Citation: Sainan Lin, Fulong Wu, Zhigang Li (2020) Social integration of migrants across Chinese neighbourhoods. *Geoforum*. Doi: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.04.008

(accepted version)

Social integration of migrants across Chinese neighbourhoods

Abstract: Existing studies on migrant social integration in China are often focused on urban villages. Very few have explored across different types of neighbourhood. Drawing on the 2014 China Migrants Dynamic Survey, we find that migrants who live in 'commodity housing' neighbourhoods have achieved a higher level of social integration in all the dimensions of socio-economic achievement, neighbourly interaction and social relationships with the city. Migrants living in urban and rural villages manage to achieve better economic integration than migrants living in factory dormitories and old neighbourhoods in the central city. However, migrants in these villages show a lower level of social integration. The findings reveal that urban and rural villages as migrant enclaves serve a stepping-stone for migrants to earn an income but do not support migrants to eventually progress into better social integration. By revealing different levels of social integration, the Chinese case seems to suggest a process of spatial assimilation through which migrants living in more mainstream and formal housing with the locals become better integrated. However, such a process does not really happen as many migrants are stuck in the informal housing of villages. That migrant enclaves demonstrate a lower level of integration suggests that a path of segmented assimilation did not exist. That is, migrants could not find a path to integrate into the city in these enclaves.

Keywords: neighbourhood, social integration, urban village, migrant, urban China

urbanisation. Research on international immigrants in Western countries generated two different frameworks of integration or assimilation. The classic framework reveals that migrants initially live in ethnic enclaves to seek mutual support and job opportunities. When their socio-economic status has improved over time, they generally move to neighbourhoods with a more mainstream setting, such as white majorities and suburban locations (Alba et al., 1999; Allen & Turner, 1996; Logan et al., 2002; Massey & Denton, 1985, 1992). Extends from the classic framework, the segmented assimilation framework suggests that immigrants may be assimilated into different "segments" of the society, including upward to white middle class, downward to the underclass or stay in ethnic communities even when achieved economic advancement. These global experiences of migrant integration suggest that the particular type of neighbourhood where migrants live is likely to indicate the stages of migrants' adaptation and integration processes into the urban society.

However, studies on internal migrants in Chinese cities have overwhelmingly focused on urban villages (Liu et al., 2014; Wu et al., 2014). Despite the increasing focus on the process and dimensions of migrant integration in the city, little attention has been given to the variation in different types of neighbourhood. With the decades of migration and increasingly diversified composition of contemporary internal migrants in China, there has been a remarkable dispersal of migrants over different types of neighbourhood in addition to urban villages (Wissink et al., 2014). Different types of neighbourhood represent different and contrasting physical environments and areas which are likely to have different social profiles (Breitung, 2012; Forrest & Yip, 2007; Li et al., 2012; Wu, 2012; Zhu et al., 2011). The limited amount of research suggests that migrants in different neighbourhoods have distinct socio-economic characteristics (Wissink et al., 2014). Living in different neighbourhoods also indicates distinct residential experiences and neighbourhood relations (Li et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2015). Moreover, research has revealed that migrants have high rates of intra-city residential mobility (Li & Zhu, 2015; Wu, 2006). They often move to different neighbourhoods due to frequent job changes (Lin & Gaubatz, 2017), urban redevelopment (Wu, 2004) or housing tenure achievement (Cui et al., 2016). Thus, it is necessary to pay more attention to different types of neighbourhood in order to better understand the process of migrants' social integration into urban society.

Against the backdrop of immigrant integration studies in Western societies, this study seeks to fill the above knowledge gap through 'mapping' the conditions and situations of migrants' social integration in different neighbourhoods of a developing and transitional economy. In these circumstances, this study neither aims to present a systematic study of migrant social integration in Chinese cities nor attempts to construct a new measurement for migrant social integration. Rather, informed by Western experiences, we intend to identify the role and experience of the neighbourhood in migrant social integration in Chinese cities. This study thus contributes to the international debate on migrants' integration/assimilation processes, extending the current integration theory by considering the specific migrant situation of Chinese cities.

The paper is organised as follows. In section 2 following a review of the literature on migrant social integration in both developed Western countries and developing countries, related studies on migrant social integration in China are discussed. In section 3 we further discuss the current debates on neighbourhoods and migrants' social integration in China and put forward our research questions. In section 4 we explain the research design for this study, including data, methodology and the research framework. In section 5 we present the empirical findings based on quantitative analysis. Finally, the last section concludes.

2 Literature review

2.1 Understanding migrant social integration in an international context

The current phase of urbanisation and globalisation has seen massive displacement and movement of migrants, at both transnational and national levels, mostly to urban spaces throughout the world (Venn, 2006). The successful integration of immigrants into a host society has become a major issue for policymakers worldwide. Primarily based on the experiences of international immigrants in US and European countries, integration theories have evolved through decades from classical assimilation theory introduced by the Chicago school in the 1920s (Park & Burgess, 1921) to "structural assimilation" (Gordon, 1964), and to segmented assimilation (Portes and Zhou, 1993). In general, immigrants' integration processes start with migrants' initial settlement in the city, which is often based on cultural and economic similarity. They mostly reside close to their ethnic groups for mutual support and close to where they work to reduce living costs. As ports of entry, these ethnic neighbourhoods provide social capital for newcomers. However, these are often

transitional neighbourhoods – they represent a practical and temporary phase in the incorporation of immigrants into the host society (Logan et al., 2002; Massey & Denton, 1985). As soon as their socio-economic situation improves, immigrants and their following generations move away from ethnic enclaves to neighbourhoods of the local majority, which typically means moving into neighbourhoods with more amenities, safer streets and better schools, where they learn to navigate daily life in a more mainstream setting. This is the process of migrants' successful integration/assimilation into their local society (Massey & Denton, 1985). According to the above classic assimilation framework, segregation at the beginning stage is natural, but it is eventually overcome by processes of individual socioeconomic mobility and acculturation (Logan et al., 2002).

Nonetheless, different from the main trend of spatial assimilation, many immigrants, particularly low-income or specific colour groups, fail to be integrated and become stuck in their ethnic ghettos. Concentration of these groups may further lead to fewer job opportunities, a high rate of crime and fewer amenities such as schools and other public services (Alba et al., 2014; Bolt et al., 1998). They may experience a "neighbourhood effect" (Friedrichs, 1998; Ostendorf et al., 2001) and connect with downward, not upward, mobility (Gans, 1992; Wilson, 1987). On the other hand, the bounded solidarity and enforceable trust of ethnic neighbourhoods may put constraints on immigrants' individual freedom and outside contacts that impede migrants' full integration in the long run (Portes & Sensenbrenner, 1993). In addition, Logan et al. (2002) found an alternative model of "ethnic community" that some immigrant groups prefer the cultural setting of immigrant concentrated neighbourhoods even when they have the means to live elsewhere.

Based on empirical studies of second-generation immigrants in the U.S., Portes and Zhou (1993) confirmed the above divergent processes, termed as segmented assimilation — one group of immigrants successfully integrated into the white middle-class; a second group lead straight in the opposite direction to permanent poverty and assimilation into the underclass; a third group achieved rapid economic advancement with deliberate preservation of their original values. They attribute the above segmented process into three reasons. The first is colour, the second is location (whether living in close contact with concentrations of native-born minorities), and the third is the absence of mobility ladders.

Unlike in Western countries, rural-to-urban migrants are the primary group of migration in developing countries. Research on internal migrants has mainly focused on the settlements where they live in the host city. The settlements where migrants concentrate, also called slums, squatter camps, favelas or shanty towns in different countries, create unique and informal urban spaces on the one hand, but also challenge urban governance on the other hand (Holm & Kuhn, 2011; Huchzermeyer, 2003; McGee, 1979; Minnery et al., 2013). However, despite rural-to-urban migrants having become the major source of urbanisation in many developing countries, little attention has been given to their integration issues compared with those of international migrants (Li & Wu, 2014). The integration of internal migrants is often believed to be not as challenging as for most international migrants due to the absence of race or colour barriers, and almost no religious barriers (Yue et al., 2013). However, as King and Skeldon (2010) argued, assuming that internal migrants are more homogenous than international migrants is a mistake. Internal migrants may also differ from local residents significantly in terms of social, economic and cultural characteristics, thus experiencing geographical, institutional and cultural barriers during the process of social integration (Chen & Wang, 2015; Wang & Fan, 2012). How internal migrants adjust to and integrate themselves into their urban society is an urgent research topic.

2.2 Migrants' social integration and its dimensions in China

China has the world's largest scale of internal migrants, and its unique social, economic and political background makes it an important place to study migrant integration. Particularly since the release of the New Urbanisation Plan in 2014, migrant social integration has also increasingly become an important policy issue. There is a growing literature on the multidimensional conditions of migrant social integration (Harder et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2018). For example, Wang and Fan (2012) and Yue et al. (2013) investigated migrant integration with respect to three dimensions: acculturation, socio-economic integration and psychological integration, although they used different terms. Liu (2019) focused on the social and psychological aspects of migrant integration. Yang et al. (2020) explored migrant social integration in the aspects of economic, social relations, cultural, psychological and community in three different types of migrant enclaves in Shenzhen.

Although there is no consistent measurement or terms on the dimensions of social

integration, there are certain dimensions that have often been used to understand/measure social integration. Some scholars take social integration as the process in which different people interact with each other (Wissink et al., 2014). Generally, they consider migrants who have contacts with people from a wide variety of occupational levels and not primarily with those from their own provinces as integrated.

Another understanding of migrants' social integration is whether they are willing to settle down in the city permanently or make hukou conversion to officially become local residents (Chen & Fan, 2016; Chen & Wang, 2019; Chen & Liu, 2016). One interesting discussion recently is about the associations between housing choices/conditions and settlement intention. Based on empirical studies in Shenzhen, Tao et al. (2015) found that migrant workers were more likely to live in commodity housing as opposed to urban villages if they did not plan to return to their home town. Migrants who live in housing with a formal setting show a stronger intention to settle in the host city (Lin et al., 2018). Liu et al. (2016) further pointed out that the positive association between access to formal housing and the settlement intention of rural migrants is not due to the enabling process in which living in formal housing directly increases settlement intention, but is more due to a sorting process in which those who are more willing to settle in cities strive to expand their housing opportunities. From this point of view, we can consider that living in formal housing itself indicates a higher level of social integration in terms of settlement intention.

Moreover, recent studies emphasise that two separate decisions underlie settlement intention, namely to obtain a local urban hukou through hukou conversion and to reside in the city permanently (Tang & Hao, 2018; Yang & Guo, 2018). Despite the fact that urban hukou is commonly known to be far superior to rural hukou and that rural migrants have a strong intention to stay in the host city, rural migrants are not enthusiastic about hukou conversion (Chen & Fan, 2016). As Tang & Hao (2018) stated, the decision about hukou conversion is a trade-off between rural and urban benefits related to the respective hukou status, and permanent settlement in the city is a consideration of better livelihood and quality of life. In recent years, increased farming and housing land values in migrants' home villages and expanded basic public services for all residents in the city have greatly influenced migrants' intentions concerning hukou conversion (Chen & Fan, 2016; Tyner & Yuan, 2016). While for employed urban to urban migrants, they

usually enjoy similar medical insurance and employee's pension insurance as local residents, thus they may be also reluctant to transfer their hukou (Tian et al., 2019).

The third topic related to migrant social integration is place attachment and identity, which represent migrants' psychological integration in the city (Du, 2017; Wang & Fan, 2012; Wu et al., 2019). This dimension is often considered as the highest level of social integration and is hard to achieve (Yang et al., 2020; Yue et al., 2013). It reflects migrants' strong bonds with local society, satisfaction with their local life, and recognition of local identity. In general, migrants have lower sentiment or attachment towards their neighbourhood than local residents (Du & Li, 2010; Wu et al., 2019). But as Du & Li (2010) claimed, although urban villages offer no more than shelter, migrants' assessment of community satisfaction and community attachment remain on the positive side, indicating a certain level of integration. Wu and Logan's (2016) work based on Beijing also shows that migrants have some sentiment towards their neighbourhood, in which socialising and exchange of help with neighbours play important roles.

3 Chinese neighbourhoods and migrants' social integration

While studies so far have paid great attention to migrant social integration and its determining factors in general, little attention has been given to the different types of neighbourhood and the process of migrants' social integration. Existing studies have mainly addressed migrants' social integration in urban villages. There is so far no consensus about the level of migrant integration in urban villages. For example, based on a case study of Beijing, Shanghai and Guangzhou, Li and Wu (2014) found that migrants' integration in urban villages was not low. Market factors, instead of institutional factors, have become the main determinant for migrants' integration. Wang and Ning's (2016) research in Shanghai suggested a not very high social integration level in urban villages of Shanghai. They found that the local place factors exert more influence on social integration in urban villages than the individual factors. Importantly, they found that low-income group of migrants are more likely to establish a sense of identity with the urban village they reside than high-income group of migrants, due to their similarities with urban villagers.

The role of migrant enclaves in social integration is also controversial. Some scholars regard urban villages as ethnic enclaves in Western countries, which act as transient places for migrants, paving the way for their integration into urban society. Urban villages provide cheap

accommodation for migrants in their initial settlement in the city. Ties based on kin and the same place of origin inside the village also facilitate migrants to find their first job (Liu et al., 2014; Ma & Xiang, 1998). With increased length of residence in urban villages, migrants are likely to achieve socioeconomic advancement (Li & Wu, 2014). In this regard, urban villages provide migrants a convenient route to emerging urbanism and further social integration in the city (Li & Wu, 2014). Moreover, Wu and Logan (2016) pointed out that migrants living in migrant enclaves develop a social space of their own by bringing in a traditional element of society (visiting and helping neighbours) into their enclaves. They intensively involved with neighbouring activities which increased their sentiment towards neighbourhoods. As such, although spatially isolated, migrants are not a socially isolated group in the city.

However, the other scholars argue kin-based and origin-based ties might put constraints on migrants' mobility decisions (Sheng et al., 2019), and even hinder migrants' further integration in the long run. Chen and Pryce (2014) found that such non-resident ties restrict migrants from social interaction with local residents who might have better knowledge about well-paid local job opportunities, resulting in them having low-skilled jobs with low levels of pay as their introduction to work. Moreover, limited social networks may not only impede migrants' economic integration, but also influence migrants' psychological integration. Yue et al. (2013) revealed that kin-based and ethnicity-based ties with home regions were negatively associated with migrants' sense of belonging in the host city, while migrant–resident ties play a crucial and positive role. Liu et al. (2012) found that new-generation migrants are more likely to draw on cross-class, non-kin, and non-territorial networks when seeking social support, which may help them to achieve social integration in the city. These studies all confirmed that contacts with local residents are important to migrants' social integration (Chen & Wang, 2015; Liu et al., 2012). Living in urban villages might hinder such integration process.

Moreover, there is in fact a great share of migrant population now living outside urban villages (Du & Li, 2010, Wissink et al., 2014), such as factory dormitories (Lin & Gaubatz, 2017). And there is also an accelerated increase in the homeownership rate of commodity housing particularly for skilled migrants (Cui et al., 2016). Different types of neighbourhood in China, such as factory dormitories, old neighbourhoods and commodity housing neighbourhoods occupy

different components of urban space and are characterised by distinctive socio-demographic mixes (for a detailed introduction of different types of neighbourhood please see (Li et al., 2012). Compared with other types of neighbourhoods, commodity housing neighbourhoods in Chinese city usually means better physical environment, more safety and privacy, indicating a mainstream living condition. However, privatised provision of neighbourhood goods and services of commodity housing make it unaffordable for the majority of migrants. Only more privileged migrants are able to afford living in commodity housing neighbourhoods, such as skilled migrants including professionals, managers and entrepreneurs (Wissink et al., 2014). By comparing migrants living in urban villages and old inner-city neighbourhoods, they are more likely to have contacts with people from other provinces than their own, and from a variety of occupational levels. For instance, Liu (2019) discovered that rural migrants living in formal housing neighbourhoods maintain significantly more frequent interactions with local residents compared to migrants living in informal settlements, and migrants living in employer-provided dorms have the least interaction with local residents.

A number of questions need to be further addressed. Who are the migrants living in a particular type of neighbourhood? How do different types of neighbourhood differ in levels of social integration in terms of socio-economic status, neighbourly behaviour and social relationships with the city? Against the China context, what facets are specific? what facets are the same as those under other contexts? Informed by the experiences in Western societies, this paper aims to extend the understanding of the processes of migrants' integration from the experiences of internal migrants in a transitional economy. This paper particularly examines migrant social integration through contrasting different types of neighbourhood, contributing to the ongoing debate in the international literature on the role of the neighbourhood in immigrants' social integration.

4 Data and methodology

This research is based on the thematic data of 2014 China Migrants Dynamic Survey (CMDS) collected by the National Health Commission of China in eight cities from regions across China: Beijing, Jiaxing, Xiamen, Qingdao, Zhengzhou, Shenzhen, Zhongshan and Chengdu. By using a

stratified three-stage probability proportion to size (PPS) random sampling method, this thematic data aims to gather evidence to understand migrants' social integration and mental health in urban China. The survey interviewed Chinese internal migrants aged 15 to 59 who had resided in the host city for more than one month. It finally collected 2,000 samples from each city, and 16,000 samples in total.

The aim of this study is to 'map' the conditions/situations of migrants' social integration in different neighbourhoods. In the questionnaire, there are eight original choices for types of neighbourhood. To be consistent with current neighbourhood studies in China (Forrest & Yip, 2007; Li et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2016; Wissink et al., 2014), we regrouped them into four categories according to their market/collective/social nature, namely commodity housing neighbourhoods, urban and rural villages, old neighbourhoods and factory dormitories. We also carefully checked the socio-economic characteristics of the original eight groups to make sure the combinations were justified. Thus, the dependent variable was split into four categories as follows.

Commodity housing neighbourhoods proliferated after China's housing reform in the 1990s. They are usually gated and guarded, and provided with exclusive amenities such as landscaped gardens and playgrounds. Due to economic and institutional barriers, relatively few migrants have made it into commodity housing neighbourhoods (Wu, 2002).

"Urban villages" refers to settlements that are designated as rural areas but are located within the jurisdictional boundaries of the city (Liu et al., 2010). Because of their low-cost housing and loose residency requirements, they have become the main habitats for a large number of rural migrants. Due to the characteristics of juridical ambiguity regarding housing, lack of settlement planning control and an unregulated rental market, they are also regarded as informal settlements that manifest a new dimension of spatial transformation in post-socialist Chinese cities (Zhang, 2011). In this study, to simplify the analysis, we have grouped rural villages with urban villages according to their similar nature.

"Old neighbourhoods", sometimes also called old-street neighbourhoods, refers to old and usually physically dilapidated housing in the city centre. Street offices and residents' committees often play important roles in managing these neighbourhoods, while market forces such as property management companies are less involved. With recent rapid development in China, many

of these old neighbourhoods have been already cleared to give way to high-rise apartments, compounds, commercial complexes and public squares, while others are waiting for urban renewal (Li et al., 2012).

Factory dormitories, usually provided free or at a low price for workers, are also an important type of neighbourhood for migrants (Tao et al., 2014). We use this term instead of work-unit to differ from traditional neighbourhood studies. Similar to the work unit, the factory dormitory is more than a workplace. They also provide housing, shops and amenities (open spaces and theatres). But living in factory dormitories often means sharing a room with other workers and thus it is not the first choice for many workers, particularly married migrants. The members of these factory dormitory may move when they form a family or gain upward social mobility to pursue a private living space (Lin & Gaubatz, 2017).

The main independent variable of interest for this study is migrants' social integration. In fact, there is lack of a common measure or united theoretical framework for social integration (Harder et al., 2018; Wang & Ning, 2016). For example, Ruiz-Tangle (2013) argued that there are four dimensions of integration including physical, functional, relational and symbolic. Harder et al. (2018) proposed six dimensions to understand integration: psychological, economic, political, social, linguistic and navigational. The main purpose of this paper is not to unpack the concept and dimensions of integration, also due to the nature of the data available, we focus on three different dimensions of the social integration experience of rural migrants which arguably constitute a critical perspective for understanding migrants' everyday life in the host society (Liu, 2019; Wang & Ning, 2016; Wang & Fan, 2012; Yang et al., 2020): socio-economic achievement, neighbourly social interactions, and social relationships with the city. In details,

(1) Socio-economic achievement, including monthly income, educational attainment, employment status and housing tenure were selected.

(2) Neighbourly social interactions, including neighbourhood composition, neighbourhood participation and willingness to integrate into the neighbourhood, indicate both migrants' de facto level of integration and their intention regarding integration. Migrants often have small social circles and weak ties in the host city, making the neighbourhood they live in vital for their social integration in the city (Liu et al., 2018). For neighbourhood composition, there is a question

asking “who are your neighbours?” with the choice of “mostly are migrants”, “mostly are local residents”, “there is an almost equal number of migrants and local residents”, and “not sure”. This question to some extent reflects migrants’ spatial integration status in terms of residence. In general, migrants who live in a local resident-dominated neighbourhood indicate a higher level of integration compared to those who live in migrant enclaves. Neighbourhood participation is a dummy variable. 1 represents migrants who have participated in at least one of the following neighbourhood activities: recreational and sports-related activities, election activities, owners’ committee activities, and neighbourhood committee activities; 0 represents migrants who have never participated in any neighbourhood activities. It is important to note that neighbourhood participation here means migrants take part in formal activities as indicated above, which is different from neighbouring or interaction with neighbours, such as visiting, helping neighbours (Wu and Logan, 2016). Willingness to integrate into the neighbourhood is evaluated on four scales, from totally disagree to totally agree with the statement that he or she is willing to integrate into the neighbourhood.

(3) Social relationships with the city. The first variable is place attachment to the city. In the questionnaire, there is a question asking how far the migrant agrees with the statement that he or she is attached or belongs (*guishu*) to the city where he or she lives, with the choice of totally agree, agree, disagree or totally disagree. This variable emphasises migrants’ sense of belonging and indicates the sense of citizenship (Wu, 2012). Moreover, identity changes are also a key process of migrant integration in the host society. As such, we select migrants’ identity as the second variable: 1 represents that the migrant considers himself or herself as a local person (identification with local identity), 0 means the opposite. The above two variables show migrants’ psychological integration. Thirdly, we also examine migrants’ intention regarding hukou conversion to the host city – 1 represents “yes”, 0 represents “no”. As stated in the literature review, hukou conversion means a trade-off between rural and urban benefits related to the respective hukou status, indicating migrants’ determination regarding permanent settlement in the host city.

We also included a series of control variables that are likely to play a role in shaping different neighbourhood spaces and characteristics. Migrants’ marriage status is classified into two

categories, namely ‘married’ (i.e. married or remarried) or ‘unmarried’ (i.e. single, divorced or widowed). All the samples are migrants who do not have local hukou. Migrants’ hukou status differentiates migrants from rural and urban areas. Years of residence in the host city variable is calculated as the exact number of years.

The empirical analysis includes three models using multinomial logistic regressions. Types of neighbourhood are the dependent variable and different dimensions of social integration are the main independent variables. The odds ratio generated by the models seemingly inform that how increased level of social integration in different dimensions would affect the result of living in certain type of neighbourhoods. However, we mainly use it to test the statistical significance of the differences in levels of social integration among the four types of neighbourhood. At the outset, we only include the control variables and socio-status variables in the model to understand the socio-economic statuses of four types of neighbourhood. We then add three neighbourly social behavioural variables to address migrant social integration in different neighbourhoods. Finally, we allow social relationships with the city variables into the model to understand the full picture of migrant social integration.

Table 1. Indicators

Dimensions of social integration	Indicators	Descriptions	Mean	Standard Deviation
Control variables	Age	Continuous variable	32.691	8.718
	Gender	Male=1, Female=2	1.45	0.498
	Marital status	Unmarried=1, Married=2	1.732	0.443
	Years of residence	Continuous variable	4.254	4.431
	Hukou	Rural hukou=1, Urban hukou=2	1.14	0.347
Socio-economic integration	Monthly income (logged)	Continuous variable	3.249	0.96
	Educational attainment	Primary and below=1, Junior secondary=2, Senior secondary=3, College+=4	2.464	0.855
	Employment status	Unemployed=1, Employed=2	1.917	0.276
	Housing tenure	Renter=1, Owner=2	1.099	0.299
Neighbourly social interactions	Neighbourhood composition	Not sure=1, Equal=2, Mostly are local residents=3, Mostly are migrants=4	3.011	0.993

	Neighbourhood participation	No=0, Yes=1	0.373	0.484
	Willingness to integrate into the neighbourhood	Totally not agree=1, Not agree=2, Agree=3, Totally agree=4	3.38	0.596
Social relationships with the city	Willingness to transfer hukou	No=0, Yes=1	0.5	0.5
	Place attachment to the city	Totally not agree=1, Not agree=2, Agree=3, Totally agree=4	3.167	0.702
	Local urban identity	No=0, Yes=1	0.22	0.414

5 Results

5.1 Descriptive findings

The descriptive statistics in Table 1 show that the majority of migrants live in urban and rural villages (58.7 per cent), and commodity housing neighbourhoods (21.4 per cent). It is noticeable that the four types of neighbourhoods vary significantly in terms of demographic and socio-economic characteristics. Compared with the other three types, members of a factory dormitory are more likely to be single, the youngest and to have lived in the host city for the shortest time. In contrast, members of commodity housing neighbourhoods are more likely to be married, to be relatively older and to have lived in the city for the longest time.

Table 2. Demographic characteristics and types of neighbourhood

Variables	All samples	Urban and rural village	Factory dormitory	Old neighbourhood	Commodity housing neighbourhood
	100%	58.7%	4.7%	15.2%	21.4%
Age	32.7	32.7	30.5	32.6	33.3
Gender					
Male	55.0%	55.1%	52.5%	54.8%	55.5%
Female	45.0%	44.9%	47.5%	45.2%	44.5%
Marital status					
Unmarried	26.8%	24.3%	53.3%	31.5%	24.5%
Married	73.2%	75.7%	46.7%	68.5%	75.5%
Years of residence	4.3	4.0	3.1	4.6	4.9
Hukou					
Rural hukou	86.0%	90.4%	84.1%	86.0%	74.2%
Urban hukou	14.0%	9.6%	15.9%	14.0%	25.8%

Table 3 shows socio-economic, neighbourly interaction and social relationships with the city statuses of different types of neighbourhood. Firstly, in terms of socio-economic characteristics, there are strong contrasts between migrants who live in urban and rural villages and commodity housing neighbourhoods. Members of urban and rural villages are more likely to be less educated, rural hukou holders and renters, while members of commodity housing neighbourhoods are well established in terms of education and housing. Secondly, for all samples, by looking at the three neighbourly interaction variables we can see that migrants expressed strong willingness to integrate in the neighbourhood, with a total 95.7 per cent of them agreeing or totally agreeing with the statement that they are willing to integrate. However, their actual integration condition is quite the opposite. The majority of them have never participated in any neighbourhood activities and live in migrant-dominated neighbourhoods. Thirdly, for social relationships with the city, we can see that more than 85.0 per cent of migrants show a sense of place attachment to the city. But most of them do not identify themselves as local urban people. There are also relatively more migrants who are not willing to transfer their hukou to the host city. This is consistent with current research that migrants are not in fact eager to obtain urban hukou (Chen & Fan, 2016).

Importantly, social integration conditions vary systematically across different types of neighbourhoods. In terms of neighbourhood composition, 50.7 per cent of urban and rural villages

perceived their neighbours as mostly migrants compared to 28.0 per cent in commodity housing neighbourhoods. A total of over 60.0 percent of migrants in commodity housing believed themselves to live in neighbourhoods dominated by local residents or with equal numbers of migrants and local residents. This mirrors the reality that urban and rural villages provide major accommodation for migrants. Commodity housing neighbourhoods, while more open to the market, were not that accessible for migrants due to their relatively high rental price. It is also interesting to note that except for urban and rural villages, there is a considerable percentage of residents in the other three neighbourhoods, particularly in the factory dormitory (12.5 per cent) and commodity housing neighbourhoods (11.1 per cent), who are not sure about their neighbours. For migrants living in factory dormitories, this is possibly because they are more likely to interact with their workmates in the same line or workshop but to communicate less with their neighbours. For migrants in commodity housing neighbourhoods, this also reflects current research findings about the “decline of neighbouring”, due to people’s preference for more exclusive and private residential environments (Forrest & Yip, 2007; Lu et al., 2018).

Secondly, migrants in urban and rural villages are less likely to have neighbourhood participation while migrants in commodity housing neighbourhoods are more likely to participate. This finding is consistent with Wu's (2012) research and is possibly due to migrants’ villages being mainly for private rental housing, and thus there may be fewer organised social activities, while commodity housing neighbourhoods often have official organisations to arrange activities for their residents, such as homeowners’ associations and residents’ committees. Thirdly, migrants in all four types of neighbourhood show willingness to integrate into their neighbourhoods. Migrants in commodity housing neighbourhoods expressed the strongest will with 52.5 per cent of them totally agreeing with the statement that they are willing to integrate compared to 38.7 per cent of migrants in urban and rural villages.

Moreover, it is evident that urban and rural villages and commodity housing neighbourhoods differ substantially in social relationships with the city. Members of all four types of neighbourhoods show a sense of attachment to the city, of which members of commodity housing neighbourhoods expressed the highest level of place attachment. Identification with local identity is generally low among migrants but members of commodity housing neighbourhoods have a

relatively higher level of identity integration. In addition, members of old neighbourhoods and commodity housing neighbourhoods show relatively stronger willingness to transfer their hukou to the host city, while the majority of migrants who live in factory dormitories are not willing to transfer their hukou to the host city. Overall, these descriptive findings point to the fact that migrants living in commodity housing appear to have the best conditions for social integration, followed by migrants living in old neighbourhoods and migrants living in factory dormitories, while migrants who live in urban and rural villages are the least integrated.

Table 3. Social integration in different neighbourhoods (%)

Variables	All samples	Urban and rural village	Factory dormitory	Old neighbourhood	Commodity housing neighbourhood
Socio-economic status					
Monthly income (1,000 yuan)	3.3	3.22	3.39	3.28	3.27
Educational attainment					
Primary and below	9.5%	11.1%	7.3%	9.0%	5.4%
Junior secondary	50.5%	55.9%	39.1%	51.9%	37.4%
Senior secondary	25.3%	22.9%	30.5%	24.5%	31.5%
College+	14.7%	10.1%	23.1%	14.6%	25.7%
Employment status					
Unemployed	8.3%	8.8%	2.9%	6.6%	9.3%
Employed	91.7%	91.2%	97.1%	93.4%	90.7%
Housing tenure					
Renter	90.1%	96.2%	94.2%	94.2%	69.4%
Owner	9.9%	3.8%	5.8%	5.8%	30.6%
Neighbourhood interaction status					
Neighbourhood composition					
Mostly are migrants	43.5%	50.7%	32.6%	40.8%	28.0%
Equal	29.5%	29.1%	30.1%	27.4%	31.8%
Mostly are local residents	20.6%	16.5%	24.8%	23.5%	29.1%
Not sure	6.4%	3.8%	12.5%	8.3%	11.1%
Neighbourhood participation					

Yes	37.3%	30.0%	46.7%	45.1%	49.6%
No	62.7%	70.0%	53.3%	54.9%	50.4%
Willingness to integrate into the neighbourhood					
Totally disagree	0.7%	0.9%	1.2%	0.8%	0.7%
Disagree	3.5%	4.0%	2.5%	3.8%	2.4%
Agree	52.5%	56.4%	52.0%	48.6%	44.5%
Totally agree	43.2%	38.7%	44.3%	46.8%	52.5%
Social relationships with the city status					
Place attachment to the city					
Totally disagree	1.7%	2.1%	1.5%	1.3%	1.0%
Disagree	12.6%	14.5%	12.3%	12.2%	7.8%
Agree	53.0%	55.3%	53.2%	51.8%	47.5%
Totally agree	32.7%	28.2%	33.0%	34.7%	43.7%
Local urban identity					
Yes	22.0%	17.1%	26.7%	22.6%	33.7%
No	78.0%	82.9%	73.3%	77.4%	66.3%
Willingness to transfer hukou					
Yes	50.4%	47.1%	31.6%	51.0%	59.6%
No	49.6%	52.9%	68.4%	49.0%	40.4%

5.2 Differentiated levels of social integration in four types of neighbourhood

Table 4 provides the results of a multinomial regression of migrants' integration status for four types of neighbourhood in terms of socio-economic integration. The model aims to identify the specific groups who live in particular types of neighbourhood. Regression results show that all individuals' socio-economic attributes are significantly related to types of neighbourhood after controlling for migrants' demographic characteristics. The model suggests that different types of neighbourhood are characterised by distinctive socio-economic mixes. Specifically, by looking at the income variable, migrants in urban and rural villages achieved a higher level of economic integration than migrants in factory dormitories and old neighbourhoods, but lower than migrants in commodity housing neighbourhoods. Despite the likelihood of unemployment in commodity housing neighbourhoods, this type still shows the highest level of economic integration. This is probably due to the fact that more than 70 per cent of unemployed members are married and may

possibly be accompanying their family in the city. However, migrants in urban and rural villages show a relatively lower level of social status than the other three types of neighbourhood in aspects of educational attainment and housing tenure. The above findings indicate a relatively high social integration level of commodity housing neighbourhoods in terms of migrants' socio-economic achievement, while migrants in urban and rural villages only achieved relatively high economic integration.

Among the control variables, it is interesting to note that years of residence is significantly related to the different neighbourhoods migrants may live in. Migrants who stay longer in the city are 0.965 times less likely to live in a factory dormitory, while 1.036 times and 1.013 times more likely to live in old neighbourhoods and commodity housing neighbourhoods respectively compared to living in urban and rural villages. In accordance with the previous descriptive findings, this result indicates that urban villages and factory dormitories often serve as transient places for migrants. When they live in the city longer, they may move to a neighbourhood with a formal setting such as old neighbourhoods or commodity housing neighbourhoods.

Table 4. Model 1 Social integration measured in terms of socio-economic status in different neighbourhoods

Reference=Urban and rural village	Factory dormitory		Old neighbourhood		Commodity housing neighbourhood	
	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)
Control variables						
Age	0.029***	1.029	0.010**	1.010	0.017***	1.017
Male (reference=female)	-0.174*	0.840	-0.054	0.948	-0.052	0.950
Unmarried (reference=married)	1.324***	3.760	0.503***	1.654	0.299***	1.349
Years of residence	-0.036**	0.965	0.035***	1.036	0.013*	1.013
Rural hukou (reference=urban hukou)	-0.252*	0.777	-0.289***	0.749	-0.489***	0.613
Socio-economic status						
Monthly income (logged)	-0.400**	0.670	-0.237**	0.789	0.222***	1.249
Education attainment (reference=college+)						
Primary and below	-0.880***	0.415	-0.492***	0.612	-1.413***	0.243

Junior secondary	-0.820***	0.440	-0.284***	0.753	-0.949***	0.387
Senior secondary	-0.352**	0.703	-0.202*	0.817	-0.363***	0.695
Unemployed (reference=employed)	-2.267***	0.104	-1.029***	0.357	0.660***	1.934
Renter (reference=owner)	-0.764***	0.466	-0.404***	0.668	-2.213***	0.109
-2 Log likelihood	29188.273***					
Sample size (valid cases)	15998					
Nagelkerke R Square	0.179					

Note: *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

Next, we examined whether there were statistical differences among the four types of neighbourhood in levels of neighbourly social interaction. Table 5 shows that the four neighbourhoods vary significantly in neighbourhood composition and participation. Consistent with the descriptive findings, migrants in commodity housing neighbourhoods achieved a higher level of social integration by living in neighbourhoods dominated by local residents compared to urban and rural villages. Compared with migrants of the other three types of neighbourhood, migrants who live in urban and rural villages have the least level of neighbourhood participation. On the one hand, this might be because the formal organisations of commodity housing neighbourhoods often have more social activities which provide more opportunities for residents to participate and get involved. On the other hand, it may indicate that migrants living in urban and rural villages tend to rely on social networks made of relatives and friends from the same place of origin. They may fail to see the utility of neighbourhood relations in current villages if these are likely to be abandoned with their next move (Palmer et al., 2011). The variable of willingness to integrate into the neighbourhood is not as significant as the other two factors, being only significant in the level of agree compared with totally agree. This result echoes the previous finding that the majority of migrants have the intention to integrate into the neighbourhood where they live.

Table 5. Model 2 Multinomial regression on neighbourly social behaviours and neighbourhoods

Reference=Urban and rural village	Factory dormitory		Old neighbourhood		Commodity housing neighbourhood	
	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)
Control variables						
Age	0.026***	1.026	0.008*	1.008	0.014***	1.014
Male (reference=female)	-0.154	0.857	-0.031	0.970	-0.020	0.980
Unmarried (reference=married)	1.264***	3.539	0.442***	1.556	0.230***	1.259
Rural hukou (reference=urban hukou)	-0.217	0.805	-0.266***	0.767	-0.453***	0.635
Socio-economic status						
Monthly income (logged)	-0.355*	0.701	-0.220**	0.803	0.246***	1.279
Education attainment (reference=college+)						
Primary and below	-0.751***	0.472	-0.379***	0.685	-1.253***	0.286
Junior secondary	-0.718***	0.488	-0.199*	0.820	-0.832***	0.435
Senior secondary	-0.324**	0.723	-0.175*	0.840	-0.3216***	0.729
Years of residence	-0.032**	0.968	0.036***	1.036	0.015**	1.015
Unemployed (reference=employed)	-2.066***	0.127	-0.912***	0.402	0.813***	2.255
Renter (reference=owner)	-0.690***	0.502	-0.350***	0.704	-2.125***	0.119
Neighbourly social interaction status						
Neighbourhood composition (reference=mostly are migrants)						
Not sure	1.406***	4.078	0.967***	2.629	1.492***	4.447
Equal	0.458***	1.581	0.120*	1.127	0.543***	1.721
Mostly are local residents	0.783***	2.187	0.500***	1.649	0.989***	2.69
No neighbourhood participation (reference=yes)	-0.529***	0.589	-0.574***	0.563	-0.721***	0.486
Willingness to integrate into the community (reference=totally agree)						
Totally disagree	0.266	1.305	-0.285	0.752	-0.374	0.688
Disagree	-0.373	0.689	-0.049	0.952	-0.258	0.772
Agree	-0.119	0.888	-0.226***	0.797	-0.257***	0.773
-2 Log likelihood	30369.091***					
Sample size (valid cases)	15996					
Nagelkerke R Square	0.236					

In the final model (Table 6), we include the three variables for social relationships with the city in the model to estimate the different integration levels of the four neighbourhoods. First of all, commodity housing neighbourhoods present a higher level of social integration in the aspect of feeling attached to the city compared with urban and rural villages. Secondly, members of different neighbourhoods also differ statistically in their local identity formation. Migrants in urban and rural villages show the lowest level of identity integration. This reflects that living in urban and rural villages does not help migrants to form local identities. Last but not least, compared with urban and rural villages, migrants in commodity housing neighbourhoods are more willing to make a hukou conversion, indicating a higher level of social integration. The above findings reveal that migrants in commodity housing neighbourhoods show the highest level of social integration in all three aspects of social relationships with the city.

Table 6. Model 3 Social integration measured in terms of social status, neighbourly interaction and social relationships with the city

Reference=Urban and rural village	Factory dormitory		Old neighbourhood		Commodity housing neighbourhood	
	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)
Control variables						
Age	0.023***	1.023	0.008*	1.008	0.014***	1.014
Male (reference=female)	-0.173*	0.841	-0.030	0.971	-0.020	0.980
Unmarried (reference=married)	1.242***	3.462	0.447***	1.564	0.242***	1.273
Rural hukou (reference=urban hukou)	-0.206	0.814	-0.249***	0.780	-0.415***	0.661
Socio-economic status						
Monthly income (logged)	-0.232	0.793	-0.225**	0.798	0.245***	1.278
Education attainment (reference=college+)						
Primary and below	-0.843***	0.430	-0.362***	0.696	-1.214***	0.297
Junior secondary	-0.795***	0.452	-0.189*	0.828	-0.810***	0.445
Senior secondary	-0.383***	0.682	-0.171*	0.843	-0.312***	0.732
Years of residence	-0.024*	0.841	0.035***	1.035	0.013*	1.013

Unemployed (reference=employed)	-1.621**	0.198	-0.931***	0.394	0.799***	2.224
Renter (reference=owner)	-0.682***	0.506	-0.314**	0.731	-2.038***	0.130
Neighbourly social interaction status						
Neighbourhood composition(reference =mostly are migrants)						
Not sure	1.359***	3.894	0.968***	2.633	1.503***	4.496
Equal	0.420***	1.521	0.110	1.116	0.523***	1.687
Mostly are local residents	0.672***	1.956	0.481***	1.617	0.940***	2.559
No neighbourhood participation (reference=yes)	-0.513***	0.599	-0.565***	0.568	-0.697***	0.498
Willingness to integrate into the community (reference=totally agree)						
Totally disagree	0.467	1.595	-0.011	0.989	0.081	1.084
Disagree	-0.341	0.711	0.051	1.052	0.054	1.056
Agree	-0.067	0.935	-0.170**	0.844	-0.076	0.927
Social relationships with the city						
Place attachment to the city (reference=totally agree)						
Totally disagree	-0.498	0.608	-0.511*	0.600	-0.773***	0.462
Disagree	-0.076	0.927	-0.098	0.907	-0.424***	0.655
Agree	-0.047	0.954	-0.064	0.938	-0.217***	0.805
Local urban identity (reference=no)	0.461***	1.585	0.119*	1.126	0.261***	1.299
Willingness to transfer hukou (reference=no)	-0.824***	0.438	0.049	1.051	0.106*	1.112
-2 Log likelihood	30359.618***					
Sample size (valid cases)	15996					
Nagelkerke R Square	0.246					

6 Conclusion

After decades of rural-to-urban migration, rural migrants are remarkably dispersed over different neighbourhoods in Chinese cities. However, most current social integration research on China has focused on urban villages. Very few have explored migrants' social integration in different types of neighbourhood. This paper has examined and contrasted migrants' social integration in four types of neighbourhood, namely urban and rural villages, factory dormitories, old neighbourhoods and commodity housing neighbourhoods. According to existing studies and available data, social integration is measured in three dimensions: socio-economic achievement, neighbourly interaction and social relationships with the city.

Our research suggests that there are different levels of social integration across different types of neighbourhood in terms of socio-economic achievement. For instance, migrants living in commodity housing neighbourhoods have achieved the highest level of socio-economic integration. They are better educated, have relatively higher income and are more likely to be homeowners in the city. Migrants living in urban and rural villages, although they have higher economic achievement than migrants living in factory dormitories and old neighbourhoods, are less integrated in terms of their social statuses, such as educational attainment and housing tenure. The study is consistent with the findings of current studies that urban and rural villages, like migrant enclaves, provide some advantages such as social capital, job information and being close to employment (Li & Wu, 2014; Liu et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2012; Yan et al., 2008).

In terms of social relations, different types of neighbourhood present significant differences: commodity housing neighbourhoods show the highest level of social integration, urban villages show the lowest level of social integration, and the other two types of neighbourhoods are in between. Specifically, migrants in commodity housing neighbourhoods achieve higher levels of actual or spatial integration than migrants living in urban and rural villages. They also participate more often in neighbourhood activities, showing a higher level of social integration in neighbourly interaction. This might be because migrants living in commodity housing are more aware of social neighbourhood interactions. Furthermore, the formal setting and organisations of commodity housing provide more opportunities for their residents to participate in neighbourhood activities (Liu, 2019). Moreover, migrants in commodity housing neighbourhoods are more attached to the

city and more likely to achieve identity integration, in contrast with urban and rural villages.

Our findings thus indicate that urban villages, or 'migrant enclaves', may serve as a stepping stone for migrants' entry into the city, helping them to achieve economic integration, but may be not favourable for their eventual progress into a higher level of social integration in the aspect of social relations. Social capital inside the villages provides many advantages for migrants' first settlement in the city, making urban villages attractive living spaces for migrants (Liu et al., 2012; Ma & Xiang, 1998). Relying on kinship and migrant friends in urban villages, migrants can easily find jobs and live close to their place of employment (Liu et al., 2019). Thus, living in urban villages to some extent can help migrants achieve economic integration in the first stage. However, the limited social network based on kinship and the same place of origin, together with their low educational attainment, may restrict migrants access to the outside world, trapping in informal employment. These employments that are often labour-intensive jobs or jobs without long-term contract leave migrants no chance for upward social mobility. Spatially segregated from local residents may further put constraints on migrants' local identity formation, hindering migrants' social integration (Sheng et al., 2019; Yue et al., 2013). As such, economic advancement of migrants may not necessarily lead to spatial assimilation into the main stream society.

Moreover, different from immigrants, the migrants in China are internal migrants who may circulate between rural origins and urban destination. Thus, even with increased income, some migrants who live in urban and rural villages may be reluctant to spend their earnings in the city, since they consider the city as a place to work rather than a home in which to live (Zheng et al., 2009). It is confirmed by their low willingness of hukou conversion. Particularly with the implementation of "rural revitalisation" policy in recent years, many migrants hold an attitude of "wait and see" towards settling in the city. On the other hand, megacities in China have strict housing purchasing policies towards migrants which restrict them for permanently settling down (Song & Zhang, 2019). The system of hukou in a broader context and local housing policies in specific hinders migrants' assimilation into the urban society. Therefore, the local context of China including both pull factors of rural origin and push factors of urban policies complicated migrants' processes of social integration in the city.

By and large, we can conclude that the role of migrant enclaves for migrants' integration in

Chinese cities is not consistent with the spatial assimilation framework. On the other hand, it is neither explained by segmented assimilation as migrant villages do not show strong social integration except an income increase. Some privileged migrants may move from urban villages to neighbourhoods dominated by local residents which often have a better quality of housing and improved amenities, achieving fuller integration. But the others might never make such transition, not only because of the absence of mobility ladders, but also due to the specific characteristics of internal migration (rural-urban dual system). However, since the data used in this paper are only cross-sectional data, we cannot know the full dynamics of migrants' mobility process. Moreover, due to the data limitation, the variable selected may not be able to reflect the real social interaction situations within different neighbourhoods. These limitations need to be solved through detailed ethnographic research in the future.

References

Alba, R., Deane, G., Denton, N., Disha, I., McKenzie, B., & Napierala, J. (2014). The Role of Immigrant Enclaves for Latino Residential Inequalities. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 40*(1), 1-20. doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2013.831549

Alba, R., Logan, J., Stults, B., Marzan, G., & Zhang, W. (1999). Immigrant Groups in the Suburbs: A Reexamination of Suburbanization and Spatial Assimilation. *American Sociological Review, 64*(3), 446-460. doi: 10.2307/2657495

Allen, J. P., & Turner, E. (1996). Spatial Patterns of Immigrant Assimilation. *The Professional Geographer, 48*(2), 140-155. doi: 10.1111/j.0033-0124.1996.00140.x

Bolt, G., Burgers, J., & Kempen, R. v. (1998). On the Social Significance of Spatial Location; Spatial Segregation and Social Inclusion. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment, 13*(1), 83-95.

Breitung, W. (2012). Enclave Urbanism in China: Attitudes Towards Gated Communities in Guangzhou. *Urban Geography, 33*(2), 278-294. doi: 10.2747/0272-3638.33.2.278

Chen, C., & Fan, C. (2016). China's Hukou puzzle: Why don't rural migrants want urban Hukou? *China Review, 16*(3), 9-39.

Chen, J., & Wang, W. (2019). Economic incentives and settlement intentions of rural migrants: Evidence from China. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 41*(3), 372-389. doi: 10.1080/07352166.2018.1439339

Chen, S., & Liu, Z. (2016). What determines the settlement intention of rural migrants in China? Economic incentives versus sociocultural conditions. *Habitat International, 58*, 42-50. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2016.09.004

Chen, Y., & Pryce, G. (2014). Migrants' job-search in urban China: Social networks and the labour market. In F. Wu, F. Zhang & C. Webster (Eds.), *Rural Migrants in Urban China: Enclaves and Transient Urbanism* (Vol. 1, pp. 69-83). London and New York: Routledge.

Chen, Y., & Wang, J. (2015). Social integration of new-generation migrants in Shanghai China. *Habitat International, 49*, 419-425.

Cui, C., Geertman, S., & Hooimeijer, P. (2016). Access to homeownership in urban China: A comparison between skilled migrants and skilled locals in Nanjing. *Cities, 50*, 188-196.

Du, H. (2017). Place Attachment and Belonging among Educated Young Migrants and Returnees: the Case of Chaohu, China. *Population, Space and Place, 23*(1), e1967. doi: 10.1002/psp.1967

Du, H., & Li, S.-m. (2010). Migrants, Urban Villages, and Community Sentiments: A Case of Guangzhou, China. *Asian Geographer, 27*(1-2), 93-108. doi: 10.1080/10225706.2010.9684155

Fainstein, S., & Gorden, I. (1992). *Divided Cities: New York and London in the Contemporary World*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Forrest, R., & Yip, N.-M. (2007). Neighbourhood and Neighbouring in Contemporary Guangzhou. *Journal of Contemporary China, 16*(50), 47-64. doi: 10.1080/10670560601026736

Friedrichs, J. (1998). Do poor neighbourhoods make their residents poorer? Context effects of poverty neighbourhoods on residents. In H. J. Andreß (Ed.), *Empirical Poverty Research in a Comparative Perspective* (pp. 77-99): Routledge Revivals.

Gans, H. J. (1992). Second-Generation Decline: Scenarios for the Economic and Ethnic Futures of the Post-1965 American Immigrants. *Ethnic & Racial Studies, 15*(2), 173-192.

Gordon, M. (1964). *Assimilation in American Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Harder, N., Figueroa, L., Gillum, R. M., Hangartner, D., Laitin, D. D., & Hainmueller, J. (2018). Multidimensional measure of immigrant integration. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 115*(45), 11483-11488. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1808793115

Holm, A., & Kuhn, A. (2011). Squatting and Urban Renewal: The Interaction of Squatter Movements and Strategies of Urban Restructuring in Berlin. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 35*(3), 644-658. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2427.2010.001009.x

Huchzermeyer, M. (2003). A legacy of control? The capital subsidy for housing, and informal settlement intervention in South Africa. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 27*(3), 591-612. doi: 10.1111/1468-2427.00468

King, R., & Skeldon, R. (2010). 'Mind the Gap!' Integrating Approaches to Internal and International Migration. *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies, 36*(10), 1619-1646.

Li, S., & Zhu, Y. (2015). Residential mobility within Guangzhou city, China, 1990–2010: local residents versus migrants. *Eurasian Geography & Economics, 55*(4), 313-332.

Li, S., Zhu, Y., & Li, L. (2012). Neighbourhood type, gatedness, and residential experiences in Chinese cities: A study of Guangzhou. *Urban Geography, 33*(2), 237-255.

Li, Z., & Wu, F. (2014). Migrant integration in China's urban villages: A case study of Beijing, Shanghai and Guangzhou. In F. Wu, F. Zhang & C. Webster (Eds.), *Rural Migrants in Urban China: Enclaves and Transient Urbanism* (pp. 121-144). London and New York: Routledge.

Lin, S., & Gaubatz, P. (2017). Socio-spatial segregation in China and migrants' everyday life experiences: the case of Wenzhou. *Urban Geography, 38*(7), 1019-1038. doi: 10.1080/02723638.2016.1182287

Lin, S., Liang, Q., Li, Z., & Pang, R. (2018). Family migration and settlement intention in China's medium-sized city: A case of Wenzhou. *Geographical Research, 38*(7), 1640-1650.

Liu, C., Chen, J., & Li, H. (2019). Linking migrant enclave residence to employment in urban China: The case of Shanghai. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 41*(2), 189-205. doi: 10.1080/07352166.2017.1413286

Liu, L., Huang, Y., & Zhang, W. (2018). Residential segregation and perceptions of social integration in Shanghai, China. *Urban Studies*(1), 004209801668901.

Liu, Y., He, S., Wu, F., & Webster, C. (2010). Urban villages under China's rapid urbanization: Unregulated assets and transitional neighbourhoods. *Habitat International, 34*(2), 135-144. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2009.08.003

Liu, Y., Li, Z., & Breitung, W. (2012). The social networks of new-generation migrants in China's urbanized villages: A case study of Guangzhou. *Habitat International, 36*(1), 192-200. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2011.08.008

Liu, Y., Li, Z., Liu, Y., & Chen, H. (2014). Growth of rural migrant enclaves in Guangzhou, China: Agency, everyday practice and social mobility. *Urban Studies*. doi: 10.1177/0042098014553752

Liu, Z. (2019). Supporting or dragging? effects of neighbourhood social ties on social integration of rural-to-urban migrants in China. *Housing Studies, 34*(9), 1404-1421. doi: 10.1080/02673037.2019.1577955

Liu, Z., Wang, Y., & Chen, S. (2016). Does formal housing encourage settlement intention of rural migrants in Chinese cities? A structural equation model analysis. *Urban Studies, 54*(8), 1834-1850. doi: 10.1177/0042098016634979

Logan, J. R., Zhang, W., & Alba, R. D. (2002). Immigrant Enclaves and Ethnic Communities in New York and Los Angeles. *American Sociological Review, 67*(2), 299-322. doi: 10.2307/3088897

Lu, T., Zhang, F., & Wu, F. (2018). Place attachment in gated neighbourhoods in China: Evidence from Wenzhou. *Geoforum, 92*, 144-151. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.04.017

Ma, L. J. C., & Xiang, B. (1998). Native Place, Migration and the Emergence of Peasant Enclaves in Beijing. *The China Quarterly*(155), 546-581. doi: 10.2307/655950

Massey, D., & Denton, N. (1985). Spatial Assimilation as A Socioeconomic Outcome. *American Sociological Review, 50*, 94-106.

Massey, D., & Denton, N. (1992). Racial identity and the spatial assimilation of Mexicans in the United States. *Social Science Research, 21*(3), 235-260. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/0049-089X(92)90007-4

McGee, T. (1979). Conservation and Dissolution in the Third World City: The 'Shanty Town' as an Element of Conservation. *Development and Change, 10*(1), 1-22. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7660.1979.tb00028.x

Minnery, J., Argo, T., Winarso, H., Hau, D., Veneracion, C. C., Forbes, D., & Childs, I. (2013). Slum upgrading and urban governance: Case studies in three South East Asian cities. *Habitat International, 39*(0), 162-169. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2012.12.002

Ostendorf, W., Musterd, S., & De Vos, S. (2001). Social Mix and the Neighbourhood Effect. Policy Ambitions and Empirical Evidence. *Housing Studies, 16*(3), 371-380. doi: 10.1080/02673030120049724

Palmer, N. A., Perkins, D. D., & Xu, Q. (2011). Social capital and community participation among migrant workers in China. *Journal of Community Psychology, 39*(1), 89-105. doi: 10.1002/jcop.20419

Park, R., & Burgess, E. (1921). *Introduction to the science of sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Portes, A., & Sensenbrenner, J. (1993). Embeddedness and Immigration: Notes on the Social Determinants of Economic Action. *American Journal of Sociology, 98*(6), 1320-1350.

Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants among Post-1965 immigrant youth. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 530*(1), 74-98.

Ruiz-Tangle, J. (2013). A theory of socio-spatial integration: Problems, policies and concepts from a US perspective. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 37*(2), 388-408.

Sheng, M., Gu, C., & Wu, W. (2019). To move or to stay in a migrant enclave in Beijing: The role of neighborhood social bonds. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 41*(3), 338-353. doi: 10.1080/07352166.2017.1324248.

Song, Y., & Zhang, C. (2019). City size and housing purchase intention: Evidence from rural–urban migrants in China. *Urban Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098019856822

Tang, S., & Hao, P. (2018). Floaters, settlers, and returnees settlement intention and hukou conversion of China's Rural Migrants. *China Review, 18*(1), 11-34.

Tao, L., Hui, E. C. M., Wong, F. K. W., & Chen, T. (2015). Housing choices of migrant workers in China: Beyond the hukou perspective. *Habitat International, 49*, 474-483.

Tao, L., Wong, F. K. W., & Hui, E. C. M. (2014). Residential satisfaction of migrant workers in China: A case study of Shenzhen. *Habitat International, 42*, 193-202. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2013.12.006

Tian, M., Li, C., & Lai, D. (2019). Household registration reform and "Luohu" of rural migrants: a paradox and explanation. *Population & Economics*, 6(237): 1-13.

Tyner, A., & Yuan, R. (2016). The hukou system, rural institutions, and migrant integration in China. *Journal of East Asian Studies, 16*(3), 1-18.

Venn, C. (2006). The City as Assemblage. Diasporic Cultures, Postmodern Spaces, and Bipolitics. In H. Berking, S. Frank, L. Frers, M. Low, L. Meier, S. Steets & S. Stoetzer (Eds.), *Negotiating Urban Conflilts: Interaction, Space and Control* (pp. 41-52): Transcript Verlag.

Wang, M., & Ning, Y. (2016). The Social Integration of Migrants in Shanghai's Urban Villages. *China Review, 16*(3), 93-120.

Wang, W., & Fan, C. (2012). Migrant Workers' Integration in Urban China: Experiences in Employment, Social Adaptation, and Self-Identity. *Eurasian Geography and Economics, 53*(6), 731-749. doi: 10.2747/1539-7216.53.6.731

Wang, Y., Wang, Y., & Wu, J. (2009). Housing Migrant Workers in Rapidly Urbanizing Regions: A Study of the Chinese Model in Shenzhen. *Housing Studies, 25*(1), 83-100. doi: 10.1080/02673030903362019

Wang, Z., Zhang, F., & Wu, F. (2015). Social Trust Between Rural Migrants and Urban Locals in China – Exploring the Effects of Residential Diversity and Neighbourhood Deprivation. *Population Space & Place, 23*(1), n/a-n/a.

Wang, Z., Zhang, F., & Wu, F. (2016). Intergroup neighbouring in urban China: Implications for the social integration of migrants. *Urban Studies, 53*(4), 651-668.

Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, The Underclass and Social Works*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wissink, B., Hazelzet, A., & Breitung, W. (2014). Migrant integration in China: Evidence from Guangzhou. In F. Wu, F. Zhang & C. Webster (Eds.), *Rural Migrants in Urban China: Enclaves and Transient Urbanism* (pp. 99-120). London and New York: Routledge.

Wu, F. (2012). Neighborhood Attachment, Social Participation, and Willingness to Stay in China's Low-Income Communities. *Urban Affairs Review, 48*(4), 547-570. doi: 10.1177/1078087411436104

Wu, F., & Logan, J. (2016). Do rural migrants 'float' in urban China? Neighbouring and neighbourhood sentiment in Beijing. *Urban Studies, 53*(14), 2973-2990. doi: 10.1177/0042098015598745

Wu, F., Zhang, F., & Webster, C. (Eds.). (2014). *Rural Migrants in Urban China: Unclaves and Transient Urbanism*. Oxon: Routledge.

Wu, R., Huang, X., Li, Z., Liu, Y., & Liu, Y. (2019). Deciphering the meaning and mechanism of migrants' and locals' neighborhood attachment in Chinese cities: Evidence from Guangzhou. *Cities, 85*, 187-195. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2018.09.006

Wu, W. (2002). Migrant Housing in Urban China: Choices and Constraints. *Urban Affairs Review, 38*(1), 90-119.

Wu, W. (2006). Migrant Intra-urban Residential Mobility in Urban China. *Housing Studies, 21*(5), 745-765. doi: 10.1080/02673030600807506

Yan, S., Zenou, Y., & Chengri, D. (2008). Let's Not Throw the Baby Out with the Bath Water: The Role of Urban Villages in Housing Rural Migrants in China. *Urban Studies, 45*(2), 313-330. doi: 10.1177/0042098007085965

Yang, G., Zhou, C., & Jin, W. (2020). Integration of migrant workers: Differentiation among three rural migrant enclaves in Shenzhen. *Cities, 96*, 102453. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.102453

Yang, S., & Guo, F. (2018). Breaking the barriers: How urban housing ownership has changed migrants' settlement intentions in China. *Urban Studies, 55*(16), 3689-3707. doi: 10.1177/0042098018757873

Yue, Z., Li, S., Jin, X., & Feldman, M. W. (2013). The Role of Social Networks in the Integration of

Chinese Rural–Urban Migrants: A Migrant–Resident Tie Perspective. *Urban Studies, 50*(9), 1704-1723. doi: 10.1177/0042098012470394

Zhang, L. (2011). The political economy of informal settlements in post-socialist China: The case of chengzhongcun(s). *Geoforum, 42*(4), 473-483. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2011.03.003

Zheng, S., Long, F., Fan, C. C., & Gu, Y. (2009). Urban Villages in China: A 2008 Survey of Migrant Settlements in Beijing. *Eurasian Geography and Economics, 50*(4), 425-446. doi: 10.2747/1539-7216.50.4.425

Zhu, Y., Breitung, W., & Li, S.-m. (2011). The Changing Meaning of Neighbourhood Attachment in Chinese Commodity Housing Estates: Evidence from Guangzhou. *Urban Studies, 49*(11), 2439-2457. doi: 10.1177/0042098011427188