

The Images of Chinese and American Character: Cross-cultural Adaptation by Chinese Students

By

Eng-kung Yeh, M.D., Hung-ming Chu, M.D., Marjorie H. Klein, Ph.D.,
A. A. Alexander, Ph.D. and Milton H. Miller, M.D.

The Chinese people have been described in literature, mostly by Westerners, to be cheerful, carefree, good-humored, honest, kind, a genius for friendship, self-respecting, posed, dignified, discreet, proud, energetic, secured, realistic and shrewd. Child rearing practices that foster their close attachment to the mother, prolonged breast feeding and flexible toilet training, close family ties and emphasis on filial piety have lead to the general thinking that Chinese are basically secure, have little problems in society, and even to the myth, based on some psychoanalytic thoughts, that some mental disorders are much less or even absent in Chinese people. (6) (10)

Overseas Chinese the world over have been regarded as living proof of the idea that the Chinese are hard-working people who adjust easily to their new environment. The Chinese students in the U. S. as well as in other Western countries have generally been regarded as "academically successful", "hard-working" and "good" intellectuals with little psychological problems. Is this all true? The Westerners' images of the Chinese could deviate from the way in which the Chinese look at themselves. Though the Chinese have traditionally been regarded as an experts in keeping good harmony with their environment, (3) and are "famous by their synthetic attitude and eclecticism in keeping harmony in the realm of the intellect and religion (8) as well as in the practical life" as stated by Moore, these may not necessarily apply in the case of cross-cultural adaptation. Cross-cultural adaptation in this rapidly changing world is far more than hard for all human beings. The increasing rates of suicide among the elderly Chinese, the use of drugs and narcotics and petty thefts and other delinquency among the American-born Chinese youth and the occurrence of mental disorders among the newly immigrated Chinese have been recorded as growing problems in China-town in the U. S. (1)

The Department of Neurology & Psychiatry at the National Taiwan University Hospital has, during the past decade, treated good many Chinese students who had to return home from their overseas study because of their mental break-down.

During the past 4 years the authors have been working together closely to study the life experiences of Chinese students at the University of Wisconsin in order to understand more clearly their adaptational style and the problems that arise from cross-cultural living. Some significant findings have

shown that Chinese students associate almost exclusively with their fellow nationals; their relationships with host country nationals rarely go beyond superficial pleasantries and that they, thus, form powerful subculture in the university setting with clear boundary from the host culture. The vast majority of Chinese students that were studied not only failed to establish close and satisfied relationship with their host nationals but also seemed to be quite willing to accept this isolation and even try to find reasons and rationalizations to support it. This isolation put down strong root in the Chinese sub-culture group, and, once established, the intensity of this isolation and its resistance to change is great. (4) These facts, which are quite opposite to what is expected for the international students, are hard to accept but can not be denied. These findings have been explained by Klein et al in light of the basic differences in interactional style, social conduct, values and attitudes toward growth, education and family between the Chinese and Americans. (4)

What might be the other explanations for these findings? We are interested in seeing 1) how the Chinese students perceive their host-nationals (Americans) and identify their home norms and 2) how the distance between this perception and identification before cross-cultural experiences might affect their adaptational style in host culture later.

This paper reports some preliminary findings obtained from our collaborative research with special reference to the Chinese students' images of their fellow nationals, themselves and of Americans. It is the aim of this paper to find better explanations for the adaptational style of Chinese students as mentioned above by comparison of these images and having them compare with the related findings.

Samples and Methods

The samples used in this study consists of 3 groups of Chinese students. Group I contains 132 Chinese students who were preparing to go to the U.S. for graduate study in the summer of 1967 (going-out students) and 108 graduate students studying in Taiwan at that time as a control group (remaining home students). They were all studied, on voluntary basis, by a 27-page questionnaire (Chinese student questionnaire) which was specifically designed for this study. Also more than half of the "going-out students" (85 students) was individually interviewed (by Yeh and Chu) to cross-validate the findings of the questionnaire and to get more psychodynamic picture of the individual student. The questionnaire has both English and Chinese version and include 1) life-experiences and backgrounds including family, school and health informations, 2) reasons and goals for overseas study, 3) adjustment problems or difficulties anticipated during sojourn, 4) images of the character of the peer Chinese, themselves and Americans and 5) 159-item personality and health

questionnaire, out of which 110 items were derived from MMPI and 48 were established by Yeh and Chu through their intensive studies on a large population of college students in Taiwan. (13) Some questions regarding attitudes, social values and relations were added to the questionnaire and were applied to the study of 44 Chinese students and 14 Chinese faculty members at the University of Hawaii in the summer of 1969. (2) This serves as the second group. In the summer of 1970, 47 Chinese students who were ready to go for graduate study in the U.S. underwent a 5-week living-in, all English speaking orientation course, aimed at the better understanding of the people, culture and general life style in the U.S. They were given the Chinese Student Questionnaire, California Personality Inventory and a specifically designed Social Attitudes and Values Questionnaire before and after the orientation course respectively. This served as the third group. The character of the peer Chinese, of themselves and of Americans rated by the students in all three groups were analysed for comparison between each group of the samples and with some of the other findings. Chi-squares of the percentage of positive answer to each items of character rated by the students were used to test the significance of differences in student's images of Chinese and American character between 3 groups of samples.

Findings and Discussion

Out of 56 words or phrases describing ones character in the questionnaire, 19 items were, as shown in Table 1, rated by all the students in Group I to be significantly "more true" for their peer Chinese and themselves than for Americans. Twenty-three items were, on the other hand, rated to be significantly "more true" for Americans as shown in Table 2. The other 14 items were rated to be equally "true" for their peer Chinese and Americans as shown in Table 3.

Table 1, 2, 3 here

Chinese students, as a whole, rated themselves to be "more true" than their peer Chinese in some character items such as active, optimistic, frank, cheerful and aggressive etc., and to be "less true" in some items such as shy, formal, emotional, listant, aloof, obedient and reserved. This seems to indicate that Chinese graduate students, as a whole, are more confident in themselves than their peer Chinese.

Some significant differences in the ratings between "going-out students" and "remaining home students" were observed. Comparing with the latter, the former students 1) gave more positive responses for their peer Chinese and themselves to the items of character, which were rated to be "more true" for Americans, such as cheerful, forceful, aggressive, spontaneous, active and optimistic and 2) rated the character of Americans to be "more true" in the items which were regarded to be "positive" or

"desirable", such as stable, tolerance of difference, gentle, cautious, respectful and treat people as equal, and to be "less true" in the items which were regarded to be "negative" or "undesirable", such as suspicious, changeable, noisy, irritable and demanding. These findings clearly show the significant relationships between the student's perceived images of host-nationals, their identification of home norms and with host-nationals and their decision making on overseas study. These who decided and area ready for overseas study in the U.S. have a more positive image of Americans and that they identify themselves more with Americans than with their peer Chinese.

Table 4 and 5 compare the ratings made by the University of Hawaii group (Group II) and the predeparture group (Group I). Interestingly enough, the findings for Group II are quite similar to Group I students, though the former have already had at least one year of cross-cultural experiences in the U.S. Out of 19 items of character rated by the Group I students to be significantly more "true" for their peer Chinese, 15 items were also rated by Group II students. In the similar way 19 items out of 23 were rated by both groups of students to be significantly more "true" for Americans (Table 5). Group III students also showed the similar findings. Table 6 shows the character items rated by the Group I, II and III students with agreement to be significantly more "true" for peer Chinese and also for Americans respectively. Thirteen items out of 15 agreed by Group I and II students to be "more Chinese" was also rated by the Group III students, and they might, thus, be regarded as description of the "Chinese Character". Similarly 18 items out of 19 reached to the agreement by all three groups of students to be more "true" for Americans, and they might, thus, be regarded as description of American character. Thus, in the images of contemporary Chinese students, the character of Americans is clearly differentiated from that of their fellow Chinese and from themselves.

There are both "positive" and "negative" aspects in these two character types rated by the Chinese students. While the Chinese are regarded to be calm, respectful, cautious, gentle and obedient, they are also noted to be shy, formal, emotional, distant and even suspicious. While the Americans are rated to be active, optimistic, frank, cheerful and cooperative, they are also regarded to be bold, aggressive, boastful, changeable and even noisy, irritable, rebellious and demanding. Chinese students, as a whole, seem to perceive more negative aspects of American character and appreciate more positive aspects of Chinese character.

Table 4, 5 and 6 here

The preliminary findings have shown that 5 weeks of intensive orientation course including 2 weeks of more structured group experiences consisting of a melange of group sensitivity

techniques and role playing designed to make the students more self-aware and to give them some experiences dealing with difficulties with Americans do not, as a whole, change the students' images of Americans, of themselves and of their peer Chinese at significant level. Though it is too early to say at this time, we can assume from the above findings that even an intensive orientation course like this would hardly change the students' images of themselves and host-nationals unless the students undergo actual cross-cultural experiences. A period of actual experiences in cross-cultural adaptation does, however, seem to affect in some way the students' images of the host-nationals, themselves and of their fellow-nationals. These changes in images seem to be more towards "negative" direction than towards "positive" direction. The University of Hawaii students (Group II), for examples, rated 1) their fellow-Chinese to be more suspicious (46% vs 31%) and aggressive (3% vs 19%), 2) Americans to be less calm (21% vs 42%), less respectful (29% vs 63%), less sincere (7% vs 9%) and more distant (37% vs 21%), rebellious (46% vs 26%) and demanding (39% vs 23%), 3) themselves to be more distant (44% vs 27%) and less optimistic (69% vs 81%) than did the students in Taiwan (Group I). With their negative images of Americans confirmed by their actual experiences abroad, it is not surprising to find that the Chinese students overseas confine their personal and warm contacts exclusively with their co-nationals with little intimate and satisfying friendship with host-nationals. One of the present authors (Yeh) has reported his paranoid manifestations to be the most prominent psychiatric symptoms in mental breakdowns among the Chinese students studying abroad.⁽¹²⁾ The increased pessimism in and distance from the fellow-nationals and social distance between themselves and American people as have been observed among the students at the University of Hawaii (Group II) in this study seems to well explain how this phenomenon develops:

It is also of interest to find that the mental health, as indicated by the Mental Health Questionnaire Score, among the University of Hawaii students, who have had a period of cross-cultural experiences, is significantly worse in terms of higher anxiety and symptom manifestations than that of the Group I students who have never had cross-cultural experiences (Table 7).

Table 7 here

This does not mean that the Chinese students studying in the U.S. are mentally unhealthy. On the contrary, our previous study have shown that the Chinese students who decided to go to U.S. for graduate study were better "selected" students comparing with those who chose their graduate study at home in terms of 1) higher socioeconomic and educational status

of family, 2) better physical and mental health, 3) better preparation to meet the host culture and people and 4) more appreciation of the American culture and values.⁽¹⁴⁾

Cross-cultural adaptation in the West is perhaps especially hard for the students from non-Western countries. Though the Chinese students studying in the U.S. are better selected intellectuals, their anxiety and level of anticipated difficulties must be quite great, as most must live alone in culturally different environment. These are well illustrated in the study of Group III students. For examples, while a great majority of the Chinese students who were ready to go for overseas study (93%) agreed that "people from different culture can be close and dear friends", yet 75% of them anticipated to be "always feeling being a foreigner while they are in the U.S.", 80% anticipated "dread and fear at times when they thought of actually going to the U.S.", only 45% of them reported that they will feel very much "at home in the U.S.", and nearly all students (95%) reported that they will always miss the way of life if they leave their country permanently".

The Chinese students appreciate and desire to maintain the "positive" aspects of the traditional Chinese culture, and at the same time, admire and accept the modern Western values. For examples, 91% of the students in Group III agreed that "parents' advice should be taken very seriously in choice of a mate", 89% disagreed with "international marriage", 86% agreed that "sexual chastity is a necessary condition for marriage at least for women", 77% disagreed that "Chinese customs are of no help in the modern world", yet, at the same time, only 41% of them agreed that "their values and outlook was very close to that of their parents", 86% agreed that "modern education is of great value to them than the teaching of Confucius", only 3% agreed "respect for parents requires absolute obedience", 96% agreed "the U.S. will be superior in many respects to their own country", 100% agreed that "they were looking forward to being more independent", 96% agreed that "the best way to develop themselves as a person was to experiment with new ways of living and thinking", and only 25% of them agreed that "they would feel inferior when they date Americans". The appreciation of traditional cultural values and readiness to accept the new, and different culture and values co-exist simultaneously with little conflict in the modern Chinese students. Perhaps this is the desirable and mentally healthy condition for today's intellectuals living in the modern world. Kinetal have found that the prevalence rates of psychophysiological reactions were lowest among the people with high Chinese traditional values and high modern life contacts in a rapidly growing suburban area in Taiwan.⁽⁹⁾

Though the confinement of their contacts exclusively with their co-nationals is neither "healthy" nor "desirable", yet this is perhaps the best and only way that is open to the Chinese students during the initial phase of their adaptation to uncertain and insecure environment. This adaptational style can also be well understood from the student's primary goal for overseas study and their anticipated difficulties. As shown in Table 8 the Chinese students' primary goal of sojourn is "to get a degree" (9%), or "to get training" (9%) rather than "to know people in the U.S." (4%), "to find out how people live in the U.S." (4%), or "to meet many different kind of people" (2%). It is, therefore, easy to understand that the students anticipated, as shown, in Table 9, more anxiety in the problems of "having no enough time and money for study" (37% and 35% respectively), "Difficulty in finding out right course" (35%), "difficulty in getting a job" (35%) or "difficulty in school work" (34%) over the problems such as "making friend with Americans" (6%), or "getting to meet Americans outside of the University" (1%). Apparently the Chinese students are "task-oriented". The same finding has been reported by Wei who studied on a group of Chinese student returnees from the U.S. (11) Out of 109 returnees studied, 94.5% reported the reasons for overseas study were "to gain knowledge and increase ability", "to be more qualified for the job desired" and "to speed promotion in one's career". Their main concerns are "to have study done", "to get a degree", "academic achievement" or "better job opportunities" rather than "making friends with host-nationals", "curiosity to and search for unknown world" or "pursuit of personal enjoyment in the new environment". This is perhaps the commonly seen phenomena among the other Eastern students studying in the U.S. Klein et al reported that 52% of the Far Eastern students said that they wanted to be friendly with Americans, but only 30% expected that these contacts would develop into intimate friendship. They may want to meet Americans, but are forewarned that these will be primarily superficial. Most said that Americans would be friendly, but few expected them to be considerate. (4) With limitations imposed by finances, English language problems and the necessity of devoting much time to studies, staying with the co-national group is perhaps the most economic way of adaptation to avoid wasting of energy in "making warm and intimate relationships with the Americans" and to concentrate their energy to their primary goal of "academic achievement".

Table 8 and 9 here

A question may arise here as to whether the adaptational style as reported by Klein et al is observed only during the

initial phase of adaptation, that is, the style of adaptation may change later as the students get more experiences with the host-nationals and culture. Though the success or failure of the international students' adaptation depend on many factors, such as school achievement, job opportunity, the attention from the appropriate authority and the friendship with the host-nationals etc., we can speculate that the basic style of adaptation of the Chinese students in general would not change or little, if any, since it stems deeply from the predisposed images of the host-culture and nationals and is mainly a matter of "psychoeconomics" to achieve their primary goal for overseas study. For those whose frustration in the initial phase of adaptation was traumatic, this may reinforce the fixation of this adaptational style which may persist for considerable period of time. The longitudinal follow-up study is now being carried out by the present authors to test this speculation. One thing that one has to keep in mind is that interpretation or evaluation of cross-cultural behavior needs multiphasic criteria and may easily lead to different conclusion according to the criteria and points of view that apply to the study. In his study on 109 Chinese students who recently returned home from their study in the U.S., Wei reported 1) only a minority (34.6%) indicated that they had had problem in adjustment, 2) 94% of respondents said that they made friends with Americans while they were in U.S. and 3) 47% of them declared one half of their friends were Americans. (11) He emphasized that these Chinese students returnees adjusted well in the U.S. with satisfied friendship with Americans. Though these findings are not comparable with that of Klein's because of different methodology and samples, they seem, at the first glance, to deny the Klein's findings. The isolated and insular nature of adaptational style of the Chinese students reported by Klein may represent the Americans view, and may well be quite different from the way the Chinese students look at themselves. We can assume from the Wei's report that the majority of Chinese students do not seem to perceive much adjustmental problems. Perhaps, even the isolation from host-nationals and staying exclusively with their co-nationals type of adaptation is not realized by a great majority of the Chinese students as a problem. They may make friends with Americans, but in their way, and they are contented themselves with the way of life and friendship with their host-nationals. These seemingly contradictory findings reported by Klein and Wei may be largely a matter of cultural differences in attitudes and value-orientation to education, friendship, social customs and the way of life in general. This speculation again needs follow-up study on our original samples for testing.

It is of extreme interest to find that the adaptational style observed in the Chinese students in U.S. is also noted among the American students in Taiwan. (15) To live in the

different culture, for example, the American students in Oriental, is perhaps as hard as the Chinese students living in the U.S. Some adjustment difficulties with negative feelings and prejudices have been openly expressed by many of the American students in Taiwan studied by these authors. "Stick to your own kind." is a word not only said in the West-side Story, but also the warning called to all human beings in cross-adaptation. (7) "Staying with their co-nationals" in unfamiliar environment is the human nature common to all nationals in the world.

Though the "isolation from host-nationals and staying with their co-nationals" phenomenon as observed in the Chinese students in the U.S. is equally shared by the American students in Taiwan, yet, some culturally determined differences in reasons for sojourn, attitudes and values to education and life in general appeared to be obvious between these two groups of students. While the fields of overseas study for the majority of Chinese students in U.S. concentrate in engineering and sciences, the American students exclusively concentrate in social sciences, history and humanities. The Chinese students in general are positively selected intellectuals in terms of socioeconomic status of family, health and psychological preparation for overseas study with rather unique backgrounds and goals for study, while the American students show wide range of personal backgrounds including frequent career changes and periods dropping-out. The Chinese students are entirely "task oriented" with hope for better job opportunities and financial status at home or to settle down in the U.S. later. With their clear goals for study and differentiation between the images of culture and people of host country and that of home country, the Chinese students may quite knowingly and intentionally withdraw themselves from all the "unnecessary" difficulties and complications involved in intimate and personal contacts with host-nationals to concentrate their energy to study with minimal vulnerability. They may feel "contented" or "secure" as long as they study well and feel being a loyal part of the co-national culture. Their major anxiety or crises is not caused by isolation from the host-nationals, but by failure in academic achievement, marriage and sex problems especially in female students and the conflict of friendship with their co-nationals in which their face-value and security are greatly threatened. (12) This is, however, not the case in the American students in Taiwan. The goals for overseas study in American students are quite wide in range and individually different, and their interest to host-culture and people shows much more richness in variety than the Chinese students in the U.S. They intend to "live", to "experiment", to "explore", and to "enjoy" the life overseas as lively and rich as possible, and as the result of difficulty or failure in associating with the host-nationals or penetrating into the host-culture, they seem to "suffer", feel "discontented" and even "angry".

Though cross-cultural experiences have become common for the international students today, yet, so much about the other culture and people is unknown and has to be learned from each other. Knowing the risks of pain and loss involved on the one hand and the personal growth and gain resulted from cross-cultural experiences on the other hand, one is impelled to wonder what might be the solution or at least the compromise. Mutual understanding and respect to each other culture and people with free and open communication between host and guest would certainly bring both parts to reach some desirable compromise. In the long run, periods of cross-cultural experiences, no matter how much they suffer, may turn out to be the "wonderful and worthwhile experiences" that enrich their life experiences and enhance their personal growth in career life and psychological maturity in later life.

Acknowledgement

This study is a part of the predeparture study in a large research project on Foreign Student Adaptation sponsored by a Ford Foundation, by the Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute, and by a grant from the University of Wisconsin Medical School Research Committee. The authors wish to express their appreciation to Dean Henry Hill and to members of the International Committee of the University of Wisconsin for their support and interest in this project. The authors also thank Mr. Phillip Hwang and Dr. Nancy Alexander for their help in participating to a part of this study.

References

1. Chen, P. H. 1970. The Chinese-Community in Los Angeles. *Social Work*, 51: 591-598.
2. Chu, H. M., Yeh, E. K., Klein, M. H., Alexander, A. A. and Miller, M. H. 1971. A Study of Chinese Students' Adjustment in U. S. A. *Acta Psychologica Taiwanica* 15: 206-218
3. Hsu, P. L. K. 1963. *Class, Caste and Club*. New Jersey, D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc.
4. Klein, M. H., Alexander, A. A., Tseng, K. H., Miller, M. H., Yeh, E. K. and Chu, H. M. 1971. Far Eastern Students in a Big University-Subculture Within a Subculture. *Science and Public Affairs, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 27: January, 10-19.
5. Klein, M. H., Alexander, A. A., Tseng, K. H., Miller, M. H., Yeh, E. K., Chu, H. M. and Workneh, F. 1971. The Foreign Student Adaptation Program: Social Experiences of Asian Students in the U.S. *International Educational and Cultural Exchange* 6: No. 3:77-90.
6. LaBarre, W. 1946. Some Observations on Character Structure in Orient: II The Chinese. *Psychiatry* 9: 215-237.
7. Miller, M. H., Yeh, E. K., Alexander, A. A., Klein, M. H., Tseng, K. H., Workneh, F. and Chu, H. M. 1971. The Cross-cultural Students. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic* 35: 128-131.
8. Moore, C. A. 1967. The Humanistic Chinese Mind, *The Chinese Mind*, Edited by Moore, C. A. Honolulu, East-West Center Press.
9. Rin, H., Chu, H. M. and Lin, T. Y. 1966. Psychophysiological Reactions of a Rural and Suburban Population in Taiwan. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 42: 410-473.
10. Tseng, W. S. and Hsu, J. 1969/70. Chinese Culture, Personality Formation and Mental Illness. *The International Journal of Social Psychiatry* 16: 5-14.
11. Wei, Y. 1971. Socio-psychological Variables and Inter-nation Migration: Findings from Interviewing Returnees in the Republic of China. *Bulletin of the Sun Yat-sen Cultural Foundation* 7: 1-37.
12. Yeh, E. K. 1969. Paranoid Manifestations Among the Chinese Students studying abroad: A preliminary Report. Presented at the Conference on Culture and Mental Health in Asia and the Pacific, University of Hawaii and East-West Center.

13. Yeh, E. K., Chu, H. M., Ko, Y. H., Lin, T. Y. and Lee, S. P. 1966. Some Psychiatric Findings of College Students in Taiwan. Presented at the Lecture-Discussion Series of the Senior Specialists, Institute of the Advanced Projects, East-West Center.
14. Yeh, E. K., Chu, H. M., Klein, M. H., Alexander, A. A. and Miller, M. H. 1969. Social and Psychological Backgrounds and the Choice of Overseas Study in Chinese Students. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Formosan Medical Association, November.
15. Yeh, E. K., Miller, M. H., Alexander, A. A., Chu, H. M., Klein M. H., Tseng, K. H. and Workneh, F. 1971. The American Students in Taiwan. To be published in the American Scholar.

Table 1 Images of Chinese Peers, themselves and Americans in the character items rated to be "more Chinese" by the two samples of Group I students (percentage of positive answers)

a. Character items (Chinese Americans)	Chinese Peers		Themselves		Americans	
	G+R	(R G)	G+R	(R G)	G+R	(R G)
1. Calm	92	(89 94)	85	(86 85)	42	(42 43)**
2. Respectful	92	(88 95)	91	(92 89)	63	(57 ± 68)**
3. Cautious	90	(91 90)	83	(87 80)	58	(58 ± 62)**
4. Gentle	89	(99 89)	93	(93 93)	71	(65 ± 76)**
5. Obedient	86	(81 ± 91)	72	(75 69)	22	(22 22)**
6. Serious	86	(82 89)	74	(73 74)	25	(25 24)**
7. Reserved	86	(80 ± 90)	65	(64 65)	10	(14 7)**
8. Spiritual	85	(86 85)	92	(91 92)	49	(47 50)**
9. Stable	84	(82 85)	82	(84 80)	50	(42 ± 57)**
10. Intellectual	83	(82 85)	89	(87 91)	74	(70 76)**
11. Considerate	81	(81 81)	79	(84 ± 74)	66	(62 69)**
12. Shy	79	(78 80)	62	(71 ± 54)	7	(8 6)**
13. Tolerant of difference	73	(67 ± 78)	87	(85 89)	45	(37 ± 51)**
14. Treats people as equals	72	(67 ± 76)	90	(87 92)	55	(47 ± 61)**
15. Formal	73	(70 76)	28	(30 27)	13	(17 10)**
16. Emotional	62	(64 60)	55	(57 54)	50	(54 46)**
17. Distant	46	(45 47)	27	(29 25)	21	(22 21)**
18. Suspicious	31	(31 31)	28	(27 28)	22	(33 ± 14)**
19. Aloof	30	(33 27)	20	(25 ± 15)	12	(14 10)**

Chi square test: Between Chinese Peers and Americans:

* P < 0.05

** P < 0.01

Between G and R samples: ± P < 0.10

± P < 0.05

±± P < 0.01

G: Going to the U.S. students
R: Remaining in Taiwan students

Table 2 Images of Chinese peers, themselves and Americans in the character items rated to be "more Americans" by the two samples of Group I students (Percentage of positive answers)

b. Character items (Chinese Americans)	Chinese Peers		Themselves		Americans	
	G+R	(R G)	G+R	(R G)	G+R	(R G)
1. Active	30	(28 32)	60	(48 ± 70)	100	(99 100)**
2. Optimistic	58	(57 58)	84	(74 ± 91)	98	(96 100)**
3. Frank	46	(49 44)	91	(87 93)	98	(96 100)**
4. Self-confident	66	(64 68)	77	(76 79)	98	(97 98)**
5. Practical	69	(68 70)	89	(88 90)	97	(97 98)**
6. Cheerful	56	(48 ± 62)	81	(72 ± 89)	97	(94 99)**
7. Responsible	75	(70 79)	96	(96 95)	97	(94 99)**
8. Materialistic	34	(38 31)	42	(37 ± 46)	95	(92 97)**
9. Cooperative	73	(70 75)	96	(97 96)	94	(92 97)**
10. Spontaneous	46	(43 48)	78	(66 ± 87)	94	(94 94)**
11. Forceful	40	(32 ± 46)	58	(47 ± 67)	91	(90 92)**
12. Helpful	78	(77 79)	96	(93 98)	86	(82 89)**
13. Outgoing	60	(63 57)	87	(89 84)	83	(76 ± 89)**
14. Eager for change	21	(19 23)	37	(31 ± 42)	83	(83 83)**
15. Bold	14	(13 14)	30	(27 25)	80	(81 79)**
16. Aggressive	19	(12 ± 25)	40	(28 ± 50)	79	(82 77)**
17. Boastful	25	(25 26)	18	(17 19)	77	(77 76)**

16. Changeable	23	(21 24)	31	(30 31)	55	(64 ± 48)**
19. Noisy	12	(12 12)	8	(7 9)	48	(65 ± 34)**
20. Irritable	16	(11 21)	22	(16 ± 26)	30	(35 ± 25)**
21. Rebellious	10	(9 11)	16	(13 18)	26	(29 23)**
22. Demanding	13	(9 16)	7	(6 8)	22	(25 ± 14)**
23. Bitter	7	(5 9)	7	(6 8)	18	(22 15)**

Chi square test: between Chinese peers and Americans; *p 0.05, **p 0.01
between G and R Samples; ±P < 0.10, ±P < 0.05, ±±P < 0.01

G: going to the U.S. students
R: remaining in Taiwan students

Table 3 Images of Chinese peers, themselves and Americans in the character items rated to be "equally for Chinese and Americans" in the two samples of Group I students (Percentage of positive answers)

c. Character items (Chinese=Americans)	Chinese Peers		Themselves		Americans	
	G+R	(R G)	G+R	(R G)	G+R	(R G)
1. Friendly	94	(94 94)	98	(97 98)	96	(91 ± 100)
2. Sincere	93	(91 95)	97	(97 98)	93	(88 97)
3. Affectionate	89	(90 89)	95	(95 94)	83	(78 86)
4. Likable	88	(86 91)	83	(78 ± 88)	83	(74 ± 91)
5. Agreeable	82	(79 85)	88	(85 91)	76	(65 ± 85)
6. Adaptable	72	(68 74)	79	(72 ± 84)	69	(71 68)
7. Unselfish	62	(63 61)	76	(74 78)	61	(56 ± 65)**
8. Critical	46	(42 49)	33	(36 30)	49	(52 47)
9. Dissatisfied	47	(42 ± 51)	48	(49 46)	54	(57 52)
10. Selfish	33	(30 35)	11	(13 9)	26	(34 ± 20)
11. Hypocritical	18	(18 17)	4	(3 5)	14	(21 ± 8)
12. Unfriendly	14	(20 ± 9)	9	(10 7)	10	(10 10)
13. Sullen	12	(11 13)	7	(8 7)	5	(5 4)
14. Hostile	7	(7 6)	6	(7 4)	11	(12 10)

Chi square test between G and R Samples: ±P < 0.10

±P < 0.05

±±P < 0.01

Table 4 Images of Chinese Peers and Americans in the character items rated to be "more Chinese" by Group I & II students (percentage of positive answers)

more "Chinese" Character	Chinese Peers				Americans			
	Group II		Group I		Group II		Group I	
	S&P	(S P)	R&G	(R G)	S&P	(S P)	R&G	(R G)
1. Calm	90	(88 100)	92	(89 94)	21	(22 17)	42	(42 43)
2. Respectful	92	(90 100)	92	(88 95)	29	(27 33)	63	(57 68)
3. Cautious	91	(95 100)	90	(91 90)	49	(45 60)	58	(53 63)
4. Gentle	90	(90 90)	89	(88 89)	66	(69 54)	71	(65 76)
5. Obedient	88	(88 90)	86	(81 91)	16	(11 33)	22	(22 22)
6. Serious	94	(95 90)	84	(82 89)	17	(14 25)	25	(25 24)
7. Reserved	94	(95 91)	86	(80 90)	10	(7 18)	10	(14 7)
8. Spiritual	88	(90 80)	85	(86 85)	54	(52 58)	49	(47 50)
9. Stable	86	(85 90)	84	(82 85)	38	(32 56)	50	(42 57)
10. Intellectual	88	(90 82)	83	(82 85)	62	(60 70)	74	(70 76)
11. Considerate	79	(74 100)	81	(81 81)	61	(63 50)	66	(62 69)
12. Shy	79	(80 70)	79	(78 80)	11	(11 8)	7	(8 6)
13. Tolerant of differences	65	(61 80)	73	(67 78)	48	(45 60)	45	(37 51)
14. Formal	74	(70 91)	73	(70 76)	9	(11 0)	13	(17 10)
15. Suspicious	46	(46 44)	31	(31 31)	24	(27 12)	22	(33 14)

S: Students (43) P: Faculty (14)
R: Students remaining in Taiwan (108)
G: Students going to the U.S. (132)

Table 5 Images of Chinese peers and Americans in the character items agreed to be "more Americans" by Group I & II students (percentage of positive answers)

Character	Chinese peers				Americans			
	Group II		Group I		Group II		Group I	
	S&P(S)	F	S&G(R)	G	S&P(S)	F	S&G(R)	G
Active	28 (26 36)		30 (28 32)		100(100 100)	100(99 100)		
Optimistic	52 (50 60)		58 (57 58)		94(93 100)	98(96 100)		
Frank	47 (48 44)		46 (49 44)		87(86 91)	98(96 100)		
Self-confident	62 (60 70)		66 (64 68)		89(88 91)	98(97 98)		
Cheerful	50 (47 60)		56 (48 62)		100(100 100)	97(94 99)		
Materialistic	46 (64 45)		34 (38 31)		98(98 100)	95(92 97)		
Cooperative	65 (61 80)		73 (70 75)		85(81 100)	94(92 97)		
Spontaneous	52 (52 50)		46 (43 48)		95(93 100)	94(94 94)		
Forceful	46 (46 45)		40 (32 46)		89(88 91)	91(90 92)		
Eager for Change	20 (17 30)		21 (19 23)		94(95 91)	83(83 83)		
Bold	12 (10 20)		14 (13 14)		89(88 91)	80(81 79)		
Aggressive	35 (32 45)		19 (12 25)		85(84 90)	79(82 77)		
Boastful	35 (37 22)		23 (25 26)		80(79 82)	77(77 76)		
Changeable	18 (18 20)		23 (21 24)		69(70 67)	55(64 48)		
Noisy	10 (7 18)		12 (12 12)		79(80 73)	48(65 34)		
Irritable	12 (10 20)		16 (11 21)		41(40 44)	30(35 25)		
Rebellious	14 (10 30)		10 (9 11)		46(47 42)	26(29 23)		
Demanding	14 (15 10)		13 (9 16)		38(39 33)	23(35 14)		
Bitter	10 (12 0)		10 (5 9)		28(31 17)	18(22 15)		

S: Students (43) F: Faculty (14)
 R: Students remaining in Taiwan (108)
 G: Students going to the U.S. (132)

Table 6 Items of "more Chinese" and "more American" Character agreed by Group I, II and III students percentage of positive answers:

"more Chinese" Character	"more American" Character
1. Calm	1. Active
2. Respectful	2. Optimistic
3. Cautious	3. Frank
4. Gentle	4. Self-confident
5. Obedient	5. Cheerful
6. Serious	6. Materialistic
7. Reserved	7. Cooperative
8. Spiritual	8. Spontaneous
9. Stable	9. Forceful
10. Considerate	10. Eager for Change
11. Shy	11. Bold
12. Tolerant of difference	12. Aggressive
13. Formal	13. Boastful
	14. Changeable
	15. Noisy
	16. Irritable
	17. Rebellious
	18. Bitter

Table 7 Mean Score of Mental Health Questionnaire in Group I & II students

		Male			Female		
		No.	Mean	S. E.	No.	Mean	S. E.
Group I	G.	87	9.64	0.625	46	12.14	0.847
	R.	71	11.18	0.621	37	12.81	0.785
Group II	S.	23	11.30	1.285	20	14.10	1.367
	F.	11	9.18	1.072	3	14.00	-

G.: Students going to the U.S. S.: Students
 R.: Students remaining in Taiwan. F.: Faculty

Table 8 Main reasons for coming to the U.S. for study (Percentage of rating "very important" and "quite important" in the two samples, G.: going group, R.: remaining group)

	Sample G.	Sample R.
1. Getting a degree	95	89
2. Getting training in my field	93	87
3. Having different experience	93	88
4. Finding out more what I am like	84	83
5. Finding out how people in my profession work in the U.S.	69	61
6. Seeing different parts of U.S.	59	55
7. Improving financial situation	59	65
8. Getting to know people in U.S.	42**	12
9. Finding out how people in U.S. live	41	35
10. Finding out what student life is like in the U.S.	36	37
11. Having a chance to live with people in another country	26*	13
12. Meeting with the parents' expectation	30	35
13. Meeting many different kinds of people in the U.S.	25±	12
14. Learning about the form of government in the U.S.	19	18
15. Having a chance to be away from home	5	4

Significance difference between the two samples:
 ±: P < 0.10
 *: P < 0.05
 **: P < 0.01

Table 9 Anticipated difficulties to live in the U.S. (Percentage of rating as "will be a great problem" in the two samples; G.: going group R.: remaining group)

	Sample G.	Sample R.
1. Not having enough time to study	37±	48
2. Finding out the right course to take	35	35
3. Getting a job if I want one	35**	60
4. Not having enough money	35**	67
5. Finding the school work too difficult	34±	44
6. Not being able to express myself in English	33	41
7. Having my behavior misunderstood	29	24
8. Concern about family, friends, conditions at home	23±	34
9. Concern about racial discrimination	23	27
10. Feeling lonesome for my home and family	22*	34
11. Not understanding English	19	27
12. Finding a place to live	15	20
13. Not having the food I used to	14	17
14. Making friends with opposite sex	13	19
15. Getting to meet Americans outside of the university	12	9
16. Getting along with my advisor	12	20
17. Keeping up with the news from home	12	20
18. Getting used to the climate	10	16
19. Getting to travel in the U.S.	8	13
20. Making friends with Americans	6	7

Significance difference between the two samples:
 ±: P < 0.10, *: P < 0.05, **: P < 0.01