuan*, more probably it was a consequence of the great number of semi-open spaces which bred high levels of neighborly familiarity that helped neighbors to see and greet each other.
Chapter 7. Planning Strategies for Designing Rural-to-Urban Migrants’ Low-Rent Housing in China

Urban renewal planning has assumed that social benefits would be accrued to the former residents of slums, but the meanings that the slum areas have for their residents and the consequent effects that relocation can have for them have not been adequately understood. Prior to being relocated from leaving in the Yimuyuan low-rent area, most residents experienced profound satisfaction with living in the area. Their satisfaction derived, in large part, from the close associations maintained among the local people and from their close-knit of communal activities to the local places. In turn, people and places provided a framework for personal and social integration.

There is evidence that in the current modern low-rent high-rise neighborhoods, migrant residents have lost memories connected with old neighbors and their houses, and the fact they had to leave the things they have valued put emotional pressure on them. Examining how to function with unaccustomed equipment in modernized, new accommodation, and getting to know new neighbors are the tasks of this chapter.

We wish to focus only on some of those differences which, at the extremes, distinguish the rural-to-urban migrant people quite sharply from the higher-status groups. Although we do not have comparative data, I suggest that in the urban middle class (most notably among the relatively high-status professional and business groups) space is characteristically used in a highly selected way. Since I have presented concluding clarifications at the end of each chapter, I am concisely summarizing the different perspectives concerning communal activities which this study has examined. They are as follows:
7.1 Comparative analyses

Compared to the migrants’ spontaneous-developed low-rent neighborhoods, the most obvious change that has occurred in the modern low-rent neighborhoods, despite the changes in bettering the spatial organization and materials, is the declining of communal activities, which is due to the removed of the spaces concerning necessary daily needs of the former neighborhood from the modern low-rent housing. This has brought forth some alterations of the relative locations and/or functions combined with some spaces. However, communal, behavioral or activity features occurring within these ‘run-down’ spaces were compared to those of matching spaces in the modern low-rent high-rise neighborhoods. As stated above, what distinguishes the communal activities between the migrants’ spontaneous-developed and modern low-rent neighborhoods, is the physical area does not truly decide the existence of communal activities, it is the provided functions combined with the space that do make the communal activities occur or stop.

7.1.1 Summary of findings

A series of summary tables are formulated to summarize the similarities and differences within the three low-rent neighborhoods. The Yimuyuan neighborhood is a more integrated community, consisting overwhelmingly of migrants from rural backgrounds in China. A large proportion of residents in the Yimuyuan neighborhood have close relations or other kin residents in the same neighborhood compared to the residents in the two other modern low-rent neighborhoods. In stark contrast, the majority of migrant residents in the Minxin jiayuan and Vanke Tulou have none. In terms of the physical characteristics of the three cases, our observation reveals that the Yimuyuan neighborhood has a pattern of forming a transitional domain in front of the rental room, in front of the rental house and between the houses.
Table 7.1. Comparison of characteristics of spatial arrangement and functions supplied in the 3 low-rent neighborhoods (Drawing by author)
Table 7.2. Summary of similarities and differences concerning the physical characteristics of the rental rooms within the 3 low-rent neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD NAME</th>
<th>YIMUUYUAN</th>
<th>MINXIN JIAYUAN</th>
<th>VANKE TULOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD COMPOSITION</td>
<td>Low-rise (1-5 floors)</td>
<td>High-rises (33 floors)</td>
<td>Low-rise (6 floors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTS</td>
<td>Largely rural-to-urban migrants</td>
<td>Mixed origin</td>
<td>Rural-to-urban migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACKGROUND</td>
<td>Largely agricultural background</td>
<td>Mixed occupational background</td>
<td>Agricultural background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>Largely close-knit/relative community</td>
<td>Rarely close to relatives</td>
<td>Rarely close to relatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>THE RENTAL ROOM</th>
<th>FEATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEIGHBORHOOD NAME</strong></td>
<td><strong>YIMUUYUAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>MINXIN JIAYUAN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD COMPOSITION</td>
<td>Low-rise (1-5 floors)</td>
<td>High-rises (33 floors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTS</td>
<td>Largely rural-to-urban migrants</td>
<td>Mixed origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACKGROUND</td>
<td>Largely agricultural background</td>
<td>Mixed occupational background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>Largely close-knit/relative community</td>
<td>Rarely close to relatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **THE RENTAL ROOM**
  - Small room
  - Largely 1 room + 2 rooms
  - No kitchen
  - Largely no restroom/bathroom
  - Largely no running (hot) water inside of each room

- **PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTIC**
  - Largest room
  - From 1 room to 4 rooms
  - With kitchen
  - With restroom/bathroom
  - With running hot water inside of each room

- **INTERIOR FORMATION**
  - Supplication of the most essential spaces, it normally contains the minimal rest space (bed) and simple storage space (desk, wardrobe)
  - Provision of the full-ranged spaces, it contains rest space (family room, at least one bed room), cooking space (kitchen + laundry), restroom (shower + toilet)

- **FEATURES**
  - Activities
  - The relation between the number of rooms and beds and number of inhabitants is inadequate
  - Minimal family activities can be done at home
  - Most residents make use of their adjacent space in front of their rental room as part of their home
  - The relation between the number of rooms and corresponding areas are satisfactory
  - Family activities can all be done at home
  - Residents do not use their contiguous space to finish domestic work

- **ACTIVITIES**
  - Activities
  - The relation between the number of rooms and beds and number of inhabitants is inadequate
  - Minimal family activities can be done at home
  - Most residents make use of their adjacent space in front of their rental room as part of their home
  - The relation between the number of rooms and corresponding areas are satisfactory
  - Family activities can all be done at home
  - Residents do not use their contiguous space to finish domestic work
Table 7.3. Summary of similarities and differences concerning the physical characteristics along the corridor in front of the rental rooms within the 3 low-rent neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>YIMUYUAN</th>
<th>MINXIN JIAYUAN</th>
<th>VANKE TULOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IN FRONT OF THE RENTAL ROOM</td>
<td>PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTIC</td>
<td>Corridor: Functionally the kitchen and storage place act as part of the interior Connecting rental rooms and door of rental house Residents’ cooking utensils Residents’ storage place</td>
<td>Corridor: Not functionally acting as part of the interior Main connection between rental rooms and elevator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRIDOR in front of the rental room</td>
<td>SPATIAL ELEMENTS in Yimuyuan neighborhood</td>
<td>Image</td>
<td>MINXIN JIAYUAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply of kitchen space and cooking utensils</td>
<td>Does not supply cooking space</td>
<td>Does not supply cooking space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply of storage place</td>
<td>Does not supply storage space</td>
<td>Does not supply storage space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functionally a part of residents’ interior</td>
<td>Main function as a connection between rental rooms and elevator</td>
<td>Main function Main connection between rental rooms and stairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor becomes an extremely effective extension of residents’ home</td>
<td>Not functionally acting as extension of home</td>
<td>Not functionally acting as extension of home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of residents in communal activities while using the corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thus it seems that residents do not need a corridor in which to complete their household work as in the Yimuyuan case, but the communal activities in the corridor is mostly related to relaxation and curiosity out of to see what is going on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7.4. Summary of similarities and differences concerning the activities along the corridor in front of the rental rooms within the 3 low-rent neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRIDOR in front of the rental room</th>
<th>RESIDENTS' ACTIVITIES in Yimuyuan neighborhood</th>
<th>MINXIN JIAYUAN</th>
<th>VANKE TULOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary daily activities</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>No cooking activity</td>
<td>No cooking activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparing food</td>
<td>No activity relating to preparing food</td>
<td>No activity relating to preparing food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>No storage activity</td>
<td>No storage activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional activities</td>
<td>Walking from rental room to other places</td>
<td>Walking from rental room to other places</td>
<td>Walking from rental room to other places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greeting during cooking/cleaning/storage</td>
<td>Most movement happens along an interior corridor and through elevators</td>
<td>Sit on the corridor; greeting during residents stay outside for free air, while continuing their journey to a specific destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal activities</td>
<td>Most movement is along the corridor and horizontal plane, supplying residents with chances to meet neighbors through using cooking facilities, both physically and visually</td>
<td>The corridor is generally devoid of residents, and the elevator directly takes residents to their desired destination, bypassing and curtailing many opportunities for communal activities)</td>
<td>The corridor is a desirable open space for walking around. Most residents use the circular corridor for receiving guests, children's play</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.5. Summary of similarities and differences concerning the physical characteristics in the alleyways in front of rental house within the 3 low-rent neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>YIMUYUAN</th>
<th>MINXIN JIAYUAN</th>
<th>VANKE TULOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IN FRONT OF THE RENTAL HOUSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTIC</td>
<td>Functionally, the place for doing housework acts as part of the interior Alleyway Front stoops Adjacent sidewalks Air-laundry line</td>
<td>Functionally, the place not for doing housework acts as part of the interior Ground garden Open space</td>
<td>Functionally, the place not for doing housework acts as part of the interior Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPATIAL ELEMENTS in Yimuyuan neighborhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water resource</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>No water resource: residents do not depend outdoor function to finish housework</td>
<td>No water resource: residents do not depend outdoor function to finish housework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk: pedestrian paths next to streets</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Has sidewalk approaching the high-rises</td>
<td>Has sidewalk connecting the main gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps nearest the doorway: the steps are a small staircase ending in a platform and leading to the entrance of an apartment building or other building</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>No steps near the doorway</td>
<td>No steps near the doorway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air-laundry line: a clothes line or a washing line is any type of rope, cord, or twine that has been stretched between two points (e.g. two sticks), outside or in front of the rental house, above the level of the ground</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>No clothes line or washing line</td>
<td>Roof terrace as the main place for residents’ hanging their laundry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleyway: a narrow lane, path, or passageway, often reserved for pedestrians, which usually runs between, behind, or within rental houses in the neighborhood.</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>No alleyway</td>
<td>No alleyway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.6. Summary of similarities and differences concerning the activities in the alleyways in front of the rental house within the 3 low-rent neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Necessary daily activities</th>
<th>MINXIN JIAYUAN</th>
<th>VANKE TULOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using tap water in front of the rental house to take care of household work (cleaning the house, cooking and washing clothes)</td>
<td>Residents do not use outdoor space for household work</td>
<td>Residents do not use outdoor space for household work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a clothes bar fixed between the houses to hang washed clothes around the dwelling on the lines</td>
<td>Washing clothes and hanging of laundry are incorporated into the inside of the rental house</td>
<td>Washing clothes and hanging of laundry are incorporated into the inside of the rental house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitonal activities</th>
<th>Walking from rental room to another place</th>
<th>Walking from one place to another place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sitting on the steps nearest the doorway</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up a table to play mahjong done by residents</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Because Tulou housing is an individual building, communal activities that occur in front of the house are not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing activities done by children</td>
<td>Walking around the street in the neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal of communal life concerning participation and spending free time among adults, sharing functions takes place on the front stoops and adjacent sidewalks</td>
<td>High-rise, due to its vertical accumulations of floor pattern, makes the unintended community participation difficult. This neighborhood is unable to provide for this form of collaboration</td>
<td>Residents living in Tulou housing do communal activities mainly in front of the rental rooms and between the rental rooms or within the whole house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLEYWAYS in front of the rental house</th>
<th>Commun al activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary daily activities</td>
<td>MINXIN JIAYUAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using tap water in front of the rental house to take care of household work (cleaning the house, cooking and washing clothes)</td>
<td>Residents do not use outdoor space for household work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a clothes bar fixed between the houses to hang washed clothes around the dwelling on the lines</td>
<td>Washing clothes and hanging of laundry are incorporated into the inside of the rental house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitonal activities</th>
<th>Walking from rental room to another place</th>
<th>Walking from one place to another place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sitting on the steps nearest the doorway</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up a table to play mahjong done by residents</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Because Tulou housing is an individual building, communal activities that occur in front of the house are not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing activities done by children</td>
<td>Walking around the street in the neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal of communal life concerning participation and spending free time among adults, sharing functions takes place on the front stoops and adjacent sidewalks</td>
<td>High-rise, due to its vertical accumulations of floor pattern, makes the unintended community participation difficult. This neighborhood is unable to provide for this form of collaboration</td>
<td>Residents living in Tulou housing do communal activities mainly in front of the rental rooms and between the rental rooms or within the whole house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These spaces also support residents' housework and relaxation, which can include the family members of the household and neighbors. Thus, they create opportunities for unplanned community.
### Table 7.7. Summary of similarities and differences concerning the physical characteristics in the space between the rental houses in the Yimuyuan neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>YIMUYUAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BETWEEN THE RENTAL HOUSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTIC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Largely public shared facilities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public restrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public bathrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public laundry rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Largely communally used services:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment agencies</td>
<td>Yimuyuan has 4 employment agencies (Minxin zhijie, Shangjing zhijie, Yimuyuan zhijie and Shengfa zhijie) that help at migrants to find jobs in their destination cities. The agencies are run by locals and migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Real Estate Agency</td>
<td>Because it is a rental room neighborhood, the real estate agency can be the most commonly used facility in this area for migrants. In the Yimuyuan area, the location of a real estate agency focus on the main street of the Yimuyuan and also some scattered in the alleyways, normally on the first floor of the rental house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training school</td>
<td>In Yimuyuan, there is one training school, focusing on the part played by the training itself. Integration into the culture of the migration cities is a major function of the schools in this neighborhood. The Qiming training school runs 3 courses and activities that improve the skills of migrants, especially the newcomers to enable them to realize their full potential and find employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>There is only one kindergarten in the Yimuyuan area for the children of migrants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.8. Summary of similarities and differences concerning the physical characteristics in the space between the rental houses in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BETWEEN THE RENTAL HOUSES</th>
<th>PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>YIMUYUAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>Largely communally used services:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery market</td>
<td>The grocery market on <em>Yimuyuan</em> East road is the place to go, all the neighbors stop there and they run in and out of here all the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable/fruit wholesale market</td>
<td><em>Yimuyuan</em> wholesale market was owned first by the local residents, since more and more migrants reside in this neighborhood, they started their own business in the wholesale market. It is well known as a physical location (motif neighborhood meeting point/topic wholesale market)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer café</td>
<td>The computer cafes seem to be other spaces where migrant residents living in this neighborhood spend time together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusement focus</td>
<td>The amusement focus in <em>Yimuyuan</em> has spread out from the alleyways within the neighborhood as well as creating other commercial strips alongside the main street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone bar</td>
<td>Migrants, especially newly arrived rural-to-urban migrants use this telephone bar to make long-distance calls to their rural family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>The <em>Yimuyuan</em> clinic operates a simple health-check support service for migrant residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>In the <em>Yimuyuan</em> neighborhood, due to the limited residential size, restaurants support the majority of residents’ daily needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motel</td>
<td>Motels in <em>Yimuyuan</em> are popular for newcomer migrants and their family members who visit migrant residents who live in this area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.9. Summary of similarities and differences concerning activities in the space in front of the rental rooms within the 3 low-rent neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLEYWAYS between the houses</th>
<th>RESIDENTS’ ACTIVITIES in Yimuyuan neighborhood</th>
<th>MINXIN JIAYUAN</th>
<th>VANKE TULOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary daily activities</td>
<td>Use restroom, bathroom, laundry room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional activities</td>
<td>Walking from rental room to other places</td>
<td>Walking from one place to another place</td>
<td>Through long-length corridor walking from one place to another place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparations for business</td>
<td>Use communal services, e.g. employment agency, real estate agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interacting while using communal services, e.g. restaurant, exercise in gym, public computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit relatives/friends: the communal activities take place in a wide hierarchy of spaces in Yimuyuan neighborhood. Beginning with each dwelling unit, the presence of a largely public shared facility spaces nurtures communal communication with neighbors, leading onto a street that can be overseen from this space, which is necessarily used for supporting daily life</td>
<td></td>
<td>The corner open spaces on each floor are where the majority of events nearly always take place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play activities with others in the courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This street connects to multiple shared facilities and communally used services. These direct one to the main street, which further leads to larger communal spaces, and finally to the boundaries of the neighborhood. It ultimately maintains a much more walkable neighborhood, Yimuyuan neighborhood is packed with different forms of collaborating occasions on the way to these shared spaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government-launched low-rent projects don’t create the three forms of spatial categories. Except the transitional space, the necessary space and social activity space are ignored. In reference to the Yimuyuan, the three forms of spatial categories are largely removed except transitional space in the Minxin jiayuan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to the Yimuyuan case, the majority of communal activities occur in front of their rental room (corridor) is not present in the Vanke Tulou case, because the function of the inside of the rental room also covers the 2 functions that exist outside of rental room in the Yimuyuan case.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.10. Summary the physical characteristics and corresponding activities that occur in the space between the rental houses in the *Minxin jiayuan* neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>MINXIN JIAYUAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BETWEEN THE RENTAL HOUSES</strong></td>
<td><strong>RENTAL HOUSE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTIC</strong></td>
<td><strong>Largely public shared facilities: public restroom, bathroom, laundry room (none)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground garden</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Ground garden" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public exercise equipment</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Public exercise equipment" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESIDENTS’ ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>Walking from one place to another place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Using public exercise facilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Spending time in the ground garden</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7.11. Summary the physical characteristics in the space between the rental houses in the Vanke Tulou neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>VANKE TULOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BETWEEN THE RENTAL HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circular corridor, Corner public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circular corridor, Corner public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circular corridor, Corner public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circular corridor, Corner public space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.12. Summary of corresponding activities that occur in the space between the rental rooms in the Vanke Tulou neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLEY-WAYS between the houses</th>
<th>Transitional activities</th>
<th>VANKE TULOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitional activities</td>
<td>Through long-length corridor walking from one place to another place</td>
<td>Residents walking along the circular open corridor, staircases and corner open spaces construct the whole housing transportation route. This combined provision of transitional spaces in the building can also be a good solution, offering a pleasing motivation for residents with more visual connections and communal activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLEY-WAYS between the houses</th>
<th>Communal activities</th>
<th>VANKE TULOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communal activities</td>
<td>Interacting while using communally services, e.g. restaurant, exercise in gym, public computer</td>
<td>Along with these there are facilities such as a community hall, a library and internet facilities. One or two shops a restaurant and office space for the management of the apartments is also be required. Open community spaces within, are evolved from the development of the form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLEY-WAYS between the houses</th>
<th>Play activities with others on the courtyard</th>
<th>VANKE TULOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Play activities with others on the courtyard</td>
<td>The continuousness of communal spaces can be shattered, on account of the inadequate floor space in a vertical format. Most communal spaces or amenities are transferred to the vertical format and rooftops, in such a way that they are visually and physically connected with the everyday paths of movement. This helps in creating vertical counterparts to horizontal communal spaces. Such integration from the course of necessary activities leads to increased use of the outdoor space, with people planning to be there during times of the day—particularly when they anticipate the presence of others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALLEY-WAYS between the houses</th>
<th>Roof terrace</th>
<th>VANKE TULOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roof terrace</td>
<td>The space between the outer circular block and the rectangular one is for circulation at ground level leading to staircases as various points. There are no elevators. There is a courtyard raised above ground within the rectangular block. In the rectangular block, at higher levels there are large double height spaces in the corners for gatherings.</td>
<td>Compared to the Yimuyuan case, the majority of communal activities occurs in front of their rental room (corridor) is not present in the Vanke Tulou case. But the roof terrace is probable that the residential outdoor space is used as an extension of their living space while they are hanging up their bed comforter and laundry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.13. Summary of residents’ perceptions and types of outdoor places within the 3 low-rent neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>YIMUYUAN</th>
<th>MINXIN JIAYUAN</th>
<th>VANKE TULOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTS’ PERCEPTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL OF COMMUNAL ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>1. Positive feeling about communal activities</td>
<td>1. Positive (normal) feeling about communal activities</td>
<td>1. Positive (normal) feeling about communal activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Close knit communal activities</td>
<td>2. A lack of communal activities</td>
<td>2. High level of communal activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DERIVE FROM</td>
<td>1. From concentration on kinship</td>
<td>1. From low level of neighbor interaction</td>
<td>1. From high degree of visual connectivity and high level of neighbor interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NECESSARY SPACES</td>
<td>1. Public restroom</td>
<td>1. Corridor (elevator) approaching the rental room</td>
<td>1. Circular corridor approaching the rental room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Public bathroom</td>
<td>2. Primary road in the apartment estate</td>
<td>2. Linking corner open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. (Corridor) public kitchen</td>
<td>4. Main gate at the apartment estate</td>
<td>4. Public computer room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. (In front of rental house) using tap water for cooking, preparing food, hand-washing clothes, air-laundry line</td>
<td>5. Entrance to underground parking lots</td>
<td>5. Public gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Public library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Main gate at the apartment estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSITIONAL SPACES</td>
<td>1. Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Alleyway approaching the rental room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Main street (Yimuyuan east street)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Vegetable wholesale market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Linking windy alleyways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPES OF OUTDOOR PLACES</td>
<td>1. Neighbors sitting on the stoop</td>
<td>1. Neighbors waiting for elevator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Neighbors playing cards on the narrow street between the rental houses</td>
<td>2. Neighbors sitting in the ground garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Neighbors buying something from a vendor in the narrow alley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Neighbors doing housework (cooking, preparing, hanging up laundry) outside in the courtyard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Neighbors hang out in the food street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Neighbors gathering chatting frontage of their rental house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL ACTIVITY SPACES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(with the presence of others)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A great deal of socializing in the *Yimuyuan* area takes place in the outside space of their rental room and adjacent to their rental room, such as the public corridor in front of their room, on stoops, on the way to the basic living facilities and in corner stores. Many streets in this area are conceived as an extension of their private space.

In the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood, the basic layout of each rental room is quite simple and has a narrow range of functions. Migrant residents spend a lot of time outside of their small room in order to complete their daily necessary. In my case studies, I have pointed out three places as suitable for research, the first place is in front of the rental room, corridor.

It is not difficult to find the corridor enable residents to complete their basic household work. The space in front of the rental room, the space in front of rental house are used for an extension of living space and part of their home, in which women process food, use the temporary area for storage, and make use of their daily functions. There is an unclear area for which the function is ad hoc depending on the necessity of residents. Essential communal activities contain those that are more or less obligatory, simply speaking, the communal activities occur to a greater or lesser degree necessary to contribute.

The ability to enlarge or frame one’s unit to the increasing requirements of the household is simply allowed in the case of the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood, such as in front of the rental room and in front of the rental house as in the expanding area. This flexibility permits residents to continue staying in one place over a lifetime, firming up their communal ties within the neighborhood. On the contrary, the *Minxin jiayuan* and *Vanke Tulou* neighborhoods are less flexible to such alterations, and all spatial elements are generally fixed. Most living satisfaction of dwelling units in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood is supported largely by facility spaces. These spaces involve the family members of the household, as well as neighbors. Thus, they create opportunities for unintended participation. High-rise neighborhoods, by virtue of
their vertical accumulations of floor patterns, are incapable of making this form of interaction available. As a result, residents are excluded from discovering and participating in the activities below or above one’s floor or line of vision.

Because such communal events in a community are necessary, their occurrence is rarely influenced by the user’s choice. These events occur simply to some extent due to the physical environment. In the Yimuyuan, the communal activities are precisely a result of the inevitability of contact. Meal time offers a chance for migrant residents to use the public corridor as a temporary kitchen, most of them eat at the same time. Due to the lack of water facilities inside of the house, migrant residents are forced to use the running water, normally outside of the rental house to do their household work. Regarding this, to some degree, the possibility of meeting neighbors is unavoidably connected with residents’ regular daily necessities. In other words, the pattern of communal activities is predictable for those who have his/her routine each day.

Regarding the space between the rental houses, migrants show greater dependence on the physical environment. Owing to the absence of a private restroom, bathroom or laundry facility, migrant residents in the Yimuyuan neighborhood have to get out of their rental house to carry out such activities. The differences in spatial usage ensure the expansion of migrants’ activities from inside to the outside of the house, from room to the village. It is in these spatial worlds that the occurrence of communal activities is envisaged.

During the meal time, a greater proportion of residents get out of their rental room and use the corridor in front of room to prepare for their cooking. On pleasant days, most of them are found sitting at the door stoops in front of their rental house or playing cards on the sidewalks. During the evening, it is not uncommon to find a dozen or more people congregated around the small stalls that line the Yimuyuan alleys. The neighborhood is an intertwined set of various forms of spatial categories.
In the Minxin jiayuan neighborhood which is packed with the typical high-rise apartments of migrants and where low-income local citizens mix. As one example of a government-subsidized low-rent neighborhood, Chinese city government is announcement of a plan to meet the basic needs of its lower-to-middle class residents, including poor migrants. Therefore, Minxin jiayuan neighborhood has disregarded its qualitative aspects such as communal activities, social integration and sense of belonging for residents.

Consequently, the 3 places—in front of the rental room, in front of the rental house and between the rental houses—are less used and seldom perceived as an extension of private spaces. The local places, corridor, elevator, street are rarely settings for continued social interaction. Using the corridor, sitting at front of the house and occupying sidewalks are not common practice in the Minxin jiayuan area. It is because their patterns of communal activities are different from those adopted by the Yimuyuan neighborhood. This phenomenon elucidates a finding that high-rise apartments lead to resident individuals becoming more selective in the creation of neighborly relationships.

Many of the communal activities in the Minxin jiayuan take place either indoors or outside of the neighborhood. The survey shows that the migrant residents meet their neighbors inside of their rental room more than outside of the neighborhood. Thus, places with communal activities selected by residents living in the Minxin jiayuan are where they visit intentionally and out of social habit and they involve greeting and receiving neighbors and visitors with enthusiasm. In fact, the high-rise apartments in the Minxin jiayuan have no front spaces at all. High-rises supporting the notion of a local area as extension of their home are rare. Therefore, the neighborhood is an intertwined set of various forms of spatial categories that do not make much sense in this neighborhood.
In the third case, the Vanke Tulou housing is where only rural-to-urban migrants are accommodated. Observation reveals that residents in Vanke Tulou are inclined to form close-knit communal activities through a high degree of visual connectivity. However, the extension of the private spaces that we observed in the Yimuyuan neighborhood is not working in the Vanke Tulou housing. Instead, such extension supplies another important thread for recreating friendly communal activities in high-rise housing and reduces the risk of a loss of residents’ privacy.

High-rise apartments are the most common housing types, globally, and outdoor space is rarely treated as the extension of private space. Concerning this point, Vanke Tulou, transfers the physical extension into the visual connectivity. The circular corridor in front of the rental room links the stairs, the corner open space of each floor, to the ground courtyard, ground-level computer room, gym and restaurants, the high degree of visual connectivity contributes to high levels of social interaction and familiarity. For residents who are entering the Vanke Tulou house so to their individual rental room, all transitional spaces result in a concentration of communal activities and a strong sense of identity and security. For the generation of communal activities in a space, a neighborhood, the results of this study lead to the following findings:

(1) **The experience of shared functions actually allows communal activities to emerge in the housing.**

Housing typology (low-rise, high-rise) is not fundamental in influencing relations between neighbors and certainly not the real cause of the high/low level of communal activities. If low-rent neighborhoods are rich in communal activities, this is not because they are either overcrowded or of a suitable density, but it is caused by the sufficiency of functions (services, facilities) that can be shared, thereby allowing communal activities to happen. The transitional spaces (in front of rooms in rental housing and between rental houses) can be considered as merely spatial
facts, the shared functions combined with these transitional spaces are the basis upon which communal activities can be formed. Residents’ communal activities concern the active utilization and sharing of the provided functions instead of merely having the space available for use. The shared functions are the real reason why the same transitional spaces in three different low-rent neighborhoods show different levels of communal activity. Moreover, the formation of long-term close-knit communal activities concerns not only the link of residents to the space, but also the connection of residents to the available functions for sharing, and the bonds between the residents themselves.

(2) Different categories of shared functions in appropriate transitional spaces. Different categories of shared functions can result in different communal activities in transitional spaces.

In creating a place that generates communal activities, an order of shared functions needs to be considered in appropriate transitional locations. According to residents’ experiences of communal activities in the Yimuyuan case, given the residents’ survey and field observation, three transitional places with communal activities are closely related to the three categories of shared functions. They are: functions for necessary daily uses; functions for commercial uses; and functions for social service and recreation uses, so each of the shared functions results in very different communal activities, respectively: necessary daily activities normally occur in front of the rental room; commercial activities in front of the rental house; and social service activities in front of the rental house and between the rental houses.

(3) Pattern that generates the formation of communal activities is in essence how residents’ inter-personal relationships, or how the experiences of sharing can be generated through space.

How residents’ inter-personal relationships can be generated through space
means how the space can form the experience of sharing that make communal activities happen as daily events. In a space, a function for sharing brings residents to specific places and therefore acts as residents' attractors. The transitional spaces are shown in the order of the front-intimate-transactional spaces. It causes people to make the place-based behavioral responses to others in the environment. Accordingly, functions represent the quality of spaces and also they become the provided functions that can be shared by residents. To reiterate, the function is in excess of a physical matter; it is the matter of the collective character of a group of residents and of how their inter-personal relationship can be enunciated through space.

(4) The transitional spaces must serve more than one primary functions for mixed use.

The public spaces within the neighborhood, such as lobbies, corridors, streets and laneways, must serve more than one primary function for mixed use. Apart from a communication purpose, transitional spaces are used as space for cooking and dining, storage for goods, gathering and leisure functions. Residents use them also as training schools, employment agencies and real estate agencies and for other social services. These kind mix-use transitional spaces ensure the constant presence of the residents, the fact that they go out of their homes daily and their continuous movement in the neighborhood.

7.1.2 Spatial patterns

The functions combined with the space are the basis for the formation of the communal activities. The cooking, and storage are functions combined with the corridor; other functions are water, airing-laundry line and household work such as that done in the alleys in front of the house; daily-used shared facilities and
communal used services performed in the space between the rental houses—all these functions, are the medium by which communal life can be formed.

The issue of residents’ communal activities, concerning the relationship with the functions combined with their neighborhood places is intertwined. It has been argued in this study that, for rural-to-urban migrant residents in a low-rent neighborhood, their lifestyle requires an ongoing process of attachment to ‘places’ and communal activities. A reciprocity between ‘functions’ and ‘communal activities’ can find its symbolic expression in a ‘sense of belonging’.

The space in front of a rental room, rental housing and between the rental houses can considered as merely ‘spatial facts’, the functions combined with these transitional spaces, in essence they turn to be interweaved with the characteristics of resident’s behaviors in daily life’. Although it seems that the spaces are reassigned to nurture the residents’ communal life, actually functions (cooking, washing, storing, air-laundering etc.) combined with the three transitional spaces are concrete devices for forming residents’ relationship with the places and residents’ connection with each other. Functions come around interweaved with ‘structures of residents’ communal activities’. As discussed previously with the different activities that happen within the different spaces in the Yinuyuan, individual and communal identity and profound centers of human existence to which residents have deep emotional and psychological ties that are combined with the physical setting.

This comprehension of the functions combined with the three transitional spaces opens a theoretical space for design professionals to move towards discussing the socio-spatial reference system through which a residential environment can be evaluated and by which the rural residents’ inherent collective lifestyle is satisfied. In fact, the 3 places turn out to be a context for the provided functions that can be shared by residents.
Accordingly, residents’ communal activities concern the use and sharing of the provided functions rather than utilizing just the space. The sharing of functions is the real reason why the three transitional spaces merge due to a high level of communal activities in the *Yinuyuan* neighborhood. For example, cooking or storage combined with the corridor are not merely functions, they are also humanitarian functions that outline the bond among residents. The spaces between the rental houses, in this respect, provide residents with a variety of available functions. Most of these are focused on or support migrants, such as a migrant training school, or employment agencies with communal functions.

The function-sharing-based communal activities for rural-to-urban migrant residents in low-rent housing are formulated in terms of an organizing pattern of the transitional spaces. The three transitional spaces are functionally a part of the interior and have significance from the perspective of both spatial characteristics and the collective spirit between residents located in one spatial setting. During the meal time, the corridor space immediately adjacent to the rental room is functionally a kitchen, forms a configuration in which partitions of the space are open and create forms of communal activities existent among the rental room residents. During the day, the stoops, sidewalks and alleyways effectively function as residents’ housework places (water, airing-laundry, recreation). The residents sit around with the shared function of housework. The function shared among the resident members living in different rental rooms or rental houses is one of the most characteristic aspects of the migrants’ spontaneously-developed housing.

It is the aspect of a hierarchy sharing of a provided function such as cooking, water, communally used services and facilities that symbolizes the empathetic character of the three transitional spaces in fostering the communal activities between resident and resident. The cooking spatial function in the meal time shared by the residents residing in different rental rooms combines with the corridor space that serves as the quality that defines the neighborly relationship between all
participants. Accordingly, using the corridor as a kitchen is both a spatial characteristic and a value of the communal activity. In this regard, the discussion of spatial characteristics with ‘function-based’ communal activities is a typical image of the symbolic expression of the sense of community in a neighborhood.

Accordingly, the low-rent neighborhood should concern not only the link of residents to available functions, but also the bond between resident and resident. Consequently, at the essence of the sense of communal activities in this study is the regard for the function-based communal activities—their dependence on function is as necessary and significant as the forming long-term close-knit communal activities among residents.

Three specific spaces in the Yimuyuan neighborhood have been studied. One is the space in front of migrants’ each single rental room, also called a corridor. The public corridor place, which is thought to be used as a transitional space, in fact, turns to be an extension of migrant residents’ interior of their home and builds a relationship between residents and residents through sharing the provided functions combined with the corridor. Correspondingly, the spatial extension and function sharing experiences foster the highest potentials for neighborly communal activities. Thus for whoever uses the corridor space (for cooking, or storage) in front of their rental room, it would be very probably for him/her to encounter others in the corridor. The functions become the medium of a sharing. The functions combined with the space are the context though which the cooking is not merely a physical activity, but also a humanitarian value that describes the bond between residents and residents.

The other space is in front of rental house. It should be noted that due to the narrow size of the inside of the room and lack of access to the facilities inside of the house, such as water, residents also use the front of the rental house as the physical place for cleaning and doing housework. The use of amenities, like water, and public
space not only provide an extension of their own private space, but also foster every individual’s contribution to communal activities.

The last space is between the rental houses. Specifically speaking, migrant residents’ communal activities between the rental houses are divided into necessary activity categories. Because of the necessity to use public facilities—going to the restroom or to the bathroom, doing laundry, those activities are called necessary activities. Because those kind of activities are necessary, their occurrence is influenced only slightly by the physical arrangement. In the Yimuyuan neighborhood, due to a restroom or bathroom being rare in private rooms, the public facility place provides an important connection in relation to making residents go outside of their rental room or house. The Yimuyuan neighborhood works as an intertwined set of various forms of spatial categories. To reiterate, the two elements are more than a physical, or environmental issue; it is the concern of the communal activities style of a rural-to-urban migrant group and of how their communal activities can be located.

In the 2 contemporary low-rent cases, in contrast to Yimuyuan, the houses are typically divided into several rooms with full functions. Each room is functionly controlled, nullifying any necessity to embed the two elements reflected in the Yimuyuan neighborhood. The boundaries between spaces are not undetermined, the spatial organization determines the pattern behavior for all individuals. The fixed space inside of the house and outside of the house does not make an inhabitant stay outside of the house for any shared functions. The outside of the house loses any function for residents to do necessary activities.

Accordingly, the inadequacy of the private space leads to various forms of communal activities through the level of household need such as cooking, storage, daily function and basic necessities of life. Conversely, the corridor in the Minxin jiayuan neighborhood, stands in the middle of the house cluster, connecting the
Figure 7.1. A comparison of the characteristics of spatial patterns in reference to the Yimuyuan neighborhood within the 3 low-rent neighborhoods (Drawing by author)
entrance of each single rental house and elevator without any additional space added. Correspondingly, the corridor does not seem to be a place as an extension of a home. Due to the strong need to provide low-rent dwellings for residents, the government has planned and developed its residential community with clear functions, to meet the minimum residential needs. In that case, the intertwined set of public network as integrated space is highly impractical in the Minxin jiayuan neighborhood.

In the third case, the Vanke Tulou collective housing, having the same physical conditions as the Minxin jiayuan neighborhood, it confirms the perception that residents need an ulterior motive to do communal activities. In the Yimuyuan neighborhood, migrant residents’ motivation is closely concerned with daily necessities, the corridor, the stoops and the alley are intertwined in a set of various forms of spatial category and are all well executed for maintaining the communal activities.

The migrants prefer to live in high enough densities so that many related families and friends can live near each other. What is important to them, in the low-rent housing context, truly, as in the Minxin jiayuan apartment, the main low-rent housing pattern, in the regulation of national manufacture of houses in China, impairs their demands of social life. By contrast, the Yimuyuan and Vanke Tulou case meet with their response.

Clearly, as changes occur in spatial construction, the level of communal activity in the Yimuyuan neighborhood context it can be seen that low-rises, and small households housing had more activity than within large high-rise residential neighborhoods (Minxin jiayuan neighborhood). We can find modern low-rent neighborhoods that cannot attain the same level as in the Yimuyuan. Because the residents in the Yimuyuan treat their transitional spaces as a spatial foundation for functions they can use or share with others. And these functions include all their necessary needs and are not shown inside of the rooms in the Yimuyuan case.
However, the Minxin jiayuan case is different. Residents do not perceive any functions as being combined with the corridor. The modern high-rises do not supply functions with the spatial arrangement that are found in the Yimuyuan neighborhood. The Vanke Tulou collective housing case is cited as an example of a modern design which incorporates particular architectural elements to preserve communal activities in the increasingly globalized context of high-rises in China.

7.1.3 Residential satisfaction and experiences

Another significant finding of this study is that what establishes a fitting inhabited setting varies according to the requirements and desire of the rural-to-urban migrant resident group. In the Yimuyuan neighborhood, the residential satisfaction and subsequent attachment to local close knit communal activities centered on their daily necessary events. In the modern low-rent high-rise neighborhoods, in contrast, the communal activities faded and were replaced by other qualities, for instance, residents’ aesthetical and symbolic appreciation of individual housing and their neighborhood.

My interviews revealed that unexpectedly, regarding the objective depiction in my observation, we should not jump to the conclusion that migrant residents are discontent with their objective living environments in the Yimuyuan neighborhood. The results of my interviews suggest strongly that, contrary to what might be expected, migrants can be viewed as content with their housing conditions, even though they feel that their housing arrangements are only half satisfactory. Their capacity for the housing planning is largely due to the extensive system of interactions between neighbors.

Migrants’ statements of satisfaction refer to two different levels of the residential conditions—house and neighborhood. Such perspectives as the size, infrastructure, and location of the house are viewed as qualitative characteristics
which were evaluated along with the degree to which they pleased the immediate purpose of the great number of migrants’ gathering CZC settlements. The Yimuyuan, for its migrant tenants, has been documented as a method to accommodated them as well as meet the challenge of having dignity with affordable comfort in their life.

In the three cases, rural-to-urban migrant residents claim their satisfaction varies. In the Minxin jiayuan neighborhood, they are pleased with their individual houses but meanwhile they are not happy at all with regard to not having communal activities. Their housing satisfaction is more concerned with the extended activities of day-to-day life and socialization than with accommodation determinations.

The migrant residents’ experiences of communal activities are distinctly different in each of the three cases. In the Yimuyuan neighborhood, the most frequent examples of communal activities are to share reciprocal help, have associative interaction, share infrastructure and social entertainment. However, in the Minxin jiayuan case, the concept of mutual assistance and communication springing from communal activities is fundamentally absent in the pattern of their experiences. Their unexpected and casual contact with their neighbors is rare, and there is frequently a distant manner of courteousness. In view of the findings of the tenants’ experiences in the Vanke Tulou collective housing, it can be ascertained that the migrant residents do not share the same kind of communal activities, and the same kinds of experiences as in the Yimuyuan were not nurtured. This was probably a consequence of the great number of semi-open spaces there where neighbors can build up high levels of familiarity since they can see and greet each other regularly.

As Table 7.1 and 7.2 shows, types of residents’ outdoor places include all three categories: necessary space, transition space, and social space. The residents’ outdoor communal activities in each neighborhood are analyzed.
In terms of essential outdoor places, places are relatively unavoidable or compulsory—restroom, bathroom etcetera. Simply speaking, these kinds of outdoor places are required to be used. Five places in the Yimuyuan neighborhood are observed as the essential places residents cannot avoid using: “public restroom, public bathroom, and laundry room, the corridor as migrants’ kitchen and in front of rental house as a household work place. While in the Minxin jiayuan and Vanke Tulou, there are no essential outdoor places for them to use compulsorily. Simply speaking, the residents have to depend on outdoor places to take care of themselves, these related activities will occur throughout the year. Residents have no choice but to go out of their rental space to complete these necessary activities. However, in the other 2 cases, this situation does not exist. Residents are completely autonomous without being subjected to the physical framework.

In terms of transitional outdoor places, they comprise a knot that characterizes ‘transitional’ area and transportation spaces—for example, corridor, alleyway, open spaces connecting transportation spaces to entrances. In the Yimuyuan neighborhood, there are 5 places (corridor, alleyway approaching the rental room, main street (food street), vegetable wholesale market and the linking windy alleyways). In the Minxin jiayuan neighborhood, there are also 5 outdoor places with transitional functions and residents residing in Vanke Tulou need to pass 8 outdoor ‘transitional’ places from their rental room to the main entrance to the apartment building. Outdoor places for Minxin jiayuan and Vanke Tulou provide more transitional functions than the essential functions of the outdoor places.

In terms of social outdoor places, their function occurs depending on the attendance of others in outdoor places. People use this type of place to spend time together, play, say greetings and start a conversation, or do communal activities. This place is selected with the presence of people who are using it. More than 6 places are categorized into this type in the Yimuyuan neighborhood, including: neighbors sitting on the stoop, neighbors playing cards on the narrow street between the rental
houses, neighbors buying something from a vendor in a narrow alley, neighbors doing housework outside in the courtyard, neighbors hanging out in the food street, and neighbors staying outside. In the Minxin jiayuan, 3 main kinds of social outdoor places are shown while at most 7 places are listed as the social outdoor places in the Vanke Tulou neighborhood (neighbors staying in the circular corridor, children playing in the circular corridor, neighbors sitting on the bench in the corner open space, neighbors on the stairs, neighbors hanging washed clothes on the roof terrace, neighbors sitting on the roof terrace and neighbors using a public computer room/public gym/library/restaurant).

The social type of outdoor places could also be characterized from the type of people’s participation because on these occasions people are connected to others. This list indicates that 3 neighborhoods have their own tendencies to represent the characteristics of outdoor spaces for residents. These outdoor spaces directly contribute to the quality of residents’ communal activities.

Thus, Table 7.14 summarizes 5 questions in the three case places. The 5 questions were planned to explain the percentage of the variation in migrant tenants’ communal activities to their neighborhood. For the designed 7th question (In sum, what do you think your neighborly relationship means in terms of sociability aspects?), the mean value of the three cases is 60.1 (Yimuyuan case), 63.8 (Vanke Tulou case) and 20.1 (Minxin jiayuan case) respectively. It shows the level of communal activities in the Vanke Tulou area is the highest position compared to the other 2 case places. The lowest mean rate is occupied by the Minxin jiayuan neighborhood. A detailed examination of our questionnaire responses reveals that migrant tenants in the Yimuyuan and Vanke Tulou collective housing show the higher sociability degree.

For question 9, how do you feel about living in the Yimuyuan neighborhood now in terms of as a real home (Table 7.15)? Minxin jiayuan neighborhood shows
the lowest level of feeling for their own neighborhood as a real home compared to
the highest level for *Yimuyuan* neighborhood. Regarding feeling of attachment (Q.
12), the mean rating of 77.8, highest value is shown in the result of *Yimuyuan*
neighborhood, followed by the rating of 75.5 for *Vanke Tulou*, and 31.2 for the
*Minxin jiayuan* neighborhood.

**Review of research questions:**

The intention of this study is to examine the rural-to-urban habitation pattern of
migrant tenants and their neighborhood-based communal activities in three case
studies of low-rent housing neighborhoods in China. The findings of the analyses
explore the research questions started in Chapter five. Inference to the findings, the
answers to the three detailed research questions can be listed as below:

**Table 7.14. Comparative mean values of three cases of level of communal activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. 7</th>
<th>Q. 9</th>
<th>Q. 12</th>
<th>Q. 15</th>
<th>Q. 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*YMY*  *MXJY*  *VKTL*

In sum, what do you think your neighborly relationship means in terms of sociability (Q. 7)
How do you feel about living in this neighborhood now in terms of as a real home? (Q. 9)
Is your rental area an ideal place to continue living in in terms of having a feeling of attachment?
(Q. 12)
High frequency of visiting neighbors (Q. 15)
High frequency of helping neighbors (Q. 16)
Question 1. What are the causes of high levels of communal activity in migrants’ spontaneously-developed low-rent housing compared with the other two modern low-rent forms of housing?

Under the same physical conditions, the sharing of provided functions make the communal activities take place. Without the sharing of functions, the communal activities become difficult. Communal activities do not concern the relationship of residents to spaces, but the relation of residents to available functions, and relationship between residents. The kinds of functions combined with the spaces have significance from the perspective of the kinds of communal activities among the residents.

In the Yimuyuan case, the functions such as cooking, and storage occur in the corridor in front of the rental room which residents use as a part of their interior home, and communal activities happen among the residents who gather there in at

Table 7.15. Comparative mean values in Question 9 according to migrant respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YMY</th>
<th>MXJY</th>
<th>VKTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Merely provisional dwelling
2. Hard to tell
3. As a real home (a place where I/we belong to)
the same time. The alleyways in front of the rental house are used as functions (water, airing-laundry, recreation etc.) for household work. The residential neighbors gather around the functions. The household functions shared among the neighbors are one of the characteristic aspects of the communal activities that occur in front of the rental rooms and in front of the rental houses. Within the neighborhood scale, alleyways between the rental houses are full of functions concerning the restroom, bathroom, laundry, migrants’ training school, employment agencies, legal assist agencies etc. They all serve as the kinds of communal activities that are participated in by residents.

In the Minxin jiayuan case, the communal activities occur less in the corridor and in front of the rental house due to the loss of provided functions that can be seen to be shared by residents. The space between the rental houses supplies residents with a ground garden and some open spaces, but due to the lack of functions that concern migrant residents’ needs to join in, the kind of communal activities simply refer to residents’ voluntary visits or intentional visits rather than communally shared experiences.

In the Vanke Tulou case, the corridor in front of the rental rooms also remove the functions as we saw in the Yimuyuan case, as a result communal activities do not occur. However, the spaces between the rental rooms are occupied with a public computer room, a laundry, a gym and a courtyard, these functions bring a certain level of residents’ communal activities.

**Question 2. What is the spatial pattern that generates the formation of communal activities?**

In reference to the three cases, the pattern of the spatial environment is merely a physical fact, but the very reason for the formation of the communal activities is that residents use the surrounding shared functions combined with the space.
Consequently, the spaces with functions for sharing by residents in essence allow the establishment of communal activities.

**Question 3. How do the lessons learned from the three case studies provide grounds for the future pattern of low-rent housing?**

From our experience with the three cases, I will use that following part of this chapter to answer the third research question.

### 7.2 Definition of shared functions combined with transitional spaces

To start, the factors affecting the level of communal activities, and the physical structure are subordinate to the most significant part which is the kind of functions that are attached to this space. There are two categories of shared functions—daily-used shared functions and communally used functions. I use the term ‘shared functions’ in a neighborhood to argue enthusiastically for the idea of to ‘live by sharing’ as an approach to designing low-rent housing neighborhoods.

#### 7.2.1 Functions and shared functions

The functions, exactly speaking, anything or quality is useful, tangible or intangible. From a spatial perspective, a function is service or resource and is obtained from the environment to satisfy human needs and wants. Functions are supplied through the spaces. The physical-based functions are palpable while functions are intangible. It enables the users to control their activities.

Functions or services can be transformed to produce a benefit while meeting human needs. In my study, functions, such as cooking, storage, water, airing-laundry,
Table 7.16. The analysis of interviews concerning the use of a shared restroom
(Drawing by author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview (inside of the rental room)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGLE MIGRANT RESIDENTS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sharing is also acceptable if within a small group)—“Sharing a restroom with other people on the same floor is okay, after all, it is better than sharing it with residents living in several buildings.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUPLE MIGRANT RESIDENTS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Separate restroom is necessary)—“Overcrowding is not seen as the biggest problem. The single room contains a bed and a small storage container. We want a private restroom or a restroom shared with a small group of tenants. The restroom is more necessary than the bathroom. We can use the restroom to take a quick shower or we can go to the nearby public bathroom.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Small restroom is tolerable)—“A big restroom is unnecessary, occupying a squat toilet is enough for us.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY-ACCOMPANIED MIGRANT RESIDENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Restroom should have bathing function)—“Restroom can be combined with bathroom.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The simplest function is needed)—“A toilet and a sink is enough for us.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.17. The analysis of interview concerning sharing kitchen in front of the rental room (Drawing by author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview (in front of the rental room)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGLE MIGRANT RESIDENTS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Simple cooking)—“We normally do not cook too much, we use simple cooking utensils for simple meals.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUPLE MIGRANT RESIDENTS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(More space)—“We desire more housing space. Making use of the corridor as kitchen makes the corridor more narrow.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cooking smell)—“Cooking smell is unpleasant within the corridor, the kitchen is located adjacent to the rental room, it doesn’t have a ventilator, after cooking, cooking smell fills the whole corridor, it takes a long time to disperse”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAMILY-ACCOMPANIED MIGRANT RESIDENTS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Conflict of kitchen between families)—“Kitchen is necessary, but a shared kitchen is also acceptable. But sharing a kitchen is just to share the cooking space, instead of cooking utensils. A lot of fights happen though,” “Residents have to use makeshift kitchens erected outside or in the corridor. In the evening when everyone returns home at roughly the same time there is competition for the use of this small space.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Diagram showing the layout of rental rooms and shared kitchen areas.](image-url)
Table 7.18. The analysis of interview concerning sharing storage in front of the rental room (Drawing by author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview (in front of the rental room)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(No enough space)—</strong> &quot;We have to put our stuff outdoor, we don’t have enough space in our rental room.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Save indoor space)—</strong> &quot;Storage is important for me. I put my unimportant stuff in front of my rental room. It saves me a lot of space in my rental room.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Importance of security of storage)—</strong> &quot;Keeping the storage area safe bothers me a lot. I want to lock my stuff. Theft is not rare. We lock our room and rental house.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Used to sharing of storage)—</strong> &quot;Sharing storage is not a big issue. We get used to sharing in this neighborhood. We do not have much space, we need to share or learn to how to share with others. We use public kitchen, storage, bathroom, restroom, water and communally used facilities.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Storage space is necessary)—</strong> &quot;Residents living on this floor must use the corridor for storage. Inside is crowded.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.19. The analysis of interviews concerning sharing functions between the houses

(Drawing by author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview (front of the rental houses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Water provision should be installed inside of the rental house.) “It is rare in Yimuyuan housing that the water resource exists inside of the rental room. We use the water outside, and it is inconvenient.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(It is the place where children can play, and adults can sit down) “A paradise for children. We sit outdoor.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Shops, restaurants are convenient) “Rental houses are connected through alleyways. Alleyways are full of shops, hobby rooms, restaurant, and other services.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Alleyways need to be preserved.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The place in front of the rental house requires work that residents have to do themselves) Residents do some compulsory work in front of their rental house, involving the use of water or house cleaning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Diagram of rental house layout]

Residents enjoy sitting outside of the rental house for doing household work, air-laundry. This experience should be preserved in the future neighborhood.

The water resource should be accessible inside of the rental house instead of in front of the rental house.
restroom, bathing, or migrant-caring services are obtained or combined with the 3 transitional spaces (in front of the rental room, rental house, and between the houses).

It is this perspective of the sharing of provided functions that acts as the role of the spaces in nurturing the relationship between different residents, or the inter-personal. The cooking function by the corridor on each single normal day is shared by a group of residents. This cooking function serves as the quality that defines the inter-personal relationship between the participants. As contended in the three cases, these functions are both a physical feature and a quality of the relationship between residents and residents. In this regard, our discussion of functions with the spatial arrangements of the migrants’ spontaneous-developed low-rent housing neighborhoods can represent an archetypal appearance of the dimension of a sustainable community.

It is a society which is planned in smaller, comprehensible units, self-governing, using local functions for sharing and production. All contribute to and are in charge of the husbanding of functions, technology, work, caring, and the managing of the residential environment. Sustainable community involves more than the connection of residents to the obtainable functions, and the bond between residents and residents (inter-personal). Subsequently, at the source of a sustainable community is the sharing between residents and residents, in which the functions should be insufficient in quantity, so it becomes the foundation and the transitional cause of equivalent participation.

7.2.2 Lessons learned from the three migrants’ low-rent neighborhoods

In the Yimuyuan case, the three main groups of migrant residents have different requirements in terms of being asked about the shared functions issue. For example, as regards using the toilet, single migrant residents stated that they can accept sharing the restroom with other residents, but the group shared with should be small in
Table 7.20. Residents' acceptable level of shared functions for daily use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Acceptable level</th>
<th>based on evidence from the Yimuyuan case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) The size of the rental room</td>
<td>One room or two rooms are the most rental type for the rental rooms Necessary furniture</td>
<td>Most of the rental rooms supplied by Yimuyuan case are single room or two rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Restroom</td>
<td>Separate restroom needs to provide to each rental room Sharing restroom with a small group (3 rental rooms) is tolerable if has to</td>
<td>Restroom is necessary for majority of residents Sharing restroom is also acceptable with a small group of tenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Bathroom</td>
<td>Bathroom can be combined with restroom Bathroom can be shared with a small group</td>
<td>Bathroom is not included inside of the rental house, residents normally use public bathroom shared by several rental buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Kitchen</td>
<td>Separate kitchen is not compulsory Kitchen utensil is necessary Due to the Chinese cuisine style, the kitchen should be located indoors to avoid spreading cooking odor</td>
<td>Kitchen is put in the corridor in front of the rental room The kitchen place doesn’t bother residents much, but the smell does Kitchen put in front of the rental room make the corridor narrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Storage</td>
<td>Inside of the rental room should consider more storage room The storage room can partly assume its place in the space in front of the rental room, but security should be considered</td>
<td>Residents use the space in front of the rental room for the accumulation of their private stuff which is of little importance or value Residents worry about the security of the storage space but they have no option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Water</td>
<td>All separate room should have cold running water Hot running water can also be considered as a provision inside the restroom in the rental room</td>
<td>Water is inaccessible inside of the rental house Water resource is mostly installed in front of the rental house Residents use the space in front of the rental house mostly for water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Laundry and drying</td>
<td>Laundry can be shared Space for airing laundry needs to be considered if the space inside of the rental room is limited</td>
<td>Residents go to public laundry room Residents use the space in front of the rental room for air-laundry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7.21. Residents’ communally used services viewed as functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Acceptable level</th>
<th>Based on evidence from the Yimuyuan case study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Employment agency for migrants</td>
<td>Employment agency as necessary function or service for migrants can be supplied in the low-rent neighborhood</td>
<td>Migrants’ employment agency supplies migrants with more fitting access to the jobs that suit them. So the future low-rent neighborhood can be an economic base for the rural-to-urban migrants. They get jobs in other migrants’ own businesses or started their first work chance in their neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Training school for migrants</td>
<td>The future migrants’ low-rent neighborhood can be an educative community for these migrants. Educative functions concern migrant residents who learn about professional training. Migrants, especially newly-arrived migrants, are mainly interested in training concerning employment for themselves and schooling for their children. Migrants’ skill training center support migrants, especially young migrants with professional training courses with which they are more capable to find a fitting job</td>
<td>Migrants’ low-rent neighborhoods can be a community of preparation for future development. It is easy for young migrants, and newcomers to begin their career using the migrants’ social network. With experience, they can reach out into the bigger society. Between the rental houses in the low-rent neighborhoods where the migrants’ school, training settlement can provide informal education aid to help the rural migrants settle conflicts and bridge their gap to the destination cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Legal aid agencies for migrants</td>
<td>A migrant law &amp; psychology consulting center in a low-rental community can be good for life especially when migrants meet a legal problem and need advice. They can inform designers about how to enhance their understanding of their self-preservation and safeguard their legitimate rights at work.</td>
<td>Legal aid agencies, migrants’ unions, employment agencies and clinics all function as social service functions where migrant residents can get necessary assistance. For migrant tenants, Yimuyuan neighborhood can be an organization to protect their legal rights and promote their interests. Migrant residents use these functions regularly and try to identify their problems and needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Recreation (Computer café, restaurant, gym, library, etc.)</td>
<td>Recreation facilities need to be considered to satisfy migrant residents’ psychological pursuits</td>
<td>Migrant residents use many recreational functions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
number. Couple migrants prefer to have their own restroom but they think they can share the bathroom with other residents. As for family migrant residents, they hope their bathroom has two functions: they can use it as a toilet and as a shower, regardless of the quality, but both functions should exist in the same room.

In considering a kitchen that normally is shared by residents, residents do not complain much about the cluster kitchen. Many of the residents said they don’t cook too much in the rental room; the simple kitchen can satisfy their daily cooking needs. Most complaints come from the cooking smell in the corridor. They say they can smell cooking from indoor, and the smell can stay for couple of hours after meal. For couple and family-accompanied residents, the experience of them has not been as positive. They admit they use the corridor as a kitchen with not as much social support as they hoped for, but the narrow space and smell make them/her dissatisfied.

Figure 7.22. Problems of the recent spaces and the improvement suggestions in the low-rent housing
Therefore, the size and the smell bother the residents, but the sharing experience is not a big deal for them.

Another function carried by the corridor is the storage. Residents share the storage functions through the corridor. The complaints which many many residents have are the security of the storage space. There are 2 aspects that result in residents’ criticisms. One is that storage is important and necessary for each of them. Indoor space, their rental room is not spacious, so they make use of the corridor to store their stuff. Second, storing stuff outdoor exposes it as potentially unsafe.

As an important motive for residents’ activities according to their interview, it was stated that residents need water resource to assist their household work. Residents said they like the life in the alleyways, but their alleyway life is closely related to the daily necessary functions. Water resource should be included inside of the rental house. However, the alleyways with migrant-support functions provide services to the residents. These are open to anybody, and thus communal activities attained a character of public facilities rather than merely communal rooms for the residents.

One of the goals is how low-rent housing neighborhood may be designed to promote both communal activities and living through the sharing of functions. Therefore, I propose that the low-rent housing constitutes an example of living by sharing. Based mainly on the Yimuyuan experience, a number of models can be distinguished under the wider concept ‘housing of sharing function’, which is defined as ‘housing with more sharing organized functions (facilities) and communal spaces than in conventional accommodation.’

From this analysis of the Yimuyuan living experiences on sharing functions, I argue for the migrant residents’ desire for living-support functions and to enjoy the communal activities during sharing these functions. The three transitional spaces
form a transitional network of living with shared functions and spaces in a variety of management forms. I propose there is an important message in housing with shared functions as innovators of low-rent housing provision, communal activities and sustainable environmental technology. The shared functions and involvement of migrant occupants make low-rent housing different from normal apartment houses. This understanding is embodied in design patterns which epitomize the ending point of this research.

7.3 Shared functions of serving the social and psychological needs of the rural migrating community (Nongmin gong)

Without professional design, it has been presented that the migrants’ spontaneous-developed Yimuyuan neighborhood has succeeded in making a low-rent neighborhood with close-knit communal activities. However, in terms of the current planning and policy of modern low-rent housing construction, there is little reference to or understanding of the spatial pattern in migrants’ spontaneous-developed CZCs. As such, the Yimuyuan neighborhood leads us to understand how a place with high level of communal activities is the shared the provided functions combined with the space. Nothing other than this sharing experience is what people today are missing.

The three cases present the inner characteristics of low-rent housing, for example the partition of space frequently functions as a mediator for the occurrence of corresponding communal activities which may reflect or transform those epitomized by the neighborhood as a whole. Simultaneously, the spatial arrangement of the rental rooms’ internal and external patterns is sometimes taken to extreme proportions, but this may work as a sign for the unintentional display of inhabitants’ movement, communal activities and social contact.
Rental rooms in the Yimuyuan are not only associated with different spaces in a general way, they have also caused a strong inter-personal link to form among residents who make up the local community. The lack of communal activities in the modern low-rent neighborhood appears to be due to the fact that the architects have ignored the very essential nature of the rental room and its environment providing a high degree of sharing and informality in the Yimuyuan neighborhood. Rental rooms in the Yimuyuan are not only associated with different spaces in a general way, they also have created a strong inter-personal link among residents to form the community. Low-rent neighborhoods, for rural-to-urban migrants, not only provide low-cost rooms but their residents are inescapably bound to the local places by making use of the functions to support their daily life.

There is, however, a key variance in the position of the three spaces when seen from the aspect of the communal activities. In simple terms, if Yimuyuan neighborhood emphasizes the multi-relations between residents and space, between residents and shared functions and between residents and residents; for modern high-rise neighborhoods, the relations between residents and shared functions and between residents and residents are absent. In the Yimuyuan case, the spatial pattern is constituted through extension (exchanging) of interior and exterior spatial elements, while in the high-rises through it is the segregation among them.

In the Yimuyuan neighborhood, migrant residents conceive the spaces immediately adjacent to their rental room as integral parts of their own ‘home’. I have shown how the communal activities are in one sense modeled on the different spaces outside of the rental room, and we can see a continuity between the corridor in front of the rental rooms, the street in front of the rental house, and the wider community between the rental houses. This intimate experience and usage of spaces as significant social places by the migrant residents are profoundly at variance with most middle- and upper-class residents in high-rises.
In the *Yimuyuan*, the inside and outside of rental rooms are part and parcel of the dynamic process. In their internal space each single rental room embodies a private home as an inside. From their external perspective, the outside of the rental rooms is also taken as being an equal element switching from being used for daily necessaries with balanced reciprocity, all of which conclude with cooking and household activities between the inside and the outside of the rental rooms. Here both the inside and outside of the rental rooms act as integrated spatial categories and epitomize the basic functions of a home.

Residents not only use the outdoor spaces frequently and outdoor spaces facilitate residents’ life and daily needs, and not merely as a linking route, which points up the high level of permeability and the margin between the dwelling unit and the adjacent environing area. Repeatedly, even the sense of other human beings close by carried by smells and noises provides communal activities with a rich sense of community. In many respects relations between houses in the wider neighborhood influence the relations among residents. Communal activities are based on the sharing of functions and consumption, rental rooms in the wider community are involved in directly reciprocal exchanges which are perceived as occurring on a shared basis.

Communal activities are conducted with varying degrees of sharing: the most routine occur in the front of the rental room with the use of cooking facilities and sorting out of the storage spaces; more casual ones happen on the street in front of the rental house and include the participation of housework, that is washing, preparing cooking, airing-laundry and sitting. Also the various systems of interaction which occur in the wider locality between the rental houses, all operate on a direct reciprocal basis in sharing the functions.

Accordingly, the differences between the *Yimuyuan* and modern low-rent high-rises residential patterns such as *Minxin jiayuan* suggest that in current modern low-
rent neighborhoods space is typically used in an extremely isolated and selective manner. The periphery between the rental room unit and the immediate situation is fairly sharp and secluded. The possibility of creating a physical context for sharing with other residents is accordingly missing. Erecting walls are clear-cut barricades between the internal dwelling unit and the external domain. Moreover, the openings, open spaces never endow residents with any functions that residents can share with each other.

Low-rent housing for Nongmin gong, or rural-to-urban migrants, is reflected in different visions when compared to normal residential places. In the case of Yimuyuan, while it includes the traditional village, this settlement pattern has grown to the point of growing into the corresponding of a balanced self-contained neighborhood with its own social, economic and information arrangements. What we are suggesting is that the function of the migrants’ low-rent housing is transitional. It distinguishes the attendance of a sturdy rural migrants-based group, and migrant residents use their way to attempt to concentrate and focus its growth on caring for themselves. On a neighborhood scale, it focuses primarily on providing housing, social services and opportunities for migrants-own economic development. Rural-to-urban migrants, especially for unaccompanied migrants, need various functions and components to support them in their everyday lives. Such functions range from daily-used to social benefit and occupation training. In the modern low-rent apartment neighborhoods, the lawn and ground garden is never functions in reference with any migrant-caring functions. Even the corridor at the very front of the rental room hardly belongs to residents in the apartment.

These opinions make us enquire into the scope to which, through Chinese government launched urban beautification and CZC demolition, a situation of pressure on or additional damage is caused to migrants and the neighborhoods where they spontaneously gather. If we assume that the local spatial area and an orientation toward localism provide the core of social organization and integration for a large
proportion of the migrant residents, then current behavioral theories would suggest that spatial sharing organization and integration are the main elements in delivering a foundation for operative spatial functioning. In other words, my consideration of some of the spatial elements embedded in the Yimuyuan residential area are largely thanks to the dilapidated condition which provides one source for the conservation of the communal activities that do not occur in modern low-rent neighborhoods.

7.4 Low-rent housing differing from the conventional housing

7.4.1 Lost functions in the contemporary low-rent housing

Dwelling and relaxing are the two main functions of contemporary planned low-rent housing for rural migrants. The product description of the contemporary low-rent housing is: dwelling units contain the full range of functions for individual use, and recreational use is only present in the form of a ground garden and open spaces. Shared functions are absent in the transitional spaces, the two functions (cooking, storage) are absent. Functions for hygiene and functions for cooking and dining are all relocated from the public transitional spaces into the inside of the rental room for separate use. The functions for social service, education and migrants’ hobbies and education are all lost in the contemporary low-rent housing.

In the migrants’ spontaneous-developed neighborhood, the primary goal of these functions combined with different communal spaces is to provide different services to help with migrants’ rural to urban migration problems. These functions include the holding of training assemblies, educational lessons, workshops and training sessions in the area of skills, migrating issues and improving the daily lives for the convenience of residents. These lost functions in the contemporary low-rent housing are actually acting as a link for the migrants’ supporting and care facilities and for those in the migrants’ community who are unable to get accustomed to the migration lifestyle.
In the contemporary planned low-rent housing, from a cognitive perspective, there is a loss in the amount and type of functions which ease rural-to-urban migrants’ process of adjustment. In this instance, we will be looking at the cognitive map which rural migrants have of their low-rent housing community and the perceived view of what neighborhood concerns and supports are present in their life and their rural lifestyle.

From a mental point of view, these functions which are in the setting of migrants’ spontaneously-developed housing echo an arrangement of ‘attachments’ essential to the procedure of adjustment. In migrating from a rural area to an urban area in China, ‘lifestyle difference and culture shock’ is alleviated by the building up of a set of attachments to shared functions in the place of the new destination environment which substitutes for the functions of their rural home environment to which they used to belong.

However, planners and designers provide functions and services grounded on middle-class values and use these values to solve migrants’ difficulties and improve their residential conditions. For the majority of rural-to-urban migrants, these shared functions serve as transitional purposes. In contrast, however, the low-rent housing without these functions cannot develop the transitional pattern of life related to the urban area culture. Without these functions, rural migrants may carry on withstanding transformation, and in doing so they may hang on strongly to the rural-based components of their new urban environment, instead of integrating as much as possible with the mainstream in the city.

7.4.2 Proposed approach to housing migrant residents in low-rent housing

The chief constituent to the success of low-rent housing that I intend to present is the method of sharing functions. What is the simple inspiration behind the sharing of space, or exactly, the sharing of functions combined with the spaces? The situation
is that there is a growing number of rural migrants who are living in urban places, so residential space will certainly become a scarce function. Shared functions and sharing use lead to a decrease in the repetitive need to use the same functions. Based on feedback from interviews with migrants, four factors seem to have produced the result of migrants having a lifestyle built around shared functions.

First, in the present urban social life, rural migrants face a change in the traditional rural family structure. Holistic emotional development for the single rural migrant, their split household and sense of belonging are needed. As one of the solutions, for rural migrants, participation in shared activities in low-rent housing can be refined to include the merits of the traditional Chinese extended family into modern society; reciprocal support, increase of intimacy with neighbors, communal activities, sense of belonging, and security in the community.

Second, this proposal draws from the first case study as a model in which rental rooms are grouped around the shared functions or facilities. These communal areas are full of functions shared by the residents, these settings don’t bother the residents much, but instead encourage the residents to gather together and participate in communal activities.

Third, it is necessary to stress that low-rent housing has to be designed to adapt to the specific needs of rural migrant residents who are at beginning migrating-stages. One key aim of low-rent housing is to fulfill the desire of migrant residents to live in a socially supportive setting and this is of most benefit to single migrant residents and newly-arrived comers. Low-rent housing can be transitional, temporary accommodation for migrant residents, instead of a permanent, lifelong housing provision.

Fourth, in order to reduce construction and living costs, shared functions have the effect of saving space based on common environmentally friendly values which
also support sustainability. This is because using communal spaces and shared functions decrease the repetitive need to use the same functions individually.

Fifth, acceptable compactness as a feature can be one of the finest methods to attain sustainability, and low cost and finally more low-rent dwelling units can be created. As for shared functions, by sharing such functions, people living in low-rent housing have access to many more facilities than they would on their own. Housing with shared functions can be understood from collective, communal or cooperative perspectives. I define the housing with shared functions as accommodation with collective spaces and shared amenities.

Shared functions are here construed as housing-related functions that involve collaboration among residents. Shared functions refer to housing designed to create a community and collective is used where the emphasis is on the collective organization. In the concept of shared function housing, migrant residents should live in low-rent neighborhood groups with communal rooms and sustain themselves by sharing functions, property and aspirations.

The main idea for the proposal of sharing functions lies in the clustering of private dwelling units around shared spaces. In the case of the whole recommended complex, the individual rental rooms cluster around the central spaces and shared functions, which comprise a kitchen, dining and living spaces, storage, and lounge areas. The main circulation at each level among rental rooms is connected to all communal spaces in that way performing moments to unite and socialize. This proposal draws from the first case study in my research as a model in which rental rooms are grouped around the communal spaces. These communal areas together with the communal spaces in front of the rental houses are full of functions shared by the residents, encouraging the residents to gather together and participate in communal activities.
Housing with shared functions is characteristically shaped by a group of migrant residents who are ‘consciously dedicated to accommodating as a community.’ It provides a balance between personal privacy and living amidst people who know and care about each other. Another feature of housing with shared functions are that ‘each rental household owns a private lodging—complete with restroom—but also shares extensive common functions with the larger group’. All apartment units are connected through indoor communication and with common functions, such as, kitchen, laundry, storage, café, gym, laundry and various other migrant-related conveniences. The housing units with (more) shared functions are based on cooperation between the tenants, not on the division of residents.

The primary goal of housing with (more) shared functions is the desire of residents to live in a socially supportive setting. Architectural design and site planning are among a number of means that, in combination with social organization factors, may serve to enhance or support the communal activities sought by residents. Under the umbrella of the term ‘shared functions’, I propose that the shared functions can be a contemporary approach to the preservation of communal activities in low-rent neighborhoods.

The ‘collaborated communities’ ‘central living’ and ‘housing with (more) shared functions’ will comprise the future low-rent housing. It can be as ‘housing that features spaces and facilities for joint use by all residents who also maintain their independent living’. I propose the low-rent housing neighborhood is not just a neighborhood where people live together, but is a community where residents share everyday life, much more than normal neighbors do. The shared functions and degree to which residents are actually doing things together in their everyday life are as the residents choose.

It should be admitted that the spatial arrangements should be flexible enough to allow for variations through the degree of sharing in the low-rent housing scheme. It
Figure 7.3. Diagram of images at elements of low-rent housing community (Drawing by author)
is generally accepted that very few urban citizens prefer to have daily collective activities more than drinking a cup of coffee or tea together. However, it is important that all residents of the low-rent housing group have roughly the same prospects of collective life in the process of managing their environmental transition. Low-rent housing can be merely transitional, temporary accommodation for migrant residents, instead of a permanent, lifelong housing provision. Truly, the majority of people prefers to have options for communal activities and shared functions, without being compelled to use them recurrently. It should vary according to low-rent housing projects.

In the sharing model, the community residents own their rental rooms but also have a share of communal facilities and the communal spaces. Everyone has a role, where people experiment with a commitment to something more than their individual interests. The proposed way people live their lives describes them as community. The sharing of functions allows us to connect with other individuals, direct how they cooperate with each other in the decisions and choices we make. Their lifestyle selections direct their consumption patterns that fulfill migrant residents’ needs and aspirations and it is these choices that have an impact on their environment. A significant shift in behaviors and increased collaboration between individuals and communities will drive collective lifestyles.

Migrant residents need only share a goal of making their lives more efficient and enjoyable through cooperating with their neighbors. Naturally, shared functions offer more opportunities for interaction with neighbors, migrant residents learn to develop their conflict resolution and mediation skills. An increasing number of people experience isolation in their housing environment in a situation when neighbourly shared functions, and cooperation become more important to solve the problem of excessive use of functions.
Participatory process; intentional neighborhood design; communal facilities; complete resident management; together with—the encouragement of human interaction, support for disadvantaged members of the society, and the awareness of the environmental concerns. This ‘shared function’ model focuses on the reduction of the functions of individual rental rooms. This model has been transferred to a ‘shared-work’ model, in which residents more often share everyday housework and the maintenance of common facilities.

Therefore, shared functions can offer a contemporary approach to urban living for the new type of rural-to-urban migrants in their low-rent housing. In doing so, the potential gain of the communal spaces can be maximized while the use of functions for each individual can be minimized. Furthermore, it can also be a method of breeding new interaction through increased communication or collaboration with a larger group of residents, or an alternate means of living with a collaborative neighborhood responsibility.

An important design expression is that the transitional space between the rental rooms is more important than the rental room itself. Rental units should be designed for nothing but basic needs, such as sleeping and personal hygiene. A minimum rental dwelling unit with furniture becomes part of this ideal. The use of low-rent housing as a device to promote the sharing experience ought to bring about architectural forms that define this ideal openly to the public.

Using compactness as a feature can be one of the finest methods to attain sustainability, low-cost, and a sense of community. However, compactness is described by how it corresponds to the neighboring community, spaces, and accessible functions. In migrants’ spontaneously-developed housing, like the Yimuyuan case, most migrant communities push the edge towards ‘the acceptable compactness’.
I argue two aspects to show how the ‘housing with (more) shared functions’ may be designed to promote both communal activities and living through the sharing of functions. One is for the design of basic residential units with shared functions. The other is the design approach used in the low-rent housing also provides a design strategy framework for low-rent housing neighborhood in China.

7.5 Guidelines for individual units and communal units

Taking the shared functions into account can be an alternative method for low-rent housing neighborhoods. To achieve this, I based my solutions on one pattern: the space immediately adjacent to the rental room becoming an extremely effective extension of the interior of a rental room or home. The private rental surfaces can be reduced in relation to normal apartment sizes, so that more low-rent rooms can be created because of the combination of the space that is shared for communal use. My research has suggested the form of group of shared functions as a way to resolve the general problems of lost communal activities and potential collaborative behaviors.

7.5.1 Standardization of the private dwelling units

Generous communal functions supplied in the low-rent housing allow for smaller separate rental rooms, which also require fewer functions to be built, maintained and operated, but better recreational facilities so there is no necessity for individuals. Likewise, a well-designed low-rent housing neighborhood results in the reduction of separate household activities, because:

- Rural-to-urban migrants have single migrants as the main resident group, their characteristics of being at a young age, having a small
family size and being at a specific migrating-stage\footnote{Young migrants have no time for leisure or for cooking meals is their daily life. Their life is filled with factory work, and they only require a space to sleep and bathe.} all contribute to prove that the small size and simple functions in the private rental units are acceptable and practical solutions for the main migrants’ group

- The common kitchens and other shared functions were designed to reduce indoor individual activity, in order to make possible the reduction in size of indoor space
- Simplification of individual functions doesn’t mean residents lose the functions necessary for their daily life. Relocating some functions into the communal space for sharing decreases the repetitive need to use the same functions individually. By giving the communal spaces multiple shared functions, people have access to many more facilities than they would on their own.
- The shared communal spaces can substitute for a large family and as a living room
- The communal kitchen will be stocked with all the appliances residents only use on occasion
- A well-stocked public kitchen in the communal space eliminates the need for a separate home-based cooking space and the storage of individual cooking utensils
- No need for one separate laundry room at home makes a communal laundry room possible
- An exercise room decreases the need to space-hog, for home-based exercise equipment
- An active ‘take-it or leave-it’ closet can help tenants pass on clothing and small items, reducing clutter and related space requirements
Figure 7.4. Standardization of the low-rent private unit and the shared unit in the low-rent housing I propose
Figure 7.5. Ways of setting up the private dwelling unit
Table 7.2. The construction of individual communal life regarding the activities and corresponding facility plan in future low-rent housing neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Group members</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Explain</th>
<th>Spatial recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual private life</td>
<td>Sleeping</td>
<td>Household member</td>
<td>Bed</td>
<td>Small private space with space for a twin sized bed and bunk beds, built in storage and a writing desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-private, semi-private life inside of the rental room</td>
<td>Dressing</td>
<td>Household member</td>
<td>Clothes chest</td>
<td>Enough storage space for dressing, the clothes chest forms the necessary space for residents’ common use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>Household member</td>
<td>Cabinet, bed with storage function</td>
<td>Considering more space for storage function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Household member</td>
<td>Visiting place: table, sofa</td>
<td>Considering putting a small meeting space inside of the rental room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Household member</td>
<td>Table, bookrack</td>
<td>Study place is useful for single migrant residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleaning</td>
<td>Household member</td>
<td>Cleaning equipment</td>
<td>Personal hygiene, room cleaning needs separate cleaning space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.23. Categories of the functions and physical structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily-used functions</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Physical structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bathing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bathing room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laundring</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laundry room (roof gardens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating</td>
<td></td>
<td>Living room (great room)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation (entertainment, watching TV/movie)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small multi-purpose room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise (workout)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-purpose room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kits room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TV/Movie room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sauna/Spa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage space, including open storage for easy finding of items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social service functions</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Physical structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-employment counseling</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Employment agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment referral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-job-training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political consulting (issue of stress, family problem, migration adjustment)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Migrant youth and community center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal advice center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving (community clinic, entertainment)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Information and referral center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-purpose room: game room with craft closet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-maintained (migrants make their own business deals)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Commercial spaces (restaurant, convenience store, café)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Political function
- Political representation makes migrants’ low-rent neighborhood a voluntary political organization for the migrants

Self-support commercial function
- The migrants’ low-rent housing can integrate with some commercial communities. The commercial function corresponds closely with potential customers, especially local migrant residents

Educational function
- Educational function can be essential for each individual migrant to help them prepare for the future in their destination cities. Education helps the migrants to reconstruct their experience and adjust with the urban environment.

Social function
- Strengthen the social function of the neighborhood, provide the opportunity for residents to meet at neighborhood meetings. Friendships and acquaintances with local residents are the likely result

Recreational function
- Serving a broader purpose and meeting the recreational needs of the neighborhood at-large. This function provides multiple facilities and allow for large group activities and other recreational pursuits, such as off-street parking, night lighting of facilities and other active recreation facilities that encourage higher levels of communal use.
It is much more cost effective to standardize the private units in a low-rent high-rise neighborhood. When establishing a low-rent neighborhood, defining basic values and goals is important. The subsequent design approaches will contribute meaningfully to building housing with shared functions more affordably and in larger quantity. The proposal includes a model design for moving towards shared function lifestyle as a catalyst for low-rent housing that triggers urban communities towards communal activities and collective lifestyles, eventually towards sustainability. The proposal is based on typical low-rent housing formats (high-rise tower). The versions are based on three variables: household composition, type of rental-room, kinds of communal spaces with shared functions. To these I have added the diagram of shared function placement and the form of the rental room.

The patterns are based on rural-to-urban migrants’ composition in the three case studies. The variables are based on this tenants’ composition, meaning that I imagined various situations for each type of tenant. In reality, designs for low-rent housing are created by the communities of future residents. This pattern used fictive residents as participants.

7.5.2 Standardization of the communal units

The content of shared functions in the modern low-rent high-rises is broken into two components (Table 7.23) s. The components are: daily-used and migrants-caring functions for maintaining communal activities in migrants’ low-rent housing neighborhoods. My space-based functions for sharing recognize two category types of functions: function and physical.

(1) Function

Function means an amenity or services, especially migrant residents connected with hygiene, daily-used and migrant-related caring aspects. It gives migrant residents options that give the opportunity to make use of and benefit from these
functions. Based on the function, low-rent residential can thus differentiate two kinds of the functions.

(2) Physical structure

Physical structures are the touchable properties the residents uses in dwelling. These comprise the spatial arrangement, its location, and the amenities obtainable at that location. The physical structure can affect the quality of the functions’ physical localization.

A shared function for low-rent housing forms can do justice to the modern high-rises. Although the term shared function refers merely to an exact communal activity to the corresponding intermediary spaces, it has turned out to be synonymous for spaces to live and share between residents and residents. I emphasize one major component in residents’ shared function to their neighborhood. Likewise, a well-designed low-rent housing neighborhood results in the enlarging of the transitional spaces to the optimum size for each communal unit, because:

- An extension of home—space immediately to the rental room is functionly a part of its interior according to the first case study. The extension of the home (interior) can be the key to the new forms of low-rent housing and living together.

- Because of the relocation of functions from inside to the communal spaces, the communal transitional spaces need to be enlarged in size for accommodating these shared functions.

- Enrichment of shared functions and enlargement of communal space do not mean residents lose their private space in favor of communal spaces. On the contrary, individual space can be more spacious and
more low-rent private units can be created because the shared functions save more space

- Since a primary goal of cohousing is the desire of residents to live in a socially supportive setting, architectural design and site planning are among a number of means that, in combination with social organization factors, may serve to enhance or support the sense of community sought by residents

### 7.6 Planning strategies for designing low-rent housing

The term ‘shared function’ or ‘collaborative function’ is used to describe a new form of sharing developing in spaces today. It can be described as ‘a trend that is reshaping our functions-based space. How can we locate the shared functions in the corresponding spaces? What kind of function can be shared reasonably by the rural-to-urban migrant residents? In this regard, I propose the structure of strategy for locating the residents’ sharing experience of provided functions combined with the spaces. I try to find the way of exploiting underutilized functions, by building communities around them and turning consumers into providers.

The kind of low-rent housing that I propose/recommend is as ‘cooperative’ as the inhabitants like to make it. The framework of its scheme is, a number of separate, small bedrooms with their own bathroom, and one or more communal facilities, of a reasonable size up to 15–20% of the total floor space, and outdoor areas. It makes it easy for the residents to eat together, cultivate common or personal interests and hobbies, to take exercise and to relax. There must be more outdoor space for communal activities, and common areas must be designed to accommodate many different uses. In designing the communal functions combined with the space, such as the laundry and kitchen, there are different spatial frames, however, it seems
necessary to understand the representative expression of sharing and the fitting of design concepts behind the recent majority of low-rent housing neighborhoods in China. A significant plan feature is that of being sharing, collaborative, and collective. Rental dwelling units are designed mainly for basic personal requirements—resting and private sanitation. Migrant residents are supposed to use their other secondary needs in a shared way. The concept of living with sharing ought to revolve around low-rent housing neighborhoods in order to meet two objectives. One, accommodating a growing number of migrant residents who fall into the category of having a lack of affordable housing provision; second, this kind of low-rent housing precludes the middle-class applying for and even can be excluded from the choice of the radical middle-class families who move in.

Referring to the *Yimuyuan* case, the conveyed aspiration to use low-rent housing as a device to encourage a ‘new’ life-style ought to bring about ‘fitting’ architectural patterns that present the ‘living with sharing’ openly to the public. Different levels of sharing components in the low-rent buildings are placed in the 3 places. Since unintentional involvement in communal activities is viewed as part of the purpose in the kind of low-rent housing that I propose, I recommend that corridors and passages are by space the agency of a collective sharing. The sharing of functions and sharing of spaces immediately adjacent to the rental rooms are the context through which self-centered individualism is conquered in support of an understanding that nurtures collectivity.

7.6.1 Strategies for designing the pattern of private dwelling units

To generate functions for sharing among residents in neighborhood, three strategies that are compared to the contemporary low-rent housing, I propose as below,
(1) Current problems of major contemporary low-rent housing: since the government has failed to build a sufficient number of the main household types needed by the second generation of rural migrants (the majority of them are young single persons), the current less suitable types of rental room are in excess of what is needed. The result is the most sought after unit types (single rooms) are well short of the number required.

**Strategy:** simplify the residential unit type according to the majority of migrant household compositions. The private rental dwelling units should be standardized into three types.

- **Dormitories**, where youths or visitors might be able to share a room, with a restroom.
- **Single room occupancy**, or single resident occupancy—one rental room in which one or two people are accommodated in one room with a toilet or a toilet with simple bathing function.
- **Double room occupancy**—a couple of migrants can be housed, in two rooms with a toilet or a toilet with a simple bathing function.
- **Three-four room occupancy**—a family-accompanied migrant residents can be lodged, three to four rooms with living room, kitchen, restroom (or bathroom).

(2) Current problems of major contemporary low-rent housing: the size of each type of rental room is far greater than what is needed to be comfortable. The cost of this extra space increases greatly the low-rent housing budget, the operation costs and also any maintenance fees which all mean the low-rent project is less affordable for the Chinese government in the long term. This even causes some cities to cancel their low-rent housing functions.
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**Strategy**: cut the size of each private dwelling unit; simplify the functions in each private unit.

- *The reduction in size of the private units. Compared to the standard residential unit, the private units are smaller because only functions such as sleeping and personal hygiene are kept inside the private unit, and the other functions (cooking, dining, resting) are relocated outside the private unit.*

- *Typical rental units have simplified functions into two parts: 1. Bedroom; 2. Restroom.*

(3) Current problems of major contemporary low-rent housing: the single dwelling unit is not the major unit in the current low-rent housing stock. This is why the Chinese government allows three or four single persons of non-family-relationship to apply for and share one big unit to meet the need for single rooms. However, this indirect supply of single rooms cannot satisfy the person who does not accept a degree of loss of privacy.

**Strategy**: in terms of the composition of private rental unit types, increase the single unit occupancy, because the majority of rural-to-urban migrants are single, then come couples and the least common situation is family-accompanied migrant residents. The more rental units we form, the less each one will cost, because fixed costs are distributed over more units. Designing a few larger rental units will lessen the price of the smaller units, and in the case of a small patio, the family-accompanied migrant residents will need a larger unit. Another situation is several single migrant residents would think about sharing a big unit, which would make sense.
7.6.2 Strategies for designing the pattern of communal units

(1) **Increase the size of the communal spaces for the shared functions and enrich the functions for the sake of migrant residents**

- *Enlarge the transitional spaces to the optimum size for each communal unit.* Compared to the standard corridor, there are more shared functions within the space, but shared functions differ according to the location of the transitional spaces (for example, corridors on upper floors, halls on ground floors, and streets between the rental houses)

- *Typical communal spaces outside of rental units have enriched functions for sharing divided into five aspects:* 1. Function for hygiene; 2. Function for cooking and dining; 3. Functions for storage and rest 4. Functions for social service and education; 5, functions for hobbies and recreation

(2) **Avoid increasing the density of dwellings, because this does not increase opportunities for communal activities. Instead, increase the densities of the shared functions.** It promotes more use of shared functions in specific locations which in turn will generate more communal activities

- Even though in high rise residential developments there is obviously a high density of residents on a small footprint, this does not necessarily mean that there are many opportunities for residents to gather

- In fact, the spatial composition of high rise residential developments, that is vertically stacked dwellings, creates low visibility of residents
and less communal space. It follows that there are proportionally fewer chances and locations for residents to gather. What is important is to increase the number and variety of shared functions in communal spaces in order to increase opportunities for residents to gather.

- Within the migrants’ acceptable level, locating more shared functions in the transitional communal space to create private units that are greater in quantity, more in spaciousness.

(3) The transitional communal spaces within the neighborhood ought to serve more than one main function in order to make residents show up at different times by using different functions combined with different spaces. These must assure the attendance of residents who go outside of their rental room to use (share) majority of amenities.

(4) Locating the shared functions in the active area on the most accessible pathway, corridor in front of the rental room, ground floor of rental house and communal building centrally located between the rental houses. Accessibility and visibility, easy accessibility to mosaic communal spaces is a very important goal. Communal units should be planned for ‘visitability’ without being fully accessible. Visitability is generally expressed as being access to the central part of each floor through the corridor, and each communal space with a wide door, open space, but not necessarily an entirely accessible outline and features.

7.6.3 Strategies for five categories of shared functions and the locations of the functions in low-rent housing

7.6.3.1 Five categories of shared functions
The design of low-rent housing should serve five functions for sharing. It includes:

(1) Function for hygiene (Table 7.24)
(2) Functions for cooking and dining (Table 7.25)
(3) Functions for storage and rest (Table 7.26)
(4) Functions for social service (Table 7.27)
(5) Functions for education and functions for hobbies and recreation (Table 7.28).

The strategies for the design of the functions of hygiene, cooking and dining, storage and rest

The strategy of the shared functions is to increase access to attractive indoor space by refraining from having some private space in favor of common rooms. Consequently, future low-rent housing constitutes an example of saving by sharing. Space may be saved both by reducing the normal dwelling unit and by accepting fewer private rooms than in non-shared living. The typical low-rent apartment comprises mostly one room and a restroom without any kitchen at all, and a few units only one or two rooms, while only a small percentage of all units have cooking facilities.

Those shared functions combined with the corridor, the cooking, dining, bathing, meeting, playing can all be accessed via the central kitchen, dining room, bathing room, living room in corridor, indicating the conspicuous role they are expected to have in the migrant residents’ lives. The dining-related spaces are nestled in three ways I propose on the corridor surrounded by the rental rooms. These communal spaces on the same floor level, are accessed by either an interior corridor connecting the cluster of rental rooms and the gate of the elevator or a public entrance to connect upstairs and downstairs.
Deliberate the subsequent types of private space and communal spaces for the low-rent house project, individually, or in some combination of accommodation categories:

- On the same floor level, cluster rental rooms, where every family owns their own rental room and a small piece of open space with the all-around patio (balconies) on each level

- The rental house is high-rise, and is usually up to thirty stories tall. They share communal spaces along a public corridor

- Shared homes within low-rent housing, where families or singles have their own private space and share a kitchen, dining and living area

- Single-room tenancy, where an individual basically probably has one or two rooms with a restroom (simple bathing) and no kitchen

- Dormitory, where young single migrants or guests can be capable of sharing a rental room, with restroom combined with bathing function, without private kitchens

- Large open spaces can be creatively restored for functions that can be shared, to make up the size shortage and function simplification of each single private rental room

- Low-rent housing neighborhood for the family-accompanied migrants is designed with full options in limited quantity. This kind of rental room is more expensive than single rental rooms, but they can be a part of a larger low-rent high-rise project.

The strategies for the design of the functions for social service, education and recreation

In answer to the question of what form of sharing migrants-caring service functions from migrants’ spontaneous-developed housing can transform it into
modern forms of living together in low-rent housing, two spaces supply the social functions. One is group-public and the other is neighborhood-public. A broader meaning of both spaces includes also places where everybody can frequent if they wish. A hall on the ground floor an example of what is transitional between the two meanings: anybody can enter and look around without obligation to join, in either individual or communal activities connected to both spaces.

Both daily-used and social service functions for the sake of migrants are equally important. Migrant residents have different demands in how they use and share such functions, so it is important that the spaces carrying these functions ought to be varied in location. The group-public space is located along the central corridor as the public space shared by the residents living on the same floor. It includes a sitting and relaxing space. An important character in sharing functions is played by the group-public and neighborhood-public spaces. The social service function should be organized around the corridor and on the ground floor. Those that remain provide an inkling to the way of accommodating that benefits from intermediary spaces to neighbors and areas of shared use.

The sharing of functions presents the idea of a working-together model to rehabilitate the modern building, which has inspired a number of spatial patterns. Following the shared function model, residents who move into the low-rent housing have formed an association that participates in the communal activities relating to their household work. The high-rise apartment area is to be reduced to allow generous collective spaces without increased construction costs.

Physical design of migrants’ low-rent housing that I proposed is fairly dissimilar from the conventional accommodation development in the context of architectural arrangement and dimension. Key components of low-rent housing development are communal space and individual dwellings located intentionally to encourage regular communal activities among tenants, while conserving privacy.
Table 7.2. The construction of functions for hygiene regarding the activities and corresponding facility plan in the low-rent housing neighborhood I recommend

**FUNCTION FOR HYGIENE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Spatial recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bathing      | Bathing room   | Locker room style shower   | Shared with residents
It could house shower, sauna, steam room, simple toilet
The size of the bathing room should correspond with the number of rental rooms
Clothes-washing sink connection to bathing is essential | The size of the bathing room should correspond with the number of rental rooms
Clothes-washing sink connection to bathing is essential
It could house dressing area, plumbing for future shower and toilet if not relatively near other toilets |
| Washing      | Laundry room   | Large communal wash station
Large wash sink and storage for supplies
Large doors open to outdoors allow circulation
Washing machines and dryer
Air drying is ideal | Shared (coin) laundry, iron facilities
Communal wash station
Considering how to deal with the air-laundry matter
The laundry room is a convenient shared amenity that draws residents into the public living room on a regular basis.
Large commercial washers and dryers can be comprised. | Consider folding area storage for soap, etc.
out of children’s reach
Ventilation
Provide clothes lines
Easy access to exterior if possible
Adjacent to path of travel to sitting room and/or individual homes, if possible
Well ventilated
The air-laundry can be located in the public space, like terrace
Preferably near laundry room
Open area for sitting |
| Restroom     | Restroom       | Co-ed restroom facility
Private floor to ceiling walled stalls separating each toilet | Restroom should be located separately instead of the rental room
A small public restroom is necessary
Consider one or two restroom(s) for sharing in the public living or laundry room | Combine the restroom with bathing room |
Table 7.25. The recommended construction of functions for cooking and dining regarding the activities and corresponding facility plan in the low-rent housing neighborhood

**FUNCTIONS FOR COOKING + DINING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Spatial recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Shared kitchen, cooking utensils</td>
<td>Kitchen sharing is a modular kitchen that will be placed in public spaces, for specific events and accessible by anyone who is living, even temporary, in a defined area. Storage space should be placed with the kitchen, the area should be considered with the number of the residents who share the kitchen.</td>
<td>Consider the spatial location of the shared kitchen to be convenient for migrant residents. Direct access for serving and transportation. Consider the size of the public kitchen. The connection between the public kitchen and public living room is important. Allowing the public kitchen for openness with the option of closing the kitchen off. Storage for pots, pans, dishes. The kitchen should make in an enclosed style instead of open one. Open to corridor as much as possible, but not at the cost of producing a noise and smell problem. Separation of dining and gatherings from kitchen noise (offer shutters or doors at all openings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigeration storage</td>
<td>Storing</td>
<td>Adjacent to the kitchen, one is a freezer and one is refrigeration</td>
<td>Multiple laces for storing dry goods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having meal</td>
<td>Dining room</td>
<td>Dining room with group seating tables &amp; chairs</td>
<td>Dining is the most frequent and important common space function.</td>
<td>Combine with public living room. Comfortable for one person as well as a crowd. Consider access to the wrap-around wrap-around balcony if possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living/sitting</td>
<td>Living/sitting room</td>
<td>Small lounge area off the kitchen a place that feels homey for one person and for a small group (say, 10 people)</td>
<td>The living/sitting room is like a great room, a common place where the community can gather. Migrant residents of all ages dine, celebrate and meet together in the space.</td>
<td>Located on the each floor Consider the various settings of the living room (say, a big living room shared by all the residents on the same floor, or groups of small living rooms shared by small groups of residents. It is near the main vertical circulation on each floor. A sitting room can be a small private living area adjacent to the dining room.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communal space occupies an area completely sufficient in size, meanwhile individual rental residences are slightly small referring to the conventional lodging. Low-rent housing with shared functions has merits with both communal and practical benefits. Residents share daily responsibilities on their own, function sharing and energy saving besides enabling communal activities with neighbors.

The low-rent housing with the social service functions for the sake of migrants can be a center for the migrant residents. The social service functions are the basis of the other functions (diverse economic, social service, and entertainment functions) of migrants’ low-rent housing. Consider the following types of spaces:

- **Social service for the sake of migrants, ought to be more accessible.** The location should be on the ground floor being most visible and accessible for population in need.

- **For social services, the subjects who share the services are not limited within a small group (residents living on the same floor or same building), but expanded through the whole low-rent neighborhood, or even all migrants who need assistance.**

- **The communal spaces with social service functions do not need to be repeated within one neighborhood. Shared social service functions may be housed in separate apartment on the site.**

- **Prioritization of communal spaces with social service functions (Essential items, very important items, important, nice to have, do not care if we have this or not).**

The sharing of functions presents the idea of a working-together model to rehabilitate the modern building, which has inspired a number of spatial patterns. Following the shared function model, residents who move into the low-rent housing have formed an association that participates in the communal activities relating to
### Table 7.2. The recommended construction of functions for storage and rest regarding the activities and corresponding facility plan in the low-rent housing neighborhood

#### FUNCTIONS FOR STORAGE + REST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Spatial recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smaller storages, changing clothes,</strong></td>
<td>Storage room, locker</td>
<td>An indoor place to store things</td>
<td>A room or area designated for changing residents’ clothes. Storage room</td>
<td>Proximity to the laundry and bathing room if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>small storages,</strong></td>
<td>room, dressing room</td>
<td>to store things and change</td>
<td>(changing room) are provided in a semi-public situation to enable residents to store their simple stuff</td>
<td>Lots of natural lighting and privacy from partition walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group living,</strong></td>
<td>Public living room</td>
<td>An entry area is an important</td>
<td>Considering whether the public living room can be connected with the public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- private and group - public life in front of the rental room</strong></td>
<td>Entry sofa, chairs, table</td>
<td>element of the communal space</td>
<td>kitchen, one of the functions in the public living room is that residents have a meal together, this is especially for majority of single migrant residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chatting/ Resting</strong></td>
<td>Exterio r wrap-around</td>
<td>Connecting to each rental room</td>
<td>Public living room can be located in a place with a good view and a better</td>
<td>Definetly combine with dining room, connected to wrap-around balcony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- balcony</strong></td>
<td>balcony</td>
<td>and communal rooms of each floor</td>
<td>ventilated space</td>
<td>Consider a closed-off area for quieter dining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- sitting room</strong></td>
<td>Chairs, small storage</td>
<td>Wrap-around balcony supplies the</td>
<td>Public living room can be put in each rental high-rise apartment. The</td>
<td>View of outside area important, proximity as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td>box</td>
<td>residents living in the high-rises a chance of having residents’ own open space</td>
<td>public tv room, computer room, gym can be the facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td>Public living room, TV,</td>
<td>This is the main gathering area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- sofa, table, tackboard space for announce-</strong></td>
<td>sofa, table, tackboard</td>
<td>of each floor. Here, residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ments</strong></td>
<td>space for announcements</td>
<td>share their gatherings for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td>meetings of the whole community,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td><strong>- sofa, table, tack-</strong></td>
<td>celebrate and dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td><strong>board space for announce-ments</strong></td>
<td>Space for recreation (tv room can be fixed on the ground level of each high-rise building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td>Accommodate other gathering and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td>functions (lounging, space for tv, playing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td>Include an open area to accommodate other vigorous activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td>(after moving tables &amp; chairs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td>Acoustically quiet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td>Comfortable for one person as well as a group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td>Windows nice but not required to get lots of natural light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td>Can be one on the middle floor shared by the whole building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td><strong>- room</strong></td>
<td>Considering whether recreation room can be put in each rental high-rise apartment. The public tv room, computer room, gym can be the facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their household work. The high-rise apartment areas are to be reduced to allow generous collective spaces without increased construction costs.

In the search for answers to the question of what form of shared functions from migrants’ spontaneous-developed housing can transform it into modern forms of living together in low-rent housing. An important character in sharing functions is played by small-scale, mixed-use alleyways. The majority of such alleyways have had to give way in modern housing projects. Those that remain provide an inkling to a way of accommodating that benefits from intermediary spaces to neighbors and areas of sharing use. The order of shared functions is based on the intermediary spaces. The shared functions have characterized migrants’ spontaneous-developed housing neighborhoods. Shared functions for low-rent housing forms can do justice to the modern high-rise towers. Although the term ‘function-sharing’ refers merely to exact communal activities to the corresponding intermediary spaces, it has turned out to be synonymous for spaces to live and share between residents and residents. I emphasize one major component in residents’ ‘function-sharing’ to their neighborhood. It is: an extension of home—space immediately to the rental room is

![Diagram](image.png)

Figure 7.7. Ways of setting up the community space on the ground floor
Table 7.2. The recommended construction of functions for social service and education regarding the activities and the corresponding facility plan in the low-rent housing neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Spatial recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrants’ kids recreation</td>
<td>Migrant youth and community center</td>
<td>Enclosed offices and receptionist table desk Small separate rooms hold educational seminars, workshops, and training sessions Information center, employment agency on the ground level</td>
<td>Non-profit, migrant community-based organization Direct towards recently-migrated, economically disadvantaged youths and their families who experience coping and adjustment difficulties Considering migrants’ low-rent housing neighborhood can be a self-contained, migrants’ caring community, support the migrating life of migrants in various ways</td>
<td>Locating the shared function in the active area on the most accessible pathway, corridor in front of the rental room, ground floor of rental house and communal building centrally located between the rental houses. Most visible space located on the first floor and in the middle of the whole neighborhood Open space with visibility to access points onto the site. Public informative views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants family meeting</td>
<td>Migrants family counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal information consulting</td>
<td>Legal advice center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant health caring</td>
<td>Simple neighborhood clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining work opportunities, gaining information</td>
<td>Information and referral center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial activities</td>
<td>Commercial center</td>
<td>Convenience stores, restaurant, pharmacy etc.</td>
<td>Concentrated in low-rent housing neighborhoods are retail and service establishments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2. The recommended construction of functions for hobby and recreation regarding the activities and corresponding facility plan in the low-rent housing neighborhood

**FUNCTIONS FOR HOBBY + RECREATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Spatial recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studying</td>
<td>Classroom area</td>
<td>Vaulted space used for group lessons and childcare</td>
<td>Creative environment for the purposes of education connection to the environment</td>
<td>Adjacent to path of travel to sitting room and/or individual homes, if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using computer</td>
<td>Computer loft</td>
<td>A small loft area with internet connection for the use of computer and laptop computers</td>
<td>Private and quiet place to work</td>
<td>Preferably located on the interval between a few floors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Training center</td>
<td>Basic skills training center, legal aid center on the ground level</td>
<td>Non-profit, community-based organization, diverse functions and services to meet the evolving needs of rural-to-urban migrant population</td>
<td>Located on the main level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbies</td>
<td>Hobby room</td>
<td>Large enough area for a ping pong table, open area for roughhousing, area for casual lounging, tv cart</td>
<td>Set up as an informal meeting space and library</td>
<td>Considering locating more skill-improved training services for migrants, especially for the newcomers. These training services make the migrants’ low-rent neighborhood into an educative community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utility room can be combined with public living room, located on the ground floor of each building.
Note: Spatial composition is typically function-managed and maintained, therefore, the design should support residents to make use of these functions.
function only a part of its interior. The extension of the home (interior) can be the key to the new forms of low-rent housing and living together.

Communal activities and a sense of community are important when daily responsibilities are achieved together. When some of the household errands—food preparation, and such, are transferred from the individual family to the communal group, they turn out to be a matter that fosters relationships between resident and resident. As a result, it is not merely a physical arrangement and a rationalization of an individual person’s work which take place. Likewise, previously unseen work becomes visible, private work becomes communal work. Communal use of places and equipment, instead of their acquirement by each private individual and household, saves function and physical functions. Though TV sets and videos are now privately owned, home space use might be fairly unevenly distributed if this cooperative living becomes a pattern.

The strategy mentioned in the previous chapter involves the integration of living with shared daily-used and social service functions. Propinquity and frequency in day-to-day interactions can mean more direct cooperation and a richer life for the majority single migrant residents living in the low-rent housing. The new organization of everyday life, represented here by communal housing, must be maintained by means of dwelling configuration, architecture and the built-up surroundings.

Some key requirements could be talked about: physical proximity as positive characteristic supports residents to encounter and propinquity; low-rise and high density as a characteristic of building configuration might support the idea of closeness more than the prevalent high-rise apartment towers. Here, connected with low-rent housing for migrant residents, living by sharing, helping each other is likely to be delivered in any form of various accommodation patterns.
Proximity to functions, daily-used and social services for the sake of migrants, are essential. Migrant residents’ participation ought to be sustained by the spatial configuration: flexibility of the house can assist the achievement of residents’ short and long term requirements. The housing arrangement and design procedure should be consistent with this adaptability.

7.6.3.2 The location of different shared functions in low-rent housing.

Finally, the strategy for improving the communal life of low-rent housing is presented in three spaces, they are, in front of the rental room, in front of the rental house, and between the rental houses. The strategies are physical qualities that create and support the communal activities of the transitional spaces in the low-rent housing. For the structure of this strategy, I present suggestions based on fieldwork from the three low-rent case studies. These suggestions also derive from recordings of the case studies.

(1) The upper floor level: functions for daily use

Instead of replicating the conventional cellular corridor rental housing type, based on experience from my fieldwork (Table 7.29), I introduce two points for architects’ consideration. First, in contrast to the conventional existing design solutions of the residential house, the architects of low-rent housing should make a reduction in size of the private units to meet the minimal needs of migrant residents while enlarging the size of the communal units to the optimum amount. To be precise, the size of individual units should be reduced while the area of the public corridor is enlarged in low-rent housing. Second, the corridor in front of the rental room becomes a center ground for the daily functions that previously existed inside of individual rooms (the functions for daily use are connected to the person-centered residential care).
Table 7.29. The strategy of spatial arrangement of upper floor with daily-used functions

|①| The reduction in size of the private units to meet the minimal needs of migrant residents while enlarging the size of the communal units to the optimum amount  
②| In terms of the functions, the corridor in front of the rental room becomes a centerground for the daily functions that previously existed inside of individual rooms (the functions for daily use are connected to the person-centered residential care)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed function, consideration and patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The communal spaces involve the functions concerning residents’ necessities for daily use. The essential function (priority 1) consists of dining, cooking, laundrying, bathing and sitting. The corresponding space is dining room, kitchen with coffee bar, laundry room, restroom/bathing room and the living room/the East room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of the residents are single young rural migrants, the important function (priority 2) consists of store, multi-purpose activities (study, reading, watching tv/movie, meeting/relaxing), having open space on the upper floor level. The corresponding space is storage room, small multi-purpose room (library, study room, tv/movie room, meeting room with sofa), roof garden and wrap-around balcony of each floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nice-to-have function (priority 3) consists of kids’ playing, relaxing/meditating, workout. The corresponding space is teen room, meditation room, exercise/movement room, exercise machines room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each low-rent housing are not forced to blindly follow the whole shared functions. In contrast, they can select which portion of the priority rank is the fitting solution for their requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The East room is a sunny, quiet room with comfortable furniture, with small reading and DVD collections available for neighbor use. It is often used for team meetings and other small neighborhood discussions and conversations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Living/sitting room provide transition areas between the individual rental rooms and outdoor. Their recommended locations would be connected to the dining room and a porch as part of the entry of the wrap-around balcony (external circulation paths on each floor)  
If wrap-around balcony is not available, the living/sitting space are better centrally located, visible and recognizable, observable from most units. It can be near the entry to vertical circulation (elevator) of major outdoor activity, they will provide ready opportunities for communal life among neighbors |
| The design of the communal dwelling unit should be in such a way that activities indoors can flow outdoors. This may suggest that there should be access directly from the kitchen, dining area or living room to the outdoor areas that ought to be situated, if possible, with a connection to such interior places and facing the communal side of the dwelling unit |
| The living space can be a enclosed space or a open space, a place that is for one person and for a small crowd (movable furnishings for flexibility) |
| Large square windows open onto the corridor, providing natural lighting and ventilation |

In a large-scale high-rise apartment, mid-sized public kitchens can be shared by small groups (3-4 households) of residents living on the same floor, instead of a big group of residents, in doing so this ensures a comfortable and enjoyable cooking experience and chance encounters. Sharing with a small group permits residents to linger comfortably with their neighbor.
Table 7.29. The strategy of spatial arrangement of upper floor with daily-used functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed function, consideration and patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At a minimum, kitchen incorporate one sitting-height counter area, consider extra cooktop &amp; sink at lower height as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to the dining room and the public living/sitting room. If the kitchen is totally exposed to the communal living/sitting room, it facilitates casual contact with the cooks and can feel more like a home. But it is more considerate to be able to close the kitchen off, so as the noise from housework and/or cooking does not bother gatherings in the living room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough storage space for simple stuff or cooking utensils (jars, pots, plates, comprise open storage for easy finding of stuffs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If possible, including a dining room with the kitchen area requires considering separating dining and social meetings from the kitchen noise (shutters or doors at all openings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider a divided area for quieter dining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referring to the <em>Yimuyuan</em> case, the sidewalk space immediately adjacent to the rental room is functionally a part of its interior. Considering the location and function of the neighboring space of the dining room to diversify the function of the dining room (e.g., semi-open spaces, wrap-around balcony)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom cannot be accepted to be shared with others, so restroom should be separately used by single tenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple bathing facilities can be considered for inclusion into the non-shared restroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A one-toilet restroom can be designed next to the public kitchen or included into the public bathroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The laundry room is a convenient shared convenience that draws residents into the communal space on a regular basis. Large washers, dryers (provide clothes lines), folding area can be comprised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The laundry room should have window and well-ventilation for air-drying, provide clothes lines both interior and exterior (roof garden) if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All daily-used functional spaces are adjacent to path of travel to living/sitting area or individual rental rooms, if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each low-rent housing apartment includes communal spaces on each floor for communal activities and shared function, not just an open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents access the ground floor from the upper floors using either a small elevator or a stairwell both located in the core of the building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This concept is to create low-rent housing with more spaces for sharing and these spaces are supplied with the necessary functions that residents require. I also list the physical arrangement details in Table 7.29. These details form the layout of the strategy of the spatial arrangement on the upper floor according to the 2 points I suggest. The architects should consider which spaces residents want to keep for privacy, and which spaces residents are willing to share with other residents. After being built, the residents can use the low-rent housing according to the corresponding guidelines. Architects are responsible for explaining to residents what the basic rules and expectations are and how to explain the use of the private and sharing units in the low-rent housing.

(2) The ground floor level: functions for commercial and recreation uses

The second point of the design guidelines concerns functions on the ground level of the low-rent housing (Table 7.30). I propose that for designers, first, the plan of the indoor communal spaces on the ground floor must be designed to be extended to the outdoor, and allow indoor activities to flow outdoors. Second, the results of the interview and survey in this study revealed that, in the Yimuyuan and Vanke Tulou neighborhoods, the majority of migrant households patronize local commercial and recreation functions which are within a few minutes walking distance. Consequently, the ground floor of each low-rent house takes on commercial and recreation functions (the functions are connected to the local corner stores, restaurants, library, studying room, computer cafes, commercial and recreation functions alike). Spaces with commercial functions not only provide conveniences for individuals but also help to enhance migrant residents’ participation to the local areas.
Table 7.30. The strategy of spatial arrangement of the ground floor with commercial and recreation functions

③ The plan of the indoor communal spaces on the ground floor must be designed to be extended to the outdoor, and allow indoor activities to flow outdoors. Well-defined in-between components such as semi-private and semi-public spaces ought to be supplied on the ground floor. Also, residents can only reach their rental rooms indirectly by ways of communal halls, elevators, or galleries.

④ In terms of the functions, the ground floor of each low-rent house takes on the commercial and recreation functions (the functions are connected to the local corner stores, restaurants, library, studying room, computer cafes, commercial and recreation functions alike).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed function, consideration and patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The design of communal spaces of the ground floor are partly connected with the inside of the rental house on the ground floor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Essential function (priority 1) consists of preparing and serving food, selling daily stuff, kids’ playing, gathering, talking, multi-purpose activities |
| The function supplied by the ground floor includes mainly restaurants, grocery stores, kids room, living/sitting room, communal hall, small multi-function room |

| Important function (priority 2) consists of reading, playing computer and meeting |
| The corresponding space is library/studying room, computer café and meeting/sitting room |

| Each apartment unit is accessed from a corridor via a partially covered forecourt or entrance porch |
| Communal spaces on the ground floor can relate to the street in front of the rental house, while providing a communal courtyard on the interior |

| The results of the interview in this study, the majority of household patrolize local corner stores, restaurants, and relaxing spaces are within few minutes walking distance and that these are important social places. It is necessary to provide more than one corner grocery stores or relaxing places within the low-rent housing neighborhood |
| Cooperative to provide shared-working space for migrant residents who living in this low-rent housing. Shared-working space can be involved with taking care of meals (restaurant), cleaning, laundry, and daycare, local shops, beauty salon, barber shop and convenience store |

| The majority of the residents are young rural people, the small-function room can be included into the study function, entertainment function, exercise function etc |
| Storage space (for example, cooking utensils: jars, pots, plates, comprise open storage for easy finding of stuffs) can be located outside of the individual rental room, for example, in front of the rental room or back of the rental room on the exterior wrap-around balcony |

| Kids’ area if possible but consideration the auditory separation. Kids’ room is open to the hall as much as possible, connected to exterior space but with |
| Design with restaurant for shared-work by local migrant residents. Not all residents might have wanted to cook their meals in the public kitchen, instead preferring to have meals in public restaurant, so that residents could go down to the restaurant within their apartments rather than going out or cook by themselves |

| Public restroom are included on the ground floor |
| Alternative space with provision of guest room (suite) for for migrant residents’ friends or their families for their visit |
3. The plan of the indoor communal spaces on the ground floor must be designed to be
extended to the outdoor, and allow indoor activities to flow outdoors. Well-defined in-between
components such as semi-private and semi-public spaces ought to be supplied on the ground
floor. Also, residents can only reach their rental rooms indirectly by ways of communal halls,
elevators, or galleries

4. In terms of the functions, the ground floor of each low-rent house takes on the commercial
and recreation functions (the functions are connected to the local corner stores, restaurants,
library, studying room, computer cafes, commercial and recreation functions alike)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed function, consideration and patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guest suite with full option is preferable, but bathroom may also be shared with other guests or other normal residents, but provide a discreet way to get the bathroom from bedrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider close-off area for quieter requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to these social service spaces via exterior is important. If possible, avoid entry from interior is for quieter residential environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid designing entry of the commercial space open to the indoor if possible (serving but not at the expense of creating a noise problem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance porch, steps of the entrance should be sheltered. If possible, porch can be portion of (or connected to) entrance of the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balcony on the ground is referring to the airy semi-open space annexed to the main low-rent house accessible from the ground, whether it is the entrance porch in the front or the back. Based on the field observation in the Yimuyuan area, the entrance steps deliver transition area between the indodor and outdoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main gathering area should be near the entrance of each low-rent house. It connects interior with exterior through porches, patios and decks surrounded by good seating (steps, low walls, benches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail area and bulletin board are included in the hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hall, or great room is the main gathering area in the single low-rent house. It inorporate sitting areas for a crowd as well as one person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besides the hall, there are one space, like a parlor, which residents could share as an area of repose and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice some lesser priority spaces for high ceiling area on the ground floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The layout of ground floor creates communal spaces that are more public and help making these spaces exposed to public. Such spaces facing street within neighborhood are to be landscaped in a manner that supports with the visibility between the porches of others and walkways in the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3) *The housing-street level: functions for social-service use*

Housing-street level between the rental houses relates to the arrangement of recreation and commercial functions (Table 7.31). Spaces with social-service functions help migrants with an effective adaptation to rural-to-urban migration. Commercial and business activities for migrants, as well as functions and services are directed towards those who have recently migrated, economically disadvantaged youths and families who have experienced managing and adjustment troubles.

The spatial arrangement of three spaces with different functions for the low-rent housing pushes us toward subsequent considerations. First, the strategy presents the space design from the spatial function aspects, it suits a wiser physical background. Architects should use the strategies as a basis for their own design of low-rent housing.

Second, the strategy takes who account the full range of functions that can be combined with the low-rent housing for the sake of rural-to-urban migrants. However, architects can selectively choose parts of the recommended functions and the location of functions. Their selections can help to determine the physical structure and constituents for designing the migrants’ low-rent housing. Therefore, architects can choose the most fitting parts of strategies that are suitable for their requirements.
Table 7.31. The strategy of spatial arrangement of between rental house and streets with social-service and recreation functions

| ⑤ Creating continuous experiences involved with sharing functions between houses and public streets are parts of residents’ social lives, and they enable residents to frequent these places. Additionally, daily experiences need to be scattered around low-rent housing |
| ⑥ In terms of the functions, the house-street level between the rental houses takes on the functions for social services, recreation for the sake of rural-to-urban migrants (functions for social services are connected by three aspects: helping migrants with the effective adaptation of rural-to-urban migration, commercial and business activities for migrants, functions and services directed towards those who have recently migrated, economically disadvantaged youths and families who experienced managing and adjustment troubles) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed function, consideration and patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The communal spaces involve the functions concerning migrant residents’ necessities of social service for their effective adaptation of rural-to-urban migration. The essential function (priority 1 between the rental houses and public streets) consists of occupation seeking, , information counseling, house searching, migrants’ legal right support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The corresponding space is occupation agency, information center, the real estate, legal assist agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of the residents are single young rural migrants, the important function (priority 2) consists of skill training, educating, reading, studying, watching tv/movie, meeting and playing, exercising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The corresponding space is technical training center, school, library, studying room, living/tv room, meeting/sitting room, ping-pong room and gym/basketball playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nice-to-have function (priority 3) consists of playing of teenager, meditating, workout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The corresponding space is teen room, meditation room, exercise/movement room, exercise machines room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The function supplied by the communal spaces includes mainly counseling service, information referral center, employment development, on-the-job-training, workshops and educational functions, legal advice center for the sake of migrants. The size of each space will be determined by use and needs

Spaces with social service functions for the sake of migrant residents are suggested not to scatter within the neighborhood, in cluster or gathering in one communal building instead. For example, each community includes a larger building facility, a ‘common house,’’ constituting the social service center of the complex where neighbors can meet, attend to activities which includes find help or information, but traditionally are not required on a daily basis, and even host guests in small guest house suite

Between the rental houses, two levels of shared functions should be present to bring communal activities. The first, basic shared function, bring residents to a specific place because they need to make use of. Transporation functions can be as basic uses. The second, more intricately mixed function, education, training, information and recreation fill in this function

Communal building: high-density high-rise apartment dwelling units are the most common low-rent housing typie, the communla building serving for the whole neighborhood, should place just next to the main entrance of this neighborhood for easy drop-in

Communal hall: the setting of spaces with social-service function should be centrally located on the ground floor or lower floors of a communal building (where population is concentrated) in order to be easily accessible by the users. Proximity to open space or playground is preferred
Low-rent housing support from a collective lifestyle from a background of traditional extended families in their use of shared functions

Definitions of the extended family must be flexible enough to accommodate a wide variety of family residential forms in the low-rent housing. For such residents, an extended family system can be defined as different individual migrants with the same backgrounds who are intimately involved. The emphasis in the extended family

---

Table 7.31. The strategy of spatial arrangement of between rental house and streets with social-service and recreation functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed function, consideration and patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A direct accessibility to dwelling from street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A need for the in-between spaces between dwelling and street, including a nice place to sit at connection with entry, indoor adjacent to the outdoor can be functionally a part of its indoor area if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design an outdoor main gathering area in the low-rent housing. Site selection can be in the center of the neighborhood or included inside of the open spaces. Here, gathering for meetings of the migrants’ community, celebrate and party. At the same time, this space is better to be felt homey and welcoming, which can be a challenge for a space of the size required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical arrangement of residential streets in the form of tartan or net structure. Streets ought to be arranged with short blocks and more turn corners to locate these ranked categorization of the shared-functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement of diverse commercial and social service facilities within comfortable walking distance from each single rental houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a shared garden and a children’s play structure, and exercise yard located in the cluster between the rental houses. These spaces will accommodate flower and vegetable gardens and act as a social space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Creating continuous experiences involved with sharing functions between houses and public streets are parts of residents’ social lives, and they enable residents to frequent these places. Additionally, daily experiences need to be scattered around low-rent housing.

6. In terms of the functions, the house-street level between the rental houses takes on the functions for social services, recreation for the sake of rural-to-urban migrants (functions for social services are connected by three aspects: helping migrants with the effective adaptation of rural-to-urban migration, commercial and business activities for migrants, functions and services directed towards those who have recently migrated, economically disadvantaged youths and families who experienced managing and adjustment troubles).
is rarely on a kinship network as a unit. Strategies and plans have been concentrated on individual migrants who comprise the extended family—single young migrants, couple migrants, and family-accompanied migrants.

Thus, the broad range of shared functions affects the needs of these migrating members living as one extended family. Almost all design strategies now recognize the problems confronted by rural migrants and their families in the current low-rent housing. Living with shared functions calls for a concentrated collaborative network, and elevating the rural migrant group’s quality of life in an alternative living environment can satisfy residents’ specific needs at different migrating life-stages. Young single migrant residents will need more practical benefit functions than emotional support in the community, while elderly family residents require the opposite priority.

This study of migrants’ spontaneous-developed low-rent housing shows that the individual tenants had smaller rental units than normal. Among the tenants interviewed, the majority expressed a willingness to keep to the simplification of the private room sizes and have more spaces for sharing with others. It was found that the size of the minimum consumption for housing is too large with regard to the ‘approach for affordable housing management’. It prescribes that the size of dwelling units should be less than 60 square meters, but in fact, most of the housing developers do not follow this when developing housing and its construction.186

The reduction of individual space perhaps goes further in youth communes. In the Yimuyuan case, individual members had a smaller size of rental room than the national average (which is about 40 sqm per person). Residents often share facilities such as the kitchen, restroom, storage, laundry and water resources. To save by

---

sharing is not only a question of keeping to space standards. It is also an issue of accepting the fact of having fewer rooms for private use. For the purpose of exploring this issue I recorded some young migrant residents in their rental housing in the Yimuyuan neighborhood and asked them whether it is easy to accept less space in their low-rent housing.

(Chen, single migrant tenant) ‘Simplification of functions in our rental room is exactly what we have now! You see, I have a one-room home (sleeping and reading) and I do many other things in the communal spaces. This does not mean that we spend most of our time down in this situation (sharing so much space). on the contrary, the sense is that my personal space is expanded.

(Feng, couple migrant tenant) Actually, it seems like we (my wife and I) have a bigger rental home than we actually have. The kitchen in front of our rental room means that our room does not have to be as chaotic and smelly as it usually becomes when cooking.

The number of households of the young generation of migrants is high in China. The reason is that young migrant people move from their parents at an early age; that urban life anticipation is combined with self-governing living. Thus, a large quantity of one-person families occupies the largest percentage (70%) of the whole number of migrants. About 30% of young migrant households are two-person households. Therefore, in the Yimuyuan case, the majority of the pattern of rental rooms is one or two-person households. The housing with shared functions could be the ‘fitting’ pattern, if migrant households in over-standard dwellings would move to houses matching their needs. The main advantage of this is that low-rent housing are facing an extremely acute shortage crisis.

The ‘migration explosion’ and ‘low-rent housing shortage’ are national-wide phenomena in China. Urban expansion, a mobile labor market and other structural changes have resulted in a growing quantity of one and two-person families. This situation means that our national conventional methods to provide accommodation become ‘unfitting’. A growing number of residents feel seclusion in their dwelling
surroundings, and under this conditions neighborly cooperation turns out to be more significant in handling the problems of excessive use of or lack of functions.

Work shall be shared by everyone. Space shall be collectively organized, keeping in mind the necessities of migrant groups. By sharing functions and spaces, people living in low-rent housing have access to many more facilities than they would on their own. Kitchen, dining area, bathing room, storage, gardens, play areas, workshops, lounges, social service spaces for the sake of migrants are a part of low-rent housing communal facilities. The spatial surroundings will deliver occasions for communal activities as well as for seclusion and privacy. This situation should be flexible to meet new requirements and supply chances for generating different morals and patterns of life style. Communal foundations for maintenance and social services should be well placed to react to residents’ need for relief. Sharing of responsibility between public and private providers can vary in line with the need.

Figure 7.9. Compare of accommodation of today and the vision of sharing function proposing
The low-rent housing neighborhood is not merely a domain where migrants dwell together, but it is a community where residents share their daily lives, much more than conventional neighbors do. The shared functions and degree to which residents are actually doing things together in their everyday life are done to the extent that the inhabitants choose by themselves. While this is true, it is important that all members of the low-rent residential groups have similar purposes and prospects. The cooperative living model for the alternate daily life emphases what we have defined as the transitional level. In other words, the interface could be established within the residential environment between private households and the public division. Individuals and families can collaborate with each other, but also with locally grounded care spaces.

The same as in different countries where household ethics have been robust the improvement is going towards gender equality and new city lifestyles. In the low-rent function-sharing housing I propose a practical level of sharing community to deliver security and valuable communal contact simultaneously as individual privacy is upheld. The sharing of all kinds of functions offers more efficient use of space and a new pattern of cooperation that stimulates function-based environmental-friendly methods of accommodating.

How can communal activities be promoted through sharing? How can design promote a more cooperative and efficient use of space? In a study of three migrants’ low-rent housing, it was concluded that the communal activities are only achieved in spaces where the functions can be provided and can be shared. It is noticed that intermediary spaces between rental room, rental house, and neighborhood have established a significant spatial location. To conclude, the corridor turns out to be a communal zone for sharing among residents, a place where ‘residents can nurture their social life through sharing a provided function’—an area that acts as an agency for a ‘reciprocated bond’. By means of these experiences of sharing, egoism is overwhelmed by collectivism.
The role of ‘low-rent housing’ in the adjustment of rural-to-urban migrant population makes a difference from the spatial pattern in normal housing neighborhoods. The recent Chinese government launched low-rent neighborhoods are no more than the gathering of the low-rent multi-family apartment blocks in a city background. This differentiates the migrants’ spontaneous gathering from the circumstances. I propose that function simplification and size reduction may seem make the private-using space becomes small, but this becomes more impressive if we consider that many of the individuals are migrant working class people in the process of forming a family. That people made a conscious selection in support of smaller houses is sustained by the fact that residents conveyed their inclination to decrease their rental room sizes pertaining to their approaching communal functions or facilities and the warmth accompanying shared facilities.

The migrants’ low-rent housing emphasizes residents’ cooperation and sharing in their daily life. The residents have had to accept some reduction in their dwelling unit dimensions and the simplification of unit functions in order to enhance communal activities and increase the quantity of units with shared kitchens and other amenities. The residents have extended their activities outside of their rental room. Communal activities connected with daily-used work are characteristic of this pattern.

To conclude, living through sharing different categories of functions complies with the strong needs of communal activities. The fact that migrants have lost memories associated with their extended families, old neighbours and the house, and had to leave the things they have valued behind and put emotional stress to themselves accentuates their desire and need for more communal integration.
Chapter 8. Conclusion

8.1 Criticism of modern high-rise low-rent neighborhoods in reference to Chengzhongcun neighborhood

(1) Nonattendance of provided functions

Exactly speaking, the high-rise configuration is not a barrier to neighbourly ties, and certainly it is not a real cause of the absence of communal life or even isolation. The same is true for open space that is greatly suggested in recent design. Similarly, the open space itself cannot act as ‘people attractors’ for communal activities and surely it is not a real motivation of the existence of communal life. Places which fail to generate close-knit communal activities, such as the Minxin jiayuan, do not do so because of a lack of open space or people but because of nonattendance of provided functions that allow for sharing. Accordingly, no matter how successful the open space present is, communal activities are only achieved where the functions can be provided and can be shared.

It has been argued in this study that, space and its relationship with the ‘function-based’ communal activities builds a symbolic expression in a sense of neighborhood. The modern manufacturing low-rent high-rise neighborhood voices differently. The fact is that the modern house is now removed the whole function to the inside from the outside in the three transitional spaces. Communal activities through functions are a phenomenon that combines spatial and social aspects. In the Minxin jiayuan high-rise neighborhood, the boundary in front of the rental room, rental house and between the houses is secluded with the shared function. The function between the inside (rental room) and outside (the three transitional spaces)
are fixed. The fixed inside and outside do not allow the sharing of the functions and accordingly the corresponding communal activities cannot be stayed.

Each room is functionally fixed, invalidating any need to share. The corridor in front of the rental room is now simply linking between the rental rooms and the gate of the rental house through the elevator. The alleyways in front of the rental houses without shared functions invalidate any possibility to form collective communal activities with other spaces by willingly sacrificing some degree of privacy to gain the necessary familiarity and trust. To repeat, the function is in excess of a physical concern; it is the issue of the communal character of a group of residents and of how their communal activities can also be enunciated through sharing the functions.

(2) No sharing experiences

In modern low-rent houses, however, the sharing of the provided functions that exist on a neighborhood scale are narrowed down to exist in a separate room scale. The spatial structure of the modern low-rent house expresses the emphasis on the individual or a family and its clear distinction between ‘the rental rooms as inside and outside of the rental rooms are as outside’. With this transformation, the potential of establishing a larger whole for the sense of neighborhood cannot be molded.

Accordingly, the loss of functions resulting from the emergence of spatially outlined categorized rooms has an effect that weakens, the communal activities at various level cannot be as embodied in the modern houses. From the perspective of the 3 transitional spaces, what is most distinguishing about the modern low-rent house is the lost function combined with corridor and alleyway. In the modern low-rent neighborhood, even though the three transitional spaces still physically stand in the middle of the rental room, the rental house and between the houses, they function without having any provided function that is shown to be shared. The lesson of migrants’ spontaneous-developed low-rent neighborhood, is in the relation between
residents and function through the spaces, without understanding this, relations between resident and resident cannot be established.

(3) One-way relationship

In the modern high-rises, the three transitional spaces merely introduce the relationship between residents and space. Without the sharing experiences, the relationship of residents to the shared functions cannot be established. Accordingly, the inter-personal relationship among residents or communal activities cannot also be generated in modern high-rise life.

The neighborly relation is embodied by the most solid form in which communal activities appears in reference to residents’ daily affairs. Furthermore, residents’ contact with transitional spaces is not a matter of isolated activity, but an issue of continuing and humanizing the function-based communal sense of neighborhood. What leads us to acquire the comprehending of communal activities is the shared functions. For this reason, the three transitional spaces do not seem to be a device for the function. The three transitional spaces are just a physical setting, however, cannot bring any communal activities due to the loss of function for sharing.

In this context, I claimed that the distinction of the level of communal activities between ‘migrants’ spontaneously-developed housing’ and ‘high-rises’ residents is not an architectural configuration issue in the three cases. The fact that makes use of functions or sharing functions is the actual motivation for residents to contribute to communal activities.

8.2 Design effects on communal activities

8.2.1 Design influence on communal activities

In the low-rent residential area, the spatial design of neighboring environment greatly affects the level and character of outdoor activities. The value of a variety of
surroundings in the outline of low-rent housing proposals lies in their potential to endow residents’ involvement in a variety of roles. Such diversified settings generate plentiful occasions for residents to cooperate and communicate with a number of other residents, which increases the likelihood of conflict but also permits a growth in empathy and acceptance.

What is desirable in designing low-rent inhabited communities is a planning structure that can comprise the connection between function combined with the communal spaces and physical organization. The intensity of communal activities seems to have resulted from three inter-connected factors: the support for casual social interaction provided by their sharing the function; the physical planning, and the thoughtful balance between privacy and community, maintained at every level from site-planning to the design of individual front doors.

A housing design incorporates shared outdoor spaces bounded wholly, or in part, by the dwellings. It serves and is designed with different function for a great variety of migrant residents. The physical spaces turn out to be a communal zone for sharing among residents, a place where ‘residents can nurture their communal life through sharing the provided function’

The internal communal spaces will allow residents to meet the ‘exterior’, and in that way build neighborliness and maintain a stronger sense of community than a design where there is no enclosed collective ‘exterior’ space. Between an open space and a semi-open space, residents with choices have a greater possibility to establish communal activities and a strong sense of community than ones where there is no option. The weighting between privacy and community is crucial. Low-rent accommodation design which appears dissimilar from the normal accommodation or environments probably enhances residents’ strong feeling of the community.
Except the economic cost consideration, the other motivation for moving into low-rent housing is that migrants do not demand total privacy, and they desire to have positive connections with other inhabitants by means of sharing function and activities in line with the fundamental strategy of low-rent housing. The layout of shared function and the corresponding area between them assists the formation of communal roles and makes certain communal relationships more likely than other factors. The function, are the reasons why the individual person makes use of and is intertwined with inter-personal relationships at all planning stages.

8.2.2 Messages to the design professionals

From a spatial perspective, function is a source and is obtained from the environment to satisfy human needs and want. First, the understanding of communal activities is that they depend on the local places, however this is possibly misleading. The space is only a physical fact, however, functions combined with the space determine the true character of the space. Making use of functions or sharing functions are the real reasons that residents participate in communal activities.

Second, as already noted, planners of low-rent high rises provide spaces based on their own value, although it would be more correct to say, the values are those of the professional upper-middle class. Certain types of physical environment strongly support this lifestyle. The rural-to-urban migrant residents prefer to live in high enough densities so that many related families could live near each other and are satisfied to live in so-called slum areas. What is important to them, in a physical context, is the combination of types of building and siting of buildings relative to each other. Migrant residents’ lifestyle cannot be changed simply by presenting it with middle-class services, such as open space, ground garden and peaceful environment.
Third, this study analyses the design provided by professionals in low-rent housing neighborhoods accommodating rural-to-urban migrants. This shows the neighborhood is far more than just an accumulation of low-rent housing blocks. More notably, the study shows that the migrant-caring functions can be the most distinctive features when compared to normal neighborhoods. Moreover, it is an important index for achieving ‘long-term’ satisfaction and a ‘sense of belonging’ in low-rent residential environments for rural-to-urban migrants.

Four, for the low-rent project to be successful, professionals must be developed with a target group of migrant tenants in mind. Variances occur between planners of modern low-rent housing and rural-to-urban migrant residents in the assessment of physical and social ‘standardness’ of accommodation. Thus, what the former define as physically standard is located in areas which the latter consider communal activities undesirable. Since communal criteria are more important to many migrants than physical standards, they may have a negative attitude on this basis to the units delivered to them by low-rent housing designers. In this regard, the national government-subsidized low-rent project may fail because of its lack of suitable users.

8.3 Values and implications

From a theoretical perspective, a focus on greatest migrants’ gathering settlement CZC (such as, Yimuyuan neighborhood) downplays the significance of CZC environment. Rural-to-urban migrant residents’ responses to their different communal activities in the 3 different cases should be reconsidered in the light of the findings of this research.

Their communal activities style of their system of values and beliefs result from their sharing of provided functions so that communal activities as preserved in their origin residential environment. This is one of the most significant qualities for
residential gratification for them. This fact is meaningful and important to national low-rent neighborhood development design, and should be taken into consideration when evaluating the initiatives of constructing low-rent housing for rural-to-urban migrants. All-inclusive emotional expansion for the majority of single young migrants, sense of belonging and communal activities for single-person and even elderly migrants’ family are desirable.

In terms of theoretical research and practical application, it is found that the contemporary improvement initiatives are not sensitive to these socio-cultural values of the rural-to-urban migrants. These I feel have the most important and valuable inferences for the achievement of low-rent schemes in China. Some policy implications for national-scale CZC (Yimuyuan neighborhood is listed in the demolition of CZC) redevelopment

Many tenants in destination cities live in crowded, under-serviced and decrepit housing, because that is all they can afford. If governments respond by demolishing this accommodation, it only makes lodging difficulties worse and causes even greater overpopulation elsewhere. A more enlightened method would be to find ways to better the quality of the current accommodation and to boost the construction of more leasing housing.

First, large-scale destruction ought to be controlled. It is not urgent to pull down all dilapidated CZC settlements. Indeed, it is implausible to think that relocation would improve the living conditions of the residents of CZCs and that the clearing away of occupied CZC housing would be of benefit to the larger migrant community. The government probably does not fully realize that for migrant workers, from tents to CZCs, these informal settlements not only provide diverse residential alternatives, but they also allow migrants to be safe and comfortable in a buffer zone between the ‘no-return’ countryside and the host urban society. Migrants depend on the CZC as
a life support system physically and emotionally, in some cases, and some use it as a step toward pursuing improved occupations and lodging.

Second, low-rent housing with certain level of communal activities needed. High-rises will be a continually growing trend in low-rent housing in China. Such living environments tend to be damaging to the sense of communal activities within the community. Researchers need to notice the negative effects of residential crowding are partly due to the collapse in individual migrant residents’ social support systems. Despite the fact that the construction cost and size limitation of low-rent housing, a low-rent neighborhood should not just be a gathering of low-rent houses, outdoor spaces should not merely be transitional space, they ought to facilitate the communal functioning of the migrant residents’ community.

Today, central and local governments have expressed increasing concern about the livelihood of rural migrants. Providing low-rent housing with rich sense of communal activities for rural migrants is considered an important task for the creation of a harmonious society. Moreover, migrants should be expected to live with greater dignity and happiness, and in this respect, the certain level of communal activities in their low-rent neighborhood has been considered of great importance to them.

Third, correction of public response. It ought to be fair to conclude that accommodation in CZCs is of more value to a large-scale low-rent supplier, rather than to those attracting low social status migrants and street-outlaws to a slum area. The current public opinion and policy does not speak of the hidden contribution of CZCs as acceptably-priced housing that is accessible to rural migrants, while the subsidized the existing social housing available falls short of being attainable for
most migrant workers. The government remains prejudicial in its approval and maintenance of CZCs. From a migrant tenant’s perspective, equal treatment and public understanding are lacking, and they can only be achieved when issues of suitable control are resolved within the bureaucracy of government administration.

8.4 Limitations of this research

By taking the patterns of the three case studies as enlightening strategies, it is possible to create a good ‘fit’ for a suitable communal activity place. However, ironically, this fit cannot be too precise, for it must admit the possibility that more and more rural-to-urban migrants may update their inherent lifestyle to the urban lifestyle which encourages nonlocalized social ties, and as such they would not be concerned with close-knit communal activities. Class (the majority of recent rural migrants are classified as working class) and the stage of life a person is at are two significant variables that can explain changes in neighborly life among city dwellers, including recent rural-to-urban migrant residents. Close-knit communal activities among neighbors would then be found mainly in newly arriving rural working class migrants. Therefore, the architectural pattern in and around housing such as the Yimuyuan area, is regarded as suitable for these families.

Therefore, the limitations of this study consist of two aspects.

First, the findings of this study focus on my field studies and questionnaire surveys that enabled me to observe the residents’ communal activities. These facts build up the goal of this study is quite practical. It aims to catch an archetypal solution to a complex problem we meet now. The model of the place-based communal activities developed in this study is useful for creating the ‘fitting’
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187 These projects provide only very limited numbers of housing units and the requirements for applying are too high for most migrants.
environment for new arrived rural-to-urban migrant population. Lack of further consideration for migrants’ updated low-rent housing function can be a limitation of my study. Therefore, the development of new archetypes must be a separate process.

Second, the issue that accommodating more residing units for growing rural-to-urban migrants, would work against the building of possibly more communal places for residents’ communal activities is overlooked in this study.

Third, the surveyed sample has the limitation to the amount of information. I only focused on migrant tenants’ residential behaviors specifically in a few months of field observations. Due to limitations in the data, I was unable to search the wider and deeper investigation on migrants’ neighborhood life.

Fourth, in terms of the interview research, the researcher could not avoid to obtain unbiased records. As non-migrant member, did not have sufficient acquaintance with the specific experience and environment. Future research, particularly qualitative work, should cover more research subjects to explore the more functions that migrants depend on in structuring communal activities.

The subsequent issues could be examined:

(1) However, the biggest challenge in the future is that when close knit/lack of communal activities turns out to be a matter of choice, how such a choice can satisfy the rural-to-urban migrants in low-rent neighborhoods in 20 or 50 years as they demand ever better conditions. Will residents feel that it isn’t the right format to suits their needs anymore?

(2) How effectively have high-rises transitional space worked with the ‘fitting’ functions that residents can make use or share in the most immediate space of their rental room (such as, the corridor in front of the rental room)?
(3) With the greatly Chinese national demolishment of CZCs, what is on-site evolutionary reconstruction pattern for rural-to-urban migrants’ transformation, to make it more habitable in the future, and also make it incorporated with the neighboring place?

(4) Do approaches concentrating on a protection of migrant residents’ privacy tend to be more successful than balancing approaches between privacy and community life?

(5) What can be learnt from the relationship between social and environmental sustainability in high-rise housing?

8.5 Conclusion

Low-rent housing has diverse functions and meanings for rural migrant residents not limited to the purely residential function. The Chinese migrant community has taken an active role in changing the urban residential environment to reflect its social needs. In other words, in addition to assimilating to the host society, the rural-to-urban migrant community has transformed their residential space, low-rent housing, by making the urban landscape more suitable for the peasant-origin migrant community. Migrants’ spontaneously-developed housing, as one of the low-rent housing types, is an innovative form of accommodation contributing economic, environmental and communal benefits over present forms of low-rent housing improvement.

However, in China, rural-to-urban migrants’ spontaneously-developed housing (CZC) comes to be seen as damaging city beautification and requiring slum clearance. This view imitates the standard values of upper-middle-class specialists. For practical purposes, the CZC may likewise be defined as a ‘harmful’ space, however it is vital from the tenants’ standpoint, as it provides an environment ‘full of
communal life’ under reasonably priced conditions, and it even plays a specific role as an adaptation area for China’s numerous internal peasant-origin migrants.

Low-rent housing can contribute to elevating rural migrant groups’ quality of life through enabling participation in shared activities. It would be fair to conclude that the majority of the structures in a CZC provide low-rent examples of minimum levels of ‘affordable comfort’, both physical and social. The high level of communal life that emerges for residents in CZCs is contrary to the low level of communal activities in the high-rise apartment buildings that engineers or architects offer. It is important to note the reasons why communal life flourishes in CZCs, even though they are not provisioned in a manner that makes urban citizens think positively about them in terms of physical comfort.

In the following, I will summarize what can be learned from these case studies. What is it that makes the same spaces where close-knit communal activities occur in migrants’ spontaneous-developed low-rent housing while other places are conversely absent of communal activities. My discussion of the spatial characteristics of the transitional spaces shows outdoor communal activities ought not to be considered as a range of secluded self-governing behavior performed by individuals, but as a combination of human activities involved with sharing function. The transitional spaces are framed in this study merely as spatial fact. It has been argued in this study that, for low-rent neighborhoods, there are transitional spaces which are rich in communal activities, not because they are crowded or more suitable places, but because they have sufficient functions to allow that sharing to take place. The same can be applied to places which have few communal activities, it is not resulting from a lack of people or open places, but it is caused by the absence of functions that can be shared, thereby stopping the communal activities to occur. Accordingly, the essence of the communal activities is the sharing of ‘functions’ among residents. The transitional places are the dominant physical settings where
functions are provided and where a sharing experience of the functions results in the occurrence of spontaneous communal activities.

The shared functions succeed in breeding a high level of communal activities. Therefore, I propose 'living with sharing', the development of housing with shared functions, which could be a potential solution to meet the needs of low-rent housing in quantity. I define the sharing goals of communal activities. I refer to the sharing-function phenomena in one of the migrants’ spontaneously-developed neighborhoods (Yimuyuan) to introduce this concept and encourage its use in modern low-rent high-rises in China. The chief physical design element of the ‘living with sharing’ low-rent housing that I propose is the reduction in size of the private units to meet the minimal needs of migrant residents while enlarging the size of the communal units to the optimum amount.

In terms of design, 'living by sharing' can be a sustainable solution for dealing with the migrants’ accommodation crisis. Particularly for rural-to-urban migrants, the strategies that I have recommended for designing low-rent housing certainly differ from the general housing stock now available and from that of most existing conventional neighborhoods. The strategies that underpin the location of functions and the design of the spaces accommodating these functions deliberately encourage regular shared interaction with other residents in the housing block. Referring to the migrants’ spontaneously-developed housing case study (Yimuyuan), it seems that there is an expressed desire to use low-rent housing as a device to promote new lifestyles and this should in turn give rise to new architectural patterns.

However, the conventional approaches to planned housing have had little to do with serving the social and psychological needs of the rural migrant community. Chinese migrants’ low-rent neighborhoods should include consideration not merely of an accumulation of low-rent housing blocks, but also of helping rural-to-urban migrants to complete their territorial claim to reduce urban cultural shock and be part
of the process of adaptation to their host environment. Also with regard to this, I proposed six strategies for improving communal life with three different levels, they are: the upper floor level, the ground floor level and the housing-street level. Based on strategies addressing the content of shared functions and the location of these shared functions, architects can recommend diverse design strategies to achieve the final goal of enhancing migrants’ lives through accommodating the needs of communal activities.

Finally, with regards to the design of the shared functions, low-rent housing does not only succeed in addressing the consumption of rural-to-urban migrants’ low-rent housing, but also does seem to hold the potential for more profound alterations in consumption practices and lifestyles that could probably challenge contemporary residential culture. Migrants’ residential space can lead to either isolation or effective connection between the rural migrating community and the other populations. Founded on concepts of the person-to-environment relationship in terms of communal activities, the study emphasizes that low-rent housing has an explicit role to play for each rural migrant, since every individual develops a different emotional connection with the environment and with the other migrants. Therefore, the different categories of shared functions form not only communal shared activities among migrant residents, but also develop diverse relationships between residents and their low-rent housing as they adjust to new environments in their destination cities.
Appendix 1. Preparation of the dissertation

The appendix starts with the time schedule for this research.

1. January 2013—July 2013

   Literature review, short visit to the research areas through paper research, and the preparing of the first fieldwork.

2. July 2013—August 2013

   First fieldwork in *Beijing Yimuyuan* neighborhood

3. September 2013—December 2013

   Second fieldwork in *Chongqing Minxin jiayuan* neighborhood

4. February 2014 (17 days)

   Third fieldwork in *Vanke Tulou* collective housing

Appendix 2. Notes on the field observation

This study starts with informal participation in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood in *Beijing*. First I lived at a friend’s house in *Beijing* when I just arrived there, but after a week I rented a room in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood. I stayed there for one month—July, 2014. That summer, when I lived with my friend, due to the long distance, I took public transportation (bus and subway) to experience the commuting conditions between *Yimuyuan* neighborhood and other places that provided daily services. After a week, I decided to rent a small room there in order to experience at first hand the migrant workers’ life. I rented a bed in a room occupied by other female migrant residents, and opposite the room in which I stayed there was a room with male migrant residents. This shared living experience was valuable in understanding the life of such migrants in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood or even as representative of all CZCs everywhere in China.

Before I lived in the *Yimuyuan* neighborhood, I just make casual contact with a small range of people there. To begin with, the concept of the CZC (*Yimuyuan* is one of the many CZCs in *Beijing*) being called a slum neighborhood by the government was foreign to me, although the area and slums have in common an unpleasant appearance and uninviting conditions. My first experience was from one landowner
when I pretended to be a migrant who wanted to rent a house in his/her building. At the same time, a different landowner allowed me to see different kinds of rented room in his/her own building in the Yimuyuan neighborhood. They were good sources of information to learn about the conditions of housing among migrant tenants. Looking at the area as a tourist, I noted the highly noticeable and different features which were strange but familiar to me. And, while the striking quality of the Yimuyuan neighborhood did motivate me, the densely-housed strangers and dilapidated situation discouraged me to do self-observation and conduce a participant study.

Based on my general experience of the Yimuyuan neighborhood, my study continues with a second, then a third low-rent housing area, and then the after that two case studies incorporated a more objective method for classifying neighborhood environments and community experiences using my survey research information.

I stayed in the Yimuyuan neighborhood by myself for one month and did research on Chongqing’s public low-rent housing for two months, then I traveled to Guangzhou to interview tenants living in Vanke Tulou house. Formal and informal frequent contacts with tenants and other residents during my participant observation changed my view of the three areas deeply.

Every day I visited migrants when they were sitting together, and carried out a survey with the migrants on their rental housing to understand their life. I got to interview migrant tenants normally through some of my ‘roommates’ in my rental room and my Beijing friends and local friends from Guangdong. I experienced their inconveniences and conveniences with their lives through the use of local facilities. I conducted systematic observation on lifestyles of migrant tenants, based on two areas: the objective environment and the interpersonal environment. The two phases raised the question: do the three low-rent housing patterns satisfy/dissatisfy migrants?

The objective conditions include the low-rent housing itself (housing patterns, facilities and conveniences); the community (situation, structure of inhabitants, compactness, and services); opinions in/outside of their residences (positive and negative); and annoyances.

The interpersonal community encompasses the relationship between patterns of space use, human contact and social interaction specifically for outdoor activities, human contact and social interaction in daily life.
Finally, I examined the attitudes of migrant tenants toward their low-rent neighborhood through a questionnaire on the use of their low-rent community, frequency of use, symbolism and importance of the low-rent community.

While as a part of participant observation, I joined many community gatherings and casual meetings. Because my first fieldwork site was on unofficial low-rent neighborhoods, conducting long-term fieldwork on the three areas was complicated. Many migrants were uncomfortable with formal interviews or refused to fill out my questionnaires, I thus tried to pass myself off as a migrant who looking for a low-rent house within these communities, and in this way I interviewed a good portion of my informants informally. The majority of my interviews with migrants were semi structured with open-ended questions.

Moreover, the majority of my data collection was conducted while attending meetings and other casual public gatherings, like renting a room, in the streets in front of my rented house, in the compound, of a market, ate food stall or in the public computer room.

My participant-observation employed four chief approaches:

(1) Use of the conveniences of the low-rent housing: Normally I spent about one week staying in a nearby motel in each of the low-rent housing case studies areas. This gave me easy access to local markets, amenities, and other conveniences. Also this allowed me to witness my own and other people’s behavior as residents of the three areas.

(2) Informal contacts with tenants and landlords: I disguised myself as a room finder to talk with different landlords and visited different rental housing areas. Such wanderings provided good support and evidence to find out about tenants’ living. I also talked with tenants who were willing to share their experiences as tenants. They gave me detailed information on the nearby rental housing patterns, rents and detailed convenience facilities.

(3) Use of questionnaire: I spent a long time persuading tenants to fill in the questionnaire.

(4) Observation: At all times, I focused all my attention on learning about the lifestyle of tenants through their physical conditions, real situations, and interpersonal communities. I examined rental homes (housing patterns, access to daily conveniences), neighborhoods (communication areas, frequency of talking, and their feelings about their environment), as well as food preparation. I also
observed interpersonal relationships through neighborhood talking, acquaintances, and mutual reciprocity.
Appendix 3. Survey materials

*Yimuyuan* low-rent neighborhood

*Yimuyuan* neighborhood, northwest section of downtown *Beijing* city (photo source: google map, edited by author)
Yimuyuan neighborhood (Drawing by author)
Housing patterns in Yimuyuan neighborhood

A smartphone salesman says that he lives in a basement dormitory-style apartment in Yimuyuan neighborhood because he wants to save money for other things. The dormitory room, also the typical rental housing pattern for single migrants (photo by author)

A migrant family was watching TV in their low-rent housing (The rental housing pattern for family-accompanied migrants)

The typical rental housing pattern for couple-accompanied migrants
Sharing facilities

The small public space in front of rental housing, the neighbors ‘at arm’s length’ from the window (photo by author)

The shared kitchen in one kind of rented housing (photo by author)

A typical small street, a female resident was washing her son (photo by author)
Street view

A typical winding street with low-rent apartments

Residents tend to congregate where other people are assembled. Residential streets in *Yimuyuan* neighborhood (photo by author)
北京一亩园社区问卷调查表
Interviews conducted in the Yimuyuan neighborhood

问题 1. 问卷调查对象分类 [性别/年龄/教育程度/婚姻状况/家庭成员/居住状态(亲人陪伴移民者，单身移民者，夫妇移民者)] Q1. Migrants’ categorization as interviewees [Sex/ Age /Education / Marriage status / Family members/ Living status (parent-accompanied, single, or couple migrants)]

问题 2. 您在这里居住年限 (Q2. How long have you been living here?)
1. 6 个月 — 1 年 (6 months-1 year)
2. 1 年 — 3 年 (1 year-3 years)
3. 3 年 — 5 年 (3-5 years)

问题 3. 在搬到这里以前您居住在哪里？(Q3. Where did you live before?)
1. 另外的城中村 (Different CZC)
2. 另外的城市 (Different city)
3. 另外的廉租社区 (Different other low-rent neighborhood)

问题 4. 您搬到一亩园社区的原因？(Q4. Why did you move to Yimuyuan neighborhood?)
1. 您的家人在这里，您同乡的朋友住在这里 (Family live here; friends from my hometown live here)
2. 通过认识的朋友介绍 (Live here through people you know)
3. 通过房屋介绍所 (Live here through the housing agency)

问题 5. 当您听到一亩园社区，您的第一印象是什么？(Q5. What first comes to your mind when you hear about living in the Yimuyuan neighborhood?)
1. 便宜 (Cheap)
2. 农村移民居住地 (Migrant settlement)
3. 低标准居所 (Housing with low standards)
4. 混乱无序 (Disordered)
5. 方便 (Convenient)

问题 6. 就您的社区，请您进行地方排序，您碰见您的邻居和朋友？(Q6. Make the sequence of places where you meet your neighbors and friends)
1. 在您的廉租屋 (In my rental room)
2. 在您廉租屋门前的位置 (In the front area of my room)
3. 在廉租屋的公共厨房 (In the public kitchen)
4. 在公共卫生间 (In the public bathing room)
5. 在廉租房门前的街区 (Front street of your house)
6. 在社区里面的便利店或者饭店 (In a local market or restaurant)
7. 在社区里面的公园或者其他便利设施 (Parks or other facilities within neighborhood)
8. 在街区路口 (Some streets within few blocks)
问题 7. 按照以下方面，您怎么评价您的社区？(Q7. In sum, what do you think your neighborly relationship means in terms of aspects as below?)
1. 社交化 (Sociability)
2. 互相帮助 (Common assistance)
3. 相互信任 (Mutual trust)
4. 认识您的邻居 (Acquaintance)
5. 邻居如陌人 (anonymous)

问题 8. 您对您居住的社区关注度？(Q8. How much do you pay attention to the community involvement in your neighborhood?)
1. 不关注 (Not pay attention)
2. 关注一点点 (Pay a little attention)
3. 非常关注 (Pay much attention)

问题 9. 您怎么评价您现在居住的一亩园社区？(Q9. How do you feel about living in the Yimuyuan neighborhood now?)
1. 仅仅是一个临时居所 (Merely provisional dwelling)
2. 很难讲 (Hard to say)
3. 是一个真正的家 (或者一个舒适的家) (As a real home (Comfortable home))

问题 10. 请用下面 3 个方面解释您因为什么方面继续呆在这个社区？(Q10. Which perspective do you stay in this neighborhood?)
1. 便宜的廉租屋 (Cheap rental room)
2. 亲戚和朋友都住在一起的社区 (Kinship (friend)-based neighborhood)
3. 非常关注 (Pay much attention)

问题 11. 当您想起您现在呆的城市，您所居住的一亩园社区对您的重要性？(Q11. When you think about this destination city, how important is Yimuyuan neighborhood to you?)
1. 非常重要 (Very important)
2. 重要 (Important)
3. 不重要 (Not important)
4. 不在乎 (Don’t care)

问题 12. 从哪个方面看，您的廉租房对您来说是理想的居所？(Q12. In which perspective is your rental area an ideal place to go on living for you?)
1. 体面的外观 (Decent look)
2. 安全性 (Safety)
3. 靠近大众设施 (Accessibility to facilities)
4. 社区归属感 (Feeling of attachment)
5. 良好的社区邻里关系 (Good community relations)

问题 13. 您评价一下您所居住的廉租社区的质量？(Q13. Neighborhood quality by details as below:
1. 感觉孤独 (Feel lonely)
2. 感觉被排斥 (Feel exclusion)
3. 良好的社区邻里关系 (Sociability)
4. 在社区里，与移民工邻居保持互动 (Interaction with migrants in this neighborhood)
5. 在社区里，与城市居民保持互动 (Interaction with urban citizen in this neighborhood)

问题 14. 您在您的社区，有多少朋友，或是亲戚？(Q14. How many friends and/or kin-based relatives do you have in this neighborhood?)
   1. 没有人 (Nobody)
   2. 1-3 人 (1-3)
   3. 3-5 人 (3-5)
   4. 5-10 人 (5-10)
   5. 多于 10 人 (More than 10)

问题 15. 您经常拜访您的邻居吗？(Q15. Frequency of visiting neighbors)
   1. 经常 (Often)
   2. 一般 (Sometimes)
   3. 很少 (Seldom)
   4. 从不 (Never)

问题 16. 您经常帮助您的邻居吗？(Q16. Frequency of helping neighbors)
   1. 经常 (Often)
   2. 一般 (Sometimes)
   3. 很少 (Seldom)
   4. 从不 (Never)
Minxin jiayuan low-rent neighborhood

Minxin jiayuan location, north section of Chongqing city (photo resource: google maps, edited by author)
Housing patterns in Minxin jiayuan neighborhood

The life between doors of each floor is also empty in Minxin jiayuan low-rent neighborhood. (photo by author)

The balcony

The life between doors is also empty in Minxin jiayuan low-rent neighborhood. (photo by author)
Street view

The high-rises in Minxin jiayuan low-rent neighborhood: one of the apartment houses (photo by author)

This is one corner of the ground garden. The life between buildings is lifeless and empty. (photo by author)
问题1. 问卷调查对象分类 [性别/年纪/教育程度/婚姻状况/家庭成员/居住状态] (亲人陪伴移民者，单身移民者，夫妇移民者) [Q1. Migrants’ categorization as interviewees [Sex/ Age /Education /Marriage status /Family members/Living status (parent-accompanied, single, or couple migrants)]

问题2. 您在这里居住年限 (Q2. How long have you been living here?)
   1. 6个月—1年 (6 months-1 year)
   2. 1年—3年 (1 year-3 years)
   3. 3年—5年 (3-5 years)

问题3. 在搬到这里以前您居住在哪里？(Q3. Where did you live before?)
   1. 另外的城中村 (Different CZC)
   2. 另外的城市 (Different city)
   3. 另外的廉租社区 (Different other low-rent neighborhood)

问题4. 您搬到民心佳园社区的原因？(Q4. Why did you move to Minxin jiayuan neighborhood?)
   1. 您的家人在这里，您同乡的朋友住在这里 (Family live here; friends from my hometown live here)
   2. 通过认识的朋友介绍 (Live here through people you know)
   3. 通过房屋介绍所 (Live here through the housing agency)

问题5. 当您听到民心家园社区，您的第一印象是什么？(Q5. What first comes to your mind when you hear about living in the Minxin jiayuan neighborhood?)
   1. 便宜 (Cheap)
   2. 农村移民居住地 (Migrant settlement)
   3. 低标准居所 (Housing with low standards)
   4. 混乱无序 (Disordered)
   5. 方便 (Convenient)

问题6. 就您的社区，请您进行地方排序，您碰见您的邻居和朋友？(Q6. Make the sequence of places where you meet your neighbors and friends)
   1. 在您的廉租屋 (In my rental room)
   2. 在您廉租屋门前的位置 (In the front area of my room)
   3. 在您廉租高楼门前的街道 (Front street of the high-rise you are living)
   4. 在社区里面的便利店或者饭店 (In a local market or restaurant)
   5. 在社区公园或是其他便利设施周围 (Ground parks or other facilities within neighborhood)
   6. 在街区路口 (Some streets within few blocks)
   7. 如果有其他地方，请说明 (If other, specify)
问题7. 按照以下方面，您怎么评价您的社区？(Q7. In sum, what do you think your neighborly relationship means in terms of aspects as below?)

1. 社交化 (Sociability)
2. 互相帮助 (Common assistance)
3. 相互信任 (Mutual trust)
4. 认识您的邻居 (Acquaintance)
5. 邻居如陌人 (anonymous)

问题8. 您对您居住的社区关注度？(Q8. How much do you pay attention to the community involvement in your neighborhood?)

1. 不关注 (Not pay attention)
2. 关注一点点 (Pay a little attention)
3. 非常关注 (Pay much attention)

问题9. 您怎么评价您现在居住的民心佳园社区？(Q9. How do you feel about living in the Yimuyuan neighborhood now?)

1. 仅仅是一个临时居所 (Merely provisional dwelling)
2. 很难讲 (Hard to tell)
3. 是一个真正的家 (或者一个舒适的家) (As a real home (Comfortable home))

问题10. 请用下面3个方面解释您为什么方面继续呆在这个社区？(Q10. Which perspective do you stay in this neighborhood?)

1. 便宜的廉租屋 (Cheap rental room)
2. 亲戚和朋友都住在一起的社区 (Kinship (friend)-based neighborhood)
3. 很难讲 (Hard to say)

问题11. 当您想起您现在呆的城市，您所居住的一亩园社区对您的重要性？(Q11. When you think about this destination city, how important is Yimuyuan neighborhood to you?)

1. 非常重要 (Very important)
2. 重要 (Important)
3. 不重要 (Not important)
4. 不在乎 (Don’t care)

问题12. 从哪个方面看，您的廉租房对您来说是理想的居所？(Q12. In which perspective is your rental area an ideal place to go on living for you?)

1. 体面的外观 (Decent look)
2. 安全性 (Safety)
3. 靠近大众设施 (Accessibility to facilities)
4. 社区归属感 (Feeling of attachment)
5. 良好的社区邻里关系 (Good community relations)
问题 13. 您评价一下您所居住的廉租社区的质量？(Q13. Neighborhood quality by details as below:)

1. 感觉孤独（Feel lonely）
2. 感觉被排斥（Feel exclusion）
3. 良好的社区邻里关系（Sociability）
4. 在社区里，与移民工邻居保持互动（Interaction with migrants in this neighborhood）
5. 在社区里，与城市居民保持互动（Interaction with urban citizen in this neighborhood）

问题 14. 您在您的社区，有多少朋友，或是亲戚？(Q14. How many friends and/or kin-based relatives do you have in this neighborhood?)

1. 没有人（Nobody）
2. 1-3 人（1-3）
3. 3-5 人（3-5）
4. 5-10 人（5-10）
5. 多于 10 人（More than 10）

问题 15. 您经常拜访您的邻居吗？(Q15. Frequency of visiting neighbors)

1. 经常（Often）
2. 一般（Sometimes）
3. 很少（Seldom）
4. 从不（Never）

问题 16. 您经常帮助您的邻居吗？(Q16. Frequency of helping neighbors)

1. 经常（Often）
2. 一般（Sometimes）
3. 很少（Seldom）
4. 从不（Never）
Vanke Tulou low-rent neighborhood

Vanke Tulou neighborhood, northwest section of downtown Beijing city (photo resource: google maps, edited by author)
A female migrant tenant in front of a ground courtyard (photo by author)

This is one of my interviewees, who works for a music company, and has lived in Tulou housing for 2 years 3 months (photo by author)

They are the roommates living in a dormitory room in Tulou housing (photo by author)
Street view

The entrance of low-rent housing

The Vanke Tulou house organizes around the two communal spaces: the outdoor circular corridor and the communal garden

The Vanke Tulou house is centered around a communal garden and community house, shared by all the residents, is located on the first level of housing.
广州万科土楼社区问卷调查表

Interviews conducted in Vanke Tulou collective housing

问题 1. 问卷调查对象分类 [性别/年纪/教育程度/婚姻状况/家庭成员/居住状态(亲人陪伴移民者，单身移民者，夫妇移民者)]

Q1. Migrants’ categorization as interviewees [Sex/ Age /Education / Marriage status / Family members/ Living status (parent-accompanied, single, or couple migrants)]

问题 2. 您在这里居住年限 (Q2. How long have you been living here?)

1. 6个月 - 1年 (6 months-1 year)
2. 1年 - 3年 (1 year-3 years)
3. 3年 - 5年 (3-5 years)

问题 3. 在搬到这里以前您居住在哪里? (Q3. Where did you live before?)

1. 城中村 (CZC)
2. 公寓房 (Apartment)
3. 另外的廉租社区 (Different other low-rent neighborhood)

问题 4. 您搬到一亩园社区的原因? (Q4. Why did you move to Yimuyuan neighborhood?)

1. 您的家人在这里，您同乡的朋友住在这里 (Family live here; friends from my hometown live here)
2. 通过认识的朋友介绍 (Live here through people you know)
3. 通过房屋介绍所 (Live here through the housing agency)

问题 5. 当您听到万科土楼社区，您的第一印象是什么? (Q5. What first comes to your mind when you hear about living in the Yimuyuan neighborhood?)

1. 便宜 (Cheap)
2. 农村移民居住地 (Migrant settlement)
3. 低标准居所 (Housing with low standards)
4. 混乱无序 (Disordered)
5. 方便 (Convenient)

问题 6. 就您的社区，请您进行地方排序，您碰见您的邻居和朋友? (Q6. Make the sequence of places where you meet your neighbors and friends)

1. 在您的廉租屋 (In my rental room)
2. 在您的廉租屋门前的位置 (圆形走廊) (In the front area of your room (corridor)
3. 每层交楼的公共空间 (Open space in the corner)
4. 底层公共设施房 （健身房，TV房，电脑房） (Public facility room (gym, TV room, computer room) on the ground floor)
5. 底层便利店或餐厅 (Market or restaurant on the ground floor)
6. 顶楼空旷空间 (Roof open space)
7. 如果有其他，请标明 (If other, specify)
问题 7. 按照以下方面，您怎么评价您的社区？(Q7. In sum, what do you think your neighborly relationship means in terms of aspects as below?)
1. 社交化 (Sociability)
2. 互相帮助 (Common assistance)
3. 相互信任 (Mutual trust)
4. 认识您的邻居 (Acquaintance)
5. 邻居如陌生人 (anonymous)

问题 8. 您对您居住的社区关注度？(Q8. How much do you pay attention to the community involvement in your neighborhood?)
1. 不关注 (Not pay attention)
2. 关注一点点 (Pay a little attention)
3. 非常关注 (Pay much attention)

问题 9. 您怎么评价您现在居住的一亩园社区？(Q9. How do you feel about living in the Yimuyuan neighborhood now?)
1. 仅仅是一个临时居所 (Merely provisional dwelling)
2. 很难讲 (Hard to tell)
3. 是一个真正的家 (或者一个舒适的家) (As a real home (Comfortable home))

问题 10. 请用下面 3 个方面解释您为什么方面继续呆在这个社区？(Q10. Which perspective do you stay in this neighborhood?)
1. 便宜的廉租屋 (Cheap rental room)
2. 亲戚和朋友都住在一起的社区 (Kinship (friend)-based neighborhood)
3. 很难讲 (Hard to say)

问题 11. 当您想起您现在呆的城市，您所居住的万科土楼社区对您的重要性？(Q11. When you think about this destination city, how important is Yimuyuan neighborhood to you?)
1. 非常重要 (Very important)
2. 重要 (Important)
3. 不重要 (Not important)
4. 不在乎 (Don’t care)

问题 12. 从哪个方面看，您的廉租房对您来说是理想的居所？(Q12. In which perspective is your rental area an ideal place to go on living for you?)
1. 体面的外观 (Decent look)
2. 安全性 (Safety)
3. 靠近大众设施 (Accessibility to facilities)
4. 社区归属感 (Feeling of attachment)
5. 良好的社区邻里关系 (Good community relations)
问题 13. 您评价一下您所居住的廉租社区的质量？(Q13. Neighborhood quality by details as below:)
   1. 感觉孤独 (Feel lonely)
   2. 感觉被排斥 (Feel exclusion)
   3. 良好的社区邻里关系 (Sociability)
   4. 在社区里，与移民工邻居保持互动 (Interaction with migrants in this neighborhood)
   5. 在社区里，与城市居民保持互动 (Interaction with urban citizen in this neighborhood)

问题 14. 您在您的社区，有多少朋友，或是亲戚？(Q14. How many friends and/or kin-based relatives do you have in this neighborhood?)
   1. 没有人 (Nobody)
   2. 1-3 人 (1-3)
   3. 3-5 人 (3-5)
   4. 5-10 人 (5-10)
   5. 多于 10 人 (More than 10)

问题 15. 您经常拜访您的邻居吗？(Q15. Frequency of visiting neighbors)
   1. 经常 (Often)
   2. 一般 (Sometimes)
   3. 很少 (Seldom)
   4. 从不 (Never)

问题 16. 您经常帮助您的邻居吗？(Q16. Frequency of helping neighbors)
   1. 经常 (Often)
   2. 一般 (Sometimes)
   3. 很少 (Seldom)
   4. 从不 (Never)
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