2015

Birds of a Feather: A Case Study of Friendship Networks of Mainland Chinese College Students in Hong Kong

Danching Ruan
Hong Kong Baptist University, druan@hkbu.edu.hk

Shu Zhu
Hong Kong Baptist University

Birds of a Feather: A Case Study of Friendship Networks of Mainland Chinese College Students in Hong Kong

(*American Behavioral Scientist*)

Danching Ruan[1]
Shu Zhu[2]

Updated on November 2014

[1] Corresponding author; Sociology Department, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong; druan@hkbu.edu.hk
[2] Sociology Department, Hong Kong Baptist University.

Abstract

We examine the formation process of friendship networks of Mainland Chinese undergraduates in Hong Kong. The data comes from a 2011 survey of Mainland undergraduates at a university in Hong Kong and from in-depth interviews with students. We found a strong in-group pattern in the friendship networks of these students. Over 60% do not have good local friends. On a campus where nearly 90% of the students are locals, on average, only 18% of the good friends named by Mainland students are locals. We find that cultural differences—such as the language barrier, differences in values and ideologies, and differences in academic orientation and future plan—discourage formation of intergroup friendship. But intergroup contacts, as indicated by participation in local organizations, have positive effects on intergroup friendship formation. Both contact opportunities and their timing (i.e., when they become available) are important. During their first year, Mainland students have many more opportunities to interact with other Mainlanders than with local students. This may also be an important factor accounting for the strong in-group pattern in Mainland students' friendship networks.

Key Words: Social Networks, Friendship formation, Homophily, Mainland Chinese students, Hong Kong

People tend to associate with people who are like themselves. This tendency, termed "homophily," has been studied by numerous scholars (McPherson et al., 2001). Understanding how patterns of social homophily arise in society is important because it enables us to understand human societies and human behavior better. It also has policy implications, such as promoting social integration among different social groups.

The participants in this study are Mainland Chinese undergraduates in Hong Kong. Since 2005, there has been a major increase in the number of Mainland undergraduate students in Hong Kong universities. Today, they account for more than 10% of the university undergraduate population in Hong Kong. In this study, we examine the degree of intergroup association between Mainland students and local Hong Kong students, and we explore the factors that may explain the friendship pattern of Mainland students in Hong Kong.

Explaining network homophily

There are two general mechanisms by which homophily arises: opportunity structure and individual preferences. McPherson and Smith-Lovin (1987) call them "induced homophily" and "choice homophily."

Wimmer and Lewis (2010) distinguish two effects under induced homophily: the availability effect and the propinquity effect. The availability effect is about the effect of opportunity structure, which is determined by the characteristics of the general population.

The contact opportunity structure is also affected by the social structures below the population level, such as neighborhood, workplace, or school settings (e.g., Feld, 1981), and this is called the "propinquity effect." That is to say, people are more likely to develop a tie when they regularly engage in joint activities and come in contact with one another. For example,

research show that students taking courses together are much more likely to form ties with one another (Frank et al., 2013), and that students' cross-race friendships are significantly influenced by the race of their roommate and by the degree of interracial contact in residence halls (Stearns et al., 2009). Integrated extracurricular activities in schools also lead to more intergroup friendships among students (Moody, 2001).

But it is not just a simple matter of opportunities for contacts. According to contact theory (Allport, 1954), three conditions need to be present in order for intergroup contacts to have a positive impact on the formation of intergroup relationships. First, people of different social groups need to interact on equal status. Second, they should have the chance to work together to achieve goals that cannot be achieved independently. Third, there needs to be explicit institutional support for intergroup relationships.

The reasons for choice homophily in social association seem quite intuitive. First of all, communication among similar people is more convenient than among dissimilar people. Language is an obvious example here. Shared life experiences and shared knowledge about a particular culture also make it easier for people to understand each other (Carley, 1991). Furthermore, it makes communication more enjoyable. Shared attitudes, beliefs, and values also facilitate more intimate exchanges of feelings and ideas (Sullivan, 1953). Thus, people who are similar in social traits are more likely to interact with one another and are more likely to form ties with one another. Social differences between social groups, on the other hand, are often viewed negatively. That is, people of one social group may have negative perceptions about people of another social group. Smith and colleagues (2014) call the extent of these negative perceptions between two social groups "affective social distance." This is another major reason for people preferring to form in-group ties to out-group ties.

In addition to the homophily tendency, the balancing tendency also contributes to the formation of homophilic networks. Wimmer and Lewis (2010) consider this the fourth homophily-producing mechanism. According to balance theory, people have a psychological tendency to befriend the friends of their friends; otherwise, people will feel tension and stress (Heider, 1946; Davis, 1963). As Kossinets and Watts (2009) show in their study of college students in the US, even a weak preference for a similar other in the beginning leads to a network with a high degree of homophily. In his study of middle and high school students in the US, Moody (2001) also found that social balance is a significant factor accounting for same-race friendship ties. In sum, the homophily pattern of social associations is the result of the dynamic interplay of these mechanisms: the availability effect, the propinquity effect, the homophily tendency, and the social balance tendency.

Research Context

Hong Kong and the Mainland have had a long history as one country. About 95% of the 7 million Hong Kong residents are ethnic Chinese. Most of them are either descendants of immigrants from China or born in China. Hong Kong culture began with the traditional Chinese culture as the foundation. Many Chinese traditions and practices are maintained in Hong Kong today.

But, there are many differences between the two societies. Hong Kong and Mainland China have different political environments. The economic systems of the two societies are also different. Hong Kong has had a capitalist economy for many years and is considered one of the most open and free economies in the world. The Mainland began to open up economically only in 1978, and its economy is still in transition to a true market system.

There are major cultural differences between the two societies. Hong Kong is a part of the regional culture of Guangdong. For example, Cantonese is the native language for people in Guangdong Province and in Hong Kong. Most Chinese outside the Guangdong region do not understand Cantonese. Popular culture in Hong Kong (e.g., movies or music) is also quite distinct from Mainland popular culture.

People in Hong Kong and people in the Mainland tend to have different ways of thinking. For example, people in Hong Kong are accustomed to the ideas of human rights and democracy; people in the Mainland are much more nationalist than people in Hong Kong (Cheung and Kwok, 1998). There are also different ways of behaving in daily life. People in Hong Kong tend to consider themselves more westernized and thus more civilized than Mainlanders, and many identify as "Hongkongese" to distinguish themselves from those living in the Mainland (Lau and Kuan, 1988).

The affective distance between the two groups can be very small sometimes. Hong Kong people take pride in Chinese culture and history. They take pride in China's achievements and support territorial unity. When natural disasters happen in China, Hong Kong people donate millions of dollars to help the victims (Chan and Chan, 2014).

But sometimes this affective distance can be quite big. Many Hong Kong people hold negative attitudes towards new immigrants from China. They are afraid that these new arrivals will take jobs away from the locals and that they will overburden the social welfare system (Chiu et al., 2005). And many Hong Kong people have resentment towards the Chinese government for its heavy-handedness in its attempt to influence Hong Kong's political affairs. The frustration and anger with the Central Government of China sometimes spill over into hostilities towards Mainland Chinese in general.

In recent years, resentment against Mainlanders has been growing. After 2003, when the travel rules were relaxed, millions of Mainlanders started visiting Hong Kong every year. To be sure, the strong Mainland presence has positive impacts on Hong Kong economy. But its negative impact has also been increasingly felt, especially by middle and lower class people in Hong Kong. For example, people complain about the increases in housing prices and the crowdedness of subway trains and shopping malls.

Some Mainlanders now compete directly for social resources with Hong Kong residents. For example, some pregnant Mainland women come to Hong Kong to give birth so that their child can have the entitlements of a permanent Hong Kong resident. The resentment of Hong Kong residents has resulted in quite a few public conflicts between Mainland visitors and Hong Kong residents in recent years (Chan and Chan, 2014).

Data and method

1.   Research site

The research site for this study is the Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU), one of the eight public universities in Hong Kong. The number of Mainland undergraduate students in Hong Kong universities has increased from 177 in 1999 to 4,638 in 2010 (UGC, 2011). The major increase occurred in 2005 when the Hong Kong government initiated an increase in the percentage of non-local students from 4 to 8-10%. Despite the high tuition and cost of living, competition among Mainland students for education in Hong Kong is very intense. Each year, only about 3-4% of Mainland applicants are admitted.

When we collected data for this study in May 2011, there were 4945 undergraduate students enrolled in HKBU, and there were 591 Mainland undergraduates on campus. Most of

them were admitted between 2007 and 2010. Among them, 35.2% were male students. These students represented all four municipalities, 20 out of 22 provinces, and one autonomous region in the Mainland. They were admitted into 7 faculties. The university arranged a host family for each of them, and they were guaranteed a place in the university dormitory during the first two years.

2. The data

The data for this study comes from a survey of Mainland undergraduate students at HKBU in April and May 2011. In addition, in-depth interviews with 10 survey respondents were conducted.

The survey was conducted from April to May 2011 on the HKBU campus. Face-to-face interviews were conducted, and each interview lasted about 20 minutes. We successfully interviewed 209 students, which was 35% of all Mainland students on campus in April and May of 2011.[3] We compared the sample with the target population in terms of gender, origin in China, faculty affiliation, and the proportions of students from different years. The comparisons yielded consistent patterns, except for the proportion of male students. Male students were over-represented in our sample (50.2% vs. 35.2% in the targeted population).

The questionnaire was divided into three parts. The first part covered respondents' basic information. The second part covered the respondents' social connections before coming to Hong Kong. The third part was about the respondents' social activities and social networks in Hong Kong. The last question was open-ended: Respondents were asked about the obstacles they faced, if any, in their communication with locals.

The name-generator method was used to assess homophilic tendencies in respondents'

---

[3] See Zhu 2011 for details about the survey and in-depth interviews.

friendship networks. In the survey, we asked respondents to tell us how many good friends they had in Hong Kong. Then we asked more detailed questions about the first 5 good friends that the respondent had named—their gender, age, occupation, education level, whether or not the person was from Hong Kong. If the friend was from the Mainland, we asked about their origin in the Mainland.

Findings

1.   Descriptive statistics

Table 1 shows the social background of the Mainland students and some basic information. We can see that most of them come from big cities (76.1%), and many of them come from families with good socioeconomic status. Specifically, 51% have fathers that are administrators, professors, or lawyers; nearly 35% have fathers that are mid- or lower level administrators or professionals; and more than 7% are small business owners. Only 6.8% of the fathers have lower middle class or working class occupations. Nearly 70% of the mothers also have an administrative or professional occupation. In comparison, just around 13% of the fathers of the HKBU first-year local students are administrators or professionals, and about 11% are business proprietors or shop owners (according to the first-year student surveys conducted by HKBU from 2006 to 2010).

(Table 1 about here)

2.   Social connections in Hong Kong

Mainland students' contact with Hong Kong had been quite limited before they came over to study. Most of the students had not been to Hong Kong before their studies. The majority of them did not have relatives in Hong Kong, and most of them (around 80%) had no acquaintances or

friends in Hong Kong; nor did the majority of their parents (62%). Their Cantonese level was quite limited when they arrived; only 12% of the students from non-Guangdong areas could understand some Cantonese.

Of course, students from Guangdong Province are significantly better "connected" with Hong Kong than other students. For example, 90% of them had visited Hong Kong before they became a student at HKBU. The corresponding figure for non-Guangdong students is 30%.

However, this does not mean that the students do not have social support after coming to Hong Kong. First of all, they keep contacts with relatives and friends in the Mainland, as Table 2 shows. Some of them (14.4%) even talk to their relatives everyday. Many Mainland students are able to establish ties with locals. About 40% of the Mainland students have had a local roommate, and nearly 45% keep regular contact with their host family during their first year in Hong Kong.

(Table 2 about here)

In terms of social participation, Table 3 shows that more than 80% of the students have joined social organizations (mostly student organizations). More than 50% of them have joined organizations with members that are mostly Mainlanders, while more than 40% have joined organizations with members that are mostly locals.

(Table 3 about here)

The above descriptions imply that Mainland students have relatively adequate social support. Indeed, as Table 4 shows, almost everyone (99.5%) can find someone to turn to for practical help (Table 4, Column 2). However, 7.2% seem to be loners with no one to have fun with, and nearly 10% claim that they have no one to turn to when they feel down. When asked to name their good friends in Hong Kong, nearly everyone (98.6%) has at least one good friend,

10

and 78% report having 5 or more good friends in Hong Kong (Table 5).

(Table 4 and Table 5 about here)

However, Table 4 reveals an important tendency. That is, Mainland students rely mostly on Mainlanders for social support, especially in the area of emotional support. Table 5 reveals the same pattern. We can see that over 60% of the Mainland students do not have good friends who are locals. With the maximum number limited to 5, the respondents named, on average, 4.5 good friends, including 0.85 local good friends. This means that, on average, only 18% of the named good friends are locals. This is a clear and strong pattern of in-group friendship formation, since almost all of these good friends are HKBU students, and nearly 90% of the students at HKBU are local students.

3.   Reasons behind the in-group friendship preference

When asked whether there were obstacles in their communication with local students, about three-quarters of the respondents reported that there indeed are obstacles in communicating with locals, although many find local students very kind and helpful. One student even said, "They are warmer than Mainland students." "However," she continued, "we just cannot become close friends."

Many respondents pointed out the language problem as an obstacle in communicating with local students. The majority of the Mainland students could not understand Cantonese when they first came. Even after they have learned to speak Cantonese, it is still hard for them to express complicated ideas. Because many cannot pronounce Cantonese correctly, they often feel too embarrassed to speak it. Most local students are able to speak Mandarin Chinese, but many do not feel confident or comfortable with it. As one student stated, "Local students are very nice to us. However, they are not comfortable with Mandarin Chinese. Sometimes, they seem to be

enjoying talking to us; but, as soon as we begin to speak Mandarin Chinese, the atmosphere just changes. Sometimes, if we express our opinion in Mandarin Chinese, local students simply do not respond. It hurts, and sometimes, I just avoid talking to local students."

Many students mentioned "cultural differences" as obstacles. The two groups do not like the same kind of movies or popular music. It is hard for them to find a topic of common interest for conversation. Very often, they simply do not understand or cannot appreciate what the other side is talking about. Many said, "We do not have the same laughing point," meaning that what is funny to one side does not sound funny to the other side.

Mainland students also expressed disapproval of certain mentality and behaviors of the local students. For example, some students disagree with local students on political issues related to China. They think that local students have been misled by the media and have formed biased ideas about China and the Chinese people. Some feel quite upset about it. For example, one student was very angry when she heard a local student telling an international student about female infanticide in contemporary China.

A frequently mentioned point was, "different values"; but few students took the trouble to elaborate what they meant by it. To a certain degree, this indicates more disapproval of certain mentalities and behaviors than just an observation of differences. For example, some Mainland students feel that local students are too practical and utilitarian, meaning they care too much about money or materialistic interests.

The difference in academic orientation was also mentioned by quite a number of students. Generally speaking, most of the Mainland students study very hard, and many get good grades; in comparison, many local students do not seem to take their studies very seriously. One reason may be the different student cultures of university life. Both Mainland students and local Hong

Kong students have worked very hard to earn a place in a university. After entering the university, many local students may want to take a break. Many also believe that life in the university is more than studying. They want to experience different things.

But for many Mainland students, becoming a university student is just the beginning of a new round of competition. Coming from upper or upper middle class families, they are keenly aware of the high expectations of their parents. Being the only child of their family—as most of them are—adds more pressure on them. Mainland students whose parents are not wealthy feel they have to study hard in order to ensure a great future, since their parents have sacrificed a lot for their education in Hong Kong.

The two groups also differ in future plans. Many local students do not have a very specific plan for the future, and some are content with just getting a job later. But many Mainland students have a clear goal of entering graduate school after graduating from university, or they aim at getting a prestigious job after graduation.

Differences in academic orientation and future plan between the two groups may be related to their significant differences in family socioeconomic status. So are the different consumption patterns of the two groups. Mainland students tend to spend more money than local students in buying things such as clothes, cosmetics, cameras, and mobile phones. Some Mainland students do not like going shopping with local students because the latter spend a lot of time looking for bargains. They seem to forget that they get their pocket money from their parents while most local students get their pocket money from their part time jobs.

Finally, some behavior-related issues appear to be quite minor, but can still cause discomfort for Mainland students in interacting with locals. The issue of time scheduling is a point raised by quite a few students. Mainland students, particularly when they first come to

Hong Kong, tend to have a more regular schedule. They go to bed before midnight or even earlier, and they get up at 7am or even earlier. However, local students are used to going to bed after 2am. When local students and Mainland students are roommates, they sometimes get into direct conflicts because of this scheduling problem.

4.   Contact opportunities: Availability, timing and consequences

There are also influencing factors beyond the factor of preferences. Several students said, "We do not have many chances to meet local students." One student stated, "it is hard to join the locals. They are a group by themselves. It is hard for outsiders to break in. On the other hand, we have our own group. Mutual exclusion."

It seems that Mainland students have many more opportunities to come into contact with one another than with local students during their first year on campus. The first year, especially the first semester, is a crucial period for friendship building, when Mainland students have just arrived in a new place, away from family and friends. It is very easy for them to become friends with people who help them adjust to the new environment. However, because of the one-year difference in the middle school system between Mainland and Hong Kong, Mainland students take courses by themselves in the first semester of their Foundation Year. Even in the second semester, they can attend only one or two courses with local students.

Furthermore, many Mainland students have already gotten to know each other before they came to Hong Kong. The Mainland Chinese student organization on campus, Association of Mainland and Hong Kong Youths (AMHKY), organizes gatherings of incoming students in many cities during the summer. At such gatherings, new students from the same city or nearby places will meet one another and senior Mainland students at HKBU. AMHKY also has an online chat group for incoming students to communicate with each other or with senior Mainland

students at HKBU.

Soon after these students arrive in Hong Kong, AMHKY organizes an orientation for them. During the orientation, students will stay together at a camp for about three days. At the orientation, AMHKY provides new students with a form to select their extracurricular activity groups organized by AMHKY, such as the drama club or football team.

Meanwhile, local freshmen have formed networks of their own. Before the fall semester begins, senior students organize a freshman orientation camp. Incoming students will spend a couple of days together with senior students as their group leaders. Many Mainland students fail to attend the freshman orientation camp. Many do not have the information about it because it is announced during the summer. Some just do not want to come back to campus early because they want to spend more time with their family in China.

Therefore, when Mainland students join their major department after the Foundation Year, Mainland and local students are clearly two groups. As one Mainland student commented, "They [local students] didn't distance themselves on purpose. They just sit together naturally, and so we Mainland students sit together. It is not really segregation, but like the first two rows belong to the Mainland students while those behind belong to the locals [laughs]. That's it."

5. Who has good local friends?

Why do 40% of the Mainland students have good local friends? To answer this question, we conducted regression analysis, and the results are presented in Table 6. One positive and significant factor is whether the student is from Guangdong Province or not. The other significant positive factor is the involvement (number of organizations ranging from 0 to 3) with social organizations that have mostly local members.[4] Furthermore, as Table 7 shows, being a

---

[4] We also tested the effects of having had a local roommate and having regular contacts with a

senior student has a significant positive effect on the involvement with local social organizations. Having had a local roommate has a significant positive effect too. Since affiliation with local organizations is positively related to forming intergroup friendship ties, these two factors contribute, indirectly, to the intergroup friendship formation between Mainland and local students.

(Table 6 and Table 7 about here)

Summary and discussion

In this study, we found a strong in-group pattern in the friendship networks of Mainland students in Hong Kong. Over 60% of the Mainland students do not have good local friends. On a campus where nearly 90% of the students are locals, only 18% of the good friends named by Mainland students are locals.

The homophilic tendency is clearly a mechanism accounting for this strong in-group friendship pattern. Cultural differences discourage intergroup ties between Mainland and local students. The language barrier and information gaps make the interaction between the two groups more difficult and less enjoyable. This is why students coming from Guangdong Province are significantly more likely to have good local friends than other Mainland students. Being able to speak Cantonese and being familiar with the local culture facilitates the establishment of intergroup friendship ties. The two groups differ in values and ideologies, and they differ in academic orientation and future plans, which may be due to their differences in family socioeconomic backgrounds. These differences underline the actual and perceived affective distance between the two groups and discourage intergroup friendship formation.

---

host family in a separate analysis. These two factors were non-significant.

However, we have also found clear evidence for the propinquity effect. That is, intergroup contacts facilitate intergroup friendship formation. In particular, we found that participating in local organizations has a significant positive effect on intergroup friendship formation. Within these organizations/groups—whether they are sport teams or departmental student societies—Mainland students get a chance to interact with local students in an informal and probably enjoyable setting, and they may get to work together to achieve a common goal. As predicted by contact theory, this kind of contact would reduce the affective distance between the two groups and promote intergroup friendship.

Unfortunately, Mainland students did not have many opportunities to interact with local students during their first year in Hong Kong. Most of them also missed the opportunity to meet their local classmates at the freshman orientation camp, when these local students started to form ties with other students. On the other hand, during their first year—a crucial period for friendship building—Mainland students had many opportunities to make friends with other Mainlanders in and outside classes. To a great extent, this may explain the strong presence of in-group ties in Mainland students' friendship networks.

The possible timing effect might also be explained in terms of the balance theory, which argues that one is likely to befriend the friends of one's friends. In our case, having Mainland friends in the beginning may lead one to have more Mainland friends. Furthermore, existing social relationships within two groups may constrain the formation of intergroup ties. When Mainland students finally joined local students in the classes, they had already bonded with each other as one group, whereas their local classmates had also formed a group of their own. There was real and perceived resistance against outsiders, as reported by the respondents in our study. Moreover, Mainland students may not have the motivation to break into the other group at this

point, since their social and practical needs can be satisfied within their own networks.

In sum, our study shows people do choose to be friends with people who are similar to them (homophily tendency). However, their choices are made within the structure of contact opportunities (propinquity effect). Once people make a choice, this newly formed tie might have an impact on the establishment of subsequent ties; for example, an in-group tie will bring more in-group ties (balance tendency). The newly formed network may then have further impact on whom one will make friends with next; for example, a clique of in-group friends may, intentionally or unintentionally, discourage its members from making out-group friendship choices Thus, both contact opportunities and their timing (i.e., when they become available) are important.

References

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Carley, K. (1991). A theory of group stability. *American Sociological Review,* 56(3), 331-354.

Chan, E., and Chan, J. (2014). Liberal patriotism in Hong Kong. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 23(89), 952-970.

Cheung, C. K., and Kwok S. T. (1998). Social studies and ideological beliefs in Mainland China and Hong Kong. *Social Psychology of Education*, 2,217-236.

Chiu, S.W. K, Choi, S.Y. P, and Ting, K. (2005). Getting ahead in the capitalist paradise. *International Migration Review*, 39(1),203-227.

Davis, J. A. (1963). Structural balance, mechanical solidarity, and interpersonal relations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 86,444-62.

Feld, S. L. (1981). The Focused Organization of Social Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 86 (5), 1015-1035.

Frank, K. A, Muller, C. and Muller, A. (2013). The embeddedness of adolescent friendship nominations. *American Journal of Sociology,* 119,216-253.

Heider, F. (1946). Attitude and cognitive organization. *Journal of Psychology*, 21, 107-12.

Kossinets, G., and Watts, D. (2009). Origins of homophily in an evolving social network. *American Journal of Sociology,* 115, 405-50.

Lau, S., and Kuan, H. (1988). *The ethos of the Hong Kong Chinese*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.

McPherson, J. M., and Smith-Lovin, L. (1987). Homophily in voluntary organizations. *American Sociological Review,* 52, 370-379.

McPherson, J. M., Smith-Lovin, L., and Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 27, 415-444.

Moody, J. (2001). Race, school integration, and friendship segregation in America. *American Journal of Sociology,* 107, 679-716.

Smith, J. A., McPherson, M., and Smith-Lovin, L. (2014). Social distance in the United States. *American Sociological Review,* 79,432-456.

Stearns, E., Buchman, C., and Bonneau, K. (2009). Interracial friendships in the transition to college. *Sociology of Education,* 82,173-195.

Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry.* New York: W.W. Norton.

UGC. (2011). Non-local Student Enrolment of UGC-funded Programmes by Institution, Level of Study, Mode of Study and Broad Academic Programme Category.

Wimmer, A., and Lewis, K. (2010). Beyond and below racial homophily. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 116, 538-642.

Zhu, S. (2012). *Birds of a feather flock together*. Mphil Thesis, Hong Kong Baptist University.

Table 1. Background Information of Survey Respondents (%; *N* = 209)

1. Gender (males)	50.2	
2. Current student status		
Foundation Year	29.2	
First Year	20.1	
Second Year	18.2	
Third Year	29.7	
Fourth Year	2.9	
3. Faculty affiliation		
Faculty of Arts	7.2	
Academy of Visual Arts	1.4	
School of Business	23.0	
School of Communication	18.2	
Faculty of Science	33.5	
School of Chinese Medicine	4.8	
Faculty of Social Sciences	12.0	
4. Hometown in China		
Beijing	20.6	
Guangdong	17.7	
Liaoning	9.1	
Yunnan	7.2	
Guizhou	5.3	
Shanghai	4.8	
Other places	35.3	
5. Big City	76.1	
6. Parental occupation	Father	Mother
-High-level administrators, managers, and professionals such as doctors or professors	51.2	28.7
-Mid- or lower level administrators, managers and professionals such as primary school teachers or nurses	34.4	41.6
-Clerical workers and sales workers	3.4	17.2
-Small business owners	4.8	1.9
-Family business owners (no employees)	2.9	2.9
-Workers	2.4	2.9
-Farmers	1	0.5
-Other	0	4.3 (9 housewives)

Table 2. Contacts with families and friends in Mainland after coming to Hong Kong (%; $N = 209$)

Contact with family and friends in the Mainland	Family	Friends
Everyday	14.4	12.0
Once or a few times per week	75.6	57.0
Once per month	6.7	16.3
Occasionally	2.4	12.4
Never	1.0	2.4

Visits from family and friends in the Mainland	Family and Friends
Never	23.4
Sometimes	70.3
Often	6.2

Table 3. Social participation (%; $N = 209$)

Number of organizations	Total number of organizations mentioned	Organizations with all or mostly Mainland members	Organizations with all or mostly local members
Did not mention any	18.7	18.7	18.7
0	-	19.6	30.1
1	43.5	41.6	32.1
2	22.0	10.5	9.1
3	15.8	0.5	1.0
Organizations with both mainland and local students	--	9.1	9.1
	100%	100%	100%

Table 4. Percentage of Mainlanders or locals in respondents' support networks ($N = 209$)

	People you spend leisure time with	People who helped you in the past 12 months	People you talked with when you felt down in the past 12 months
No one	**7.2**	**0.5**	**9.6**
Mainlanders only	22.5	2.9	40.7
Mostly Mainlanders	53.1	52.6	34.0
Mostly locals	2.4	3.3	0.5
Locals only	0.0	0.0	0.5
Half and half	14.8	40.7	12.0
Other	0.0	0.0	2.9
	100%	100%	100%

Table 5. Number of good friends in Hong Kong (%) $N = 209$

Number of close friends	Good friends	Non-Mainland good friends
0	3 (1.4)	126 (60.3)
1	4 (1.9)	37 (17.7)
2	8 (3.8)	17 (8.1)
3	13 (6.2)	16 (7.7)
4	18 (8.6)	7 (3.3)
5	163 (78)	6 (2.9)

Table 6. Regression of number of good local friends[a] ($N = 209$)

	Unstandardized Coefficients[b]
Male	-.020 (-.008)
From Guangdong	.603 (.231)*
Foundation Year student	-.085 (-.030)
Member of one or more organizations with mostly local members	.326 (.173)*
Total number of good friends mentioned	.192 (.155)*
Constant	-.266
R square	.096
Adjusted R square	.074

    a.   Ranging from 0 to 5.
    b.   Standardized regression coefficients are in parentheses.

*$p < .05$

Table 7. Regression of the number of local student organizations joined[a] ($N = 209$)

	Unstandardized Coefficients[b]
Male	-.191 (-.137)*
Coming from Guangdong Province	-.049 (-.027)
First Year student[c]	.101 (.058)
Second Year student[c]	.310 (.169)**
Third or Fourth Year student[c]	.347 (.229)***
Having or having had a local roommate	.207 (.146)**
Having met with the host family regularly during the first year at HKBU	-.013 (-.008)
Total number of social organizations joined[a]	.430 (.589)***
Constant	-.208*
R square	.465
Adjusted R square	.444

a.   Ranging from 0 to 3.
b.   Standardized regression coefficients are in parentheses.
c.   With the Foundation Year students as the reference group.

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$

Authors' Bios

Danching Ruan is Associate Professor in the Sociology Department, Hong Kong Baptist University. Her research interests include social network, social stratification, and education.

Shu Zhu got her bachelor's and M.Phil. degrees from the Sociology Department, Hong Kong Baptist University. She now lives in China.