Urban Poverty in a Socialist Country: Myths and Realities Changing Urban Landscape in Transitional China since the 1970s

Guo Chen Department of Geography Pennsylvania State University

Abstract

Urban poverty in China was perceived as virtually non-existent until the late 1990s. Contemporary literature on Chinese urban poverty suggests the urban poor are comprised of a highly diverse cohort of laid-off and low-paid workers, disabled persons, and rural migrants. Migration research suggests rural migrants as a select group have different life course outcomes from the abject urban poor in China. This paper connects the separate domains of research on urban poverty and rural-urban migration in China and explores the complex dual nature of urban poverty in a transitional socialist market economy. Based on the literature review of urban poverty during the Maoist era and its structural and cultural aspects, the life experiences of "traditional poor", "new urban poor", and migrant poor are compared within the broader concern of the interrelationship between the economic transition after 1978 and its effect on the poor segment of urban population in China. The difference between the emerging new urban poverty groups and the traditional urban poverty group: the 'three nos' (people without income, working ability, or family support), in their residential choices is discussed. The conclusion is made with some of the recent findings from the latest two decennial censuses.

I: Introduction

Since the 1978 economic reform, China has achieved remarkable success in reducing abject poverty. China's official estimates of income poverty show an extraordinary drop of poverty population from 260 million in 1978 to 42 million in 1998¹. However, until the later half of the 1990s, due to the low rate of urbanization and lack of public attention, urban poverty had long been ignored as a social problem in China. According to the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) survey data (Wang 2002) the urban poor living below the official poverty line was about 10-15 illion. In 2002, the State Minimum Standard of Living Security System, which keeps tract of all the recipients of the Community-based Social Assistance Program, estimated the urban poverty population to be 12.35 million persons, an increasing of eight million since 2001. Chinese sociologists, argued as early as the late 1990s, that the number of urban poor in China already exceeded 10 million (Li 2000). One recent estimate concludes, that approximately 10 percent of China's urban population (20-30 million urban residents), are living in poverty (Sun 03/10/2002). A report in *China Daily* states that half of the country's 60 million poor and needy people are in urban areas now (China Labour Bulletin 2002).

¹ Using a higher poverty line, the World Bank estimated that in 1998 the poor numbered more than 100 million.

Recent literature on Chinese urban poverty suggests that the urban poor are composed of a highly differentiated cohort of disabled persons, laid-off and low-paid workers, and rural migrants (World Bank 1997; Qian and Wong 2000). The literature tends to treat the experience and outcome prospects for these disparate groups of individuals as approximately the same. However, migration research suggests rural migrants are a select group of individuals and that the life course outcomes of urban migrants will not necessarily be the same as that of the abject urban poor in China (Goldstein and Goldstein 1991; Zhang 1998). Deprivation of opportunities, lack of social ties and marginalized status of the poor urban residents set them apart from rural migrants.

Why is there such a sea change in the absolute number and perception of urban poverty in China? What is unique about the increasing heterogeneity of poverty group in urban China? Research on urban poverty in China is unusually limited compared to other developing countries. However this paper attempts to answer the questions with both literature reviews and empirical analyses. In the following text, words like "socialist era" and "transitional" might appear interchangeable, however, "socialist era" is used to refer to the general period since 1949 while "transitional" or "transforming" refers to the time since 1978 when China initiated the Open Policy. I will first contrast the understanding of urban poverty in pre-reform, or Maoist and post-reform urban China. Then I will compare the life experiences of "traditional poor", "new urban poor", and migrant poor, and situate the discussion within the broader concern of the interrelationship between the economic transition after 1978 and the changing socioeconomic stratification in China. I focus on the difference between the emerging new urban poverty groups and the traditional urban poverty group: the 'three nos' (people without income, working ability, or family support), in their residential choices. I will conclude with some of the recent findings of urban poverty and its geographical implications in China from the latest two decennial censuses.

II: Urban Poverty in Maoist China

Before the 1990s, the nature of poverty in China was considered absolute poverty because of the characteristics of the poor. This was due to several reasons. *First*, the incidence of absolute poverty as predicted by the World Bank was very high. In 1978, the majority of the Chinese population, approximately 82.1% of the total 963 million population, still lived in rural areas with an average per capita income of 134 Yuan. Thirty-three percent of the rural population and 4.4% of the urban population lived in poverty (World Bank 1992). *Second*, the class structure under Mao suppressed the feeling of comparative disadvantage for the mass population. In 1926 Mao Tse-tung himself listed six classes and decomposed them into twenty four strata. However his class analysis was less an outcome based on property ownership or stage of production by individuals, and instead was politically motivated by the members of a socialist state. In other words, the major questions he asked were 'who are the enemies' and 'who are the friends' (Wortzel 1987). Even in the late 1970s, the rhetoric of class was still emphasizing the antagonistic relationship between the

capitalists, those including new capitalist owners engendered by a small commodity economy, and the socialist workers and peasants. In addition, the difference among the non capitalists, such as intellectuals, cadres and peasants, was blurred. Third, socioeconomic stratification in Maoist China was low by international standards. This was largely attributed to the role of the state in inhibiting the expression of income differentiation in terms of differentiated life-styles and consumption patterns. The state also promoted social equality by maintaining dated political labels that emphasized the so called struggle between "old classes" and "new classes". Fourth, low inequality amongst groups was particularly evident within villages, towns and cities. As Vermeer (1979) summarized, China has seen a decrease in differentials of income and social services within each village and town since 1949, accompanied by larger disparities in development and income between agrarian regions. Drawing mainly from factual evidence, he attributes the low inequality to a number of social political restrictions including (1) limited mobility, compartmentalization, and regional seclusion, (2) the lack of open repudiation and criticism of the restrictive policies, (3) and the obligatory political attitude, dress and life-style the population was required to pursue. However as sociological research on China accumulated over the 1980s, perceptions of social change after the 1949 revolution were altered markedly.

In China, there is the tradition of perceiving poverty as a cultural phenomenon. This is attributable to both the pre-revolutionary legacy and the socialist experience. *First*, all through Chinese history, the family system occupied a revered place as the core unit of society. Nothing could be more unfilial than remaining single and breaking up the blood line. Concepts of mutuality were an integral part of Confucian thinking. But the concepts were different from their Western counterparts. The entitlements and obligations were extremely ordered and confined within local community and common occupation, resulting in localism. Also ecology-based values were strong in rural areas, which explain the emphasis on self-reliance and hardwork in Chinese society. Second, the above all gave rise to the traditional institutional framework in China. For example, the role of government was more to provide a macro-framework for social order, stability and prosperity than to engage in direct social aid. Finally, a large proportion of the above factors persisted through the socialist era. Negative images were associated with les misérables, namely, people without kin and ability to work, poverty-stricken households, the disabled and victims of natural disasters (Wong 1998).

In contrast to the above notion that poverty in China was a cultural phenomenon there are indeed structural reasons for the existence of poverty and inequality during the Maoist era. *First*, the antagonistic relationship between 'new classes' and 'old classes' actually created a new dimension of differentiation in socialist China. Within the 'class status system', class labels were not supposed to be inherited, however, family origin remained, especially in the countryside, the main determinant of an individual's social economic position. As Whyte et al (1977) point out, the distinctive features of stratification in China, is characterized by a group of fairly stigmatized families discriminated against for having divergent class interests a generation ago, and a separate and self-perpetuating stratum of "new class" elites. *Second*, it has been argued that cadres have become a class with particular advantages in the socialist and the transitional eras. *Third*, the 'rural bias' and 'urban bias' intrinsic to the Maoist regime created new regional inequality. It is still open to debate whether the Chinese

socialist development favored urban or rural areas (Nolan and White 1984), since the urban and rural forces are not as clear-cut as they were supposed to be. On the one hand, there were considerable 'urbanist ideological themes' in the country's Maoist era development policy. On the other hand, there is evidence that the state retained strong rural elements in terms of policy, personnel et al. For example, the Cultural Revolution was an example of the state's effort to divert resources from town to countryside. Nevertheless, the income disparity between rural and urban areas widened during this period. This is evident in Walder's (1989) work on examining social stratification in China. He concludes that income distribution within Chinese cities in the 1970s was more equal than in developing countries with market-based economies, because migration policy could be used to keep out the rural poor. Compared with other socialist states, China affords fewer privileges to professionals and officials in housing and consumption of commodities. However, certain inequalities were exacerbated by the Maoist pattern of development. As intra rural and intra urban inequalities were low, while the urban-rural income gap grew from the mid-1950s to the late 1970s.

The structural aspects of inequality and poverty should be treated carefully though. *First*, it is important to note that as the political and economic regimes changed, the old structures that shaped old inequalities were replaced by new structures that shape new inequalities. The Chinese social stratification of the Maoist era was characterized by the preponderate impact of shifting state policies on individual life chances, through dramatic alterations in opportunity structures, the status of structural locations, and the nature and value of political and human capital (Zhou, Tuma et al. 1996). Second, even during the socialist era, there were vicissitudes of policies and programs. One of the most radical programs, the Cultural Revolution, is regarded not only as an attempt to narrow the gap in material well-being between the haves and have-nots, but also an effort to invert the old class order and break the chain of inheritance between privileged fathers and privileged children. According to Parish (1984), this appears to be true, given that before the 1960s class was declining as an indicator of educational attainment. However this trend was drastically altered by the Cultural Revolution, when class origin became one of the criteria for university admission. The children of new elite cadres began to get the most education. Third, after the 1970s, China was predicted to experience a transition from destratification to restratification given the increasing role of property and wealth in the intergenerational transmission of status and political privilege. But it is unknown which process played the most important role in shaping the new stratification order. It is unclear whether political positions still translate into higher socioeconomic status in the market economy — or in other words, whether current or former cadres benefit from current reforms in China (Szelenyi and Kostello 1996). There are various attempts to predict the transformational mechanism of stratification, including Nee's (1989) "market transition theory", which claims that market mechanisms have predictable implications for inequality. Finally, it is unclear to what extent and in what fashion social stratification responds to changing policies. Historical evidence shows that there has not always been a quick shift of the society following each move of national policy. Some old mechanisms are entrenched despite policy intervention. For example, in the early years of the Maoist regime, peasants and workers remained the least advantaged groups in terms of education and occupation opportuniy. Educational differences among those of different class labels did narrow quite quickly, when the urban residents of peddler, worker, and peasant origin began to approach educational

levels of the formerly dominant capitalists. But the rank order of educational accomplishment remained the same, except for the children of elite cadres. Workers, peasant, and peddler children continued to get fewer years of education. Meanwhile, the children of workers and peasants got the worst jobs or no jobs at all. When the youth were sent to the countryside, it was often the worker and peasant children with poor academic records who were sent first (Parish 1984).

III: Urban Poverty in Transitional China

A. What's new about urban poverty in China?

Until the late 1980s, there were no official estimates of urban poverty and no official urban poverty lines until the early 1990s (Ahmad and Yan 1991). Until the early 1990s, poverty in China was perceived to be almost entirely a rural and regional phenomenon (World Bank 1992; Guan 1995; Gustafsson and Li 1998; Yao 1999). The World Bank (1997) data indicates that no urban residents in China had incomes below the absolute poverty line from 1990-95. And in 1995 just 0.1 percent of the registered urban population lived below the higher poverty threshold. This was down from a peak of 1.8 percent in 1989. Yet since 1978, when 80 percent of its total population survived on less than one US dollar purchasing power a day, the nation made great efforts to alleviate poverty among the bulk of its rural population. Partially due to the pervasiveness of rural poverty, and partly due to the intentionally maintained rural-urban divide, urban poverty in China had long been a negligible problem. As the World Bank (1992) reports, "superior income levels, complemented by annual consumer food subsidies of at least Y200 per urban recipient" leave the urban population "much better nourished than their rural counterparts". The urban poor were mainly comprised of the "three nos", those without income, working ability, or family support. They were regarded as "Civil Relief Targets" which was a slightly derogative term during the pre-reform era (Wong 1998).

Since the mid 1990s, poverty gradually urbanized due to the bankruptcy of State Owned Enterprises (SOEs), the retreat of the state from welfare provision and regulation, and the increasingly lax migration policy that enabled significant ruralurban migration. Accompanying the rising urban poverty is the increase in the ruralurban disparity and intra-urban inequality that otherwise was low during the prereform era. As such the World Bank estimates and the official poverty measurements are now only capable of identifying fractions of the urban poverty strickened population. The traditional "three nos" are now a small fraction of the urban poverty population, which includes laid off workers, long term unemployed people, early retirees, and rural migrants living in the city (See table 1). The increasing volume and the changing demographic composition of the urban poor challenges traditional understandings of poverty in China and also poses a series of questions of significant geographic interest.

Table 1: Composition of Urbar	Poor Households in Chir	ia, 2000
Household Members	Number	Percentage
	(10 thousands)	(%)
Laid off Workers	415	30

Unemployed	235	17
Working Poor	207	15
Retirees	124	9
"Three Nos"	83	6
Non-employed, disabled, and students	318	23
Total	1382	100
		X 10 10 1

Source: Ministry of Civil Affairs, 2002, Report on Chinese Social Welfare and Social Progress, Beijing, Social Sciences Documentation Publishing House.

B. Estimates on Urban Poverty: Can we measure it in China?

A significant feature of poverty in China is the great variation between estimates based on absolute and relative poverty levels as well as the difference between a nutrition-based and an income/expenditure-based absolute poverty line. These measurement problems also characterize urban poverty estimates (See Appendix 1). The official poverty line as a whole has been harshly criticized by an array of scholars (Wong 1995; Wong 1997; Gustafsson and Zhong 2000; Park and Wang 2001) because it is believed to underestimate actual poverty given its austere threshold, the neglect of regional differences in prices, costs of living and inflation rates (Khan and Riskin 2001), and its sensitivity to local financial capability (Hussain 2003). The Rural/Urban Household Survey as a sample survey for poverty estimates is also criticized for its low level of representativeness, exclusion of the illiterate population, rural migrants in urban districts and inclusion of rural/township residents with urban *hukou*² who actually should be excluded from the survey, and so forth (Bramall 2001; Hussain 2003).

Generally, the Chinese government uses a relative measure to estimate urban poverty, with each province defining its own poverty line (World Bank 1992). The way China monitors its number of urban poverty is through the Urban Household Survey (UHS) conducted by the National Statistical Bureau (NSB). The UHS together with the RHS (Rural Household Survey) combine urban and rural samples and include more than 100,000 households over the course of a year. Respondents selected through a stratified sampling procedure, are required to keep a daily expenditure diary for a full 12-month period. The survey data is then collected and coded by local statistical bureaus (Gibson, Huang et al. 2001). The UHS data set is so comprehensive that "there are 1,500 entries for each household including details of household composition, income and expenditure", however the state had not effectively used the data to calculate a nationwide urban poverty line until the 1990s. As Hussain (2003) documents, a number of Chinese organizations including the NSB started to calculate an urban poverty line in terms of expenditures needed for a socially acceptable subsistence level. However, the national poverty lines vary greatly across institutions. The ones currently in use fall in the range of Y1, 700 to Y2, 400 per year per head.

 $^{^{2}}$ *Hukou* is the Chinese for household registration. According to Zhang (1998), permanent migration in China is defined as a change of place with *hukou* registration. Otherwise, migration is considered as temporary (officially called "floating population" or *liudong renkou*), regardless of the actual duration of movement.

For practical purposes of providing social relief or assistance to urban poor, each province sets its own poverty line. Methods to determine individual provincial poverty lines vary greatly across provinces. Prices, the consumption pattern, and average income per capita are widely different across localities. Furthermore, the poverty line determines the "Minimum Living Standard Scheme" (MLSS), principally financed by each city government. The variation may reflect both the disparity in prices and living standards and the ability of the public to finance social support payments across cities in different sizes (Hussain 2003).

The NSB survey data are only accessible to a handful of institutions and scholars. Alternative estimates based on the data set do not greatly vary from the official estimates, except for an estimate based on the NSB grouped data of income distribution (Khan 1996). For example, with the UHS data collected from urban Sichuan and Liaoning, Yao (1999) uses two official absolute poverty lines and concludes that the incidence of urban poverty in the two places was very low (less than 1 percent) in the period 1986-93. However he surmises that the number would change dramatically given the reforms of State-Owned Enterprises and the limitation of his data that does not include migrant workers in the urban areas. Taking an approximately 19% sample from the UHS parent data, Khan and Riskin (2001) use their own series of poverty lines— Urban Broad Poverty, Urban Deep Poverty, and Urban Extreme Poverty in terms of Head Count (HD), Proportionate Poverty Gap (PPG), and Weighted Poverty Gap (WPG) indexes and estimate that in 1988 the HD indices for the three lines were 6.7, 2.2, and 1.1, and increased to 8.0, 4.1, and 2.7 in 1995.

The World Bank (1992) has used the minimum nutritious intake of 2150 calories per day as the absolute poverty line to measure the incidence of urban poverty in China. They found from 1983 to 1990, there were less than 1 percent of urban residents living in absolute poverty. Even the poorest 5 percent of urban residents earned an average income of Y689, more than double the absolute urban poverty line (World Bank 1992). An alternative to the calorie-based absolute poverty line is the 1 USD per day measure initiated by the World Bank for cross-country comparisons. Chen and Wang (April 30-May 4, 2001) have used the 1 USD per day as a measurement and found that the urban poverty incidence was 1% in 1998 for China. However, Fang et al (2002) using both the 1 USD and the 1.5 USD per day poverty lines in the 28 provinces found that under the 1 USD poverty line, about 2% of urban residents were poor in 1998, a number barely changed from 1992. When using a poverty line of 1.5 USD, the measure changes to 9% in 1998 dropping from 14% in 1992. Both measures show an increase from 1996 to 1998. Furthermore, their estimates are significantly higher than both Chen and Wang's and the World Bank's estimates. The reason lies first in the data sets they examined and secondly in the way the 1 USD poverty line was operationalized.

Alternative measurements have been used in individual research on urban poverty in China. However, due to the variation in poverty thresholds used and the time periods examined, it is hard to compare these estimates. Furthermore, as Khan and Riskin (2001) argue, most Chinese poverty thresholds do not represent an income with unchanged purchasing power over time. Nevertheless, a number of estimates based on relative poverty lines give us a rough estimate of the discrepancies based on absolute and relative poverty measurements. Ahmad and Wang (1991) use a set of expenditure based poverty lines including an absolute urban poverty line of 1985 at an income level of approximately 50% of mean urban income and a relative poverty line that equals to 50% of yearly mean urban income. Using these cut off points, they found during the 1980s much higher levels of urban poverty (8.75% and 9.12%) respectively in 1988) than the official level and the World Bank estimates. Wong (1995) uses the median-income-based international poverty line in his early case study of Guangzhou and suggests that approximately 13 percent of the respondents in his survey were reporting household income less than half of the median income and were conspicuously less well off than the rest. He later sees the widening urban income inequality and an Engel Ratio below 0.6; two requirements that justify the usage of the relative income-based measurement in the third world countries as China and estimates that 12 percent of the Shanghai population was poor in 1996 (Wong 1997). On the basis of national statistics provided by the NSB (National Statistical Bureau) Fan (1996) estimates that urban poverty was as high as 18.5 million or approximately 7.8 per cent of the urban population in 1993, rising to 20 million in 1995. This is definitely higher than the official Chinese estimates.

C. Spatial Characteristics of Urban Poverty

Another characteristic of urban poverty is the wide regional disparity in the extensiveness and intensity of its experience. In 1987, The World Bank (1992) identified six provinces where the poorest 5 percent of city dwellers averaged Y400 per capita or less and were contiguous and extended from Xinjiang to Jilin. There also are intraprovincial differences in average income. According to the World Bank, those inter and intra provincial spatial patterns reflected the national and provincial power in granting city status to urban areas and urban residency status to individuals, and the distribution of investment in the State Owned Enterprises (SOEs), the major employer and care taker for most urban residents (World Bank 1992).

The decade of 1990s saw even greater concentration of poverty in China's western and some central provinces (World Bank 2001). This pattern also was evident in the report from the Ministry of Civil Affairs (MOCA) (2002). As table 2a demonstrates, the percentage of the urban population that regularly receive social assistance in the west almost quadruples that found in the east coast. These numbers might even underrate the real disparity given the poor financial capacities of the western provinces. Based on smaller regional groupings, Hussain (2003) provides a finer grained picture of the regional pattern of urban poverty in the year of 1998. Interestingly his research reveals little coincidence between the location of rural and urban poverty, with the north-west being the worst affected region of urban poverty (See table 2b, table 2c, figure 1 and figure 2) and the south-west below the average urban poverty rate. In general, the three regions that have a greater incidence of urban poverty than average are: the north-east, the north and the north-west, and the south-west.

	Table 2a: Regional Distr	ibution of Urban Poverty in Chin	a, 2000
Region	Number	Non-agriculture Population	Percentage

	(10 thousands)	(10 thousands)	(%)
East coast ^a	154.7	8952	1.7
Middle ^b	897.7	16796	5.3
West ^c	329.6	5470	6.0
Total	1382	31218	4.4

Source: Ministry of Civil Affairs, 2002, Report on Chinese Social Welfare and Social Progress, Beijing, Social Sciences Documentation Publishing House.

a: includes Beijing (Independent Prefecture), Shanghai (Independent Prefecture), Shandong, Jiangsu, Zhejiang, Fujian, and Guangdong Provinces.

- b: includes Tianjin (Independent Prefecture), Liaoning, Jilin, Heilongjiang, Shanxi, Inner Mongolia, Hebei, Henan, Hubei, Hunan, Guangxi, Hainan, Anhui, and Jiangxi Provinces.
- c: includes Chongqing (Independent Prefecture), Xinjiang, Tibet, Ningxia, Qinghai, Gansu, Shaanxi, Sichuan, Guizhou, Yunnan.



Figure 1: Regional Pattern of Urban Poverty in China, 1998 Source: Hussain, Athar, 2003

Regions	Poverty Rate (%)	% of the National Headcount of the Poor
North-West	8.80	12.89
North-East	6.75	21.37
North	5.22	14.70
South-West	4.52	10.12
South-East	4.26	22.72
East	2.97	18.19
National	4.73	100.00

Source: Hussain, Athar, 2003, Urban Poverty in China: Measurement, Patterns and Policies, International Labour Office, Geneva.



Figure 2: Provincial Pattern of Urban Poverty in China, 1998 Source: Hussain, Athar, 2003

]	Fable 2c: Provincial	Pattern of Urba	an Poverty, 1998	
Table 2c:ProvincialPattern ofUrbanPoverty,1998Low0-2%	Below Average 2-4%	Average 4-6%	Above Average 6-8%	High to Severe >8%
Beijing	Anhui	Guizhou	Gansu	Henan
Jiangsu	Fujian	Chongqing	Hainan	Shaanxi
Zhejiang	Guangxi	Hebei	Heilongjiang	Ningxia
Guangdong	Hunan	Hubei	Inner Mongolia	Tibet
	Jiangxi	Qinghai	Liaoning	
	Shanghai	Shandong	Jilin	
	Yunnan	Sichuan	Shanxi	
			Tianjin	
			Xinjiang	

Source: Hussain, Athar, 2003, Urban Poverty in China: Measurement, Patterns and Policies, International Labour Office, Geneva.

IV: New Urban Poverty in China: New Concept and New Characteristics

A. Heterogeneity of the New Urban Poor

Despite relatively inconsistent measurements of urban poverty and discrepancies in the estimates of urban poverty changes from 1980s to the 1990s (Khan and Riskin 1998), there is general agreement that there was a significant reduction in urban poverty between the late 1980s and the mid-1990s (Khan 1996; Khan and Riskin 2001), followed by an increase of urban poverty since the mid 1990s (World Bank 1997; Leung and Wong 1999; Wang 1999; Qian and Wong 2000; Park and Wang 2001). Two recent studies using absolute poverty measures support these trends (Fang, Zhang et al. 2002; Chen and Wang April 30-May 4, 2001).

What is more important, there are notions of the difference between the new urban poverty and the traditional urban poverty composed of the "three nos". A few studies have been focused on urban poverty and income distribution, with a primary interest in the livelihood of poor urban residents, including recession-stricken workers, unemployed and laid off workers, retirees, low wage workers, and welfare dependants (Qian and Wong 2000). Others pursue a historical and structural analysis of urban poverty and recognize that the urban poor are comprised of poorly paid state workers, the unemployed, and migrants from the countryside (World Bank 1997; Leung and Wong 1999). Zhu (1997) suggests that the urban poverty stricken population is comprised of three main categories of households: the traditional government relief targets, or the "three nos", the low-income families, and the unemployed. Here the findings from urban China are not dissimilar from those in other developing countries (Shaw 2003). In general, the new urban poor do not constitute a homogeneous interest group. Instead, they are separated by many factors including socio-economic status and conditions including age, gender, education, employment, and occupation, and institutional factors such as *hukou* status and length of stay in the city.

A number of terms used to categorize various urban poverty groups help illustrate the above point. According to Zhu (1997) the "*three nos*" are comprised of the childless elderly and disabled people with no working ability or source of support. This traditional notion of poverty was well accepted in both urban and rural areas and was directly linked to social relief projects. In 1991 Ahmad and Wang (1991) characterized poverty right before the urban reforms of the 1990s.

"The characteristics of a typical poor household are illustrated by an example in Jiangsu. This was a household of three unemployed adults, headed by a disabled worker, aged 64. They subsisted on a disability pension equivalent to Y984 a year paid by the head's prior employer, a SOE."

Besides the 3 million claimants of the "five guarantee system"³ or *wu bao*, mainly composed of widows, orphans, and the elderly without family support and mainly in the rural areas, Ahmad and Wang (1991) further distinguish two groups of potential risk populations: the 51.6 million disabled persons nationwide and the 100 million victims of natural disasters that seem to arise each year. The *wu bao* in rural areas and the "three nos" in urban areas were only the largest group to receive regular relief

³ According to Wong (1998), the 'five-guarantee' scheme has been the foundation of the rural relief programme. Originally, the 'five guarantees consisted of food, fuel, c_1 othing, education, and burial''. There were upgrading of contents, but generally, the beneficiaries were and are still confined to the elderly, disabled and young orphans who have no family support, work ability or means of livelihood.

from local civil affair departments. According to Wong (1998), the "three nos" were conceived as a part of China's *les misérables*, namely, people without kin or the ability to work, poverty-stricken households, the disabled and victims of nature disasters. The negative image given these people stemmed from the fact that in Chinese society where family and work status have been the benchmarks of social identity, deprived persons become virtual pariahs. However, the "three nos" have become a numerical minority among the poor in the cities since the 1990s. It is estimated that in 1995 the "three nos" only accounted for 0.5 percent out of the 18.5 million urban poor (Zhu 1997).

The official number of *unemployed* is unusually low and presents a partial picture of unemployment in urban areas because of its restricted coverage (See table 3). It only includes the registered unemployed and excludes two categories of persons: "laid-off" employees who are still formally attached to their work units; and the unemployed rural migrant residents living in urban districts for six months or more (Hussain 2003). Among the unemployed or Shiye category, there is further differentiation. After having carefully examined the data sources on unemployment and joblessness, Solinger (2001) concludes that the statistical judgment about China's current unemployment, especially that drawing upon official statistics is fundamentally flawed. The reasons lie in inconsistent state statistics, flexible, disaggregating definitions, and multi-layering of the laid-off and jobless. She further argues that there exists an implicit rank ordering of workless laborers in terms of benefits and treatment. At the very peak are "those furloughed workers who were formerly employed in firms that remained relatively healthy, and whose leaders have reported their existence to the authorities." Resting at the bottom are those temporary workers and the peasantry from outside the city eking out a living despite an ever increasing hostility toward outsiders.

Rural migrants are regarded as a portion of the urban poverty population only figuratively. Few statistics or research is available to convey a rough understanding of how many migrant poor are in Chinese cities today. The reason lies in the complex nature of rural migrants living in urban China and therefore the World Bank suggests that "when considering the place of these people in urban poverty it is useful to divide them between short term, often seasonal, migrants and long term migrants." The reasoning is that although both groups face disadvantages unknown among the inveterate urban population, the short term are regarded to be at much less risk than the long term (World Bank 1992). Hussain (2003) points out that the problem is not who should be included in the urban poor but rather who are the urban population now. He indicates the need to incorporate long-term migrants into the urban population in any type of poverty analysis, while it is far from obvious whether shortterm migrants should be considered as part of the urban or rural population. He also compares the incidence of urban poverty amongst rural migrants and that among permanent residents using a NSB survey in 1999 (See table 4). The analysis presents strikingly high poverty rates in some cases: for example amongst locals in Huhot, Shenyang and Xian and amongst rural migrants in Huhot, Nanjing, Jinan, Zhengzhou, Yinchuan and Urumqi.

The above poses questions on how to incorporate the rural urban divide into research on urban poverty. When peasant workers and farmers are regarded as a quasi caste in China, how do notions of class and socioeconomic stratification interplay in the formation of new urban poverty? Research shows that the rural migrants, although disadvantaged in a number of ways due to limited access to basic services, nonetheless they are highly selective, having considerable social ties and support from close-knit family networks. In contrast, unemployed or laid-off urban residents are often portrayed as desolate individuals, lacking social and human capital, and often suffering a decline in their socioeconomic status.

Table 3: The Changing Official Registered Unemployment in Urban China, 1985-2001 1985

Registered Unemployment (millions)	2.39	3.83	5.20	5.95	6.81
Registered Unemployment Rate (%)	1.8	2.5	2.9	3.1	3.6
Source: National Bureau of Statistics	of China,	China Statistical	Abstract,	2002,	Beijing: China

1990

1995

2000

2001

Table 4	. I overty h	ales for Kur	ai wiigi a	ants and Locals	III Selecteu	Cities, 1999	
City	P	Poverty Rates	S	City	P	overty Rates	5
	Locals	Migrants	Ratio		Locals	Migrants	Ratio
	а	b	b/a		а	b	b/a
Beijing	4.6	10.3	2.3	Nanchang	12.8	19.0	1.5
Tianjin	3.5	11.9	3.4	Jinan	11.0	39.3	3.6
Shijiazhuang	5.1	13.3	2.6	Qingdao	16.8	12.1	0.7
Taiyuan	14.9	17.4	1.2	Zhengzhou	11.2	20.5	1.8
Huhot	23.0	28.7	1.2	Wuhan	6.3	15.1	2.4
Shenyang	22.9	15.0	0.7	Changsha	8.4	5.0	0.6
Dalian	14.1	14.3	1.0	Guangzhou	9.2	15.0	1.6
Changchun	8.3	8.1	1.0	Shenzhen	0.0	16.9	
Harbin	7.1	7.6	1.1	Chengdu	17.2	10.7	0.6
Shanghai	5.8	18.3	3.1	Chongqing	16.9	9.4	0.6
Nanjing	9.5	29.0	3.1	Xian	27.5	17.9	0.7
Hangzhou	7.1	7.8	1.1	Lanzhou	8.6	12.5	1.5
Ningbo	3.7	5.7	1.5	Xining	16.2	9.8	0.6
Hefei	12.2	10.9	0.9	Yinchuan	11.4	22.7	2.0
Fuzhou	3.8	2.7	0.7	Urumqi	14.2	54.0	3.8
Xiamen	8.2	2.0	0.2	All Cities	10.3	15.2	1.5

Table 4: Deverty Dates for Dural Migrants and Legals in Selected Cities 1000

Source: Hussain, Athar, 2003, Urban Poverty in China: Measurement, Patterns and Policies, International Labour Office. Geneva.

Note: The poverty lines for the 31 cities are calculated from the 1998 annual urban household survey by NSB and are not adjusted for the price change between 1998 and 1999.

B. Spatial Isolation of the New Urban Poor

Another aspect of the new urban poverty is their differentiated access to urban benefits including housing. Here we focus on the migrant poor as a group whose situation is, if not worse than, quite different from the native urban poor residents. In western societies, income disparity translates into households' bidding. In many African and Asian cities, race has declined in importance in residential segregation compared with the colonial era. Instead, urban authorities zone their cities according to income and housing density. "African and Asian cities are moving closer to the pattern, long apparent in Latin America, whereby income determines where people can live" (Gilbert and Gugler 1992). But is there a residential segregation process undergoing in contemporary China?

Year

Statistics Press.

1. The Transforming Urban Spatial Structure

To answer this question, it's necessary to review the urban structure of Chinese cities before and after the economic transition. In the Socialist era, Chinese cities resembled other socialist cities, which were designed to reflect the ideal of a "classless society" (French and Hamilton 1979; Yeh and Wu 1995). Among the socialist urban policies are (1) a commitment to central planning at the national level; (2) an eradication of the land market; (3) the elimination of social-class divisions; and (4) the creation of neighborhood units that provide all the necessities and minimize the distance to work (French and Hamilton 1979; Hu and Kaplan 2001). Since the economic reform, the traditional socialist urban spatial structure based on functional land use is changing (Gaubatz 1995; Yeh and Wu 1995). Chinese cities are increasingly differentiated based on population density, education, employment, housing quality, and household composition (Yeh, Xu et al. 1995). Research in Beijing suggests a similar pattern of differentiation is emerging along the lines of education, employment, occupation, age and type of household (Sit 2000). Furthermore, something unique to China, which distinguishes it from other post-socialist economies and developing countries, is the long-term *controlled* inequality between urban areas and rural areas (Chan 1996; Solinger 1999), and therefore the controlled status difference between inveterate urbanites and temporary urbanites, or the so called "floating population" (Solinger 1995).

Ever since the economic reform, there are new patterns of consumption, industry, transportation and residence in urban areas. The social activities and informal reciprocal ties in traditional communities are either disappearing or decaying. As Solinger (Solinger 1999) put it, while the socialist state had the capacity to determine both the allocation of the goods of daily life and the roster of membership in the urban community, it is starting to change now with the incursion of markets. Former homogenous urban communities are challenged and are thereby being reformed with the spatial relocation of market elements, such as capital, real estate, and employment within cities.

2. Where Do Rural Migrants Live?

Correspondingly, empirical studies show the connection between market mechanisms and the concentration of peasant residences in the city. The socio-spatial segregation process has created contrasting landscapes in urban China (Gu and Kesteloot 2002). Migrant enclaves are presented as examples of the segregation in the city of Beijing, where 60 percent of migrants choose to live in the suburbs. In contras, the "new elite" are spatially concentrated in the north and the east, where gated "affluent neighborhoods" flourish (Hu and Kaplan 2001). Simultaneously, in Guangzhou, the old Chinese southern gate city, the distribution of migrants is found to be strongly correlated with the location of the "*chu zu wu*", such as apartments and houses for lease mainly built by the farmers on their remaining collective land (Taubmann 2002).

There are various theories and models that explain migrant residential patterns and behaviors in developing countries, most of which are derived from the experience of Latin American cities. According to Turner (1968), there are three variables determining the residential location of low-income migrants, tenure of housing, proximity to unskilled employment opportunities, priority for modern shelter. It also specified a two-stage process of residential movement. At first, Most low-income migrants will live as renters in the inner city and later move as owners into the peripheral low-income settlements (Gilbert and Ward 1982).

In China there is a growing amount of research on migrant settlements. Generally, it has been argued that institutional factors such as the Chinese housing market, household registration or *hukou* system is limiting migrants' access to urban housing. In China, housing, which is strongly associated with *hukou*, remains difficult to attain for migrants. It has been argued that although urban housing reforms have been implemented, the old institution of work units still play an important role in housing distribution by funding the construction and purchase of public as well as commercial housing (Zhou and Logan 1996; Bian, Logan et al. 1997). Migrants that do not even have access to state job opportunities are totally overlooked by housing reforms.

The circular nature of migration determines the type of housing ownership for most migrants. Temporary migrants might be less willing to invest in substantial housing, similar to third world immigrants in developed countries. Surveys in Shanghai and Beijing indicate that renting remained the best opportunity for migrants without local *hukou* and more than half of them did so in both cities (Wu 2002). The second choice for migrants is institutionally provided dormitories. Besides, a new type of housing named "migrant housing complexes" managed by sub-district and township agencies is available in cities now.

As to where migrants choose to live in cities, several factors play important roles in such decisions. First, the availability of rental housing is a key factor. The bulk of rental housing is private housing located in suburban or even rural areas. In some places, only rural residents have been allowed to build private housing. These housing were made available to migrants when the owners were automatically converted to urban residents during urban expansion and land acquisition by the urban municipality. Second, the employment opportunity, as indicated by Turner, is another factor that matters. Given the availability of employment opportunities on the outskirts of built-up areas, which is mostly comprised of construction jobs, migrants are not making random choices of where to live. Last but not the least, chain migration also impacts on the choice of residential location (Gu and Liu 2002). This is particularly prominent in Beijing, where migrants from the same province form "migrant enclaves" in suburban areas where rental housing is available (Wu 2002), and where job opportunities can be found in both informal sectors and heavy industries recently relocated to the periphery of the city (Jie and Taubmann 2002).

3. The Segregation or Integration of Rural Migrants?

For rural migrants, the process of integration is suggested to be a slow one. According to Solinger (Solinger 1995), at least eight features of the receiving society determines the life chances of migrants: (1) The nature of the class structure in the city (clearly a function of state policy in the Chinese case); (2) the pattern of property ownership; (3) the type of labor market; (4) the political system; (5) the patronage networks available

to the migrants; (6) the urban educational system and access to it; (7) housing opportunities in the cities; (8) and the attitudes of the receiving community. Judging from the above features, Solinger (Solinger 1995) predicts a gloomy picture of a "new two-class structure" in Chinese cities, within which the urban dwellers are privileged by entitlement to such benefits as jobs, housing, education, cheap goods, and medical care, whereas rural "outsiders" must scramble for these goods or do without. She also predicts the current economic transition is not a guarantee of the assimilation and integration of rural migrants into current urban life. For the floating population, there has not been a full "withdrawal of the state" from maintaining the old barriers.

In any case, given the still stringent policy on *hukou* status changes, (Wu 2002), the dominant role of government in urban renewal and real estate practices, is slow in integrating rural-migrants. It is reasonable to predict that the integration is likely to take place on the periphery of the city (Jie and Taubmann 2002; Wu 2002), or even outside the city (Gu and Liu 2002), rather than near the urban center. However, the spatial pattern of migrant residence varies with different cities and economic and institutional factors (Smart and Smart 2001). There is also differentiation based on age, gender (Roberts 2002), education (Meng 2001) among migrants that might enable upward social mobility of certain sub groups of migrants while keeping other groups lingering at the lowest stratum of society.

V: Concluding Remarks and Recent Findings from the 1990 and 2000 Censuses

Urban and rural areas can have a positive or negative relationship with development (Satterthwaite and Tacoli 2002). In China there is an inextricable relationship between the economic transformation and the nexus of urban poverty, rural-urban migration, and spatial inequality. In contrast to the traditional understanding of poverty as a cultural phenomenon there were structural causes of urban poverty despite low incidence of urban poverty and suppressed stratification during the Maoist era. Some of the old structures such as rural-urban divide persist despite policy interventions and some new policies introduced during economic reform cause new types of working poor, which result in the dualistic nature of urban poverty in China. The duality is not only reflected in the fundamental differences amongst the traditional (the "three nos"), the native and migrant poor in their life chances but also is evident in the differentiated socioeconomic well-being across cities.

At the end of the paper, I will share some of the recent findings from the latest two decennial censuses of China with the readers. From the 1990 and 2000 Population Censuses in China⁴, social economic indicators including educational attainment, employment status, industry and occupation, rural migration, and housing condition (see Appendix 2) for all the Chinese cities are extracted and analyzed (see table 5 and

⁴ The 1990 Census data was obtained from a free dataset titled "The 1990 Population Census and Agriculture Data" developed by CITAS (China in Time and Space) and funded by CIESIN. The 2000 Census data is from the recently released data file named "2000 China County Population and Socioeconomic Indicators with county maps" from the China Data Center at University of Michigan.

table 6). Factor analysis, a statistical technique for identifying a small number of important factors to represent many interrelated variables is applied to the data set of 7 variables for Chinese cities in 1990 and 20 variables for Chinese cities in 2000. Factor scores for each city can then be calculated for each year to represent the level of deprivation in each city (see Figure 3 and Figure 4). From the maps we can see that (1) there is no evident pattern of deprivation across Chinese cities in 1990; (2) and there is increasing polarization among Chinese cities in wellbeing or deprivation. Judging by factor loadings, the principal factor in 2000 has strong relationship with migration. However, to explain the recent pattern of urban poverty and deprivation, more empirical work is needed.



Figure 3 The Spatial Structure of Urban Deprivation in China, 1990

Figure 4 The Spatial Structure of Urban Deprivation in China, 2000



				1990					2000		
Category	Indicator	Average of 452 Cities	Municip alities (3)	Provinci al Capitals etc. (33)	Prefectu re-level cities (152)	County- level cities (264)	Average of 662 Cities	Municip alities (4)	Provinci al Capitals etc. (32)	Prefectu re-level cities (229)	County- level cities (397)
Education	Percentage of Illiterate	100	47.1	58.8	82.4	111.8	100	54.9	64.8	93.1	107.3
Attainment	(including Semi-illiterate Population in 1990)	(16.6%)	$\bigtriangledown \bigtriangledown$	\triangleleft	\triangleleft	*	(7.5%)	\triangleleft	\triangleleft	\triangleleft	*
	Average Years at School	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (8.05)	125.2 *	119.3 *	105.7	95.0 △
	Gender Difference in Education (Years)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (0.96)	330.8 ***	232.8 **	169.6 *	46.8
Employment Status	Percentage of Employed Population	100 (78.1%)	89.7	92.3 △	98.7	102.6 *	100 (69.6%)	78.6 △	85.7	92.9 △	104.3 *
	Percentage of Non- working Population	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (30.4%)	152.6 *	132.4 *	114.3 *	88.6
	Percentage of Non- working Population without Working Ability	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (3.68%)	35.1	44.0	79.9 △	116.8 *
	Percentage of Non- working Population who have lost jobs and are looking for jobs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (1.74%)	318.4 ***	187.4 *	144.3 *	64.9 △

Table 5: Comparison of basic social economic indicators for cities at 4 administrative levels, 1990 and 2000

GUO CHEN

Table 5: con	tinued										
				1990					2000		
Category	Indicator	Average of 452 Cities	Municip alities (3)	Provinci al Capitals etc. (33)	Prefectu re-level cities (152)	County- level cities (264)	Average of 662 Cities	Municip alities (4)	Provinci al Capitals etc. (32)	Prefectu re-level cities (229)	County- level cities (397)
Industry and Occupation	Percentage of Employed Population in 2 nd Industry	100 (29.2%)	187.7 *	154.8 *	144.9 *	66.4 △	100 (23.0%)	147.9 *	150.1 *	126.5 *	80.2 △
	Percentage of Occupation in Farming, Commerce,	100 (83.8%)	78.6	86.9	95.2 >	103.6 *	100 (85.2%)	19.9	29.8 >>>	74.3	121.3 *
	Service personnel, Production and Transportation etc.	~]	1]		~]]]	1	1	
	Percentage of Occupation	100	168.6	146.9	137.2	71.8	100	125.8	142.9	123.0	83.4
	in manufacturing, construction, transport, etc.	(27.7%)	*	*	*	\triangleleft	(21.7%)	*	*	*	\triangleleft
	Percentage of Occupation	100	181.4	163.9	128.9	75.3	100	192.4	188.5	123.7	77.9
	in Commerce and Service Sectors	(9.7%)	*	*	*	\triangleleft	(13.1%)	*	*	*	\triangleleft
Rural-Urban	Percentage of In-migrants	100	94.4	178.9	131.0	71.8	100	162.5	275.0	125.0	75.0
Migration	from other counties or cities	(7.1%)	\triangleleft	*	*	\triangleleft	(8.1%)	*	*	*	\triangleleft
	Percentage of In-migrants	100	86.0	162.8	132.6	72.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	from rural townships	(4.3%)	\bigtriangledown	*	*	\triangleleft					

GUO CHEN

Table 5: Co	ontinued										
				1990					2000		
Category	Indicator	Average of 452 Cities	Municip alities (3)	Provinci al Capitals etc. (33)	Prefectu re-level cities (152)	County- level cities (264)	Average of 662 Cities	Municip alities (4)	Provinci al Capitals etc. (32)	Prefectu re-level cities (229)	County- level cities (397)
Housing Condition	Average Floor Space (sq meters per person)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (23.43)	74.5 △	88.0 △	96.2 △	103.4 *
	Percentage of Self-built houses	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (60.7%)	24.6 △△△	37.7	78.7 △	118.0 *
	Percentage of Rented Houses/apartments	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (11.0%)	418.2 ****	254.5 **	127.3 *	63.6 △
	Percentage of Family Household without Kitchen	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (13.8%)	142.9 *	102.6 *	96.5	101.4 *
	Percentage of Family Household without Tap Water	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (42.7%)	19.1	27.6 △△	77.4 △	119.7 *
	Percentage of Family Household without Bath Facilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (68.2%)	68.4 △	73.8 △	92.0 △	107.1 *
	Percentage of Family Household without Lavatory	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (28.6%)	116.6 *	73.2 △	94.0 △	105.4 *
Note: All nu	imbers are relative to the avera	age of all the	cities, which	lis set to 10	$0. \triangle$ indicat	es that the v	alue is lowe	r than the all	-city average	e at the same	Census

year. * indicates that the value is higher than the all-city average at the same Census year.

GUO CHEN

			1	066			2	000	
Category	Indicator	Average of 452 Cities	East Coast (116)	Middle (245)	West (91)	Average of 662 Cities	East Coast (199)	Middle (342)	West (121)
Education Attainment	Percentage of Illiterate (including Semi-illiterate Population in 1990)	100 (16.6%)	108.3 *	89.3 △	118.2 *	100 (7.50%)	102.7 *	88.0	130 *
	Average Years at School	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (8.05)	98.1 △	102.6 *	96.0 △
	Gender Difference in Education (Years)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (0.96)	96.9 △	113.5 *	67.7
Employment Status	Percentage of Employed Population	100 (78.1%)	98.6 △	102.1 *	96.1 △	100 (69.6%)	102.9 *	97.0	103.7 *
	Percentage of Non- working Population	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (30.4%)	93.2 △	116.7 *	91.6 △
	Percentage of Non- working Population without Working Ability	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (3.68%)	111.2 *	9.6e △	82.8
	Percentage of Non- working Population who have lost jobs and are looking for jobs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (1.74%)	89.1	115.2 *	75.1 △

Table 6: Comparison of basic social economic indicators for cities in 3 geographic regions, 1990 and 2000

GUO CHEN

Table 6: continu	ied								
			1	066			2(000	
Category	Indicator	Average of 452 Cities	East Coast (116)	Middle (245)	West (91)	Average of 452 Cities	East Coast (116)	Middle (245)	West (91)
Industry and Occupation	Percentage of Employed Population in 2 nd Industry	100 (29.2%)	104.0 *	103.2 *	86.3 △	100 (23.0%)	135.0 *	88.7 △	74.4 △
	Percentage of Occupation in Farming, Commerce, Service personnel, Production and Transportation etc.	100 (83.8%)	102.8 *	98.4	100.7 *	100 (85.2%)	101.6 *	98.9 △	100.3 *
	Percentage of Occupation in manufacturing, construction, transport, etc.	100 (27.7%)	110.6 *	100.4 *	85.4	100 (21.7%)	131.8 *	90.0	76.0 △
	Percentage of Occupation in Commerce and Service Sectors	100 (9.7%)	102.3 *	103.7 *	87.2 △	100 (13.1%)	105.8 *	99.2 △	92.9 △
Rural-Urban Migration	Percentage of In-migrants from other counties or cities	100 (7.1%)	97.8 △	97.1 △	110.5 *	100 (8.1%)	137.8 *	75.4 △	107.5 *
	Percentage of In-migrants from rural townships	100 (4.3%)	98.9 △	95.8 △	112.8 *	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Category IndicatorIndicatorAverage of 452East CoastMiddle (345)West (91) of 452Average (110)East (110)Mousting (110)Housing ConditionAverage (sq meters per person)N/AN/AN/A100117.29Housing Condition(sq meters per person)(23.43) $*$ \angle Percentage of Self-built housesN/AN/AN/AN/A100110.79Percentage of Self-built housesN/AN/AN/AN/A10089.19Percentage of Self-built housesN/AN/AN/AN/A10089.19Percentage of Family Houses/apartmentsN/AN/AN/A10089.39Percentage of Family Household without WaterN/AN/AN/AN/A10089.91Percentage of Family WaterN/AN/AN/AN/A10089.911Percentage of Family WaterN/AN/AN/AN/A10076.111Percentage of Family WaterN/AN/AN/AN/A10076.111Percentage of Family WaterN/AN/AN/AN/A10076.111Percentage of Family WaterN/AN/AN/AN/A10076.111Percentage of Family Household withoutN/AN/AN/AN/A76.	Table 6: Contin	ued			1990			2	000	
Housing ConditionAverage Floor SpaceN/AN/AN/A100117.29Condition(sq meters per person)(sq meters per person)(23.43) $*$ \angle Percentage of Self-builtN/AN/AN/A100110.79Percentage of Self-builtN/AN/AN/A100110.79Percentage of RentedN/AN/AN/A10089.19Percentage of RamilyN/AN/AN/A10089.19Houses/apartmentsN/AN/AN/A10088.39Percentage of FamilyN/AN/AN/A10088.39Household withoutPercentage of FamilyN/AN/AN/A10089.91Household withoutPercentage of FamilyN/AN/AN/A10089.91Household withoutN/AN/AN/AN/A10076.11Household withoutPercentage of FamilyN/AN/A10076.11Household withoutPercentage of FamilyN/AN/AN/A10076.11Household withoutParcentage of FamilyN/AN/AN/A10076.11Household withoutParcentage of FamilyN/AN/AN/A10076.11Household withoutParcentage of FamilyN/AN/AN/A100104.39Household withoutParcentage of Family </th <th>Category</th> <th>Indicator</th> <th>Average of 452 Cities</th> <th>East Coast (116)</th> <th>Middle (245)</th> <th>West (91)</th> <th>Average of 452 Cities</th> <th>East Coast (116)</th> <th>Middle (245)</th> <th>West (91)</th>	Category	Indicator	Average of 452 Cities	East Coast (116)	Middle (245)	West (91)	Average of 452 Cities	East Coast (116)	Middle (245)	West (91)
Percentage of Self-builtN/AN/AN/A100110.79housesPercentage of RentedN/AN/AN/A10089.19Percentage of RamityN/AN/AN/A10089.19Houses/apartments (11.0%) Δ Δ Δ Δ Percentage of FamilyN/AN/AN/A10088.39Household without N/A N/AN/A10088.39Household without Tap N/A N/AN/A10089.91Household without Tap N/A N/AN/A10076.11Household without Bath N/A N/AN/A10076.11Household without Bath N/A N/AN/A10076.11Household without Bath N/A N/AN/A10076.11Household without N/A N/AN/A10076.11Household without N/A N/AN/A10076.11Household without N/A N/AN/A10076.11Household without N/A N/AN/AN/A100104.39Household without N/A N/AN/AN/A100104.39Household without N/A N/AN/AN/A100104.39Household without N/A N/AN/AN/A100104.39<	Housing Condition	Average Floor Space (sq meters per person)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (23.43)	117.2 *	91.9	94.8 △
Percentage of RentedN/AN/AN/A10089.19Houses/apartments(11.0%) \bigtriangleup (11.0%) \bigtriangleup \bigtriangleup \bigtriangleup \bigtriangleup \bigtriangleup Percentage of FamilyN/AN/AN/A10088.39Household withoutN/AN/AN/A10088.39Percentage of FamilyN/AN/AN/A10089.91Percentage of FamilyN/AN/AN/A10089.91Water(42.7%)(42.7%) \bigtriangleup ***Percentage of FamilyN/AN/AN/A10076.11Household without BathN/AN/AN/A10076.11Percentage of FamilyN/AN/AN/A100104.39Percentage of FamilyN/AN/AN/A100104.39Household withoutN/AN/AN/AN/A100104.39Household withoutN/AN/AN/AN/A100104.39Household withoutN/AN/AN/AN/A100104.39Household withoutN/AN/AN/AN/A100104.39Household withoutN/AN/AN/AN/A100104.39Household withoutN/AN/AN/AN/A100104.39Household withoutN/AN/AN/AN/A100104.3<		Percentage of Self-built houses	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (60.7%)	110.7 *	96.6 △	92.0 △
Percentage of Family N/A N/A N/A 100 88.3 9 Household without Kitchen (13.8%) Δ Δ Δ Percentage of Family N/A N/A N/A 100 89.9 1 Household without Tap N/A N/A N/A 100 89.9 1 Household without Tap N/A N/A N/A 100 89.9 1 Percentage of Family N/A N/A N/A 100 76.1 1 Percentage of Family N/A N/A N/A 100 76.1 1 Household without Bath Facilities (68.2%) Δ * * * Percentage of Family N/A N/A N/A 100 104.3 9 Household without N/A N/A N/A N/A 100 104.3 9 Household without N/A N/A N/A N/A 100 104.3 9		Percentage of Rented Houses/apartments	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (11.0%)	89.1 △	96.6 △	127.6 *
Percentage of Family Household without Tap WaterN/AN/AN/A10089.91Household without Tap Water (42.7%) \bigtriangleup \ast (42.7%) \bigtriangleup \ast Percentage of Family Household without Bath FacilitiesN/AN/AN/A10076.11Percentage of Family Household withoutN/AN/AN/A10076.11Percentage of Family Household withoutN/AN/AN/A100104.39		Percentage of Family Household without Kitchen	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (13.8%)	88.3	7.79 △	125.6 *
Percentage of Family N/A N/A N/A 100 76.1 1 Household without Bath Facilities (68.2%) \land * Percentage of Family N/A N/A 100 76.1 1 Pacilities (68.2%) \land * * Percentage of Family N/A N/A 100 104.3 9 Household without (28.6%) * * * *		Percentage of Family Household without Tap Water	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (42.7%)	89.9	102.6 *	109.3 *
Percentage of Family N/A N/A N/A 100 104.3 9 Household without (28.6%) * /		Percentage of Family Household without Bath Facilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (68.2%)	76.1 △	110.3	110.3 *
Lavatory		Percentage of Family Household without Lavatory	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100 (28.6%)	104.3 *	99.5 △	94.5 △

snsu age 5 Note: All numbers are relative to the average of all the cities, which is set to $100. \triangle$ indic year. * indicates that the value is higher than the all-city average at the same Census year.

GUO CHEN

Sources	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Ahmad & Wang (1991) 50 % of mean incomes % of households % of population				1.96	1.35	1.75	2.02	9.02 11.92	5.60	6.71 7.92	7.77 9.12											
 1.5 / 3 aujusted for full lation % of households % of population V200 advised for inflation 				11.2	8.9	8.1	4.7	9.87 13.03	5.42	5.30 6.24	7.29 8.57											
% of population				3.05	1.91	1.66	1.50	7.89 10.43	4.33	3.52 4.17	5.84 6.86											
World Bank (1992) % of population % of households				1.9 1.5	0.9 0.6	0.6 0.5	0.3 0.2	$0.4 \\ 0.2$	$0.2 \\ 0.1$	0.2 0.2	0.2 0.2	0.30. 2	0.40. 3									
Khan (1996) Extreme Poverty: % of population				20.08				12.70				7.42	7.39	4.73			5.90					
Ren & Chen (1996) % of population														5.8	4.5	5.1	5.7	4.4				
Khan & Riskin (2001) Broad Poverty Deep Poverty Extreme Poverty											6.7 2.2 1.1							8.0 4.1 2.7				
Chen & Wang (2001) \$ 0.75 per day \$ 1.00 per day \$ 1.50 per day													$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 1.0\\ 8.6\end{array}$		0 0.8 3.9	0.3 0.7 4.2	0.3 0.9 4.6	0.3 0.6 3.0	0.2 0.5 2.6	0.2 0.5 2.7	0.0 1.0 3.4	0.2 0.5 2.2
Fang et al (2002) \$ 1.00 per day \$ 1.50 per day Official poverty line World Bank															2.09 13.74 2.48 0.83		2.73 13.18 2.90 0.86	1.65 10.27 1.68 0.61	1.69 8.41 1.76 0.46	2.00 9.21 2.44 0.53	2.06 8.86 2.13 0.98	
Hussain (2003) Income p/h Expenditure p/h																					4.73 11.87	

Appendix 1: List of Estimates on Urban Poverty in China, 1978-99

GUO CHEN

Category	Variables f	from the Census
	1990 Population Census	2000 Population Census
Education Attainment	 Illiterate or semi-illiterate Population / Total Population age 15+ 	 The Percentage of Illiterate Population for age 15 and over (%) Average Years at School Gender Difference in Education:
		Average Years at School for Male less those for female
Employment Status	2. Total Employed Population / Total Population age 15+	4. Total Employed Population / Total Population age 15 +
		5. Total Non-working Population /Total Population age 15 +
		6. Total Non-working Population without working ability /Total Population age 15+
		7. Total Non-working Population who have lost their jobs and are looking for jobs /Total Population age 15+
		8. Percentage of Population Employed in 2 nd Industry
Industry and Occupation	3. Total Employed Population in 2 nd Industry /Total Employed Population	9. Percentage of Employed Population in 2 nd Industry
	4. Total Employees in commercial and service sectors, workers in agric., forestry, animal husb., fisheries, and workers in manufacturing, construction, transport, etc. /Total Employed Population	 10. Total Employed Population of Commerce, Service Trade Personnel, Farming, Forestry, Husbandry, Fishing and Water Conservancy Industry, and Production and Transportation /Total Employed Population 11. Employed Population in Commerce, Service Trade December (Total)
	5. Total Employees in Commercial and Service Sectors /Total	Employed Population
	Employees 6. Total Workers in Manufacturing, Construction, Transportation etc. /Total Employees	12. Employed Population in Production and Transportation /Total Employed Population
Rural-Urban Migration	7. Immigrants from urban and rural townships since 1985	13. Moving-in population from other counties/cities
	8. Immigrants from rural townships	

Appendix 2: Variables from the 1990 and 2000 Census for Comparison

	since 1985	
Housing Condition	N/A	14. Average Floor Space per person
		15. Total Self-built Houses/ Total Houses
		16. Total Rented Houses or Apartments /Total Houses
		17. Total Family Households with no kitchen /Total Family Households
		18. Total Family Households with no tap water /Total Family Households
		19. Total Family Households with no bath facilities /Total Family Households
		20. Total Family Households with no lavatory /Total Family Households

References:

- Ahmad, E. and W. Yan (1991). "Inequality and poverty in China: institutional change and public policy, 1978 to 1988." <u>World Bank Economic Review</u> **5**(2): 231-257.
- Bian, Y., J. R. Logan, et al. (1997). "Work units and the commodification of housing: observations on the transition to a market economy with Chinese characteristics." Social Science in China 18(4): 28-35.
- Bramall, C. (2001). "The quality of China's household income surveys." <u>China</u> <u>Quarterly(167)</u>: 689-705.
- Chan, K. W. (1996). "Post-Mao China: A Two-class urban society in the making." <u>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</u> **20**(1): 134-150.
- Chen, S. H. and Y. Wang (April 30-May 4, 2001). <u>China's growth and poverty reduction:</u> <u>recent trends between 1990 and 1999</u>. a WBI-PIDS Seminar on "Strengthening Poverty Data Collection and Analysis", Manila, Philippines.
- China Labour Bulletin (2002). News Review: Unemployment and Urban Poverty Cause Concerns at NPC. **2002**.
- Fan, P. (1996). "China's urban low income group-a sociological investigation on urban poor employees." <u>Chinese Social Science</u>(4): 64-77.
- Fang, C., X. B. Zhang, et al. (2002). "Emergence of urban poverty and inequality in China: evidence from household survey." <u>China Economic Review</u> 13(4): 430-443.
- French, R. A. and F. Hamilton (1979). Is there a socialist city? <u>The Socialist City: Spatial</u> <u>Structure and Urban Policy</u>. F. Hamilton. New York, John Wiley and Sons: 1-21.
- Gaubatz, P. R. (1995). Urban transformation in post-Mao China: impacts of the reform era on China's urban form. <u>Urban spaces in contemporary China</u>. E. J. Perry. Cambridge; New York; Melbourne, Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Cambridge University Press: 28-60.
- Gibson, J., J. Huang, et al. (2001). Improving estimates of Inequality and Poverty from Urban China's Household Income and Expenditure Survey, ARE Working Paper No. 01-018. Davis, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, UCD.
- Gilbert, A. and J. Gugler (1992). <u>Cities, poverty and development : urbanization in the</u> <u>Third World</u>. Oxford;New York, Oxford University Press.
- Gilbert, A. G. and P. M. Ward (1982). "Residential movement among the poor: the constraints on housing choice in Latin American cities." <u>Transactions, Institute of British Geographers</u> **7**(2): 129-149.
- Goldstein, S. and A. Goldstein (1991). Permanent and Temporary Migration Differentials in China. Honolulu, Papers of the East-West Population Institute, East-West Center.
- Gu, C. and C. Kesteloot (2002). Beijing's Socio-Spatial Structure in Transition. <u>Studies in Segregation and Desegregation</u>. W. Ostendorf. Hampshire, England and Burlington, U.S.A., Ashgate: 285-311.
- Gu, C. and H. Liu (2002). Social Polarization and Segregation in Beijing. <u>The New</u> <u>Chinese City: globalization and market reform</u>. J. R. Logan. Oxford; Massachusetts, Blackwell: 198-211.

- Guan, X. P. (1995). "Poverty and Antipoverty Programs in Rural China since the Mid-1980s." <u>Social Policy & Administration</u> **29**(3): 204-227.
- Gustafsson, B. and S. Li (1998). "The structure of Chinese poverty, 1988." <u>Developing</u> <u>Economies</u> **36**(4): 387-+.
- Gustafsson, B. and W. Zhong (2000). "How and why has poverty in China changed? A study based on microdata for 1988 and 1995." <u>China Quarterly</u>(164): 983-1006.
- Hu, X. and D. H. Kaplan (2001). "The Emergence of Affluence in Beijing: Residential Social Stratification in China's Capital City." <u>Urban Geography</u> **22**(1): 54-77.
- Hussain, A. (2003). Urban Poverty in China: Measurement, Patterns and Policies. Geneva, International Labour Office.
- Jie, F. and W. Taubmann (2002). Migrant Enclaves in Large Chinese Cities. <u>The New</u> <u>Chinese City: globalization and market reform</u>. J. R. Logan. Oxford; Massachusetts, Blackwell: 183-197.
- Khan, A. R. (1996). The Impact of Recent Macroeconomic and Sectoral Changes on the Poor and Women in China. New Delhi, International Labour Organization, South Asia Multidisciplinary Advisory Team (ILO/SAAT).
- Khan, A. R. and C. Riskin (1998). "Income and inequality in China: composition, distribution and growth of household income, 1988 to 1995." <u>China</u> <u>Quarterly</u>(154): 221-253.
- Khan, A. R. and C. Riskin (2001). <u>Inequality and poverty in China in the age of</u> <u>globalization</u>. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Leung, J. C. B. and H. S. W. Wong (1999). "The emergence of a community-based social assistance programme in Urban China." <u>Social Policy and Administration</u> **33**(1): 39-54.
- Li, Q. (2000). Shehui Fenceng Yu Pinfu Chabie, Lujiang Publication.
- Meng, X. (2001). "The informal sector and rural-urban migration A Chinese case study." <u>Asian Economic Journal</u> **15**(1): 71-89.
- Ministry of Civil Affairs (2002). <u>Report on Chinese Social Welfare and Social Progress</u>, <u>2002</u>. Beijing, Social Sciences Documentation Publishing House.
- Nee, V. (1989). "A Theory of Market Transition from Redistribution to Markets in State Socialism." <u>American Sociological Review</u> **54**(5): 663-681.
- Nolan, P. and G. White (1984). Urban Bias, Rural Bias or State Bias? Urban-Rural Relations in Post-Revolutionary China. <u>Development and the Rural-Urban Divide</u>. M. Moore. London; Totowa, N.J., Frank Cass: 52-81.
- Parish, W. L., Jr. (1984). Destratification in China. <u>Class and Social Stratification in Post-</u> <u>Revolution China</u>. J. Watson. New York, Cambridge University Press: 84-120.
- Park, A. and S. G. Wang (2001). "China's poverty statistics." <u>China Economic Review</u> **12**(4): 384-398.
- Qian, Z. and T. C. Wong (2000). "The rising urban poverty: A dilemma of market reforms in China." Journal of Contemporary China **9**(23): 113-125.
- Roberts, K. (2002). "Female labor migrants to Shanghai: Temporary "floaters" or potential settlers?" International Migration Review **36**(2): 492-519.
- Satterthwaite, D. and C. Tacoli (2002). Seeking an understanding of poverty that recognizes rural-urban differences and rural-urban linkages. <u>Urban livelihoods: a people-centred approach to reducing poverty</u>. T. Lloyd-Jones. London & Sterling, VA, Earthscan: 52-70.

- Shaw, A. (2003). "Planning and Local Economies in Navi Mumbai: Processes of Growth and Governance." <u>Urban Geography</u> **24**(1): 2-15.
- Sit, V. F. S. (2000). "A window on Beijing The social geography of urban housing in a period of transition, 1985-1990." <u>Third World Planning Review</u> **22**(3): 237-259.
- Smart, A. and J. Smart (2001). "Local citizenship: welfare reform urban/rural status, and exclusion in China." Environment and Planning A **33**: 1853-1869.
- Solinger, D. J. (1995). The floating population in the cities: chances for assimilation?
 <u>Urban spaces in contemporary China</u>. E. J. Perry. Cambridge; New York;
 Melbourne, Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Cambridge University Press: 113-139.
- Solinger, D. J. (1999). <u>Contesting Citizenship in Urban China: peasant migrants, the state,</u> <u>and the logic of the market</u>. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London, University of California Press.
- Solinger, D. J. (2001). "Why we cannot count the "unemployed"." <u>China Quarterly</u>(167): 671-688.
- Sun, C. (03/10/2002). Zhongguo Chengshi Pinkun Renkou Jieyu Liangqian Zhi SanqianWan. <u>Lian He Zao Bao</u>. Singapore.
- Szelenyi, I. and E. Kostello (1996). "The market transition debate: Toward a synthesis." <u>American Journal of Sociology</u> **101**(4): 1082-1096.
- Taubmann, W. (2002). Urban Administration, Urban Development and Migrant Enclaves: The Case of Guangzhou. <u>Resource Management, Urbanization and Governance in</u> <u>Hong Kong and the Zhujiang Delta</u>. J. Shen. Hong Kong, The Chinese University Press: 79-96.
- Turner, J. F. C. (1968). "Housing patterns, settlement patterns, and urban development in modernizing countries." Journal of the American Planning Association 34(6): 354-63.
- Vermeer, E. B. (1979). "Social Welfare Provisions and the Limits of Inequality in Contemporary China." <u>Asian Survey</u> **19**(9): 856-880.
- Walder, A. G. (1989). "Social Change in Post-Revolution China." <u>Annual Review of</u> <u>Sociology</u> **15**: 405-424.
- Wang, H. (1999). "Urban poverty alleviation and development: The chinese experience." <u>Regional Development Dialogue</u> **20**(1): 100-119.
- Wang, Y. (2002). Dui Muqian Woguo Chengshi Pinkun Zhuangkuang De Panduan Fenxi, Zhongguo Tongji Wang. **2002**.
- Whyte, M. K., E. F. Vogel, et al. (1977). "Social Structure of World Regions: Mainland China." <u>Annual Review of Sociology</u> **3**: 179-207.
- Wong, C. K. (1995). "Measuring 3rd-World Poverty by the International Poverty Line the Case of Reform China." <u>Social Policy & Administration</u> **29**(3): 189-203.
- Wong, C. K. (1997). "How many poor people in Shanghai today? The question of poverty and poverty measure." <u>Issues & Studies</u> **33**(12): 32-49.
- Wong, L. (1998). <u>Marginalization and social welfare in China</u>. London and New York, Routledge.
- World Bank (1992). <u>China: strategies for reducing poverty in the 1990s</u>. Washington, D. C., World Bank.
- World Bank (1997). Sharing rising incomes: disparities in China, World Bank.

- World Bank (2001). <u>China: Overcoming Rural Poverty</u>. Washington, D. C., The World Bank.
- Wortzel, L. M. (1987). <u>Class in China: Stratification in a classless society</u>. New York, Wesport, Connecticut, and London, Greenwood press.
- Wu, W. (2002). "Migrant Housing in Urban China: choices and constraints." <u>Urban</u> <u>Affairs Review</u> **38**(1): 90-119.
- Wu, W. (2002). Temporary Migrants in Shanghai: Housing and Settlement Patterns. <u>The New Chinese City: globalization and market reform</u>. J. R. Logan. Oxford; Massachusetts, Blackwell: 212-226.
- Yao, S. J. (1999). "Economic growth, income inequality and poverty in China under economic reforms." Journal of Development Studies **35**(6): 104-130.
- Yeh, A. G. O. and F. Wu (1995). "Internal Structure of Chinese Cities In The Midst of Economic Reform." <u>Urban Geography</u> **16**(6): 521-554.
- Yeh, A. G. O., X. Q. Xu, et al. (1995). "The social space of Guangzhou city, China." <u>Urban Geography</u> **16**: 595-621.
- Zhang, K. (1998). Some Findings from the 1993 Survey of Shanghai's Floating Population. <u>Migration in China</u>. B. Bakken. Copenhagen, NIAS Publishing: 67-106.
- Zhou, M. and J. R. Logan (1996). "Market transition and the commodification of housing in urban China." <u>International Journal of Urban and Regional Research</u> **20**(3): 400-421.
- Zhou, X. G., N. B. Tuma, et al. (1996). "Stratification dynamics under state socialism: The case of urban China, 1949-1993." <u>Social Forces</u> **74**(3): 759-796.
- Zhu, J. F. (1997). "Re-employment and urban poverty relief." <u>Economics Dynamics</u> (Jingji Dongtai Xue)(1): 25-8.