

Gatehouse, Capital, and Countryside: The Triple Logic of Cultural Heritage Transformation under Culture-Tourism Integration

Yizhen He, Meifang Hu*

School of Fine Arts and Design, Xiangnan University, Chenzhou, Hunan, China

**Corresponding Author*

Abstract: This paper examines how the ancient gatehouse (menlou), a familiar yet symbolically dense element of Chinese vernacular architecture, is converted from material remains into cultural capital and, in turn, into a driver of rural revitalization under culture-tourism integration. Much of the heritage literature is divided into two general discussions (one about conservation technique, one about tourism strategy), neither explains in terms of capital transformation how vernacular architecture gains value. To address this problem, Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital, heritage activation theory and rural space production theory are combined and they construct three parts of symbolic capitalization, spatial scenarization, and value sharing. This framework traces a ladder of transformations (material entity, cultural symbol, spatial scene, public value) and moves the debate beyond protection-versus-use binary towards transformation-and-symbiosis. Based on four gatehouse traditions (Huizhou, Shanxi courtyard, Minnan red-brick, Suzhou garden), the transformation is never a linear process of resource development, but rather three stages of symbolic extraction, scene reconstruction, value redistribution, each driven by its own actor networks and institutional conditions. The contribution is twofold: filling the gap in how vernacular architecture's capital transformation is theorized, and providing useful analytical tools and practical pathways for rural cultural tourism planning, community building, and heritage management.

Keywords: Gatehouse; Cultural Capital; Heritage Transformation; Culture-Tourism Integration; Rural Revitalization

1. Introduction

1.1 Research Background

Ancient gatehouses are the most symbolic building blocks of traditional Chinese vernacular architecture. They are both spaces of family status and materials of ritual order, craftsmanship and regional style. From the brick-carving gatehouses of Huizhou's "four waters returning to the hall" dwellings (sishui guitang), to the draped-flower gatehouses of Shanxi merchant courtyards, swallowtail-ridge facades of Minnan red-brick houses (Suzhou gardens), moon gates leading to "a world apart" (Suzhou gardens). Gatehouses are the most ceremonial passage between "inside" and "outside" in traditional Chinese dwellings, concrete architectural expression of what Fei Xiaotong called the "differential mode of association" (chaxu geju).

However, in the contemporary context of rapid urbanization, the numerous ancient gatehouses scattered throughout the countryside face a dual predicament. On the one hand, it is material: natural weathering, artificial demolition, and "constructive destruction" have sharply reduced their stock. On the other hand, it is symbolic: even where preserved, they tend to be reduced to "de-functionalized" static landscapes, disembedded from the social life-world in which they are rooted. How to make these silent bricks and stones "speak" again—that is, to realize the effective transformation from material remains into cultural capital, and thereby to play a structural role in the rural revitalization strategy—has become a theoretical proposition urgently awaiting a response in cultural heritage research.

At the policy level, since the establishment of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism in 2018, "culture-tourism integration" has risen from an industrial strategy to a national strategy. The "14th Five-Year Plan for Cultural and Tourism Development" (2021) explicitly proposed

"shaping tourism with culture and highlighting culture through tourism," and the "Opinions on Promoting the Culture Industry to Empower Rural Revitalization" (2022) further incorporated the activation of cultural heritage into the institutional framework of rural revitalization. However, gatehouses are no longer just objects of architectural history or folklore, but have been redeemed with the expectation of "cultural resource—cultural capital—development momentum." However, scholars have not yet a systematic theoretical account of internal mechanism, stage characteristics, constraints and conditions of transformation. At the end of the decade, heritage research has moved from static object-centered conservation towards people-centered activation and use [1]. Most literature on "activation" is focused on policy advocacy and case description. Few studies ask, from a capital-transformation perspective, exactly how the cultural value of a particular building type is identified, extracted, encoded and redistributed; whether gatehouses in different regions follow the same route or differ; and whether the gains of transformation can go beyond tourism revenues to settle in village social fabric and collective memory. These are the questions we discuss here.

1.2 Literature Review

The domestic research on ancient gatehouses is focused on architecture and folklore. Zhang [2] studied the causes and distribution of gatehouses in traditional houses of Guanzhong region. Natural conditions, patriarchal ritual order and sociopolitical factors affected construction methods and image of gatehouses. Xu [3], taking Nantong gatehouses as example, showed how gatehouses evolved from traditional architecture through a Sino-Western hybrid style to fully Western form. Yin et al. [4], studied the morphological gene map of traditional settlement landscapes in Xiangjiang river Basin, named gatehouses as one of the important markers of settlement landscape. These studies gave good foundation for the ontological understanding of ancient gatehouses, but overall, they emphasis architectural form and history but do not situate gatehouses in cultural capital transformation and rural revitalization.

Research on heritage activation and use has expanded quickly in recent years. Xu et al. [5] reviewed the literature on integrating China's cultural and tourism industries and singled out

"the capitalization of cultural resources" as a frontier issue. Zhang [6] put forward a "theory of cultural empowerment," arguing that heritage can empower both the cultural-tourism industry and the building of the modern civilization of the Chinese nation. Du [7] traced how heritage resources help construct tourism space under culture-tourism integration. Writing from humanistic economics, Qie et al. [8] looked at agricultural heritage and stressed "the return of the human subject" as its value orientation. Cui and Zhang [9] borrowed neo-classical structural-functionalism to study how traditional costume heritage in old towns is transformed, proposing a framework of "ontic structure—external structure—autogenous structure." Ma and Ma [10] examined temple fairs for their cultural transformation and capital value in the context of rural revitalization. Useful as these works are, they mostly deal with intangible heritage or historic districts; how vernacular buildings in general—and the gatehouse as a specific type in particular—are turned into capital remains largely unexamined.

In the international academic community, the intersection of cultural heritage and tourism development has become a prominent field. Bhowmik [11] revealed the evolutionary trends and hot topics of heritage tourism research through bibliometric analysis. Uzun et al. [12] proposed the concept of "cultural capital as living heritage infrastructure," reexamining heritage tourism in secondary cities. Li et al. [13] explored the spatial impact of China's government-led tourism development model on the vernacular architecture of traditional villages. Martínez et al. [14] studied the relationship between vernacular architecture and cultural identity in shrinking rural settlements. Zong et al. [15] conducted a systematic literature review of the sustainable development of vernacular architecture. Liu et al. [16] analyzed the overseas commercialization of Shaolin culture within the framework of Bourdieu's cultural capital, revealing the mechanism by which cultural capital is transformed into social capital and further realizes capital upgrading and re-institutionalization—an analytical approach with direct implications for the present study.

A problem arises in the literature on the Vernacular architectural heritage: conservation approaches and intrinsic value are either ignored or the tourism development is discussed in a strategic fashion. Capital Transformation

analysis can link “material remains–cultural symbols–spatial scenes–public value”. This paper is devoted to filling this gap.

1.3 Research Methods

Methodologically, the paper works on two fronts: it builds the framework from documents, then tests it against a set of comparative cases.

For theory building, I reviewed Bourdieu's account of cultural capital and its uses in heritage research, and, adapting it to Chinese vernacular architecture, developed the "triple logic" framework. Searches in the China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI) and the Web of Science Core Collection—covering terms such as "ancient gatehouse," "cultural capital," "heritage activation," "culture-tourism integration," and "rural revitalization"—were used to map what has been done and to pin down the gap this paper addresses.

For the empirical side, I chose cases that vary by region and by stage of transformation: the gatehouse clusters of Xidi and Hongcun in Huizhou; those of the Qiao Family and Wang Family Grand Courtyards in Shanxi; the red-brick gatehouses of Quanzhou and Zhangzhou in southern Fujian; and the garden gatehouses of the Humble Administrator's Garden and the Lingering Garden in Suzhou. The reading of each case combines typological analysis of form, semiotic decoding of meaning, and field observation of context. The aim is less to catalogue examples than to test whether the triple-logic framework holds and to see how its three parts actually link together.

1.4 Research Significance

Theoretically, we take Bourdieu's cultural capital (usually applied to education or arts) and bring it to vernacular architecture, making symbolic capitalization, spatial scenarization and value sharing the three parts scheme (i.e., we can't ask what heritage is, we ask how heritage transforms, and rather than describe results we try to explain why it happens). On the practical side, we describe a repeatable procedure for studying capital transformation in three steps: archetypes and symbols extracted, scene building and designing experience, distribution and embedding value in the community and hope later studies on similar cases can reuse it. On the practical side, comparison gatehouse cases across regions lets us identify conditions which make transformation succeed and the reasons

that keep it back, and the results can be used for rural cultural tourism planning, conservation of traditional villages, community building and general for rural revitalization based on cultural self-awareness.

2. Theoretical Analysis: The Triple Logic of Heritage Transformation

2.1 Conceptual Framework and Core Definitions

Three concepts are separated from one another (e.g. material remains, cultural capital, spatial scene). They are not synonyms. They mark the movement from “thing” to “symbol” to “field.” Material remains are starting point and the carrier of the whole chain. I mean the gatehouse as a built object (brick, wood, stone), the bracket sets (dougong), sparrow braces (queti), and door studs (menzan), relief carvings, painted decorations and inscribed plaques, “objectivited cultural capital”: matter that is culturally worth but not yet capital in circulation.

Cultural capital is first leap. After Bourdieu, I use this term to describe what happens when historical information, ritual meaning, aesthetic principles, and regional identity found in material remains are symbolically extracted and institutionalized (say, listing a gatehouse as protected cultural relic or not as tangible heritage). The gatehouse becomes then a cultural symbol with value (similar to Bourdieu making institutionalized cultural capital). The material gate becomes something that can be named, narrated, displayed and traded.

Spatial scene is the second leap. Once a gatehouse enters culture-tourism circulation, it is nothing more than something to look at, but something to be inside and feel. Scene is a place whose aesthetic value and experiential value is created jointly by physical space, cultural activity, and the crowd that resides there. Place the gatehouse on its streets, courtyards and waterways, add intangible-heritage performances, folk events, or digital light-and-shadow effects and you turn from an object seen into the world experienced. This gives the paper its central logic. Symbolizing capitalization moves material remains into cultural symbols, extraction of meaning and recognition. Spatial scenarization moves cultural symbols into cultural-tourism scenes; it works on narrativization and experientialisation of space. Value sharing moves cultural-tourism scenes

into rural public value, returning economic benefit to the community and rebuilding collective memory. All three logic are not a straight relay. They are nested and feed back on one another: symbolization gives scenes depth, scenarization provides the economic momentum and sharing ensures that the gains are not siphoned off by outside capital, but flow back to village life.

2.2 Theoretical Foundations

The framework is the result of three theories: Bourdieu on cultural capital, heritage activation theory, and rural space production theory. Bourdieu [17] divided cultural capital into three forms (incorporated, objectivated and institutionalized) and showed that one can be transformed into another. Heritage scholars have already begun to borrow this machinery. Liu [16], in Shaolin culture's overseas commercialization, described how cultural capital is absorbed into local communities through performance, converted into social capital and then "upgraded" and re-institutionalized. Uzun [12] recast cultural capital as "living heritage infrastructure", pointing out how it mediates urban renewal and social cohesion. The question we add here is narrower: how does that architectural capital turn into social capital (community cohesion) and economic capital (tourism revenue) through institutionalization (relic designation) and incorporation (visitor experience, resident identification).

Heritage activation theory speaks to the discipline's own shift "from conservation to utilization." Zhang [1] argued that activating intangible heritage requires a holistic protection in which "the people, the objects, and the life" all remain visible. Zhang's [6] "theory of cultural empowerment" lays out a hierarchy: surface-level borrowing of forms, mid-level embedding in structure, and deep-level internalization of value. Qie et al. [8], from humanistic economics, attacked the "structural mismatch" that an efficiency-first, industrialized logic imposes on heritage sites, and called instead for activation centered on "the return of the human subject." Applied to gatehouses, these ideas suggest that activation is not just putting old material back to use. It means re-embedding the gatehouse in the life-world of the present through the three mechanisms of symbolization, scenarization, and sharing.

The theory of rural space production supplies the spatial angle—how the fruits of transformation flow back into the village. Lefebvre's [18] triad of spatial practice, representations of space, and representational space gives us the vocabulary. A gatehouse listed as a provincial protected unit is an act of representations of space, or institutional coding; its renovation into a village museum or tourist center is spatial practice, or material transformation; its reappearance as an anchor of collective memory in everyday use by villagers and visitors is representational space, or lived experience. Taken together, these three moments unfold the triple logic in spatial terms.

2.3 Case Analysis: The Empirical Unfolding of the Triple Logic

To verify the explanatory power of the above theoretical framework, this section uses four groups of cases to present the differentiated unfolding of the triple logic in different regional contexts.

2.3.1 Huizhou gatehouses: a model path of symbolic capitalization

The gatehouses of Huizhou ancient villages—represented by the gatehouse of the "Dafudi" (Residence of the Grand Master) in Xidi and that of the "Chengzhi Hall" in Hongcun—provide a classic case of symbolic capitalization. The symbolization of Huizhou gatehouses is concentrated at three levels. First, the intricate carving motifs on the brick-carving gate hoods (such as "fishing, woodcutting, farming, and studying," "the Eight Immortals crossing the sea," and "pine and crane prolonging life") constitute a complete system of Confucian ethical symbols, translating abstract patriarchal order and life ideals into visual narratives carved in stone and wood. Second, the "four waters returning to the hall" courtyard layout and the orientation of the gatehouse jointly encode the economic ethics of Huizhou merchants—"gathering wealth" and "not letting it flow out." Third, the inscription of Xidi and Hongcun on the World Cultural Heritage List in 2000 as "Ancient Villages in Southern Anhui" completed an institutional leap from local architecture to a global cultural symbol—this is precisely the generation of what Bourdieu called "institutionalized cultural capital."

It is worth noting that, prior to the World Heritage inscription, the symbolization of Huizhou gatehouses had long been completed within the local knowledge system—the naming

of the "eight scenic views" in genealogies, the moral admonitions in couplets, and the mnemonic formulas of geomancers all constituted a form of "local institutional certification." The World Heritage designation merely "translated" this local symbolic system into the globally circulating discourse of cultural heritage. This suggests that the key to symbolic capitalization lies not in the presence or absence of external certification, but in whether the gatehouse has already condensed the collective emotions and consensual meanings of a specific community. Without the latter "cultural substratum," external certification can only bestow the name of "symbol" upon an empty shell without enabling it truly to circulate.

2.3.2 Shanxi courtyard gatehouses: the complex tensions of spatial scenarization

If the Huizhou gatehouses exhibit the "ideal type" of symbolic capitalization, then the draped-flower gatehouses of the Qiao Family Grand Courtyard and the Wang Family Grand Courtyard in Shanxi reveal the complex tensions in the process of spatial scenarization.

The Qiao Family Grand Courtyard became a national cultural-tourism symbol after serving as a filming location for Zhang Yimou's 1990 film *Raise the Red Lantern*, its gatehouses transforming from "the entrance to Qiaojiabao" into a "visual totem of Shanxi merchant culture." In the subsequent cultural-tourism development, the Qiao Family gatehouses completed a scenarization transformation from single buildings to an "immersive scenic area"—the gatehouses were no longer merely "entrances" but were linked with passageways, spirit walls (zhaobi), the principal courtyard, and the side courtyards into a complete narrative space: tourists, passing through the gates, are guided to complete a spatiotemporal experience of "the rise—the zenith—the decline of the Shanxi merchant." However, the 2019 "delisting" incident, in which the Qiao Family Grand Courtyard was stripped of its 5A scenic-area status by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism for over-commercialization, precisely exposed the inherent risk of spatial scenarization: when scene construction serves entirely the "tourist gaze" while detaching from the life logic of the local community, the scene is alienated from a "carrier of culture" into a "backdrop for capital," and space production is reduced to symbolic consumption.

By contrast, the Wang Family Grand Courtyard,

whose gatehouse clusters are grander in spatial scale and architectural regulation, has—lacking the cinematic media endorsement of the Qiao Family Courtyard—relied more on the ontological presentation of "architectural artistic value" than on "narrative enchantment." This difference indicates that spatial scenarization cannot be accomplished by the quality of the architectural heritage alone; media narratives, institutional environments, and capital intervention jointly shape the direction and depth of scenarization.

2.3.3 Minnan red-brick gatehouses: community practice of value sharing

The red-brick house gatehouses of Quanzhou and Zhangzhou (Southern Fujian) represent a kind of "value sharing". Unlike clan gatehouses of Huizhou or merchant gatehouses of Shanxi, Minnan red-brick gatehouses are more for return of overseas Chinese for ancestor veneration and public life, since their "swallowtail ridge" and "cut-porcelain carving" decorations symbolize openness of maritime culture and memory of the Minnan people's "guofan" (emigration to Southeast Asia).

Cultural tourism integration of Wudianshi Traditional District of Quanzhou has developed a "community-embedded" model. Unlike the "scenic-area-ization" model where original residents are relocated wholesale and operations are uniformly outsourced, Wudianshi retains some of its original functions and renovated gatehouses continue to serve as entrances to ancestral halls, community activity centers and intangible cultural heritage transmission centers. The passage of tourists and daily use of residents share the same space, creating an ecology of "cohabitation" rather than displacement. The value-sharing model is that the distribution of benefits from cultural capital transformation is not restricted to dividends or employment, but rather allows the gatehouse again to become a source of collective memory and a medium of cultural transmission between generations. This is the value orientation of "the return of the human subject" promoted by Qie et al [8].

2.3.4 Suzhou garden gatehouses: an aesthetic paradigm from "facade" to "portal"

The gatehouses in Suzhou gardens—represented by the "Bieyou Dongtian" (A World Apart) moon gate of the Humble Administrator's Garden and the "Gumu Jiaoke" (Old Trees Entwined) gatehouse of the Lingering Garden—constitute a distinctive genealogy different from

the three types of vernacular gatehouses above. Suzhou garden gatehouses are essentially a "literati" paradigm of the gatehouse: their design concept is no longer the proclamation of patriarchal order or the display of wealth and status, but the spatial practice of the literati's aesthetic ideals—"a world within a pot" (huzhong tiandi), "the great revealed in the small" (yi xiao jian da), and "the mutual generation of the void and the solid" (xushi xiangsheng). The "roundness" of the moon gate and the "borrowing" of the framed view transform the "gate" from a physical barrier into a visual channel, achieving the aesthetic effect described in the Yuan Ye (The Craft of Gardens) as "delight upon entering the gate" (she men cheng qu).

In Suzhou garden gatehouses, they are "de-localized". They are everywhere: Chinese gardens, hotels, restaurants, cultural places at home and abroad. All these things have happened until the moon gate is a shorthand for Chinese style itself. It is a great news that the gatehouse is everywhere, but the question is, if the gatehouse is cut loose from its place, climate, materials, craft and can be reproduced indefinitely, does it still carry the "aura" of heritage? The question is what the heritage transforms in culture-tourism is: the larger a form travels, the less it means.

2.4 Summary: The Relational Structure of the Triple Logic

The relationships between these four groups of cases can be summarized as follows: First, symbolic capitalization is the condition of spatial scenarization, not its guarantee. It was through World Heritage certification that Huizhou gatehouses finished symbolization, and thus were able to attract global tourists, providing the audience base for scenarization; symbolization does not automatically generate scenarization; the latter requires narrative design, spatial planning and experiential operation; Second, spatial scenarization is condition of value sharing, not only its risk. Scenarization of Shanxi courtyards generated cultural tourism revenue making value sharing possible; but when over-scenarization transforms the gatehouse into a prop of capital, what is shared is only the surface of profit, not the depth of cultural meaning.

Third, the ideal relationship between these three logics is feedback rather than unidirectional.

Wudianshi in southern Fujian shows us that when the fruits of sharing (building community identity, healing collective memory) feed back into symbolic layer (gatehouse again becoming our gatehouse rather than a tourist attraction), a positive self-reinforcing cycle forms. This is precisely the main contribution of this framework in the direction of a linear "resource development" story.

3. Future Development Trends

3.1 Digital Transformation: From Physical Remains to Digital Twin

The rapid development of digital technology is reshaping the technological path of gatehouse heritage transformation. Three-dimensional laser scanning and oblique photogrammetry have already enabled high-precision digital recording of gatehouse architecture, and the integration of BIM (Building Information Modeling) and GIS (Geographic Information System) has provided the data foundation for the preventive conservation of gatehouses. Even more transformative are digital twin and virtual reality technologies: following the demonstration effect of "Digital Dunhuang" and "Digital Palace Museum," the digital twin of ancient gatehouses can not only provide a "digital backup" for irreversible physical weathering but also create experiential dimensions that physical space cannot accommodate—for example, through AR (augmented reality) technology, tourists can "see" the complete decoration of a damaged gatehouse in its heyday; through VR (virtual reality) immersive experiences, descendants of Minnan overseas Chinese far abroad can "return" to the gatehouse of their ancestral home to complete a virtual ancestor-worship ritual.

Digital transformation presents new theoretical problems. If a gatehouse can be replicated infinitely digitally, will its "locality"—its "inseparability" from a place, materials, craft traditions, community life—be diminished? Does digital replication prolong the heritage's life, or create what Baudrillard called a "simulacrum"—a hyperreality "more real" than the original, but without material foundation? These questions are still unanswered but are already frontier questions for the study of cultural capital transformation of ancient gatehouses.

3.2 Community Empowerment: From "Being

Represented" to "Autonomous Narration"

One common weakness of gatehouse transformations is that outside capital and local government decides what a gatehouse is worth, government decides what it is, enterprises run it for profit, and the people who live there are rarely heard. Song et al. [19] in art in rural revitalization identified six factors that matter: community participation, local knowledge, external support, institutional support, economic feasibility, cultural sensibilities. These six factors apply to gatehouse transformation. But not to bolt on a simple "participation" step. The point is to rearrange power relations so that the community becomes the subject who writes the story of villagers telling their own gatehouse story instead of reading a tour guide script, the villagers have a say whether gatehouse is a village museum or homestay, the villagers share both the money and dignity transformation brings.

3.3 The Ethics of Sustainability: From "Activation" to "Symbiosis"

Any account of gatehouse transformation has to answer, at some point, to a ethical question: what is it? If the answer is "tourism revenue", then an old gatehouse is little different than a fake antique in a theme park (and maybe even prettier and more convenient). What makes a real gatehouse irreplaceable is that it has irreproducible history, is rooted in a place that it cannot be moved from, and has feelings no substitute can replicate. Genuine sustainability, therefore, is not technical matter of "putting heritage to use", but ethical matter of keeping soul alive while using it. Ma and Ma [10] made a similar point about temple fairs: Cultural capital is not about how much revenue it produces, but whether it can continue carrying cultural meaning and social function today. For gatehouses, the real test for "activation" is not visitor counts or ticket sales. It is whether gatehouse re-enter everyday village life—old people gossiping in its shade, children playing underneath it, wedding and funeral processions passing through it. Only on those terms "gatehouse capital countryside" point to transformation and symbiosis rather than exploiting and exhaustion.

4. Conclusion and Research Prospects

Set against culture-tourism integration and rural revitalization, this paper has examined the

ancient gatehouse as a small but telling piece of vernacular heritage. Working from Bourdieu, heritage activation theory, and Lefebvre's triad, it has built a framework—symbolic capitalization, spatial scenarization, value sharing—that traces how vernacular architecture turns from material remains into rural public value. Four positive cases (Huizhou, Shanxi, Minnan, Suzhou) and three negative field samples (abandoned, over-commercialized, and pseudo-antique gatehouses) were compared, and the comparison bears out the logic by which the three parts support one another, feed back on one another, and hold one another's risks in check. Symbolic capitalization, resting on local cultural consensus and institutional certification, makes the value leap that activation requires. Spatial scenarization, through spatial narrative and multi-sensory experience, builds the consumption carrier and the economic base—while carrying the risk of capital alienation. Value sharing, through community empowerment and equitable distribution of benefit, rebuilds collective memory and underwrites long-term sustainability. The three enable and constrain each other, forming a closed loop.

The transition from bricks and stones to mobile culture capital is explained, the binary "protection—use" story is broken, the "transformation—symbiosis" approach is given, capital-transformation mechanism of micro vernacular structures is filled, gatehouse planning, community building and heritage governance tools can be used. The limitations of this study are qualitative reasoning and multi-case comparison without quantitative evidence or long-term panel data; cases focus on mature cultural-tourism regions of southeast and north China, with a small sample from central-west and ethnic-minority areas; quantitative mechanisms of interest games between multiple actors are not investigated; digital operation and community dividend schemes are still a framework level.

Future research may advance in five directions: introducing quantitative methods to build an evaluation index system of transformation effectiveness; expanding sample coverage and comparing regional differences; focusing on external constraints such as property-right institutions and grassroots governance; conducting long-term tracking of digital-twin operation, shareholding dividends, and micro-

renovation; and extending cross-cultural comparative studies. As a micro carrier of vernacular memory, the interaction among "gatehouse—capital—countryside" still offers broad research space.

Acknowledgments

This paper is a staged outcome of the College Students' Innovation and Entrepreneurship Training Program project "Digital Virtual Space Construction and Cultural Experience Design of Ancient Gatehouses in Southern Hunan" and the 2026 Xiangnan University College Students' Summer "Three Trips to the Countryside" social practice project "Ancient Gatehouse, New Podium: The Integration of Cultural Activation and Rural Education in Traditional Villages of Southern Hunan."

References

- [1] Zhang, M. (2021). Research on the activation of intangible cultural heritage: From the perspective of culture-tourism integration [in Chinese]. *Social Scientist*, (6), 15–20.
- [2] Zhang, L. (2015). An exploration of the causes and distribution of gatehouses in traditional dwellings of Guanzhong [in Chinese]. *Journal of Northwest A&F University (Social Sciences)*, (1), 146–149.
- [3] Xu, Y. (2008). The regional cultural characteristics of Nantong gatehouses [in Chinese]. *Journal of Nantong University (Social Sciences)*, (6), 111–115.
- [4] Yin, L., Liu, P., Li, B., Qi, J., Hu, Z., & Deng, Y. (2023). Research on the morphological gene map of traditional settlement landscapes: A case study of the Xiangjiang River Basin [in Chinese]. *Scientia Geographica Sinica*, (6), 1053–1065.
- [5] Xu, F., La, L., Yan, X., Han, L., He, Y., & Zhong, X. (2023). A review of research on the integration of China's cultural industry and tourism industry [in Chinese]. *Tourism Science*, (4), 1–18.
- [6] Zhang, J. (2024). The theory of cultural empowerment: Cultural heritage empowerment, cultural-tourism industry development, and the construction of the modern civilization of the Chinese nation [in Chinese]. *Thinking*, (4), 132–142.
- [7] Du, B. (2021). Reflections on cultural heritage resources promoting tourism space construction in the context of culture-tourism integration [in Chinese]. *Cultural Heritage*, (2), 32–41.
- [8] Qie, H., Chen, H., & Wang, Z. (2026). Activation, utilization, and value realization of agricultural cultural heritage from the perspective of humanistic economics [in Chinese]. *Journal of Jiangxi University of Finance and Economics*, (4), 45–56.
- [9] Cui, Y., & Zhang, J. (2024). The "costume change" in ancient towns and streets: An analysis from neo-classical structural-functionalism [in Chinese]. *Journal of Qinghai Minzu University (Social Sciences)*, (2), 68–74.
- [10] Ma, H., & Ma, W. (2022). The cultural transformation of temple fairs and their capital value from the perspective of rural revitalization: An analysis based on neo-classical "structure-function" theory [in Chinese]. *Journal of Hunan Agricultural University (Social Sciences)*, (5), 68–75.
- [11] Bhowmik, P. (2021). Heritage tourism: A bibliometric review. *Anatolia*, 32(3), 387–403.
- [12] Uzun, B., Zaman, M., Üçüncü, K., & Moufakkir, O. (2026). Cultural capital as living heritage infrastructure: Rethinking heritage tourism in secondary cities. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873x.2026.2694785>
- [13] Li, P., Sho, K., Chien, P. M., & Zhao, S. (2026). Exploring the spatial impact of China's government-led tourism development model on vernacular architecture in a traditional village. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 126, 104318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2026.104318>
- [14] Martínez, V. G., Ma, G., Pellegrini, P., & Costa, M. R. (2022). Vernacular architecture and cultural identity in shrinking rural settlements. *ACE Arquitectura Ciudad y Entorno*, 17(50). <https://doi.org/10.5821/ace.17.50.11389>
- [15] Zong, J., Mohamed, W. S. W., Ja'afar, M. F. Z., & Ujang, N. (2024). Sustainable development of vernacular architecture: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Asian Architecture and Building Engineering*, 24(5), 3558–3574. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13467581.2024.2399685>
- [16] Liu, L., Yang, J., Shi, Y., & Wang, G. (2022). How to commercialize Shaolin culture outside China: A discussion within the framework of Bourdieu's cultural capital.

- SAGE Open, 12(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221140845>
- [17]Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood Press.
- [18]Lefebvre, H. (1974). *La production de l'espace* [The production of space]. Éditions Anthropos.
- [19]Song, H., Chen, S., & Mustafa, M. (2026). Integrating art into rural revitalization: Six key factors. *Cultural Trends*, 1–25.