

Internal Migration, Social Exclusion, and Victimization: An Analysis of Chinese Rural-to-Urban Migrants

Journal of Research in Crime and
Delinquency

2017, Vol. 54(4) 479-514

© The Author(s) 2016

Reprints and permission:

sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/0022427816676861

journals.sagepub.com/home/jrc



Hua Zhong¹, Jianhua Xu², and Alex R. Piquero³

Abstract

Objectives: This article applies a multidimensional social exclusion framework to examine Chinese rural-to-urban migrant victimization. *Method:* Data from the 2012 China Labor Dynamics Survey is used to examine whether Chinese migrants are more likely to be victimized compared to urban residents and to what extent the prior findings on the mediating roles of social exclusion between immigration and victimization can be applied to understand Chinese migrants' victimization. *Results:* Findings reveal the elevated victimization risks among nationwide rural-to-urban migrants. Logistic regression models find that social exclusion mediates the link between migrant status and victimization and that social exclusion predicts victimization. *Conclusions:* The discriminative institutional arrangements in China are a major force of the universal disadvantages of Chinese migrants. That is, it is not the migrant status itself, but the social exclusion suffered by individuals that increase the likelihood of being criminally victimized.

¹ The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong

² University of Macau, Macau, Macao

³ The University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, TX, USA

Corresponding Author:

Hua Zhong, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 437 Sino Building, Shatin, Hong Kong.

Email: sarazhong@cuhk.edu.hk

Keywords

social exclusion, migration, victimization, China

There is an abundant literature examining the vulnerability of international immigrants in Western societies in terms of their high risk of criminal victimization (Zatz and Smith 2012; though see Kubrin and Desmond 2015). The high victimization rate experienced by immigrants is believed to be one of the consequences of the multidimensional social exclusion (i.e., social rejection and spatial segregation) they suffer from receiving societies (Fussell 2011; Sulkowski et al. 2014; Venkatesh 2008). However, there remains a lack of research concerning the link between internal migration and criminal victimization.

The lack of research on this topic among Western scholars might reflect the nearly complete urbanization of their countries. For example, in the United States, internal migration reached an inflection point in the 1980s, subsequently declining (Molloy, Smith, and Wozniak 2011). Unlike Western developed countries, large-scale internal migration in many developing countries is ongoing, and internal migration massively outnumbers transnational immigration in the current world (Bell and Charles-Edwards 2013). In particular, many developing societies are now experiencing large-scale urbanization and facing various crime and victimization problems in this process, such as Turkey, India, Vietnam, and China (Kusuma, Pandav, and Babu 2014; Nguyen et al. 2012; Sercan et al. 2015; Xu 2014). More studies are needed to examine whether theories and findings on international immigrants and criminal victimization from Western societies can be applied to explain the pattern of victimization for internal migrants in non-Western contexts, and China offers one intriguing case study.

In 2015, China had 269 million rural-to-urban migrants, a population almost the same size as the U.S. population. Along with its rapid modernization and urbanization, almost all types of crime have dramatically increased over the past several decades (Bakken 2005; Liu 2006). Researchers in China have often argued that the influx of rural migrants in cities is a main reason for this escalation (Ma 2001; Wang 2002). However, scholars and the public have long neglected to consider that migrants also frequently experience victimization (Cheung 2013; Xu and Song 2005). More recently, researchers have paid closer attention to the vulnerability of Chinese rural-to-urban migrants as they are one of the most disadvantaged social groups in contemporary

China (Pun 2005; Siu 2015). These internal migrants have been regarded as foreigners and second-class citizens in their own country (Solinger 1999) due to institutional discrimination and multidimensional social exclusion (Xu 2014). An interesting and unaddressed question, then, is whether China's internal migrants face similar disadvantages in criminal victimization like international immigrants in developed countries.

Although various victimization-related surveys, including the 1994 Beijing Household Victimization Survey, the 2004 Tianjin Household Victimization Survey, and the Annual National Public Security Survey (conducted by the Chinese Statistics Bureau since 2001), have been conducted in China, these surveys have generally neglected the victimization experience and the preventive/risk factors among migrant workers. Internal migrants have been systematically excluded from research due to their lack of official *Hukou*, or household registration system, in urban China, a type of information all samplings relied on in previous surveys. Although some research attempted to address the problem of migrant victimization and the social exclusion they experienced in urban *China* theoretically, data limitations have not allowed for a large-scale empirical examination due to methodological and political challenges (Xu 2016), until Sun Yat-sen University (SYSU) in Guangdong began to conduct the China Labor Dynamic Survey (CLDS) in 2012. Not only did the survey apply advanced Geographic Information System (GIS) sampling techniques to survey migrant workers so that their sample would be nationally representative, but importantly the survey also included a series of vulnerability questions, including respondents' victimization history and deviant behaviors.

Using these data, the current study presents the first nationally representative examination of victimization and its social correlates among Chinese rural-to-urban migrants. Specifically, we explore (1) whether there is higher risk of victimization among rural-to-urban migrants compared to urban residents in China, and (2) if so, to what extent the prior research findings on the mediating effects of social exclusion between international immigration and victimization can be applied in the non-West context of China. In so doing, results from the current study will extend the nascent knowledge base by permitting a rigorous exploration of the patterns and correlates of migrants' victimization in China. Before we turn to the results of our investigation, we provide an overview of the theoretical and prior research issues on victimization and then within the Chinese context.

Theoretical Overview: Immigration, Social Exclusion, and Victimization

An important omission from prior criminological, theoretical, and empirical research with respect to explaining victimization is the lack of attention to how the social structure may push potential victims into high-risk situations/circumstances in the first place (Miethe and Meier 1994; Sampson and Lauritsen 1990; Xu 2009). We focus on one structural deficiency that affects the lives of some marginalized groups and by extension, increases their risk of criminal victimization: the systematic social exclusion they suffer in a particular society (Gaetz 2004).

Social exclusion was originally defined in France in the 1970s to describe “social misfits” unprotected by social insurance (Silver 1994). Although social exclusion has emerged as a useful concept to understand the process of social disintegration, there is no universally accepted definition. Here, we use a more systematic version developed by the University of Bristol:

Social exclusion is a complex and multi-dimensional process. It involves the lack or denial of resources, rights, goods and services, and the inability to participate in the normal relationships and activities, available to the majority of people in a society, whether in economic, social, cultural or political arenas. It affects both the quality of life of individuals and the equity and cohesion of society as a whole. (Levitas et al. 2007:9)

After recognizing that social exclusion is a multidimensional and accumulative process, our next consideration is how social exclusion increases the risk of victimization among marginalized populations in general and for immigrants in particular. Examining homeless youth in Canada, Gaetz (2004) argues that their social exclusion is manifested in several domains: restricted public policies that reduce their capabilities to find suitable employment and then develop a healthy lifestyle, denial of entry to safe urban spaces, and limited social capital. Under the influence of such multi-dimensional social exclusion, these youth are closer to more motivated offenders, become more available as vulnerable targets, and have less capable guardians, consequently increasing their risk of victimization as routine activity theory predicts (Cohen and Felson 1979).

Similar explanations can be applied to international immigrants. Prior research finds that international immigrants, who often face systematic exclusion from social development (Gore 1995), are also more likely to

be victimized (Hanish and Guerra 2000; Le and Wallen 2009; Sulkowski et al. 2014). Following the segmented assimilation framework, scholars in the immigration field have identified several mechanisms contributing to social exclusion of immigrants that may lead to their high risk of criminal victimization. Below, we first introduce segmented assimilation and then discuss the multidimensional social exclusion (linked with victimization) derived from the segmented assimilation experienced by immigrants.

Over 90 years ago, Sutherland (1924) observed that immigrants often underwent a slow process of acculturation and integration into mainstream local communities. However, segmented assimilation theory points out that not all immigrants must follow this linear track and ultimately adapt to the host culture. The agency of immigrants and the interplay among individuals, cultures, and structures may all affect the process of acculturation and integration (Morenoff and Astor 2006; Zhou and Lin 2005), and there are different forms of adaptation among immigrants (Portes 1995; Pumariega, Rothe, and Pumariega 2005). In short, segmented assimilation anticipates that the hierarchical nature of the receiving society may constrain opportunities of immigrants' assimilation into various social strata, such as labor markets, social relations, and neighborhoods (Akresh, Do, and Frank 2016; Samson 2014). For example, some disadvantaged immigrants have very limited access to decent employment, sufficient social support networks, and secure communities in the United States. As a result, they may experience long-time exclusion (marginalization by the majority) instead of conventional integration (mirroring the White middle class; Chen and Zhong 2013; Fox and Guglielmo 2012; Ports and Rumbaut 2001).

First, some groups of immigrants are likely to be excluded from decent employment. There are various explanations regarding the disadvantages of these immigrants in the job market (Burchardt, Le Grand, and Piachaud 2002; Young 1999, 2007). Some believe that such immigrants lose their motivation to work and rely on governmental assistance in their host societies. These immigrants are self-excluded from the society, although the welfare state is partially responsible for engendering a state of "dependency" (Murray 1994, 1999; Murray and Lister 1996). Some scholars emphasize discrimination against immigration or minority groups, making many of them unable to find satisfactory employment (Wacquant 2008). And still others highlight the roles of institutions and systems, such as capitalism and globalization. Through technological transformation and downsizing of the economy, some low-skilled immigrant workers have become unnecessary and redundant for late capitalism (Bauman 2000, 2004, 2005). Although explanations vary, exclusion from decent

employment may increase immigrants' attraction to likely offenders and hence increase their likelihood of being victimized. For instance, prior studies have found that Latino immigrants in the United States often take low-skilled jobs due to their illegal status and insufficient knowledge; such jobs are likely to pay in cash and make these immigrants look like "walking ATM (Automated Teller Machine)," so that they are more likely to experience robbery and wage theft (Barranco and Shihadeh 2015; Fussell 2011).

Second, exclusion from sufficient social support networks in the receiving societies also contributes to the high level of victimization among immigrants. According to the voluminous social network and social support literature (cf. Gottlieb 1978; Vega, Kolody, and Valle 1987), the immigration process is often linked with the "loss" of important network ties that could provide multiple supporting functions, including information/resource help (instrumental support) and emotional nurturance (expressive support). Immigrants have to rebuild their networks in the destination, and as a result, the social support networks of new immigrants may shape their acculturative experience (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. 2006; Vega et al. 1991). Unfortunately, the acceptance of immigrants by the host society varies from being neutral to being hostile; some immigrants' communities are tightly knit while others are not (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Immigrants would encounter serious difficulties to reconstitute their instrumental and emotional support networks if they are living with local social rejection (i.e., lack of local friends) and with weak coethnic ties (i.e., absence of relatives or hometown acquaintances). Instead of integrating into the mainstream society, such immigrants are likely to enter into an "exclusion" mode of acculturation and face many disadvantages due to their marginalization, such as poverty, stress, and a high rate of criminal offending and victimization (Chen and Zhong 2013; Forster et al. 2015; Portes 1995; Weeks 2001; Zhou and Bankston III 1994). In sum, as an outcome of their immigration experience, some immigrants might be excluded by the social majority and pushed into risky routines and lifestyles. On this score, a recent study by Sulkowski et al. (2014) found that immigrant youth in the United States were more likely to be victimized by physical aggression because of the prevalent anti-immigrant sentiment among their local peers. As well, due to such nativism, many bystanders may not go out of their way to help immigrant victims. Thus, to some extent, the shortage of social support networks in a hostile society demonstrates the insufficient informal guardianship in the face of crime so that such immigrants are more likely to be victimized.

Third, the exclusion from relatively safe communities may also increase immigrants' risk of criminal victimization. Due to limited financial

resources and the exclusive housing market/policies in the receiving societies, certain groups of immigrants are more likely to reside in poor ethnic enclaves with concentrated disadvantage (Andersson 2012; Van Kempen and Ozuekren 1998). Their modes of assimilation and subsequent life experience are thus constrained by such neighborhood segregation and different from the other groups of immigrants who locate in better communities (Akresh et al. 2016; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Following the classic work emerging from the Chicago School, people living in criminogenic communities may experience high levels of offending and victimization. In the United States, many immigrants come from less-developed nations, and they have historically been concentrated in ethnic enclaves with high turnover rates. Heterogeneity and high residential mobility for immigrants not only impede residents' ability to sustain reciprocal and interdependent relationships but also intensify distrust and conflict within and among diverse groups, weakening informal neighborhood controls, and boosting crime and victimization rates (Shaw and McKay 1942). Consistent with Shaw and McKay, Frank, Cerdá, and Redón (2007) identify that there is an increasing likelihood of risky health behaviors among Latino youth if they are living in communities with a higher concentration of Latinos and poverty. In addition, the inadequate and inefficient public control contributes to the high risk of victimization in immigrant-concentrated communities. The police are often understaffed or become indifferent toward these communities, resulting in less protection from official guardians when crime happens (Anderson 1978; Venkatesh 2008). On the other hand, more recent social disorganization literature shows that the level of social cohesion (or collective efficacy) in the neighborhood is negatively related to crime (Sampson and Raudenbush 1999; Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997). In sharp contrast to the early work of Shaw and McKay, Sampson, Morenoff, and Raudenbush (2005) argue that Mexican American neighborhoods in fact provide collective efficacy (sharing similar values and becoming more involved in community issues) and other revitalizing effects for immigrants, including new arrivals with minimal language and labor skills. Thus, these homogeneous neighborhoods may actually be beneficial for immigrants, so that residents have diminished opportunities to be victimized, although such enclaves may remain relatively excluded from mainstream society.

Recently, scholars have started to offer more comprehensive explanations about such immigrant revitalization effects: Instead of all enclaves, only well-established coethnic communities with necessary infrastructure (i.e., strong informal social control and long-standing ties to mainstream political, economic, and social institutions) could have a high level of social

integration and protect immigrants from crime and victimization (Ramey 2013; Velez and Lyons 2012). That is, immigrants living in newly established enclaves with weak power in the receiving society are the most risky group in terms of victimization.

With this larger theoretical backdrop in hand, we now situate this line of work within the Chinese context that comprises the location of our research.

Internal Migration, Social Exclusion, and Victimization in China

Notably, there should be both similarities and differences between international immigrants and internal migrants. To what extent, the aforementioned research findings on immigrants' victimization derived from the Western studies can be applied into the experience of Chinese internal migrants remains unexamined. For instance, international immigrants are usually far away from sending countries, and the main purpose is to get settled down permanently in receiving countries. The strong permanent migration will motivate them to form mutual support networks and avoid risky lifestyles which may threaten their permanent migrant status (Zhou 1992). On the contrary, internal migrants in China are blocked from settling down permanently in receiving cities due to the institutional barrier of the *Hukou* system (Chan and Buckingham 2008; Chan and Zhang 1999).

Chinese *Hukou*, or household registration system, was established in the late 1950s to prevent internal migration and tighten social control in Mao's China. According to *Hukou* system, individuals are assigned to either a rural (agriculture) *Hukou* or an urban (nonagriculture) *Hukou*. Citizens with urban *Hukou* can enjoy a comprehensive social welfare system including, but not limited to jobs, public housing, medical care, pension, and education, while those with rural *Hukou* are systematically excluded from these benefits. With the increasing demand of labor (and laborers) in cities when China started its economic reform and opening-up policy in the 1980s, the control of internal migration was gradually loosened, and hundreds of millions of people moved to cities seeking employment. However, those with rural *Hukou* can hardly change their *Hukou* to urban and enjoy the same social welfare as their urban counterparts even if they have worked and lived in cities for decades. Currently, *Hukou* becomes the major mechanism of social exclusion for millions of Chinese internal migrants. As a result, for Chinese rural-to-urban migrants, their migration to cities is largely work oriented and always temporary due to institutional exclusion. Most of the time, they migrate individually rather than migrate with the whole family

(Cai and Wang 2007). Being excluded from various urban social welfare, the rootless migrants in China can hardly integrate into urban societies (Yan 2008). Therefore, Chinese internal migrants may experience a different, or at least partially different, story in criminal victimization compared to international immigrants in the West.

Along with China's rapid urbanization and influx of rural-to-urban migrants in urban China, the country's crime rate has also increased. It is widely observed that increasing numbers of rural-to-urban migrants are a main reason of the upward trajectory of crime and victimization in contemporary China (Wang 2002). The majority of street crime offenders in urban China, especially in the economically developed southeastern coastal areas, are rural-to-urban migrants. For example, one study in Guangzhou and Shenzhen showed that migrants are the subjects of 80 to 90 percent of police arrests (Wang 2006). However, international victimization research has long demonstrated that for interpersonal crimes, offenders and victims are more often recruited from similar backgrounds (Anderson 1990; Bourgois 2003; Hampton, Gulotta, and Ramos 2006). Some survey research in subareas of China does indicate that internal migrants and their children are more likely than local citizens to be victimized (Chen and Zhong 2012; Cheung 2013). Other studies based on official statistics identify that for urban violent crimes, most of the victims are migrant workers (Xu and Song 2005). One qualitative study also reports that migrants living in urban villages (i.e., Chinese urban slums where migrants concentrate) face increased odds of experiencing theft, robbery, assault, and sexual assault (Zhong 2010).

Very few studies have explored the mechanism of the high risk of criminal victimization among Chinese rural-to-urban migrants. In studying the victimization of a particular group of migrants, motorcycle taxi drivers in a city from southern China, Xu (2009) demonstrates that migrant drivers' risk of being robbed was more than 10 times higher than their local counterparts. One of the main reasons for the high risk of being robbed for migrants is local government's discriminatory policy in banning motorcycles which prevents migrants from using motorcycles while local citizens could use them legally. In this way, migrant motorcycle taxi drivers are excluded from legitimate employment and then lose the legal protection. Although they lack a theoretical approach to victimization, some China-specific studies (Yang and Guo 1996; Zhao 2011) have identified rural-to-urban migrants as being highly excluded from professional or even normal white-collar jobs due to the *Hukou* limitation (many jobs are only open for urban natives), lack of relations in the market, and their weak human capital (also due to

long term rural–urban inequality in the education domain). Their exclusion from the higher-level jobs in a global capitalist economy is further deteriorated by various exclusionary local government policies (Huang, Xue, and Li 2014).

Similar to international immigrants, rural-to-urban migrants in China suffer from the lack of a sufficient social support network. Internal migrants in China move to urban areas with a distance from their original family and friends in their rural hometowns. They thus risk losing their old social ties and have to restore their social support network in their receiving societies (Tong and Piotrowski 2012). In Chinese cities, migrants rely highly on their hometown networks or familial support (Wu, Chen, and Sung-Chan 2014; Xiang 2000; Zhang 2001). Such networks could provide rural-to-urban migrants both information/resource assistance for better jobs and emotional support when encountering negative life events such as discrimination and victimization (Cheung 2013; Jin et al. 2012; Zhao 2003; Zhong 2010). Due to prevalent social rejection in urban China, there are great difficulties for rural-to-urban migrants to develop strong social ties with urban residents. For example, Lan (2014) points out that migrant children are more likely to experience social segregation at urban public schools, and there are tangible social boundaries between migrant and local students in the same classroom; local students may directly express hostility to bully migrant children due to their hometown accent, academic inferiority, “uncivilized” posture, and lack of wealth.

Moreover, Chinese internal migrants are often excluded from mainstream urban neighborhoods with relatively good public order, strong conformity to law, a beautiful and clean environment, and a harmonious neighborhood relationship, though some local governments have tried to improve the safety of migrant-concentrated neighborhoods (Zhong and Broadhurst 2007). There are consistent findings that Chinese rural-to-urban migrants tend to reside in poor enclaves (urban villages) characterized by high population density, low level of regulation, unhealthy living environment, frequent safety, and other social problems (Liu et al. 2010; Zhong 2010; Zhou and Cai 2008). However, although they are more likely to be victimized in such risky neighborhoods, many migrants do not want to move out since they value the low living cost and the supportive hometown social networks developed in these enclaves (Chen and Chen 2015; Wu et al. 2014). In other words, spatial segregation in urban China will continue and rural-to-urban migrants are stuck in these enclaves with minimal chance to achieve geographical upward mobility.

Current Study

Synthesizing the above criminological and migration/immigration research, this study adopts an integrative framework of migration, social exclusion, and victimization and outlines three specific hypotheses: (1) rural-to-urban migrants are more likely than urban residents to be victimized; (2) internal migration in China may lead to migrants' multidimensional social exclusion from decent employment, sufficient social support network, and safe communities; and (3) the multidimensional social exclusion mediates the direct relationship between internal migration and victimization for these migrants.

Method

Data and Sample

The CLDS is a large-scale biannual cross-sectional household survey designed and conducted by the social survey center at SYSU, China. The first round of this survey was completed in 2012. This nationally representative survey applied multistage cluster proportionate probability sampling methods: Primary sampling units (PSUs) include 2,282 city districts and counties in overall China after balancing the population size of each province, streets, and townships. Secondary sampling units (SSU) are urban neighborhood committees, rural village committees, and then 35 families in each SSU. Working populations in this survey are defined as individuals above 15 years old; all family members above 15 were interviewed. The SSU questionnaire (answered by neighborhood/rural committees and survey interviewers), family, and individual questionnaires were separately designed, but the data analyst was able to link all three levels together by matching identification numbers. In each selected SSU, the survey administrators use GIS sampling methods, so that migrant families without an urban *Hukou* registration would be included in the sampling frame. The final sample for 2012 includes 42 urban PSUs and 140 urban SSUs covering all major cities in Guangdong province (oversampling Guangdong) and Eastern, Central, and Western China. In total, there are 4,900 families in the final urban family sample. Among these urban families, about one tenth includes migrant workers. The present study focuses only on the normal working population in urban China (ages 15–64), including both rural-to-urban migrants and local workers. Respondents who reported that they were enrolled at school or were retired are excluded in the analysis. The final sample size is 3,846, including 3,123 urban residents (with urban *Hukou*)

and 723 rural-to-urban migrants. Here, respondents with a rural *Hukou* and those who have lived away from their registered permanent residence (rural) over half a year are classified as rural-to-urban migrants.

Measures

Dependent variable. The hypotheses are tested through logistic regression models (see details in Analysis Strategy section). In the CLDS, respondents are asked to report whether they have experienced blackmail/intimidation, assault, fraud, theft, and robbery in the past 12 months. Our dependent variable is scored one (1) if the respondent experienced any of the five victimization types, and zero (0) if no victimizations were experienced.

Migration and social exclusion. We first use “being rural-to-urban migrants” (1 = yes; 0 = no) as the major independent variable, as well as commonly used control variables in victimization studies. Then, we introduce social exclusion indicators as mediators between migration and victimization. Following our hypotheses, the model addresses how migration may lead to migrant workers’ victimization through three different mechanisms of social exclusion. To measure social exclusion, we use three dimensions: employment (to determine whether they were excluded by the more advanced job market in urban areas), social network (to assess whether they had sufficient interactions with mainstream societies), and types of residential communities (to see whether they were blocked by the urban housing institution and thus had limited access to safe places).

In the domain of employment, there are three specific indicators. The first is risky jobs. Prior literature has identified that Latino immigrants are more likely to be robbed because of their risky jobs (Barranco and Shihadeh 2015), such as low-skilled jobs that the workers often work outside or carry a lot of cash. Six occupations in this survey are considered as being riskier than others, including manual workers, low-level skilled workers, low-level clerks, small private businessmen, and staff in retail trade and other services. Educational attainment has also been used to rank various occupations (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2006). In China, rural residents often view higher level of education as the access to “clean jobs” in cities (Lan 2014). We thus include education as the second indicator in this employment dimension, ranking from 6 to 22 years in the full sample. In addition, unemployment has been identified as a risk factor in previous victimization

studies since unemployed people are more likely to appear on the street and thus become more exposed to likely offenders (Maxfield 1987; Sampson and Wooldredge 1987).

Following prior migration/immigration studies, the social network is also measured by three variables: (a) local language proficiency, ranging from 1 (*cannot understand or speak at all*) to 5 (*very proficient*), (b) number of local friends/acquaintances who can provide support and help, ranging from 1 (*none*) to 5 (*16 or above*), and (c) living alone (1 = *yes*, 0 = *no*), meaning that there are no friends/partners/family members living in the same household, and the person may be very marginalized in this society (Messner et al. 2007).

Immigrants/migrants may lack access to communities with order and stability, so that they are more likely to experience crime and victimization (Shaw and McKay 1942). Mainly derived from the social disorganization literature, we identify three risky characteristics of the communities in which the respondents live: weak social cohesion, high proportion of migrants, and low level of public control. Similar to Sampson et al. (1997), we use three questions to measure neighborhood social cohesion: “Do you think people in your neighborhood are familiar with each other?” “Do you think people in this neighborhood trust each other?” and “Do you think people in the neighborhood would help each other when needed?” Answers to each were indicated on a Likert-type scale from 1 = *certainly not* to 5 = *certainly so*. We then compute a social cohesion index by aggregating and summing the individual-level responses in the same neighborhood. The reliability coefficient of this index is .78. In the full sample, the final scores of this index range from 3 to 15. To measure the migrant proportion in each community, we match the individual questionnaire and the SSU questionnaire since the SSU questionnaire contains the following two questions: “number of total population in this neighborhood” and “number of population without local *Hukou* in this neighborhood.” We can then calculate the rate of migrants in this particular neighborhood. The mean migrant rate for all communities in the full sample is 27.4 percent. Also matching the individual and the SSU questionnaire, the level of public control is measured by the rate of households enjoying basic living allowances (*Dibao*, a major type of social welfare for poor families in China) among all households in the neighborhood. In China, *Dibao* is a social welfare policy available only to urban residents but not to rural-to-urban migrants (Gustafsson and Deng 2011). A neighborhood with more *Dibao* households in fact implies that the local government takes good care of this neighborhood instead of an indicator of poverty level in this

neighborhood. Using the full sample, the mean *Dibao* coverage of these communities is 3.9 percent.

Control variables. We control for age, gender (1 = *male*), and social class in our logistic regression models. For social class, we use subjective social status ranging from 1 (*lowest*) to 10 (*highest*) since the objective income measure in the survey contains substantial missing values. Yu (2015) has tested and supported the validity of this subjective social status measure in the CLDS 2012. In many immigration studies, the origins of the immigrants are usually controlled since such origins or ethnic identities indicate the differences of the sending societies (Bianchi, Buonanno, and Pinotti 2012). Chinese internal migrants only have hometowns instead of home countries. We thus control regions of the migrants (i.e., East, West, and Middle of China). Here, we use “East of China” to compare with the other regions since East is the most developed region in China. Prior victimization studies also found a significant positive relationship between personal deviance and his or her victimization experience (Anderson 1999). We thus control for drinking, the only available self-reported deviant behavior in the CLDS. The level of drinking is measured by self-reported weekly frequency (how many times do you often drink in one week), ranging from 0 to 35 in the full sample.

Analysis Strategy

We first conduct descriptive analysis for all variables using the full sample, including both migrants and urban residents. Then, we test the mean differences of these variables between migrants and local residents using *t*-tests. By comparison, we identify distinctive disadvantages faced by migrants (see Table 1 for detailed results). In the second stage of the analysis, we first run correlations and estimate variance inflation factor tests (available from the authors). The results do not show any multicollinearity problems among our independent variables and control variables. We then perform Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) and logistic regression models to examine the impact of migrant status on all potential mediators (the aforementioned nine measures of social exclusion). The results are summarized in Table 2. Lastly, using the full sample, we run full logistic regression models to test the direct effect of migrant status on victimization and the mediating effects of social exclusion between migrant status and victimization. The effect of migration on victimization should become

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Rural-to-urban Migrants and Urban *Hukou* Holders.

Variables	Full Sample		Migrant		Urban		t-test statistics
	N = 3,846		n = 723		n = 3,123		
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	
Migrant	0.176	0.381					
Victimization	0.144	0.351	0.216	0.412	0.129	0.335	-5.110***
Job segregation							
Risky job	0.500	0.500	0.539	0.499	0.491	0.500	-1.969*
Education	11.472	3.154	9.690	2.738	11.853	3.107	14.557***
Unemployed	0.048	0.214	0.057	0.232	0.046	0.211	-0.992
Social segregation							
Live alone	0.056	0.230	0.108	0.310	0.045	0.208	-5.600***
Local network	2.830	1.274	2.516	1.177	2.897	1.284	6.181***
Local language proficiency	4.729	0.841	3.461	1.439	5.000	0.000	52.286***
Community segregation							
Proportion of <i>Dibao</i> household	3.923	6.439	2.293	4.882	4.271	6.675	6.339***
Percentage of migrants	0.274	0.273	0.451	0.313	0.237	0.247	-16.921***
Social cohesion	9.195	2.402	8.241	2.423	9.398	2.348	10.045***
Control variables							
Age	38.275	11.997	32.884	10.245	39.426	12.032	11.425***
Male	0.498	0.500	0.512	0.500	0.495	0.500	-0.688
Drinking	0.800	2.001	0.917	2.174	0.775	1.962	-1.451†
Subjective social status	4.412	1.728	4.045	1.807	4.490	1.701	5.308***
Eastern area	0.503	0.500	0.639	0.481	0.474	0.499	-6.807***

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001. †p < .1.

insignificant (or at least much smaller) if measures of social exclusion are in fact acting as mediators between migration and victimization. We also run the models separately for migrants and urban residents, including the significant mediators identified in previous stages and necessary controls. By comparing the results of these two models, we can better understand the distinct mechanisms between social exclusion and victimization among migrants compared to their urban counterparts. Table 3 shows the logistic regression results of all these models.¹

Table 2. Regression Results on the Relationship between Migrant Status and Three Dimensions of Social Exclusion.

Social Exclusion	Job Segregation					Social Segregation				Community Segregation		
	Model 1.1 Risky Job	Model 1.2 Education	Model 1.2 Unemployed	Model 1.3 Language	Model 1.4 Network	Model 1.5 Alone	Model 1.6 Cohesion	Model 1.7 Migrant Rate	Model 1.8 Dibao Rate	Model 1.9 Dibao Rate		
Migrant	.284** (.103)	-2.534*** (.148)	0.179 (.224)	-22.14*** (2.44)	-644*** (.0934)	0.642*** (.184)	-0.840*** (.117)	.189*** (.0128)	-1.421*** (.316)			
Age	.0219*** (.00330)	-0.0644*** (.00469)	-0.00486 (.00767)	-0.0238** (.00832)	-0.0230*** (.00298)	-0.0195** (.00730)	0.0373** (.00371)	-0.000830* (.000405)	0.0182† (.0100)			
Male	-.373*** (.0802)	0.349** (.115)	-0.594** (.192)	-0.0212 (.173)	.256*** (.0719)	0.310† (.174)	-0.0215 (.0909)	.0175† (.00994)	-0.268 (.246)			
Drinking	.00452 (.0202)	-0.0264 (.0290)	0.0321 (.0449)	0.0184 (.0324)	.0735*** (.0192)	0.0330 (.0364)	-0.00883 (.0229)	-0.00122 (.00250)	0.00157 (.0619)			
Subjective social status	-.117*** (.0224)	0.175*** (.0318)	-0.0875† (.0508)	0.102* (.0463)	.157*** (.0203)	-0.226*** (.0484)	0.151*** (.0251)	-0.00456 (.00274)	-0.0542 (.0678)			
Eastern area	.0716 (.0763)	0.158 (.110)	-0.160 (.176)	-1.578*** (.186)	-.180** (.0684)	0.344* (.170)	-0.0236 (.0867)	.123*** (.00947)	-2.777*** (.234)			
Constant	-.227 (.182)	13.38*** (.261)	-2.142*** (.412)	0.516 (.207)		-1.719*** (.388)	7.279*** (.075)	.206*** (.0226)	5.244*** (.558)			
R ² /pseudo R ²	.026	0.142	0.013	.024		0.052		.143	0.061			

Note: Standard errors in parentheses.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001. †p < .1.

Table 3. Logistic Regression Models on the Relationship between Migrant Status, Social Exclusion, and Victimization^a.

	Model 2.1	Model 2.2	Model 2.3	Model 2.4	Model 2.5	Model 2.6	Model 2.7
	Full Sample			Migrant	Urban		
Victimization							
Migrant	.472*** (.130)	.378** (.137)	.319* (.178)	.303* (.137)	.110 (.185)		
Job segregation							
Risky job		.146 [†] (.109)			.176 [†] (.111)	-.351 [†] (.225)	.350** (.129)
Education		-.0352* (.0183)			-.0396* (.0186)	.00473 (.0441)	-.0484** (.0207)
Social segregation							
Local language			-.100 [†] (.0764)		-.0638 (.0783)	-.0567 (.0872)	
Local network			.0358 (.0433)		.0610 [†] (.0446)	.110 (.0948)	.0434 (.0510)
Live alone			.288 [†] (.207)		.275 [†] (.209)	.311 (.329)	.220 (.278)
Community segregation							
Social cohesion				-.0271 (.0232)	-.0328 [†] (.0240)	-.00522 (.0483)	-.0407 [†] (.0277)
Migrant rate				.612** (.205)	.574** (.208)	.122 (.422)	.705** (.244)
Dibao rate				-.0262* (.0113)	-.0277** (.0114)	-.0359 (.0321)	-.0279* (.0124)

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

Victimization	Model 2.1	Model 2.2	Model 2.3	Model 2.4	Model 2.5	Model 2.6	Model 2.7
	Full Sample			Migrant	Urban		
Control variables							
Age	-.0223*** (.00474)	-.0251*** (.00487)	-.0217*** (.00478)	-.0204*** (.00486)	-.0225*** (.00504)	-.0186† (.0126)	-.0244*** (.00559)
Male	-.0789 (.114)	-.0569 (.114)	-.0933 (.114)	-.0985 (.114)	-.0899 (.115)	-.0112 (.242)	-.103 (.132)
Drinking	.0677*** (.0251)	.0667*** (.0252)	.0662*** (.0252)	.0689*** (.0252)	.0653*** (.0253)	.0302 (.0528)	.0693*** (.0291)
Subjective social status	-.0410† (.0311)	-.0316 (.0314)	-.0373 (.0316)	-.0377 (.0314)	-.0260 (.0321)	-.143* (.0651)	.0163 (.0373)
Eastern area	-.0706 (.108)	-.0654 (.109)	-.0983 (.111)	-.233* (.117)	-.244* (.119)	-.199 (.274)	-.250* (.133)
Constant	-.857*** (.254)	-.461† (.349)	-.496 (.481)	-.659* (.311)	-.0568 (.558)	.0448 (.895)	-.381 (.463)
N	2,889	2,889	2,889	2,889	2,889	509	2,380
Pseudo R ²	.021	.024	.023	.029	.033	.034	.029

Note: Standard errors in parentheses.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001. †p < 0.1.

Results

Table 1 shows that migrants and local residents have substantial differences in terms of both victimization and social exclusion. Consistent with the first hypothesis, victimization risks among migrants are significantly higher than those of urban residents (21.6 percent vs. 12.9 percent). In our supplemental analyses, we find that compared to urban residents, migrants in fact have significantly greater risks of victimization for assault, robbery, theft, and fraud (results are available from the authors). There is no significant difference between the two groups in terms of blackmail/intimidation perhaps because such offenses are very rare. Consistent with prior research, migrants are more socially excluded. Compared to their urban counterparts, migrants report a significantly higher percentage of taking a risky job (53.9 percent vs. 49.1 percent), less average years of education (9.7 vs. 11.9), a higher percentage of living alone (10.8 percent vs. 4.5 percent), less average number of local friends/acquaintances (2.5 vs. 2.9), and lower average level of local language proficiency (3.5 vs. 5). Notably, there is no significant difference between migrants and urban residents in terms of the percentage of being unemployed. In comparison with urban residents, migrants are also significantly more likely to reside in a risky community with lower *Dibao* coverage rate (2.3 percent vs. 4.3 percent), higher proportion of migrants (4.5 percent vs. 2.4 percent), and lower level of social cohesion (8.2 vs. 9.4). Among the control variables, migrants are significantly younger (mean age = 32.9) than urban residents (mean age = 39.4); migrants also drink more frequently than urban respondents (0.9 vs. 0.8). Migrants also report significantly lower scores of subjective social status (mean score = 4.0) than urban residents (mean score = 4.5). Migrants in this sample are more likely to come from eastern areas (63.9 percent), indicating that the most developed areas in China (East of China) may provide more incentives and opportunities for poor rural peasants in the same region to move into adjacent cities. Significantly different from the regional distribution of migrants, urban respondents in this survey are more diversified (47.4 percent from East and 52.6 percent from other regions of China). However, there is no significant gender difference between the two groups, with both male and female respondents around 50 percent, reflecting the high quality of the survey's GIS sampling methods.

Table 2 reports the OLS or logistic regression results of the relationship between migrant status and social exclusion, controlling for age, gender, deviant behavior, subjective status, and region. As hypothesized, we find that migrant status has significant positive effects on the possibilities of

taking risky jobs (model 1.1) and living alone (model 1.6), whereas migration is negatively related to years of education (model 1.2), level of local language proficiency (model 1.4), and number of local supportive contacts (model 1.3). Being a rural-to-urban migrant also significantly increases the chance of living in urban neighborhoods with lower level of social cohesion (model 1.7), higher proportion of migrants (model 1.8), and smaller *Dibao* coverage (model 1.9). These results strongly imply that rural-to-urban migration does increase a person's vulnerability to obtain decent employment, sufficient supportive local network, and access to safe communities in urban areas. The relationship between migrant status and unemployment is the only insignificant one, suggesting that rural-to-urban migrants may be not very disadvantaged compared to urban residents in terms of job hunting. Facing the labor shortage of developed areas in China, it may be easy for rural-to-urban migrants to find a job in cities without considering the quality of the job (Cai and Li 2015).

Next, we closely test the mediating effects of social exclusion between migrant status and victimization. We first examine the direct effect of migrant status on victimization with all control variables (model 2.1). This model confirms that migrant status significantly increases the likelihood of being victimized. Next, we introduce the eight potential social exclusion mediators (identified in Table 2) into the model to understand why migration may potentially increase the risk of victimization. The three domains of social exclusion are examined separately in models 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4. Except for the lack of local network, all of the other types of social exclusion significantly increase the risks of victimization. Contrary to our hypothesis, the higher number of local friends/acquaintances who can provide support and help increases the risk of victimization. This finding indicates that the extensive local network may be a risk factor of victimization (i.e., meaning more opportunities to socialize with people outside) instead of forces protecting people from social segregation and victimization. In each of the three models, the effects of migration on victimization are also reduced after we introduce a group of social exclusion indicators. For example, once we include the three measures on community segregation, the coefficient of migrant is reduced from .472 ($p < .001$) to .303 ($p < .01$).

Next, we combine all three domains of social exclusion into model 2.5. One noteworthy finding is that after we include all these social exclusion variables, the effect of migrant becomes insignificant, and the coefficient also drops by 76.7 percent, from .472 to .110, suggesting that the mediating effects of social exclusion are supported in the full sample. In general, model 2.5 reflects that migration increases the risks of victimization mainly

through job, social, and community segregation in urban areas. Notably, the effects of local network are still contrary to our hypothesis. In this comprehensive model, local language proficiency becomes insignificant perhaps because the number of urban residents is much higher than the number of migrants in the full sample. For urban residents, their local language skills are considered universally high, and thus the variance of this variable is low.

Lastly, we divide the full sample into two groups (migrant vs. urban) and run the logistic regression models separately for these two groups (see Table 3). Model 2.6 shows the effects of social exclusion on victimization among migrants, whereas model 2.7 reports the corresponding effects for urban residents. For urban respondents, the results are very similar to those shown in model 2.5: Except for social segregation, all of the other types of social exclusion significantly increase the likelihood of being victimized. Thus, for Chinese urban residents, their victimization risks are more related to the communities they live in and the nature of their jobs more so than their social relations. However, in the migrant model, only risky job, local network, and *Dibao* rate remain significant or approach significance. Contrary to our expectation, the relationship between local network in fact increase migrants' victimization risks instead of lowering it and holding a risky job also turns to be a protective factor for migrants to reduce their risks of being victimized. Compared to the other types of social exclusion, living in unsafe places with a low level of official care and control seems more important when explaining migrants' high risk of victimization.

Consistent with previous findings in the victimization literature (Cohen, Kluegel, and Land 1981; Tseloni et al. 2004), across models in Table 3, young people are more likely to be victimized. We also find that drinking has a positive effect on victimization, but only in the urban sample. For rural-to-urban migrants, drinking is not significantly related to victimization perhaps because rural-to-urban migrants have yet to adopt urban values and lifestyles, so that their drinking behaviors take different forms (Shen and Zhong 2015). A higher level of subjective social status can significantly reduce migrants' victimization, meaning social upward mobility does provide substantive protections for migrants. Surprisingly, such effects do not exist in the urban model. The reason may lie in the fact that a long period of rural-urban divide in China has made urban citizens collectively (regardless of their hierarchical social status within cities) more beneficial than rural people (Zhao 2011). As we expect, the eastern area can significantly reduce the risks of victimization among urban residents. However, this regional measure has no significant effects on migrants' victimization. The

disadvantages faced by different geographical groups of migrants thus might be universal in China. No gender effects were observed in both the migrant and urban models.

Discussion and Conclusion

According to segmented assimilation theory, not all immigrants are likely to be socially excluded in various mainstream social strata and thus they may not face high risks of victimization. For example, some immigrants are professionals or speak fluent English, so that their life experiences would be similar to Whites (Fox and Guglielmo 2012; Samson 2014). Hispanics who settle down in the long-established coethnic communities actually engage in lower crime (Bersani 2014; Bersani, Loughran, and Piquero 2014) and experience lower rates of victimization as collective efficacy among immigrants may protect them from being victimized (Morenoff and Astor 2006; Sampson et al. 2005). Empirical research in the West identifies that certain groups of immigrants experience more victimization mainly because of the multidimensional social exclusion they suffer in receiving countries, such as being excluded from decent employment, safe communities, and sufficient social support (Anderson 1978; Venkatesh 2008).

In China, rapid urbanization, industrialization, and modernization have occurred concomitant with an unprecedented rise in crime and victimization rates in the past three decades (Xu and Liu 2015). One particularly noteworthy fact is the realization that different groups experience differential risks of criminal victimization, with rural-to-urban migrants experiencing a higher risk of victimization than urban residents. This study utilized the first nationally representative labor survey data, the 2012 CLDS, to rigorously examine the risks of criminal victimization as well as some of the potential mechanisms underlying differences among urban and rural-to-urban migrants. In particular, we examined the extent to which common research findings in Western research on the mediating roles of social exclusion between international immigration and criminal victimization can be applied to explain victimization for rural-to-urban migrants in China, and what factors may be unique to Chinese migrants with respect to affecting their risk of victimization.

The results confirmed that rural-to-urban migrants' risks of victimization in China were considerably higher than their local counterparts in terms of both property (e.g., theft and fraud) and violent (e.g., robbery and assault) crime. We also found a significant positive link between internal migration and criminal victimization, even after we controlled for their originality

(“region” is insignificant in the following migration model) and other personal characteristics. Our findings are consistent with those drawn from some small-scale, nonrepresentative data in previous research (Cheung 2013; Xu and Song 2005). Yet, our work is also the first to demonstrate the elevated risks of victimization among nationwide rural-to-urban migrants in China. Rather than falling into different modes of assimilative experience, various groups of rural-to-urban migrants seem to face universal disadvantages in terms of victimization. One reason may be due to China’s unique institutional arrangements through the *Hukou* system which strongly limits the life chances of all of these migrants to obtain full urban citizenship, including housing, education, welfare, and security in cities (Chan and Buckingham 2008; Solinger 1999). This feature of internal migration not only mismatches the international immigration process but also distinguishes China from the early stages of the United States (Blau and Duncan 1967; Greenwood 1997) and many other developing countries (Bhagat 2008; Brockerhoff 1994; Phan 2008; Tunali 1996), where types of internal migration are vastly diversified across regions/racial groups and many internal migrants could achieve assimilation/upward mobility in the destination.

We then turned our attention to whether migrating from rural to urban areas in China increases various dimensions of social exclusion among these migrants. As we expected, such migration experience significantly increases nearly all types of social exclusion (except unemployment). Compared to their urban counterparts, rural-to-urban migrants in China have significantly less access to decent employment (more likelihood of taking risky jobs and shorter years of education), a supportive social network (more likelihood of living alone, less local friends and weaker local language skills), and safe communities (more likely to live in communities with minimum welfare coverage, concentrated migrants and low level of social cohesion). Such findings are consistent with research about certain groups of international immigrants who fall into the exclusion model of assimilation (Burchardt et al. 2002; Forster et al. 2015; Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Venkatesh 2008; Weeks 2001). Prior China-specific studies have also pointed out all these types of social exclusion suffered by Chinese migrants, though they lacked the national-level evidence or theoretical linkages with assimilation that we were able to showcase herein (see Lan 2014; Liu et al. 2010; Wu et al. 2014; Zhao 2011).

However, when we examined whether the above three dimensions of social exclusion could explain the high risks of victimization suffered by Chinese rural-to-urban migrants, only the relationship between *Dibao*

(measuring “community segregation”) and victimization was consistent with our hypothesis. That is, the higher risks of victimization among migrants were mainly due to their social exclusion from safe communities that are well protected by the local government (with more *Dibao* coverage). To some extent, if the Chinese government could try to provide relatively equal care and protection to all communities (both migrant communities like urban villages and normal urban communities concentrated by urban natives), migrants’ victimization risks would be significantly reduced. Such findings again emphasize that the institutional/official arrangement, not the other social strata such as labor market and social relations, plays a critical role in reducing the vulnerabilities of all migrants in China. This is a distinctive structural feature in the process of Chinese internal migration, rarely seen in the international immigration literature and the internal migration studies in other societies. The current, highly unequal institutional settings to migrant workers are also possibly an important source of other types of social exclusion. Future work should elaborate the relationship between the exclusive official policies and the segregation from other social strata with more information about both central and local policies in China.

Also contrary to prior findings in the immigration–victimization literature (see Fussell 2011; Barranco and Shihadeh 2015), although Chinese migrant workers are more likely to take risky jobs compared to their local counterparts, such risky jobs in fact reduced their likelihood of being victimized instead of increasing it. It might be related to China’s unique “dormitory labor regime” (Pun and Smith 2007:42). Derived from both the legacies of state socialism and the expansion of global capitalism, Chinese migrant workers who take factory jobs in urban areas (usually low-skilled jobs) are likely to be accommodated into dormitories within or close to their factories, which is sharply different from the conventional work–life separation model. By combining the working and residential space, factories could exert their strict control over not only the production sphere but also the private sphere of the workers, which allows frequent overtime work and reduces the bargaining power of the workers. Such factory dormitories are highly monitored, and thus workers are less likely to experience victimization inside. For example, the Taiwanese-owned Foxconn Technology Group (China), the world’s largest contract manufacturer of electronics (i.e., iPhones), currently has more than 400,000 low-skilled migrant workers (jobs requiring no experience or qualifications) and 33 high-rise dormitory buildings in Shenzhen, one of the four most developed cities in Mainland China. The accommodation, food, social, and leisure activities of workers are all provided within the wall of “Foxconn Campus.”

However, lack of opportunities to be victimized by street criminals does not mean such living arrangements are entirely beneficial for these migrant workers. Instead, the workers suffer a lot from subordination, alienation, low wages, long working hours, and separation from families, resulting in an increased risk of suicide, high turnover rates, and other types of resistance (Pun and Chan 2012). With the growth of global monopoly capital, such dormitory labor regimes favored by employers is likely to be prevalent in other developing countries. Future studies should try to explore the balancing mechanism between capital and labor, so that workers could reduce both criminal victimizations and labor grievances.

Another distinctive feature related to the sphere of job market in China is the insignificant relationship between migration and unemployment. To examine why this may be the case, we estimated additional analyses to include unemployment in our full regression model, although it is apparently not a mediator between migration and victimization (available from authors). Our earlier analyses showed that the risks of being unemployed are not significantly different between migrants and urban residents in China, which differs from the pattern identified in the West (Gore 1995). This pattern may be related to the large demand of low-level workers in Chinese urban areas since China is now experiencing rapid economic growth and China's economy is still dominated by labor-intensive sectors; some cities even encounter labor shortage and have to increase salaries to attract more migrant workers (Cai and Li 2015). The additional analysis further implies that unemployment is an important risk factor of victimization for urban people, which is consistent with prior victimization studies in the West (Sampson and Wooldredge 1987), but this is not the case in the migrant model. More importantly, for Chinese migrants, the relationship between unemployment and victimization is negative though not significant. One previous study interviewed some unemployed female migrants in urban villages, and the findings indicated that they had to give up their jobs and stay at home to take care of their children and cook for their husbands in large part because the salary of female migrants is extremely low in sweatshops, and it is not worthwhile for them to go to work with heavy transportation (the several major migrant receiving cities in China are geographically large), meal, and child-care costs (Zhong 2010). Thus, being unemployed does not mean that migrants will search for jobs on the street, but as a temporary household arrangement. Instead, they may be less likely to be victimized due to their fewer opportunities to socialize with others and go out. Future studies could directly compare the lifestyles of the employed and the unemployed migrant workers and examine which group is more

attractive to motivated offenders and has less capable informal guardians. Such studies are also necessary in other developing countries with similar labor-intensive economy characterized by sweatshops.

Notably, the relationship between local social ties and migrant's victimization is positive, which is opposite to our expectation. As we have discussed, Chinese migrants face extreme difficulties in establishing strong local ties due to prevalent social rejection or discrimination from urban residents (Lan 2014; Zhao 2011). Therefore, for migrants who have reported sufficient number of local supportive social contacts in this survey, they must spend great effort in crossing the social boundaries and developing such "*guanxi*," a Chinese version of interpersonal relations. It is possible that they have to attend many more social events outside and/or in the evening (i.e., dining out or going to the bar) compared to other migrant workers, which may themselves be risky and increase the likelihood of victimization among Chinese urban residents (Messner et al. 2007). That is, instead of providing instrumental and emotional help, the local ties may alter migrants' lifestyles and increase their assimilation to the high-risk local population, resulting in a higher likelihood of victimization among this group of migrants. If so, such findings would be consonant with another group of studies asserting that more assimilated immigrants are in fact more likely to be victimized in Western societies instead of immigrants with strong traditional values (Adams, Todorova, and Falcón 2015; Morenoff and Astor 2006). However, more direct measures on the above risky activities and more detailed information on these migrants' local contacts are needed in order to conduct a more thorough examination of this issue.

Unlike other research in the West which shows immigrants may have a lower victimization rate due to social cohesion in the established and powerful coethnic communities as protection (Ramey 2013; Sampson et al. 2005), Chinese internal migrants may not be able to form strong social cohesion since the Chinese migrant communities in cities are often newly established, small-scale, and lack power in mainstream society (Chen and Chen 2015; Lan 2014). Moreover, the formation of collective efficacy is closely related to the development of civil society, while the Chinese government tends to suppress the growth of civil society as they view a strong civil society as a potential threat to authoritarian party control (Spies 2011). As latecomers of modernization, many other developing countries, similar to China, began developing their industrialization and urbanization rapidly in recent decades, and such latecomers also tend to have authoritarian governments to initiate and mobilize large-scale socioeconomic reforms within their countries (Levy 1965). It would be valuable if more

comparative research can be done to discover whether the low-level social cohesion in the migrant communities and its insignificant effects on crime and victimization are prevalent across these developing societies.

To conclude, rural-to-urban migrants have become China's largest disadvantaged social group, and the social science community has the responsibility to use scientific methods to analyze the various structural and institutional barriers they face. This study begins such an analysis, particularly targeting their marginalized life in urban China, and offers a platform to build on in subsequent work. The results reveal how multidimensional social exclusion contributes to high risk of criminal victimization among China's 269 million rural-to-urban migrants. Among all these migrants, the most vulnerable groups in terms of criminal victimization are those who could not live in urban communities well taken care by local governments (community segregation), who do not hold a job offering dormitories closely monitored by employers (a distinctive type of job segregation), and who form a risky lifestyle to socialize with their local ties (in order to reduce their social segregation). Most importantly, the above disadvantages experienced by migrants are mainly due to the discriminative institutional arrangement in China.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This research is funded by the 2014/15 General Research Fund of Hong Kong (RGC Ref No.14414014) and Multi-Year Research Grant (MYRG2015-00163-FSS & MYRG2015-00039-FSS) from University of Macau.

Note

1. We also ran multilevel Rasch models to examine the relationship between migration, social exclusion, and victimization. The results of the Rasch models are similar to Table 3 (the comparisons are available from authors).

References

- Adams, Wallis E., Irina L. G. Todorova, and Luis M. Falcón. 2015. "Puerto Rican Victimization and Crime on the Mainland: The Role of Acculturation." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 37:59-74.

- Akresh, Ilana Redstone, D. Phuong Do, and Reanne Frank. 2016. "Segmented Assimilation, Neighborhood Disadvantage, and Hispanic Immigrant Health." *Social Science and Medicine* 149:114-21.
- Anderson, Elijah. 1978. *A Place on the Corner*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Anderson, Elijah. 1990. *Streetwise: Race, Class, and Change in an Urban Community*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Anderson, Elijah. 1999. *Code of Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Andersson, R. 2012. "Understanding Ethnic Minorities' Settlement and Geographical Mobility Patterns in Sweden using Longitudinal Data." Pp. 263-91 in *Minority Internal Migration in Europe*, edited by Nissa Finney and Gemma Catney. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Barranco, Raymond E. and Edward S. Shihadeh. 2015. "Walking ATMs and the Immigration Spillover Effect: The Link between Latino Immigration and Robbery Victimization." *Social Science Research* 52:440-50.
- Bakken, Børge. 2005. *Crime, Punishment, and Policing in China*. Oxford, UK: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 2000. *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 2004. *Wasted Lives: Modernity and Its Outcasts*. Oxford, UK: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 2005. *Work, Consumerism and the New Poor*. New York, NY: Open University Press.
- Bersani, Bianca E. 2014. "An Examination of First and Second Generation Immigrant Offending Trajectories." *Justice Quarterly* 31:315-43.
- Bersani, Bianca E., Thomas A. Loughran, and Alex R. Piquero. 2014. "Comparing Patterns and Predictors of Immigrant Offending Among a Sample of Adjudicated Youth." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 43:1914-33.
- Bell, M. and E. Charles-Edwards. 2013. *Technical Paper No. 2013/1: Cross-national Comparisons of Internal Migration: An Update on Global Patterns and Trends*. New York, NY: UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division.
- Bhagat, R. B. 2008. "Assessing the Measurement of Internal Migration in India." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 17:91-102.
- Bianchi, Milo, Paolo Buonanno, and Paolo Pinotti. 2012. "Do Immigrants Cause Crime?" *Journal of the European Economic Association* 10:1318-47.
- Blau, Peter and Otis D. Duncan. 1967. *The American Occupational Structure*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bourgois, Philippe I. 2003. *In Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Brockerhoff, Martin. 1994. "The Impact of Rural–Urban Migration on Child Survival." *Health Transition Review: The Cultural, Social, and Behavioral Determinants of Health* 4:127-49.
- Burchardt, Tania, Julian Le Grand, and David Piachaud. 2002. "Introduction." Pp. 1-12 in *Understanding Social Exclusion*, edited by J. Hills, J. L. Grand, and D. Piachaud. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Cai, He and Chaohai Li. 2015. "The Inequality behind Migrant Workers' Wage Rising." *Wuhan University Journal (Philosophy and Social Sciences)* 68:111-20.
- Cai, He and Jin Wang. 2007. "A Study on Migrant Workers' Permanent Migration Intentions." (in Chinese) *Sociological Studies* 6:86-113.
- Chan, Kam Wing and Will Buckingham. 2008. "Is China Abolishing the Hukou System?" *The China Quarterly* 195:582-606.
- Chan, Kam Wing and Li Zhang. 1999. "The Hukou System and Rural–Urban Migration in China: Processes and Changes." *The China Quarterly* 160:818-55.
- Chen, Juan and Shuo Chen. 2015. "Mental Health Effects of Perceived Living Environment and Neighborhood Safety in Urbanizing China." *Habitat International* 46:101-10.
- Chen, Xi and Hua Zhong. 2012. "Strain, Negative Emotion, and Delinquency among Migrant Children in Urban China" (in Chinese). *Issues of Juvenile Crime and Delinquency* 5:22-33.
- Chen, Xi and Hua Zhong. 2013. "Delinquency and Crime among Immigrant Youth: An Integrative Review of Theoretical Explanations." *Laws* 2:210-32.
- Cheung, Nicole W. T. 2013. "Rural-to-urban Migrant Adolescents in Guangzhou, China: Psychological Health, Victimization, and Local and Trans-local Ties." *Social Science and Medicine* 93:121-29.
- Cohen, Lawrence E. and Marcus Felson. 1979. "Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach." *American Sociological Review* 44:588-608.
- Cohen, Lawrence E., James R. Kluegel, and Kenneth C. Land. 1981. "Social Inequality and Predatory Criminal Victimization: An Exposition and Test of a Formal Theory." *American Sociological Review* 46:505-24.
- Forster, Myriam, Timothy Grigsby, Daniel W. Soto, Seth J. Schwartz, and Jennifer B. Unger. 2015. "The Role of Bicultural Stress and Perceived Context of Reception in the Expression of Aggression and Rule Breaking Behaviors among Recent-immigrant Hispanic Youth." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 30:1807-27.
- Fox, Cybelle and Thomas A. Guglielmo. 2012. "Defining America's Racial Boundaries: Blacks, Mexicans, and European Immigrants, 1890-1945." *American Journal of Sociology* 118:327-79.
- Frank, Reanne, Magdalena Cerdá, and Maria Rendón. 2007. "Barrios and Burbs: Residential Context and Health-risk Behaviors among Angeleno Residents." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 48:283-300.

- Fussell, Elizabeth. 2011. "The Deportation Threat Dynamic and Victimization of Latino Migrants: Wage Theft and Robbery." *Sociological Quarterly* 50:581-607.
- Gaetz, Stephen. 2004. "Safe Streets for Whom? Homeless Youth, Social Exclusion, and Criminal Victimization." *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 46:423-55.
- Gore, Charles. 1995. "Introduction: Markets, Citizenship and Social Exclusion." Pp. 1-40 in *Social Exclusion: Rhetoric, Reality, Responses*, edited by G. Rodgers, C. Gore, and J. B. Figueiredo. Geneva, Switzerland: International Institute for Labour Studies.
- Gottlieb, Benjamin H. 1978. "The Development and Application of a Classification Scheme of Informal Helping Behaviors." *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science* 10:106-15.
- Greenwood, Michael J. 1997. "Internal Migration in Developed Countries." Pp. 647-720 in *Handbook of Population and Family Economics* (1st ed.), edited by M. R. Rosenzweig and O. Stark. New York, NY: North Holland.
- Gustafsson, Bjorn A. and Quheng Deng. 2011. "Di Bao Receipt and Its Importance for Combating Poverty in Urban China: Vol. 3: Issue 1." *Poverty & Public Policy* 3:1-32.
- Hampton, Robert L., Thomas P. Gulotta, and Jessica M. Ramos. 2006. *Interpersonal Violence in the African American Community: Evidence-based Prevention and Treatment Practices*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Hanish, Laura D. and Nancy G. Guerra. 2000. "The Roles of Ethnicity and School Context in Predicting Children's Victimization by Peers." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 28:201-23.
- Huang, Gengzhi, Desheng Xue, and Zhigang Li. 2014. "From Revanchism to Ambivalence: The Changing Politics of Street Vending in Guangzhou." *Anti-pode* 46:170-89.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga, Karmela Liebkind, Magdalena Jaakkola, and Anni Reuter. 2006. "Perceived Discrimination, Social Support Networks, and Psychological Well-being among Three Immigrant Groups." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 37:293-311.
- Jin, Lei, Ming Wen, J. X. Fan, and G. Wang. 2012. "Trans-local Ties, Local Ties and Psychological Well-being among Rural-to-urban Migrants in Shanghai." *Social Science and Medicine* 75:288-96.
- Kubrin, Charis and Scott A. Desmond. 2015. "The Power of Place Revisited: Why Immigrant Communities have Lower Levels of Adolescent Violence." *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* 13:345-66.
- Kusuma, Yadlapalli S., Chandrakant S. Pandav, and Bontha V. Babu. 2014. "Socio-demographic Profile of Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Internal Migrants in Delhi." *Journal of Identity and Migration Studies* 8:37-49.

- Lan, Pei-chia. 2014. "Segmented Incorporation: The Second Generation of Rural Migrants in Shanghai." *The China Quarterly* 217:243-65.
- Le, Thao N. and Judy Wallen. 2009. "Risk of Non-familial Violent Physical and Emotional Victimization in Four Asian Ethnic Groups." *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health* 11:174-87.
- Levitas, Ruth, Christina Pantazis, Eldin Fahmy, David Gordon, Eva Lloyd, and Demi Patsios. 2007. "The Multi-dimensional Analysis of Social Exclusion." A Report to Department for Communities and Local Government. University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.
- Levy, Marion J. 1965. "Patterns (Structures) of Modernization and Political Development." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 358:29-40.
- Liu, Jianhong. 2006. "Modernization and Crime Patterns in China." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 34:119-30.
- Liu, Y., S. He, F. Wu, and C. Webster. 2010. "Urban Villages under China's Rapid Urbanization: Unregulated Assets and Transitional Neighbourhoods." *Habitat International* 34:135-44.
- Ma, Guoan. 2001. "Population Migration and Crime in Beijing, China." Pp. 65-72 in *Crime and Social Control in a Changing China*, edited by J. Liu, L. Zhang, and S. F. Messner. London, UK: Greenwood Press.
- Maxfield, Michael G. 1987. "Household Composition, Routine Activity, and Victimization: A Comparative Analysis." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 3: 301-20.
- Messner, Steven F., Zhou Lu, Lening Zhang, and Jianhong Liu. 2007. "Risks of Criminal Victimization in Contemporary Urban China: An Application of Life-style/Routine Activities Theory." *Justice Quarterly* 24:496-522.
- Miethe, Terance D. and Robert F. Meier. 1994. *Crime and Its Social Context: Toward an Integrated Theory of Offenders, Victims and Situations*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Morenoff, Jeffrey D. and Avraham Astor. 2006. "Immigrant Assimilation and Crime: Generational Differences in Youth Violence in Chicago." Pp. 36-63 in *Immigration and Crime: Race, Ethnicity, and Violence*, edited by R. Martinez, Jr., and A. Valenzuela, Jr. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Molloy, Raven, Christopher L. Smith, and Abigail K. Wozniak. 2011. *Internal Migration in the United States*. No. w17307. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Murray, Charles. 1994. *Losing Ground: American Social Policy, 1950-1980*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Murray, Charles. 1999. *The Underclass Revisited*. Washington, DC: AEI Press.

- Murray, Charles and Ruth Lister. 1996. *Charles Murray and the Underclass: the Developing Debate*. London, UK: IEA Health and Welfare Unit in Association with the Sunday Times.
- Nguyen, L. T., Rahman Z., Emerson M. R., Nguyen M. H., and Zabin L. S. 2012. "Cigarette Smoking and Drinking Behavior of Migrant Adolescents and Young Adults in Hanoi, Vietnam." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 50:S61-67.
- Phan, Diep Ngoc. 2008. "The Determinants and Impacts of Internal Migration—The Case of Vietnam." PhD dissertation, The University of Wisconsin—Madison, Madison, WI.
- Portes, Alejandro. 1995. *The Economic Sociology of Immigration: Essays on Networks, Ethnicity, and Entrepreneurship*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Portes, Alejandro and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. 1st ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pumariega, Andres J., Eugenio Rothe, and JoAnne B. Pumariega. 2005. "Mental Health of Immigrants and Refugees." *Community Mental Health Journal* 41:581-97.
- Pun, Ngai. 2005. *Made in China: Women Factory Workers in a Global Workplace*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Pun, Ngai and Jenny Chan. 2012. "Global Capital, the State, and Chinese Workers the Foxconn Experience." *Modern China* 38:383-410.
- Pun, Ngai and Chris Smith. 2007. "Putting Transnational Labour Process in Its Place the Dormitory Labour Regime in Post-socialist China." *Work, Employment & Society* 21:27-45.
- Ramey, David M. 2013. "Immigrant Revitalization and Neighborhood Violent Crime in Established and New Destination Cities." *Social Forces* 2013:1-33.
- Sampson, Robert J. and Janet L. Lauritsen. 1990. "Deviant Lifestyles, Proximity to Crime and the Offender-victim Link in Personal Violence." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 27:110-39.
- Sampson, Robert J., Jeffrey D. Morenoff, and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 2005. "Social Anatomy of Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Violence." *American Journal of Public Health* 95:224-32.
- Sampson, Robert J. and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 1999. "Systematic Social Observation of Public Spaces: A New Look at Disorder in Urban Neighborhoods." *The American Journal of Sociology* 105:603-51.
- Sampson, Robert J., Stephen W. Raudenbush, and Felton Earls. 1997. "Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy." *Science* 15:918-24.
- Sampson, Robert J. and John D. Wooldredge. 1987. "Linking the Micro- and Macro-level Dimensions of Lifestyle-routine Activity and Opportunity Models of Predatory Victimization." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 3:371-93.

- Samson, Frank. 2014. "Segmented Political Assimilation: Perceptions of Racialized Opportunities and Latino Immigrants' Partisan Identification." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37:467-95.
- Sercan, Mustafa, Fatih Oncu, M. Can Ger, Rabia Bilici, Cenk Ural, and Burcu Rahsan Erim. 2015. "Does Internal Migration Affect Criminal Behavior in Schizophrenia Patients." *Düşünen Adam The Journal of Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences* 28:17-26.
- Shaw, Clifford R. and Henry D. McKay. 1942. *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Shen, Yinzhi and Hua Zhong. 2015. "Rural-to-urban Migration and Juvenile Delinquency in Urban China: A Social Control Perspective" (in Chinese). *Jing Yue Police Journal* 1:104-12.
- Silver, Hilary. 1994. "Social Exclusion and Social Solidarity: Three Paradigms." *International Labour Review* 133:531-78.
- Siu, Kaxton. 2015. "Continuity and Change in the Everyday Lives of Chinese Migrant Factory Workers." *The China Journal* 74:43-65.
- Solinger, Dorothy. 1999. *Contesting Citizenship in Urban China: Peasant Migrant, the State, and the Logic of the Market*. London, UK: University of California Press.
- Spires, Anthony J. 2011. "Contingent Symbiosis and Civil Society in an Authoritarian State: Understanding the Survival of China's Grassroots NGOs." *American Journal of Sociology* 117:1-45.
- Sulkowski, Michael L., Sheri Bauman, Savannah Wright, Charisse Nixon, and Stan Davis. 2014. "Peer Victimization in Youth from Immigrant and Non-immigrant US Families." *School Psychology International* 35:649-69.
- Sutherland, Edwin H. 1924. *Criminology*. Philadelphia, PA: J.B. Lippincott.
- Tseloni, Andromachi, Karin Wittebrood, Graham Farrell, and Ken Pease. 2004. "Burglary Victimization in England and Wales, the United States and the Netherlands." *British Journal of Criminology* 44:66-91.
- Tong, Yuying and Martin Piotrowski. 2012. "Migration and Health Selectivity in the Context of Internal Migration in China, 1997-2009." *Population Research Policy Review* 31:497-543.
- Tunali, Insan. 1996. "Migration and Remigration of Male Household Heads in Turkey, 1963-1973." *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 45:31-67.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2006. *Career Guide to Industries (CGI)*. 2006-2007. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Labor.
- Van Kempen, Ronald and A. Sule Ozuekren. 1998. "Ethnic Segregation in Cities: New Forms and Explanations in a Dynamic World." *Urban Studies* 35: 1631-56.

- Vega, William, Bohdan Kolody, and Ramon Valle. 1987. "Migration and Mental Health: An Empirical Test of Depression Risk Factors among Mexican American Women." *International Migration Review* 21:512-29.
- Vega, William, Bohdan Kolody, Ramon Valle, and Judy Weir. 1991. "Social Networks, Social Support, and Their Relationship to Depression among Immigrant Mexican Women." *Human Organization* 50:154-62.
- Velez, Maria B. and Christopher J. Lyons. 2012. "Situating the Immigration and Neighborhood Crime Relationship across Multiple Cities." Pp. 159-77 in *Punishing Immigrants: Policy, Politics, and Injustice*, edited by M. Zatz, C. Kubrin, and R. Martinez. New York: New York University Press.
- Venkatesh, Sudhir Alladi. 2008. *Gang Leader for A Day: A Rogue Sociologist crosses the Line*. London, UK: Allen Lane.
- Wacquant, Loïc J. D. 2008. *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Wang, Z. 2002. *Migrants Crime in Contemporary China*. Beijing, China: China People's Public Security University Press (in Chinese).
- Wang, Z. 2006. *Crime Research in Three Big Economy Regions in Contemporary China*. Beijing, China: China People's Public Security University Press (in Chinese).
- Weeks, John R. 2001. *Population: An Introduction to Concepts and Issues*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Wu, Ka-ming, J. Juan Chen, and Po-Lin Pauline Sung-Chan. 2014. "Re-uniting Family among Rural Migrants in Beijing." *Ethnology* 50:305-18.
- Xiang, Biao. 2000. *Transcending Boundaries-Zhejiangcun: The Story of a Migrant Village in Beijing*. Beijing, China: Joint.
- Xu, Jianhua. 2009. "The Robbery of Motorcycle Driver in China: A Lifestyle-routine Activity Perspective and Beyond." *The British Journal of Criminology* 49:491-512.
- Xu, Jianhua. 2014. "Urbanization and Inevitable Migration: Crime and Migrant Workers." Pp. 209-23 in *Routledge Handbook of Chinese Criminology*, edited by Liqun Cao, Ivan Y. Sun, and Bill Heberton. London, UK: Routledge.
- Xu, Jianhua. 2016. "Criminologizing Everyday Life and Doing Policing Ethnography in China." Pp. 154-72 in *Engaging with Ethics in International Criminological Research*, edited by M. Adorjan and R. Ricciardelli. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Xu, Jianhua and Jianhong Liu. 2015. "Crime and Punishment in China." Pp. 209-16 in *The Encyclopedia of Crime and Punishment*, edited by W. G. Jennings. Oxford, UK: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- Xu, Jianhua and Xiaoming Song. 2005. "A Study of the Demographic Characteristics of Criminals and Victims in Pearl River Delta Area" (in Chinese). *South China Population* 20:12-20.

- Yan, Hairong. 2008. *New Masters, New Servants: Migration, Development, and Women Workers in China*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Yang, Quanhe and Fei Guo. 1996. "Occupational Attainments of the Rural to Urban Temporary Economic Migrants in China, 1985-1990." *International Migration Review* 30:771-87.
- Young, Jock. 1999. *The Exclusive Society: Social Exclusion, Crime and Difference in Late Modernity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Young, Jock. 2007. *The Vertigo of Late Modernity*. London, UK: Sage.
- Yu, Tieshan. 2015. "Social Factors Influencing Subjective Social Status" (in Chinese). *Population and Society* 31:89-97.
- Zatz, Marjorie S. and Hilary Smith. 2012. "Immigration, Crime and Victimization: Rhetoric and Reality." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 8:141-59.
- Zhang, Li. 2001. *Strangers in the City: Reconfiguration of Space, Power, and Social Networks within China's Floating Population*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Zhao, Shaohua. 2011. "What Determines Migrant Workers' Life Chances in Contemporary China? Hukou, Social Exclusion and the Market." *Modern China* 37: 243-85.
- Zhao, Yaohui. 2003. "The Role of Migrant Networks in Labor Migration: The Case of China." *Contemporary Economic Policy* 21:500-11.
- Zhong, Hua. 2010. "Migration and Victimization: A Study of Migrant Workers in Urban-Villages of Guangzhou." Presented at the 2010 International Sociological Association World Congress, Gothenburg, Sweden.
- Zhong, Lena Y. and Roderic G. Broadhurst. 2007. "Building Little Safe and Civilized Communities: Community Crime Prevention with Chinese Characteristics?" *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 51: 52-67.
- Zhou, Min. 1992. *Chinatown: The Socioeconomic Potential of an Urban Enclave*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Zhou, Min and Carl L. Bankston III. 1994. "Social Capital and the Adaptation of the Second Generation: The Case of Vietnamese Youth in New Orleans." *International Migration Review* 28:821-45.
- Zhou, Min and Guoxuan Cai. 2008. "Trapped in Neglected Corners of a Booming Metropolis: Residential Patterns and Marginalization of Migrant Workers in Guangzhou." Pp. 226-49 in *Urban China in Transition*, edited by John R. Logan. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Zhou, Min and Mingang Lin. 2005. "Community Transformation and the Formation of Ethnic Capital: The Case of Immigrant Chinese Communities in the United States." *Journal of Chinese Overseas* 1:260-84.

Author Biographies

Hua Zhong is an associate professor at the Department of Sociology at The Chinese University of Hong Kong and an honorary research fellow of Hong Kong Police College. She has been a visiting scholar at Institute of Criminology, Cambridge University and Cybercrime Observatory, Australian National University. Her research focuses on trends in crime and delinquency, crime and victimization related to migration/immigration, substance abuse, and cross-cultural comparisons of criminal justice system.

Jianhua Xu is an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Macau. His research interests include sociology of crime and deviance, crime and victimization related to rural-to-urban migrant workers in China, policing, victimology, and urban sociology.

Alex R. Piquero is Ashbel Smith professor of Criminology and associate dean for Graduate Programs in the School of Economic, Political, and Policy Sciences at the University of Texas at Dallas; an adjunct professor in Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice, and Governance, Griffith University; and a faculty affiliate in Center for Violence and Injury Prevention George Warren Brown School of Social Work Washington University in St. Louis. He has received several research, teaching, and service awards and is fellow of both the American Society of Criminology and the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. In 2014, he was awarded the University of Texas System Regents' Outstanding Teaching Award.