

Rural Migrants and Shantytown Communities in Chinese Cities¹

(DRAFT)

Dr. Fei GUO
Department of Business
Division of Economic and Financial Studies
Macquarie University
Sydney, NSW 2109, Australia
Tel: 61-2-98508445
Fax: 61-2-98506065
Email: fguo@efs.mq.edu.au

Professor CAI Fang and Dr. ZHANG Zhanxin
Institute of Population and Labour Economics
Chinese Academy of Social Sciences
Beijing, China.

¹ This project is supported by a two-year research grant from the Ford Foundation.

Abstract

As a result of economic reforms and the relaxation in the household registration system (or *hukou*), China in the past three decades has seen an increasing number of migrants (estimated between 20 to 100 million) moving from countryside to cities. Although the massive number of rural migrants have become an important part of labour force in cities, majority of them were temporary in nature – working as temporary workers (in most of cases no formal contract protection), receiving minimal wages, and living in temporary shabby housing condition. Many are not regarded as “urban citizens” by urban authorities and public. The communities where rural migrants are concentrated are often labelled as “migrant villages” and are sometimes faced the fate of being dispersed or “cleaned up” by the authorities.

This paper examines the livelihood of rural migrants and structures of their communities in Chinese cities. Based on a newly conducted survey in five Chinese cities - Beijing, Shijiazhuang, Shenyang, Wuxi and Dongguan, the study attempts to understand the process of formation or transformation of migrant communities into “shantytown communities” and its contributory factors, structure of these communities, living arrangement of members of these communities, their social and economic activities, and their levels of income and economic wellbeing.

Preliminary results suggest that two institutional factors have contributed to the formation of the shantytown communities in Chinese cities. First, the household registration system (or *hukou*) and its associated policies, such as labour recruitment policies, are still effective in determining people’s life chance in cities. Fieldworks of this study suggest that migrants with agricultural background are more likely to live in shantytown communities in cities while migrants with non-agricultural background are less likely to live there. Second, communities with private housing ownership located in urban periphery areas and communities with collective housing ownership in the inner urban areas are the two main types of communities that were more likely to attract migrants and then eventually transformed into “shantytown communities”.

Results of this study show that among all members of selected communities, “the type of occupation” is the most important factor in determining people’s income. People with “white-collar” occupations are likely to earn a higher income compared with those with “blue-collar” jobs in which most of members in these communities were concentrated. It suggests that on average migrants earn much less compared with local residents in all studied cities, with the exception of Shenyang where unemployment problems among local residents have been pronounced. Results from all five cities show that compared with local residents, migrants tend to receive much less benefits and welfare from urban system, either from public system or their employers.

I. Introduction

In the early decades of the People's Republic of China, population growth in urban centres was strictly controlled by the well-known household registration system, or *hukou*. Spontaneous migration from rural to urban areas was particularly restricted (Yang, 1993; Zhang, 1988; Cheng and Selden, 1994). While urban residents were provided with housing and other basic welfare benefits by their employers or local governments, rural residents were not entitled to such privileges. Urban housing allocation and planning were primarily for the needs of locally registered residents. The majority of urban residents were looked after either by their employers if they or their family members were employed, or neighbourhood/street committees if they were unemployed. In the pre-reform era, although the overall living standard was low, the society was remarkably egalitarian (Khan, Griffin and Riskin, 1999), and shantytown communities, or *pin min qu*, in the cities were not very visible.

Over the past two decades, as a result of economic reforms and the relaxation in *hukou* policy, China has seen an increasing number of migrants (estimated between 20 to 100 million) moving from one place to another, especially from rural to urban areas (Solinger, 1999). The majority of rural migrants in Chinese cities have been seen as active labour force participants that supplement the existing labour force structure in the cities. Studies about migrants' occupation structure have suggested that migrants, especially those coming from rural origins, were concentrated in the occupations that were not desirable by the city residents, which were mainly "3-D" jobs – demanding, dirty, and dangerous (Solinger, 1999; Yang and Guo, 1996; Goldstein and Goldstein, 1991; Wang and Zuo, 1999). Although a massive number of migrants have become an important part of the labour force in cities, the majority of them were temporary in nature – working in informal sectors as temporary workers (in most cases no formal contract protection), receiving minimal wages, and living in temporary shabby shelters. They were not regarded as urban residents, as permanent settlement in the cities, especially big cities, had been harshly restricted.

It has been observed that in many cities, the housing system is no longer able to accommodate massive numbers of migrants. The supply of affordable housing to migrants in many cities has not been available. Therefore, all forms of temporary housing have been mushroomed in almost all cities in China -- self-built houses, huts, shelters, or tents, form communities that lack basic access to urban facilities and services. Wang and Zuo's study (1999) in Shanghai has suggested that there is a clear pattern of residential segregation between migrant communities and local residents. Migrants in Shanghai tended to live in much smaller and inferior living condition compared with local residents and few of them had access to basic urban facilities and services. Fieldtrips by members of our research teams to China in recent years have also clearly suggested that there is an emergence of shantytown communities in many cities, including major cities like Beijing and Shanghai, and many provincial and small cities. The majority of residents living in these communities are migrants from other regions, especially from rural areas. In some regions, an increasing number of urban poor -- petty business people and unemployed urban residents also live in these communities

Although there have been a number of studies on migrant communities (Xiang, 1998, Jeong, 2000; Solinger, 1999; Guo, 2004), very few have focused on living conditions

and livelihoods of residents in these communities. Most of the previous studies have tended to look at the dynamic forces of the communities, social and economic activities, occupational structure, or process of negotiating space with the state, etc. Whether or not it has been intentions, the term “shantytown”, or *pin min qu*, has rarely been mentioned in previous studies.

The Chinese government made great efforts in the pre-reform era to avoid the problems of “over-urbanisation” and “slumisation” of urban areas that many other developing countries have suffered. It is clear that the emergence of shantytown communities in Chinese cities has challenged many aspects of government policies, including basic welfare, housing, medical services, education, and community management. It should also be noted that it is possible that residents in the shantytowns could join those who have been laid off from factories and other urban sectors to form a new class of urban poor in China.

Despite the profound importance of the issue, studies on shantytown communities, or *pin min qu*, in Chinese cities have been extremely limited. Studies and policies about poverty in China have tended to focus on absolute poverty in poor rural communities or ethnic minority regions (Xinhua News Agency 2001; *The Economics*, 1999; Ravallion and Jalan, 1999). Poverty-reduction programs have never addressed the problems of people living in shantytowns in cities, because officially they don’t belong to cities, and physically don’t belong to rural areas. In short, even though migrant communities or shantytowns are highly visible nowadays in many Chinese cities, they remind little understood by researchers and policy-makers.

This paper presents some preliminary results of a five-city study on migration and urban poverty in China. It examines the community structure of disadvantageous migrant communities and the living conditions, working conditions, and livelihoods and economic wellbeing of the residents in these communities. It aims to establish an understanding of whether or not rural migrants have become pauperised in the cities and joined the legions of urban poor; and to what extent government policies attempting to restrict the influx of migrant workers have affected these communities. This paper is one of the several research papers that will be generated from the project.

II. Data

This paper is based on the data collected from a five-city study in China. The five cities are Beijing, Shejiazhuang (Hebei province), Shenyang (Liaoning province), Wuxi (Jiangsu province), and Dongguan (Guangdong province). In each of the five cities, 5 communities were selected. The fieldwork was carried out from April to October 2003. A team of local research collaborators in each city provided assistance in conducting the fieldwork.

There were three main forms of data collection: structured questionnaire for individual respondents (both migrants and non-migrants); community profiles, and intensive interviews with individual respondents. The structured questionnaire was mainly used to obtain detailed information about migrants and local residents in the communities, including household structure, living conditions, income and consumption patterns, employment status, interactions with other members of the

communities. In each city, five communities were selected based on the types of community, e.g. either migrant-concentrated communities or mixed communities of local residents and migrants (see the community profile section and the Appendices). In migrant-concentrated communities, 100 migrant households were randomly selected and one adult member from each of the selected households then was interviewed using the structured questionnaire. In the mixed communities of local residents and migrants, around 50 local residents and 50 migrants were selected to fill in the individual questionnaire. The type of the five communities in Dongguan was different from that of other cities. All five communities were predominantly migrant-concentrated communities, as this reflects the population structure of the city. The total number of individual interviews using structured questionnaire were 2,531.

In addition, a profile for each selected community was constructed under a carefully-designed guideline. Key information obtained from the community profiles include: the process of community formation or transformation since the 1980s; migrants in the community, social and economic activities of the community; living conditions and public facilities, and community management and relevant policies concerning migrant population in the community.

Ten intensive interviews of six migrants and four local residents in each city were conducted using an open-end interview guideline. The key information obtained from local residents include: basic demographic characteristics of the respondents, observation of the changes in the community since the 1980s; changes in occupations and income for local residents since migrants moved in the community; interaction between migrants and other members of community. Additional information obtained from migrant respondents include: migration experiences, comparisons between their current social economic situations with their pre-migration situation, and perception of future settlement plan in the city. The total number of intensive interviews in the five cities was 50.

III. Profiles of the Selected Communities in the Five Cities

The five cities selected in this study have various levels of social and economic development and different types of policy on migration. Five communities were selected in each of the five cities, which include migrant-concentrated communities and mixed communities of migrants and local residents. In the five cities, 2,531 respondents were interviewed, which include 1,972 migrants and 559 local residents.

Beijing As the capital city, Beijing is the economic and cultural centre of the country, which is also one of the major migrant-attractive destinations. The 2000 census shows that Beijing has a population 13.82 million, of which 77.5% are urban residents. Beijing is chosen to represent the economically advanced large cities in China. A full-scale “Migrant Census” conducted in November 1997 in Beijing revealed that, by the time of the survey, there were about 1.58 million migrants who had been to Beijing for at least three months (Office of Beijing Migrant Census, 1997). It has been recognized that migrants, especially those with rural backgrounds, tend to be concentrated in a number of “migrant villages”, such as Zhejiang Village, Henan Village, Anhui Village, and Xinjiang Village – referring to their places of origin (Xiang, 1998; Jeong, 2000; Solinger, 1999; Guo, 2003). Many smaller scale

migrant communities scattered around the outskirts of the city. In Beijing, five communities were selected, three migrant-concentrated communities and two mixed communities of locals and migrants. The five communities are Xiaojiahe, Miaopuxili, Dongjie, Tujing, Shoupakou Beijie, of which the first four communities are located at Beijing's out-skirt suburban areas and the last one is located in one of central urban districts. Although a considerable number of migrants live in some major "migrant villages", many others do not live there. Their communities tended to be at much smaller scales. The community structures and the patterns of integration to the host societies may also differ from larger migrant communities. Miaopuxili and Dongjie communities are close to the so-called "Zhejiang Village" in Beijing's Fengtai District. The other three are smaller communities in which migrants came from various provinces. Major community characteristics are described in the Appendix 1.

Shijiazhuang is the capital city of Hebei province in the North China Plain region with a population 9.2 million (35% urban population) in 2000. Shijiazhuang is the first major city in China that has recently (since 1995) adopted a radical reform policy in *hukou*, which allows all eligible migrants to obtain an urban *hukou*. According to the new policy, those migrants who have been employed as contract workers in Shijiazhuang for more than two years are entitled to have an urban *hukou*, and their family members could also be granted urban *hukou*. Two of the five selected communities in Shijiazhuang were migrant concentrated communities and three are mixed communities of local residents and migrants. Major characteristics of the communities in Shijiazhuang are described in the Appendix 2.

Shenyang is the capital city of Liaoning province in North-east China with a population of 7.2 million in 2000. It has been an important industrial city with many state-run steel-making and coal-refining enterprises. As one of the most important cities in the region, Shenyang has attracted a significant number of migrants from surrounding North-east provinces. It has been observed that some scattered migrant communities have appeared on the outskirts of the city in recent years. But there is little information available about these communities. With strengthening economic reforms, especially state enterprise reforms, the city has also seen an increasing number of workers laid-off from state-owned enterprises. It is not clear whether the newly laid-off workers have joined the army of migrant workers to take up 3-D jobs that were previously regarded as "migrant's jobs". Five communities in Shenyang were selected, three migrant-concentrated communities and two mixed communities of migrants and factory workers. See the Appendix 3 for the major characteristics of the communities in Shenyang.

Wuxi is a middle size city in Jiangsu province with a population of 4.3 million in 2000. Like other middle-sized cities in southern Jiangsu province, Wuxi has been highly developed with a significant share of collective economy. Since the pre-reform era, Chinese government has actively promoted the "small town" urbanisation strategy that aims to avoid the problem of over-urbanisation of large cities. Although Wuxi is not a small town in terms of population, it is only a regional city surrounded by a number of similar scale cities in the area. The patterns of migration and urbanisation in cities like Wuxi would be to certain extent different from that of the other cities in the country. Unlike big cities, restrictions over migration to Wuxi are not as strict. Housing is much more affordable to both local residents and migrants alike. Five communities in Wuxi were selected, three migrant-concentrated

communities in city districts, and two mixed communities of migrants and local residents (also see Appendix 4).

Dongguan is a middle size city in Guangdong province in Southern China with a population of 6.5 million, in which about 5 million were migrants. Dongguan is another type of city that has developed rapidly in the past two decades. Dongguan is close to one of the two “Special Economic Zones”, Shenzhen, and a number of highly developed cities such as the provincial capital Guangzhou and Hong Kong. Like similar cities nearby, Dongguan is known by its export-oriented manufacturing industry, which produces small electronic appliances, toys, clothing, and shoes. In the past two decades, Dongguan has attracted a large number of migrant workers from all over the country, especially young rural girls from nearby or interior provinces. Many migrant workers live in employer provided dormitories. It is hypothesised that the characteristics of migrant communities in Dongguan would be notably different from that in other big cities. In Dongguan, the special attention was devoted to the factory dormitories and surrounding communities. All five communities selected were migrant-concentrated dormitory communities (see Appendix 5 for detailed information).

In four out of the five cities, migrant respondents in the sample outnumbered local residents, as more than a half of the selected communities were migrant-concentrated communities. In Dongguan only migrant respondents were selected. The total sample includes 22% local residents who lived in the communities and 78% migrants. Roughly equal proportion of male and female respondents was selected. From each of the selected households, only one adult member was interviewed to fill in the individual questionnaire. Majority of the respondents aged between 15 to 59 years old. It should be noted that this age distribution did not represent the age distribution of migrant population or local residents in the communities, as very young members of the selected households were excluded in the survey (they were included in the household structure data). Respondents’ *hukou* status, however, does reflect the *hukou* status of the population in the communities. In almost all the communities, more than two-third (as high as 89% in Dongguan) of the respondents held an agricultural *hukou* status. Marital status of the respondents in the five cities varied considerably. In all cities except for Dongguan, majority of the respondents were currently married, with the highest proportion of currently married (89.5%) in Wuxin city. In Dongguan, more than one half of the respondents were single and slightly less than one half were currently married. This reflects the structure of the population in the selected communities in Dongguan. All the five communities were “high-tech” “science park” communities which provided dormitories for single young workers, of which majority were migrants (see Table 1).

The community profiles and fieldwork in the selected communities suggest that the household registration system (or *hukou*) is still effective in determining people’s life chance in cities. In all the selected cities, it is clear that migrants with agricultural *hukou* backgrounds are more likely to live in the migrant-concentrated communities in the selected cities while migrants with non-agricultural background are less likely to live there. The five cities have various social and economic development levels and various migration policies, but the majority of members living in the selected communities were with agricultural *hukou*.

Fieldworks in the selected communities also strongly suggest that the type of housing ownership in the communities was one of the important factors in shaping the structures of the migrant communities in Chinese cities. Urban work units – businesses, enterprises or government organisations, played an important role in shaping urban communities in the planned economic era by providing housing to their employees. In the recent decades, controls over collective ownership of urban housing markets have been weakened, and ownerships of housing in cities have been gradually transferred to individual households. Consequently, the residential housing rental markets have grown substantially in many Chinese cities.

The results from this study suggest that migrant communities are more likely to be formed or transformed from two major types of urban communities. The first type includes the communities located in urban periphery areas in which houses/apartments are owned by private households even before the privatisation and the economic reforms. The private ownership of the houses/apartments was the necessary condition for the formation of migrant communities, especially those communities which were gradually transformed into shantytown communities. Most of the communities in Beijing, Shenyang and Shijiazhuang were among this type of communities. Most of the houses were owned by local residents, who had rights to lease out their houses for extra income. However, because of private housing ownerships in the communities, the local governments did not have strong interests in maintaining the community environment, such as sanitation and other community services. Eventually the living conditions in the communities were worsened and eventually the migrant communities became “shantytowns” in the eyes of others, local residents and local authorities.

The second type includes the communities in which houses/apartments are owned by collective units, such as a textile factory or a transportation company, but have not been transferred to private ownership during the process of privatisation and economic reforms. Some inner city communities in Beijing and Shijiazhuang were among this type of communities. Apartments/houses in this type of communities were old style, sometimes without adequate services of running water and toilet. A number of communities (e.g. Nankazimen and Ertaizi communities in Shenyang) were faced the problem of being demolished at any time due to the new urban planning project. Most of the residents in this type of communities were employees of the previously state-run or collective-run enterprises, and many were laid off in the recent years. Rental income became an important source of income for many local residents in these communities. Although residents in these communities are benefited economically from receiving migrants into the communities, they also suffered from the gradually deteriorated living conditions as a result of influx of migrants.

IV. Living Conditions

The 25 communities selected in the five cities, to certain extent, also represent a variety of communities with different proportions of migrant population. The selected communities in Beijing, Shijiazhuang and Shenyang shared some similarities in terms of community attributes and locations. Most of the communities in these three cities were informally regarded as “migrant communities” or “outsiders’ communities” by

local residents regardless of the proportion of migrant population in the communities. Most of the communities have suffered increasingly worsened living conditions and community environment. Many houses, especially those rented by the migrants, in these communities were poorly constructed and many did not have construction approval. Migrant residents in these communities were often faced the possibility of being “*qing cha*” or “expelled” and their houses being “*chai qian*” or “demolished” by the urban planning authority.

Two selected migrant communities that were considered as shantytown communities in Shenyang were not serviced by the urban sewage system. Open swage run through residential areas in the communities. A recently built public toilet, the “white house”, in one of the communities was regarded the best building in the entire community. Even in the five selected communities in Beijing, where some migrants in large “migrant villages” have negotiated spaces with the local authorities by establishing business ventures in Beijing, vast majority of migrants who lived in one of the smaller migrant communities did not share the same resources. Regardless of their economic status, the selected migrant communities in Beijing did not have a positive image in the eyes of local residents, migrant themselves, and the local authorities. Garbage filled streets and crowded living quarters were the commonly seen pictures in almost all communities in the study. It is observed that the migrant-concentrated or mixed communities were among the most disadvantageous communities in the three cities (Beijing, Shenyang and Shijiazhuang). Given the poor living conditions and limited access to public services, most of these communities could be classified as shantytowns. However, it should be noted that the concept of “shantytowns” was often not acknowledged by the urban planning officials in the cities.

The migrant communities in Wuxi and Dongguan differ considerably from that in the other three cities. Both cities have experienced rapid economic development in the past two decades. While Wuxi’s development has been largely based on the legacy of collective economy, Dongguan’s development has been mostly based on the new form of industries invested by the capitalists from Hong Kong and Taiwan in recent years. Migrants in Wuxi and Dongguan have become an important and permanent part of local labour force. Migrant population in Dongguan have even become majority in the total population. Although disadvantageous compared with local communities, the living conditions in the migrant communities in Wuxi and Dongguan were much better compared to the migrant communities in the other three cities. Local governments in these two cities have played an important role in establishing the communities and providing services to members of the communities.

However, fieldworks and intensive interviews reveal that migrant workers who lived in the dormitories in the science parks in Dongguan do not have personal freedom. Most migrant workers were not allowed to leave the parks from Monday to Friday without permission from their employers. On weekend they were sometimes harassed by the local community’s “public security” personnel outside of the science parks, because they were not locally registered and were subject to pay all sorts of fees. Although many migrant workers claimed that they were able to make a better salary in Dongguan compared with what they earned at home, they were treated as “second class” or “under class” citizens.

Results shown in Table 2 suggest that among all migrant respondents in the selected communities, a large proportion (41.4%) lived in rented single-storey houses, one third (33.8%) lived in rented apartment units, and 20.9% lived in other types of dwelling in these five cities. Most of those single-storey houses are commonly seen in many migrant communities, especially in Beijing, Shenyang and Shijiazhuang. People who lived in these houses were considered the most disadvantageous in the city, as the communities were not adequately serviced by urban system. Among all migrants, a considerable proportion lived in “other types of dwelling” which mainly include the sheds on construction sites and dormitories provided by employers. Fieldworks for this study show that the places provided by employers (except for Dongguan and Wuxi), such as construction site sheds or restaurant storage rooms, were mostly in unliveable conditions without adequate services and necessary facilities such as toilets and running water.

Compared with migrants, local residents in the communities tended to be slightly better off in terms of their housing condition. One-third lived in self-built storey houses which were considered better quality and more expensive to construct. 26.8% of local residents in the selected communities have purchased their own apartment units, which symbolised a relatively stable and well-off living condition. In addition, 15.2% of local residents lived in their self-built single-storey houses. It was widely observed in all communities except for those in Dongguan that many local residents relied on the rental income from those self-built single-storey houses. Although sharing the same living conditions with their tenants in the poorly constructed single-storey houses, local residents at least were able to generate some income from renting.

Fieldwork in the communities indicated that one of the most common problems faced by the migrants was the crowdedness in their living space. It was quite common that three or four adults, sometime two married couples, shared a small bedroom in a rented place. Results in Table 2 show that more than 78% of migrants lived in a one-bedroom house/unit, only 16.6% lived in a two-bedroom place, and very small proportion lived in a place with more than 3 bedrooms. However, among all migrants, only 16.4% lived in a one person households, 29% lived in a 2-person households, and more than half (54.6%) lived in a household with more than 3 people. It is clear that migrants in the selected communities lived in a very crowded condition. Compared with migrants, local residents in the communities enjoyed more living space, and a large proportion of them (45%) lived in a house/unit with more than three bedrooms.

Access to tap water and toilet facilities was also an important indicator of people’s living conditions. Among all migrants in the selected communities, less than a half had access to their own indoor tap water and about 42% had access to public shared tap water. 87% of local residents had their own indoor tap water. Similarly, only small proportion of migrants had their own toilet facility, and majority of them had to use public shared toilet facility. Local residents tended to be much better off and more than 71% used their own toilet facility. Access to indoor tap water and private toilet are regarded as the basic necessity in urban living. It is clear from the result of this study that majority of the migrants in the selected communities did not enjoy the basic living standard in the city – without adequate living space and necessary facilities such as indoor tap water and toilet. If excluding the respondents from

Dongguan, the proportion of migrants without access to indoor tap water and toilets would be even greater.

However, migrants and local residents shared some common facilities in the communities, such as garbage disposal services. Two main types of communities were selected in this study, migrant-concentrated communities and mixed communities with migrants and local residents. Results from Table 2 showed that both migrants and local residents share the same level of garbage disposal services, which indicated that the migrant-concentrated communities did not worse off in accessing to this service in the cities.

V. Working Conditions

It has been well-documented that migrants, especially migrants from rural areas, in Chinese cities tend to have a much different occupational structure. Migrants are more likely to take up jobs that urban residents are unwilling or unable to take (Guo, 2004; Solinger, 1999; Yang and Guo, 1996). Results from this study (in Table 3) reveal more details in terms of migrants' working conditions in comparison with that of local residents in the selected communities. The occupational structure of migrants confirmed the results of the previous studies, suggesting majority of migrants were concentrated in low-end "blue-collar" or service type of occupations, and very small proportion of migrants worked in "white-collar" occupations. One-third of local residents worked in "white-collar" occupations.

It was widely speculated that many migrants in Chinese cities tended to take on more than one job. Results from this study (see Table 3) suggest that, like local residents, majority of migrants (97%) only took on one job in the month before the survey, and very few took on more than one job. However, migrants tended to work much longer hours on average compared with local residents in the selected communities. More than 64% of migrants worked between 9 to 15 hours per day and even some (4%) worked more than 15 hours per day in the month before the survey was undertaken. Local residents, on the other hand, tended to work shorter hours, with 60% working only 8 hours per day.

It seems true that the local residents in the selected communities were slightly better off in terms of job security. While 45.5% of migrants were not offered any forms of contract from their employers, only 35.5% of local residents were in the same situation. A considerable proportion of migrants (11%) were on a short term contract (6 months to 1 year). On the other hand, 18.2% of local residents were able to secure a relatively long term contract (five years and above). It is noted that a large proportion of migrants (30.6%) and local residents (21.4%) reported that their terms of employment contract were "other arrangement", in which "verbal agreement" between employees and employers would be a main arrangement. Fieldwork by the authors of this paper suggested that some respondents did not have any knowledge of a "contract" between employees and employers, as they were never provided with any contract in their previous jobs as farmers or taking on other odd jobs. It is worth noting that although the local residents seemed to be slightly better off in terms of job security, both migrants and local residents in the selected communities by and large do not enjoy secured employment.

China migration is an important form of migration in China. This pattern of migration is also reflected from the results of this study. More than 43% of migrants in the selected communities obtained their first job in the city through referral from relatives or friends, and about one-third landed a job by migrants themselves without any referral. Among the local residents, more than 44% landed their first job through official job allocation or assignment. Although living in the same communities, migrants did not get much help from formal recruitment channels in the job markets in cities. They tended to rely on their family and social resources in finding their first jobs.

In addition to the terms of employment contract, the types of welfare and benefit program enjoyed by migrants and local residents in the five cities also indicate the types of working condition. Table 4 presents the proportion of migrants and local residents who enjoyed various welfare/benefit programs in the five cities. It is not surprising that in all the cities (except Dongguan) a much greater proportion of local residents enjoyed all items of welfare/benefits listed in the table, including public holiday, weekend off, healthcare or insurance, pension benefits, unemployment benefits, workplace injury insurance, maternity leave benefits, and payment to overtime. The proportion of local residents who enjoyed unemployment benefits, workplace injury insurance and payment to overtime in Shijiazhuang and Shenyang tended to be much smaller compared with that in Beijing and Wuxi. This may indicate that the overall working conditions in Shijiazhuang and Shenyang, regardless one's migration status, seemed to be much worse compared with that in Beijing and Wuxi, and even the majority of the local residents do not enjoy these benefit programs.

VI. Income and Economic Well-being

One of the objectives of this study is to understand the livelihood of the members of selected shantytown communities, which is indicated by income and other measurement of economic wellbeing. In order to get more accurate information on income, this study collected respondents' household income and savings and detailed information on respondents' individual monthly income.

The monthly household incomes by migrants and local residents in the selected communities are listed in Table 5. Migrant households in Beijing and Wuxi were much worse off compared with the local residents in the same communities, while migrants in Shenyang and Shijiazhuang tended to have a higher monthly income than their local neighbours living next door in the communities. However, local resident households in Shenyang were the worst off in terms of monthly income and monthly savings. This result is confirmed by the observations in the field by one of the authors of this paper. Most of the local residents, who lived in the selected communities and shared the poor living conditions with migrants, were more likely to be laid-off factory workers and whose employers were unable to provide sufficient unemployment benefits. Rental income became an important source of income for many local residents in the selected communities in Shenyang. Local residents in Shenyang also had the least amount of monthly savings. Many cities in China have set up various poverty lines in recent years. Most urban residents whose incomes

were below the poverty line would be able to get a minimum living allowance from the local welfare department. However, this benefit is not available to those who are not locally registered. Community survey in Shenyang showed that a considerable proportion of local resident households have applied for minimum living allowance in 2003. For example, among 1,621 local households in Liuhe community, 130 households have applied for minimum living allowance and 64 households were granted in 2003.

Migrants in Beijing earned much less than their local neighbours, but they were able to have slightly more savings than the locals. Observations in the selected communities in Beijing show that many migrants consume much less than their urban counterparts. Because of their temporary living conditions in the cities, they do not spend much money on purchasing durable household appliances. For many families, the only durable appliance is a TV set. Many migrants plan to go back to their places of origin after they have saved enough money for building a new house or getting married.

Although migrants in Wuxi earned a better household monthly income compared with migrants in other cities, they were not better off than the Wuxi locals. The selected community in Dongguan were different from that in other cities. The five communities in Dongguan were predominantly unmarried young migrants living in dormitories provided by their employers in the “high-tech” science parks. Therefore, the monthly income (1,877 *yuan*) was more or less the monthly income per person.

It should be noted that the household income is not a precise indicator of economic wellbeing as the average sizes of households may vary. However, as shown in Table 1, the proportions of single, currently married and other types of marital status in all four cities were similar (with the exception of Dongguan), which indicate the size of household would be similar. Another reason of using household income instead of individual income is that many migrants (as well as locals) in the selected communities worked in small family business, e.g. as street vendors or shop keepers, both husband and wife (and other family members) contributed to the business. It would be hard to identify the share of contribution of labour by every member in the family. It should also be noted the living standards in all five cities included in this study vary considerably. Dongguan and Wuxi are among the most expensive cities in terms of rent, foods and other daily consumer goods. Beijing is less expensive than Dongguan and Wuxi, but is much more expensive than Shijiazhuang and Shenyang. The authors of this paper are aware of this variation, and will make efforts to take it into the consideration in to further analysis.

Table 6 lists the proportion of ownership of household appliances by migrants and local residents in the selected communities. It is very clear that in terms of consumer goods, migrants enjoyed much less compared with local residents even though in some communities migrants’ incomes were slightly higher than the locals. TV is the most common household appliance for migrants and local residents. But the proportion of owning a TV set for migrants is much lower compared with that of local residents. The other common appliances for migrants were electric fan and telephone. Some appliances that were considered as necessity for urban residents, such as refrigerator and washing machine, were not affordable for migrants. Overall, migrants in the selected communities have a much lower living standard compared

with their local resident neighbours, although most of them shared the same poor community environments.

A regression analysis was carried out to examine the effects of various independent variables on individual respondent's monthly income. The independent variables include: *hukou* status, marital status, having or not having children, number of jobs have taken, whether have an employment contract, whether the job is hourly-based or piece-based, length of employment, and type of current occupation. Table 7 shows the means and standard deviations and Table 8 shows the regression coefficients.

The results show that the two most significant factors are “the length of employment” and the “types of occupation”. It is quite clear that the longer the employment the better income one is able to earn. The results also suggest that a white-collar worker is able to earn much more than a blue-collar worker. If all other factors are the same, the “type of occupation” and “the length of employment” would largely determine one's economic wellbeing. However, as it was shown in Table 7, there were only 18% of the respondents (including both migrants and local residents) had white-collar jobs, majority of the respondents living in the selected communities were engaged in blue-collar jobs.

It is rather surprising that one of the important factors, *hukou* status, only show a low level significance in determining one's economic wellbeing. Many previous studies indicated that agricultural *hukou* and non-agricultural *hukou* have very significant effects on one's life chance. However, results from this study suggest that being a non-agricultural *hukou* holder has some positive effects on one's monthly income, but it is not the most important factor. This may suggest, being a member of the selected communities, one's non-agricultural *hukou* status would only have limited impacts on one's earning. Another factor, whether having an employment contract, also shows some positive impacts on one's earning, but it is not the most significant factor.

All other factors, one's marital status, whether having children or not, number of jobs have taken, and whether the job is hourly based or piece based, do not show any significant effects on one's monthly income. This suggests that a single person does not have advantage in getting a higher monthly income compared with a married person, and an hourly-based worker may not earn less than a piece-based worker if she/he lives in one of the selected communities.

VII. Conclusions and Discussions

The selected communities in this study were much disadvantageous compared with other communities in the cities in terms of access to public services and resources, standard of living, and community environment. These communities are often labelled as “migrant communities”, “outsiders' communities”, or in Dongguan “migrant workers' dormitories”. Although members in the selected communities have different living and working conditions, most of them were considered “second class” citizens by the local residents and local authorities.

Dongguan is a unique city in which migrant workers have outnumbered local residents. Many “high-tech” science parks were built in the 1980s and the 1990s,

which have attracted a large number of migrant workers from other provinces. The small local labour force was simply not enough to meet the rapid expansion of local economy. Most of the science parks were well serviced and strictly managed. Majority of the migrant workers lived in the dormitories provided by their employers in the science parks. Local residents lived in their own houses in the area where were segregated from the graded dormitory communities. A small number of local residents also build houses for rent. Unlike the selected communities in other cities, where local landlords normally lived in the same communities with their tenants, migrant communities in Dongguan were largely segregated from local communities and treated as “second class” citizens.

Compared with the migrants in Dongguan, migrants in most other cities (except Shenyang) were not better off financially. They earned much less income and lived in much worse living conditions. Although migrant workers in Dongguan did not enjoy personal freedom, their communities were well serviced. Migrant communities in Beijing, Shijiazhuang and Shenyang were often located at outskirts of the cities and sometimes inner city areas. The communities where were in the areas of “soon-to-be-demolished” would normally attract large number of migrants simply because of its cheap rent. The common images of these communities are dirty streets and crowded living quarters. If other means of making a living were not sufficient, local residents often relied on rental income. Most of the selected communities in Beijing, Shijiazhuang and Shenyang could be considered as “shantytown communities” in which most of the residents were economically disadvantageous, occupationally concentrated, and sometimes socially segregated. Public services were insufficient in the communities and access to the public facilities was inadequate. Although more than 90% respondents claimed that their communities were serviced by garbage disposal services, the fieldwork observations often confirm otherwise, which may reflect poor quality of the services.

Compared with the local residents in the selected communities, migrants were even more disadvantageous. They tended to work much longer hours and earn much less in most of the communities (except for those in Shenyang). Migrants were less likely to be protected by any forms of employment contract, and they were more likely to work in blue-collar types of occupations, such as production workers, various service workers, or petty street vendors. The results show that “the type of occupation” is one of the most important factors in determining one’s economic wellbeing. A person working in one of the “white-collar” jobs would earn much more than a person working in one of the “blue-collar” jobs. It is very unlikely that migrant workers would be able to take any advantageous in job markets in the five selected cities. They were not only “second class” citizens, but also “second class” workers.

It was expected that the recent fundamental *hukou* reform in Shijiazhuang would have some positive impacts on the migrant communities. However, the preliminary results in Shijiazhuang so far suggest that the relaxed *hukou* policy has not seen improved living condition for migrants and their communities. Further analysis is needed in this area.

This paper only presents some preliminary results of the project. It is hoped that more intensive analysis will be carried shortly.

References

- Cheng, T. and M. Selden (1994) 'The origins and social consequences of China's hukou system,' *China Quarterly*, vol. 139, pp644-668.
- The Economist* (1999) 'China's Inglorious Poor'. Jan 16, vol 350 no. 8102 p40.
- Goldstein, S. and Goldstein, A. (1991) *Permanent and temporary migration differentials in China*, Paper of the East-West Population Institute, East-West Center, No. 17.
- Guo, F. and R. Iredale (2003) 'Unemployment among the migrant population in Chinese cities: the case study of Beijing', in Coate, B., R. Brooks, I. Fraser and L. Xu (ed.) *Proceedings of the 15 th Annual Conference of the Association for Chinese Economic Studies Australia (ACESA)*, Melbourne: RMIT Business Research Development Unit (<http://www.rmit.edu.au/bus/events/acesa/proceedings.htm>).
- Guo, F. (2004), 'A rural migrant community in urban Beijing', *Social Sciences Volume on Urban Sustainability, The Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems*, EOLSS Publishers, UNESCO.
- Khan, A. R. Griffin, K. and Riskin, C. (1999) 'Income distribution in urban China during the period of economic reforms and globalisation', *The American Economic Review*, vol. 89, no. 2, pp296-300.
- Jeong, J. (2000) *Renegotiating with the State: The Challenge of Floating Population and the Emergence of New Urban Space in Contemporary China*. Doctoral Dissertation, Yale University.
- Lee, J. and F. Wang (1999) *One Quarter of Humanity: Malthusian Mythology and Chinese Realities, 1700-2000*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Office of Beijing Migrant Census (1997) *Beijing wailai renkou pucha ziliao (Tabulations from the Beijing Migrant Census)*, China Commercial Press, Beijing.
- Solinger, D. (1999) *Contesting citizenship in Urban China: peasant migrants, the state, and the logic of the market*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wang, F. and X. Zuo (1999) 'Inside China's cities: Institutional barriers and opportunities for urban migrants', *American Economic Review*, vol. 89 no. 2.
- Xiang, B. (1998) *A Community without Boundary: the Basic Structure of a Migrant Enclave in Contemporary China*. Paper presented at International Conference on "Labour Mobility and Migration in East Asia", April 17-18, Beijing.
- Xinhua News Agency (2001). *Nearly one million people in central China shed poverty*. Feb 26.

Yang, Q. and F. Guo (1996) 'Occupational attainment of rural to urban temporary economic migrants in China, 1985-1990,' *International Migration Review*, 30(3): 771-787.

Yang, X. (1993) 'Household registration, economic reform and migration,' *International Migration Review*, vol. 27 pp796-818.

Table 1. Percentage Distribution of the Respondents in the Five Cities

	Beijing	Shijiazhuang	Shenyang	Wuxin	Dongguan	Total
Migration Status						
Non-migrants	19.6	29.9	19.9	40.9	0	22.1
Migrants	80.4	70.1	80.1	59.1	100.0	77.9
Gender						
Males	62.3	67.1	53.2	57.2	40.4	56.0
Females	37.7	32.9	46.8	42.8	59.6	44.0
Age groups						
<15	0.2	0	0	0	0.2	0.1
15-24	29.3	24.6	29.1	10.1	53.5	29.3
25-44	60.8	60.3	53.3	63.4	44.9	56.5
45-59	7.9	15.0	17.4	26.1	1.4	13.6
60+	1.8	0.2	0.2	0.4	0	0.5
<i>Hokou</i> status						
Agriculture	63.7	67.1	79.8	60.9	89.0	72.2
Non-agriculture	35.5	32.7	20.2	38.9	9.4	27.3
Undecided	0.8	0.2		0.2	1.6	0.5
Marital status						
Single	34.7	24.6	27.2	8.1	51.5	29.2
Currently married	62.7	73.9	69.0	89.5	46.5	68.3
Divorced	1.6	0.8	1.9	1.4	0.8	1.3
Widowed	1.0	0.8	1.1	0.4	0	0.7
<i>De facto</i>	0	0	0.8	0.6	1.2	0.5
Sample Size	499	501	523	506	502	2,531

Table 2. Percentage Distribution of Various Living Conditions in the sample Communities

Items	Migrants	Local residents	Total
Type of dwelling			
Self-built storied building	0.8	31.8	7.7
Purchased apartment unit	1.5	26.8	7.5
Rented apartment unit	33.8	7.0	27.9
Rented single-storey house	41.4	5.2	33.4
Self-built single-story house	1.4	15.2	4.4
Self-built shelter	0.2	-	0.2
Other type of dwelling	20.9	14.2	18.9
Number of people living in the household			
1	16.4	1.4	13.1
2	29.0	14.4	25.8
3	22.5	49.6	28.5
4	11.5	19.0	13.2
5 and +	20.6	15.5	19.5
Number of bedrooms			
1	78.6	19.0	65.4
2	16.6	35.9	20.9
3	3.4	24.5	8.0
4 and +	1.4	20.6	5.7
Use of tap water			
Indoor family own use	47.6	87.1	56.4
Indoor public use	11.4	1.4	9.2
Outdoor family own use	4.9	8.1	5.6
Outdoor public use	30.4	2.7	24.3
No tap water	5.6	0.7	4.5
Types of toilet			
Indoor family own use	31.1	71.4	40.1
Indoor public use	9.5	0.4	7.2
Outdoor family own use	2.7	6.8	3.6
Outdoor public use	42.7	19.0	37.5
No toilet facility	13.8	2.5	11.3
Garbage disposal			
Regular disposal service	93.5	98.7	94.7
Irregular disposal service	1.4	0.5	1.2
Self disposal	2.7	0.5	2.3
Other methods of disposal	2.3	0.2	1.8
Sample size	1,972	559	2,531

Table 3. Percentage Distribution of Various Working Conditions in the Sampled Communities (%)

	Migrants	Local residents	Total
Main occupation			
Cadre/manager	2.6	4.2	2.9
Professional/technician	6.6	13.7	8.0
Cleric/office worker	4.3	16.0	6.6
Trading /retail business)	49.8	25.6	45.0
Agricultural worker	1.8	2.7	2.0
Production worker	28.2	26.7	27.9
Other occupations	6.6	11.1	7.6
Number of jobs engaged last month			
No job	1.4	2.6	1.7
1 job	97.3	97.2	97.3
2 to 3 jobs	0.9	0	0.7
3 jobs and above	0.4	0.2	0.3
Average number working hours per day			
Less than 8 hours	6.6	9.7	7.2
8 hours	25.4	60.3	32.1
9-15 hours	64.1	28.0	57.2
15 hours and above	3.9	1.9	3.5
Term of employment contract			
No formal contract	45.5	35.5	43.7
On a 6-month contract	0.6		0.5
On a 6-month to 1-year contract	11.2	6.9	10.4
On a 1-2 years contract	9.1	9.0	9.1
One a 2-5 years contract	2.5	9.0	3.7
On a 5-years and above contract	0.5	18.2	3.8
Other arrangement	30.6	21.4	28.9
Channels of obtaining the First job in this city			
Official job allocation	0.2	44.2	13.3
Referred by private agent	5.0	0.7	3.8
Referred by official agent	2.5	1.5	2.2
Referred by relative/friend	43.9	10.9	34.0
No agent, landed by oneself	31.0	10.2	24.8
Through recruitment ad	6.5	3.6	5.7
Recruited directly by employer	7.9	20.4	11.7
Other channels	3.0	8.4	4.6
Sample size	1,972	559	2,351

Table 4. Proportion of Migrants and Local Residents Who Enjoyed Various Welfare/benefits in the five selected cities (%)

	Beijing	Shijiazhuang	Shenyang	Wuxi	Dongguan	Total
Public holiday						
migrants	18.1	12.8	21.8	34.3	60.5	31.2
local residents	52.0	45.3	43.1	77.6	-	58.1
Weekend off						
migrants	11.2	7.7	11.1	17.0	42.1	19.4
local residents	50.0	39.3	41.4	69.0	-	52.5
Free healthcare/insurance						
migrants	3.6	1.7	10.3	26.7	26.3	12.4
local residents	70.4	64.0	25.0	84.5	-	67.7
Pension program/insurance						
migrants	3.1	0.9	8.9	9.4	24.0	10.2
local residents	64.3	82.0	41.3	85.1	-	74.4
unemployment						
payment/insurance						
migrants	2.0	0.6	1.3	2.1	6.6	2.8
local residents	57.3	10.7	22.2	43.2	-	33.3
workplace injury insurance						
migrants	2.3	0.9	7.4	15.3	38.6	14.3
local residents	46.3	8.7	8.2	34.1	-	25.3
Maternity leave for females						
migrants	8.8	16.1	11.3	28.5	52.6	31.0
local residents	82.9	69.2	42.1	74.2	-	71.1
Payment to overtime						
migrants	22.3	8.9	38.9	42.1	75.1	42.5
local residents	56.7	25.4	24.3	66.2	-	48.1

Table 5. Monthly Household Income and Savings in the Five Selected Cities (yuan)

	Migrants		Local residents		Total	
	Income	Savings	Income	Savings	Income	Savings
Beijing	1195.79	367.19	1813.20	344.11	1316.53	362.51
Shijiazhuang	1312.84	631.16	1236.86	453.33	1290.09	577.71
Shenyang	1534.65	643.96	922.21	173.68	1412.87	566.19
Wuxi	1562.58	570.94	2461.15	939.80	1929.86	721.27
Dongguan	1877.25	813.58	-	-	1877.25	813.58

Table 6. Proportion of ownership of household appliances (%)

	Migrants	Local residents
TV	67.7	98.6
Refrigerator	21.9	85.2
VCD	27.8	55.4
Tape-recorder	19.8	45.8
Camera	16.5	37.1
Micro-wave oven	5.4	45.7
Electric Fan	76.7	89.6
Washing machine	18.0	84.9
Telephone or cell phone	58.1	87.8
Air-conditioner	7.9	50.8
Motorcycle	8.8	26.3
Computer	4.9	25.6

Table 7. Means of Variables Used in Regression Analysis

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Personal monthly income (INCOME)	990.10	1107.92
Hukou status (HUKOU) (code non-agriculture as 1, and agriculture as 0)	0.30	0.46
Marital status (SINGLE) (single as 1 and non-single as 0)	0.32	0.47
Having or not having children (CHILDREN) (code having children as 1, 0 if no children)	0.91	0.28
Number of jobs (F3) (JOBNUM) (code 1 if only have 1 job, code 2 if having 2 jobs, code 3 if having 3 jobs or more)	1.01	0.14
Contract (CONTRACT) (code 1 if having any forms of contract, 0 if no contract)	0.27	0.45
Hours-based or piece-based job (JOBBASE) (code hours-based as 1, 0 if piece-based)	0.59	0.49
Length of current employment (EMPLENGTH) (months)	51.04	67.36
Type of current occupation (OCCUP) (code 1 if working as “white –collar jobs, 0 if working as “blue-collar jobs”)	0.18	0.38

Table 8. Regression Coefficients of monthly income

Variables	Coefficients	s.e.	Sig.
HUKOU	.1430	-.492	.053
SINGLE	-.1400	.1430	.195
CHILDREN	-0.005	-.140	.938
JOBNUM	-.259	-0.005	.117
CONTRACT	0.090	-.259	.046
JOBBASE	0.041	0.090	.439
EMLNGTH	0.001	0.041	.007
OCCUP	.275	0.001	.000
Intercept	6.912	0.188	.000

Appendix 1. Community Profile of selected migrant communities in Beijing

Community	Location	Major characteristics
Xiaojiahe	Haidian District, out-skirt northern suburb of Beijing	Migrant-concentrated community. Migrants outnumbered local residents. Originally an agricultural farming community. Main traditional economic activity was vegetable farming. First group of migrants from neighbouring Hebei province moved to this community as contract vegetable farmers. Cheap rentals later attracted a large number of migrants from other regions. Locals worked in village and township factories. First group of migrants moved in around 1994.
Tujing	Haidian District, out-skirt northern suburb of Beijing	Migrant-concentrated community. Originally a small agricultural farming village. Geographically close to the newly developed “high-tech” parks. Migrants outnumbered local residents. Farming land was contracted to migrants. Local residents worked in non-agricultural activities. 50% local families earn rental income. Employees of near-by “high-tech” parks and college students were the main sources of tenants. Other types of occupations of the migrants include garbage recycling and factory workers. First migrants moved in the early 1990s.
Miaopuxili	Fengtai District, out-skirt south-east suburb of Beijing	Migrant-concentrated community. Originally an urban residential community with a number of dormitory buildings and residential compounds built by a railway company. Local residents were predominantly factory workers. A considerable number of laid-off workers in recent years. Around 200 migrant households in the community. Rental income was an important source of income for many local residents. While more migrants moving in, some local residents have moved out of the community. Migrants started to move in around the late 1980s.
Dongjie	Fengtai District, out-skirt south-east suburb of Beijing	Mixed community of locals and migrants. Originally a community with both agricultural and non-agricultural residents. A collective-own compound with multiple units of house was first rented out to a factory and later on rented out as residential units. Migrants from Zhejiang province rented the place as both garment-making factories and living quarters of their workers. Local residents with agricultural <i>huhou</i> lived closely with the migrants, as most of them had their own houses which could be rented out. Some local residents moved out (some still collecting rents) the communities as more migrants moved in.
Beijie	Xuanwu District, central district of Beijing	Mixed community of locals and migrants. A community with a number of low-rise buildings. Close to the South Beijing Railway Station. Before the 1990s, there was no migrant in this community. Many migrants lived a nearby community (Xiaomachang) where single-story houses were available for rent. After the demolition of Xiaomachang, some migrants started to move in to this community – most of them rented basement units of the multiple-story buildings. Some small houses attached to the main buildings were built to meet the demand for cheap rent in this area. Migrants in this area came from various provinces and mainly were engaged in small business, street vendors, or operating small restaurants.

Appendix 2. Community Profile of selected migrant communities in Shijiazhuang

Community	Location	Major characteristics
Taoyuancun	Qiaodong District, north-east Shijiazhuang	Originally an agricultural village located at the close proximity to the central urban area. Well established village and township enterprises and above average income per capita. Main agricultural activities included vegetables and fresh flower farming. About one-third households were migrants. Migrants started to move in to the community in the mid-1990s. Many migrants in this community were engaged in small business.
Dangjiazhuang	Xinhua District	Originally farming village located at very close to central urban area. Before the 1990s, local residents' main source of income was farming – vegetable and wheat farming. In the early 1990s, new residential buildings were built and most local residents moved into the new buildings. Their old single-story houses were available for rent. Migrants lived in this community were engaged in small trading business, making-garments, or working in the nearby factories. Some employees of a nearby prison also rented places in this community.
Nanjie	Qiaoxi District, city west	Very close to urban centre. Local residents were traditionally engaged in vegetable farming but later on moved to other non-agricultural activities. Migrants from Zhejiang province started to move in to this community in the 1990s. Garment-making, wholesale and retail were the main activities for migrants. Many young local residents have moved out and elderly local residents still lived in the community. Some local residents joined migrants in garment-making and related activities.
Beidu	Qiaoxi District, city west	Migrant concentrated community. Very close to urban centre. One of the oldest villages in the city. A couple of main streets run through the village. Estimated number of migrants outnumbered local residents. A new village was built to accommodate one-third of local residents. Old style single-story houses were available for rent. A number of small goods market in the nearby areas, which attracted a large number of migrants. Since the 1990s, less farming lands were available. Many factory workers were laid off. Rental became one of important sources of income for many local households. Rental income was also an important source of income for the village collective, the main welfare provider to local residents.
Shizhuang	Xinhua District	Migrant concentrated community. Close to one of major clothing wholesale market in the city. Since the late 1980s, migrants started to move in. In late 1990s, the proportion of migrants in the community reached 80%. Many low-rise residential buildings were built illegally by the local residents and later rented out for income. In recent years, many village and township enterprises were closed down and many workers were laid off from factories. Rental income became one of important sources of income for local residents.

Appendix 3. Community Profile of selected migrant communities in Shenyang

Community	Location	Major characteristics
Ertaiizi	Dadong District, north-east of central Shenyang	Traditionally an urban residential area. Most of the local residents were employees of state-run enterprises. More and more workers were laid off recently. Since the late 1990s, migrants from other provinces started to move in. They rented places in those poorly structured old-style units/rooms in the community. Rental income became an important source of income for those laid-off workers. Many migrants were engaged in small self-employed business. Laid-off workers in the community also took up similar jobs. Local residents who were better-off have moved out of the community, but they may continue to collect rent from tenants.
Tieling	Dadong District	Traditionally an urban residential area. Most residents were employees of state-run enterprises. More and more workers were laid off recently. Originally it was a single-story housing area with limited public services, such as running water and public toilets. Cheap rent in this community attracted a large number of migrants from other province and from out suburban area of Shenyang. Recently, a large number of single-story houses were demolished, and now residential buildings were built. Local residents moved into the new buildings, and migrants rented those soon-to-be demolished houses.
Liuhe	Shenhe District, central Shenyang	This was mainly a low-rise residential area. Most of the buildings were built after 1985. Very close to one of the major small good wholesale market. Many migrants rent units in the residential buildings and were engaged in small trading business in the market. Rental became more and more expensive, some local residents decided to rent somewhere else and rent out their own unit for higher rental income. Before the establishment of the wholesale market, very few migrants lived in the community. Now this community was considered as a predominantly migrant community.
Nankazimen	Dadong District	A community with low-rise residential buildings, single-story houses, and temporary shelters. Most of the local residents were employees of state-run or collective-run enterprises. Recently more and more workers were laid off and lived on the minimum living allowance provided by the welfare program for urban residents. Many houses/units/shelters rented by migrants, even lived by local residents, were illegal construction and had never been approved by the authority. Rental income was a major regular income for many laid-off workers in the community. Any re-construction plan in this community would jeopardise their major source of income.
Changnan	Huanggu District, central Shenyang	A low-rise urban residential community. Most of the buildings were built in late 1980s. Majority of the local residents were factory workers and very few were professionals or in other “white-collar” occupations. More and more workers were laid off and they sought employment in retail market or as street vendors. Migrants started to move in this community in early 1990s. Most of them worked in a nearby small good wholesale market. Rental income was an important source of income for those who were laid off from factories.

Appendix 4. Community Profile of selected migrant communities in Wuxi

Community	Location	Major characteristics
Nanjian	Beitang District, near central Wuxi	Traditionally an urban residential community with many professional and government cadres. Since the early 1990s, more and more migrants from neighbouring Zhejiang province moved in to the community, now it was considered as a mixed community of local residents and migrants. Majority of the migrants in the community lived with other family members. Most of them were engaged in small good wholesale and retail business in the nearby markets. Some of migrant families have purchased residential units in the area and have well integrated in to the community. Some recently laid-off local residents were even employed by migrants in their small trading business.
Jinxingcun	Nanchang District, suburban area	A community with well-established village and township enterprises (VTE). Migrants started to move in the community since 1985 when the VTEs were rapidly developed and demand for cheap labour was strong in the area. Majority of the migrants came from the relatively poor area in North Jiangsu. Recently a migrant-concentrated dormitory community was established around the factory area. Manufacturing and other non-agricultural activities consisted of a significant share of economy in this community.
Sumiaocun	Huishan District, suburban area	A community with a large number of migrant population and well-established heavy industrial sector. Relatively cheap housing (both rent and purchase) and job opportunities attracted a large number of migrants. There were a couple of migrant-only dormitory buildings to accommodate the needs of migrant workers. Migrants became a part of local community.
Qingshan	Binhu District, suburban area	A vegetable retail market with a large number of migrant vendors. Originally a “street market” without proper management. In 1993, based on the original “street market”, the local township government built this massive in-door vegetable retail market and have attracted a large number of migrants and local residents. Many migrants lived in nearby rented units. Some local residents also worked in the vegetable market, but majority of them worked in manufacturing sectors. Small number of well-off migrants have purchased properties in this community.
Longshan	Binhu District, suburban area	A suburban community with well-established village and township enterprises (VTE). Migrants started to move in the community since 1980s, when the demands for skilled carpenters, painters and construction workers, and factory workers were strong. Local labour supply was not sufficient. Most of the migrants came from North Jiangsu, Anhui and Sichuan provinces where economic development was less advanced and job opportunities were scarce. Local residents were employed as permanent workers with full benefits and migrant workers were employed as temporary workers with limited benefits.

Appendix 5. Community Profile of selected migrant communities in Dongguan

Community	Location	Major characteristics
Shangyang	Changan Township, suburban area	A traditional agricultural farming community before the mid-1980s. Investors from Taiwan and Hong Kong started to build factories in this area since the mid-1980s. Migrants started to move in as more factories were built and demands for workers increased. Gradually migrants outnumbered (five times) local residents. Local residents took advantages of having land ownership and built low-rise residential buildings (commonly five-story) to earn rental income, which became an important source of income for some local residents.
Zhenan Science Park	Changan Township, suburban area	A “science park” with 18 “high-tech” manufacturing companies making electronic appliances, computer chips, communication equipments and other types of products. The community was well serviced with clinic, bank branches, post office, bookstores, supermarkets, childcare centres, restaurants and other facilities. Almost all employees in the park were migrant workers. Some middle level management personnel were also migrants. This was predominantly a migrant concentrated community with very small proportion of local residents.
Xiayang	Changan Township	Originally an agricultural farming community before the mid-1980s. Because of its proximity to Hong Kong and social connections with Hong Kong relatives, many young men in this community traditionally would go to Hong Kong to seek for job opportunities. Since the late 1980s, investors from Hong Kong and Taiwan started to build various manufacturing factories in this community. Demands for cheap labour increased greatly and migrants started to move in. Since the 1990s, migrant population had already outnumbered local residents. Many local residents were middle level managers in the factories. Others were engaged in trading business and other activities. Rental income is also an important source of income for many locals.
Anli Science Park	Changan Township	Similar to Zhenan science park. A well-serviced but strictly managed community with a number of dormitory buildings. Most migrant workers in this community were singles or married but do not live with their spouses. A special accommodation could be arranged if a spouse was to visit. Some married migrant workers also rented places outside of the science park.
Zhendi Xincun	Changan Township	A community with a close dormitory compound and mixed residential area with local residents and migrant workers. The new community (<i>Xincun</i> , or new village) was built in 2001 (close to the nearby old village), mainly to accommodate the increasing needs for local residents and migrant workers. Migrants have outnumbered local residents in the new community. Many locals worked as managers in nearby factories, some of them were also engaged in small business. Rental income in this community was also an important source of income for local residents.