Issues & Studies 34, no. 3 (March 1998): 88-125.

"Extended Connections, Divided Identities": A Study of Hong Kong People of Chinese Ancestry Having "Ties" with Australia*

DONALD H. MCMILLEN AND SU MINGXIAN

This article profiles and explores the evolving sense of identity of Hong Kong people of Chinese ancestry who have established a range of "ties" with Australia. Through archival, survey, and interview methods, the article highlights the factors which have prompted members of this group to establish "international" ties, and ascertains some of the worries and difficulties, as well as some of the more positive experiences and feelings, they have had about their lives and the lives of their families in their physical and emotional "movement" between three sociocultural environments. The present article, which is based upon the initial findings of a wider and longer-term research endeavor, is only part of the larger, ongoing story of this group's "journeys of adjustment" between differing political systems and multicultural settings.

Keywords: Australia; Chinese; Hong Kong; identity; immigration; migrants; multiculturalism

---

Donald H. McMillen is Chair Professor and Head of Asian Studies at the University of Southern Queensland (USQ), Australia. His latest publication is *Globalization and Regional Communities: Geoeconomic, Sociocultural and Security Implications for Australia* (editor, 1997).

Dr. Su Mingxian is Research Associate in Asian Studies at USQ.

*This research has been made possible by generous funding grants from the University of Southern Queensland to the project "Community and Citizenship in Transition: Studies of the Overseas Chinese in Asia and Australia."

* * *

Since the Chinese "gold rushers" began to seek their fortunes overseas in large numbers during the late Qing period, the issue of identity among the overseas Chinese community has been a very sensitive issue researched by many scholars.[1] More recently, this issue has drawn the attention of scholars concerned about the large numbers of Hong Kong people of Chinese ancestry (hereafter referred to as HKPCA) who have immigrated to Western countries in search of more freedom and safety since Hong Kong entered the transition back to Chinese rule with the 1984 Sino-British Joint Declaration on the Question of Hong Kong. This has generated a series of questions concerning their connections with both Hong Kong and China, as well as places they have chosen to settle down in and their sense of identity.[2]

As the Sino-British dialogue concerning the transition of sovereignty over Hong Kong (the so-called "1997 Question") in the early 1980s led to what seemed to be at least a nominally optimistic set of promises in the 1984 Sino-British Joint Declaration,[3] places like Australia became attractive as refuges for many unconvinced HKPCA–a sentiment heightened enormously by the events of April-June 1989 in Tiananmen Square. But

---

[1]For detailed discussion of the reasons for Chinese immigration overseas and the issues concerning their identity, see Yen Chinghwang, *A Social History of the Chinese in Singapore and Malaya, 1800-1911* (Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1986); Yen Chinghwang, *Community and Politics: The Chinese in Colonial Singapore and Malaysia* (Singapore: Times Academic Press, 1995); Yen Chinghwang, *The Overseas Chinese and the 1911 Revolution: With Special Reference to Singapore and Malaya* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1976); and Michael R. Godley, *The Mandarin-Capitalists from Nanyang: Overseas Chinese Enterprise in the Modernization of China, 1893-1911* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981). The latest work on the identity of the overseas Chinese is Tu Wei-ming, ed., *The Living Tree: The Changing Meaning of Being Chinese Today* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1994).

[2]For a thorough discussion of this issue, see Ronald Skeldon, *Reluctant Exiles? Migration from Hong Kong and the New Overseas Chinese* (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1994).

[3]In fact, London's later secret dealings with Beijing over Hong Kong amounted to a series of "sell-outs" on the issue of political reform and development. Documented elsewhere, these agreements, which gave China a virtual "veto" over all transition matters, make Britain culpable for nothing less than appeasement of China and betrayal of Hong Kong's people, all for the sake of future trade. In any event, lingering allusions among many Hong Kong people about an optimistic future based on Deng Xiaoping's "one country, two systems" formula were severely eroded by the April-June 1989 events in Tiananmen.

also significantly, by the mid-1990s larger numbers of HKPCA returned, even if only temporarily, to Hong Kong from "Down Under" after establishing Australian residence (recently estimated to be as many as one in three such persons) to take advantage of high-paying jobs and more familiar lifestyles.[4] This has had the effect of changing the composition of the 32,000-35,000 Australian expatriate community there, as well as having interesting domestic repercussions on Australian views concerning multiculturalism and citizenship.

However, few scholars have focused on HKPCA migrants in Australia in terms of their identity and relevant issues. From May 23 to June 16, 1997, the authors undertook a survey-questionnaire (in English and Chinese) targeting members of this group currently residing in Southeast Queensland, Australia. One hundred and twenty questionnaires were distributed randomly on a one-per-household basis through such organizations as the Hong Kong Professionals and Business Association of Queensland, the Queensland Chinese Forum, and the Valley Business Association (Brisbane). Seventy completed questionnaires were either returned directly by the assisting members or by mail to the researchers. This constitutes a very respectable 58 percent return rate. The questionnaire had eighty questions focusing on profile information about the HKPCA residing in Australia and issues concerning identity, attitudes, and concerns about both Hong Kong and Australia; personal, family, and social conditions; and migration issues. A six-point Lickert scale was adopted for most questions. The study presents a demographic profile of this group based on the best available (but somewhat limited) information. The purpose here is to focus on issues of the most recent HKPCA generation who have established for themselves and their families a set of "internationalized ties" largely (but not necessarily exclusively) through emigration to other places.[5] Of the many objectives of this research, the following are of

---

[4]See Diana Giese, *Astronauts, Lost Souls and Dragons: Voices of Today's Chinese Australians* (St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1997); and Pe-Pua Rogelia et al., *Astronaut Families and Parachute Children: The Cycle of Immigration Between Hong Kong and Australia* (Canberra: A.G.P.S., 1996).

[5]A multi-method approach has been adopted for the research, including archival-documentary work, in-depth interviews of members of the targeted group residing both in Hong Kong

central importance here (and please note that this study will not delve into "Hong Kong's diasporic business and economic networking," which is nonetheless both fascinating and significant):

- to establish a "profile" of the Hong Kong people of Chinese ancestry who have established "extended connections" or "ties" with Australia;
- to ascertain their motivations for establishing such "connections";
- to explore the problems of social, economic, and political "adjustment" they have encountered in passing through these processes;
- to assess the nature and evolution of their senses of identity and "belonging" (basically defined by their notions and practice of citizenship and political participation); and
- to gauge their attitudes about the futures of post-1997 Hong Kong and Australia, both for themselves and their families.

In the following profile of the HKPCA, the number of respondents answering each question varied somewhat, so the number of responses (N) is provided in each case, with the results shown in percentages of the N (rounded to the nearest full percentage). Tables prepared for questions answered on a Lickert scale have the following column headings: SD + D ("strongly disagree" and "disagree"); N ("neither disagree nor agree" [or "neutral"]; A + SA ("agree" and "strongly agree"); and U/S ("unsure"), but the description of the results uses four scales as follows: "agree" (including "agree" and "strongly agree"), "disagree" (including "strongly disagree" and "disagree"), "neutral" (or "neither disagree nor agree"), and "unsure."

---

and Australia, and survey-questionnaires of the targeted group residing in both Hong Kong and Southeast Queensland, Australia. The in-depth interviews for this study began in November-December 1996 in Hong Kong and in May-June 1997 in Australia. Survey data has been drawn from a series of computer-aided telephone interviews undertaken since February 1993 by the Hong Kong Transition Research Project headquartered at Hong Kong Baptist University, but especially the survey involving 546 respondents (of whom 34, or a little more than 6 percent, were identified as having "Australia ties") undertaken in February 1997 (see Michael E. DeGolyer et al., "Golden Sunset, Red Sunrise: Hong Kong Public Attitudes in the Transition to PRC Rule," Hong Kong Transition Project 1997).

The Backgrounds of Individual Respondents and Their Families and Relatives

Individual Respondents

As the gathered data indicates, all of the respondents were people of Chinese ancestry, with the vast majority (83 percent) being born in Hong Kong, 11 percent in mainland China, and 6 percent in other places. All respondents considered themselves to be, in one way or another, HKPCA.

According to 1996 statistics, there were 68,430 Chinese migrants with Hong Kong as their birthplace in Australia. Among them, 6,764 were residing in Queensland (9.8 percent of the total HKPCA population).[6] The number of respondents is indeed small, but considering that Queensland is so geographically large that the HKPCA population is widely distributed, this result is reasonable. In particular, compared with the overall profile of the HKPCA currently available, the preliminary results of the gathered data indicate that it approximately reflects the basic demography and sociology of this group, as, for example, in age group and education. The 1991 Census indicated the average age of the HKPCA was 27 years, with the predominant age groups being 15-24 and 30-39 years.[7] In contrast with this, the predominant age group among the respondents was 30-50 years (80 percent), 11 percent were under 30 years, and 9 percent over 50 years. The predominant age group represents those who are most likely to have completed their education, married and started a family, and established employment and career paths. Eighty-three percent of all respondents reported being married or having (living with) a partner.

All but 6 percent of the respondents spoke Cantonese as their first/native language. Further data provided below concerning the languages with which respondents were able to conduct business *and* the adequacy of their English language skills for life in Australia indicates that this group had significant and solid multi-lingual and cross-cultural communication skills.

---

[6]Australian Bureau of Statistics, *1996 Census of Population and Housing: Selected Social and Housing Characteristics–Australia* (Canberra: A.G.P.S., 1997).

[7]Bureau of Immigration and Population Research, *Community Profiles–1991 Census: Hong Kong Born* (Canberra: A.G.P.S., 1995).

Virtually all of the respondents (98 percent) said that their current place of residence was Queensland, Australia (with those citing Brisbane as their place of current residence being 96 percent of that group). Only 2 percent reported that they currently resided in both Queensland and Hong Kong. Ninety-eight percent of the respondents stated that they were permanent residents of Australia, with the vast majority obtaining such status between the years 1986-90 (42 percent), 1991-95 (44 percent), and 1996-97 (2 percent). Thus, 88 percent became permanent residents of Australia over the past decade, arguably the period during which the issues and events concerning Hong Kong's 1997 turnover became the most intense and provoked a significant exodus of Hong Kong people. The period grouping here, in fact, is based on the defining events of the past decade or so, such as the Sino-British Joint Declaration of 1984, the April-June 1989 events in Beijing, the promulgation of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region in 1990, and the more recent "economic boom" within southern China and Hong Kong (which, as mentioned above, was a main factor accounting for the significant number of Hong Kong migrants returning there after obtaining at least permanent residency status in places like Australia). Valid Australian passports were held by 73 percent of the respondents, with 43 percent (N=51) having obtained their passport in the period 1991-95, 18 percent in both 1986-90 and 1996-97, and only 10 percent having received their passport before 1985 (12 percent of the respondents did not answer the question).

When asked when they first came to Australia, 28 percent reported that they had come prior to 1985, 38 percent in 1986-90, 32 percent in 1991-95, and only 2 percent in 1996-97 (N=60). Respondents who later became passport-holders came as migrants (60 percent), tourists (17 percent), students (16 percent), employees (3 percent), and businesspeople (2 percent). The place they (N=58) stated that they had first arrived in Australia was Queensland (71 percent), New South Wales (21 percent), Victoria (7 percent), and Canberra (2 percent). This suggests that slightly over 20 percent of all respondents had either opted to settle in Queensland after their first arrival elsewhere in the country or had shifted there after their arrival as migrants.

Respondents currently holding Hong Kong residency status consti-

tuted 87 percent, compared to 98 percent holding Australian permanent residency status. This means that there was a high level of joint-residency status in this group, which quite naturally raises questions about the degree of commitment such individuals have had to *either* place. Moreover, such a factor could contribute to any sense of "divided identity" members of this group may have had.

When asked what type of residential housing they had in Australia (N=69), 87 percent of the respondents said it was in flats or houses owned by themselves or their relatives–all in Queensland. When asked if they owned property in Australia (N=67), 78 percent said "yes," and 98 percent of the property owned (N=48) was described as a house rather than a flat (2 percent). This high proportion of residential property ownership in Australia undoubtedly contributed to the group's "connections" to the country (and, perhaps, it implies some hesitancy about owning property in post-1997 Hong Kong).

All respondents had completed at least a secondary-level education, with 80 percent reporting a completion of education at post-secondary or higher levels, including over 50 percent at undergraduate degree and post-graduate degree levels. Among them, 53 percent completed their education only in Hong Kong, with only 3 percent completing their education in Australia. However, 91 percent had completed various levels of their education in both Hong Kong and overseas (mainly in North America and England, with one-third having done so in both Hong Kong and Australia). This "internationalized educational experience" strongly suggests a "cosmopolitanism" which has brought with it some important links for individuals beyond Hong Kong (and beyond Australia as well) that must play into individuals' senses of identity and shape their perspectives on the affairs of Hong Kong and countries like Australia. Overall, the data shows that this group is highly-educated and well-travelled.[8] That many HKPCA migrants

[8]According to statistics of the 1991 Census, 24.3 percent of HKPCA migrants to Australia received tertiary and postgraduate education, which was nearly double the percentage of the Australian population in this category (12.8 percent). Our data indicates that the percentage of the respondents with a tertiary education was higher than the average for the whole population of HKPCA migrants because of the target of our random survey, but it reflects the fact that HKPCA migrants, whether in Queensland or elsewhere in Australia, have a very good education. See ibid.

to Australia may be frustrated by the fact that their educational qualifications or international experiences are not recognized in terms of employment opportunities or the contributions they could make to society in general is understandable. When asked if they were currently employed, 27 percent answered "no." This high rate of non-employment may be affected by a number of respondents being students or housewives (who in some cases are the effective "heads of households" when their spouses/partners travel for business or employment purposes; the HKPCA in Australia tend to have a higher-than-normal component in this respect compared to other groups).

Of the respondents who reported that they were currently employed (N=51), 43 percent said that they either had their own company (usually a small business) or were self-employed. Thirty-seven percent were working for an Australian company/employer, while only 4 percent were working for a Hong Kong company/employer. Other categories accounted for 16 percent. When asked what percentage of time during the working year their employment or business required them to be present in Hong Kong, 87 percent of the 55 respondents said "not at all." Of the 13 percent who said their work or business required them to be in Hong Kong, the majority reported it to be less than one-quarter of the working year. When asked the same question about time spent in China for similar reasons, 85 percent said "not at all." Only 9 percent of those who reported that their work or business required them to be in China reported that it amounted to 7-14 days per annum, and 6 percent for 16-28 days per year. Because the survey-questionnaire took place in Queensland, it is likely that those who were more regularly and more fully involved in work or business activities in both Hong Kong and in China were missed in the sample; thus the real percentages may well be higher than those reported here.

Respondents' Families and Relatives

The importance of family in the Chinese culture is well known. To the degree that family background and family environment contribute to an individual's identity and activities over time, it was important to obtain some basic "profile" information about the respondents' family members in order to better analyze or understand the role that family may play in the

shaping of respondent identities and attitudes. Many mainland Chinese found their way to Hong Kong after 1949 as "refugees" due to political and social upheavals in China or better economic opportunities in the territory. In fact, it was not until at least the early 1960s that the Hong Kong-born component of the population there achieved a majority. Many China-born persons and their Hong Kong-born children still have family in China or retain strong views about the conditions there (especially memories of conditions which "stimulated" them to move to Hong Kong). Thus, many such people might identify to some degree with China on family grounds while on political grounds they might not do so. In any event, the survey-questionnaire sought information about the birthplace and length of residence in Hong Kong of the immediate family members of respondents, with a view to cross-tabulate that information with responses to questions about such things as identity and attitudes about issues pertaining to Hong Kong and Australia in a later analysis.

Sixty-four percent and 30 percent of all respondents reported that their mother's birthplace was China and Hong Kong, respectively, while 71 percent said that their father's birthplace was China, compared to 21 percent for Hong Kong. In each case, a small percentage said that their mother (6 percent) and father (8 percent) were born elsewhere (usually in Southeast Asian countries). When queried about the birthplace of their spouse/partner, 70 percent cited Hong Kong, while only 19 percent said China, 2 percent said Australia, and 9 percent said elsewhere (mostly in Southeast Asian countries).

All but 9 percent of respondents' spouses/partners were reported to be permanent residents of Australia (N=58), with about three-quarters obtaining that status after 1985 (and 47 percent in the period 1991 to mid-1997 alone). Nearly three-quarters of respondents' spouses/partners held a valid Australian passport (N=58), with only 11 percent obtaining such a document prior to 1985, 24 percent in 1986-90, 45 percent in 1991-95, and 21 percent in 1996-97. As data below suggests, holding either Australian permanent residency status or a valid Australian passport in particular is deemed to be an important factor in the shaping and articulation of identity for many members of the HKPCA group.

In terms of children, only 19 percent of respondents having a spouse/

Table 1
Respondents' Children's Sex, Age, and Birthplace

Unit: %

	Birthplace			Sex		Age Group					
	Hong Kong	Australia	Other	M	F	1-5	6-12	13-18	19-22	23-25	26+
Child 1 (N=48)	68	32	0	43	57	11	35	35	6	6	6
Child 2 (N=30)	69	28	3	47	53	17	53	13	10	0	7
Child 3 (N=12)	42	58	0	50	50	23	42	8	8	8	8
Child 4 (N=3)	67	33	0	67	33	33	0	0	33	0	33
All Children (N=93)	66	33	1	46	54	15	41	24	9	4	8

partner (N=59) reported having no children, while those who had one child totalled 31 percent, two children 31 percent, three or more children 15 percent, and four or more children 20 percent. The total number of children reported by parent-respondents (48) was 93. As table 1 indicates, about two-thirds were born in Hong Kong and one-third were born in Australia. In terms of age group, children aged 1-5 years accounted for 15 percent, while those aged 6-12 years (41 percent) and 13-18 years (24 percent) accounted for 65 percent. Thus, around two-thirds of the children were of primary and secondary school age. Another 13 percent in the 19-22 and 23-25-year groups were of an age commensurate with post-secondary education.

Identity Issues

Ascertaining the identity of individuals in any ethnic group is never easy. We know that individuals may answer the same questions relating to their identity quite differently in different situations and at different times. Often, individuals may feel that the social context or situation compels or at least influences them to answer such questions in "socially acceptable" or "politically correct" ways. Equally, individuals do not always answer such questions according to their innermost preferences, opting instead to respond for the sake of some kind of "personal protection," "gain," or "benefit." While one could utilize a fair bit of sociopsychological theory,

suffice it to say that what an individual may report in a confidential survey conducted by non-intrusive methods such as has been done in this case probably provides as good a measure as any for our purposes of exploring some aspects of identity here.

Respondents were asked to describe themselves according to several categories provided in the survey (which in this case did not include the category "Hong Kong Person"), with the following results (first preferences are italicized) (N=69):

- 59 percent identified themselves as being to some degree "Australian" (*Chinese*-Australian = 19 percent; *Australian*-Chinese = 33 percent; and *Australian* = 7 percent);
- 93 percent identified themselves as being to some degree "Chinese" (*Australian*-Chinese = 33 percent; *Hong Kong*-Chinese = 25 percent; *Chinese*-Australian = 19 percent; *Chinese* = 13 percent; and *Chinese*-Hong Kong = 3 percent);
- more respondents identified themselves as *Hong Kong*-Chinese (25 percent) than *Chinese*-Hong Kong (3 percent) or *Chinese* (13 percent);
- in all categories, those identifying themselves first as Australians totalled 40 percent; first as Chinese 35 percent; and first as Hong Kongers 25 percent; and
- only 7 percent identified themselves as being *Australian* (and only Australian), compared to 13 percent who selected *Chinese* (and only Chinese) and 25 percent who selected *Hong Kong-Chinese*.

Respondents were similarly asked to describe their spouse's/partner's identity (N=58).

- 64 percent identified their spouse/partner as being to some degree "Australian" (*Chinese*-Australian = 19 percent; *Australian*-Chinese = 36 percent; and *Australian* = 9 percent);
- 89 percent identified their spouse/partner as being to some degree "Chinese" (*Australian*-Chinese = 36 percent; *Hong Kong*-Chinese = 24 percent; *Chinese*-Australian = 19 percent; *Chinese* = 7 per-

cent; and *Chinese*-Hong Kong = 3 percent);
- more respondents identified their spouse/partner as *Hong Kong*-Chinese (24 percent) than *Chinese*-Hong Kong (3 percent) or *Chinese* (7 percent);
- those identifying their spouse/partner first as Australians in all categories were 45 percent; first as Chinese 35 percent; and first as Hong Kongers 25 percent; and
- only 9 percent identified their spouse/partner as being *Australian* (and only Australian), compared to 7 percent who selected *Chinese* (and only Chinese) and 24 percent who selected *Hong Kong-Chinese*.

Thus, the ascribed identity of spouses/partners leaned slightly more toward the categories of Chinese-Australian and Australian–and overall more "Australian"–than that of the respondents themselves.

Respondents were likewise asked to describe their children's identity (N=52):

- 73 percent identified their children as being to some degree "Australian" (*Chinese*-Australian = 33 percent; *Australian*-Chinese = 33 percent; and *Australian* = 10 percent);
- 85 percent identified their children as being to some degree "Chinese" (*Australian*-Chinese = 33 percent; *Hong Kong*-Chinese = 13 percent; *Chinese*-Australian = 33 percent; *Chinese* = 6 percent);
- more respondents identified their children as *Hong Kong*-Chinese (13 percent) than *Chinese*-Hong Kong (0 percent) or *Chinese* (6 percent);
- those identifying their children first as Australians in all categories were 43 percent; first as Chinese 39 percent; and first as Hong Konger 13 percent; and
- only 10 percent identified children as being *Australian* (and only Australian), compared to 6 percent who selected *Chinese* (and only Chinese) and 13 percent who selected *Hong Kong-Chinese*.

Thus, the ascribed identity of children favored the categories of Chinese-

Australian and Australian–and overall significantly more as "Australian" in general–than that of both the respondents themselves (59 percent) and their spouses/partners (64 percent).

In further analyzing the respondents' description of their identities by sex (see tables 2, 3, and 4), only male respondents identified themselves and their partners as being Australian, and female respondents were more likely than male respondents to select their identities as Chinese-Hong Kong or Hong Kong-Chinese.

Table 2
Respondents' Self-Description of Identity (N=67)

	By Sex (in number)		
	Female	Male	Percentage
Chinese	5	3	11.9
Chinese-Australian	4	7	16.4
Chinese-Hong Kong	2	0	3.0
Hong Kong-Chinese	12	5	25.4
Australian-Chinese	11	11	32.8
Australian	0	5	7.5
Chinese, Chinese-Australian, Australian-Chinese	0	1	1.5
Chinese, Australian-Chinese, Australian	0	1	1.5
Total:	34	33	100%

Table 3
Respondents' Description of the Identity of Their Partners (N=56)

	By Sex (in number)		
	Female	Male	Percentage
Chinese	2	1	5.4
Chinese-Australian	4	6	17.9
Chinese-Hong Kong	2	0	3.6
Hong Kong-Chinese	8	6	25.0
Australian-Chinese	8	12	35.7
Australian	0	5	8.9
Chinese, Chinese-Australian, Australian-Chinese	0	1	1.8
Chinese-Australian, Hong Kong, Chinese	0	1	1.8
Total:	24	32	100%

Table 4
Respondents' Description of the Identity of Their Children (N=47)

	By Sex (in number)		
	Female	Male	Percentage
Chinese	2	1	6.4
Chinese-Australian	5	9	29.8
Hong Kong-Chinese	5	2	14.0
Australian-Chinese	6	10	34.0
Australian	2	3	10.6
Chinese-Australian, Australian, Hong Kong-Chinese	0	1	2.1
Chinese-Australian, Australian	0	1	2.1
Total:	20	27	100%

Respondents were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with a number of factors that might have shaped their identities in a general sense. As table 5 indicates, the factors deemed (by at least a majority of respondents) to be the most important in this regard were (in order of descending agreement) race, cultural beliefs/practices, language, type of passport/citizenship held, life experiences, emotional attachments, and social connections in Australia. Interestingly, just less than half felt that family relationships were important. Those factors which were deemed to be the least important factors in shaping their identity included stories and novels, the media, the opinions/behavior of others, religion and belief system, and their job. That race, cultural beliefs/practices, and language, which are probably the most overt factors setting any ethnic group apart from others, were deemed to be of such consequence was likely enhanced by the recent wave of "Hansonism" in Australia, as inspired by anti-Asian politician Pauline Hanson. The largely historically-based "patriotic euphoria" (at least among some people of Chinese ancestry) over the July 1, 1997 resumption of Chinese sovereignty over Hong Kong also may have been a factor influencing respondents' views on their identity.

Respondents were also queried as to what extent they agreed or disagreed with a number of factors that might have influenced their identities, given their experiences in Australia (see table 6). The factors deemed (by

Table 5
The Main Factors Shaping Respondents' Identity

Unit: %

	SD + D	N	A + SA	U/S
Race (N=65)	(0+8) 8	9	(60+18) 78	5
Language (N=65)	(2+12) 14	8	(60+14) 74	5
Cultural beliefs/practices (N=65)	(0+12) 12	8	(55+20) 75	5
Type of passport I hold/my current citizenship (N=63)	(8+13) 21	5	(51+17) 68	6
My family relationships (N=64)	(6+14) 20	20	(36+13) 49	11
My friends/peers (N=63)	(5+10) 24	29	(32+6) 38	9
My life experiences (N=64)	(3+19) 22	16	(44+13) 57	6
My emotional attachments (N=63)	(3+18) 21	22	(37+14) 51	6
The opinions/behavior of others (N=63)	(6+32) 38	29	(24+5) 29	5
My educational experiences (N=67)	(4+21) 25	24	(33+12) 45	6
Government policies (N=65)	(3+18) 21	26	(34+9) 43	9
Economic circumstances (N=65)	(6+26) 32	25	(25+8) 33	11
My religion/belief system (N=65)	(12+25) 37	32	(20+3) 23	8
The media (N=61)	(11+30) 41	31	(21+3) 24	10
My job (N=64)	(6+31) 37	27	(22+8) 30	3
My social connections in Australia (N=64)	(3+17) 20	27	(44+6) 50	3
Stories and novels (N=64)	(16+42) 58	27	(8+2) 10	6

SD = strongly disagree; D = disagree; A = agree; SA = strongly agree; U/S = unsure.

at least a majority of respondents) to be the most important in this regard were (in order of descending agreement) cultural tastes, racial difference, lifestyle habits, connections to place of origin (Hong Kong), and family. Those factors which were deemed to be the least important factors in shaping their identity included the ability/opportunities to make money in Australia, the media, and friends. Again, that cultural tastes, racial difference, and lifestyle habits were deemed to be of even greater consequence, given respondents' experiences in Australia, was likely enhanced by the recent wave of "Hansonism" in Australia. This seems to be supported by the low disagreement-moderate agreement-high neutral opinions and usually high unsure responses given on the questions concerning the behavior of work colleagues and the behavior of Australians of non-Chinese heritage.

When asked if they had given much thought about their identity, 44 percent of the respondents indicated that they had thought about it before,

Table 6
Factors of the Australian Experience Influencing Respondents' Identity

Unit: %

	SD + D	N	A + SA	U/S
My racial difference (N=61)	(0+8) 8	7	(64+18) 82	3
My cultural tastes (N=62)	(0+8) 8	5	(71+13) 84	3
My lifestyle habits (N=61)	(0+11) 11	10	(66+10) 76	3
Behavior of my colleagues (N=60)	(3+18) 21	33	(30+3) 33	12
Behavior of Australians of non-Chinese heritage (N=60)	(2+15) 17	38	(28+7) 35	10
The media (N=60)	(5+25) 30	27	(30+7) 37	7
My family (N=62)	(3+13) 16	27	(42+10) 52	5
My friends (61)	(3+21) 24	31	(31+8) 39	5
My connection with my country/place of origin (N=61)	(3+11) 14	16	(52+11) 63	5
The ability/opportunities to make money here (N=60)	(5+28) 33	32	(22+7) 29	7

but one-third said they had not done so previously, compared with 18 percent who were neutral and 6 percent who were unsure (N=64). Again, there is a hint that "Hansonism" might have prompted them to do so. The majority of respondents (53 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that their citizenship and identity were synonymous. Perhaps this gave them some feeling of "protection" as people who tended to "move between two cultural localities," namely, Australia and Hong Kong and/or China.

Respondents were asked about the extent they agreed or disagreed with a number of factors that might have influenced their identities, given their experiences in Hong Kong (see table 7). The factors deemed (by at least a majority of respondents) to be the most important in this regard were (in order of descending agreement) their language practice, cultural tastes, educational experiences, lifestyle habits, and the sociopolitical processes at work in Hong Kong over the past few years. Nearly half said that the policies of the Hong Kong and Chinese governments were factors influencing their identity. Those factors which were deemed to be the least important included the ability/opportunities to make money in Hong Kong, the behavior of work colleagues, and the media.

An aspect of identity maintenance which has come out strongly both

Table 7
Factors of the Hong Kong Experience Influencing Respondents' Identity

Unit: %

	SD + D	N	A + SA	U/S
My lifestyle habits (N=59)	(3+12) 15	17	(54+8) 62	5
My educational experiences in Hong Kong (N=58)	(3+10) 13	9	(60+9) 69	9
The media (N=58)	(5+22) 27	22	(40+2) 42	9
Behavior of my colleagues (N=59)	(3+27) 30	29	(27+5) 32	8
Behavior of my children (N=51)	(6+20) 26	24	(33+4) 37	14
HK government policies (N=59)	(5+19) 24	19	(42+5) 47	10
My language practice (N=60)	(2+10) 12	13	(52+17) 69	7
Chinese government policies (N=59)	(8+10) 18	24	(39+8) 47	10
The sociopolitical processes at work there over the past few years (N=58)	(8+10) 18	21	(48+3) 51	10
My cultural tastes (N=59)	(2+14) 16	8	(53+15) 68	8
The ability/opportunities to make money there (N=59)	(7+27) 34	15	(29+14) 43	8

in in-depth interviews and the survey-questionnaires is the maintenance of Hong Kong culture and language by families of this group in Australia. Over three-quarters (77 percent) of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that this was important to them.

Respondents' Attitudes and Concerns about Australia

The survey-questionnaire contained a number of questions aimed at measuring respondents' attitudes and concerns about Australia. They first were asked what factors about Australia were most worrisome to them (see table 8). By asking such a question, one can better ascertain the potential for social volatility both for this group and for the environment(s) in which it functions. The two predominant types of worries expressed were related to economic and immigration-multicultural issues. The worries were (in order of descending agreement) Australia's economic future, high taxation, debates over racism/immigration, Australia's "confusing multiculturalism," sociocultural influences on their families, problems of law and order,

Table 8
The Factors about Australia That Worry Respondents the Most

Unit: %

	SD + D	N	A + SA	U/S
The debates over racism/immigration (N=66)	(2+2) 4	5	(48+42) 90	2
Problems of law and order (N=65)	(2+12) 14	20	(42+23) 67	2
High taxation (N=65)	(1+3) 4	5	(45+45) 90	1
Australia's economic future (N=65)	(1+0) 1	3	(54+37) 91	5
Sociocultural influences on my family (N=63)	(2+8) 10	16	(49+22) 71	3
Australia's confusing multiculturalism (N=66)	(3+6) 9	8	(50+29) 79	5
Australian government policies toward Hong Kong and China (N=65)	(3+5) 8	31	(38+17) 55	6
My children's identity has become confused (N=56)	(4+14) 18	25	(29+18) 47	11
My personal/family standard of living (N=63)	(2+14) 16	22	(46+13) 59	3
My career future (N=66)	(6+6) 12	20	(35+26) 61	6
Australia's boring lifestyle (N=64)	(9+33) 42	22	(19+13) 32	5

their future careers, their personal and family standard of living, and the Australian government's policies toward Hong Kong and China (which also received the highest percentage of neutral responses). Those factors deemed to be least worrisome were Australia's "boring lifestyle" and their children's identity becoming confused (although this was also deemed to be a concern for nearly half of the respondents).

When asked what things they least liked about Australia, responses were nearly identical with those concerning worries, but tended to be more dominated by economic-related issues (see table 9). The least-liked things about Australia were (in order of descending agreement) high taxation, fewer job opportunities, fewer investment opportunities, the stronger influence of trade unions, racism, government policies toward Asia, and the social welfare system. The things which were least-liked to a lesser degree were (in order of preference) Australia's multiculturalism, education system, higher living standard, and people's strong awareness of protecting the environment. Those things about which respondents indicated higher rates

Table 9
The Things Respondents Like Least about Australia

Unit: %

	SD + D	N	A + SA	U/S
Racism (N=65)	(2+12) 14	17	(26+42) 68	2
More liberal social practices and their effects on my spouse and/or children (N=58)	(3+28) 31	29	(28+5) 33	7
Multiculturalism (N=62)	(16+58) 74	19	(5+0) 5	2
Fewer investment opportunities (N=63)	(0+10) 10	17	(38+33) 71	2
Education system (N=62)	(13+53) 66	18	(11+3) 14	2
Fewer job/work opportunities (N=65)	(0+8) 8	9	(48+34) 82	2
Social welfare system (N=64)	(11+22) 33	13	(36+14) 50	5
European heritage (N=64)	(6+27) 33	38	(19+6) 25	5
Government policy toward Asia (N=62)	(0+10) 10	31	(45+11) 56	3
Small population with vast land (N=65)	(11+28) 39	26	(22+8) 30	6
People's strong awareness of protecting the environment (N=63)	(17+44) 61	21	(11+3) 14	3
Higher living standard (N=63)	(10+56) 66	27	(16+0) 16	2
Stronger influence of trade unions (N=65)	(5+11) 16	14	(57+11) 68	3
Higher taxation rates (N=66)	(0+3) 3	2	(48+45) 93	2

of neutrality or uncertainty in their views included Australia's European heritage and its more liberal social practices and their effects on the lives of their families and children.

When asked specifically about multiculturalism in Australia (see table 10), respondents had a fairly positive set of views. For instance, around three-fourths agreed that it increased social and cultural tolerance, was attractive to potential migrants, and enhanced their sense of identity with Australia. A majority also felt that it was clearly defined and understood, promoted the practice of "good citizenship," and was a component of the "Australian identity." There was a split view over whether multiculturalism perpetuates racial practices in Australia, as less than one-quarter of the respondents felt that multiculturalism "confused" their sense of identity.

In response to the view "Hong Kong people don't care about politics; they will be satisfied to obey the government and make money," 46 percent of the respondents agreed and 31 percent disagreed, with 20 percent responding that they neither agreed nor disagreed to the statement, and 3

Table 10
Multiculturalism in Australia

Unit: %

	SD + D	N	A + SA	U/S
Confuses my sense of identity (N=64)	(14+42) 56	13	(22+5) 27	5
Increases social and cultural tolerance in Australia (N=64)	(3+5) 8	9	(61+17) 78	5
Is attractive to potential migrants from overseas (N=65)	(2+8) 10	11	(58+17) 75	5
Is clearly defined and understood by me (N=65)	(3+11) 14	14	(52+11) 63	9
Perpetuates racial practices in Australia (N=64)	(5+27) 32	21	(23+5) 28	9
Is a main component of the "Australian identity" (N=62)	(3+10) 13	24	(47+5) 52	11
Promotes the practice of good citizenship in Australia (N=63)	(5+8) 13	19	(56+6) 62	6
Enhances my sense of identity with Australia (N=62)	(3+6) 9	10	(60+13) 73	6

percent unsure (N=65). About one-third indicated that they might be interested in politics–presumably either relating to Australia or Hong Kong (and probably related to the issues raised in Australia by "Hansonism" and in Hong Kong by the resumption of Chinese sovereignty over the territory). The data also indicates that respondents' concerns about Australia are strongly linked with their family and social life in Australia.

A series of questions was asked concerning respondents' settlement and family and social life in Australia. Table 11 provides data in response to the question of the most difficult aspect encountered in individuals' settlement in Australia; the most difficult problem (68 percent of respondents) was finding a job for which the individual was trained, qualified, or experienced. Between 30 and 40 percent said that the most difficult aspect was making new friends, language and communication difficulties, and "strange social customs." Government assistance to migrants was deemed not to have been a difficulty (although nearly 30 percent gave a neutral answer to the question).

Proficiency in the English language by respondents and their family members was generally deemed to be adequate for living in Australia.

Table 11
The Most Difficult Aspect of Settling into Australia for Respondents

Unit: %

	SD + D	N	A + SA	U/S
Language and communication problems (N=65)	(9+42) 51	12	(29+6) 35	2
Strange social customs (N=63)	(6+48) 54	11	(27+5) 32	3
Poor government assistance to migrants (N=63)	(6+38) 44	29	(16+5) 21	6
Making new friends (N=60)	(2+42) 44	17	(27+12) 39	2
Finding a job for which I'm trained/ qualified/experienced (N=66)	(3+17) 20	11	(45+23) 68	2

Eighty-nine percent of the respondents considered their English abilities to be adequate for such purposes (N=67), 85 percent thought their spouse's/ partner's English proficiency was suitable (N=56), and 79 percent felt that their children's English proficiency was good enough (N=48). Taking the fact that many respondents' children were still too young to describe their abilities in English (56 percent were under 12 years old), the lower rate of their English proficiency is reasonable and understandable. Considerably fewer respondents (but still a majority) thought that other members of their family (presumably their elders, such as parents, parents-in-law, and uncles and aunts) had English proficiency adequate for life in Australia (N=44).

When asked about their religious beliefs/affiliations, the majority said they had none (N=64). Of those reporting a religious belief/affiliation, 19 percent and 9 percent cited Catholicism and Protestantism respectively, and 17 percent mentioned Buddhism, while 6 percent mentioned others. Such religious belief/affiliation has been said to provide considerable support, socially, emotionally, and even materially, to those making the transition into Australian society as migrant settlers. Some religious-based support groups and worship centers catering for the HKPCA in Australia have also been established in recent years. Over 71 percent of respondents agreed that they actively encouraged their family to make friends with non-Chinese Australians, compared with 27 percent indicating a neutral attitude toward this question, and only 2 percent answering "no" (N=62).

While the vast majority of respondents indicated that they were not

active members of organizations which focus specifically on Hong Kong (78 percent), it is known through in-depth interviews that a number of social organizations composed primarily of people of Chinese ancestry, and a few that are predominantly oriented toward HKPCA, do exist in Australia. Socially, this group, like other Chinese groups in Australia (and in Queensland specifically), tends not to interact frequently with non-HKPCA groups, although the Hanson-colored sociopolitical climate has brought such groups together somewhat in forum activities designed to counter "anti-Asianism." And, as will be discussed briefly below, some within this group have taken a more active (albeit possibly ephemeral and single issue-dominated) interest in the political sphere. One of the main, yet not numerically strong, groups among the HKPCA is the Hong Kong Professionals and Business Association of Queensland, centered in Brisbane.

In terms of political participation, some 80 percent of the respondents claimed to have both registered to vote and voted in local elections. Only 20 percent reported that they had actively campaigned for candidates in Australian elections, although over half stated that they had signed letters or petitions related to sociopolitical issues in the country (possibly in relation to the "Hanson phenomenon"). A mere 5 percent said they were members of a local political party or group. Finally, when asked if they had no interest or activity in Australian political affairs, 45 percent disagreed–a considerably higher percentage than those who agreed (29 percent), and thus deemed themselves to be "politically apathetic" (see table 12).

It is a well-understood dictum among persons who are married or have a partner that if your mate is happy, then your life together and as an individual in a site away from your place of origin will be more tolerable, especially as settlement into a new sociocultural environment occurs. A major source of dysfunction among migrant families is the unhappiness of a spouse/partner or the children. When asked if their spouse/partner is happy living in Australia (N=54), over three-fourths answered that they were (76 percent), while only 9 percent said they were not. But, only given that adequate and caring communication exists between spouses/partners (and between parents and children as well), can one assume that this reportage is accurate. In response to the statement "My children are happier

Table 12
Respondents' Political Participation in Australia

Unit: %

	SD + D	N	A + SA	U/S
Registering to vote in local elections (N=49)	(2+6) 8	8	(53+27) 80	4
Actually voting in local elections (N=54)	(2+6) 8	7	(54+28) 82	4
Campaigning actively for candidates in Australia (N=45)	(11+29) 40	31	(16+4) 20	9
Being a member of a local political party or group (N=41)	(17+29) 46	34	(5+0) 5	15
Signing letters/petitions related to sociopolitical issues (N=50)	(10+8) 18	16	(52+4) 56	10
No interest/activity in Australian political affairs (N=53)	(11+34) 45	21	(23+6) 29	6

living in Australia compared to Hong Kong" (N=48), 83 percent of the respondents agreed and none disagreed (although 10 percent were unsure and 6 percent were neutral).

Respondents were asked about a range of issues concerning the lives of their children in Australia (see table 13). A majority agreed that the cultural heritage of their children was difficult to maintain in Australia, although their children's understanding of citizenship had increased. Nearly half of the respondents disagreed that their children's respect for them as parents had eroded in Australia, but respondents were split in their views about their children's personalities becoming more aggressive and their identities becoming confused in Australia. When asked to respond to the statement that their children's friends were mostly non-Chinese children, respondents again were split in their views (N=47), although 15 percent more agreed than disagreed with the statement (with 38 percent agreeing, 23 percent disagreeing, and 38 percent being either neutral or unsure). In response to the statement that "My children feel comfortable with their Chinese heritage while at school" (N=51), 39 percent agreed (although 18 percent were unsure and 31 percent were neutral in their view) and 12 percent disagreed. In response to the statements "I have no problem with my children developing a close relationship with a person of the opposite

Table 13
Respondents' Children in Australia

Unit: %

	SD + D	N	A + SA	U/S
Identity has become confused (N=47)	(0+30) 30	28	(19+9) 28	15
Respect for parents has eroded (N=47)	(4+43) 47	19	(21+2) 23	11
Cultural heritage is difficult to maintain (N=47)	(2+21) 23	11	(51+4) 55	11
Understanding of citizenship has increased (N=47)	(0+9) 9	26	(47+4) 51	15
Social relationships have become too free (N=47)	(0+6) 6	36	(43+2) 45	13
Personality has become more aggressive (N=47)	(6+10) 25	40	(17+4) 21	13

sex outside their ethnic group" (N=43) and "My children have already developed such a relationship" (N=43), 61 percent disagreed with the former (compared with 39 percent who were neutral) and 93 percent said "no" to the latter (with only 7 percent saying "yes"). Finally, in reply to the statement that "My children view friendship as being more important than family relationships" (N=47), 60 percent disagreed, 19 percent agreed, 13 percent were neutral, and 9 percent were unsure.

Respondents' Attitudes and Concerns about Hong Kong

The survey-questionnaire also included several questions aimed at measuring respondents' attitudes and concerns about Hong Kong. The two predominant types of worries expressed were related to economic and immigration-multicultural issues (see table 14). The worries were (in order of descending agreement) Hong Kong's political uncertainty, corruption, interference from the Chinese government in Hong Kong's economy, erosion of the rule of law, uncertainty over questions of nationality as they apply to Hong Kong, their family's future, their livelihood future, erosion of human rights and freedoms, decline of educational standards, and decline of press freedom and rise of self-censorship (which also received the highest percentage of neutral responses). Those factors deemed to be least

Table 14
The Factors about Hong Kong That Worry Respondents the Most

Unit: %

	SD + D	N	A + SA	U/S
Political uncertainty (N=64)	(2+9) 11	5	(42+39) 81	3
Corruption (N=65)	(2+11) 13	17	(40+28) 68	3
Inflation (N=66)	(2+11) 13	18	(44+23) 67	3
Interference from the Chinese government in HK's economy (N=62)	(2+8) 10	11	(40+32) 72	6
Erosion of the rule of law (N=64)	(2+9) 11	14	(31+34) 65	9
Uncertainty over questions of nationality as they apply to HK (N=64)	(0+16) 16	19	(39+20) 59	6
My family's future in Hong Kong (N=63)	(2+16) 18	22	(35+19) 54	6
My livelihood future in Hong Kong (N=62)	(2+15) 17	26	(35+16) 51	6
Erosion of human rights and freedoms (N=64)	(5+3) 8	17	(34+34) 68	6
Decline of educational standards (N=65)	(3+14) 17	6	(43+28) 71	6
Decline of press freedom and rise of self-censorship (N=64)	(5+5) 10	3	(41+34) 75	13

worrisome were "family's future" and their "livelihood future" in Hong Kong, although this was also deemed to be a concern for nearly half of the respondents.

When asked about the level of their optimism in light of Hong Kong's reunion with the PRC, about four out of ten respondents felt some degree of pessimism, with at least as many feeling ambivalent about the matter. This lack of solid optimism, and thus confidence, about the reversion to Chinese rule among HKPCA living abroad (which echoes the same feelings held by Hong Kong residents) in fact reflected a complicated feeling and should be taken as a real challenge by the new leadership of the HKSAR.

Respondents were also asked about their feelings concerning specific issues related to the 1997 handover and Hong Kong's future (see table 15). The greatest degree of optimism was given to Hong Kong's economic performance and its continuing status as an "international city" (one must note that these views were obtained prior to the more recent financial crises that

Table 15
Respondents' Views on Hong Kong's Future, Taking into Consideration Issues Relating to the 1997 Handover

Unit: %

	VOpt + Opt	N	Pess + VPess	Other
Economic performance (N=66)	(8+52) 60	33	(8+0) 8	0
Political performance of HK government and civil service (N=66)	(2+29) 31	39	(27+3) 30	0
The PRC government's handling of HK's political affairs (N=66)	(2+20) 22	30	(41+8) 49	0
Status as an international city (N=66)	(6+47) 53	33	(14+0) 14	0
Suitability as a place for my family to reside (N=65)	(0+14) 14	51	(28+8) 36	0
Suitability as a place for me to do business/work (N=66)	(2+30) 32	47	(17+3) 20	2
Current lifestyle (N=64)	(0+28) 28	44	(27+0) 27	2
Relatively corruption-free political and economic environment (N=65)	(0+11) 11	32	(49+8) 57	0

have occurred throughout Asia). This coincided with opinions of a majority in the Queensland Chinese community, and residents in Hong Kong as well.[9] The greatest degree of pessimism was felt about the maintenance of a relatively corruption-free political and economic environment and the Chinese government's handling of Hong Kong's political affairs (with the two seemingly closely linked). Importantly, respondents indicated a high degree of ambivalence about a number of issues crucial to their own interests, including Hong Kong's suitability as a place for their families to reside and for them to do business, as well as their feelings about the continuation of the current Hong Kong lifestyle and the political performance of the

[9]Such an opinion was also reflected in a panel about "Hong Kong's Handover to China" which was organized by the Mainland Chinese Society Queensland and held on May 25, 1997, including some professionals, such as university lecturers and businessmen, as speakers and discussants; and in another panel organized by Hong Kong Professionals and Business Association of Queensland, Mainland Chinese Society Queensland, and Queensland Chinese Community Voice and held on July 1, 1997. It was also found in Hong Kong by a survey on the eve of the handover. For more on the same opinion as reflected by Hong Kong residents, see Wang Jiaying, "The Latest Public Opinion Trend on the Eve of Handover," *Xingdao yaowen* (Brief News of Sing Dao) (Electronic edition), June 4, 1997.

Table 16
Respondents' Methods for Keeping up with Current Events in Hong Kong

Unit: %

	SD + D	N	A + SA	U/S
Correspondence with family members/ relatives and friends there (N=64)	(3+6) 9	11	(70+6) 76	3
Through mainstream media such as TV and English newspapers (N=64)	(0+2) 2	6	(78+13) 91	2
Through local Chinese newspapers and cable TV (N=65)	(0+2) 2	5	(78+14) 92	2
Exchanging and sharing information with friends (N=62)	(0+2) 2	6	(79+11) 90	2
Attending seminars/forums relating to HK issues (N=62)	(2+18) 20	30	(44+2) 46	5

HKSAR government and civil service. These concerns have also been shown in recent surveys among the people in Hong Kong by the Hong Kong Transition Project.[10]

The survey-questionnaire sought to better understand by what means the HKPCA in Australia have attempted to keep up with current events in Hong Kong (see table 16). Multiple methods were used by the vast majority, with the specific methods adopted being (in order of descending frequency) local (Australian) Chinese newspapers and cable television, the mainstream English-language media (newspapers and television), the exchange/sharing of information with friends in Australia, and correspondence with family members and friends in Hong Kong.

Respondents' Views about Remaining in Australia or Returning to Hong Kong

Lastly, a series of questions was asked concerning the factors which would most influence respondents in terms of their remaining in Australia

[10]It was also shown in a survey undertaken by scholars from the University of Hong Kong on the eve of the handover. See ibid.

Table 17
The Reasons Why Respondents Came to Australia, or Have Chosen to Remain

Unit: %

	SD + D	N	A + SA	U/S
Family reunion (migration) (N=63)	(11+21) 33	17	(41+8) 49	2
Employment/business involvement (N=62)	(5+39) 44	18	(31+5) 36	3
More political freedom and stability (N=63)	(3+11) 14	10	(56+19) 75	2
Lifestyle advantage (N=63)	(3+11) 14	13	(44+27) 71	2
Better investment opportunities (N=62)	(15+47) 62	23	(8+3) 11	5
More healthy environment (N=65)	(3+2) 5	3	(49+43) 92	0

or returning to Hong Kong. When asked the reasons why they had come to Australia, or would remain there, respondents replied that the most important ones were (in order of descending choice) Australia's healthier environment, its greater political freedom and stability, and its (particularly Queensland's) lifestyle advantages. A much less important reason was Australia's better investment opportunities. Respondents were split in their views on employment/business involvement (44 percent disagreeing and 36 percent agreeing), and just under half agreed that family reunion (migration) was a reason for coming to or remaining in Australia (see table 17).

The factors which would most affect respondents' decision to leave Australia and return to Hong Kong, given the opportunity and means to do so, included (in order of descending choice) a belief that racial/immigration problems in Australia are serious, better employment/business opportunities in Hong Kong, and family preferences. The factors that would have a lesser affect on respondents' decision in this matter, but factors which prompted somewhat split and/or ambivalent responses, included corruption and the erosion of the rule of law in Hong Kong not being serious and a belief that personal freedoms in Hong Kong will remain. An equal percentage of respondents agreed and disagreed with the statement "None, I will remain in Australia no matter what." However, 43 percent of the respondents were neutral in their position on this statement, and 12 percent were unsure (see table 18). Again, the results of this question, if asked in the present financial crisis affecting Hong Kong and the Asia region (especial-

Table 18
The Factors Affecting Respondents' Decision to Leave Australia and Return to Hong Kong, Given the Opportunity and Means to Do So

Unit: %

	SD + D	N	A + SA	U/S
Family preferences (N=61)	(5+13) 18	20	(44+18) 62	0
Corruption in HK is not serious (N=61)	(7+30) 37	34	(21+3) 24	5
Erosion of the rule of law in HK is not serious (N=60)	(5+23) 28	27	(35+5) 40	5
A belief that personal freedoms in HK will remain (N=61)	(7+26) 33	16	(41+7) 48	3
A belief that racial/immigration problems in Australia are serious (N=61)	(2+7) 9	15	(48+28) 76	2
Better employment/business opportunities in HK (N=62)	(2+10) 12	16	(47+24) 71	2
None, I will remain in Australia no matter what (N=58)	(7+16) 23	43	(16+7) 23	12

ly the erosion of the property market and demise of several Hong Kong corporations which had heavily invested in Asian economies now disturbed by the crisis) may be quite different.

The survey asked respondents to consider the relevance to themselves of several options related to the statement "Having migrated with my family to Australia, I now want to return with them to Hong Kong." For the most part, the responses to all options reflected mixed views and ambivalence. Although there was a high neutral response to the following options, a higher percentage agreed than disagreed with them: "My family members are not all in agreement to do so" (22 percent were unsure); "I have no means to do so"; "not applicable to my situation"; "Hong Kong's political situation is not conducive to do so"; and "I have no employment or business prospects to allow it." A higher percentage disagreed than agreed with the statement "The socioeconomic situation in Hong Kong is not conducive to do so" (see table 19).

Lastly, respondents were asked how often they visited Hong Kong and their main reason for doing so. Thirty-five percent said once per year, 9 percent said twice per year, and 11 percent answered four or more times per year. Thus, over half of the respondents said that they visited Hong

Table 19
Respondents Who Have Migrated with Their Families to Australia, and Now Wish to Return with Them to Hong Kong

Unit: %

	SD + D	N	A + SA	U/S
Not applicable to my situation (N=52)	(0+31) 31	25	(29+13) 42	2
I have no means to do so (economically) (N=46)	(7+20) 27	28	(26+13) 39	7
I have no employment or business prospects to allow it (N=46)	(9+24) 33	26	(30+7) 37	4
My family members are not all in agreement to do so (N=46)	(4+9) 13	35	(24+7) 31	22
HK's political situation is not conducive to do so (N=47)	(9+15) 24	34	(26+4) 30	13
The socioeconomic situation in HK is not conducive to do so (N=47)	(4+28) 32	36	(17+2) 19	13

Kong frequently (and 20 percent do so more than once), while 45 percent indicated that they visited Hong Kong every few years if at all (N=66). The main reasons given for visiting Hong Kong (N=44) were to see family members residing there (57 percent), for holidays/tourism (20 percent), to see friends (14 percent), for business (5 percent), and for other reasons (5 percent). It would appear that the HKPCA in Australia have kept their "Hong Kong connections" very much alive.

In fact, respondents' employment and business affairs are the factors directly and indirectly affecting their views about remaining in Australia or returning to Hong Kong. The survey-questionnaire asked respondents a few business-related questions, with some interesting results. For example, when asked to respond to "I prefer to do business with people of Chinese ancestry" (N=58), 71 percent said "yes," while 21 percent said "sometimes." It is interesting, but as yet unexplained, that 7 percent said "no." When queried about the languages in which they could conduct business (N=61), 97 percent reported that they could do business in English, 96 percent could do business in Cantonese, and 74 percent could do business in Mandarin. As mentioned above, it is significant that seven out of ten respondents said they could conduct business in all three languages/dialects.

The Australian government's business policy and prospect of economic development are also factors affecting their decision-making to stay or return. Survey data indicates that respondents were evenly divided, or unsure, as to whether the Australian government's policies encouraged their business dealings in Australia. Such factors as high taxes, high labor costs, and unionism were cited as disincentives in this regard. Moreover, when asked if their business/economic interests in Hong Kong were of value to Australian interests, nearly two-thirds either agreed or strongly agreed that they are thought to be so. These results certainly suggest that further research needs to be done on such questions if Australia wishes both to attract businesspeople and investment to Australia, promote Australian business interests in Hong Kong (and China), and take advantage of the positive talents and "connections" of the HKPCA in Australia for business purposes.

Politicization and Political Profile of the HKPCA in Queensland and Australia

A combination of factors, the main ones recently being the "Hanson phenomenon" in Australia (and the formation of its "One Nation" party) and the July 1, 1997 turnover of Hong Kong to Chinese rule, has generated a greater interest and activity in the sociopolitical sphere for HKPCA in Australia. Among Hansonism's targets are the growing numbers of ethnic Chinese arriving in or returning to Australia, a country now tied to Asian markets by necessity. But in a newspaper poll conducted in Australia in February 1997, 71 percent of the respondents agreed that Canberra should cut back Asian immigration.[11] In May 1996, Andrew Tse, a senior executive with Hong Kong magnate Stanley Ho's Shun Tak Group, warned in Perth that the "growing hint of racial discrimination could damage foreign investment in Australia."[12] In mid-November 1996, the Chinese Australia

[11]*Courier-Mail* (Brisbane), June 14, 1997, 11.
[12]*The Australian*, May 19, 1997, 34.

Forum had already released a survey reported in Hong Kong that attacks on Chinese-Australians had more than doubled since Hanson's anti-Asian speech in the Australian Parliament in September 1996.[13] The Forum claimed that it had reports of 47 incidents of written abuse, 670 of verbal abuse, 97 of physical abuse, and 79 of spitting. In a letter to the editor of *The Australian* in May 1997, a highly respected academic, Jamie Mackie, wrote that "Hanson is not important in her own right .... [She] symbolizes the alienation within part of the community caused by a conjunction of force–globalization, economic restructuring, and social changes–where people need scapegoats to explain their frustration."[14] He added, "How can we reach and mobilize the Australian-born Asians and children of Australian parents married to Asian spouses so they can make their voices heard? There must be nearly half a million of them among us by now."

As one example of the politicization emerging over this issue among the communities of people with Chinese ancestry in Australia, in mid-June 1997, Wellington Lee, chairman of the Australian Chinese Association in Melbourne, announced a campaign to "destabilize" Hanson's "One Nation" party by "stacking" it with Australian Chinese members and voting her out as leader.[15] Lee said, "We request all Australian citizens to use his or her democratic rights to join the 'One Nation' party and vote Pauline Hanson out. We have talked to other leaders of the different [ethnic] communities in supporting this plan and we are confident that this is workable." The campaign, Lee stated, was to be launched in a newly-established Chinese newspaper, *The Chinese Weekly*, with an anticipated readership of 100,000.

As mentioned before, there was a rather mixed feeling among the HKPCA in Australia about the Hong Kong handover, ranging from feelings of "Chinese patriotism" and the "righting of historical wrongs" to fears about CCP rule (colored by memories of the Tiananmen events of 1989) and the erosion of the lifestyle and freedoms Hong Kong people have come to enjoy. In particular, the reinstatement by the Provisional Legislature of

[13]See *South China Morning Post*, November 23, 1996, 17.
[14]*The Australian*, May 12, 1997, 10.
[15]Ibid., June 16, 1997, 2.

the Societies Ordinance scraped by Governor Chris Patten in 1992 which limits the freedom of local political groups to form links with foreign organizations has been a topic of much concern among this group. Hong Kong's new Chief Executive Tung Chee-hwa has launched several attacks on Martin Lee and his Democratic Party over their travels overseas seeking support for Hong Kong's civil and human rights. Tung has stated that "these are issues which should be talked through in Hong Kong instead of going overseas in such a way that it creates doubts and confusion which may or may not affect investment, and invites foreign countries to tell us how to do things."[16] In what was described as "a wave of anger" over these plans, Tung's popularity in Hong Kong plummeted, prompting him in an April 1997 speech to signal some "flexibility" in defining the term "alien," which now could exclude even returning migrants from donating money to local political parties.[17] Much, of course, depends on the degree of "flexibility" the Hong Kong administration will be allowed to have on this matter by Beijing.

A brief survey of what might be termed "political activities" by the HKPCA in Queensland is enlightening. For example, the Queensland Chinese Forum, formed within the past few years, describes itself as a "liaising organization covering 14 different Chinese organizations in Queensland and represents the majority of Queensland-based ethnic Chinese Australians."[18] The member organizations include: the Cathay Club, the Chinese Business and Professionals Association of Queensland, the Chinese Catholic Community, the Chinese Ethnic Broadcasting Association of Queensland, the Chinese Fraternity Association of Queensland, the Chinese Kung Fu Academy, the Fortitude Valley Chinatown Business Association, the Gold Coast Chinese Club, the Hong Kong Professionals and Business Association of Queensland, the Mainland Chinese Society Queensland, the Queensland Chinese Food and Beverage Hospitality Association, the Taiwan Friendship Association, the Taiwan Women's League of Queensland,

[16]*The Weekend Australian*, February 15-16, 1997, 16.

[17]Ibid., April 19-20, 1997, 15.

[18]Document supplied to the authors in June 1997 by the Queensland Chinese Forum.

and the World Orthodox Buddhist Association of Queensland.[19]

The Forum's main activities are to promote and sponsor social gatherings for its member organizations and, most importantly, to serve as a "clearing house" for the discussion of issues relevant to the Chinese communities, especially in light of the "Hanson phenomenon." According to the Forum's broadsheet, "the member organizations agree that for matters related to the Queensland Chinese community in general, the Forum will be the sole source of any media release. The spokesperson for the Forum is the President. Matters related to individual associations will be dealt with by the association concerned." Forum President Bill Qui and Vice-President Michael Yau (who is also vice-president of the Hong Kong Professionals and Business Association of Queensland),[20] in an interview published in the local newspaper *The Southern Star* on May 7, 1997, outlined the public stance of the organization by criticizing Prime Minister John Howard for his reluctance to speak out against Pauline Hanson:

> In principle [we] don't think we can object to anyone setting up a political party; that's freedom in Australia. We think the silence from John Howard represents agreement with what Pauline Hanson and her people are saying. As business people we see that if this carries on, we'll have some sort of trade sanctions from other countries.

Forum members, the two have stated, want to focus their attention on improving the public's understanding of multiculturalism, which they believe is the key to improving attitudes toward ethnic minorities. In a speech delivered at the November 23, 1996 Rally Against Racism in Ipswich, Queensland, Michael Yau began by pointing out the importance of racial harmony and spoke of the dangers perceived racism would have for Aus-

---

[19]The membership of the Queensland Chinese Forum (QCF) dramatically dropped to seven from the previous fourteen when the 1997 annual general meeting was held in late October. According to unofficial sources, some senior members of the Queensland Chinese Community Voice successfully persuaded some organizations to withdraw their membership from the QCF. The other obvious factor in this is that all organizations with a Taiwan background abandoned their membership. As its reputation was being eroded by the dropping membership, many people doubted whether the QCF could continue to represent the Chinese community in Queensland for matters declared in its broadsheet.

[20]Michael Yau was elected to the presidency and Bill Qiu the vice-presidency in the 1997 annual general meeting of the QCF.

tralian trade in the Asian region. He spoke of the contributions to Australian society by Chinese immigrants, stating that "we are not 'lowly people'; we are doctors, engineers, teachers, business people, and workers in every field" and "we create employment and opportunities for all Australians."

However, there are some within the Chinese community in Queensland who have felt that organizations like the Forum have been assertive enough about both local issues and issues concerning China and Hong Kong. For example, in September 1996, at a debate focused on the Daoyutai issue between younger, well-educated members of the Forum and the Forum's elders, the idea to establish a more "outspoken" organization emerged. The former group felt that the Forum had been too slow and "conservative" in terms of support for Chinese sovereignty over the disputed islands. Failing to prompt the more conservative elders into greater action, the more "radical" group split off and in October of that year formed the Queensland Chinese Community Voice (QCCV). The QCCV initiated a series of newspaper articles on that issue, but also became involved in participating in and organizing rallies against racism and lobbying politicians to promote multiculturalism in Australia. How many members are in this group is unknown, but its impact within the Chinese community in Queensland has been considerable. In an interview with Michael Yau in Brisbane on June 1, 1997, the authors were told that the Forum was finding it hard to compete with the QCCV in terms of making timely and expert public commentary on politically-related issues. This was said to be due to the fact that the Forum had functioned primarily as a facilitator of social gatherings and a provider of community services among the local Chinese community, and that "the leaders of the Forum could neither write nor speak to the public." He noted that if the Forum did not succeed in promoting some young and well-educated people into its leadership–people who could "compete" with the QCCV spokespersons in publicly articulating "responsible, but forthright" views and positions, the Forum's position in the Chinese community would be weakened.

The convener of the QCCV is Reverend Enoch Choy, a Catholic priest and M.A. graduate of Yale University aged in his late thirties, who came to Australia as a migrant from Hong Kong. Based on initial investigation into the core leadership of this group, seven other individuals have

been identified: Dr. Cheung Chiu-yee, Sam Chow, Lawrence Ma, Dr. Anthony Lee, Fred Hong, Peter Chang, and Wayne Lee. They are mostly persons with some "connections" to Hong Kong, with several having mainland China family backgrounds or experiences. Most are aged in their thirties and forties (with two aged about sixty), and most came as migrants to Australia. One individual, Fred Hong, came to Australia in 1990 as a university student, and later was given permanent residency as a "refugee" under Canberra's November 1, 1993 decision granting sanctuary to those claiming to be affected by the Tiananmen events of 1989. By occupation, these individuals are barristers, postgraduate students, university lecturers, and professionals. Before his migration to Queensland from Hong Kong, Anthony Lee was involved in the activities of the pro-democracy "Frontier" political grouping headed by Emily Lau Wai-hing. He maintains his connections with this group, and in his activities in Queensland often publicly advocates a close scrutiny of China's handling of post-1997 Hong Kong (particularly civil and human rights). Unlike the younger Anthony Lee, Wayne Lee advocates a focus on activities and events in Australia rather than on those in the country of origin (in this case Hong Kong). This has led to some speculation within the local Chinese community that there are splits among the QCCV leaders, which could lead to a weakening of its position.

Indeed, there is intense factional struggle among the QCCV, similar to that in all organizations of the overseas Chinese community,[21] particularly in regard to attitudes toward Hong Kong's handover to China. As a result, two opposite factions have emerged: one mostly composed of HKPCA who immigrated to Australia in the late 1980s and after, with Anthony Lee as the main representative, and the other including HKPCA who came to Australia before the mid-1980s.[22] Also, the QCCV is deemed to be too politicized, considering its mission declared to monitor political

[21]For a detailed discussion of factional struggle in the overseas Chinese community, see Yen, *A Social History of the Chinese in Singapore and Malaya.*

[22]This expression is obtained from interviews with Wayne Lee and Peter Chang in Brisbane in May and July 1997. Recently, Anthony Lee announced that he would seek for a seat in the State Legislative Assembly in the 1998 Queensland election. This further strengthens the political aspect of this radical faction in the QCCV.

development on both sides of the Taiwan Strait as well as Hong Kong's civic and political progress after 1997. These developments have already caused much worry among members of the QCCV, particularly some of its founders.[23] In any event, these happenings do reflect the intensification of politicization among Chinese groups in Australia and Queensland, a development which is worth watching in the future.

Conclusion

Fortunately, Australia has little heavy baggage to burden its relations with China so far as Hong Kong is concerned. Nonetheless, relations will be complicated by forces seeking to preserve, if not expand, political and human rights in Hong Kong and China, and such issues will be of increasing importance in local electorates in Australia where Hong Kong migrants have settled.

This study has pointed to a number of factors which have posed and will pose challenges for the HKPCA in Australia and Queensland, as well as for Australians as a whole. Among these are their search for an identity in an Australia in search of itself in the Asian region, and in a Hong Kong now under a new authority from across the Shenzhen River. This is not simply a "movement of peoples" but a "shifting or adjustment of identities" and all the emotions that accompany them. That many from Hong Kong (and in Hong Kong) are frustrated by being "caught" between racially tinged polemics of Hansonism in Australia and the perceived heavier hand of Beijing in Hong Kong is undeniable. There will be a need for mutual tolerance, if not compassion, in Australia for this group and others like them experiencing such seminal processes in their lives. Of necessity, there will continue to be a period of "sorting-out" for all as those with "extended connections" and (at least perceived) "divided loyalties" find their stride. They are not "faceless" numbers to be auctioned off to past prejudices or held hostage to purely economic profit. In all of this, neither the Australian

[23]Interview with Cheung Chiu-yee in August 1997.

authorities nor the Australian public should lose the "plot" of Hong Kong in the "play" of Greater China, and should recognize that the days are past when Aussies, including those in Queensland, can expect to perform successfully at the competitive cutting edge by shadow dancing at the margins–especially when the discordant sounds of racism "cut in."