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Chinese social housing governance: the secret of multi-level government and the voiceless community
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As one of the most cited works in social housing governance field drawing upon ‘actors’, Pestoff’s (1992) welfare mix has omitted the precise hybridity zones of state, market and community, on the one hand, and the interaction among actors involved in the governance, on the other. By linking to another prominent work, Billis’ (2010) organizational hybridity, and adding the dimension ‘interrelationships’, we develop a conceptual framework of social housing governance allowing to take into account the Chinese zones of hybridity. Empirical data collected in two Chinese cities, Chongqing and Fuzhou, help to verify the applicability of the framework.

This study argues that although multi-actor governance based on western theories, and the intent to include the ‘market’ and ‘civil society’ in the provision of social housing has been discussed vividly, the current Chinese social housing governance still shows the dominant government as before, but in a different way. Within this way, many conflicts and interests exist at different layers of government in China. More specifically, the central government has tried to promote inclusiveness of the private sector and civil society in the governance, while the municipal-level government has regulated the market sector tightly, and the street-level government has restrained the community from active participation.