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1. Introduction

Prior to the reform it was impossible for foreigners to buy real estate in China. With the start of the housing reforms in 1979 and establishments of special economic zones in the early 80’s it became clear that the housing market would change dramatically over the upcoming years. The special economic zones made China much more accessible to people from other countries. The explosion of wealth, that brought with them, lead to a higher living standard which is directly linked to better housing. In 1979 it became finally much easier for ethnic Chinese (Hong Kong, Taiwan or overseas), to buy housing in China.

During the Third Full Meeting of the Central Committee of the Eleventh Term of the China communist Party in December 1978, four modernizations (agriculture, industry, defence and science & technology) where added to the rules of the party. To achieve these goals China had to engage in economical reforms and slowly started the introduction of an open market economy (Park, 1997, p. XIII). The economic reforms in the late 70’s and early 80’s led to a concept which is known as special economic zones (SEZ) as the Chinese call them. According to Park (1997, p. 13) the most important distinction is between ownership and the economic management system. The benefits for a manufacturing company are for example that they do not need to pay taxes until they make a profit. Even when they start making a profit the tax payments only slowly increase in the first few years. In 1980 the first four SEZ were opened; Shenzhen, Zhuhai, Xiamen and Shantou. These were deliberately located in these areas because it would be easier to attract foreign investment.

Shenzhen is in close proximity to Hong Kong, while Zhuhai borders the former Portuguese colony of Macau. Xiamen and Shantou are relatively close to Taiwan. Currently the number for SEZ are; five cities, one province, fourteen costal development areas (including Guangzhou), eleven border cities and six Yangtze river ports.

Figure 1: Special Economic Zones China
These Sez’s led eventually to the Pearl River Delta economic zone, which covers all the major cities of the Guangdong province. With these reforms foreign investment started to pour into the country thus people from all origins slowly found their way back into China. Inherently Hong Kongnese started to move to Guangzhou. Hong Kong has been a bastion of the west since as early as 1842 (treaty of Nanking) and thus bringing British colonial virtues and values into the Hong Kongnese society.

**Figure 2: Pearl River Delta**

Over the course of 155 years upon the handover in 1997 Hong Kong transformed from a city into one of the world most important cities. Since the 1980’s the Chinese government established a model for mainland China’s reunification with Hong Kong. The key element was ‘one country, two systems’. Hong Kong would become a special administrative zone. Deng Xiaoping sought to link reunification with modernization, thus making Hong Kong very important for China’s modernization (Bin & Tsungting, 1996, pp. 110-111). Deng Xiaopeng spoke of one country, China, with two discrete systems: one communist, for most of China, and one capitalist, for Hong Kong (Cohen & Zhao, 1997, p. 2). According to GaWC\(^1\), Hong Kong is an alpha+ city (GaWC, 2011), which indicates that it is classified in the second tier of cities. Only New York and London are a part of the first tier. GaWC classifies the cities by ‘describe the office networks of 175 advanced producer service firms across 525 cities worldwide (Derudder et al, 2010; Taylor et al 2011). The largest firms in the following sectors are included: the top 75 in financial services, and the top 25 each in accountancy, advertising, law and management consultancy. For each firm, its use of a city is coded from 0 (no presence) to 5 (for the city housing its headquarters) with scores of 1 through to 4 based upon size and functions of offices. The result is a ‘service values matrix’ that arrays 525 cities against 175 firms that defines the world city network (Taylor, 2001, 2004 and Taylor & Hoyler, 2010).

---

\(^1\) Globalisation and World cities research network
Guangzhou is a Beta- city and is categorized amongst cities such as Sofia, Karachi and Rio de Janeiro. There is a difference in international allure if both cities are compared. The British occupation of Hong Kong has made a huge impact on Hong Kongese and Chinese society. ‘Thus while the British considered Hong Kong as an important commercial outpost in the Far East, the colony was a symbol of Western imperial domination in Chinese eyes (Tang, 1994, p. 320). The Chinese government questioned whether London even had gained control over Hong Kong in a legal way. ‘The Beijing government has been consistent in rejecting the legality of the Sino-British treaties which led to the establishment of the colony of Hong Kong’ (Tang, 1994, p. 334). ‘Ardent British imperialists have always shared a conviction of the superiority of the English language and culture, and its potential to transform the cultures of its colonies’ (Boyle, 1997, p. 170). British and Western colonialism alike have always had the grand notion of ‘we have the best ideas about society’ and thus the colonies need to change and become as much alike as the motherland. In respect to economic, political, military, communicational, cultural and social aspects (Galtung, 1980). Those roughly 150 years of British occupation have changed the virtues of the Hong Kongese society to a Western way of thinking with still large chunks of ancient Chinese virtues remaining. In the mid nineties a women said:’ what should I write, British, British Hong Kong, Hong Kong or Chinese’, when asked about her nationality (Mathews, Kit-wai Ma, & Tai-Lok, 2008, p. 1). In similar ways several Hong Kongese citizens had during the years prior to the reunification with China questions in regards to which identity they had. London, was far way, while Beijing was communist China. While one must not forget that ‘In China, nationalism- and with it, national identity- came later’ (Watson, 1993, p. 81). Chinese nationalism first appeared in the late eighties and early nineties (Zhang, 1999). A focus group study in 2007 (Man Lau & Lam, 2007) for example describes how Hong Kongese identify themselves. It compared the situation prior to the reunification in 1996, with the situation 10 years later.
Table 1: Adolescents, born in Hong Kong social identification in 1996 and 2006 (Man Lau & Lam, 2007, p. 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kongnese</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kongnese,</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondarily Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese, secondarily</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kongnese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these 10 years, Hong Kong adolescents’ political and economic evaluation of China had become more positive, and their confidence in themselves and the future of Hong Kong had also improved. However, their views of Mainlanders remain quite negative (Man Lau & Lam, 2007, p. 4). Hong Kongnese are still quite negative towards mainlanders. On a 7-point scale (4 being neutral), the trust in Hong Kongnese was in 2006, 4.9, while the trust in a mainland Chinese was only 3.2. Referring to the question that Hong Kongnese are superior to mainlanders, the average in 2006 was 5.2. So even in 2006, 10 years after the reunification, substantial cultural differences, also in their self-estimation remain.

In the past 15 years, the number Hong Kongnese who moved to mainland China doubled, increasing from 122,000 in 1995 to 237,000 in 2005. It was reported that until June 2010, the number had increased to 400,000. Ninety percent of them moved to Guangzhou, Shenzhen and Dongguan and other Pearl River Delta cities. The number reached its highest point in 2010 when 40,000 Hong Kongnese moved out of Hong Kong. It was the first time that the number of people from Hong Kong who moved to mainland China exceeded that of those who moved to Hong Kong (Ycwb, 2010)

During our lives we have endless opportunities to try and understand other cultures. Some cultures are quite alike (Netherlands and Germany), while the difference between China and France is enormous. Not understanding other people’s culture can lead to conflicts and discontent. ‘Cultural differences are ever-present barriers to communication’ (Nida, 1954, p. 220). ‘Each cultural world operates according to its own internal dynamic, its own principles, and its own laws- written and unwritten. Even time and space are unique to each culture’ (Hall & Reed, 1990, p. 3). On the surface the Hong Kongnese look quite alike when comparing them to mainland Chinese, however British imperialism has had a tremendous impact on the Hong Kongnese as one can see in Table 1. As there is a difference in cultural background between Hong Kongnese and mainland Chinese it is important
that if these different groups want to interact they understand each other and furthermore have the opportunity to interact with each other. Most people in Chinese cities live in gated communities. ‘An emphasis on work, long hours and regular relocation, provided a recurring theme as detailed by residents and those outside the Gated communities who regarded this as a barrier to social interaction, both within and beyond the gated community’ (Atkinson & Flint, 2004, p. 887). ‘The typical resident in a gated community does not seem to interact with his or her neighbours any more frequently than the typical suburbanite’ (Szasz, 2007, p. 76). The connection between the loss of public space and interaction is totally clear. Public space provides room for person to person interaction (Orum & Neal, 2010, p. 202). It becomes clear that being ‘locked up’ in an apartment in a residential complex will lead to less interaction between different groups of people.
1.1 Societal relevance

Hong Kong was and still is a global city (GaWC, 2011) based upon Western values and virtues in the East. The reunification with China led to the end of the British administration and thus of the Western dogma’s which made Hong Kong to what it is today. Guangzhou on the other hand is a Chinese city with only mediocre Western influences in comparison to Shanghai and Shenzhen. Both cities flourish with sky scrapers and gated communities, which is evidently due to the lack of space in the city core. By means of gated communities the inhabitants are supposed to have a feeling of belonging. The walls and gates of the community reflect the physical as well as metaphorical separation, of good people inside, and the bad remaining outside (Low, 2003, p. 56). As also the next quote once more confirms:

*Q: Do you think he thinks you are better or he wants to be like you, he looks up to you because you’re from HK.
A: Some sense, yes.*

*(Personal interview with interviewee 6. August. 2010.)*

Also in the field of education this phenomena can be observed. In a survey in response to the question; ‘Why do you study in Hong Kong?’ the answers where: the mainland education is not good (50%), internationalism (44,9%) and they could not secure a scholarship (33,5%) (Li & Bray, 2007, p. 805). One can see that there are persistent differences between Hong Kong and mainland China. At the unification these discrepancies could still be felt: ‘The Chinese flag was raised and the national anthem played. It was more embarrassing than being in church..... when everyone else is praying’ (Lee 1997, as quoted in Mathews, Kit-wai Ma, & Tai-Lok, 2008, p. 2). Honkongnese citizens did and do not feel Chinese, even today as was already revealed in Table 1. Furthermore the Hong Kongnese still they have pretty negative thoughts about the mainland Chinese in general. A lot of Hong Kongnese, however, work or live in Guangzhou. It will be interesting to see if they agree to the notion that they are ‘better’ than mainland Chinese and if so in what ways this expresses itself. Despite that Hong Kongnese see and are seen as the better half, will this effect the way they interact with mainland Chinese residents in their gated community?

Cultural differences has been a topic of discussion for centuries now. Whether it was during the pre-Columbus era when Western Europe decided it was better for the natives Americans to convert to Christianity or much more recently when a German dictator decided a certain culture was not to his liking and decided to eradicate it. Although these are examples from certain groups to intervene with cultures which were not even close to their own country, there are also numerous examples in history where neighbouring cultures intervene with each other. The Khmer rouge in
Cambodia or even more recently the war in Yugoslavia. All this can be related to culture. Hence even China had in the last 50 years these differences in its own culture. The Republic of China (Taiwan) or Tibet are examples of this. However I don’t want to make an argument that differences in culture lead to war. If there are differences in a culture this will lead in a lot of cases to a form of segregation. Australia and South Africa are the most known and worst cases in regards to this matter, these countries however solved or are solving their problems. Integration between different cultures has always been a problem throughout history. The lack of understanding the other culture is evident to this problem. Although Hong Kong and mainland China are quite alike there are several differences. Table 1 and the quote on the previous page already give an indication that this is the case. Furthermore as one can read in the introduction, British imperialism has marked the identity of the Hong Kongese. If the Hong Kongese feel that they are a minority and are thus different than the mainland Chinese this can potentially lead to seclusion. The following quote confirms that some Hong Kongese feel they are an minority:

Q: Inside your complex, do you feel yourself a minority or a majority there? Because you’re from Hong Kong. Do you think you’re a minority?
A: Yes, a little.
Q: Why?
A: Because… maybe we have a different culture. We have a conversation when… different point for the conversation. That makes me to want to have more conversation with the Hong Kongese guys, not the Chinese, because they don’t know everything.

(Personal interview with Interviewee 1. August. 2010.)

If they feel they can’t interact with the local Chinese society, the might stop interacting at all.

Add into this equation the problem of communication inside gated communities and the lack of interaction becomes apparent. Gated communities decrease the interaction between neighbours ‘there is a very distant relationship among neighbours, everybody minds their own business’ (Roitman, 2010, p. 286). If you can’t see if your neighbours are at home, you are less likely to end in a conversation with them. Furthermore if you leave your apartment you are likely to be heading somewhere, thus making it harder to have a longer conversation with them as you both have a different destination.

Social integration or as Habermas terms it ‘organization principle’ is a matter of sharing world views, moral system or group identity (Smith, 1991, p. 78). If someone is not able to communicate with his neighbours, he could become excluded from society. A social life is for a part based upon the connection between you and your neighbours, if this does not exist, something is missing. By not being able to communicate with his neighbours one should think about three issues; language, different world views or hardly ever meeting them, which happens when you live in a apartment in a gated community. Language is in most cases not a problem, most Hong Kongese speak Mandarin and Cantonese, while most Mainland Chinese speak either Cantonese or Mandarin. This leaves different world views or hardly ever running in to each other. In the case of the Hong Kongese and
mainland Chinese both options are viable. Gated communities are definitely not the best place to interact with your neighbours and even if you interact with your neighbours different views of the world can be problematic. All this can lead to isolation.

This research can be relevant to educate the Hong Kongese in a way that they will assimilate with the dominant culture, or for the matter even work on social integration. Adapting to their new culture and with this acquiring new skills, contacts and communications is essential for every human being. Human kind is not an solitary being. Assimilation is the way to go in this context. They all had the same ancestors and a lot of the traditions and culture is still the same. It is the British influence which made these two cultures different. Over the upcoming generations these problems will diminish. One will feel more connected with their neighbours as one is born in China and thus only knows this way. Interaction inside gated communities is a problem which is almost impossible to solve. This is not a specific Chinese problem, but a problem which is known all over the world. Living in a society where half of the world’s population lives in cities will increase the number of people who life in gated communities, as there is a lack of space.
1.2 Scientific relevance

Today’s society is becoming more urbanised by the second. As of 2008 54.6% of the Chinese population lives in a rural area while 45.7% lives in an urban environment (NBS, 2009). The United Nations predict that in the year 2017 China will have more people living in urban then rural areas (UNFPA, 2007). According to Professor Lu Dadao, president of the Geographical Society of China, China’s urbanisation rate took 22 years to increase from 17.9% to 39.1%; which took Britain 120 years, US 80 years, and Japan more than 30 years to accomplish (Ma, 2002). Furthermore we are also living in a new society (Castells, Toward a sociology of the network society, 2000, p. 693). ‘Understanding the kind of economy we live, culture and society in which we live is heightened by the crisis and conflicts that have characterised the first decade of the twenty-first century’ (Castells, 2010).

Table 2: Urbanization, China 1950-2030 (Hu, 2011, p. 59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Urban population (million)</th>
<th>Urbanization rate (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>130.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>144.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>191.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>302.0</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>459.1</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>637.0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>856.0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>1,043.0</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interaction nowadays happens mostly in three ways; face-to-face, by cell phone or over the internet. As lately the number of smart phones have tremendously increased, I propose to combine internet and cell phones in the same category, leaving thus two categories, face-to-face and internet. Face-to-face interaction has been of all ages. Despite the fact that more and more interaction is digital nowadays, the face-to-face communication remains the backbone of today’s society. ‘Nie & Erbring, (2002) Kraut et al. (1998) found that the more people used the Internet, the lonelier they felt and the less they engaged in interpersonal communication, even with their family members. The finding was consistent with the findings of McKenna & Bargh (2000), and McKenna, Green, &
Gleason, (2002)’as quoted in (Shim, 2007, p. 1). So people who have face-to-face interaction feel less lonely and thus stay in better touch with society as a whole.

In today’s society everyone has the potential to interact with everyone, this is mainly based upon the use of internet. In 2002 China had 59 million internet users, in 2009 this number increased to almost 384 million (Reuters, 2010). With this every increasing number it becomes easier for people to learn more about things they are interested in. Despite that the Chinese government tries to control the internet (the great firewall) more and more information is available to the Chinese citizens. The Hong Kongese who live in Guangzhou, live in the city and not in rural areas. As it is easy to gain access to the internet in an urban environment, it becomes less of a reason for them to have face-to-face interaction with their neighbours. But as Shim (2007) already pointed out face-to-face communication is better. Furthermore as reported by Coyle, Alexander, & Ashcroft (2005, p. 80) the information technology is actually increasing the demand for face-to-face interactions and ultimately cities. The best example for this is Silicon Valley. Silicon Valley is the industry which has the best access to technology and face-to-face interaction was crucial for its growth (Coyle, Alexander, & Ashcroft, 2005, p. 80).

As mentioned the urbanisation of society is becoming more visible each day. ‘We find ourselves in the largest wave of urbanisation in the history of mankind’ (Castells, 2010). As Table 2 already displays the urban population in China is growing to seventy-one percent in 2030. All these new citizens need to be housed somewhere. The largest part of these citizens will find a gated community to live in. In the upcoming 10 years the average income will more than double according to (Zheng, 2007) the deputy director of the Policy Research Office of the Communist Party of China Central Committee. ‘As long as the per capita income of Chinese people remains at the current seven percent growth rate, 55 percent of Chinese households will have an income of over 60,000 Yuan ($8,000), after factoring in inflation, by 2020. In the year 2000 the average household had a population of 3.5 people. 1.300.000.000 people are living in China, so there are approximately 371 million households in the year 2000. ‘The projected drop in household size to 2.2 people by the year 2030 alone would add over 250 million new households — more than the total in the entire Western Hemisphere in 2000, even if China’s population size remained constant’ (Liu, 2005). This leads to a number of around 600 million households in China by the year 2030. Zheng further predicted that 2% of the households will have an income of over 200,000 Yuan ($29,000) in the year 2020. We can safely assume that there are around 450 million households by the year 2020. Two percent equals 9 million households. The Netherlands for example had 7.3 million households in the year 2009 with an average annual income of $28,000 (CBS). By the year 2020 China has an upper middle class which have more households then the Netherlands in total and are capable of spending more than the Dutch did 2009. With an upper middle class of 9 million and fifty-five percent of the households...
earning $8,000 the possibility to have the funds to live in a gated community are enormous. When comparing the living space per head in China between 1978 and 2005 there is a sevenfold increase to 26m² (Zhang, 2008, p. 26). Cities did not increase their size in sevenfold during this time. The only solution is to build skyscrapers. Skyscrapers which are all part of different gated communities. Figure 4 shows us that all the major cities in China have skyscrapers and thus build towards the sky.

Figure 4: Aerial overview of Guangzhou, Shanghai, Beijing and Shenzhen

Thus, interaction between citizens will mainly take place inside a gated community. In this thesis I will look at the interaction between Hong Kongese living in Guangzhou and their Chinese neighbours, one can ask why Hong Kongese and not foreigners? The answer for this is quite simple. Most Chinese do not speak English while most foreigners don’t speak Chinese. Hong Kongese still have British imperialism as backbone of their society. A high living standard, European laws, educational system et al., while only foreign and defence affairs where transferred to the People’s Republic of China (Government, 2007) This is known to the rest of the world as ‘one country, two systems’. The differences between both groups of citizens should be noticeable, although in some cases they can be pretty blurry. As Table 1 already pointed out 76.6% of the population felt more
Hong Kongese then Chinese. By identifying oneself as Hong Kongese instead of Chinese an distinct identity is created.

The cities in China are growing rapidly, but are also changing. As reported by Tang (1994, p. 320) before the reform ‘the place of residence was in a large part inseparable from the workplace. This has to do with the way resources, particularly capital construction investments, were allocated in a centrally planned economy. But the cellular urban spatial structure also facilitated monitoring and control by the socialist state’. Nowadays the workplace is separated from their residential quarters (Breitung, 2012, p. 2). People pay more rent for a quiet environment and less strangers. The property developer has a major interest in keeping the ‘free riders’ out of the complex and offer exclusivity to their clients. This is a key reason why there are gates and fences (Breitung, 2012, pp. 5,6). Most published material criticizes gated communities as they pave a path for social exclusion and isolation (Blakely & Snyder, 1997; Massey & Denton, 1998) and also threatens the community relationship between different social groups (Caldeira, 1999). Walls and gates incrase the social distance between residents who life inside, but also outside the community. This itsensifies the mental barriers, and social relationships will become worse (Low, 2003 and Davis, 1990). Wilson-Doenges (2000) informs us that through the lack of responsibilites, the sense of community is weak inside a gated community (Breitung, 2012, p. 8).

The cultural differences between Hong Kong and Guangzhou are evidently. The British heritage is a factor which is very important in this matter. The mainland Chinese think that Hong Kong is better. They have a different language, respectively Mandarin and Cantonese.

As previously mentioned in Chapter 1.2, 40,000 Hong Kongnese (Ycwb, 2010) are immigrating from Hong Kong to China mainland. Ninety percent of them end up in the Pearl River Delta. A substantial amount will therefore spend their lifes in Guangzhou. If you combine the above factors with eachother one can see a interesting research field. Hong Kongnese are moving in masses into Guangzhou. How will this affect the interaction when they end up living with mainland Chinese in the same residential complex. Will the Hong Kongnese despite their different culture interact with mainland Chinese or will this be minimal?

This research can therefor be interesting for several actors. The data can be used to see whether there are differences between the Hong Kongnese and mainland Chinese interaction or;

- Macaunese and mainland Chinese
- Taiwanese and mainland Chinese
- Oversea and mainland Chinese

All of the previous groups have influences from other cultures mingled into their culture.
1.3 Objectives

This research has as objective to analyse the interactions between Hong Kongese and mainland Chinese who live in a residential complex in Guangzhou, China. In our society we constantly interact with other people. Whether these interactions take place in a supermarket, gym, bar or inside a residential complex we all communicate with other involved parties. As my research question already indicates, I am particularly interested in the everyday social interactions which the Hong Kongese have with their Chinese neighbours. I want to come to a conclusion whether the Hong Kongese have personal relationships with their Chinese neighbours and what the implications of these interactions are.

1.4 Research question

More specifically this leads me to the following sub questions:

During the ages men of all cultures and races have had ‘problems’ with their neighbouring tribes, races, countries, states, empires, etc. Even in recent history we see these events, Yugoslavia. The situation Hong Kong-China is one which dates back since the time of the first opium war in 1839. The result was catastrophic for China meaning they had to give up Hong Kong to British imperial rule. Hong Kong became a crown colony of the British. Over the course of history tensions faded and Hong Kong was eventually given back to the Chinese in 1997. Since then it became much easier for Hong Kongese to travel and work in mainland China. With Guangzhou being relatively close to Hong Kong (two hours) it became a viable option for Hong Kongese to go out and seek work in Guangzhou. There was no language barrier as all could speak Cantonese. By moving to another city and from another cultural background in what way do these Hong Kongese blend in with the locals? Will there be ‘problems’ with the local neighbours? Will the Hong Kongese seek each other’s company, how will the interaction be with their neighbours. Do they see differences between the way of life in Hong Kong and Guangzhou?

Main Question

In what way interact Hong Kongese living in gated residential complexes in Guangzhou with the Guangzhounese in their everyday social relationships.
The following sub question will lead to a more concrete matter of the issue

**Sub Questions**

1) How do the Hong Kongnese feel they interact with the Guangzhounese.
2) Do the Hong Kongnese feel that there is a cultural difference when they look at themselves and the Guangzhounese.
3) Do the Hong Kongnese feel at home in their home.

**1.5 Research methods**

The research I conducted is a case study towards the social interactions between Hong Kongnese and locals inside residential complexes in Guangzhou.

(Verschuren & Doorewaard, 2007, p. 161) use five research strategies which can be used when conducting research:

· Questionnaire
· Experiment
· Case study
· Substantiating theoretical approach
· Desk research

For my research I have used three different sources for collecting data: standardised survey, interviews and desk research.

I used a survey because I had the desire to know, which is to say measure, some unknown characteristics of a population (Czaja & Blair, 2005, p. 4). Out of these results I want to draw a conclusion which answer my research questions. The survey was conducted amongst approximately 150 Hong Kongnese living in residential quarters in Guangzhou or Hong Kongnese living in Hong Kong but owning an apartment in Guangzhou. Several methods where used to select these Hong Kongnese respondents. Hong Kong Chamber of commerce meetings where visited by the researcher to let them fill in the questionnaire. The Hong Kong chamber of commerce distributed the questionnaires to members who visited the office during a two week period. Furthermore questionnaires were handed out in the residential complex ‘The Clifford estates’ in which a lot of foreigners including many Hong Kongnese live. By waiting nearby in a local food court or at the bus stop (with busses to
Hong Kong every 30 minutes) I was able to track down a lot of Hong Kongese. The search for Hong Kongese was restricted to Guangzhou.

To get more in-depth information I used semi-standard interviews because I wanted to use an interview method with an open framework enabling a two-way communication, so that I could enhance my knowledge of their situation with issues not addressed in the survey. In this way I could ask follow-up questions if needed and it also allowed the interviewee to pose themselves

1.6 How do the questions help to solve the scientific problem

As mentioned in Section 1.5, I used a standardised survey and interviews. The surveys were processed and analyzed by using SPSS. The interviews were transcribed, and are used in this research to support or to substantiate the results from the surveys. The data which was acquired from the surveys will help me to come to a conclusion in regards to my research question.

1.7 Structure of the thesis

The thesis is divided into several parts. Chapter 2 is the theoretical framework which will be basis for my analysis. In that chapter I will address mainly two relevant theories-Cross cultural interaction-, by Geert Hofstede and the body of theory on gated communities. Chapter 3 will focus on my main data source, namely the survey. Chapter 4 will give a closer look on the semi-structured interviews and the questionnaires in relationship with the theoretical framework. In Chapter 5 I will draw conclusions and formulate recommendations.
2. Theoretical framework

2.1 Introduction

Over time there have been several theories developed which discuss the interactions between different cultures. As Table 1 already showed, Chinese who were born in Hong Kong still feel Hong Kongese instead of Chinese. Their 155 years of being part of the British Empire changed their cultural identity. British values, virtues and laws have made Hong Kong to what it is nowadays. Before the British occupation the differences between Hong Kong and the rest of Guangdong province were no existent. The same language (Cantonese), the same culture and the same Emperor (Qing Dynasty). Since the treaty of Nanking (1842) a new identity and culture were slowly created by the British, changing Hong Kong forever. Derrida (2004, p. 7) taught us that identity can be constructed. ‘We need to situate the debates about identity within all those historically specific developments and practices which have disturbed the relatively ‘settled’ character of many populations and cultures, above all in relation to the process of globalization, which I would argue are conterminous with modernity and the process of forced and ‘free’ migration which have become a global phenomenon of the so-called ‘post-colonial’ world’ (Hall, 1996, p. 4). Identity was thus constructed and changed the post-colonial world. It is this free migration which Hall (1996, p. 4) refers to that becomes an issue in relationship towards my main question. As previously mentioned approximately 40,000 Hong Kongese leave Hong Kong each year of which ninety percent ends up living in the Pearl River Delta (Ycwb, 2010). These Hong Kongese most likely end up living in residential quarters. This movement of people and thus identity and culture indicates that there is a flux of social dimensions.

Culture has been a topic in society for a long time. It dates back to the Latin word *cultura* which stems from *coloere*, meaning to cultivate. Modern understanding of culture however has its origins in the ideas of Bastian (1868). The psychic unity of mankind which tests the identification of culture with the way the European elite live. Bastian inspired a German-American scholar called Franz Boas who in his turn had a student named Clyde Kluckhohn. In 1952 the scholars Clyde Kluckhohn and Alfred Koeber wrote the book Culture: a critical review of concepts and definitions, which gave a better understanding of the concept of culture.

There are several different paths which have, over the last few decades, emerged from scientific research in regards to culture. First, they used the country as the basic unit of analysis (e.g. Lynn et al., 1993; Roth, 1995; Schwartz and Ros, 1995; Steenkamp et al., 1999). This, however, does not imply that country and culture are the same. ‘National boundaries need not always coincide with
culturally homogeneous societies. A culture can be validly conceptualized at the national level if there exists some meaningful degree of within-country commonality and between-country differences in culture. The literature indicates that this is indeed the case. Hofstede (1994, p. 12) argued that today's nations “are the source of a considerable amount of common mental programming of their citizens” due to a relatively similar history, language, political, legal and educational environment, among others’ (Benedict & Steenkamp, 2001, p. 36). Many others (Smith and Bond, 1993; Smith et al., 1996; Schwartz, 1994) agree to this idea. ‘Moreover, the empirical work by Hofstede (1980; 1994), Hoppe (1990), Schwartz (1994), and Smith et al. (1996) among others, shows that there is systematic variation between countries on the national-cultural level’ (Benedict & Steenkamp, 2001, p. 36). The countries are clearly different from each other on a national-cultural level. Hofstede (1980) found that in, countries which are not that culturally integrated, the different ethnicities or linguistic groups still are more bound with each other than they are to other countries (Benedict & Steenkamp, 2001, p. 36).

Benedict and Steenkamp (2001, pp. 36, 37) distinguish three different groups of cultures: meta (pan-regional, global) culture; national culture; and micro culture. Firstly, meta culture: there is growing evidence of emerging global cultures with the accent on modernity, technology, freedom and individual choice. The internet, social media and cell phones, are clear examples of this. Hannerz (1990) notes that global cultures are developing as a result of the “increasing interconnectedness of varied local cultures as well as through the development of cultures without a clear anchorage in any one territory”. People who belong to a global culture identify similar items to a certain place (Alden et al., 1999). Hannerz (1990) argues that they share symbols (brands, consumption), experiences (travel) and attitudes (cosmopolitan outlook) with each other (Benedict & Steenkamp, 2001, p. 37). Appadurai (1990, p.p. 297-299) also sees the world as a global village. He identifies the cross cultural flow in scapes, thus: etnoscape (the landscape of persons who constitute the world we live in, tourists, immigrants, guestworks); technoscape (the fluid motion of technology and that technology moves at high speeds across various kinds of previously impervious boundaries); finanscape (the disposition of global capital becomes more and more mysterious as off-shore companies make it impossible to trace capital transactions); mediascape: (imagine-centred, narrative-based accounts of strips of reality, and what they offer to those who experience and transform them is a series of elements (such as characters, plots and textual forms) out of which scripts can be formed of imagined lives, their own as well as those of others living in other places); and ideoscape (this concentrates on images, is often directly political, and relates to the ideology of states. It is explicitly oriented to capture state power, and Further indicated by terms such as freedom, welfare, rights, sovereignty, representation and democracy).

Secondly, national cultures may only be relevant for a particular society, others for multiple,
while some are relevant for all societies. In the past, prior to 1980, cross-cultural interaction was perceived as less rigorous because, theory-based national-cultural frameworks were missing. Over the last three decades, this changed dramatically. First Hofstede (1980, 1991, 2001) introduced his framework while later Schwartz (1994, 1997) developed his framework. These frameworks are a starting point for understanding the different layers of culture, for starting to understand national culture, and for assessing cultural stability (Benedict and Steenkamp, 2001, p. 31).

Finally, micro culture is more specific than the national culture. Societies become less homogeneous due to immigration and individualisation. A micro culture preserves parts of the national identity but also develops its own unique culture. Examples of this are the Karen (Burma), the Maasai (Kenya, Tanzania) and the Sami (Finland, Norway and Sweden). Furthermore, these cultures can be defined on various overlapping criteria such as language, ethnicity, religion and even social class (Benedict and Steenkamp, 2001, p. 38).

The concept of culture is of vital importance for my research. The interaction between the Hong Kongese and the locals will be the key aspect as already made clear in my research question. Furthermore, the interaction and the differences in interacting with each other are a direct consequence of a different culture. The Hong Kongese bring with them a similar culture to that of the locals; however, the British occupation of Hong Kong clearly left a mark regarding the traditions, interactions and culture compared to the mainland Chinese. Therefore, due to British imperialism, Hong Kong has a slightly different culture.

2.2 Different approaches towards cultural dimensions

This section will look at the different cultural dimensions which are available. Benedict and Steenkamp (2001, p.31) introduced the work of Hofstede and Schwartz in Section 2.1. In this section I will take a closer look on both of the frameworks and choose the framework which I think is most suitable.

**Geert Hofstede**

Geert Hofstede’s theory about cultural dimensions in work-relations has been a longitudinal study since 1984. In his theory he refers to different cultural dimensions such as: power distance, individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance index and long-term orientation. Hofstede studies the interaction between national cultures. Hofstede’s theory demonstrates that there are differences between national and regional cultural groups. These differences affect the behaviour or interaction...
within a society or an organisation and these differences perpetuate over time. Kluckhohn and Kroeber (1952-1962, pp. 317-318) give us an idea of how Hofstede’s sees cultural dimensions. ‘In principle... there is a generalised framework that underlies the more apparent and striking facts of cultural relativity. All cultures constitute so many somewhat distinct answers to essentially the same questions posed by human biology and by the generalities of the human situation.... Every society’s patterns for living must provide approved and sanctioned ways for dealing with such universal circumstances as the existence of two sexes; the helplessness of infants; the need for satisfaction of the elementary biological requirements such as food, warmth, and sex; the presence of individuals of different ages and of differing physical and other capacities’.

‘Cultures, especially national cultures are extremely stable over time’ (Hofstede, 2001, p.34). Change in a culture comes from the outside, trade, conquest, economy, political scene and technology. In the past there was hardly any change in culture at all. However according to Hofstede (2001, p.34) however nowadays the mass media are the major force of cultural exchange. In China more and more citizens have access to the internet, thus more and more information is spreading. Most of this new information comes from other countries (e.g., USA). As all the countries are exposed to the same technology and scientific discoveries it becomes apparent that societies are becoming more and more alike (Kerr, Dunlop, & Myers, 1960, p. 101). ‘Technological modernization is an important force towards cultural change that leads to somewhat similar developments in different societies’ (Hofstede, 2001, p. 34). Hofstede’s (2001) work indicates that ‘the relationship of the dimensions to basic problems of societies and the historical evidence of he continuity of the national solutions to such problems suggest that even over much longer periods the measures obtained will retain their validity’ (Hofstede, 2001, p. 36). This is the basic structure of what Hofstede perceives as cultural dimensions.

Shalom Schwartz

Between 1991 and 2001, the period when Hofstede updated his approach in regards to cultural dimensions, the works from Schwartz (1994, 1997), Schwartz and Ros (1995), Smith and Schwartz (1997) came up with an alternative framework. Schwartz framework is based on his seminal work. Schwartz was like Hofstede, influenced by Kluckhohn (1951). His research is based upon interviewing teachers and students in sixty-seven different countries. He identifies three basic societal issues: relationship between individual and group, assuring responsible social behaviour and the role of humankind in the natural and social work. The cultural adaptations to resolve each of these issues make up his framework, which consists of two bipolar dimensions, defining seven national-cultural
domains (Benedict and Steenkamp, 2001, p.32). The seven cultural values are conservation, hierarchy, intellectual autonomy, affective autonomy, competency, harmony, and egalitarian compromise. Gouveia and Ros, (2000, p.27) distinguish these two bipolar dimensions as:

- ‘Autonomy versus Conservation. Close to the individualism collectivism dimension (Hofstede, 1984; Kagitcibasi and Berry, 1989; Schwartz and Ros, 1995). The principle that organizes this bipolar dimension is the opposition between pursuing values that especially benefit the individual, those of self promotion, as opposed to achieving values that mostly benefit the collective, those of self-transcendence’ (Gouveia & Ros, 2000, p. 27).
- ‘Hierarchy and Competency versus Egalitarian compromise and Harmony. The former legitimize the pursuit of personal or group interests even at the cost of others, while the latter require the sacrifice of personal interests to maintain the social and material surroundings. Hierarchy and Egalitarian Compromise are more clearly opposed in the aspect of whether persons should be treated as equals. Competency and Harmony are opposed more precisely in the area of change versus adaptation to the social environment’ (Gouveia & Ros, 2000, p. 27).

Differences between Hofstede and Schwartz

‘Both Hofstede (1980) and Schwartz (1994) attempted to identify national cultural dimensions that could be used to compare cultures. Hofstede derived his framework empirically, while Schwartz developed his framework theoretically. Both scholars have empirically examined their frameworks using large-scale multi-country samples. They found greater cultural differences between countries than within countries, suggesting the frameworks could be used to compare countries’ (Ng, Lee, & Soutar, 2007). Schwartz’s (1994) value dimensions include Hofstede’s dimensions, but, in some context, they offer a different way to reach a conclusion. Hofstede (1981, 1984, 2001) thinks that values should be central between different cultures. People from different countries are expected to have different graduations on items which they find important. The accepted value emphasis in a society is the most central characteristic of a society (Weber 1958; Hofstede 1981; Schwartz 1999). Schwartz ( 1994, 1997, 1999) largely agrees with Hofstede; The differences between cultures, social classes, professions, religions, and political affiliations, are reflected by the individual answers to ‘value’ questions, and that these values can differ in different societies (Nieves & Mutjaba, 2006). Jackson (2001) argued that Hofstede’s individualism dimension is too simple and suggests that Schwartz egalitarianism is more appropriate (Ng et al., 2007). Furthermore, several researchers (McSweeney, 2002; Shenkar, 2001; Smith, et al., 2002) criticized Hofstede’s work as being collected
with data which was old and not of this time anymore. Hofstede (2002, p. 1356) responded to this criticism:

‘.. the dimensions found are assumed to have centuries-old roots; only data which remained stable across two subsequent surveys were maintained; and they have since been validated against all kinds of external measurements; recent replications show no loss of validity’ (Ng et al., p. 168)

‘As with all research, there are limitations to be considered in evaluating the results from Hofstede and Schwartz. One potential limitation of the study relates to the sample representativeness. Hofstede (1981) and Schwartz (1994) used respondents from different demographic backgrounds, IBM employees for the former and teachers and students for the latter. Thus, it could be argued that the frameworks are incomparable, although both Hofstede and Schwartz stressed that the matched samples were used to control for possible demographic effects, so that the resultant cultural scores reflect pure country differences on cultural emphasis’ (Ng et al., 2007). Secondly, they only have twenty-three countries in common. Hofstede’s framework originally had countries, while Schwartz’s had thirty-eight.

Table 3 on the next page shows us that dimension one, two and three are almost the same, with only minor differences. Hofstede’s model, however, also includes the uncertainty avoidance index and long and short term orientation. The reason which makes Hofstede very interesting in my case is that his fifth dimension (long term vs. short term orientation) was a Chinese value survey, which was created to better understand the West, when compared with the East, Hong Kong being the West in this picture and mainland China being the East. The notions that Hofstede added to the long and short term orientation should help me to better understand the differences between these two groups. As all the other values are almost the same, the reason I chose Hofstede over Schwartz is merely due to Hofstede’s fifth dimension.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Left hand aligned dimensions</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Right hand aligned dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism (Hofstede)</td>
<td>Beliefs and behaviours are affected primarily by the society</td>
<td>Individualism (Hofstede)</td>
<td>Beliefs and behaviours are affected primarily by the individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism (Schwartz)</td>
<td>The person embedded in society. The emphasis on maintenance of the status quo, propriety, tradition, family security</td>
<td>Autonomy (affective/intellectual) (Schwartz)</td>
<td>Emphasis on the desirability of individuals independently pursuing their own ideas and intellectual directions, Promoting pleasure, exciting and varied life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High power distance (Hofstede)</td>
<td>Power is distributed unequally in institutions and organizations</td>
<td>Low power distance (Hofstede)</td>
<td>Power is distributed equally in institutions and organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy (Schwartz)</td>
<td>Emphasis on values such as assertiveness, competition and achievement</td>
<td>Egalitarianism (Schwartz)</td>
<td>Emphasis on everyone’s welfare equality, social justice, freedom, responsibility, and honesty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity (Hofstede)</td>
<td>Emphasis on values such as assertiveness, competition and achievement</td>
<td>Femininity (Hofstede)</td>
<td>Emphasis on avoiding self-assertion, quality of life, harmony with environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery (Schwartz)</td>
<td>Emphasis on self-assertion, ambition, success, daring and competence</td>
<td>Harmony (Schwartz)</td>
<td>Emphasis on avoiding self-assertion, quality of life, harmony and environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede)</td>
<td>Tolerance for unknown events, lack of written rules and regulations</td>
<td>High uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede)</td>
<td>Intolerance for unknown, many written rules and standardized procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Available (Schwartz)</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>Not Available (Schwartz)</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term orientation (Hofstede)</td>
<td>Emphasis on long term orientation</td>
<td>Short term orientation (Hofstede)</td>
<td>Emphasis on short term orientation and immediate gratification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Available (Schwartz)</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>Not Available (Schwartz)</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Cross-cultural interaction

The international business community continues to expand and international refugees and immigrants swell national populations; organizations such as the Peace Corps and various missionary groups send increasing numbers of people to overseas destinations; schools within many nations are increasingly addressing the needs of individuals and groups from cultures other than the mainstream; and business and communities worldwide struggle as their workforces become increasingly diverse, mixing nationalities, ethnicities and races (Cushner & Brislin, 1996, p. 1). As mentioned by Cushner the world is becoming a place where different groups of people will live in the same environment. In my case this will be the Hong Kongese living in Guangzhou and interacting with the Guangzhounese.

There are several types of cross-cultural contact (Bochner, 1982, p. 9). He distinguishes the following (Table 4):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact variables</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On whose territory</strong></td>
<td>Home or foreign territory</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kongnese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overseas students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrants and their respective hosts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-span</strong></td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium-term</td>
<td>Hong Kongnese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overseas students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Make a life in study in</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kongnese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overseas students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of involvement</strong></td>
<td>Participate</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exploit</td>
<td>Hong Kongnese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribute</td>
<td>Immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observe</td>
<td>Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of contact</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Hong Kongnese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overseas students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of intimacy between participants</strong></td>
<td>High to low social distance (variable)</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kongnese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overseas students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relative status and power</strong></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>Hong Kongnese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overseas students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Numerical balance</strong></td>
<td>Majority-Minority</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kongnese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Host and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visible distinguishing characteristics</strong></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Hong Kongnese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overseas students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The questionnaires and the interviews will refer to these cross-cultural contacts. All nine contact variables are helpful to get a better grasp of the overall picture. In what way do Hong Kongese interact with the Guangzhounese in residential complexes in Guangzhounese in their everyday social relationships. On whose territory, time-span, purpose, type of involvement, frequency of contact, degree of intimacy between participants, relative status and power, numerical balance and visible distinguishing characteristics are the variables which are used by Bochner. Relative status and power will be an important variable. Hofstede refers in his work to Power distance index (PDI). It is possible to link these two variables with each other. Long-Term Orientation (LTO) and Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI) cannot be linked with any of the above contact variables.
2.4 Hofstede’s theoretical framework

As mentioned in Section 2.2 the theoretical framework will be the theory of Geert Hofstede (Hofstede, 1980). Hofstede’s theory talks about the interactions power distance, individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance index and long-term orientation. Hofstede’s framework will be explained by four out of the five interactions and furthermore it will discuss these interactions by looking at the situation of the Hong Kongnese investors in Guangzhou. The reason that I only chose four and not all five is that in my opinion masculinity does not contribute in one way or the other to the research question. Masculinity looks more or less on the difference between men and women. The research question is not gender related and thus is not important in this framework.

**Power Distance Index (PDI)** ‘that is the extent to which the less powerful members of organisations and institutions (like the family) accept and expect that power is distributed unequally. This represents inequality (more versus less), but defined from below, not from above. It suggests that a society’s level of inequality is endorsed by the followers as much as by the leaders. Power and inequality, of course, are extremely fundamental facts of any society and anybody with some international experience will be aware that ‘all societies are unequal, but some are more unequal than others’ (Hofstede, 2001).

**PDI and Hong Kongnese in Guangzhou:** In what way do the Hong Kongnese accept the locals as being the 'members' with more or less power than them and to what extent do they accept that there are 'members' who have more power than them? How do these power relations affect the way that the Hong Kongnese communicate with the locals? The society as mentioned by Hofstede can be seen as the residential complex which will be researched. Which experiences are made by the Hong Kongnese in the way how they are treated by the locals or the way how they treat the locals. Does the power that one side has over the other create more difficulties or does it make living easier? In what way does inequality play a role in the differences between the Hong Kongnese and the Chinese? Do the Hong Kongnese people feel that there is segregation between them and the Chinese? In what way do the security devices such as fences, gates, guards, walls and alarms contribute to a feeling of insecurity inside the building because of the presence of the Chinese?

**Individualism (IDV)** versus collectivism on the one side versus its opposite, collectivism, is the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups. On the individualist side we find societies in which the ties between individuals are loose: everyone is expected to look after her/himself and her/his immediate family. On the collectivist side, we find societies in which people from birth onwards are
integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, often extended families (with uncles, aunts and grandparents) which continue protecting them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty. The word collectivism in this sense has no political meaning: it refers to the group, not to the state. Again, the issue addressed by this dimension is an extremely fundamental one, regarding all societies in the world (Hofstede, 2001).

**Individualism (IDV) and Hong Kongnese in Guangzhou:** The difference between China and Hong Kong is rather small (20 vs. 25 points). One would expect that the British influence would have made the Hong Kongnese more individualistic than the mainland Chinese. The United Kingdom has an IDV of 89, thus one would expect that a higher IDV would be the case for other Commonwealth countries in general. If we look solely on the Asian Commonwealth countries, we can see that the scores are overall much lower than those of the United Kingdom. Bangladesh (20), India (48), Malaysia (26), Pakistan (14), Sri Lanka (35) and Singapore (20). Hofstede did not research the countries of Brunei and the Maldives. If we look at the scores, we can see that Hong Kong does not score that differently than the other Commonwealth countries in the region. Despite the fact that the Hong Kongnese originate from a ‘free society’ and are now living in a socialist society this does not indicate that they are unfamiliar with the idea of collectivism. To a certain degree this makes sense, as probably a large percentage of their family are living in Hong Kong as well, which means they can easily visit them and look out for them. Furthermore, a majority of the Hong Kongnese who are migrate into China move to the Pearl River Delta and are thus still very close to their relatives in Hong Kong.

**Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI)** deals with a society’s tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity. ‘It indicates to what extent a culture programs its members to feel either uncomfortable or comfortable in unstructured situations. Unstructured situations are novel, unknown, surprising, different from usual. Uncertainty avoiding cultures try to minimize the possibility of such situations by strict laws and rules, safety and security measures, and on the philosophical and religious level by a belief in absolute Truth; “there can only be one Truth and we have it”. People in uncertainty avoiding countries are also more emotional, and motivated by inner nervous energy. The opposite type, uncertainty accepting cultures, are more tolerant of opinions different from what they are used to; they try to have as few rules as possible, and on the philosophical and religious level they are relativist and allow many currents to flow side by side. People within these cultures are more phlegmatic and contemplative, and not expected by their environment to express emotions’ (Hofstede, 2001).
UAI and Hong Kongese in Guangzhou: In what way are the Hong Kongese who live in the residential quarter anxious about the unknown and as a consequence of this trying to cope with this uncertainty and in what way do they try to abbreviate this? In a culture where there is strong uncertainty avoidance, the population prefers explicit rules. According to Hofstede there are almost no differences in the way Hong Kongese and Chinese people think in this matter (29 vs. 30 point). Chinese and Hong Kongese people live by many laws and they feel comfortable by doing so. In what way does this affect the life of the Hong Kongese investors in the residential complexes. Do they live by the same rules as the local population or do they live differently as they would normally in Hong Kong.

Long-Term Orientation (LTO) versus short-term orientation: This fifth dimension was found in a study among students in 23 countries around the world, using a questionnaire designed by Chinese scholars to deal with Virtue regardless of Truth. ‘Values associated with Long Term Orientation are thrift and perseverance; values associated with Short Term Orientation are respect for tradition, fulfilling social obligations, and protecting one’s ‘face’. Both the positively and the negatively rated values of this dimension are found in the teachings of Confucius, the most influential Chinese philosopher who lived around 500 B.C.; however, the dimension also applies to countries without a Confucian heritage’ (Hofstede, 2001).


Figure 5: Cultural dimensions comparison
Figure 5 explains China’s and Hong Kong’s position according to Hofstede. It is a comparison between both countries. As we can see by the figures both countries are alike. PDI is higher in China (80) than it is in Hong Kong (68). IDV is higher in Hong Kong (25) then it is in China (20) and LTO is higher in China (118) than it is in Hong Kong (96). The difference most likely can be explained by the former occupation of England.

2.5 Critiques towards Hofstede’s work

Hofstede’s work is criticized for his identity essentialism. Hofstede works with behavioural patterns and attitudes. The standardized questions he uses are for all countries the same and, the results of these questions lead to the results which Hofstede uses (Hofstede, 1994). ‘The essentialist view says that ‘culture’ is a concrete social phenomenon which represents the essential character of a particular nation’ (Holliday, 2000, p. 1). Much of Hofstede’s work is based upon characteristics which distinguishes different countries. ‘He presents geographical maps which present a world divided into cultural bubbles From this view comes the notion that ‘cultures’ are physical entities, which can be seen, touched and experienced by others’ (Holliday, 2000, p. 1).‘The non-essentialist view says that ‘culture’ is a movable concept used by different people at different times to suit purposes of identity, politics and science’ (Holliday, 2000, p. 1)

The essentialist idea ignores the fact that cultures have no structure and are unlimited. The relationship between a person and his living cultural environment is less static than what Hofstede wants people to believe. The following makes that clear: ‘No doubt a Serb is different from a Croat, but every Serb is also different from every other Serb, and every Croat is different from every other Croat. And if a Lebanese Christian is different from a Lebanese Muslim, I don’t know any two Lebanese Christians who are identical, nor any two Muslims, any more than there are anywhere in the world two Frenchmen, two Africans, two Arabs or two Jews who are identical’ (Maalouf, 2000).

Post colonial literature has been highly critical towards Hofstede. Hofstede’s theory (Section 2.2) and framework (Section 2.4), as presented, are based upon his essentialist view of the world. Post colonialism is presently researching the effects of colonial and neo-colonial encounters and its influences on the economic, political, ideological and cultural spheres (Moulettes, 2007, p. 446). ‘No one can deny the persisting continuities of long traditions, sustained habitations, national languages, and cultural geographies, but there seems no reason except fear and prejudice to keep insisting on their separation and distinctiveness, as if that was all human life was about’ (Said, 1978, p. 408).
The gaps in Hofstede’s essentiaist framework, are fixed when they are combined with the five scapes from Appadurai’s (Section 2.2). The views that are missing according to the postcolonialist are presented by Appadurai and are implemented into the equation.

2.6 Limitations when using this framework

In Section 2.5 I already introduced the criticism towards Hofstede. Furthermore, we must not forget that using this framework leads to several limitations in regards to my research question. In this section I will elaborate further on the following notions: national culture, gated communities and segregation.

National culture

In Section 2.1 I briefly mentioned that Hofstede’s framework is based upon the idea of national culture, and leaves little room for either a global culture or a micro culture. However, over the last fifteen years many scientists believe that we are more and more living in a global world. Appadurai’s (1996) book Modernity at large tells us the following: ‘Modernity at Large shows how the imagination works as a social force in today’s world, providing new resources for identity and energies for creating alternatives to the nation-state, whose era some see as coming to an end’. ‘The nation-state, he suggests, is on its last legs, no longer able to contain or comprehend the profusion of “diasporic public spheres” that threaten its grip on the project of modernization. In its wake, new kinds of yet unimagined social groups are waiting to emerge, and agency abounds’ (Szeman, 1996, p. 1). Lechner and Boli (2004) agree with this: ‘Globalization is still going strong. In many different fields, the world is drawing together as a single society, marked by common institutions and organisations, by a shared culture and consciousness’. On the other hand the world is becoming more and more local, hence the term glocalisation. The catchphrase ‘thinking globally and acting locally’ (Lyons, 2006) is derived from this idea. ‘As the world has become more integrated, it is no longer possible to look at society separate from global forces. Hence, a sociology of globalisation is called for, so as to explain the intricacies of the relationship between local and global factors’ (Hong & Song, 2010, p. 667). As Hofstede takes a look upon society from a national point of view, my research can be limited by issues which Hofstede is missing.
**Gated communities**

In Section 1.2 I already referred to China’s explosive urbanization rate. In 2017 the United Nations expect that more Chinese are living in an urban environment than in a rural environment (UNFPA, 2007). In China it is common for the majority of rural dwellers to live in gated communities or the Chinese equivalent of gated communities. Breitung (2012, p. 4) distinguishes the following bounded residential spaces:

- Traditional work unit housing (*danwei fang*), which has successively been privatized and sold to the former residents at a good price (reform housing, *fanggai fang*).
- Post-reform commercially built housing, mostly as gated communities, which are designed according to the tastes of the growing urban middle class and privately managed.
- Former villages, which due to urban expansion are now surrounded by urban or suburban areas. The village collectives cash in on the high demand for housing by migrants with limited access to the urban housing market, thus turning the land-use rights they enjoy into a significant source of income. The villages thereby became densely built-up migrant enclaves (urbanized villages, *chengzhong cun*).
- Factory estates providing housing for company employees have become quantitatively significant in a city with high numbers of migrant workers, but remain spatially very separated (enterprise-provided housing, *yuangong sushe*).

It can be said that most of the Hong Kongnese who live in Guangzhou have high paid jobs and work for firms in the business district (white collar jobs). Forty-five percent of my standard questionnaires interviews were taken near the Clifford estates. The Clifford estates (Figure 6) are a gated community, or as Breitung (2012) refers to them, post-reform commercially built housing which are twenty minutes from the CBD, and cater the needs of a more upscale (hospital, several schools) inhabitant. Blakely and Snyder (1997) would refer to them as ‘enclaves of the rich and famous’ or ‘top-fifth development’. The difference between the two is that the Chinese variant caters to a larger public while Blakely and Snyder is solely a subtype which caters to the upper class. The results of my research are going to be somewhat biased. Forty-five percent of my surveys results were from respondents who lived in the Clifford estates. As mentioned, the Clifford estates cater to a more upscale group of inhabitants. Many mainland Chinese dwellers will not have sufficient funds to rent an apartment inside this residential complex. Thus, interaction will take place between the Hong Kongnese and those mainland Chinese earning higher than average salaries. There is a direct connection between income and education (Bureau of labor Statistics, 2011): In general one could
safely assume that educated people are more in touch with a globalising world and one can make an argument that this will slightly increase interaction between the Hong Kongese and the mainland Chinese.

Figure 6: Impression Clifford Estates

**Segregation**

All of the aforementioned in this section can create social segregation. In the past, scholars have often suggested that there is a link between gated communities and social residential segregation (Blakely and Snyder, 1997; Caldeira, 1999; Webster, Glasze and Franz, 2002; Low, 2003). However, it wasn’t until 2005 (Le Goix) and 2008 (Vesselinov) before this statement could actually be backed up with empirical evidence. In China, however, there is something different going on: ‘Segregation is often seen as a solution to the problem of social diversity in the growing Cities’ (Breitung, 2012, p. 12). All of the bounded residential spaces as described by Breitung can be seen as segregated areas. As (Marcuse, 1997 and Webster, Glasze, & Frantz, 2002) mentioned this creates a distinction between rich and poor. In my survey and interviews, I will mainly conduct research in these residential complexes.
Survey and interviews

I fully understand that my research will not uncover universal laws, which are common in the natural sciences. My research will not provide exact details on the behaviour of Hong Kongese in relationship with the mainland Chinese (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983, p. 4 as quoted in Marvasti, 2004, p. 4). People keep changing all the time, identities of entire countries can be changed over the course of just a few decades. The difference between Hong Kong in 1996 and Hong Kong in 2026 will be gigantic.

As I did my interviews and questionnaires in Guangzhou China, it becomes clear that there is a language barrier. While most Hong Kongese speak English to some degree, due to their colonial background, it will be difficult to have a interview with a Hong Kongese who does not speak English on a professional level. With regard to the written surveys, there was no problem. All the questionnaires were handed out in English or Mandarin, whichever was preferred by the recipient. Secondly it will be a immense hassle to find these Hong Kongese people in a city with a population of almost thirteen million people, and then trying to find Hong Kongese who have the exact same appearance as the locals. By contacting the Hong Kong Chamber of commerce in Guangzhou, and asking people who I have interviewed to try to put me in contact with acquaintances from Hong Kong, I hope to tackle this problem.

In a man based society typical for South Asia (Hofstede, 1994), it is a fair assumption that most of the recipients are, in fact, men. China has a ‘masculinity factor’ of sixty-six while the Netherlands, for example, has 14. It is a fair assessment to make that most of the respondents, therefore, are males.
2.7 Why is this approach relevant in this case

Hofstede refers to culture as, ‘the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes one group of people from another’ (Hofstede, 2011). He focuses on the way culture is acquired. How do people acquire their programming as he pictures a human being as someone who comes into this world with an operating system, but still needing a lot of programming to function. It is a collective program and is shared by people who grew up in the same place. There is a universal operating system, which makes people human. Culture is measured on the basis of collective phenomena; so, for example, how people behave in a certain environment. One can also collect data from individuals but take general tendencies (average or certain percentage) in their replies. Furthermore, he believes that culture is subconsciously acquired before people reach puberty, meaning that national culture is composed of unconscious elements. Finally, he believes that every human being is unique. However, he believes that despite humans being is unique, the majority are affected by the culture they were born in.

In this case, as the majority of the Hong Kongese are born and raised in Hong Kong, they therefore have those unconscious elements, and thus differ from the mainland Chinese. This can be seen as ‘values’ in the figure below (Hofstede, 2001, p. 10). These ‘values’ will guide people when they make a decision in their lives, and therefore are the backbone of our culture. As these values are in the inner core, they are not transparent and very difficult for an outsider to understand or even observe.

Secondly, ‘rituals are collective activities that are technically unnecessary to the achievement of desired ends, but that within a culture are considered socially essential keeping the individual bound
within the norm of the collective. Ways of greeting and paying respect to others are examples, as are social and religious ceremonies. This means that the Hong Kongnese have, over time created different norms. What is normal for Hong Kongnese is not normal for mainland Chinese and vice versa. Thirdly, heroes are seen as national icons of a country and have characteristics that are highly priced in that country. Finally, ‘symbols are words, gestures, pictures, and objects that carry often complex meanings recognized as such only by those who share the culture’ (Hofstede, 2001, p. 10). These four different layers in the onion model help us better understand that there are cultural differences between Hong Kong and mainland China. They can be very influential in the way that the Hong Kongnese and the mainland Chinese interact with each other. Furthermore, as Hofstede measures national cultures, I should be able to see a difference between the Hong Kongnese and the mainland Chinese. The four interactions that are used by Hofstede will be a valuable element to better understand the interactions that are taking place between the Hong Kongnese and the mainland Chinese.
2.8 Hypotheses

Guangzhou and Hong Kong, even although geographically close, do not share similar histories. Hong Kong, as a former colony of the British Empire, is seen to the outer world as a bastion of Western society in Asia. However, according to Abbas (2002), Hong Kong has no pre-colonial past to speak of, in contrast to India, Africa and South America. ‘It is not true, as some might wish to believe, that if you scratch the surface of a Hong Kong person you will find a Chinese identity waiting to be reborn’ (Abbas, 2002, p. 2). King (1990, p. 38) argues in this perspective the notion of Westernisation and Europeanisation: ‘The period of Westernisation in Hong Kong has been long enough for Western and Chinese cultures to penetrate each other, and as a result, ethnic Chinese in Hong Kong are bicultural at least to some degree, rather than Chinese-only’ (Hughes 1968 and Wang 1997 as quoted in Ng & Lai, 2011, p. 90). Colonial cities can be seen as the forerunners of world cities, with all the ‘perks’ which came with being colonised. ‘The institutions, as well as physical-spatial forms introduced in the colonial city, were not only ‘European’ but the ‘norms and forms’ of the capitalist industrial city. (King, 1990, p. 38). It is these norms and forms which are different between Hong Kong and Guangzhou and the Chinese society, in general, as a communistic state. One of the best examples that Hong Kongese don’t feel Chinese was displayed in 2009. The public opinion stated that sixty-nine percent found that the Chinese government did the wrong thing on the 4th of June 1989 (anniversary of the Beijing uprising). Those feelings were made abundantly clear during a demonstration of some 8,000 protestors; all of this taking place in a country where there is no ‘official speech of free will’. Despite all this, Hong Kong is still a democracy with Western rule of law, religion, freedom of speech and an educated population. ‘In the case of Hong Kong, patriotism is a fundamental part of its transformation from a colonial city under British rule to a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of China, which entails patriotism toward both China (愛國 – ai guo) and Hong Kong (愛港 – ai gang). Dual patriotisms have quickly become part of the political culture since 1997 and now co-exist with bicultural development that has been nurtured by the century-long confluence of Chinese and Western cultures’ (Ng & Lai, 2011, p. 96). Thus, the Chinese and the Hong Kong Chinese identities are likely to be positively correlated with the Chinese self, but the Hong Kongese identity may not, because the former two identities offer a better “fit” for satisfying the social identity needs of a person who has a strong Chinese self.’(Ng & Lai, 2011, p. 92)

The ETHOS of the Hong Kong Chinese (Siu-Kai & Hsin-Chi, 1988) gives us more details about how the Hong Kongese see themselves: 67.9% of the respondents replied to the question; Hong Kongese have a lot of common characteristics, these make it difficult for them to get along with the Chinese on the mainland, with an ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’. Furthermore 23.7% (very strongly) and 55.8% (strongly) had a strong sense of belonging to Hong Kong (Kai, 1988, p. 178 and 179). Although
the book is from 1988, it gives a very clear indication to how they feel towards mainland China in general. In response to the question: Feeling close to the Mainland Chinese, the following results were presented:

Table 5: How close do you feel to mainland Chinese?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>20 or below</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51-60</th>
<th>Above 60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results are clear: Only 36.1% of people under 30 felt an affinity with mainland China. There is a clear pattern; the older the respondents are, the more sense of belonging they have to China. Please bear in mind that this is 23 years ago.

In that perspective, it becomes clear that Hong Kongnese think that they are different. This is not only a Hong Kongnese issue, it can be seen across the entire world. The metropolitan or global cities around the world all have some mystique. Alpha++ (New York and London) or Alpha+ cities such as Paris, Tokyo, Hong Kong and Shanghai are the best cities in the world according to Sassen (1991). Citizens are proud to be members. T-shirts with the text I love NY (or Amsterdam, Sydney etc) are common all over the globe. Imagine the sight; in one apartment a businessman from Hong Kong, while, in the next apartment are several locals who never had the chance to experience the world. The cultural differences between them will be enormous.

The above examples show that the Hong Kongnese find themselves different from the mainland Chinese. Add to this various dimensions of cultural, as mentioned by Appadurai, and I can conclude that there is a difference between the Hong Kongnese and Guangzhounese. Hofstede’s work, on different cultural dimensions, provides grounds for answering the following question: In what way do Hong Kongnese in their everyday social relationships interact in residential complexes in Guangzhou with locals.
Furthermore, there are several other sub-questions which need answering:

1) How do the Hong Kongnese feel they interact with the Guangzhounese?
2) Do the Hong Kongnese feel that there is a cultural difference when they look at themselves and the Guangzhounese?
3) Do the Hong Kongnese feel at home in their home?

To find an answer to the above questions a survey (Appendix 1) was conducted.
- Sub-question 1 is answered by the following survey questions: 7, 8, 9, 16 and 17
- Sub-question 2 is answered by the following survey questions: 10, 11, 12, 14, 18, 19 and 20
- Sub-question 3 is answered by the following survey questions: 6, 13 and 15

Question 1 to 5 are the ‘standard’ questions which are relevant for every sub-question. Age, gender, place of birth and the reason for living are amongst these first five questions. To understand all this data received from the questionnaires several statistical hypothesis test were used. In addition some log-linear models for more complex associations we used, while for the analysis of association between two categorical variables a Chi-Square test for independence was used.

2.9 Concluding notes

In this chapter, I have presented the conceptual framework for my research. I used Hofstede’s framework. The survey is based upon these theoretical concepts. With this framework I will able to answer my main research questions (Chapter 4).

Hofstede’s theory talks about the following dimensions: Power distance, Individualism, Masculinity, Uncertainty avoidance index and Long-term orientation. Out of these five interactions, I used four (PDI, UAI, IDV and LTO) to explain my case.

In this chapter, I also explained why these approaches are relevant to the main research question: In what way do Hong Kongnese in residential complexes in Guangzhou interact with locals in their everyday life. I explained the relationship between Hofstede’s approaches and national culture and the critiques towards Hofstede. Finally, with data presented by, Kai, Abbas and King I argued why colonialism has had an effect on the Hong Kongnese society and thus on the concept of culture and on the cultural differences between Hong Kong and Guangzhou.
3. Data and Methodology

After my description of the conceptual framework of this research in the foregoing chapter, in this chapter, I will explain the methodological approach which I used in my research in more detail (Section 3.1). In this research I used both qualitative and quantitative research methods. As I am looking at the interaction between Hong Kongnese and Guangzhounese it is necessary to use qualitative research. Section 3.2 will give more information about the population from which I took a sample for my survey. First, I will present the statistical data I gathered from the survey I conducted in Guangzhou. Secondly I will discuss the more impressionistic data I collected by means of semi-standard interviews (Scheel & Groeben, 1988) I conducted with the Hong Kongnese people living in Guangzhou and how I experienced this myself.

3.1 Research methodology and research methods

There is a big difference between research methodology and research methods. Indian scholars Rajaskar, Philominathan and Chinnithambi (Rajeskar, Philominathan, & Chinnathambi, 2006, p. 2) explain this as:

‘Research methods are the various procedures, schemes, algorithms, etc. used in research. All the methods used by a researcher during a research study are termed as research methods. They are essentially planned, scientific and value-neutral. They include theoretical procedures, experimental studies, numerical schemes, statistical approaches, etc. Research methods help us collect samples, data and find a solution to a problem. Particularly, scientific research methods call for explanations based on collected facts, measurements and observations and not on reasoning alone. They accept only those explanations which can be verified by experiments.

Research methodology is a systematic way to solve a problem. It is a science of studying how research is to be carried out. Essentially, the procedures by which researchers go about their work of describing, explaining and predicting phenomena are called research methodology. It is also defined as the study of methods by which knowledge is gained. Its aim is to give the work plan of research’ (Rajeskar, Philominathan, & Chinnathambi, 2006).
Research Methods

This thesis is based upon research which took place between April and September 2010. First, I had to understand the entire subject better by reading books and scientific articles about subject such as national culture, China, Hong Kong, gated communities and cross cultural interaction. With this information I was able to introduce a framework (Hofstede) that would be able to identify potential interaction between Hong Kongnese and mainland Chinese. Most of the literature research took place while living in China. Furthermore, by being able to access the database of the Sun Yat Sen University, I was able to obtain scientific articles which I would have not been able to access in the Netherlands.

By researching the fields as presented above I was able to better understand the current problems, and was able to come up with new questions which were very helpful to answer the research question as well as the sub questions.

While in Guangzhou I was able to speak to Hong Kongnese who could talk about their thoughts and ideas about the interaction between the Hong Kongnese and mainland Chinese. Furthermore, these Hong Kongnese could direct me to ideas which I didn’t think about before. Secondly, they were able to get me in contact with other Hong Kongnese. These interviews were very insightful to better grasp the Hong Kongnese way of life. One of these Hong Kongnese was able to put me in contact with the Hong Kong Chamber of Commerce in Guangzhou (HKCCCGD). The Chamber of commerce was very helpful in handing out surveys to Hong Kongnese who are living in Guangzhou.
Research population

My aim is to find Hong Kongese who are living in Guangzhou. Any Hong Kongese living in Guangzhou and above 18 was accepted as a potential subject. Whether the subjects knew that they would only be living in Guangzhou for a few years did not matter for the survey. Although not mentioned earlier I did not include children. In my opinion, children are a complete different issue to adults, and therefore are not important for my research. The surveys were distributed to Hong Kongese in different places. Forty-five percent of the questionnaires were taken near a gated community known as the Clifford estates. Another forty percent of the surveys were handed out by the Hong Kong Chamber of Commerce in Guangzhou (HKCCGD). Finally, the last fifteen percent of the sample was obtained at various different locations (over the internet, in social gatherings, in companies and so forth). As such this was probably the most randomised part of the survey.

A total of 169 surveys were handed out. Out of these 169 questionnaires I was able to use 158. The other eleven where not Hong Kongese while I asked this before I handed out the survey. Furthermore I had 15 semi-standard interviews with Hong Kongese who are living in Guangzhou. The surveys were distributed at different places all over Guangzhou. Firstly there where surveys completed online by the use of social media sites, such as facebook, gzstuff.com and skype. Secondly, I contacted the Hong Kong chamber of commerce who volunteered to hand-out the survey to members during the day. Most of my questionnaires, however, I gathered at a place called ‘The Clifford estates’. The Clifford estates is a housing complex, twenty minutes from downtown Guangzhou and directly located between Guangzhou and Hong Kong. By approaching people who were waiting for the bus to Hong Kong I was able to get around forty-five percent of my surveys.

The semi-standard interviews gave me room to manoeuvre during a conversation, and change the subject whenever I felt like changing. Instead of a standard interview, where one cannot change from the given guideline, during a semi-standard interview, one can change. So if there was an intriguing twist I could focus more on this and go on from there. The interviews where held all over the city. I conducted several interviews during a meeting from the Hong Kong chamber of commerce; furthermore, I had interviews in a Hong Kongese firm in Guangzhou, a coffee bar owned by a Hong Kongese and even during and after a break in badminton practice, where I was invited by several Hong Kongese. All of the Hong Kongese who had an interview also filled in a survey.

The data were analysed by using Statistical Package for the social sciences. SPSS is a computer program which is used for data mining, analysing surveys, text and statistical analyses. To get more in dept information, I used semi-standard interviews, because I wanted to use an interview method with an open framework, enabling a two-way communication, so that I could enhance my
knowledge of their situation with issues not addressed in the survey. In this way I could ask follow-up questions if needed and it also allowed the interviewee to pose themselves.

3.2 The basic descriptive results from the questionnaire

This paragraph will give basic information from the respondents who answered the survey.

Question one: Gender. 158 respondents answered this question. 96 of them were male, while 61 were female.
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**Figure 9: Male-Female ratio, questionnaire**

The difference between roughly sixty-one percent and thirty-nine percent can, as previously mentioned, be explained by the places where the sample was taken as well as due to the masculinity factor as described by Hofstede. One needs to remember that, on several occasions, while the men were filling in the survey, the females were standing by, and were not willing to participate.
Question two: What is the age of the respondents: 36 of the respondents are below 25 years. 72 are between 25 and 45. 42 are between 46 and 65, while 8 are over 66 years old.
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**Figure 10: Age of the respondents**

Question three: Which country were you born in? In total 169 responded to this question. Eleven of them, however, said they were born as overseas Chinese (Taiwan, USA, Australia for example).
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**Figure 11: Place of birth of the respondents**

Question four: How many years have you been living in Guangzhou? 48 of the respondent answered less than one year. 21 said they were living between one and two years in Guangzhou. 41 responded with three to five years. 21 had been living there six to ten years while 22 had been living there for over ten years now. 5 respondents did not answer this question.
Question five: Why do you live in Guangzhou? 62 people lived in Guangzhou for work. 17 respondents are retired. 43 have a weekend or vacation apartment in Guangzhou. 13 have a partner who works in Guangzhou, and 21 have another reason for living in Guangzhou (University for example). Two respondents did not answer this question.
3.3 Concluding notes

In this chapter, I presented the descriptive data and research methodology which I used for my research. I am using qualitative and quantitative research methods in this thesis. The limitations of my researched surrounded around the issue of direct interaction. As I do not speak Mandarin or Cantonese, it is impossible for me to directly connect with Hong Kongnese who don’t speak English. Furthermore, there were problems in regards to the sample. Eighty-five percent of the survey where gathered from only two sources. There was a research population of 169 surveys. Out of these 169 surveys, I was able to use 158 as legitimate data. Semi-standard interviews where held with several Hong Kongnese who are living in Guangzhou. In this last part of this chapter, I presented the results of the basic information from the questionnaires, such as gender, age, place of birth, how many years have you been a resident of Guangzhou and reason for living.
4. Hong Kongnese living in Guangzhou

4.1 Introduction

This chapter will present the results from my survey in relationship to the theoretical framework. Each question will be analyzed by using the theoretical framework from Hofstede, which are presented in Chapter 2. The basic results of the survey can be found in Section 3.2.1. The other results of the survey can be found in the appendix. In Section 1.4 the following sub questions were presented:

- Do the Hong Kongnese feel that there is a cultural difference when they look at themselves and the Guangzhounese?
- Do the Hong Kongnese feel at home in their home?
- How do the Hong Kongnese feel they interact with the Guangzhounese?

The next section will provide some information on the cultural differences between the Hong Kongnese and the Guangzhounese seen from a Hong Kongnese perspective and will take a closer look on Hofstede's LTO vs STO dimension. In Section 4.3 I will elaborate on the feeling of belonging, which the Hong Kongnese who live in Guangzhou have. Thirdly in Section 4.4 I will answer the last sub question. Each of the sub questions will be answered with the help of different questions from the survey. Finally, in Section 4.5 there will be a partial conclusion.

4.2 Do the Hong Kongnese feel that there is a cultural difference when they look at themselves and the Guangzhounese?

This is the first sub question which eventually will lead to answer the main question. This section will shed more light on how the Hong Kongnese perceive the mainland Chinese, and which cultural differences there are according to the Hong Kongnese. If this sub question can be answered with yes, these cultural differences may provide a barrier for the interaction between these two groups. There have been several questions in the survey which serve to determine if this is the case. The following three questions will be my guideline throughout this section:
• 13a) Hong Kongese are more punctual when they have an appointment than mainland Chinese.

• 13b) By not being occupied by a formal European colonizer Guangzhou missed out on enriching their culture (culture should be seen in the general sense of the word).

• 20) Out of the following statements which would you say are more alike for Hong Kong and which are more alike for Guangzhou: spending money, perseverance, respect for tradition, fulfilling social obligations, protecting one’s face.

Question number twenty is entirely based upon Hofstede’s LTO vs STO dimension. Question twenty will help us to determine whether there is a difference between Hong Kong and mainland China. Hofstede’s score indicate that China (118) is more LTO than Hong Kong (96).

As the sub question already states, ‘culture’ is the main concept in this section. First, how do Hong Kongese see themselves? Secondly, how do Hong Kongese see the other mainland Chinese? These are important questions which need answering. Culture in this question cannot be seen without the notion of migration. According to Appadurai (1996 as quoted in Szeman, 1996, p. 1) migration creates instability in the creation of identity. Since the transfer of sovereignty in 1997, it is much easier for Hong Kongese to travel, and even live in other cities in China; however, for other mainland Chinese, it is almost impossible to travel or find work in Hong Kong. As already referred in Section 1.1, the number of Hong Kongese who moved to mainland China doubled in the past 15 years to around 400,000. Out of these 400,000, almost 90% moved to cities in the Pearl River Delta.

In my opinion, as I have argued before, I think that British imperialism has changed Hong Kong quite a bit. What do the Hongkongese think about this? Question 13B from the survey tells us if the Hong Kongese think that Guangzhou missed out on enriching their culture, having not been occupied by a formal European colonizer.
Table 6: By not being occupied by a formal European colonizer Guangzhou missed out on enriching their culture (culture should be seen in the general sense of the word)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>9.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see in Table 6, the Hong Kongnese don’t think that their culture was enriched in comparison to the Guangzhounese culture, just because they were occupied by the British. This is an interesting result from the survey. I expected that more people would have agreed to this statement. However, if we take a look at the interviews, it becomes clear that they think that their culture is better. The following interview citations agree to the statement as given above.

A: But for local Chinese, because they were born here, they fully understand this culture, or this society.  
(Personal interview with interviewee 8. August. 2010)

A: The Hong Kongnese behave better on average, they keep their place cleaner, sense of public benefits, more polite, less noisy.  
(Personal interview with interviewee 7. August. 2010)

A: We have international exposure; we know more things; and in business world, we’re more professional.  
(Personal interview with interviewee 7. August. 2010)

These quotes, however, give a totally different image in regards to culture. I’m fully aware that I should not be using British colonial past as a framework for the definition of culture. Abbas, however, states that ‘any discussion of Hong Kong culture must sooner or later raise the questions of its relation to colonialism’ (Abbas, 2002, p. 1). Hong Kongnese culture, therefore, cannot be seen without a certain relationship towards colonialism. Although Hong Kong has a history before 1841 when it was handed over to the British; however, all the relevant parts that have shaped Hong Kong in present time, can be dated back to colonialism (Abbas, 2002). ‘Another point to note is that while 98 percent of the population is ethnic Chinese, history (both colonial history and history of themainland) has seen to it that the Hong Kong Chinese are now culturally and politically quite distinct from mainlanders’ (Abbas, 2002, p. 2). Abbas confirms with these statements that there is a huge difference between Hong Kongnese and mainland Chinese.

As Abbas points out, Hong Kongnese and mainlanders are quite different from each other. Differences in people can be seen in the way that certain ethnicities treat each other.
Table 7: Do you think that the mainlanders treat you in a different way than that they treat each other?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 7 inform us that the Hong Kongnese feel that they are treated in a different way than the mainland Chinese. If a person is treated in a different way than other people from a society, this can lead to friction, segregation, problems interacting and so forth.

With regards to the question of culture, we can see in Table 6 that Hong Kongnese don’t think that their culture is more enriched than the Guangzhounese, just because they have been occupied by the British. Once again, though, I have the feeling from all of the interviews I conducted that the Hong Kongnese feel superior to the mainland Chinese and that the mainland Chinese agree to this notion, in the eyes of the Hong Kongnese. The following citations support this:

A: Because they expect Hong Kongnese more educated, compared to other Chinese. And that’s why they would like to immigrate to Hong Kong.
(Personal interview with interviewee 9. August. 2010)

A: Because... maybe we have a different culture. We have a conversation when... different point for the conversation. That makes me to want to have more conversation with the Hong Kongnese, not the Chinese, because they don’t know everything.
(Personal interview with interviewee 1. August. 2010)

The above citations, once again, show that the Hong Kongnese feel that they are not entirely the same as the mainland Chinese. From a cultural point of view, this makes sense. Hofstede taught us that culture is subconsciously acquired, and that natural culture is composed of unconscious elements. Diller (2011, p. 20) agrees with this notion: ‘Each individual begins life with a singular experience of culture that is taken for reality itself’. Most people never acknowledge how their everyday behaviours are shaped by the world they live in, and are constantly being reinforced by families, peers and social institutions (Cross, 1988, p. 2 as quoted in Diller, 2011, p. 21). By accepting these facts, the outcome of the question (Table 6), ‘by not being occupied by a formal European colonizer Guangzhou missed out on enriching their culture (culture should be seen in the general sense of the word)’, starts to make much more sense. As people are usually unaware of the culture in which they live, it is very difficult for them to distinguish the specific norms that make that culture. In all the previous interview citations, I made a case for the difference in culture between Hong Kong and Guangzhou, and how this can be related back to colonialism. As Abbas already pointed out very clearly, the culture of Hong Kong is the culture of colonialism.

Hofstede’s fifth dimension refers to five notions, which are either long-term orientation (LTO) or Short-term orientation (STO). These notions, perseverance and thrift (LTO) and respect for
tradition, fulfilling social obligations, protecting one’s face (STO) can all be seen in relation to culture. Table 8 shows us the following results from the survey:

Table 8: Out of the following statements, which would you say are more alike for Hong Kong and which are more alike for Guangzhou

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Guangzhou</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thrift (spending money)</td>
<td>31,2%</td>
<td>68,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>17,2%</td>
<td>82,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for tradition</td>
<td>51,9%</td>
<td>48,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilling social obligations</td>
<td>18,4%</td>
<td>81,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting one’s face</td>
<td>39,5%</td>
<td>60,5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in relation to LTO are one-sided. This is strange to say the least. In the introduction of this section I referred to the fact that LTO is, according to Hofstede, seen as a Chinese issue and to a far less extent Hong Kongnese. The results of the questions in regards to Hofstede’s fifth dimension contradict this. First, let me make clear that I used a paradox in the thrift related question. The Hong Kongnese find that, in regards to thrift and perseverance, they are clearly doing much better than their Chinese counterparts. Spending money makes perfect sense as the average GDP in Hong Kong is $31,514, while in China, it is $4382 (IMF, 2011). With an average income factor 7 times that of China’s, it makes sense that spending money is more a Hong Kong thing to do. Furthermore, one needs to realize that saving money is a good thing in China. 60% of Chinese households save money for precautionary reasons (Yao, 2011), followed by purchasing a house, car or for retirement (Alessie, Lusardi, & Aldershof, 1997). However, and this is the twist, Hofstede indicates thrift with saving money and long term investments. Thus, one can see that this result makes perfect sense, and fits perfectly in Hofstede’s results. Perseverance is, according to the Hong Kongnese, also quite obvious. With almost 83%, they think that they work harder than their Chinese counterparts. Recruitment firm Robert half backs this statement up somewhat. Hong Kongnese are Asia-Pacific’s most hardworking people, with 77% glued to work outside of office hours, compared to a regional average of 66% (Half, 2011). Respect for tradition is almost a tie. Fulfilling social obligations is a virtue that is more Hong Kongnese than mainland Chinese, which makes sense if you think about the following example: retirement is a very important factor in China’s and Hong Kongnese society. Due to the one child policy in China, a lot of elderly have no one to rely upon during the last stage of their lives. Their children work in the city while the parents stay behind in the rural towns. This could explain why the Hong Kongnese feel they fulfil their social obligations much better than the mainland Chinese. If you live in the same city as your parents, it is easier to stay in touch and support them. Wang Yuesheng
informs us that, ‘their demand for social services has increased, especially as many who had only one child under the country’s birth-control policy do not live in the same cities as their children’ (2011, p. 1). Secondly Zhang (2011, p. 1) tells us that there is a spiritual vacuum in today’s China. ‘Our traditional values of communitarianism and social harmony have been replaced by selfishness and individualism’ (Zhang, 2011). The last virtue is ‘protecting one’s face’. There is a different definition of ‘face’ in the West than there is in the East. ‘Face’ as a concept in social theory was coined by Erving Goffman in 1955 (Goffman, 2005). People try to protect the face they develop in a social situation. People are emotionally attached to their face; a feel good moment comes when they can protect the face they have established for themselves; loss of face will make them nervous and disturbed. In social interactions, people are more inclined to do the ‘right thing’ and interact in a politically correct way. In China and Hong Kong, however, face is such an important part of society. ‘Face’ cannot be translated or defined (Lin, 1935). Michael Carr (1993) however thinks there are several good definitions. ‘Face is a sense of worth that comes from knowing one’s status and reflects concern with the congruency between one’s performance or appearance and one’s real worth (Huang, 1987, p. 71). ‘A recent study conducted by the China Youth Daily found that over 93% of the 1,150 respondents surveyed admitted that face is very important to them, with 75% acknowledging that making a mistake in public was, by far, the most humiliating experience they could ever have (Shan, 2005). In other words, most Chinese will do whatever they can to avoid looking bad in public and that often manifests itself in an unwillingness to openly admit to any wrongdoing, no matter how small or insignificant the error might have been. We have established that face is a very important factor in Chinese and Hong Kongnese society. While talking with one of the Hong Kongnese residents of the Clifford estate the notion of face came up:

Q: So it’s all about reputation, that’s what you’re saying.
A: Yes. Because they think... they’re living in the same villa, they want the neighbours, all is the same level, maybe the rich, for they mind, they just think rich is the good reputation.

(Personal interview with interviewee 1. August. 2010)

With all the above information, I cannot exclude face from the survey nor the interviews. Appearance is a key factor in this society. Although the differences in the results (61 vs. 39) are not as large as I would have expected. Face could account for unexpectedly few ‘yes’ responses to these questions. In general, the Hong Kongnese would be more inclined to answer in a politically correct way. In general, people do not say that their culture is better than another culture. Hofstede’s fifth dimension favours the Hong Kongnese in three of the five results, while respect for tradition is a tie. According to Hofstede’s results, the outcome should be the other way around. What does the outcome of the fifth dimension mean for interaction between Hong Kongnese and mainland Chinese? First, as Hofstede’s results already indicated, the Hong Kongnese spend more money while...
the mainland Chinese save more money. With different spending patterns comes misunderstanding. Savoley (1991, p. 88) informs us that ‘However, this main effect was qualified by a significant publicity of allocation X envy interaction. Although the results of this experiment are only suggestive, they are nonetheless consistent with the view that envy is associated with a hostile orientation toward the envied person, and, furthermore, that it operates in private realms of experience’. Thus, having different spending patterns can lead to envy and can hamper social interaction (Savoley, 1991, p. 96). The Hong Kongnese work harder (according to them) and work longer (Robert Half). Both of these factors can be problematic for potential interaction. The likelihood of them running into each other and being able to communicate diminishes when one is away from their homes longer then their neighbour. Furthermore, the willingness to communicate decreases when a person is rarely at home and therefore has no connection with the neighbourhood. Eijk (2010, p. 166) agrees with this: ‘rather, interaction is structured by everyday encounters and practices, which may or may not, confirm or shape general beliefs about the neighbourhood. Interaction is furthermore structured by the setting in which these encounters take place’. Thirdly, respect for tradition was the same. This can therefore not harm interaction.

Now we consider, fulfilling social obligations. From a Hong Kongnese point of view it makes sense that this can potentially hurt interaction in two ways. First, if the Hong Kongnese felt that they are more in touch with their social obligations, they would visit their parents more often, or receive more visits. The only viable option to visit their parents would be during the weekend, as they work themselves during the week. Thus, potential interaction time with their neighbours at the weekend is lost, as they are not at home or their parents have come to visit. Volker and Flap (2007) agree with this; ‘If one is not present at a certain place, no other can be met and no relationship can be built’. Secondly, if the Hong Kongnese visit their parents on a regular basis, and they know (or just don’t know) if their neighbours visit their parents, they create a certain image about neighbours.

And finally, let’s discuss protecting one’s face. I have already explained that in Chinese and Hong Kongnese society this notion is of vital importance. They try to impress their friends, colleagues, acquaintances and neighbours. ‘In China, a gift must be expensive. It’s not just the price for the price’s sake. It’s more like the costlier it is, the more respect you show someone’ (Monfret, 2011). Furthermore, when being asked the question: If you interact with your neighbours, where does this take place? Twenty six percent said in their own home, while only four percent interacted with their neighbours in their neighbours apartment (more on this in Chapter 4.4). This is a clear indication that they want to show their apartment to their neighbours and be the host. A situation like the above can never be healthy for potential interaction. Furthermore, if one envies or is jealous of their neighbours, this can potentially hurt the interaction. Savoley (p. 248) confirms this; jealousy may affect the social interaction in a variety of ways. One can conclude that for a Chinese or Hong
Kongnese one of the worst things that could happen to them is to lose face. They are aware that they are different from each other. To avoid situations where they or their neighbours can lose face it is very understandable that they limit their interaction. Eijk (2010, p. 54) agrees with this: ‘an idea of what is “appropriate” behaviour given the setting and the network in which people are embedded, always plays a role and structures the formation of the relationship’.

This section has informed us about culture and cultural differences that there are, according to scholars, the survey results, and the interviews. The Hong Kongnese are, in their eyes, and in the eyes of scholars, different from the mainland Chinese. Although the British heritage is not a key factor for enriching a culture, the Hong Kongnese feel that their culture is ‘better’. This could explain the results of Table 6 (p. 48). Three out of Five notions, from Hofstede’s fifth dimension are positive towards the Hong Kongnese. The following section will take a closer look on how welcome the Hong Kongnese feel in Guangzhou, their residential complex and their homes.

4.3 Do the Hong Kongnese feel at home in their own homes, in Guangzhou?

In the previous section, I analysed whether or not there was a difference in culture between Hong Kong and mainland China, according to the Hong Kongnese. The Hong Kongnese response to this was that there is a difference. In their eyes, however, this has nothing to do with Colonialism. Cross (1988, p. 2 as quoted in Diller, 2011, p. 21) reminds us that people see their living environment in a different way than it actually is. Secondly the citations from the interviews paint a clear picture that there is a difference between Hong Kongnese and mainland Chinese culture. To come to a final conclusion about the degree of interaction between Hong Kongnese and Guangzhounese, we must firstly analyse if the Hong Kongnese feel at home in Guangzhou. Is there a sense of belonging when they enter Guangzhou, their complex or their residential tower, or do they not feel at home in regards to this matter.

The dominant narrative about cities is that they are unsafe (Block, 2009, p. 2). ‘It seems to me incontrovertible that if people in one milieu perceive fundamental differences between themselves and the members of another, then their behaviour is bound to reflect that sense of difference: it means something to them which it might not mean to others’ (Cohen, 1982, p. 3). Although a popular discourse, if one tends to believe that gating is due to the fear of crime, this is clearly not the case; they even create a greater sense of uneasiness and thus vulnerability (Blakely & Snyder, 1999). ‘It provides a verbal component that complements, even reinforces, the visual landscape of fear created by the walls, gates, and guards’ (Low, 2003, p. 56). Gated communities are like islands (Blakely & Snyder, 1999). When you are on an island, you are not in contact with the
outside world; thus you are in your own ‘safe’ environment. On this island, you are with similar people, away from the atrocious, which is the world outside of the gates. ‘The walls and gates of the community reflect the splitting physically as well as metaphorically, with “good” people inside, and the “bad” remaining outside’ (Low, 2003, p. 139). Cohen’s (1982) work, on belonging and attachment is a great help in this respect. He argues that communities are best approached as ‘communities of meaning’. In other words, ”community” plays a crucial symbolic role in generating people’s sense of belonging ’ (Crow and Allan 1994, p. 6 as quoted in Smith, 2001-2002). With this sense of belonging, one can see why people feel ‘at home’ in their gated community. It is due to this gated community that people feel part of a group. With the help of the following questions from the survey, I have tried to understand better if the Hong Kongnese feel at home in their current place of residency:

- 10) Do you feel at home when you step over the doorstep of your apartment?
- 11) Do you feel at home when you enter your residential complex?
- 12 )Do you feel at home when you enter Guangzhou?

I will start by looking at how much people feel at home when they enter Guangzhou. Do they see Guangzhou as a part of their life or is it something that is just ‘there’?

Table 9: Do you feel at home when you enter Guangzhou?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/ a moderate amount</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakly</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 16,5% have a weak or bad feeling when they enter Guangzhou. The majority of the population feels at home in Guangzhou. As previously mentioned, a large part of the surveys were conducted at the Clifford Estates. The outcomes of Table 9, 10 and 11 can be biased to a certain degree because: ‘Research on the place attachments of immigrants, however, shows that objects and rituals from their own country are important mediators for feelings of attachment to a new country’ (Van der Graaf, 2009, p. 151). Thus, by still participating in things from their Hong Kongnese heritage, they will feel a more positive vibe for their new hometown. Research by Janet Flammang (2009, p.237) shows us that items from back home can trigger a relationship with our new home, ‘We love to garden the food of our country, one said, it makes it feel like home, it is home’ (Flammang, 2009, p. 237). As can
be seen in Figure 5 (p. 28); cultural dimensions by Hofstede, the differences between Hong Kong and Guangzhou are, on the surface, not that different. What makes people feel at home in the city they live in? This is often complicated by the disparity between how immigrants identify themselves, based on their social status in their home country, and how the locals, whose views are often derived from, or influenced by, stereotypes (Crahan & Vourvoulias-Bush, 1997). Secondly another important factor, for feeling at home in a new city, is to have access to the food you are accustomed to (Teitelbaum & Asher, 2005 and Zukin, 2009). This is obviously not a big problem. Geographically the cities are within two hours from each other, thus creating the same taste for foods, combined with the fact that, before the British occupation, Hong Kong already had a Cantonese kitchen.

Secondly, do the Hong Kongnese feel at home when they enter their gated community? Question eleven from the survey answered this:

Table 10: Do you feel at home when you enter your residential complex?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/ a moderate amount</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakly</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As previously mentioned, people feel at home in a gated community because they are ‘the good’, while the world behind the gates is ‘the bad’. Only 12.2% of respondents did not feel at home when they entered their gated community, thus creating a sense of belonging to the residential complex. Almost 88% of respondents indicated they had some feeling of being at home, after entering their gated community, thus creating a sense of belonging to the residential complex. ‘Cohen argues that ‘community’ involves two related suggestions that the members of a group have something in common with each other; and the thing held in common distinguishes them in a significant way from the members of other possible groups’ (Cohen, 1985, p. 12 as quoted in Smith, 2001-2002). The Hong Kongnese feel at home in their gated community. As Cohen argues, this means that they will feel related to their neighbours; consequently, this should encourage possible interaction.

Furthermore, according to Hofstede (2001), both China and Hong Kong are highly collectivist cultures where people act in the interest of the group and not themselves (IDV dimension). Granovetter (1973) reminds us that neighbour relations are usually weak, and weak ties are good indicator of social cohesion. In China and Hong Kong, relationships for in-groups are cooperative where relationships for out-groups are cold and even hostile. It is therefore important to feel at home in your residential complex. As the idea of in-groups and sense of belonging is an important criterion
for both ethnicities, Volker and Flap (2007) suggest that 'all conditions that cause people to spend more time in the area where they live will facilitate contacts among neighbours'. Furthermore, Volker and Flap (2007, p. 60) also suggest that 'Hence, time spent in the local area increases the chances of meeting neighbours. All conditions that cause people to spend more time in the area where they live will facilitate contacts among neighbours. However, to develop neighbourhood relations, it is not enough that an individual spends time in the neighbourhood; other neighbours have to be present too'. Another important issue to address is that forty-five percent of the questionnaires were taken at the Clifford Estates (upscale gated community), which is, according to Breitung, (2012) post-reform commercially built housing. Fisher (1982, p. 100) reported that neighbourhood contact is less frequent in low-income neighbourhoods than in high-income neighbourhoods. In Guangzhou there are all the ingredients for the Hong Kongnese to interact with their neighbours if they can create a sense of community or are welcomed into an already existing community. Both ethnicities are highly collectivist cultures which should enhance potential interaction. The physical barrier is already present, they live in a gated community. They feel welcome in their residential complex, which is an important criterion to spend more time with your neighbours. Finally, most Hong Kongnese live in more upscale residential complexes, which is another indicator that they should be able to interact with their neighbours.

Do the Hong Kongnese feel at home in their apartment? To feel at home in your apartment, it is most likely that you need to feel at home in your city as well as your residential complex. Kaplan’s (2001) study ‘The view from home’ gives us several indicators that are preferred by residents when they want to feel at home. First of all, ‘being able to look at the sky’ only plays a very small role in their satisfaction. Secondly the availability of having one’s own garden would surely have be a positive element to a resident’s satisfaction. ‘The view from windows in these apartment communities generally includes streets, sidewalks, other buildings, parking areas, and fences or walls. It is striking that these built elements played no significant role with respect to the participants’ sense of well-being. The built aspect of the view did affect satisfaction with nature and with the neighbourhood’ (Kaplan, 2001, p. 535). Nature in the view from the window was a strong factor in comfort and residential satisfaction. ‘In popular usage and especially in the urban context, nature is a very inclusive concept’ (Kaplan, 2001, p. 536). With all this being said, do the Hong Kongnese feel at home in their home?
Table 11: Do you feel at home when you step over the doorstep of your apartment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/ a moderate amount</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakly</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A very small part of the respondents (11.4%) did not feel at home in their own apartment. The majority (57.3%) had a strong feeling towards their home. Furthermore, the Hong Kongnese feel welcome in their residential complex, although the number of respondents that answered ‘Don’t know’ is astonishingly high.

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses to the question: Do you feel welcome as Hong Kongnese living in your residential complex?]

**Figure 14: Do you feel welcome as Hong Kongnese living in your residential complex?**

In the first part of the section, it was already made clear that the Hong Kongnese feel at home in Guangzhou, their residential complex, and in their own apartment. Feeling welcome, or at home, in a new environment is essential for interacting with your neighbours. When you feel at home in a new environment, the likelihood that you will eventually interact with your neighbours increases.

Finally, is there a possible association between question 4 (how many years have you lived in Guangzhou) and question 14 (do you feel welcome in your residential complex). Out of the 157 questionnaires, 151 (96.2%) were valid, while 6 (3.8%) were missing (Table 12). By looking at the results, one can see that there is an association between the two questions. As presented by the Pearson chi-square test for survey questions four and fourteen. The chi square score is 23.155 with eight degrees of freedom and has a p value of 0.003. This shows we can reject the null hypothesis.
that there is no relationship between these two variables at the .05 significance level. Thus, the data show that there is some relationship between these two variables.

Table 12: Years living in Guangzhou and do you feel welcome as Hong Kongnese living in your residential complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many years have you been a resident of Guangzhou</th>
<th>Do you feel welcome as a Hong Kongnese living in your residential complex</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>Count, (expected count)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24 (21,9)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Count, (expected count)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10 (9,1)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>Count, (expected count)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26 (19,2)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Count, (expected count)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 (10,1)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>Count, (expected count)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 (8,7)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count, (expected count)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It makes sense that there is a relationship between years of residency and how welcome one feel himself in his residential complex (Hurtig, 1995) Hong Kongnese living longer than ten years in Guangzhou feel very welcome (fourteen vs. one), if someone would not have felt happy in Guangzhou they would have moved. The group between six and ten years though is quite odd, with ten vs. seven. On first sight, this wouldn’t make much sense, future research should focus more on this group. What can be seen in the three groups (<1, 1-2 and 3-5), is that a lot of the respondents responded with ‘don’t know’. This indicates that they haven’t made up their mind yet. There were more people uncertain about the way they felt, than felt welcome in their residential complex.
4.4 How do the Hong Kongnese feel they interact with the Guangzhounese

In the previous two sections, I reached several conclusions. There is a difference in culture between the Hong Kongnese and the Guangzhounese. The Hong Kongnese response to this matter was that there is a difference. In their eyes, however, this has nothing to do with Colonialism. Cross (1988, p. 2 as quoted in Diller, 2011, p. 21) reminds us that people see their living environment in a different way than it is. Secondly, the citations from the interviews clearly indicate that there is a difference between the Hong Kongnese and mainland Chinese culture. Thirdly, the Hong Kongnese feel at home in Guangzhou, their residential complex, and their homes. On average, only 14% did not feel at home.

In this section I will analyse the interaction between the Hong Kongnese and the Guangzhounese. The previous section gave us a clear idea that the Hong Kongnese feel at home in Guangzhou, which is some indication that they have a sense of belonging. Feeling at home in a new environment will lead to an increase in potential interaction. The following questions from the survey will help me to analyse this section:

- 7) If you have a personal relationship with your neighbours, how often do you interact with them?
- 8) Where does this interaction take place?
- 16) Do you feel more comfortable when interacting with Hong Kongnese than with mainland Chinese?
- 17) Do you feel more comfortable when interacting with foreigners than with mainland Chinese?

This sub-question can be answered quite simple by just analysing question 16 (Table 13). The results speak for themselves. 47% does agree with the statement while another 16% agrees sometimes. 37% disagrees with the statement.

Almost 50% of the sample feel more comfortable when interacting with ‘one of their own’ than with a local. This is perhaps surprising for a group of people who speak the same language (Cantonese and Chinese) and are all inhabitants of the People’s Republic of China. If we compare this to the results from the interaction with a ‘foreigner’, what are we able to see? The ‘yes’ part drops significantly from 47% to 29%; however, we see a tremendous increase in the ‘sometimes’ response, from 16% to 32%.
Table 13: Interaction between Hong Kongnese and mainland Chinese and the interaction between Hong Kongnese and foreigners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hong Kongnese vs Mainland Chinese</th>
<th>Hong Kongnese vs Foreigner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have established that Hong Kongnese prefer to interact with other Hong Kongnese instead of mainland Chinese. In Section 4.2, I already concluded that culture is a very important issue in regards to possible interaction. Interaction between two different cultures can be troublesome, as neither party necessarily understands the other culture particularly well. Table 14 analyses the interaction between the Hong Kongnese, foreigners, and mainland Chinese.

Table 14: Results of Chi-square test of independence between question 16 and 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do you feel more comfortable when interacting with foreigner than mainland Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33 (21,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7 (16,5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5 (7,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By looking at the above results one can see that, assuming a random sample, there is an association between the two questions. As presented by the Pearson chi-square independence test for survey questions 16 and 17. The chi square score is 28.023, with six degrees of freedom and has a p value of 0.000. This shows we can reject the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between

---

2 The sample which I provided is rather small, however, in my analysis I made the assumption that my sample was large enough. The way that the respondents were collected will be the norm to collect this data, thus I can conclude that the data is not bias.
these two variables at the .05 significance level. Thus, the data show that there is some relationship between these two variables.

Age is also an important factor in regards to interaction. Older people are more likely to have a direct relationship with China (family living there), while, for the youngest generation, this is much less likely. Table 15 and Table 16 identify interactions between the different age groups, as well as their nationality.

Table 15: How does age affect the interaction between Hong Kongese and mainland Chinese?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Do you feel more comfortable when interacting with Hong Kongese than mainland Chinese</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>Count (expected count)</td>
<td>17 (17)</td>
<td>10 (10,3)</td>
<td>9 (5,7)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-45</td>
<td>Count (expected count)</td>
<td>39 (33,9)</td>
<td>21 (21,6)</td>
<td>12 (11,5)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Count (expected count)</td>
<td>16 (19,3)</td>
<td>22 (15,1)</td>
<td>3 (6,5)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;66</td>
<td>Count (expected count)</td>
<td>2 (3,8)</td>
<td>5 (3,0)</td>
<td>1 (1,3)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count (expected count)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16: How does age affect the interaction between Hong Kongnese and foreigners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Do you feel more comfortable when interacting with Hong Kongnese than foreigners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count (expected count)</td>
<td>11 (10,5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count (expected count)</td>
<td>20 (20,6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count (expected count)</td>
<td>12 (11,6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count (expected count)</td>
<td>2 (2,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count (expected count)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The associations displayed in Table 15 and 16 on are statistically significant. Table 15 has a significance of 0.027, while Table 16 has a significance of 0.051, we therefore, can conclude on this matter that there is an association between age and interaction. Despite that 0.051 is above 0.05, we must not forget that five percent is a completely arbitrary number. Values slightly above 0.05 still indicate that there is a sort of significance. As previously seen in Table 1 (p. 3) there is a relationship between age and how close one feels to mainland China. The lowest tiers in Table 5 (p. 37), below the age of 20, had a closeness of 38.3 with China, and this number increases to 81.1 when one is above the age of 60, which makes perfect sense. How older one is, the greater the affinity with China is. In Table 16, we see exactly the same thing happening. The two youngest groups that were born in Hong Kong clearly have more problems interacting with mainland Chinese than the older generations. Secondly, the younger generations are much more familiar with the internet and the concept of free speech. China has internet censorship (the great firewall), and has no freedom of speech; this is, however not the case in Hong Kong. We should not forget that today’s society is becoming more and more individualistic and is happening at a tremendous pace. Ever since Charlie Chaplin popularized the notion of being a cog in the wheel of the industrial machine in the film A ‘Modern Times’, we have lived with the idea that our everyday routines are hurried, regimented, and

---

3 Since the 1950’s over 100,000 left China each month due to the communist regime which was established in 1966 in Beijing. In over a decade Hong Kong’s population increased from 2 to 3 million.
largely beyond our control. Urbanization and the Taylorization of the workplace led to a feeling of being in a rat race’ (Daly, 2000).

To understand why the Hong Kongnese don’t feel comfortable interaction with the mainland Chinese, we first need to take three aspects into consideration. ‘First, a supply-side perspective stresses that the social context in which people participate influences their networks by shaping the ‘pool’ from which they have to select their contacts. In other words, the choice of one’s social contacts is constrained by the opportunities provided by the social contexts in which one participates. There can be no mating without meeting’ (Verbrugge, 1979 as quoted in Vervoort, 2011, p. 30). Secondly, the willingness of the mainland Chinese to engage in social contact with the Hong Kongnese (Vervoort, 2011, p. 30). A third factor is the influence of third parties. Others can encourage or discourage contact with mainland Chinese. A higher percentage of Hong Kongnese in the neighbourhood is, therefore, thought to result in less social contact with mainland Chinese and other ethnic minority groups, but in more social contact with Hong Kongnese (Vervoort, 2011, p. 31).

If we translate the above information to the current situation, I can conclude the following: As already mentioned, 45% of my surveys were taken from Hong Kongnese who live in the Clifford Estates. The likelihood of Hong Kongnese living in the Clifford Estates interacting with other Hong Kongnese is much higher, which would lead to less interaction with mainland Chinese. Secondly, willingness from the mainland Chinese is present. There are numerous citations where the Hong Kongnese think that mainland Chinese find their culture interesting or better. This could lead to interaction. Finally, as 45% of the surveys were taken at the Clifford Estates, the influence from other Hong Kongnese who live nearby should be taken into consideration. This could explain why the Hong Kongnese feel more comfortable when interacting with other Hong Kongnese than with mainland Chinese.

In which way does all of the above mentioned in this section lead to Hofstede’s framework and how does it affect interaction? If we take a look at Hofstede’s PDI and compare Hong Kong (68) to mainland China (80), we notice a different outcome in the results. China’s society is more unequal than the Hong Kongnese society. A good example of this is the so called Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI, 2011). The difference between Hong Kong and China is gigantic. On a scale of 0 to 10, Hong Kong scores 8,3 (overall 12th), while China scores 3,6 (Overall 75th). One can conclude that the level of corruption is higher in China than Hong Kong. Furthermore, Dong and Togler’s (2001, p.15) empirical research directly links social interaction to having a positive effect on the corruption rate in China. Bourdieu (1986 as quoted in Eijk, 2010, p. 57) informs us that the ‘dominant class maintain their position by excluding others from their networks and thus from their capital’. This fits perfectly in the Corruption perceptions index. A society which is top heavy and where the lower tiers don’t know better or are unable to change the system. What do the Hong Kongnese think of this? Question 18 of
the survey asks: Do you agree that Guangzhou society is more unequal (distribution of power) than the Hong Kongnese society?

**Table 17: Do you agree that Guangzhou society is more unequal (distribution of power) than the Hong Kongnese society**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>5,1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>18,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>13,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15,9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 17 clearly proves, the Hong Kongnese feel that the Guangzhounese society is more unequal than the Hong Kongnese society. George (1973, p. 41) identifies the lack of power in an unequal society with an inferior status and an inability to protect oneself against the discriminating effects of the social, political, economic and legal system of the society. As the Hong Kongnese are a minority in Guangzhou, they are not located at the top of the society, they clearly are limited by the society as a whole. During one of the interviews this problem was mentioned:

> A: For example, we need some good relationship with government or maybe some civil departments, which we Hong Kongnese people may not be good to do compared with the local Chinese here, in Guangzhou. So to speak, we need to get help from Guangzhou local Chinese.

(Personal interview with interviewee 5. August. 2010)

‘The lack of effective resistance against this discrimination results in a perpetuation of the vicious circle between the lack of power and a low status’ (George, 1973, p. 41). Furthermore, ‘highly unequal societies spend heavily for exclusion and repression, prisons, judicial system, and gated communities’ (Goldsmith & Blakely, 2010, p. 22). All of the abovementioned has a negative effect on possible interaction between both ethnicities. If you feel that your mainland Chinese neighbour has more ‘power’ than you, or accepts that some people in a society have more power, it is clear that they will try to avoid contact. If the Hong Kongnese feel that the society is more unequal than their ‘home society’, it would make sense that they would have trouble interaction with their neighbours. If you are used to the concept of freedom and wish discuss this topic your neighbour who has lived his entire life in China, friction could arise. If the mainland Chinese think that China’s society is based upon freedom, interaction will be unsatisfactory and will most likely end in disagreement. This was also mentioned during the interviews.
First example:

Q: So not really a personal relationship between you... no private thing to discuss?
A: No
Q: Why do you think that is?
A: Topic, different topics. Different cultures. Hong Kongese like professional topics. Education level is different, this is why the different topic.

(Personal interview with interviewee 2. August. 2010)

A: Maybe is the... the main thing is, I guess, is, Hong Kong is more westernized than the Chinese in Guangzhou. Of course, if normally, people in Guangzhou, strictly, they do not travel outside of China, even not to Hong Kong, they have a ... So probably restrict their insights at the people outside, or whatever Westerns, they probably won’t be able to understand, what is the other side like.

(Personal interview with Interviewee 6. August. 2010.)

It is common that (social) interaction in a residential complex will be a two-way event or even three-way event. In Weber’s theory of social action (Weber, 1978, p. 31), he suggests that interaction between persons changes when they venture into a relationship in which they feel uncomfortable. Hence, if they feel that the outcome of the interaction is not desirable, they will adjust their statements. In my opinion, this is closely related to the notion of face, as described in Section 4.2. Changing a statement, or acting politically correct, is something which is the way to go in China.

The concept of minorities has already been briefly mentioned in this section. Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan are seen as an outer periphery region in China (Barabantseva, 2011, p. 3). Most mainland Chinese require a visa to visit these regions. As Table 7 in Section 4.2 showed, Hong Kongnese feel they are treated differently than the mainland Chinese; thus, one could say that the Hong Kongnese are a minority. The following citations from the interviews indicate that the Hong Kongnese do feel a minority as if they are a minority:

Q: Inside your complex, do you feel yourself a minority or a majority there? Because you’re from Hong Kong. Do you think you’re a minority?
A: Yes, a little.
Q: Why?
A: Because... maybe we have a different culture. We have a conversation when... different point for the conversation. That makes me to want to have more conversation with the Hong Kongnese, not the Chinese, because they don’t know everything.

(Personal interview with interviewee 1. August. 2010)

A: For example, we need some good relationship with government or maybe some civil departments, which we Hong Kongnese people may not be good to do compared with the local Chinese here, in Guangzhou. So to speak, we need to get help from Guangzhou local Chinese.
Q: So, because you’re a Hong Kongnese, you think you’re a minority?
A: Yes.

(Personal interview with interviewee 5. August. 2010)

If the Hong Kongnese feel that they are a minority, and are thus different to the mainland Chinese, this can potentially lead to seclusion ergo no interaction. Interviewee number five feels that he needs
help to get certain things done, while interviewee number one even feels a minority in his own residential complex. Visible minority groups have less opportunity to interact with locals (Prato, 2009, p. 48). In spite of the Hong Kongese officially being Chinese, they still have a Hong Kongese passport. This passport gives them a certain degree of freedom: they can travel to almost any destination while the mainland Chinese don’t have this option. As previously pointed out in Table 1 the Hong Kongese feel first Hong Kongese and then Chinese (76,6%). The Hong Kongese feel better than their Chinese counterparts and think that the mainland Chinese have a certain image of them, creating a certain identity. The following citations underline the above:

A: Because they expect Hong Kongese more educated, compared to other Chinese. And that’s why they would like to immigrate to Hong Kong.  
(Personal interview with interviewee 9. August. 2010)

A: They know Hong Kongese are gentlemen, more cultivated, they observe the rules, the laws.  
(Personal interview with interviewee 2. August. 2010)

The creation of this identity can be a problem but also an opportunity for possible interaction.

Now that I have established that the Hong Kongese feel like a minority and are more comfortable when interacting with other Hong Kongese than with mainland Chinese, I want to take a look at their interactions with their neighbours. The following question from the survey is being analysed: If you have a personal relationship with your neighbours, how often do you interact with them?

**Table 18: If you have a personal relationship with your neighbours, how often do you interact with them?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>33,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>29,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>19,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a week</td>
<td>14,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>3,85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above results say it all. 62,8% of the respondents interact never or only once a month with their neighbours. If you live in China, in a gated community, this often entails living in a residential tower. As the residents live inside their own home and have no view of the inside of the complex, they can’t see if their neighbours are even at home. Therefore, it will be very hard for them to connect with them in an informal ‘hi-hello, how are you? way. The following citations are from the interviews:

A : Because, maybe, OK. Just OK. Open the door, we say “Hi”, or someday we go to work, we say “Hi”, “Hello”, “Hello”, just.  
(Personal interview with interviewee 4. August. 2010)
Gated communities don’t deliver a vital occurrence of daily face-to-face interaction. Neighbours don’t spend much time together and don’t feel close to each other (Szasz, 2007, p. 84). These communities promote privacy within privacy; residents tend to stay in their own place (Tucker, 1998 as quoted in Szasz, 2007, p. 84). Furthermore, a Dutch survey (1998) on the quality of neighbours contacts concluded: ‘They find that people with direct neighbours of different ethnic origin are less likely to socialize with their neighbours and are more likely to value their contact with neighbours negatively’ (Eijk, 2010, p. 126). Thus by limiting their contact with their neighbours they try to avoid a negative moment in their lives. However, the question remains how having neighbours of a different ethnicity would influence the potential interaction (Eijk, 2010, p. 126). All of the above could make sense why 62.8 percent rarely speak to their neighbours and 33 percent never speak to them.

We have established that the 33% of the recipients don’t talk to their neighbours, so what of the other 67%. Interactions can happen in different places: in the hallway, in your apartment, in their apartment, in public areas of the state or somewhere else. The following Table shows the results where the Hong Kongnese interact with their neighbours.

**Table 19: Where does the interaction take place?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the hallway/elevator</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your place</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In their place</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public areas of the estate</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhere else</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First of all, ‘physical proximity of fellow-residents will only structure interaction when people spend time, at the same time, in and around their dwelling’ (Eijk, 2010, p. 118). Volker and Flap (2007, p. 230) inform us that a synchronization of daily routines, leaving and coming home from work, will increase potential interaction. The most logical answer is ‘in the hallway/elevator’, and it comes out on top. If you only meet once a month/week, the biggest chance of meeting your neighbour would indeed be in these places. Eijk, (2010, p.44) comes to the same conclusion: ‘living next to, above, or opposite each other structures interaction’. Even if you meet on a weekly or daily basis, the most likely place for interaction is the hallway/ elevator. In your apartment scores second which is surprising, to say the least, even more so, you compare this to in their apartment (26% vs. 4%).
significant gap can be explained by the notion of face, as which was previously presented in Section 4.2. When the respondents answered the questions, they instinctively chose their own apartment over their neighbours apartment. One wants to be seen as the host, as in that way you can impress your neighbours with all the possessions you have. Finally, around twenty percent of the Hong Kongnese meet their neighbours in the public areas of the estate. This can mean anywhere on the residential complex.

In the previous sections I made a link between the following of Hofstede’s dimensions, LTO, IDV, PDI and possible interaction. Finally I will take a closer look at UAI and the way it effects interaction. Hong Kong and China have almost identical scores (30 vs 29). For both countries these scores are low. One would expect them to be higher. Since almost fifty percent of the population already live in an urban environment, and with this a large number in gated communities, one should ask oneself: why do people live in gated communities? The main reason why people live in gated communities is that they seek to wall out uncertainty (Lang & Danielsen, 1997, pp. 867-868). First of all, a popular discourse is that people live behind gates because they are afraid of crime; this, however, is clearly not the case. Gating creates a larger sense of uneasiness and thus vulnerability (Blakely & Snyder, 1997). ‘It provides a verbal component that complements, even reinforces, the visual landscape of fear created by the walls, gates, and guards’ (Low, 2003, p. 56).

The Hong Kongnese and mainland Chinese are very comfortable with living in an uncertain situation (Hofstede 1994, 2001). Apparently the above information in regards to gated communities does not affect the UAI, while in other societies it most likely does.

However, Interaction with people outside the gates will diminish and will cause segregation. ‘Many observers have suggested that urban segregation has represented the crystallisation of wider social divisions and problems that are largely negative in their impact’ (Atkinson & Blandy, 2005, p. 179). ‘The importance of socially diverse areas lay in the empathy generated by meeting people of different social backgrounds and experiences’ (Gans, 1968 as quoted in Atkinson & Blandy, 2005, p. 179). ‘However, in China segregation is often seen as a solution to the problem of social diversity in the growing Cities’ (Breitung, 2012, p. 12). The gap between poor and rich is increasing rapidly: ‘In 2005, China’s Gini coefficient was in excess of 0.48 and approaching 0.5, while the internationally recognized standard for intermediate gap between rich and poor is 0,3 to 0,4’ (Hsiao & Yi Lin, 2009, p. 123). Most Hong Kongnese who live in Guangzhou have a white collar job and thus are earning more money than most Chinese. The Hong Kongnese people inside the gate will have less and less interaction with locals who live outside the gates, knowing less and less about what is going on in the city, which will eventually lead to less interaction with their Chinese neighbours. The topics they discuss are, in a lot of cases, already very limited (as presented in the previous sections).
This section demonstrated that the Hong Kongnese feel more comfortable when interacting with Hong Kongnese than with the mainland Chinese. The results also showed us that the Hong Kongnese are equally comfortable interacting with a foreigner or another Hong Kongnese. Thus, a Hong Kongnese is more comfortable interacting with a foreigner than with a mainland Chinese. Age was a big factor in relation to interaction. Older Hong Kongnese are more much more comfortable when interacting with mainland Chinese than with foreigners. For younger Hong Kongnese, this is the other way around, they are more inclined to interact with foreigners than mainland Chinese. There are three possible reasons why the Hong Kongnese are more comfortable interacting with their own than mainland Chinese. A supply side-perspective, the willingness of the mainlanders to interact, and last the influence of other Hong Kongnese. A significant part of the surveys were taken in the Clifford Estates; thus, there is a possibility of interacting with other Hong Kongnese. Hofstede’s PDI in relation to interaction taught us that the distribution of power is unequally divided in Guangzhou. Bourdieu (1986) taught us that the dominant class maintained their position by excluding others from their network; inherently the power is not shared. Lack of power leads to society which does discriminate (George). This leads to a vicious circle, low power means low status. The Hong Kongnese see themselves as a minority in Guangzhou, which could lead to less interaction. 33,3% of the Hong Kongnese never speak to their Chinese neighbours, while 29,5% only spoke to them once a month. These relatively high numbers can be partially explained by the concept of gated communities and how they promote privacy within privacy. Furthermore, a Dutch survey (1998) linked different neighbours ethnicities directly to be negative. By limiting this sort of interaction they try to avoid uncomfortable situations in their lives. The Hong Kongnese who actually interact with their neighbours interact in three areas: the hallway/elevator (35,8%), in your apartment (26%) and in public areas of the estate (21,1%). In these three areas combined, more than 80% of the interaction happens. Finally, Hofstede’s UAI scores for both countries are almost equal and will hardly affect potential interaction. The three previous sections helped us to determine in which way the Hong Kongnese in residential complexes interact with the locals. The following section will give us a partial conclusion of this chapter.
4.6 Partial conclusion

In this section, I took a closer look at the interactions between the Hong Kongnese and the mainland Chinese. Several topics were discussed in relationship to Hofstede’s framework.

Section 4.2 takes a closer look at the cultural differences between the Hong Kongnese and the mainland Chinese. Culture is an important part of this section. The Hong Kongnese did not feel that their British heritage enriched their cultures. However, ‘Each individual begins life with a singular experience of culture that is taken for reality itself’ (Diller, 2011, p. 20), which means that they take their Hong Kong heritage for granted and, therefore, have no frame of reference. The citations from the interviewees agreed with this. They kept mentioning ‘culture’ as why they think that both societies are different. Three out of Five of Hofstede’s notions from LTO and STO were seen as more Hong Kongnese than mainland Chinese. Respectively, these were, perseverance, fulfilling social obligations and protecting one’s face. Thrift was seen as a Chinese notion, while respect for tradition is a tie.

Section 4.3 informs us about the Hong Kongnese sense of belonging. The Hong Kongnese feel at home in Guangzhou, their residential complex and their homes. Hofstede’s IDV dimension is portrayed in several ways. When the mainland Chinese and Hong Kongnese feel part of a group, they are very cooperative towards the common cause. However, they are hostile towards people outside of the group. Volker and Flap (2007) make several arguments that time spend in the neighbourhood will lead to more interaction amongst neighbours. However, both neighbours have to be present to actually make a connection. Furthermore, as most Hong Kongnese live in upscale residential complexes I can conclude according to Fisher (1982, p.100) that potential interaction is higher.

Section 4.4 tells us more about the interaction between the Hong Kongnese and mainland Chinese. The Hong Kongnese feel more comfortable interacting with a foreigner than with a mainland Chinese. While they would much rather interact with another Hong Kongnese than a Chinese, they would equally interact with a Hong Kongnese or another foreigner. Age, however, plays a big role in this interaction. Overall, the younger generations (under 45) has fewer problems interacting with foreigners than the older generations. The older generations have fewer problems interacting with the mainland Chinese and more with foreigners. Hofstede’s third notion refers to PDI. The Chinese society is more unequal than the Hong Kongnese society. Corruption can lead to different classes of people and it will be difficult for outsiders to fully understand this. Furthermore, the lack of power is closely linked discrimination and having a lower status in society. Interaction in general doesn’t occur very often. The Hong Kongnese feel like a minority. Problems in interaction can arise if they are seen as a minority as a Dutch survey (1998) learned us
Thirty-three percent never interact with their neighbours, while thirty percent only interacts once a month. The main problem for this is the limited possibility for interaction between neighbours. Gated communities are not built for optimal interaction. However, if neighbours interact, this mainly occurs in three places: the hallway/elevator, in their own apartment or in the public areas of the estate. There is a big difference between interaction in your own apartment or your neighbour’s apartment. This can be explained by the notion of face, which is presented in Section 4.2. Furthermore, being in psychical proximity of your neighbours and having the same routine (work) as your neighbours will increase interaction (Eijk, 2010; Volker and Flap, 2007). Finally, Hofstede’s UAI does hardly matter in this case. The results for both countries are almost equal (30 vs 29). Both societies can handle uncertain situations very well. It is interesting though that with a urban population of almost fifty percent, most urban people live in a type of gated community. The irony is that gated communities try to wall out, uncertainty. In the next chapter, I present my final conclusions and recommendations.
5. Conclusions

5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapters, I worked in several steps towards the final result of this research, answering the research question: ‘In what way do Hong Kongese in residential complexes, in Guangzhou, interact with locals in their everyday life?’ This chapter will introduce the final results towards answering this question, and will be divided between a conclusion (Section 5.2) and recommendations (Section 5.3).

5.2.1 Summary

This section will help us to gain a better insight on this entire paper. First, this section will refresh our memories on the theoretical framework as well as the data which was collected in Guangzhou. By summarising the previous chapters, it will be easier to understand the final conclusions. Secondly, I will translate the presented data towards a final conclusion.

In this research I started by explaining the interactions between different cultures and how the situation for the Hong Kongese was after they were a colony of the British Empire. By moving to another city, they would experience a new society, which would lead to a flux of social dimensions. This is, thus, movement of people, identity and culture. Two of the most influential scholars in this field were Geert Hofstede and Shalom Schwartz. Hofstede’s and Schwartz’s work focuses on different cultural dimensions. Hofstede argues that his work can only be seen in context with history. It is this history which distinguishes the Hong Kongese from the Guangzhounese. The British occupation is the reason behind this. Although Hong Kong has a history before 1841, when it was handed over to the British, all the relevant parts that have shaped Hong Kong in present time can be dated back to colonialism (Abbas, 2002). ‘Another point to note is that while 98 percent of the population is ethnic Chinese, history (both colonial history and history of the mainland) has seen to it that the Hong Kong Chinese are now culturally and politically quite distinct from mainlanders’ (Abbas, 2002, p. 2).

Schwartz’s his work focuses on seven different values, while Hofstede framework has five notions. There are several differences between both concepts. First Hofstede derived his framework empirically, while Schwartz’s framework is derived theoretically. Hofstede’s data was collected in twenty-three countries while Schwartz’s data was collected in thirty-eight countries. Table x shows the notions which both researchers have in common and on which they disagree.

Hofstede’s framework is based on five notions, of which I use four; these are power distance index (PDI), individualism (IDV), uncertainty avoidance index (UAI), and long term orientation (LTO).
PDI relates to the extent to which less powerful members of a society accept and expect power to be distributed unequally. IDV relates to the degree how individuals are integrated into a group. UAI relates to a society’s tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity. LTO relates to issues that deal with virtue regardless of the truth. Several limitations were pointed out. Firstly, Hofstede’s dimensions are based upon the idea of national culture, while over the last decade several scholars made a case for globalisation and glocalisation. Secondly, gated communities are abundant in Chinese society. In general, gated communities decrease interaction with neighbours and the neighbourhood. Furthermore, this can create social segregation (Le Goix, 2005; Vesselinov, 2008).

In chapter three, I handed out some basic information from the survey. Sixty percent of the researched population was male, while forty percent was female. Forty percent of the population was between twenty-five and forty-five. Furthermore, the questions of length of Guangzhou residency, and their reason for living there have been answered.

5.2.2 Conclusion

In chapter four, the results were introduced to the reader. It is these results which will lead to a conclusion. Section 4.2 tried to answer the first sub question: Do the Hong Kongese feel that there is a cultural difference when they compare themselves and the Guangzhounese. Over the course of the transfer of sovereignty from Hong Kong to China, the number of emigrants to Guangdong province has increased with a tremendous pace. Approximately 360,000 Hong Kongese have chosen to work in this area. The Hong Kongese do not think that Guangzhou missed out by not being occupied by a European colonizer. However, several citations from the interviews indicate that the Hong Kongese see Hong Kong as being different from the mainland. Hofstede (2001) learned us that culture is subconscious acquired, Diller (2011) agrees with this. The words ‘different culture’ are named on several occasions. As Abbas (2002) already pointed out, Hong Kong cannot be seen without its English heritage. Secondly, the Hong Kongese feel that they are treated in a different way than the Hong Kongese (Table 7). The interviews back this statement up. Hofstede’s notions on LTO and STO are mainly contributed to be a Hong Kong issue and not an Guangzhou issue. Three out of five notions are Hong Kongese (respect for tradition was a tie). The remainder of Section 4.2 informs us why these other three virtues are being attributed to the Hong Kongese instead of the Guangzhounese.

In which way do the above issues relate to the main question. Firstly, interaction between two different groups of people can be troublesome. In my opinion, the British heritage has played a key issue in this matter. It is this heritage which causes these problems in interacting. The Hong Kongese refer to this as ‘another culture, not our society; Hong Kong is more professional; Hong
Kongnese are more educated,’ and so forth. If the Hong Kongnese feel that they are being treated different by the indigenous population, this will harm the potential interaction. Furthermore, Hofstede’s LTO dimension was explained in a detailed matter. The table below shows the results.

**Table 20: Out of the following statements, which would you say are more alike for Hong Kong and which are more alike for Guangzhou**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTO Dimension</th>
<th>Which country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thrift (saving money)</td>
<td>Mainland China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for tradition</td>
<td>Tie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilling social obligations</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting one’s face</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do these five notions attribute to potential interaction? Firstly, thrift is attributed to being a mainland China issue. Data shows that the mainland Chinese like to save money. The average GDP of Hong Kong is more than sevenfold that of China. Yao (2011) informs us that the mainland Chinese like to save money for precautionary reasons. Savoley (1991) directly links different spending patterns to be a problem for social interaction. Envy is associated with hostile orientation towards the envied person. Secondly, perseverance is attributed to the Hong Kongnese. Robert Half (2011) confirms that the Hong Kongnese work longer hours than any other Asian country. This is a problem for potential interaction. According to Volker and Flap (2007, p. 230), if a person is not at home he cannot interact with his neighbours. Eijk (2010, p. 166) agrees with this; interaction is structured by everyday encounters. Thus, the perseverance factor of the Hong Kongnese will lead to interaction problems. Thirdly, respect for tradition was a tie and thus, it cannot effect interaction. Next is fulfilling social obligations. The Hong Kongnese think that this is more Hong Kongnese than mainland Chinese. Interaction can be inhibited if we take this notion into consideration. The Hong Kongnese visit their family more often as they are geographically closer to their family than most of the mainland Chinese. Thus, they are home less and at their families place more. Volker and flap (2007) directly link the concept of being at home towards building relationships with your neighbours or neighbourhood. Furthermore, by spending time with their parents, the Hong Kongnese create a certain image. If they are away during the weekends and holidays, the Chinese neighbours can feel upset about this. This is a direct link to envy as presented in the notion of thrift as well as the last notion, protecting one’s face. The last notion is one of the most important concepts in Chinese and Hong Kongnese society. However, the Hong Kongnese feel that it is more Hong Kongnese than Chinese. 'In China, a gift must be expensive. It's not just the price for the price's sake. It's more like
the costlier it is, the more respect you show someone’ (Monfret, 2011). One of the worst things that could happen is that they lose face and they try to avoid this at all cost. In retrospect to fulfilling social obligations, they do not want to end up in situations where they feel uncomfortable and potentially lose face, in other words, they do not want to feel inferior to their neighbours. Savoley (1991, p. 248) confirms that jealousy can affect the social interaction in a variety of ways. Furthermore, Eijk (2010, p.54) agrees with this: ‘an idea of what is “appropriate” behaviour given the setting and the network in which people are embedded, always plays a role and structures the formation of the relationship’. One can conclude that the interaction from a LTO dimension perspective is problematic to say the least. The four notions all create friction between Hong Kongnese and mainland Chinese.

Section 4.3 answered the following sub question: Do the Hong Kongnese feel at home in their homes. This section took a closer look on the sense of belonging. This sense of belonging was introduced in three different categories: Do you feel at home in Guangzhou, in your residential complex and your own home. Firstly, the Hong Kongnese felt at home in Guangzhou. Only 16,5 percent of the respondents felt weakly about their relation to the city. Secondly, only 11,2 percent had a weakly relation when being confronted if they felt at home in their residential complex. Finally, 11,9 percent did not feel at home in their own homes. In which way do the above results affect the main research question.

Hofstede informs us that both Hong Kong and China are highly collectivist cultures, where people act in the interest of the common good and not themselves (IDV). In China and Hong Kong, people from inside your own group are treated in a friendly manner, while outsiders are treated in a hostile manner. Thus, both ethnicities prefer a sense of belonging. As the Hong Kongnese and mainland Chinese live in gated communities, and these have a physical border, there is ‘space’ which should give them a sense of belonging to their gated community. The results from the questionnaire present us with the fact that the Hong Kongnese feel at home in their gated community, thus creating a sense of belonging. Furthermore, as Volker and Flap (2007) have concluded, ‘all conditions that cause people to spend more time in the area where they live will facilitate contacts among neighbours’. Both ethnicities will benefit from spending time together in their gated community. Secondly, Volker and Flap (2007, p. 60) also concluded that time spent in the vicinity of your home increases the likelihood that you meet your neighbours. As the Hong Kongnese are happy living in their gated communities and their homes, the chances of them interacting with their neighbours increase. Fisher (1982, p. 100) came to the conclusion that there is a stronger sense of community in high-income neighbourhoods. As the Hong Kongnese in general live in more upscale complexes, the likelihood that they will interact with their neighbours will further increase.
The question ‘Do you feel welcome as Hong Kongese living in your residential complex’ was answered in a curious way. While sixty-one respondents answered yes and twenty-six answered no, an astonishing seventy respondents had no idea if they felt welcome in their complex. A Pearson chi-square test was used to determine whether this could be related to years of residency in the gated community. Fifty percent of the respondents who had lived for less than one year in their residential complex answered ‘don’t know’. Which makes sense according to Hurtig (1995). Years of residency is closely related to how welcome one feels himself. However, the group who had lived three to five years in their residential complex had the same problem. Sixty-two percent of this group were not sure if they were welcome in their residential complex. Of the respondents who had lived for longer than six years in their residential complex, approximately twenty percent did not feel at home. This research did not find an answer to why this is.

Section 4.4 answered the question: How do the Hong Kongese feel they interact with the Guangzhounese. Several interesting results were published in this section. Hong Kongese prefer to interact with other Hong Kongese rather than mainland Chinese; however, there was no difference, percentage wise, if they had the choice whether they wanted to interact with Hong Kongese or foreigners. Three solutions were given why the Hong Kongese are more comfortable interacting with other Hong Kongese than mainland Chinese. Firstly, ‘a supply-side perspective stresses that the social context in which people participate influences their networks by shaping the ‘pool’ from which they have to select their contacts. In other words, the choice of one’s social contacts is constrained by the opportunities provided by the social contexts in which one participates. There can be no mating without meeting’ (Verbrugge, 1979 as quoted in Vervoort, 2011, p. 30). Secondly, the willingness of the mainland Chinese to engage in social contact with the Hong Kongese (Vervoort, 2011, p. 30). A third factor is the influence of third parties. Others can encourage or discourage contact with mainland Chinese. A higher percentage of Hong Kongese in the neighbourhood is, therefore, thought to result in less social contact with mainland Chinese and other ethnic minority groups, but in more social contact with Hong Kongese (Vervoort, 2011, p. 31). Furthermore, Hofstede’s PDI was introduced as being an obstacle towards interaction. The Chinese society is more unequal than the Hong Kongese society. Because of this, the dominant culture tries to maintain its position by excluding others from their network (Bourdieu 1986, as quoted in Eijk, 2010, p. 57). The results from the survey where one sided. 62.4 percent of the respondents agreed that the Guangzhounese society was more unequal than the Hong Kongese society. ‘The lack of effective resistance against this discrimination results in a perpetuation of the vicious circle between the lack of power and a low status’ (George, 1973, p. 41). This leads to potential problems in interaction.

As already presented forty-five percent of the surveys were conducted at the Clifford Estates, a gated community, where the opportunity to interact with other Hong Kongese is much higher.
than in other gated communities, in Guangzhou. The Hong Kongnese feel that they are a minority in Guangzhou as the citations from the interviews clearly indicate. The last part of Section 4.3 presented how often the Hong Kongnese interact with their neighbours, and where this interaction takes place. 62.8 percent of the Hong Kongnese interact only once a month with their neighbours. This number can be explained by the concept of a gated community. If you live in China, in a gated community, this often entails living in a residential tower. As the residents live inside their own home and have no view of the inside of the complex, they can’t see if their neighbours are even at home. Therefore, it will be very hard for them to connect with their neighbours in an informal ‘hi-hello, how are you?’ way. Furthermore, a Dutch survey from 1998 directly linked the likelihood of interaction between different ethnicities to be less likely, and even value interactions with their neighbours as being negative (Eijk, 2010, p. 126). Thus, by not having contact with your neighbours, they avoid a potential negative experience in their lives. Secondly, most of the interaction takes place in the hallway/elevator (35.8%), which is the most logical location for interaction. The remainder was accounted for by 26% in a respondents own apartment, and 21.1% in other public areas of the estate. We must not forget that even physical proximity of residents does not mean that they will actually spend time together. They must be in the right place at the right time (Eijk, 2010, p. 118). Eijk (2010, p. 44) reaches the conclusion that living next to, above, or opposite each other gives interaction a better structure.

Finally, Hofstede’s dimension of UAI was analysed to see if this would cause problems for potential interaction. As the scores of both countries are almost the same (30 vs 29) I came to the conclusion that this is not the case.
Overall I can conclude the following: There is hardly any interaction between the Hong Kongnese and the mainland Chinese. 62.8 percent of respondents interact only on a once a month basis with their Chinese neighbours. Despite that, the Hong Kongnese feel very comfortable living in Guangzhou, their residential complex and their own homes. There are several reasons why this is the case.

Firstly, Hofstede’s LTO dimension and the notions attached to it form a problem for interaction. Only one out of five notions was seen as something which is the norm in both countries, leaving four potential reasons why there is this limited amount of interaction. If the Hong Kongnese are not in their homes (work, family), they cannot interact with their neighbours. Furthermore, different spending patterns lead to problems in social interaction. As both Hong Kong and China are societies which is based upon ‘face’, they do not want to lose this. To avoid losing face they will stay away from certain social interactions that will put them in awkward situations.

Secondly, Hofstede’s IDV dimension has the potential to be very valuable to increase interaction between both groups. As both ethnicities are highly collective, their thinking pattern is based upon the common good. Thus, if they have a space where they can feel and act like a group, interaction will increase. Time spent, in the area where they live will increase interaction between neighbours (Volker and Flap, 2007, p. 60). Fisher (1982, p.100) reached the conclusion that there is more interaction amongst neighbours in high-income neighbourhoods. As most of the Hong Kongnese live in these neighbourhoods, this should increase interaction.

Next we consider Hofstede’s PDI dimension. The Chinese society is more unequal than the Hong Kongnese, thus the dominant culture tries to exclude others from its network. This could be seen in the results of the question on how they interact with the Guangzhounese. A majority of the Hong Kongnese preferred to interact with other Hong Kongnese instead of mainland Chinese. This is of course never beneficial for interaction. Three reasons where presented why there was more interaction among their own than among both ethnicities: a supply side perspective, which cannot be the problem as they live in China; the willingness of the Chinese to mingle; and the influence of third parties. If you live in the Clifford Estates there are relatively large numbers of other Hong Kongnese, thus there is less need to interact with locals.

Finally, Hofstede’s last dimension, UAI, was not seen as something that could cause problems for potential interaction. The scores for both countries are almost identical.

I think that the biggest problem in this is the concept of gated communities. As most of the Hong Kongnese live in a residential tower, they are less likely to interact with their neighbours than if they lived in a normal house. Eijk (2010) and Volker and Flap (2007) both notice that interaction amongst neighbours is highly based upon the same daily schedule and or routines. As one cannot see when their neighbours leave or enter their apartment interaction is going to hard. The Hong Kongnese do not see when their neighbours are in their apartment or are outside. Another reason
why they hardly interact is the differences in culture. In almost all the interviews, the Hong Kongnese identified themselves as having a different culture than the mainland Chinese. This can be attributed to the British colonization of Hong Kong. A culture that the mainland Chinese think is better; at least that is what the Hong Kongnese think. This ‘better’ is revealed in several notions, such as better culture, better education, more international exposure, more civilised etc. It was interesting to conclude that the younger Hong Kongnese felt more comfortable interacting with other Hong Kongnese and foreigners than the older Hong Kongnese who had more trouble interacting with foreigners, and less with mainland Chinese.

Reflection on this research:

When taking a closer look at this research, I have to identify several points which need critical reflection. There are several issues that were not taken into account and it is important to understand what these points are, exactly. In this section I will take a closer look at these issues.

First, I only researched the Hong Kongnese population and decided to completely ignore the Chinese population, thus leaving me with a one-sided perspective. Although I cannot say it with certainty, as I have not researched it, I think that the outcome of some of the questions from the questionnaire, when being addressed to the mainland Chinese, would have come out exactly the same way (i.e. losing face, respect for tradition and in they feel at home in Guangzhou, their complex and their homes). If I had interviewed and given out questionnaires to mainland Chinese who live next door to Hong Kongnese I would have gotten more conclusive results on several issues. I could have made conclusions upon a two-sided information stream, instead of just the Hong Kongnese view of the matter.

Secondly, forty-five percent of the questionnaires were taken at a residential complex named the Clifford Estates. As the location of this complex is in south Guangzhou and has a very good connection (train, bus, and car) with Hong Kong the number of Hong Kongnese residents who live in this complex is above average. As Vervoort (2011, p.30) informed us, a high percentage of Hong Kongnese in close proximity living together will decrease the interaction with non Hong Kongnese. If the questionnaires had been distributed more geographically the outcome of the research could have potentially been different.

Thirdly, it was very hard to find Hong Kongnese outside of the Clifford Estates. It was very time consuming work and could definitely have been much more effective. If one is able to get data where Hong Kongnese live in Guangzhou, one is able to have a much more representative sample in a much shorter time span. Furthermore, being able to speak the local language (Mandarin or
Cantonese) is highly advisable. The interviews would definitely have more depth to them as not every Hong Kongnese is as fluent in English as they are in their mother tongue.

5.3 Recommendations:

For further research, it would be important to focus on the following issues: Firstly, it would be interesting to see whether the distance between the Hong Kongnese and mainland Chinese will remain the same. Table 5 (p. 39) already indicates that the Hong Kongnese experience a slight increase towards their feelings for China. Below the age of twenty, this was 38.3 percent, while the age group 21-30 was at 34 percent. One could say that the differences between Hong Kong and mainland China are very slowly beginning to diminish. The Hong Kongnese will feel more Chinese over the coming decades. It would be interesting to see how this will play out, when looking at the interaction from the Hong Kongnese with the mainland Chinese. In the future, one should probably see an increase in interaction between the two groups. It will be hard to determine, with how much it will increase. The problem lays with the gated community in general. Gated communities do not encourage interaction, and with all the probable technological advancements in the future, I cannot see this getting any better on that issue.

Secondly, one could do research for Hong Kongnese who live in the Clifford Estates and for Hong Kongnese who do not live in the Clifford Estates. The results should vary to some degree from the above results, due to the reasons as presented in Section 4.4. From conducting this research, one can see if location of the gated community, and, thus, opportunity to interact with other Hong Kongnese, affects whether or not Hong Kongnese who don’t live on Clifford Estates interact more with mainland Chinese.

Finally, another angle that needs further investigation is in which way the mainland Chinese see the Hong Kongnese. The Hong Kongnese think that the mainland Chinese perceive them in a certain way. Is this actually the case? For example, if the mainland Chinese do not see Hong Kong as a better place, while the Hong Kongnese think that the mainland Chinese see it as a better place, this will clearly have implications for further research.
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Appendix

Sun Yat Sen University, Guangzhou, China.

Please take some time (approximately 5 minutes) to complete this questionnaire. Your responses will provide important information that will help me finish my research.

What is this survey about:

The survey tries to get a better understanding of the interacting of Hong Kong people in residential complexes in Guangzhou with locals in their everyday social relationships.

You do not have to complete this survey if you do not wish to do so. However, everyone’s views are important and the more participation I receive, the better the results will be. Please understand that this questionnaire is completely confidential.

1 Gender

❑ Male    ❑ Female

2 Age

❑ <25    ❑ 25-45    ❑ 46-65    ❑ 66>

3 Are you

❑ Hong Kong resident    ❑ Mainland China    ❑ Other Chinese    ❑ Foreigner

4 How many years have you been a resident of Guangzhou?

❑ <1    ❑ 1-2    ❑ 3-5    ❑ 6-10    ❑ 10>

5 I live in Guangzhou because:

❑ Work    ❑ Retired    ❑ Holiday/weekend get away    ❑ My partner works here    ❑ Other

6 Which background do your neighbors (the apartments which border your apartment) have?

❑ Hong Kong resident    ❑ Mainland Chinese    ❑ Overseas Chinese    ❑ Foreigner

7 If you have a personal relationship with your neighbors, how often do you interact with them?

❑ Never    ❑ Once a month    ❑ Once a week    ❑ Several times a week    ❑ Daily

8 Where does this interaction take place?

❑ In the hall way/ elevator    ❑ In your place    ❑ In their place    ❑ Public areas of the estate    ❑ Somewhere else
9  How long do these conversations last (on average)?

- <1 min
- <1-5min
- 5-15min
- 15+ min

10 Do you feel at home when you step over the doorstep of your apartment?

- Very strongly
- Strong
- Somewhat/ a moderate amount
- Weakly
- Not at all

11 Do you feel at home when you enter your residential complex?

- Very strongly
- Strong
- Somewhat/ a moderate amount
- Weakly
- Not at all

12 Do you feel at home when you enter Guangzhou?

- Very strongly
- Strong
- Somewhat/ a moderate amount
- Weakly
- Not at all

13 Upon what level do you agree with the following statements:

Hong Kongese are more punctual when they have an appointment then mainland Chinese.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Disagree a little
- Agree a little
- Agree
- Strongly agree

By not being occupied by a formal European colonizer Guangzhou missed out on enriching their culture (culture should be seen in the general sense of the word).

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Disagree a little
- Agree a little
- Agree
- Strongly agree

14 Do you feel welcome as a Hong Kongese living in your residential complex?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

15 Do you think that the mainland Chinese treat you in different way then that they treat each other?

- Yes
- No

16 Do you feel more comfortable when interacting with Hong Kongese then with mainland Chinese?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
17  Do you feel more comfortable when interacting with foreigners then with mainland Chinese?

❑ Yes  ❑ No  ❑ Sometimes  ❑ Don't know

18  Do you agree that Guangzhou society is more unequal (distribution of power) then the Hong Kongnese society.

❑ Strongly disagree  ❑ Disagree  ❑ Disagree a little  
❑ Agree a little  ❑ Agree  ❑ Strongly agree

19  Do you agree that there are more laws which you need to follow in Guangzhou then there are in Hong Kong.

❑ Yes  ❑ No  ❑ Don't know

20  Out of the following statements which would you say are more alike for Hong Kong and which are more alike for Guangzhou.

Spending money  ❑ Guangzhou  ❑ Hong Kong
Perseverance (hard work, commitment, patience)  ❑ Guangzhou  ❑ Hong Kong
Respect for tradition  ❑ Guangzhou  ❑ Hong Kong
Fulfilling social obligations  ❑ Guangzhou  ❑ Hong Kong
Protecting one's face.  ❑ Guangzhou  ❑ Hong Kong