Academic Journal of Management and Social Sciences
ISSN: 2958-4396 | Vol. 18, No. 3, 2026

Hosts Who Were Guests: Shenzhen Residents' Impressions of Hong Kong Visitors after the Reversal

Fan Zhang [1, 2, a], Fangmei Liu [1, *]

[1] School of Management, Shenzhen Polytechnic University, Shenzhen, Guangdong, 518055, China
[2] Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area Cultural and Tourism Integration Innovation Development Research Center, Shenzhen, Guangdong, 518055, China

*** Corresponding author:** Fangmei Liu (Email: lfm20220133@szpu.edu.cn), [a] lorrainezhang@szpu.edu.cn

Abstract: The direction of travel between Hong Kong and Shenzhen has reversed, yet little is known about how Shenzhen residents see the visitors who now arrive. The study draws on 38 semi-structured interviews conducted in January and February 2026 near the border and in three commercial districts. Recognition comes before speech, from bags and luggage, dress, payment interface, language and pace. Judgements of behaviour were favourable and stable. Most participants described the visits as an economic gain; a minority said that prices and rents had risen. Cold treatment in Hong Kong did not predict a cold reception here. Six participants who had been received coldly welcomed the visitors anyway, for reasons that ran from self-interest to a wish not to repeat what they had been given. As visits grew frequent the category became less distinctive, while its content remained available. The account fills a gap on the Shenzhen side of a border so far studied from Hong Kong, and shows that a favourable impression of a group can sit beside an unfavourable judgement of what the group costs.

Keywords: Tourist Stereotypes; Host–guest Relations; Resident Attitudes; Cross-border Tourism; Shenzhen.

1. Introduction

Since quarantine-free travel between Hong Kong and Shenzhen resumed in early 2023, movement across the border has reversed in direction and changed in scale. Border statistics recorded more than 77 million entries by Hong Kong residents at Shenzhen checkpoints in 2024, against some 38 million departures in the other direction [1]. Industry estimates put northbound spending in Guangdong at about HK$55.7 billion, some HK$20 billion more than in 2023. A survey cited in the same report found that 95 per cent of Hong Kong respondents had visited Shenzhen more than once [2]. The flow has become routine: at the Liantang market, Hong Kong customers account for more than half of the footfall [3].

These figures record movement and expenditure rather than how residents of the host city understand the people who arrive. Research on this border has examined the opposite direction, documenting Hong Kong residents' perceptions of mainland visitors [4,5,6,7] and mainland visitors' experience of being watched in Hong Kong [8]. The reverse side has received little attention, because until 2023 the flow was small enough to be treated as an anomaly.

The omission matters. Co-presence is now dense enough to shape daily life in border districts. Participants named restaurant queues in Huangbeiling, tour buses parked seven or eight deep outside the Futian checkpoint, and a checkpoint that fills to capacity on Hong Kong public holidays. The direction of the flow has also reversed, and with it the positions of host and guest. Research on host–guest relations has generally treated the host as a settled party [9,10]; here the hosts were the guests within living memory. The change is recent enough that residents can still describe how they thought before it, and their accounts record a direction that a single cross-section cannot.

This descriptive study aims to explore how residents of Shenzhen see Hong Kong visitors: how they recognise them, what attributes they attach to them, in what terms they justify welcoming or criticising them, and what change they report.

Two implications follow for research on tourist stereotypes. The account comes from the Shenzhen side of a border whose studies have so far described Hong Kong, and it arrives while residents can still compare the present with a period they remember. It also shows that a favourable impression of a group can sit beside an unfavourable judgement of what the group costs, and that residents treated coldly abroad do not necessarily pass the treatment on.

2. Literature

2.1. The Dimensional Structure of Tourist Stereotypes

Research on tourist stereotypes has concentrated on content: the attributes residents attach to a group. Two dimensions organise most of that work. Warmth follows from a group's intent toward the observer and competence from its status, and the combination predicts distinct emotions and conduct [11]. Mixed judgements are common, and the mix says more than a favourability score does. The same city can be judged warm and incompetent in one account, and cold and competent in another.

Tourism research adapted the pair and then divided it. The four-dimension tourist stereotype model holds two positive dimensions, approachable and competent, and two negative ones, boastful and rude, and it treats the negative as separate from the mere absence of the positive [6]. A group can therefore be judged warm and boastful at once, which a single good or bad score cannot express. Evidence from visible spending supports the separation, since conspicuous consumption can be read as boastful rather than as able [12]. A design that let residents produce attributes without a list obtained three dimensions instead, civility, travel behaviour and economic power, and found civility the most accessible and the best predictor of response [13]. For that model the order of production carries information about the category

and not only about the respondent. The two accounts agree that content is multi-dimensional and differ on what is stable: one treats the dimensions as general, the other treats their accessibility as a property of the category.

Content reaches conduct through emotion. The same belief can lead to different behaviour depending on the feeling it evokes, which is why content alone predicts conduct poorly [14]. Surveys of both parties show that evaluation is reciprocal rather than one-way, and that the routes from stereotype to intention differ between groups [15,16]. What it settles is a set of dimensions, a rule about which comes to mind first, and a reading of spending as a sign of standing. All of it concerns residents of a destination describing visitors. None of it concerns residents of Shenzhen describing visitors from Hong Kong, a direction that has existed since 2023.

2.2. Resident Attitudes and Host–guest Relations at the Destination

Reviews of residents' attitudes keep finding the same structure. Perceived impacts explain support, and later work has refined the instruments without changing that order [10,17]. That explains support well. It says little about the encounter, because the resident is weighing a development rather than meeting a person.

A second line takes volume as the driver. Research on overtourism frames resident opposition as a response to growth in visitor numbers and to the loss of everyday space that follows [9], and examines that opposition through perceived impacts and willingness to cooperate [18]. It explains why dense arrivals produce resistance. It assumes that the host population stays in place and the visitors arrive, which is the arrangement the present study does not have.

Emotional solidarity treats the relation as a bond. Shared beliefs, shared behaviour and interaction were proposed as its components [19], and the framework has been brought to stereotypes directly: interaction weakens them, with solidarity carrying part of the effect [20]. This is the nearest existing work to the present question. It establishes the connection and leaves open which kind of interaction produces which change, since interaction enters as a quantity. Across these lines the resident is an evaluator, a member of an exposed population, or a partner. None asks what the resident takes the visitor to be like.

2.3. Discrimination, Intolerance and Conflict in Host–guest Encounters

Conflict research asks what predicts hostility once it exists. Discrimination against tourists is traceable to discrimination residents have themselves experienced, which makes it a transfer of treatment rather than a judgement about the group [21]. Intolerance can be present without overt hostility and without a change in stated attitudes [22]. Appearance is among the main triggers of discriminatory conduct in service settings, alongside nationality, language and age [23]. Together they show what makes conduct harden, and all three begin after conflict has appeared, so a destination where high density produces no hardening is one they cannot account for.

2.4. Cross-border Tourism between Shenzhen and Hong Kong

The Shenzhen–Hong Kong border combines economic integration with institutional separation: several checkpoints, separate currencies and payment systems, different travel documents [24]. The arrangement leaves traces on the people who cross, and those traces are what residents see. A payment screen in traditional characters, a trolley for goods carried home and a day organised around the checkpoint queue are products of the border rather than of the people.

Studies of this border describe one direction of it. Hong Kong residents support tourism for its economic return, criticise visitor conduct and stop short of endorsing restrictions [7]. Their assessment of mainland visitors' behaviour is predominantly negative, with concern centred on public conduct rather than on economic effect [5]. Superiority and deprivation appear in the same accounts rather than in different groups of respondents, which makes the attitude ambivalent [4]. The three differ in emphasis and agree on the object: Hong Kong residents judging mainland visitors.

Studies that look both ways are fewer. Young people in Hong Kong and Guangzhou hold asymmetric stereotypes, and the two sides attribute responsibility for disputes differently [25]. Among mainland tourists in Hong Kong, perceived identity risk lowers revisit intention and positive word of mouth through weaker emotional solidarity [26], and tourists register intergroup conflict as a constraint on their own behaviour [8]. Each keeps Hong Kong as the destination. The literature therefore documents one side of the relation. The reverse arrangement has been in place since 2023, and no study has described it from Shenzhen, whose residents were recently visitors themselves.

2.5. Research Gaps and Questions

Four gaps follow from the review, one for each question the study asks. The first concerns recognition. Studies of this border describe the arrangements that leave traces on travellers, such as separate payment systems and a price difference [24], and research on discriminatory conduct finds appearance to be a main trigger of unequal treatment [23]. Neither says which of those traces residents actually read. Nor does either describe the cues by which a Hong Kong visitor is identified on a street in Shenzhen.

The second concerns the attributes attached to the group. Dimensions of tourist stereotypes have been established with other host populations, including Hong Kong residents rating mainland tourists [6,13]. No such account exists for residents of Shenzhen describing visitors from Hong Kong, so which attributes are named in this direction, and how favourable and unfavourable ones sit together, is unknown.

The third concerns the terms of judgement. Research on residents' attitudes explains support through perceived impacts or through the volume of arrivals [9,17]. That work reports how favourable residents are, not how they argue for a welcome or a criticism, and not how their own time as visitors enters that argument.

The fourth concerns change. Studies of this border hold a single point in time, and the reversal is recent enough that residents can compare the present with a period they remember. No study has asked how impressions have changed as the flow has become routine.

The study therefore asks four questions. Which cues lead residents to identify someone as a Hong Kong visitor (RQ1)? What attributes do they attach to the group, and how do favourable and unfavourable attributes sit together (RQ2)? In what terms do they justify welcoming or criticising these visitors (RQ3)? What change, if any, do they report in their impressions, and how do they explain it (RQ4)?

3. Method

3.1. Research Design

The study used a qualitative design informed by grounded theory, with semi-structured interviews conducted in Shenzhen between 13 January and 2 February 2026. It examines the cross-border encounter as it appears to residents of one host city, in the period after the direction of travel reversed. A qualitative design suits a phenomenon that is spatially concentrated and recent. Cross-border shopping by Hong Kong residents is visible in a few districts near checkpoints and in a small number of retail centres. The arrangement that produced it was about three years old when the fieldwork began.

Interviews were chosen over a survey because the study asks for the vocabulary residents use, not for agreement with a list of attributes supplied in advance. Interviews also allow a participant to move between an impression, an episode and a comparison within one answer, and that movement is where the line between a complaint and a characterisation becomes visible.

The unit of analysis is the individual account. The study is exploratory and descriptive. It documents how one host population describes a group that has recently become its guest, and it does not test a causal model. Analysis followed the procedures of grounded theory, set out in Section 3.4.

3.2. Setting and Participants

Participants were recruited at four types of site, chosen to vary exposure to Hong Kong visitors. The first was the Shekou and Sea World area in Nanshan, a leisure district away from the land checkpoints where Hong Kong visitors buy groceries and eat. The second was the Futian checkpoint area, where cross-border traffic is heaviest. The third was Huangbeiling in Luohu, an older residential and market district near the Luohu checkpoint. The fourth was the Uniwalk and Lijiang City retail complexes in Bao'an, which attract family shoppers. Recruitment was purposive, seeking variation in occupation, age and prior experience of Hong Kong. Interviewers approached potential participants in shops, restaurants, markets and public spaces, explained the study, and interviewed on site if the person agreed.

The sample comprised 38 residents. Most worked in shops, restaurants and other service settings, or ran small businesses in the districts where they were interviewed. Seven held professional or managerial positions, including two estate agents, a dentist, an entrepreneur and a university teacher. Three were students or retired. The remaining participants were interviewed in public space and did not state an occupation. Interviews took place on ten days in January and February, with the largest single day, 18 January at the Futian checkpoint, contributing nine.

Table 1. Participants profiles

ID	Sex	Occupation or role	Date
T01	F	Calligraphy teacher	13 Jan
T02	F	Snack-shop assistant	14 Jan
T03	F	Mother of a young child	14 Jan
T04	F	Grocery shop owner	14 Jan
T05	M	Boat security guard	14 Jan
T06	F	Bakery assistant	14 Jan
T07	F	Braised-food shop owner	14 Jan
T08	F	Fruit-shop assistant	14 Jan
T09	M	Ice-cream seller	14 Jan
T10	F	Retired volunteer	14 Jan
T11	F	Restaurant owner	14 Jan
T12	M	Resident near the Futian checkpoint	15 Jan
T13	M	Resident, Bao'an	16 Jan
T14	F	Academic researcher	16 Jan
T15	F	Resident of a commercial district	16 Jan
T16	M	Estate agent, checkpoint branch	18 Jan
T17	M	Dentist	18 Jan
T18	M	Security guard	18 Jan
T19	M	Street vendor	18 Jan
T20	M	Estate agent	18 Jan
T21	M	Restaurant staff	18 Jan
T22	M	Sweet-potato stall vendor	18 Jan
T23	F	Jewellery shop assistant	18 Jan
T24	F	Resident, Luohu	18 Jan
T25	F	Resident	20 Jan
T26	M	Parent, frequent mall visitor	21 Jan
T27	F	University student	31 Jan
T28	M	Hairdresser	31 Jan
T29	F	Foot-massage assistant	31 Jan
T30	M	Resident, Huangbeiling	31 Jan
T31	M	Porter	31 Jan
T32	F	Cross-border doctoral student	31 Jan
T33	F	Restaurant waitress	31 Jan
T34	M	Employee in a commercial district	31 Jan
T35	M	Resident who crosses the border often	1 Feb
T36	F	Entrepreneur	1 Feb
T37	F	University teacher	1 Feb
T38	M	Resident, Luohu checkpoint area	2 Feb

3.3. Data Collection

Interviews lasted between 20 and 60 minutes, were audio-recorded with permission, and were transcribed verbatim. The guide contained four open questions, each followed by probes: what impressions the participant associated with Hong Kong people; what Hong Kong visitors did and where they spent time in Shenzhen; how the participant viewed the visits and any effect on daily life; and what suggestions the participant had. The guide did not use the word "stereotype". It asked for descriptions, and the attributes reported below emerged from them. The first question asked for an impression before any question about frequency or effect, so participants characterised the group before they had reason to justify an attitude.

3.4. Analysis

Interviews were coded in Mandarin, following the procedures of grounded theory [27]: initial coding of each transcript, focused coding that grouped codes into categories, constant comparison across accounts, and memo writing to record analytic decisions. Coding combined deductive and inductive elements. Deductive codes came from the research questions and from dimensions reported in earlier studies of tourist stereotypes, namely civility, travel behaviour and economic power [13] and the four dimensions of Tung et al. [6]. Inductive codes were added for material that did not fit, most importantly the cues used in recognition, which no existing codebook covered.

Coding proceeded in two rounds, initial coding of all 38 transcripts followed by focused coding into categories. Four categories were retained, corresponding to recognition, content, negative content, and the host position. A fifth, change over time, cut across the others and is reported separately. Where a statement described a single episode it was coded as a complaint rather than as a characterisation of the group. This distinction accounted for most of the coding decisions that required judgement, and it separated, for example, a participant's irritation at a blocked road from a claim about the character of Hong Kong people.

New codes continued to appear until approximately the thirtieth interview. The final eight added instances but no new categories. Guest et al. [28] found that saturation in a relatively homogeneous sample can occur within twelve interviews. The present sample was deliberately heterogeneous, and the later interviews served mainly to test categories already formed.

A second coder checked consistency, a PhD holder in tourism management who had not taken part in the interviews and who worked from the Mandarin transcripts. The second coder independently coded 18 of the 38 transcripts against the final coding frame, applying the same rule on episodes and characterisations. Agreement was reached on 92 per cent of coded segments, and disagreements were resolved by discussion.

3.5. Translation and Reflexivity

Quotations were translated from Mandarin by the first author and checked against the recordings. Where translation would flatten a local meaning, the original is retained, as with *suzhi*, a compound of manners, education and civic conduct widely used in mainland discourse on civility. Cantonese and Mandarin are distinguished because participants distinguished them.

The interviewers were residents of Shenzhen, and some participants knew them as staff or customers of the same establishments. This helped access, and it also means that participants may have moderated criticism of a group physically present in the same space. The accounts are therefore read as talk produced in a particular setting.

3.6. Ethics

Participation was voluntary. Participants were told the purpose of the study and gave verbal consent before recording. Names, shop names and street-level locations are not reported. Participants are identified by codes T01 to T38, assigned in the order in which transcripts were produced. No account is quoted in a way that would allow identification by a colleague or a regular customer.

4. Findings

The chapter answers the four questions in order. Section 4.1 describes how participants recognised Hong Kong visitors, Section 4.2 what they said about them and about their effects on Shenzhen, Section 4.3 how their own experience in Hong Kong entered the judgement, and Section 4.4 what change they reported.

4.1. The Pattern of Visits and the Cues Used for Recognition

Participants described a regular pattern before they described any individual visitor. Visits concentrated at weekends and, in districts with food markets, on weekday mornings. Visitors came as families and were mostly middle-aged or older. A jewellery-shop assistant said that "they come in groups, mostly one family, old and young together, and it is more obvious on Saturdays and Sundays" (T23). A volunteer at Sea World described the weekday pattern: "From Monday to Friday it is mostly the older ones who come to buy vegetables. The Shekou seafood market is where they go most" (T10). A resident of Luohu said that "there are fewer young people, mostly older ones, at Futian and at Luohu where I work" (T24).

The purpose was eating and shopping, and the shopping was organised around price. The owner of a braised-food shop said: "They buy a lot, but they buy cheap things. If the price is too high they will not buy. They walk around to see where it is cheapest, comparing prices" (T07). A grocery owner read the same behaviour as a class distinction: "Some are generous, some are stingy. They carry such heavy things back, all for the lower prices. If they had money, who would come here to buy?" (T04).

Recognition was immediate and usually preceded speech. A resident near the Futian checkpoint said:

> Their features are very obvious. You do not need to talk to them to know they are visitors from Hong Kong. Most of them carry a backpack, some even drag a suitcase, especially that distinctive shopping trolley, the shopping basket. One look and you know. (T12)

Five cues recurred. Bags and luggage came first: backpacks, small shopping trolleys and suitcases, taken into shops rather than left at a hotel. An estate agent who had worked at the checkpoint for more than ten years said that "Hong Kong people like backpacks, double-strap bags, cloth bags, and they

push trolleys" (T16). A porter read the same thing through clothing: "They wear a bag, and there are many pockets in the trousers, many pockets in the jacket. You can tell" (T31). A university teacher who had lived in Hong Kong for five years described a configuration:

> You can tell at a glance, because I lived in Hong Kong. First, of course, they speak Cantonese, and Hong Kong Cantonese is not quite the same as Guangdong Cantonese. Then their dress: they carry a backpack and wear trainers. For women, the hair is very neat, and many have dyed it. The look is uniform, sporty casual. In the warehouse store it is even easier: they push a trolley or a suitcase. (T37)

Dress was the second cue, and participants disagreed about it. One man who crossed the border often described them as "neat, not expensively dressed, but crisp and clean. They stand upright, their hair is combed" (T35). A resident of Luohu described the same visitors as more casual than locals: "They dress more casually and like trainers. Local people still smarten up a bit" (T24). The braised-food owner called their clothes "like what we wore a few years ago" (T07).

Payment was the third. Participants read the interface rather than the act. A bakery assistant said: "The Alipay they use is different from ours. Theirs is the Hong Kong version, in traditional characters, and the scan position is different" (T06). A street vendor estimated that "about seventy per cent of them pay cash, and thirty per cent use WeChat or Alipay" (T19), and an ice-cream seller gave the reason: "Older ones carry cash; they have not learned to use WeChat" (T09).

Language was the fourth. Cantonese alone did not identify anyone, because residents of Guangdong speak it too, so participants listened for accent and register (T37). A porter noticed the other direction: "When they speak Mandarin it comes out a bit halting. They often ask me for directions" (T31). An entrepreneur noticed volume and code-mixing: "They speak more quietly than we do, and they mix English into the sentence" (T36).

Pace was the fifth. A dentist said: "They pull a little trolley, and they walk unhurriedly. We are always in a rush; they are unhurried" (T17). A foot-massage assistant said only that they wore "casual slippers" (T29).

Table 2. The visiting pattern and the cues used for recognition

Aspect	What participants described	Accounts
The visiting pattern		
Purpose and consumption	eating out and buying food to carry back, comparing prices	T04, T07, T10, T24
Timing and grouping	weekends, families and groups; weekday mornings for older buyers	T10, T18, T23
Age	middle-aged and older visitors predominate	T10, T24, T35
Cues used for recognition		
Bags and luggage	backpacks, shopping trolleys, suitcases taken into shops	T12, T16, T31, T37
Dress	sporty casual and trainers; neat for some, plain for others	T07, T24, T35, T37
Language	Hong Kong Cantonese, halting Mandarin, quieter speech, English mixed in	T31, T36, T37
Payment	Hong Kong Alipay interface in traditional characters, cash among older visitors	T06, T09, T19
Pace and manner	unhurried gait, queueing	T12, T17, T29, T36

Note. Codes refer to Table 1, and one interview may appear in several rows

Two qualifications belong here. Recognition was not always first-hand. One mother of a young child said she identified visitors through her husband: "My husband told me these are Hong Kong people, they chat in Cantonese. I only knew because of what he said" (T03). A university student who had never been to Hong Kong said her image came from social media and that she had "no real basis" for it (T27). Recognition also depended on the place. A participant noticed that a shopping centre in Bao'an displayed shop names in simplified and traditional characters side by side, and that a bookshop counter carried traditional signage (T26). When the setting is adjusted for a group, the group becomes easier to spot and less distinctive at the same time.

4.2. Impressions of the Visitors and of Their Effects on Shenzhen

Participants talked about three things: how the visitors behave, what their visits do to the local economy, and a short list of objections. The three did not always agree with one another. Several participants liked the visitors and disliked the effects in the same interview.

Behaviour. Almost every participant began with politeness and order. A restaurant waitress in Huangbeiling said:

> They are different from our mainland customers. Very well mannered, very gentle, they speak politely. That is something we could learn from. Very civil, very courteous. They never waste food; they eat only as much as they need. For those of us in the service trade, serving them is a pleasure. (T33)

A calligraphy teacher made the same judgement while objecting to something else: "Their language and their manners are certainly better than ours. You can see it in their children" (T01). Even the most critical participant in the sample described the Hong Kong owners of flats in his district as "very well mannered" (T20).

Order was described through queueing rather than in the abstract. One participant said: "Hong Kong visitors are relatively rule-abiding. They like to queue, and they have brought a lot of business and activity" (T12). An entrepreneur explained the disposition by the city: "Hong Kong people are more willing to queue and wait for a table. In a cramped city you get used to waiting everywhere" (T36). Family composition was read as a disposition too: a jewellery-shop assistant said that "their sense of family is very strong. They would not come out alone; they come as a whole family"

(T23), and a security guard made the same observation without evaluating it (T18). Appearance was read as care, though the braised-food owner read it as plainness (T07, T35).

Effects on the local economy. Most participants described the effect as a gain. A grocery owner put it as a rule of trade: "Doing business is just like this; a customer who comes is a guest, right?" (T04). Others were briefer: "Of course I welcome them. If nobody comes to spend, where does the economy come from?" (T16); "Welcome, of course I welcome them, I am doing business. The more the better" (T07). One participant described the gain as more than local, saying that Hong Kong spending in Shenzhen was "a geographical advantage that Guangzhou does not have" (T12). Another said the flow had widened the choice of food and shops available to residents (T13).

A minority described a cost, and they described it as a change in prices and rents. The volunteer at Sea World said: "Prices have gone up now. They come here, especially the older ones from Monday to Friday, to buy vegetables" (T10). The estate agent near the checkpoint acknowledged the dependence and then answered against it: "The rents here are this high, and it is not as if it is not because of Hong Kong people coming and going. Is it a good thing for Shenzhen? No" (T20). A participant who ran a business gave the opposite verdict on the same facts: "It is a good thing, it drives spending, and rents have gone up too, along with the metro, taxis, hotels, restaurants" (T38).

Others denied that prices had moved. A security guard said: "I do not feel it is crowded, or that prices have gone up" (T05). A fruit-shop assistant said: "No effect at all, not crowded, prices not higher. I welcome them, the more the better" (T08). A dentist answered "not crowded, nothing more expensive" (T17). A sweet-potato seller supplied a mechanism for why prices had not moved: "The vegetables sold to Hong Kong people are a bit fresher, so a little more expensive, but that is the grade, not the buyer" (T22). The price effect was therefore a contested claim within the sample, and where it was asserted it concerned the market rather than the visitors' conduct.

Unfavourable impressions. Objections to behaviour were fewer and narrower than favourable judgements, and they were attached to particular groups or occasions. The estate agent near the checkpoint was the most explicit critic:

> They talk very loudly, shouting. It is a kind of revenge spending, like venting. Personally I find it annoying. The tour buses stop on Fridays, seven or eight of them, and block the road. They do not care what you are doing here. (T20)

He then divided the category by class rather than by origin: "The middle-aged and older ones, and those from lower backgrounds, their *suzhi* is not high" (T20). A resident of a commercial district objected to the effect on her own use of the area: "If you want to eat you may have to queue for a long time. When there are too many Hong Kong people it affects local residents' experience of eating out" (T15). One participant objected to women smoking: "Some of the women smoke, and I cannot stand it, none of my friends smoke" (T01). The volunteer at Sea World described a change over time: "At the beginning it was fine, but now that they come more often they do not follow the rules on the bus either. At the start they really queued; now they just crowd together" (T10).

No participant described Hong Kong visitors as dishonest, aggressive or threatening. Two participants refused to generalise at all. A restaurant owner said: "Wherever you go there are people with *suzhi* and people without. Foreign or domestic, it is the same. You do not divide by region" (T11). A snack-shop assistant said: "If someone behaves badly, that is that person's own problem" (T02).

Circumstances. One participant made an observation that was not an evaluation. He watched Hong Kong visitors at a bank and in restaurants "the way you watch a landscape", and said:

> From their expressions and their body language you can tell they are enjoying themselves, they look relaxed. You can see that they work very hard in Hong Kong, the pace is fast, it is exhausting. It makes me feel that I could not do that kind of work. (T38)

He was describing the visitors' circumstances, not their qualities, and he read the relaxation he saw as the product of a contrast with the life they had left behind.

Table 3 summarises the attitudes and impressions, using the categories that emerged from the coding.

Table 3. Attitudes and impressions, by category

Category	What participants said	Accounts
Positive attitude to the visits	spending brings business and activity; visitors are one of us	T04, T07, T12, T16, T19, T38
Neutral or qualified attitude	a normal demand; one matter is not another; an economic behaviour	T01, T15, T25
Negative attitude	objection to smoking, to crowding and to coach congestion	T01, T15, T20
Favourable judgement of behaviour	polite and orderly, good manners, no waste of food	T01, T12, T33, T36
Favourable judgement of the economic effect	spending drives the local economy and is good for Shenzhen	T12, T13, T16, T38
Unfavourable judgement of the economic effect	prices and rents have risen; residents' own interests are affected	T10, T20, T34

Note. Categories emerged from the coding of the interviews and are not mutually exclusive: one interview may appear in several rows. Codes refer to Table 1.

4.3. Prior Experience in Hong Kong and Present Attitudes

Most participants had been to Hong Kong, and they described three kinds of reception there. Some had been treated coldly. The estate agent at the checkpoint recalled being called "mainlander" (T16). A man who crossed the border often said that "some were not warm to us, and you

could feel that they did not want to attend to us" (T35). A snack-shop assistant said simply that "they were not so friendly to me" (T02). Others described an ordinary reception and explained it by the pace of the city rather than by hostility. A resident of Luohu said that service in Hong Kong was "worse than on the mainland, because their pace is faster. They hurry you to finish your meal" (T24). A third group described friendly treatment and good service (T19, T23).

The three kinds of experience did not predict the present attitude. Six participants who described cold treatment in Hong Kong were among those who welcomed visitors in Shenzhen, and participants who described friendly treatment were not more favourable than the rest. The estate agent who had been called "mainlander" welcomed the visitors for their spending (T16). The most critical account in the sample came from another estate agent who had been to Hong Kong and who praised the visitors' manners in the same interview (T20).

Participants gave five reasons for their present attitude. The first was economic interest. Visitors spend, and the spending supports shops, wages and rents (T04, T07, T16, T38). The second was goodwill in return for cold treatment, which several participants expressed as a refusal to pass on what they had received. The snack-shop assistant said: "Not everyone is like that. I would not treat them badly because they treated me badly" (T02). Another participant stated it as a collective standard: "We should be more civilised in how we receive guests, not treat them the way they once treated us" (T15).

The third reason was keeping matters separate. The estate agent said: "It is one thing and another. He has no conflict with you, he is not doing anything to you, so it is fine" (T16). The calligraphy teacher said: "I cannot do that, one thing is one thing and another is another. Mainly because there is not much contact between us" (T01). The man who crossed the border often put it as a principle: "How others treat me is their choice; how I treat others is my choice. The two things are independent" (T35).

The fourth was empathy. The university teacher who had lived in Hong Kong for five years explained the visits by symmetry:

> When I lived in Hong Kong we were sojourners there, and they had the mentality of hosts. Now it seems to have turned around. We were more like guests; now they come over and we are the hosts. They come because it is cheaper and they want to relax, the same way we used to go there because the schools were better and there were more jobs. It is a rational thing. (T37)

A resident who called herself neutral used the same comparison to decline any sense of triumph: "It is an economic behaviour. Compared with people from Huizhou coming to Shenzhen to shop, there is no difference" (T25). She added that pride would require having been looked down on herself, and that she had not been.

The fifth reason was professional standards and a sense of representing the city. A jewellery-shop assistant said:

> I do not represent myself alone; I represent Shenzhen, I represent the mainland. So I must do it well, be warm and hospitable, help where I can. (T23)

Not every account was conciliatory. A mother of a young child reported her husband's pleasure at the reversal: "He feels that we have turned over and become the big brother now" (T03). She reported it as his view and did not endorse it. A participant who worked in a commercial district objected to a practice that favoured the visitors: "Some shops give discounts only to Hong Kong customers. That makes me less interested in going to that mall, because in my own city I feel a bit discriminated against" (T34). Her objection was to unequal treatment, not to the visitors.

Two further differences ran through the sample. Participants who traded with visitors spoke of customers and of business, and their complaints concerned obstruction (T04, T07, T20). Those who did not trade spoke of queues, of prices and of discounts, and their complaints concerned their own use of the area (T15, T34). Neither group was more favourable than the other. What differed was the object of criticism. Participants who had never been to Hong Kong described the group in terms supplied by others, by a husband or by social media (T03, T27), and said so themselves.

Table 4. Reasons given for the present attitude

Reason	How it was expressed	Accounts
Economic interest	visitors spend, and the spending supports shops and wages	T04, T07, T16, T38
Goodwill in return for cold treatment	I would not treat them badly because they treated me badly	T02, T15
Keeping matters separate	what happened in Hong Kong has no bearing on what happens here	T01, T16, T35
Empathy	they come for the reasons we once went	T25, T37
Professional standards and representing the city	I represent Shenzhen, so I must receive them well	T15, T23

Note. Reasons are those participants gave when asked to explain their attitude; one interview may give more than one. Codes refer to Table 1.

4.4. Changes in Impressions

Participants also said that their impressions had changed. The change concerned how far the category stood out rather than what it contained. Three mechanisms account for it.

The first was familiarity. Repeated encounter made the category less noteworthy, and daily observation outweighed mediated accounts. A porter who saw visitors several times a week said: "I do not really watch that news. I see them every day. That is my own feeling" (T31). A restaurant waitress, asked whether reports of Hong Kong hostility affected her, answered: "I do not entirely believe the media. If someone behaves badly, that is that person's own problem" (T33).

The second was the growing visibility of particular kinds

of visitor. Coach groups, low-price groups and elderly groups were named repeatedly as the source of the objections in Section 4.2, and they were described as recent arrivals. The participant who had watched the flow since quarantine-free travel resumed said: “At the beginning it was fine” (T10). A participant who divided the phenomenon into phases called the present “the first stage of northbound travel” and expected the flow to spread to other cities once the novelty faded (T34).

The third was a change in the setting rather than in the visitors. A resident of a commercial district explained it through queueing:

> Now everyone queues in the shopping malls, whether they are Hong Kong visitors or mainland residents; it is all numbered queuing now. So I do not feel an obvious difference any more. (T15)

Queueing had marked the group. Once everyone queued by number, the practice no longer distinguished anyone.

One account described a change in the other direction. The participant quoted above said that the visitors had queued at first and now crowded together, which is a change in their behaviour rather than in their visibility (T10). Hers was the only account of deterioration in the sample, and it came from a participant who also said she paid little attention to the visits.

A further change concerned the residents’ own side rather than the visitors. A participant who had visited Hong Kong before 2020 and again after 2023 described the change as mutual: “At the beginning they were a bit exclusive towards us. Now, after the pandemic, things there have been so quiet, and their attitude has improved” (T10). She was describing how Hong Kong residents now regard visitors from Shenzhen, which is a separate question and is not pursued here.

5. Discussion

5.1. Recognition through the Signs of a Cross-Border Shopping Trip

The first question asked which cues residents use to recognise a Hong Kong visitor. Participants named bags and luggage, dress, payment, language and pace, usually in that order and usually before any conversation took place. Cantonese confirmed an identification that other cues had already made.

The cues have a common source. A trolley and a backpack belong to a shopping trip between two price levels. A payment screen in traditional characters belongs to a separate payment system. An unhurried gait belongs to a day organised around a checkpoint. Park et al. [24] describe this border as economically integrated and institutionally separate, and the cues participants used are the visible products of that arrangement. None of them is a property of Hong Kong people, and none marks an ethnicity.

This explains two features of the accounts. The category is easy to learn, because its markers are present in every shop near a checkpoint, and it is easy to lose, because a change in practice removes a marker without changing the people. One participant said that since the malls introduced numbered queues she no longer felt an obvious difference (T15). The finding also specifies what Zhou et al. [23] call appearance as a trigger of discriminatory conduct. Appearance here means bags, trolleys and trainers, and it becomes visible in bulk when a coach group arrives at a known hour. That is why the objections in Section 4.2 were directed at coach groups rather than at Hong Kong visitors as a category.

Chen and Hsu [13] show that the order in which attributes are produced carries information about a category. The present accounts add that the category itself can be more or less visible, and that its visibility depends on the setting rather than on the group.

5.2. Favourable Judgements of Behaviour and Separate Judgements of Economic Effects

The second question asked what attributes residents attach to the group and how favourable and unfavourable attributes sit together. Two patterns answer it.

First, judgements of behaviour were favourable and stable. Politeness, queueing, quiet speech and not wasting food were named first, and they were named by participants who went on to criticise the visits (T01, T20, T33). Objections were few and were attached to coach groups, older visitors or single individuals rather than to the category (T10, T15, T20). That fits the stereotype content model, where warmth comes from perceived intent, and fits the finding that civility is the most accessible dimension of a tourist stereotype [11,13]. The mixed stereotype the model predicts takes a particular shape here: warmth is high, and the rest of the content is either narrow or contested.

Second, judgements about the visits were formed separately from judgements about the visitors. Most participants described an economic gain (T04, T07, T12, T16). A minority described higher prices and rents (T10, T20, T38), and that claim was contested within the sample, since four participants denied that prices had moved (T05, T08, T17, T22).

The separation matters for the model. Its four dimensions all describe the group [6], so a judgement about the effects of a flow has no place in it. A resident can hold an unfavourable view of the effects and a favourable view of the people, and one participant did both in a single answer (T38). Where the literature treats the unfavourable part of a stereotype as a property of the stereotyped, these accounts put part of it in the relation between the host city and the flow.

Boastfulness, one of the model’s negative dimensions, did not appear. Loudness was attributed to coach groups and treated as a nuisance rather than as a display of status (T20). The accounts also had a limit of register: one participant described the visitors’ circumstances rather than their qualities, which shows that not everything residents say about visitors is an assessment of them (T38).

5.3. Prior Experience in Hong Kong and Present Attitudes

The third question asked in what terms residents justify a welcome or a criticism. Prior experience supplies the answer. Participants who had been to Hong Kong described cold, ordinary or friendly treatment there, and none of it predicted the verdict given now. Six who had been treated coldly welcomed the visitors; those treated well were no warmer.

This runs against the expectation in the conflict literature. Tse and Tung [21] report that discrimination against tourists is traceable to discrimination that residents have themselves experienced, which makes it a transfer of treatment. The transfer did not occur here. Participants gave five reasons, and each is a reason for not transferring.

Economic interest came first. Visitors spend, and the spending supports shops and wages, so the encounter is described as a gain (T04, T07, T16, T38). This is the mechanism the resident attitude literature already supplies, in

which perceived impacts explain support [17]. What the present accounts add is that the impact was named in personal terms, as a shop that stays open or a wage that continues, rather than as a general attitude to tourism development.

Goodwill in return for cold treatment came second. Several participants refused to pass on what they had received: "I would not treat them badly because they treated me badly" (T02), and "we should be more civilised in how we receive guests, not treat them the way they once treated us" (T15). This is a norm about behaviour, not a revised opinion of the group, and it explains why a favourable reception can coexist with an unchanged memory of cold treatment.

Third, keeping matters apart: a counter in Hong Kong and a counter in Shenzhen are different encounters with different people (T01, T16, T35). Fourth, empathy: participants who had lived or worked in Hong Kong explained the visits by the motives that once took them there, and called the movement rational (T37). Fifth, professional standards and a sense of representing the city: a shop assistant said that she represented Shenzhen and the mainland, and was therefore obliged to receive visitors well (T23).

Two of these reasons connect to the contact literature. Contact here is brief, role-bound and commercial, and Sharpley [10] describes host–guest contact in contemporary destinations in exactly those terms. Contact of that kind produces familiarity with a role rather than knowledge of a person, which is why participants learned how Hong Kong visitors shop and not how they live. It also gives few occasions for a remembered slight to be acted on, since the person at the counter is a customer rather than the person who was once unfriendly.

The comparison with studies of this border in the other direction is instructive. Hong Kong residents assessing mainland visitors reported predominantly negative views of their behaviour, with concern centred on public conduct [5], and their accounts combined superiority with deprivation [4]. Shenzhen residents assessing Hong Kong visitors reported predominantly favourable views of conduct and divided views of spending. Two differences in the arrangement help explain the contrast. The visitors now come from the richer city to the cheaper one, so their presence is read as a gain rather than as a burden. The hosts also remember being guests, and several of them stated a norm against repeating what they had received. Studies of resident attitudes that treat the host as a settled party do not capture either condition [9].

Two accounts mark the limits of the conciliatory pattern. One participant reported her husband's pleasure at becoming "the big brother" and did not endorse it (T03). Another objected to discounts reserved for Hong Kong customers, because the practice made her feel discriminated against in her own city (T34). The first shows that a reading of the reversal as a gain in rank is available in the city even when participants distance themselves from it. The second shows the practice most likely to turn a favourable account, because it converts a category distinction into unequal treatment.

5.4. Familiarity and the Weakening of a Category

Table 5. Summary of findings and their relation to previous work

Question	Finding	Evidence	Relation to previous work
How are Hong Kong visitors recognised?	By bags and trolleys, dress, payment interface, language and pace, before any conversation. All five are products of the border rather than traits of the people.	T12, T16, T31, T37, T06, T17	The cues are the visible products of an integrated but institutionally separate border [24], and they specify what appearance means as a trigger of unequal treatment [23].
What impressions do residents hold?	Behaviour is judged favourably and stably. The economic effects are judged separately from the visitors, as a gain for most and as higher prices for a minority.	T33, T12, T20, T10, T38, T05	Warmth stays high and objections attach to sub-groups [11,13]. Unfavourable content can concern the effects of a visitor flow rather than the visitors, which the four-dimension model does not capture [6].
How does prior experience in Hong Kong enter the judgement?	It does not predict the present attitude. Six participants who described cold treatment welcomed the visitors, citing economic interest, goodwill in return for cold treatment, keeping matters separate, empathy and professional standards.	T02, T15, T16, T35, T37, T23	Treatment received as a visitor is not necessarily passed on, which contrasts with the transfer of discrimination reported by Tse and Tung [21].
What change do residents report?	The category has become less distinctive while its content remains available, through familiarity, the visibility of coach and elderly groups, and numbered queueing. One account describes worsening behaviour instead.	T31, T33, T15, T10, T34	A decline in the salience of a category is distinct from a change in its content or in attitude, which extends the finding that interaction weakens tourist stereotypes [20].

Note. Codes refer to Table 1.

The fourth question asked what change residents report. Those who addressed it described the category as less distinctive than before, while its content stayed available. A participant who said that Hong Kong visitors were now much

like everyone else could still list the trolley, the sanitiser and the cash.

Three mechanisms account for the change. Familiarity made daily observation outweigh mediated accounts (T31, T33). The arrival of coach groups and elderly groups gave the objections a visible target and left the category as a whole untouched (T10, T20). Numbered queueing removed a practice that had distinguished the group, because the setting changed rather than the visitors (T15).

This qualifies the finding that interaction weakens tourist stereotypes [20]. Interaction weakened the stereotype here without supplying more accurate content. What declined was the salience of the category, not the favourability of its content and not its availability. Studies of contact generally look for a change in content or in attitude. A decline in salience is a third outcome, and it can occur while content and attitude remain in place.

One account shows that salience and evaluation can move in opposite directions. The volunteer who had watched the flow since the border reopened said that visitors had queued at first and now crowded together (T10). She described a decline in behaviour, not a decline in visibility. A study that asked only whether impressions had improved or worsened would have recorded her answer as negative and missed what she actually described.

One account concerned the other side of the relation. A participant who had visited Hong Kong before and after the pandemic described how Hong Kong residents now regard visitors from Shenzhen (T10). That is a metastereotype, and it belongs with work on how mainland visitors experience being watched in Hong Kong rather than with the present question [8]. Table 5 summarises the four findings and the work each one speaks to.

5.5. Implications for Research and Practice

Three points follow for research. Studies of tourist stereotypes should record what residents say about a flow's effects as well as what they say about the people, since the two can point in opposite directions. They should note whether residents trade with visitors, because the object of complaint differs even where warmth does not. They should record prior experience as a visitor, because the transfer of treatment that conflict research documents cannot be assumed [21].

For practice, four measures follow. Reception training in border districts could address recognition directly, since the cues are enumerable and staff already act on them. Congestion management could target coach arrivals at fixed hours and the concentration of visits on Hong Kong public holidays, rather than treating crowding as a general effect of volume. Discounts reserved for Hong Kong customers deserve a fairness review, since the practice converts a category distinction into unequal treatment. The price effect deserves separate attention, because it is the item most likely to turn a favourable account and it cannot be addressed at a counter.

5.6. Limitations and Future Research

The study is confined to Shenzhen, and the accounts come from a purposive sample recruited in commercial spaces, which over-represents people who work in or frequent them. That bias matters because the economic reason for welcoming visitors was the most common one, and traders were over-sampled relative to residents who never meet a visitor. The guide did not collect age, education or income, so the sample is described by occupation and interview date. The interviews were conducted for a broader study of residents' responses to Hong Kong visitors, and the content reported here emerged from open questions rather than from a validated instrument, which limits comparability with survey research.

Two limits bear on specific claims. The price effect is reported as residents described it, and no price or rent data were collected, so the claim is a perception whose accuracy is untested. The sample itself was divided on whether prices had moved. The change accounts are retrospective, and participants compared the present with a period that some described imprecisely.

Three extensions are worth pursuing. A second round of interviews in the same districts would show whether the decline in salience continues as the flow matures, and whether the price effect grows as the novelty of the trade weakens. Interviews with residents who neither trade with visitors nor live near a checkpoint would test whether the conciliatory pattern belongs to the setting or to the sample. Interviews with Hong Kong visitors on the same streets would show whether the cues residents use are the ones visitors intend to give.

6. Conclusion

This study examined how 38 residents of Shenzhen talked about Hong Kong tourists in early 2026. Participants recognised them before speaking to them, by bags and luggage, dress, payment interface, language and pace. They described their behaviour as polite and orderly. They judged the effects of the visits separately: most described an economic gain, and a minority said that local prices and rents had risen. Those who had been treated coldly in Hong Kong did not pass that treatment on. They explained their attitude through economic interest, goodwill in return for cold treatment, keeping matters separate, empathy and professional standards. They also said that the category had become less distinctive as visits became frequent, while its content remained available.

The contribution is a description of a host population whose position has moved. The residents who now receive visitors were, a few years ago, the visitors, and their judgements are made at a counter rather than from a distance. Recognition runs through the equipment of a shopping trip, so the category appears wherever a trolley appears and fades where the queue has been numbered. Judgements of the visitors and judgements of the effects of the visits are formed separately, which is why a welcome and a complaint about rents can sit in the same answer. Treatment received in Hong Kong is not carried home: participants describe their welcome as a decision about how to behave, not as repayment for what they were given. High density and reversed positions did not harden the stereotype at this border. They made the visit ordinary, and then made the category hard to see.

Acknowledgments

Funding: This research was funded by Guangdong Provincial Philosophy and Social Science Planning Project (Discipline Co-construction Project) [Grant No.GD24XTQ04, GD25YYJ07].

References

[1] Economic Daily. (2025, February 10). More than 77 million Hong Kong residents entered through Shenzhen checkpoints in

2024. Economic Daily. https://www.sz.gov.cn/cn/xxgk/zfxxgj/bmdt/content/post_11998077.html (in Chinese)

[2] Guancha. (2025, April 24). Northbound travel hits a record as Shenzhen–Hong Kong checkpoints fill again. Guancha. https://news.qq.com/rain/a/20250424A08WYE00 (in Chinese)

[3] Shenzhen News. (2026, July 3). Hong Kong customers account for more than half of the footfall at the Liantang market. Shenzhen News. https://www.sznews.com/news/content/2026-07/03/content_32110348.htm (in Chinese)

[4] Chen, N., Hsu, C. H. C., & Li, X. (2018). Feeling superior or deprived? Attitudes and underlying mentalities of residents towards China's Mainland tourists. Tourism Management, 66, 94–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.11.007.

[5] Nie, K., & Hu, Y. (2017). Hong Kong residents' perceptions of mainland visitors' behaviour: A sustainable tourism perspective. Areal Research and Development, 36(4), 88–92. (in Chinese)

[6] Tung, V. W. S., King, B. E. M., & Tse, S. (2020). The tourist stereotype model: Positive and negative dimensions. Journal of Travel Research, 59(1), 37–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287518821739.

[7] Wen, T., & Liao, H. (2009). Hong Kong residents' perceptions of mainland tourists' behaviour. Tourism Forum, 2(4), 504–508. (in Chinese)

[8] Zhang, C. X., Fong, L. H. N., & McCabe, S. (2025). Intergroup identity conflict in tourism: The voice of the tourist. Journal of Travel Research, 64(2), 322–336. https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875231217898.

[9] Milano, C., Novelli, M., & Cheer, J. M. (2019). Overtourism and tourismphobia: A journey through four decades of tourism development, planning and local concerns. Tourism Planning & Development, 16(4), 353–357. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2019.1599604.

[10] Sharpley, R. (2014). Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research. Tourism Management, 42, 37–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.10.007.

[11] Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82(6), 878–902. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878.

[12] Tse, S. W. T., Shen, S., & Tung, V. W. S. (2024). Mapping boastfulness with warmth and competence in tourist stereotypes. Tourism Analysis, 29(2), 297–302. https://doi.org/10.3727/108354224X17052905631282.

[13] Chen, C.-C., & Hsu, C. H. C. (2021). Tourist stereotype content: Dimensions and accessibility. Annals of Tourism Research, 89, 103212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2021.103212.

[14] Tse, S., & Tung, V. W. S. (2022). Understanding residents' attitudes towards tourists: Connecting stereotypes, emotions and behaviours. Tourism Management, 89, 104435. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2021.104435.

[15] Hsu, C. H. C., Fan, D. X. F., Chen, N., & Zhang, S. (2025). The stereotype–emotion–interaction relationship: A tourist–resident dual perspective. Journal of Travel Research. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875251406539.

[16] Su, S., & Hsu, C. H. C. (2025). Broadening narratives of tourist stereotypes: How perceived cultural distance influences host–tourist interaction valence and intensity. Tourism Management Perspectives, 59, 101422. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2025.101422.

[17] Hadinejad, A., Moyle, B. D., Scott, N., Kralj, A., & Nunkoo, R. (2019). Residents' attitudes to tourism: A review. Tourism Review, 74(2), 150–165. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-01-2018-0003.

[18] Kuščer, K., & Mihalič, T. (2019). Residents' attitudes towards overtourism from the perspective of tourism impacts and cooperation: The case of Ljubljana. Sustainability, 11(6), 1823. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11061823.

[19] Woosnam, K. M., Norman, W. C., & Ying, T. (2009). Exploring the theoretical framework of emotional solidarity between residents and tourists. Journal of Travel Research, 48(2), 245–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287509332334.

[20] Tan, G., & Hsu, C. H. C. (2024). Can host–tourist interaction pull the plug on tourist stereotypes? Exploring the power of emotional solidarity. Tourism Management Perspectives, 50, 101211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2023.101211.

[21] Tse, S., & Tung, V. W. S. (2021). Residents' discrimination against tourists. Annals of Tourism Research, 88, 103060. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.103060.

[22] Tung, V. W. S., & Tse, S. (2022). Residents' intolerance in host–guest relation. Annals of Tourism Research, 92, 103306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2021.103306.

[23] Zhou, L., Liu, J., & Liu, D. (2022). How does discrimination occur in hospitality and tourism services, and what shall we do? A critical literature review. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 34(3), 1037–1061. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-07-2021-0849.

[24] Park, J., Tse, S., Mi, S. D. B., & Song, H. (2022). A model for cross-border tourism governance in the Greater Bay Area. Journal of China Tourism Research, 18(6), 1259–1283. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388160.2022.2036664.

[25] Zhang, L. (2016). Regional conflict, responsibility attribution and individual attitudes: An empirical study of Hong Kong and Guangzhou youth. Jinan Journal (Philosophy and Social Sciences), 38(5), 59–67. (in Chinese)

[26] Fong, L. H. N., Zhang, C. X., & Wang, Z. (2023). Tourist–host identity risk: Scale development and consequences. Journal of Travel Research, 62(7), 1588–1604. https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875221127680.

[27] Charmaz, K. (2014). Constructing grounded theory (2nd ed.). Sage.

[28] Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. Field Methods, 18(1), 59–82. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05279903.