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ABSTRACT

A CROSS CULTURAL STUDY OF CONCEPTS OF INTIMACY AND PERSPECTIVE TAKING ABILITIES IN AMERICAN AND CHINESE YOUNG ADULTS

SEPTEMBER 1993

JUN-CIH GISELA LIN, B.A.

TAMKING UNIVERSITY, TAIWAN, ROC.

M.Ed., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Ph.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor John C. Carey

Intimacy is an important aspect of human life. Little is known, however, about cultural differences of concepts of intimacy from a developmental perspective. Individuals' capacities for concepts of intimacy are manifested by their Social Cognitive Development stages. The main purpose of this dissertation is to examine cultural differences of concepts of intimacy and Social Cognitive Developmental stages in American and Chinese young adults.

The first chapter reviews relevant literature; cross-cultural methodological considerations and suggestions for future intimacy research are also addressed. The second chapter describes an empirical study to test the cultural differences of concepts of intimacy and perspective taking abilities in American and Chinese female university students; it also examines whether the results of the relationship between concepts of relationships and perspective taking abilities support Selman's (1980) assumptions.
Twelve white Americans from the U.S. and twelve Taiwan Chinese participated. Based on the structure of Selman's (1980, p. 322-323) "friends dilemma" (adolescent and adult version), four dilemmas (same-sex, opposite-sex, boyfriend-girlfriend and mother-daughter) were developed in English and then translated into Chinese.

Selman's (1980) model was applicable but not all data were described in his model; traditional concepts of relations stages and perspective taking levels were found. The quantitative results found significant differences in American and Chinese subjects' concepts of relations stages but not in perspective taking levels. Significant differences were found on the lowest CR scores on general questions and across domains and on the frequency distributions of concepts of relations stages. American subjects gave a higher percentage of CR 2 and CR 2/3 stages scores than their Chinese counterparts.

The qualitative data analysis found similarities and differences in American and Chinese subjects' concepts of intimacy; some differences were related to cultural norms. The results of this study do not support Selman's assumption that perspective taking levels are a "necessary but not sufficient" condition for the same parallel concepts of relations stages. Perspective taking levels and concepts of relations stages could be two ways of measuring the same constructs. Implications, suggestions for future studies, limitations, and applications for interventions are also addressed.
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CHAPTER I
SELECTED LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review relevant literature on cultural differences in the concepts of intimacy and socio-cognitive developmental stages between American and Chinese young adults. It will also discuss methodological considerations for cross-cultural psychology studies and make suggestions for future intimacy research.

Intimate relationships are among the most important facets in an individual’s life and constitute a central part of human experience. Intimacy has been addressed from a variety of perspectives in sociology, communication, social psychology and cognitive-developmental psychology. Recent advances in the cognitive developmental approach examine people’s interpersonal concepts of persons, friendships, peer relationships, and parent-child relationships through five perspective taking levels (Selman, 1980). White proposed three levels of Relationship Maturity and hypothesized that a person’s relationship patterns with parents will influence the levels of Relationship Maturity with his or her spouse (White et al., 1987).

Despite this attention, there is little information on cultural differences in American and Chinese university students’ concepts of intimacy. Investigating people’s concepts of intimate relationships can help individuals to understand other people’s thoughts, feelings and behaviors; it can also help people to make sense of
their significant personal experiences, thus promoting interpersonal communication and improving their interpersonal relationships.

Social Cognitive Development models define an individual's capacities for intimacy. Theorists in Social Cognitive Development traditions (e.g. Kegan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1969; Selman, 1980) have hypothesized that development is a result of person/environment interactions and that "individuals in all cultures go through the same order or sequence of gross stage development though they vary in rate and terminal point of development" (Kohlberg, 1969, p. 175). These theorists have proposed different models of development but generally believe that people who strive for independence and who have a strong sense of personal identity are at a higher stage than those who consider others' needs first and who sacrifice themselves for other people (e.g. Kegan, 1982).

However, this study argues that not all people can reach the stage which emphasizes independence and autonomy, especially if those ideals are not part of the cultural norm. If this hypothesis is true, then the terminal point of development could vary from culture to culture. For example, research has shown that the postconventional stage in Kohlberg's model of moral development is not reached by the members of tribal or village folk societies although these individuals do possess the cognitive abilities Kohlberg defined as prerequisites for mature moral reasoning (Snarey, 1985). Ma (1988) suggested that the upper stages could be culture bound rather than universal. Ma (1988) looked at socio-moral development stages from a
Chinese perspective and proposed an alternative Chinese moral development system (See Appendix A).

The results of previous studies on the developmental stages of Chinese people were controversial. Some studies found different rates of development at a given time in Chinese people's life cycle compared to American norms (e.g. Chen, 1980) or to their American counterparts (e.g. Liu, 1950) but others found cross-cultural similarities "in terms of developmental rate and sequence of structural stages" (Lei, 1992, p. 181).

Do individuals in all cultures go through the same gross development but vary in their rate and terminal points of development? In other words, is the process of development universal? If development is a result of the interaction between a person and his/her environment, then the process of development is not totally culture free because people are influenced by the cultural norms in a given socio-cultural "environment" (the process of socialization). Cultures can actively intervene to restrict both the range and level of thinking in areas where entrenched norms prevail (Keats, 1986). People tend to behave differently depending upon the proper norms and world views in their given environment. Chinese culture emphasizes collectivism whereas American culture accentuates individualism. In terms of this study, Chinese university students in Taiwan have different languages, cultural expectations, and timing of intimate experiences in comparison with their American counterparts. Therefore, the role of culture could reinforce the timing and terminal point of development and thus lead to developmental differences in these two cultural settings.
Cultural Differences in Concepts of Intimacy

Chinese university students in Taiwan have different languages, cultural norms, and timing of their intimate experiences in comparison with their American counterparts. These differences may lead to differences in their concepts of intimate relationships because these concepts are "constructed" out of the individual's "interactions with the environment"; and, "the interactions with fundamentally different types of objects and events experienced should result in the formation of distinct concepts" (Turiel, 1983a, p. 75). The following section will examine these concerns.

Languages

One useful way to examine cultural differences in concepts of intimacy is to examine the languages of the given cultures. "Languages convey concepts, structures and rules that define the boundaries of culturally appropriate behavior" (Pederson, 1984, p. 387). For example, gender expectations in Chinese culture can be observed by the Chinese characters for "woman" and "man". In Chinese characters, the written word "woman" is a combination of the symbol for "female" and "broom" whereas the word "man" is a combination of "power/strength" and "rice paddy". It is not difficult, therefore, to imagine that Chinese women are expected to be at home doing housework and Chinese men are expected to work outside.

In the same line of reasoning, the languages associated with "intimacy" can influence people's concepts of it. The word "intimacy" is derived from intimus, the Latin term for "inner" or "inmost" (see Perlman and Fehr, 1987, p. 17 for previous
studies on intimacy). Intimacy translates into Mandarin Chinese (the official language in Taiwan) as "chinjihn" or "chinmih", meaning "closeness" or "privacy" (Lin, 1972, p. 879). *Chinjihn* means "(1) v.t. & adj., close, intimate; be close to; (2) n., close friends or relatives"; *chinmih* means "adj, very intimate, (friend, lover, relative)". Another word for closeness in Chinese is "Yaw Haw". *Yaw Haw* is frequently used to describe the closeness between lovers or to refer to very close relationships. Chinese people may use one of these three terms when referring to interpersonal "closeness".

From a linguistic perspective, Chinese people may tend to define intimate relationships not merely as romantic ones but also as relationships with friends or relatives. The concept of intimate relationships, therefore, may have broader meanings for Chinese people than for Americans. One purpose of this study is to examine the definitions of "intimacy" in American and Chinese culture.

**Cultural Differences in the Norms for Interpersonal Relationships/Behaviors of American and Chinese Young Adults**

Differences in norms, child-rearing attitudes, and personalities are important dimensions for exploring the cultural differences for interpersonal behaviors/relationships. Table 1.1 contains topics of cultural norms of interpersonal behaviors for Chinese people.

* Cultural norms for interpersonal behaviors. People tend to behave differently depending upon their cultural norms. Tajfel (1972, p. 101, cited in Hinde, 1979) defined norms as "an individual's expectations of how others expect him to
behave and of how others will behave in any given situation". Cultural norms for interpersonal behaviors are related to "roles and level of intimacy", "with the particular role(s) that an individual has in relation to the other person(s) and the intimacy of the relationship serving as salient cues for the behavior that is expected from him or her" (Abe, 1992, p. 44).

Chinese and American societies have different cultural assumptions for people's interpersonal behaviors. Chinese culture emphasizes collectivism, whereas American culture accentuates individualism; Chinese people are often social-oriented, situation-oriented and relationships-oriented whereas American people tend to be more individual-centered (Hsu, 1972). In an individualistic society, individuals' rights, values, freedom, autonomy, enhancement, fulfillment, self-reliance and choices are valued highly (Yang, C.F., 1992). American people are socialized to be obedient to rules which protect the rights of self and others. They regard equal economic, social, and political opportunity as the right of each individual; they expect competition; they believe that achievement and status are the result of their efforts; they value independence, personal autonomy, and self-motivation (e.g. if you want friends, you initiate the relationship) and believe in the importance of gratifying personal needs in relationships (Hoopes and Ventura, 1980).

In a collective culture, an individual values the group's needs over his or her self-interests. However, Chiu (1989) argued that Chinese collectivism is target specific. In other words, a Chinese person may behave collectively toward one person but individually toward another, depending upon the normative expectation of
Table 1.1

Topics of Cultural Norms of Interpersonal Behaviors
Studied on Chinese University Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiu (1989)</td>
<td>Collectivism (target-specific)</td>
<td>questionnaires</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang (1981)</td>
<td>Social-orientation</td>
<td>Rorschach, questionnaire</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abe (1992)</td>
<td>Situation-orientation</td>
<td>questionnaires</td>
<td>California, U.S.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang (1981)</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>questionnaires</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwang (1982)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho, Chen, and Chao (1991)</td>
<td>Relationship-orientation</td>
<td>Conceptual paper</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tseng (1991)</td>
<td>Child rearing</td>
<td>Conceptual paper</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Her study is a cross-sectional study on white Americans, U.S. born and American born Asians, including Chinese people.
social behavior specific to that type of relationship. Chiu (1989) examined this hypothesis on 158 (64 male, 94 women) Chinese college students in Hong Kong. In this study, two of the instruments were the Chinese Popular Saying Questionnaire (CPSQ) and the Individualism-Collectivism Scale (INCOL). CPSQ contains Chinese sayings of normative expectations of social behavior. INCOL measures the degree of concern for parents, spouse, kinsmen, neighbors, friends, and coworkers (schoolmates). Chiu (1989) divided CPSQ items into three factors - Self-interest and individual property rights, Self Reliance, and Cooperation; Chiu then analyzed the relationship between CPSQ and INCOL. The results found that "the different expectations of social behavior are related to collectivism toward different targets" (Chiu, 1989, p. 108). Specifically, the "concern for one's parents, kinsmen, and neighbors was negatively related to Self-reliance and unrelated to Cooperation. Concern for one's friends and coworkers was positively related to Cooperation but unrelated to Self-Reliance. Concern for spouse was negatively related to Self-Reliance and positively related to Cooperation." (Chiu, 1989, p. 107). Although the results supported Chiu's (1989) hypothesis, that Chinese are relationship-oriented and their collectivism is target specific, the reliability and validity of the instruments used, were not clearly stated, even though Chiu claimed that INCOL had acceptable reliability (from a previous study) and validity and that CPSQ items were content analyzed.

Yang (1981a, p. 159-160) indicated that social-orientation represents "a tendency for a person to act in accordance with external expectations or social norms,
rather than internal wishes or personal integrity so that he would be able to protect his social self and function as an integral part of the social network. The behavior patterns of social-oriented people are "social conformity, non-offensive strategy, submission to social expectations and worry about external opinions in an attempt to achieve reward attainment, harmony maintenance, impression management, face protection, social acceptance, and avoidance of punishment, embarrassment, conflict, rejection, ridicule, and retaliation in a social situation" (Yang, 1981a, p. 159). They tend to be "less autonomous, more conforming, more persuadable by messages attributed to mass media, and more cohesiveness of judgment under authoritarian leadership" (Yang, 1981a, p. 160).

In his study of 218 university students in Taiwan (110 male, 108 female), Yang (1981a) analyzed Rorschach responses of the total number of responses, proportion of popular responses, and the time lag between reaction time and of average responses time and the Individual Traditionality-Modernity Scale. He found that "more modernized Chinese students in Taiwan tend to be less social oriented" and that more modernized students in Taiwan were less cautious and less conforming than those who were more traditional (Yang, 1981a, p. 167).

In attempting to answer the question of whether Asians are more situation-oriented than white Americans, Abe (1992) studied 191 university students in California: 68 white U.S.-born Americans, 65 foreign-born Asians, and 58 U.S.-born Asian Americans (33 Chinese, 19 Japanese, and 6 Koreans, second generation and beyond). She used self-reported questionnaires on social psychological scales (e.g.
self-monitoring, self-consciousness, personal/social identity, interpersonal orientation, individualism-collectivism, and impression management scales) and situational responses on four hypothetical scenarios (Abe, 1992, p. 51), targeting a character with different levels of intimacy (high/low intimacy) and types of role (high/low status). She found ethnic differences in situational responses. In given conditions, American-born Asians and foreign-born Asians showed significant changes in their responses depending on the status (high or low) of the target person. Their responses were also more predictable by their position on the social psychological scale and whether the target person was high or low in intimacy. Americans, however, did not demonstrate these changes. Abe did not find significant differences between Asians' and Americans' situational responses, noting that Asians did not demonstrate greater response variability across conditions. Therefore, whether Asians are more situation-oriented than their American counterparts remains a research question. Abe's (1992) finding that foreign-born Asians vary their responses according to status was interesting because social status is important in Chinese culture. For example, when making new friends, Chinese people are likely to ask about their personal and family background as well as social status while American people tend to be more interested in an individual's characteristics (Ho, Chen, and Chao, 1991).

Chinese culture values harmony and interdependence in relationships (King and Bond, 1985). Relationship-oriented Chinese individuals often define themselves through the groups they belong to and behave differently depending on their relationship roles and the types of relationships they have (Ho, Chen, and Chao,
1991). For example, Chinese people may not be very friendly toward outsiders or strangers (King and Bond, 1985). This idea is similar to Chiu's (1989) study on target-specific collectivism. Under the influence of Confucius, the Chinese individual is a social being and is not conceived of as an isolated separate entity (Tu, 1985). Certain role relationships are of paramount importance; these are the so-called Five Cardinal Relations - those between sovereign and subject, father and son, elder and younger brother, husband and wife and friend and friend (King and Bond, 1985). Each individual has a role in these relationships. Unlike American culture, where the law is used to maintain social justice, individuals in Chinese culture are expected to perform according to their roles in order to maintain harmony and social order. In addition, they are expected to perform individual responsibilities, to obey social rules, and to discipline themselves in accordance with public opinion (Yang, C.F., 1992).

Chinese people are also taught to return favors when they receive one; they think of others in a reciprocal manner and show sympathetic concern for others. In a conflict situation, a Chinese individual is expected to sacrifice personal interests (the small me) for the welfare of others to achieve harmony in society (the big me) (Dien, 1983) whereas American people may stress an individual's choices. If a Chinese person chooses to be "independent" and act upon free will, others may show little sympathy if he or she fails. That person "betrays" the loyalty and trust of the family or group and "deserves" whatever happens.

The Confucian version of individualism has a relational emphasis (King and Bond, 1985). Therefore, because of their collective values, Chinese people may not
experience the same type of self-identity or gradual separation and individuation from their families as Americans (Dien, 1983). The American emphasis on individualism affects the balance of family relationships and obligations in the U.S.; however, these notions of self-reliance and free will could create conflict in the Chinese family because of Chinese collective norms (Fong, 1973).

An important Chinese concept of intimate relationships is the idea of "Yuan". According to Yuan, many things are the result of fate and are predetermined (Lee, 1982). Two people meet as the result of a very special acquaintance process - called "Yuan". According to the Buddhist idea, "Yuan" is one's destiny, luck as conditioned by one's past. It also means the "good luck to meet and natural affinity among friends" (Lin, 1972, p. 1423). In Chinese, there is a saying "if two people have 'Yuan', they will meet even if they are thousands of miles away; if they don't have 'Yuan', they will run across each other but won't know each other"; once the "Yuan" is over, people break up (Lee, 1982). Therefore, one should try to cherish and love dearly this special opportunity. Research in the early 1980s showed that 80% of Taiwan Chinese believed in "Yuan"; the concepts of "Yuan" applied to the relationships between opposite-sex friends, spouses, classmates and same-sex friends (Yang, 1982).

Cultural differences in child rearing attitudes. American and Chinese people also differ in their developmental experiences, a fact which may be underscored by examining differences in child rearing attitudes (Tseng, 1992). Child-rearing attitudes influence personality formation and thus may result in cultural differences in concepts
of intimate relationships and interpersonal behaviors. Tseng (1992, p. 227-250) described cultural differences in the child rearing attitudes of Chinese parents. It is very common for Chinese babies to sleep with their parents, thus allowing their dependency on others whereas American babies usually sleep in their own beds and are expected to learn to do things for themselves as early as possible. Therefore, Chinese children might be more dependent in relationships compared to their American counterparts. Chinese parents discourage their children from expressing opinions but expect them to follow orders (e.g. children have ears but no mouth). Chinese children are taught "external control" (e.g. you should not do that because other people will laugh at you; pick your things up otherwise your father will punish you) whereas American children learn "internal control" (you motivate yourself and do things for your own good).

Chinese children learn history and memorize documents but are not taught to think critically or creatively. They are encouraged to follow, to obey, to mediate, to keep the traditions rather than to conquer or overcome the environment. Chinese children are taught not to say no to people because it might hurt the other’s feelings. They are taught, instead, to use indirect, gentle, and ambiguous ways to express their disagreements (Tseng, 1992). Therefore, Chinese people may appear non-assertive and indirect to westerners. Chinese people often ask for advice in order to appear humble and to avoid making mistakes. They are also easily affected by other people’s opinions and often act upon social pressure. Chinese children are taught to obey their parents’ wishes in disagreements. Chinese children may yearn for
independence from their parents as they grow older but they may not have opportunities (or may not be allowed) to be independent until they have their own family and/or careers (Tseng, 1992). Therefore, Chinese people may express the need to be independent from their parents but they may not have the freedom to make individual choices; rather, they are expected to obey their parents' wishes to a certain extent. Further, most Chinese people view a good relationship as a permanent one and believe they can rely on intimate others in all situations (Tseng, 1992). Therefore, Tseng (1992) pointed out that Chinese people may view true intimate others as people they can always depend on.

**Cultural differences in personalities.** In their process of development, individuals adapt to normative values, integrate operative cultural ideas, and identify with normative values in addition to their personality dispositions (Lei, 1992, p. 113). Personality is another factor that can influence an individual's concepts and interpersonal behaviors. Studies have suggested that Chinese university students are "more introverted, more restrained, more withdrawn, more cautious, less impulsive, less social, less dominant and less aggressive" in comparison to American norms (Hwang, 1982, p. 288), and more gentle, modest, patient, reserved, and socially sensitive (Fong, 1973). Further, Chinese people tend to behave according to norms to avoid shame or losing face; they are more reserved about their achievements to maintain modesty and avoid attack by other people for their success. Chinese people tend to perceive other people's achievement as a threat because they often compare themselves with others; they also tend to express their opinions indirectly and show
their superiority in a subtle way (Yang, C. F., 1992, p. 130-131). For example, Chinese people may express their opinions as if it were other people's opinion. An example of this is using the expression "I have heard people say " rather than "I think". Further, saying "those people cannot do the job" - may be an indirect way of saying "I (the speaker) am the only one who can do it" (Yang, C.F., 1992).

**Concepts of intimacy may change over time.** The influence of cultural expectations changes over time (Hinde, 1979). Taiwan Chinese society has changed rapidly over the past few years due to advances in industry, transportation and media (Yang, 1981b). Yang (1981b) pointed out that modernization and economic change have transformed the Chinese social structure and might be promoting considerable changes in the personalities of Taiwan Chinese people (Yang, 1981b). He (Yang, 1981b) summarized his hypothesis about changes in the Chinese personality and world views due to modernization as follows: "from group-other orientation to individual-self orientation, from authoritarian character to egalitarian character, from external control to internal control (I am responsible for what happens to me), from autoplastic adaptation (change oneself to obey the wishes of nature) to alloplastic adaptation (control nature for one's needs), from past perspective (look back and against new ideas) to present and future perspective, from mediation and inner development to action and achievement, from dependency to independence, from preference for conformity to tolerance of differences, from particularism to universalism (more than one view can be correct), and from suspecting others to trusting others." He (1981b) further pointed out that modernization may lead to changes in Chinese people's world
view, attitudes, values and personalities, e.g. they may begin to value individualism over collectivism, individual action and achievement over group activities, individual-self orientation over interpersonal relationships, and independence over dependence (Yang, 1981b).

In a study similar to Yang's, Hwang (1982) compared the personalities of Taipei Normal University students (in Taipei) as measured in 1975 and in 1963. Using Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) in both studies, Hwang found that students in 1975 got higher scores on exhibition, autonomy, introspection, and heterosexuality and lower scores on deference, order, nurturance, and endurance in comparison to students in 1963. Hwang (1982) concluded that students in 1975 were "less concerned with social conventions and customs, made less effort in planning and in having things organized, were more easily distracted from their work or job, and showed less affection and offered less help to others." They further displayed "a greater tendency to talk about their own achievement and experiences, with a stronger urge to be independent of others in making decisions and in doing things, and were more interested in associating with people of the opposite sex" than their 1963 counterparts (Hwang, 1982).

Also using EPPS, Chang (1991) studied Tunghai University students (in Taichung, Taiwan) from 1972 to 1989 and found gender differences. He found that male university students showed higher needs for exhibition, dominance, heterosexuality, and assertiveness compared to their female counterparts. Female students showed higher needs for deference, order, affiliation, introspection,
succorance, abasement, and changing than their male counterparts. Therefore, Chang (1991) suggested that most Chinese students still held "traditional values" of their proper gender roles.

Taiwan is in a transition period. Many adolescents and young adults are caught between traditional Chinese values and western values; many of them may feel unclear about their identities, life goals and world views. Chinese concepts of individuals and relationships may change with the increasing influence of western individualistic values. Some values, however, may persist, because the "changes did not start at the same time nor are they moving with a uniform speed, and they do not, at any given time, arrive at the same point on the scale of modernization" (Hwang, 1982).

To conclude, although American and Chinese people have different cultural norms for interpersonal behaviors, social change might encourage variations in Chinese university students' concepts of intimacy in different types of intimate relationships. Therefore, there could be both similarities and differences between American and Chinese students' concepts of intimacy.

Cultural Differences in the Timing of Intimate Relationships

Adolescence and the young adult period are seen as times to experiment with different types of interpersonal relationships. Forming intimate relationships with significant others is the normative expectation for young adults (Levinson et al., 1978). Developmentally, heterosexual young adults move from intimate relationships with family members to relationships with same-sex friends, to relationships with
opposite-sex friends to romantic ones. New relationships may supplement (not necessarily replace) the old ones but the experiences gained may be applied to new relationships (Steinberg, 1989). However, the timing of these intimate experiences may vary from culture to culture; as a result, the concepts of intimacy may vary depending on the type of relationships and their timing.

In American culture, a young adolescent is primarily centered in the family and in peer groups. Many girls start dating around age 13 or 14 but sexual feelings are usually discussed and explored within same-sex friendships (Steinberg, 1989). During late adolescence (17-18), girls lessen the intensity of emotional commitment in same-sex friendships and apply important qualities of same-sex friendships to heterosexual friendships and relationships (Dickens and Perlman, 1981). For many young people, experimentation with sex and intimacy continues well into late adolescence. Steinberg (1989) points out that about 75 percent of high school students in the USA have become steadily involved with someone of the opposite gender by the end of high school.

Young adults in their twenties are in the process of separating from their parents and developing a sense of self, and forming goals, values and life structures (Levinson et al., 1978). They make their choices, such as marriage, occupation, residence and living style. Love and work seem to be two main concerns at this phase of the human life cycle (Levinson et al., 1978). After young adults leave home for college or work, the family is removed from the center of their lives, beginning
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the process of change that will lead to new home bases for living as young adults (Levinson et al., 1978).

In Chinese culture, people are expected to maintain a close bond with their families even after they are married (Hwang, 1982). Chinese pre-adolescents are centered around family and peers, especially peers of the same gender. However, Chinese cultural norms discourage the formation of close relationships with members of the opposite sex, especially before college. School is the central activity for Chinese adolescents because of the competitive educational system in Taiwan. Chinese people value education highly; any student who wishes to be admitted into a university has to pass a national university entrance examination which is held once a year. Chinese parents believe that going out with members of the opposite sex will result in a "spilt heart" (in the Chinese language), which means divert their concentration from studying because they spilt their hearts from studying and going out. Therefore, Chinese parents strongly discourage their children from dating before college.

Because of these intense parental pressures and cultural expectations, as well as the stress from endless examinations, Chinese adolescents (who are in the university in the 1990s), male or female, are not likely to begin dating until late adolescence or early young adulthood. Even though Chinese society is rapidly changing, Chinese adolescents' first dating experiences probably happen later than for their American counterparts.
It is also not difficult to assume that Chinese women have different dating attitudes than their American gender counterparts. Chinese young adults have fewer opportunities to get to know members of the opposite sex because many middle and high schools in Taiwan are gender segregated; students are discouraged from forming opposite sex relationships and have limited dating experiences prior to entering the university. However, they are also expected to be married in their young adulthood. Therefore, many Chinese young women might view dating as an activity for finding a potential husband, especially when they are considering pre-marital sex. Most Chinese people probably don’t believe that men and women can have "pure" or platonic friendships because Chinese culture discourages such relationships.

To conclude, this study argues that Chinese people will have intimate relationships with their families and with their same-sex friends throughout their lives. Americans, however, will tend to switch intimate relationships away from their family and move from same-sex relationships to romantic ones when reaching young adulthood. Further, when conflicts exist between parental expectations and personal interests, Chinese people may act according to societal pressure while Americans may stress an individual’s choices.

Summary of Cultural Differences on Concepts of Intimacy

In summary, the intimate relationships of Taiwan Chinese and their American counterparts differ in several areas: linguistics, cultural expectations for interpersonal behaviors, and the timing of intimate experiences.
Linguistically, Chinese people may think of intimate relationships as relationships with families, friends, and lovers but Americans will think mostly in terms of romantic ones. Further, because Chinese culture discourages children’s independence from their parents, Chinese people will have intimate relationships with their families throughout their life span while Americans might switch intimate relationships from their families to romantic ones when reaching young adulthood.

Because of the concept of "Yuan", Chinese people tend to believe in fate; the concept of "Yuan" might also influence their attitudes toward relationships and decisions about breaking up. Because most Chinese young adults start their first dating experiences in their late teens but are expected to get married in their twenties, they usually see dating as providing opportunities to find potential partners. Therefore, Chinese young adults may have different dating attitudes compared to their American counterparts.

Cultural Differences in Social Cognitive Development Stages

Social Cognitive Development

Social Cognitive Development studies are influenced by Piaget's work. The idea that the study of cognitive development should be coordinated with a systematic understanding of the issues under investigation stems from Piaget's genetic epistemology. Among Piaget's ideas, those of egocentricism, moral judgment, and the idea of structure and restructure in development have greatly influenced Social Cognitive Development research (Turiel, 1983b).
Social Cognitive Development studies examine cognitive development in social domains. The basic assumption of this body of literature is that development is a result of *interactions* between persons and their environment and that there is a close relationship between "what is in the culture" and "how individuals behave" (Turiel, 1983a, p. 54). Within a given culture, there is an orderly progression of qualitatively different ways in which people understand themselves and their relationships with one another. This progression moves from simple ways of understanding to more differentiated, empathetic ways (Kegan, 1982; Selman, 1980). The ways in which an individual conceptualizes and reasons about other people have a major effect on how she/he interacts with them; this process is a primary issue of social-cognitive development. The sequence of Social Cognitive Development stages represents increasing levels of differentiation and integration and these stages are significantly correlated with age as the individual accumulates knowledge; this process leads to the reorganization of experience and thus to a new level of development (Byrne, 1974).

Therefore, one goal of Social Cognitive Development research is to define qualitatively distinct ways in which an individual arrives at his or her concepts of various aspects of the social world.

Recent advances in the social cognitive developmental approach examine perspective/role taking (Byrne, 1974; Flavell, 1968; Selman, 1980), moral judgment (Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1969), reflective thinking (Kitchener and Fischer, 1990), friendship (Bigelow, 1977; Selman, 1977), interpersonal understanding (Selman, 1980), relationship maturity (White et al. 1987), self knowledge (Weinstein and
Alschuler, 1985), development of self (Kegan, 1982; Noam, 1985), ego development (Leovinger, 1976), women’s ways of knowing (Belenky et al., 1986), skills theory (Fischer, 1980), developmental psychopathology (Noam, 1988), and developmental supervision (Carey, undated) models.

Concepts of intimate relationships are one aspect of the social domain that can be examined by the Social Cognitive Development models. Individuals’ capacities of intimacy (e.g. empathy, altruism, willingness to anticipate others’ needs, conflict resolution strategies) are manifested by their Social Cognitive Development competencies.

Using the development of interpersonal competencies as an example, theoretically, through child rearing practices and the socialization process, individuals use their cognitive capacities and their personality dispositions to learn a set of norms, values and beliefs about how to interact with other people. Early on, a child believes that everyone thinks the same way she/he thinks. Later on, the child recognizes that people have their own opinions and that these opinions might not be the same; the child realizes that in order to get what she/he wants, it is necessary to know what other people think; the child learns to anticipate other people’s needs and to give and take fairly; gradually, the child is willing to sacrifice the self for the sake of the relationship; the child develops a sense of trustworthiness, loyalty, fairness, interpersonal sensitivity (e.g. insight, empathy, sensitivity) and an ability to understand the deeper or inner needs of the self and others. Social Cognitive Development models claim that this process is universal.
As previously pointed out, the Social Cognitive Development model posits that "individuals in all cultures go through the same order or sequence of gross stage development though they vary in rate and terminal point of development" (Kohlberg, 1969, p. 175). However, if development is a result of the interaction between a person and his/her environment, then the process of development is not totally culture free. Rather, there is a close relationship between culture and development because knowledge/concepts are neither innate nor do they "stem directly from the environment". Rather, they are organized and "constructed" out of the individual's "interactions with the environment" (Turiel, 1983a, p. 75). Through this interactive process, "the nature of conceptual knowledge constructions", though not determined "by the environment, would be influenced by it" and "the interactions with fundamentally different types of objects and events experienced should result in the formation of distinct concepts" (Turiel, 1983a, p. 75). In other words, what has been taught within a given culture (e.g. norms for interpersonal behaviors, timing of intimate experiences), could influence individuals' capacities for intimacy attainment.

If American and Chinese people learn about concepts of intimacy in different ways, the question remains whether the process of developing their capacities for intimacy is universal. For example, American people might learn it is "normal" to be independent in relationships. Chinese people, however, might believe it is normal to depend on others in relationships because their cultural norms do not encourage independent behaviors. However, moving from dependence to independence is expected as a "normal" developmental process by Social Cognitive Development
models (e.g. Kegan, 1982; Selman, 1980). Thus, this author questions whether Chinese people will develop the need to be independent in relationships because the "terminal" point of development could vary from culture to culture. Another question is whether Chinese people will tend to stay in the "dependent" mode longer than their American counterparts because the "rate" of development also could vary from culture to culture.

The universality hypothesis requires empirical support in more than one culture (Sahoo, 1983). Cross-cultural studies on the development of concepts of intimacy can examine the "universal" assumptions of the Social Cognitive Development model of the developmental process. Although little is known about cultural differences in concepts of intimacy from a developmental perspective, previous Social Cognitive Development studies (both cross-sectional and longitudinal studies) have been applied to Chinese people.

It is hypothesized that "the structure of an individual's thinking" is "a coherent system" and "different aspects of social judgment are presumed to be linked with one another" (Turiel, 1983a, p. 55). Individuals acquire knowledge and skills in one area of development through observation, exploration, and direct experiences. This knowledge and the skills gained from previous experiences are hypothesized to serve as background knowledge for new levels of development in other areas (Dobert and Nunner-Winkler, 1985). Therefore, even though Social Cognitive Development studies have not yet examined cultural differences in the development of concepts of intimacy, this study will use previous Social Cognitive Development research on
Chinese people to examine the possible cultural differences in the Social Cognitive developmental stages of American and Chinese young adults.

The next part of the paper will examine previous Social Cognitive Development studies on Chinese people. The focus will be on the moral developmental stages and perspective taking levels because these are the two majors research areas that have been conducted on Chinese people and their American counterparts.

**Cultural Differences in Moral Development**

The best known Social Cognitive Development studies on Chinese people are based on Kohlberg’s moral development model.

Cheng and Lei (1981) examined 213 elementary through graduate students in Taiwan; they compared their results with Kohlberg’s (1958) study. By percentage of subjects, they found that (1) more Chinese 9-year-olds reached stage 2, Naive Instrumental Orientation and more Chinese 12-year-olds reached stage 3, Good-boy, nice-girl Orientation; (2) the Chinese subjects reached stage 4, Law and Order Orientation later/slower (at about age 16) compared to American norms, and (3) the Chinese subjects reached stage 5, Social-contract Orientation is also slower than American norms. However, the researchers also pointed out that Kohlberg’s (1958) study used the old scoring manual. When comparing their results with a more recent study (e.g. Holstein, 1976), they found "no significant cultural difference in terms of mean moral maturity scores at each age" (Cheng & Lei, 1981, p. 11-12).
In a study of Piaget's model of moral judgment, Liu (1950) examined 52 Chinese Americans and 52 non-Chinese Americans aged 6 to 12 years. Liu (1950) found that second-generation Chinese American children in New York showed higher moral stage scores compared to their non-Chinese American counterparts of equivalent age, intelligence, and socio-economic status. Liu pointed out that Chinese children tended to appeal more to authority or authoritative solutions in situations involving parental roles, and to reciprocity in situations involving sibling roles than their American counterparts. Liu (1950) suggested that Chinese social roles and cultural influences had a significant impact on Chinese children's maturity in moral judgment (Liu, 1950).

Using Kohlberg's (1971, 1976) scoring manual and semi-structured interview to present three dilemmas to 120 Chinese students (age 9 to 14), Chen (1980) found that the 13 to 14 year olds had lower stage scores (more Chinese showed stage 3 scores) compared to American adolescents at similar ages (more Americans showed stage 4 scores); further, he found no gender differences. Chen (1980) suggested that cultural norms influence moral development stages because many Chinese adolescents remained in stage 3, Good-boy, nice-girl Orientation, while American adolescents moved into stage 4, Law-and-order Orientation and stage 5, Social-contract Orientation. Possible explanations for these results could be that Chinese children are taught to obey authority and to sacrifice themselves for the welfare of others (being "good/nice") instead of thinking critically from the viewpoints of law and order. As a
consequence, Chinese children are not trained to make independent judgments but rather to obey their parents’ and teachers’ wishes (Chen, 1980, p. 95).

Lei’s (1992) studies of 211 Chinese people ranging from age 7 to 30 found an invariant sequence of moral development (most of his subjects were interviewed twice in four-to-five year intervals). He (1992) utilized cross-sectional and longitudinal comparisons of Americans and found cross-cultural similarities (statistically) in "developmental rates and sequence of structural stages" (Lei, 1992, p. 181). He pointed out, however, that nearly 26% of the Chinese samples showed a meaningful amount of principled stage reasoning, compared to only 13% of American subjects. Lei (1992, p. 225) suggested that this finding was due to the fact that his Chinese subjects had more education and possibly higher social economic status.

Relationship between Perspective Taking Abilities and Other Areas of Study

Social Cognitive Development models proposed interrelations between general cognitive abilities and moral judgment and between changes in perspective-taking abilities and changes in moral judgments (Byrne, 1974); these models also proposed that perspective taking ability is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the same level of moral development. The relationship between moral development stages and concepts of intimate relations stages, in the author’s view, is like two "parallel" studies in the social domain, which both "share" perspective taking abilities as one aspect of the underlying structure for reasoning. Therefore, interrelations should also exist between changes in perspective taking levels and changes in concepts of relations
stages; perspective taking levels are also hypothesized to be the "necessary but not sufficient" condition for the same stages of concepts of relations.

Studies on Chinese people have tested the relationship between moral development and perspective taking abilities (Chen, 1980; Lee, 1979; Lei, 1992) and the relationship between concepts of intimacy and perspective taking abilities (Lin, J.C.G., 1990).

This author conducted a pilot study in which she modified Selman's (1980) model according to the subjects' age and cultural norms in the areas of intimate relationships (Lin, J.C.G., 1990). Comparing cultural differences between American and immigrant Taiwan Chinese female university students (who were in the U.S. less than five years), the author found that both American and Chinese female young adults demonstrated the perspective taking abilities described in Selman's (1980) model; all subjects' perspective taking levels were higher or equal to parallel concepts of relations stages (Lin, J.C.G., 1990). However, the Chinese woman who demonstrated perspective taking level 4, "In-Depth and Societal-Symbolic Perspective Taking" only showed stage 3 concepts of relations, "Close friendship as intimate and mutual sharing", according to Selman's (1980) model (see Appendix B for brief descriptions of Selman's model). Again, the author argues that these differences were the result of Chinese cultural norms because the major focus in stage 3 is on the relationship rather than on the individuals (Selman, 1980, p. 140).

Selman's model (1980) of perspective taking abilities in friendships and peer relationships was applied in Lin's study (Lin, W.N., 1990) of sixth-grade male
students in Taiwan. He (Lin, W.N., 1990) found that certain issues elicited more varied responses than others. For example, issues such as formation, trust, and intimacy-closeness resulted in more diverse responses than those of jealousy, conflict resolution, and termination (Lin, W.N., 1990). He attributed these differences in emphasis to the different nature of the dilemmas and to the subjects' abilities and experiences in understanding them. He suggested that the dilemmas should be modified according to subjects' age and culture so that subjects could relate to the situations, thus allowing the researcher to get more data.

Lee (1979) examined the relationship between moral judgment and role taking abilities in fourth grade elementary students (9 to 10 year olds) and eighth grade (13 to 14 year olds) middle school students in Taiwan. In his study, he (Lee, 1979) modified Rest's (1974) paper and pencil methods to test Kohlberg's moral development model, and modified Selman's (1971) model to multiple-choice questionnaires. He (Lee, 1979) found a positive relationship between moral judgment scores and role taking scores; however, when the two groups were examined separately, the middle school students did not demonstrate a significant positive relationship whereas elementary students did. In terms of whether role taking abilities are the necessary condition for the same level of moral judgment, he found that most (but not all) subjects who scored level 4 moral development also received the same perspective taking level (but some received perspective taking level 3 and some
received perspective taking level 5). Finally, there were no gender differences found. Lee (1979, p. 83) pointed out that his study "partly" proved the hypothesis that perspective taking abilities were the necessary condition for the same level of moral development.

Lee's (1979) study was interesting, but his results may not be reliable. He reported that the test-retest reliability of the revised instrument was (r = .35, N = 35) on Moral development, and was (r = .56, N = 35) on Role Taking (he did not report the significant level).

Conclusions of Social Cognitive Development Studies on Chinese People

Social Cognitive Development models seem to be applicable to American and Chinese people but there might be differences in the rate and terminal point of development at some point in their life cycles. However, whether or not these differences are statistically significant needs more investigation because previous studies comparing the moral development stages of Chinese and American people have been controversial (see table 1.2). For example, Chinese children and pre-adolescents seemed to reach stage 1, Punishment and Obedience Orientation, and

1 Selman's (1971) earlier perspective taking model used level 1 to 5 instead of levels 0 to 4 in his Selman's (1980) model. In other words, Level 4 in his old model is equivalent to Level 3 in his new model.

2 "Partly" proved, in this author's view, did not prove the hypothesis. It was also the author's (also a Chinese person) personal experience that it is easier to say "partly" prove than "did not support" under similar circumstances. This may be because Chinese cultural norms tend to foster agreement rather than challenge and may also be the result of their training (e.g. less critical thinking) in Taiwan.
Table 1.2

Cultural Differences in the Developmental Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reference</th>
<th>topic</th>
<th>age of the subjects</th>
<th>method</th>
<th>Chinese compare to Americans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liu (1950)</td>
<td>Moral Development</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>interview, (Piaget), match groups with Chinese American &amp; Americans comparisons</td>
<td>higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen (1980)</td>
<td>Moral Development</td>
<td>9-14</td>
<td>interview (Kohlberg), compare to American norms</td>
<td>lower (13-14 olds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Development</td>
<td>Moral Development</td>
<td>6-19</td>
<td>interview (Kohlberg), compare to American norms</td>
<td>vary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng &amp; Lei (1981)</td>
<td>Moral Development</td>
<td>6-19</td>
<td>interview (Kohlberg), compare to American norms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lei (1992)</td>
<td>Moral Development</td>
<td>7-30</td>
<td>interview (Kohlberg), compare to American norms</td>
<td>similar, but more reach principle stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin, J.C.G. (1990)</td>
<td>Perspective Taking</td>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>interview (Selman), match groups of Chinese immigrants &amp; Americans</td>
<td>similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin, W.N. (1990)</td>
<td>Friendship and Peer relationship</td>
<td>12-14 (6th graders)</td>
<td>Interview (Selman), compare to American norms</td>
<td>similar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cheng & Lei (1981) included 10 graduate students in their study but the author cannot find the ages of these students reported in their study.
stage 2, Naive Instrumental Orientation earlier than their American counterparts (Liu, 1950), but more Chinese adolescents remained in stage 3, Good-boy, nice-girl Orientation longer and moved into stage 4, Law-and-order Orientation later than their American counterparts (Chen, 1980; Cheng & Lei, 1981).

To conclude, the author believes that there are two major problems with the Social Cognitive Development studies that have been conducted in Taiwan. Cross-cultural comparisons have to be "compatible" to be "comparable". Not all studies used the same methods or procedures to make comparisons with other studies either within or across cultures. Some studies were not conducted in the same time frame (were not direct comparisons). Conducting studies in the same time frame is important because the world is changing; as a result, cultural norms could be changing, and so could people's concepts. Thus, the rate and terminal point of development could be changing. The author believes that direct comparisons in cross-cultural studies require the following: the same researcher or a group of trained researchers, use of the same instruments and procedure, reliable data analysis and a comparison of the performances from different cultures. This approach provides a more "compatible" study; it is ideal but is not always possible because it is very time consuming and costly. Other theoretical issues involved in cross-cultural studies will be addressed in the next section.
Methodological Issues in Cross-cultural Studies

Since the 1960s, cultural differences have become a major concern in the fields of counseling psychology and mental health. There is a growing awareness that psychology developed mostly in Europe and North America should expand its field to the understanding of other cultures. The interest in Eastern cultures, the rise of economic, political, and cultural influences of the Third World, the impact of refugees, and the need for preparation of missionaries and Peace Corps workers - all have stimulated research in cross-cultural studies.

Cross-cultural studies, in this paper, refer to studies of people from different countries. Within each culture (country), there are sub-cultural differences such as race, ethnicity, religion, ability, age, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, geographic location; while each group has a common way of being, behaving and thinking, there are also variations in individuals within a cultural group (Ivey, 1991).

Cross-cultural psychological studies are essential because they examine whether there is a universal psychological process and whether there are patterns between psychological issues and cultural variables. Cross-cultural psychologists are interested in how behaviors relate to "ecological, cultural and social factors in an interactive system that characterizes a particular population" (Berry, 1989, p. 729). Cross-cultural psychology studies, thus, can enhance multi-cultural understanding because they provide useful information to help culturally different people to understand why people behave the way they do within a cultural context; they also
allow an opportunity for them to relate to their similarities and understand their
differences.

Cross-cultural studies can involve different languages, cultural norms and
world views. The following are important considerations in designing cross-cultural
studies: (1) whether the original research model is universal for different cultural
settings; (2) whether the research design is culturally appropriate; and (3) whether the
translated instruments are valid, culturally appropriate, and have equivalent meanings
in their languages and the same concepts as the original research design. These
methodological considerations will be discussed in the following sections.

Theories and Models

The lack of an overall theoretical framework is one of the major problems in
cultural/ethnic research because many empirical studies have examined "fragmented
pointed out that many cultural studies defined certain issues of interest and designed
instruments to investigate the issues rather than integrating and grounding their
investigation from a conceptual framework/theory. Theoretical models can help
researchers to interpret the observations under investigation and to provide summaries
of conceptual knowledge (Wagner and Davis, 1979). Although the use of
psychological theory is necessary, it is not sufficient for conducting cross-cultural
studies (Wagner and Davis, 1978).

The purpose of this section is to propose a model to effectively examine
cultural similarities and differences. Good cross-cultural research should be grounded
in a sound theoretical model which includes universal assumptions, and should employ
a systematic approach (e.g. integrating the etic and emic approaches) for
investigation.

There is a long-standing argument about the use of emic and etic approaches in
both psychology and anthropology research. The emic approach is culture specific and
ethnocentric; it studies from inside the system whereas the etic approach from
outside the system (Feleppa, 1986). Researchers who take the emic approach work
"intensively within a single culture in order to understand psychological phenomena"
and "how they are related to cultural contexts" (Berry, 1989, p. 721). Emic
researchers emphasize that the emic approach provides a native's points of view; emic
research allows "a whole understanding of the way in which a culture is constructed"
and it allows researchers to understand all aspects of individuals and their daily lives
(Pike, 1967, cited in Berry, 1989, p. 723). Emic researchers criticize the etic
approach because it imposes outside ideas to other cultures and only examines "parts"
(certain events, issues, behaviors, or ideas) rather than the "whole". Etic researchers
work "comparatively across cultures in order to understand broad patterns of
relationships between behavioral and cultural variables" (Berry, 1989, p. 721). Etic
researchers emphasize that etic studies provide a broad perspective of events around
the world so as to recognize cultural similarities and differences; by selecting certain
cultures for investigation, this approach can also save time and money because etic
approaches provide tentative descriptions (certain ideas) for investigation; etic
researchers criticize emic researchers’ objectivity and ask how observers from inside can see the whole (Pike, 1967, cited in Berry, 1989).

Berry (1989, p. 722-723) summarized Pike’s (1967, p. 37-38) distinctions between emic and etic approaches as follows: (1) the emic approach provides an internal view with criteria chosen from within the culture whereas the etic approach treats more than one culture/language at the same time; (2) the emic researcher does not "predict" but "discovers" the knowledge under investigation, whereas the etic analyst may "create" "cross cultural schemes in advance"; (3) the emic study determines the units of data during the analysis whereas the etic study has units/classification available in advance; (4) emic data require "knowledge of the total system to which they are relative" before drawing the conclusions of significance whereas etic data are "obtainable early in analysis with partial information"; and finally (5) emic studies provide "final analysis or presentation" while etic studies are a starting point of research. The etic approach provides access into the system; it is an essential approach to an alien culture; it provides tentative results; these initial results/etic descriptions are refined for final emic analysis.

Both emic and etic approaches have particular strengths in cross-cultural psychology (Berry, 1989). Using a combined etic-emic approach is better than using an etic cross-cultural study alone because the researcher begins with a model that has been validated through the emic studies. Berry (1989) suggested three stages in combining the etic-emic approach. First, the "researcher identifies an etic construct that appears to have universal status." Second, "emic ways of measuring this
construct are developed and validated". Third, "the emically defined etic construct can be used in making cross-cultural comparisons" (p. 732). Berry (1989, p. 730) proposed a five-step model to make cross-cultural generalizations with the results generated from etic-emic cross-cultural comparisons: (1) "Begin research in own culture" (emic culture A); (2) "transport to other culture" (imposed etic); "discover other culture" (emic in culture B); (3) "compare the two cultures" (after studying them independently) (emic A and emic B); (4) a "comparison" is "not possible" if there are no shared features; and (5) "comparison" is "possible" if there are shared features in the two cultures ("derived etic" phenomena). When the procedure is validated in "all cultures", "derived etic phenomena" are attained and "the universality" is established (p. 728).

This author argues that Social Cognitive Developmental models can serve as a conceptual framework for cross-cultural psychology research because the models meet all of the criteria for emic-etic research. Social Cognitive Development models have been tested both emically and etically; the models have a universal assumption on which to make cross-cultural comparisons. Some Social Cognitive Development models (e.g. moral development, perspective taking levels) have been validated in cross-sectional and longitudinal studies; they also have been carried out across cultures, including the Chinese culture as previously examined.

Carrying out Social Cognitive Development studies as a starting point for an etic-emic approach to cross-cultural research is invaluable. Using research into the human development process of Chinese people as an example, the emic approach will
be very time consuming and costly, even though it does provide much information about the culture and Chinese people's developmental process as a whole. If the researchers start their research by adapting the ideas of Social Cognitive Development, the use of the etic-emic approach can be beneficial. To elaborate Berry's model, the Chinese researchers can take the following steps: (1) use the Social Cognitive Development models to begin their research in the American culture (emic culture A); the models have a universal assumption, and some of these assumptions have had empirical supports (emically defined etic). Therefore, (2) the researchers can transport the ideas in the Social Cognitive Development models to the Chinese culture (imposed etic); (3) they then can validate these models (emic in culture B); (4) make comparisons (emic A and emic B); (5) make generalizations on the similarities between American and Chinese people (comparison possible - "derive etic" - confirm universal assumption in the Chinese culture); (6) examine any differences to ascertain whether these differences are culturally specific and relate to cultural norms (comparison not possible - disconfirm the universal assumption). (7) the researchers can propose alternative models and test them within the Chinese culture (etically defined studies in culture B);¹ (8) propose or modify the alternative models for further studies until they are validated; and (9) draw conclusions on the process of human development in the Chinese culture.

¹ The author wishes to name this step as "the etically defined emie". However, it doesn't fit Pike's (1967) definition of "emic" research (e.g. no "pre-assumptions" in emic approach). Therefore, this is a step of the "etically defined studies".
The study of Chinese people's capacities of intimacy can also follow the same steps. Ideally, cross-cultural comparisons can be made by a group of trained researchers (who have knowledge about the cultures under investigation) who carry out their studies in the same time frame or by bi-cultural researchers who use "direct" comparisons.

Research Design

When researchers design a model for cross-cultural studies, they should determine how they are going to collect the data (instruments) and how to analyze the data (data analysis). The research questions usually influence the choice of methods, such as whether to use "questionnaires, structured interviews, group discussions, in-depth interviews, and participant observations" (Sackmann, 1991, p. 300). Data gathered by questionnaires are usually analyzed quantitatively; interview protocols and the data collected in group discussions or field observations are analyzed qualitatively; however, quantitative data analysis can also be used with focused data analysis (e.g. to compare whether there are developmental differences between culturally different people and whether these differences are statistically significant).

Questionnaires are cost effective in studying larger samples with low cost and less time. They are also more objective in terms of administration, analysis and interpretation; however, this research design is usually structured toward close-ended questions (Seidman, 1991) and is more subjective to the researcher's culture. Its validity, thus, is unclear for cross-cultural studies (Sackmann, 1991).
In-depth interviewing is time-consuming and costly; however, by asking open-ended questions, this method provides "access to the context of people's behaviors", and thus provides "a way for the researcher to understand the behaviors" in his or her particular cultural settings (Seidman, 1991, p. 4). The basic assumption of in-depth interviewing is that "the meaning people make of their experiences affects the way they carry out the experiences" (Seidman, 1991, p. 4). A limitation of in-depth interviewing is that the researcher needs to differentiate between individual opinions and cultural data, and also needs to ensure objectivity and reliability in obtaining and analyzing interview data (Sackmann, 1991).

The structured interview method is particularly helpful in examining specific issues, but it is less effective in its sample size than questionnaires. It shares problems with questionnaires. The semi-structured interview method takes advantage of aspects of both the structured and in-depth interview methods. The semi-structured interview method is issue-focused based on a phenomenological orientation. It allows more open-ended questions and provides an opportunity for the participants to make sense of their experiences. The semi-structured interview often uses hypothetical dilemmas or film strips to stimulate participants' responses.

Life observation (e.g. field work) is more difficult in cross-cultural studies because it requires on-site collection of data over a long period of time. It could serve as an emic approach but is difficult to do as an etic study because it is very costly and time-consuming and involves the researchers' ability to obtain access to
culturally hallowed matters (Sackmann, 1991). If different researchers are involved, their training (reliability) is an important consideration.

Group discussion about cultural issues could stimulate the group to bring out what is ordinarily hidden. This method shares some of the same difficulties as life observation; it also requires a skilled group leader to stir up the discussion in depth (Sackmann, 1991). Therefore, this method is not widely used in cross-cultural studies.

Finally, some subjects might be more verbal than others; some might write better, some might be more familiar with one task than another, and some topics are more sensitive to discuss in certain cultures. Therefore, the researcher should consider the type of tasks under investigation and the nature of the culture involved when choosing instruments for cross-cultural research.

Instrumental Considerations

The most common instruments used in Social Cognitive Development models are interviews, either semi-structured interviews (e.g. Kohlberg, 1969; Selman, 1980; Weinstein and Alschuler, 1985), in-depth interviews (e.g. Carey, undated; Kegan, 1982), or group discussions (Kohlberg, 1969). Questionnaires are also sometimes used since interviewing methods are time consuming and costly (e.g. Lee, 1979). Researchers in the Social Cognitive Development tradition have developed several scoring manuals to define qualitative differences in the interview protocols. When applying Social Cognitive Development models to cross-cultural studies, the following are important instrumental considerations:
translation of the instrument. Cross-cultural studies might involve the translation of languages. In translating a language, cross-cultural researchers should consider whether a "symmetrical" or a "decentered" translation is more appropriate for the study (Sahoo, 1983). In a symmetrical (unicentered) translation, the source language is a fixed referent and translation attempts are made to bring the target language close to the source; in the decentering approach, elements of both languages are changed carefully to allow a natural-sounding version in the target language (Sahoo, 1983). Sahoo (1983) described three techniques of the decentering process: (1) in the back-translation approach, a bilingual person translates from the source language to the target language; then a different bilingual speaker translates this completed target language to the original language; the differences are then discussed; (2) in the bilingual technique, a group of bilingual participants is divided into two random groups, one group takes one half of the test in one language and the other group takes the other half in another language. Their performances are then compared; and (3) in the committee approach, a group of bilingual speakers translates from the source language to the target language, compares the results with materials translated by a different bilingual person, and then pretests the translated materials (field-tested like a pilot study) (Sahoo, 1983). Choosing a proper translation approach to ensure the equivalent meanings of issues studied in the given cultures is crucial in cross-cultural studies.

validity and reliability. To apply a theoretical model to a different culture is complicated and to design a universal scoring manual is even more so. The
challenges include covering the universal rules and norms in developing the instrument. Doebert and Nunner-Winkler (1985, p. 225) pointed out that "measurement operations are complicated and difficult to standardize and many modifications are necessary before validity is accomplished." Thus, cross-cultural researchers need to ensure that the instrument is compatible, reliable and valid with the original research model.

With etic studies using models derived from emic research, modifications of original methods may make them more culturally appropriate. For example, Cheng (1991) pointed out several studies on Chinese people which found unscorable data using the moral development scoring manual. Some of the unscorable data could have resulted from the fact that some moral dilemmas were not problematic enough for university age students. Another possibility is that the dilemmas didn’t include enough specific culturally appropriate factors, or that the interviewer didn’t ask follow-up questions to clarify underlying meanings for scoring. Cheng (1991) suggested that future studies on moral development should take into account cultural norms (e.g. filial piety in Chinese dilemmas,) world views, age and meanings of languages.

When modifying an original research model, the researcher needs to carefully examine the validates: the content (content validity), the structure (construct validity) and the scoring criteria (criterion-related validity). After validity is reached, consistency of the modified model also needs to be achieved. If Social Cognitive Development etic researchers carefully integrate and translate the methods into their
cross-cultural research design, both validity and reliability should be enhanced because the Social Cognitive Development models have established validity and reliability in at least one culture.

Summary: A Model for Cross-cultural Studies

This paper provides an operational framework for cross-cultural research: combining good theoretical models with good methods; using the etic-emic approaches; developing reliable instruments; validating these instruments across cultures; investigating the performances in each culture independently in the same time frame; comparing the results across cultures to make generalizations or culturally specific assumptions for further emic investigation; and then drawing conclusions for final analysis.

This paper also proposes a cross-cultural psychology model to examine the cultural similarities and differences of various psychological issues by adapting Berry’s (1989) etic-emic approach and by using Social Cognitive Development models as a starting point to advance cross-cultural studies. Finally, cross-cultural research will generate much data; however, there might be a temptation to use the researcher’s standards in interpreting the results (Brislin, 1983). The combined etic-emic approach, in conjunction with sound Social Cognitive Development theoretical models, may provide a more objective method for future cross-cultural research.
Conclusions: Suggestions for Future Research on Cultural Differences in People’s Understanding of Intimate Relationships

Intimate relationships are among the most important facets in an individual’s life and constitute a central part of human experience. Intimacy has been studied in a variety of ways. However, there is little information on cultural differences in people’s concepts of intimate relationships from a developmental perspective.

As previously discussed, Social Cognitive Development models have a strength in cross-cultural studies because of the universality assumption and because of the established validity and reliability in emic and etic studies. For example, Kohlberg’s moral development model has established its universality, from the Pre-conventional Level to the Conventional Level, but the Post-conventional Level (Principled) still needs further examination. Selman’s model of perspective taking abilities is intriguing but it seems to be in the "derived etic" phase and requires more cross-cultural studies to establish the "universal" assumption. Other Social Cognitive Development models, therefore, are also appropriate as a starting point for the integration of etic-emic cross-cultural psychology studies.

Social Cognitive Development stages define individuals’ capacities for concepts of intimacy; concepts of intimacy are influenced by the languages, norms and intimate experiences of a given culture. Therefore, there is a close relationship between culture and the development of individuals’ capabilities for intimacy attainment. Social Cognitive Developmentalists proposed models of stages/levels development to define the qualitatively different ways (from simplistic to differentiated ways) in
which these capabilities are developed. They hypothesized that these stages/levels are universal but that the rate and terminal point of development may vary from culture to culture because development is a result of person/environment interaction.

Chinese university students in Taiwan have different languages, cultural expectations, and timing of intimate experiences in comparison to their American counterparts. These differences may lead to differences in individuals’ concepts of intimacy and capacities for intimacy in American and Chinese young adults. One purpose of this paper is to test the "universal" assumptions proposed by Social Cognitive Development models by examining cultural differences of concepts of intimacy and Social Cognitive Development stages between American and Chinese young adults. Another purpose is to examine whether Social Cognitive Development models can be applied in the intimacy domain.

Many Social Cognitive Development approaches employ interview methods. Shantz (1983, p. 542) pointed out that a structured or semi-structured clinical interview "has a strength particularly important during the early phases of research" because it minimizes the constraining of the participants’ responses and enhances the researcher’s ability to probe what the participants mean by what they say.

Of all the Social Cognitive Development models, the author suspects that Selman’s (1977, 1979, 1980) semi-structural developmental interview using a set of interpersonal dilemmas is most appropriate to examine cultural differences of concepts of intimacy in American and Chinese young adults. The purpose of his method is to probe the participants’ reasoning, to "clarify the nature of their interpersonal concepts
and to explore the complete understanding of the category" (Selman, 1974, p. 19-20).

The advantages of Selman’s semi-structural hypothetical dilemmas are: (1) the semi-structural interviewing method can get richer information because of the interview methods. Semi-structural interview methods ask open-ended and follow-up questions when necessary (as in the in-depth interview). It thus provides an opportunity for the researcher to understand the meaning of behaviors (although not as good an opportunity as in-depth interview methods). (2) It can provide an opportunity to examine subjects’ responses systematically because the interview questions are semi-structured. Finally, (3) because intimacy is personal and private, it invites participants to discuss the presenting dilemmas without directly asking participants to reveal their own stories; it asks questions about the designated characters in the dilemmas rather than asking participants to share their own experiences. However, it allows subjects to share their experiences if they so choose.

To conclude, this author believes that Selman’s (1980) semi-structural interviewing method on hypothetical dilemmas is a better approach than in-depth interview methods (e.g. asking self-reflective questions or self-referential questions about their own experiences) in investigating people’s concepts of intimacy; this may be especially true considering that Chinese people may be more reluctant to reveal private thoughts to outsiders. Semi-structured interviews on hypothetical dilemmas offer subjects the opportunity to talk about their concepts of intimacy either from the situations in the dilemmas or from their own experiences; therefore, they are more culturally appropriate.
Selman's (1980) dilemmas were originally written for the common social experiences of children and adolescents, although he does have an adult version of friendship dilemmas. His model, therefore, needs some modification before being applied to young adults. When re-designing his methods for use in another culture, appropriate cultural norms needed to be built into the dilemmas; other methodological considerations as previously discussed also needed special attention. Finally, Selman (1980) proposed that the perspective taking level is "a necessary but not sufficient" condition for the same stage of concepts of interpersonal relationships. However, not all studies on Chinese people supported this hypothesis as previously reviewed (e.g. Lee, 1979). Therefore, examining concepts of intimacy and perspective taking abilities separately can provide another opportunity to test Selman's (1980) assumption.
CHAPTER II

TEST OF MEASURING CONCEPTS OF INTIMACY AND PERSPECTIVE TAKING ABILITIES IN AMERICAN AND CHINESE FEMALE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Introduction

The main purposes of this study are to examine how American and Chinese female university students are similar or different in their concepts of intimate relationships and in their perspective taking abilities; to examine whether cultural norms result in qualitative differences in concepts of intimacy between the two groups; and to examine whether the results of the relationships between concepts of relationships and perspective taking abilities support Selman’s (1980) model.

Intimate relationships are among the most important facets in an individual’s life and constitute a central part of human experience. Intimacy has been addressed from a variety of perspectives in sociology, communication, social psychology and cognitive-developmental psychology. Recent advances in the cognitive developmental approach examine interpersonal concepts of persons and of friendships, peer relationships and parent-child relationships through five perspective taking levels (Selman, 1980). Researchers proposed three levels of Relationship Maturity under the assumption that a person’s relationship patterns with parents influence the levels of Relationship Maturity with his or her spouse (White et al., 1987).

Despite this recent attention, there is little information on the cultural similarities and differences of young female university students’ concepts of intimate
relationships from a developmental perspective. Investigating concepts of intimacy can help individuals to understand other people's thoughts, feelings and behaviors; it can also help people to make sense of their significant personal experiences, thus promoting interpersonal communication and improving their relationships.

Perspective taking abilities reflect one aspect of interpersonal competencies since understanding the perspective of others requires the ability to infer other people's thoughts, feelings and behaviors. Studying perspective taking abilities can help us to understand how people think, feel and behave in the same situation as well as predict the outcomes. These competencies can promote interpersonal communication, enhance multi-cultural understanding and help people to achieve more satisfying relationships. It is postulated that "Individuals in all cultures go through the same order or sequence of gross stage development though they vary in rate and terminal point of development" (Kohlberg, 1969, p. 175). A cross-cultural study on perspective taking abilities will provide information to investigate the assumptions of "universal" developmental sequence. If this premise of universal development is correct, then American and Chinese female university students should be able to demonstrate similar perspective taking abilities and concepts of relationships; if not, the assumption of universality must be reconsidered.

The remainder of this section contains a review of selected research on the major concepts relating to this study.
Concepts of Intimacy

Concepts of intimacy in this study refer to each individual as a person, and his/her ideas, beliefs, views, and expectations about himself/herself in four different types of intimate relationships: same-sex, opposite-sex, boyfriend-girlfriend, and mother-daughter. In different cultures, people tend to behave differently depending upon the proper norms in that given environment. Cultural norms are crucial in determining the level of intimacy appropriate in a relationship. Hinde (1979, p. 168) indicated that "processes of socialization may permit or inhibit certain properties of relationships by influencing the sorts of emotions that individuals feel"; further, cultural differences affect the extent to "which these emotions are expressed or inhibited, and the context in which they are elicited." The influence of these expectations is different among cultures, and changes over time (Hinde, 1979).

Chinese culture emphasizes collectivism whereas American culture accentuates individualism. Chinese university students in Taiwan have different languages, cultural expectations, and timing in their intimate experiences than their American counterparts. These differences may lead to differences in their concepts of intimate relationships because concepts are hypothesized to be "constructed" out of the individual's "interactions with the environment"; and, "the interactions with fundamentally different types of objects and events experienced should result in the formation of distinct concepts" (Turiel, 1983a, p. 75). The following section will explore cultural factors in concepts of intimacy between American and Chinese young adults.
Languages

The word "intimacy" is derived from *intimus*, the Latin term for "inner" or "inmost" (refer to Perlman and Fehr 1987, p. 17 for previous studies on intimacy). Intimacy translates into the Mandarin Chinese language (the official language in Taiwan) as "chinjihn" or "chinmih," both of which mean "closeness" or "privacy" (Lin, 1972, p. 879). *Chinjihn* means "(1) v.t. & adj., close, intimate; be close to; (2) n., close friends or relatives"; *chinmih* means "adj, very intimate, (friend, lover, relative)". Another word for closeness in Chinese is *Yaw Haw*. "Yaw Haw" is frequently used to describe the closeness between lovers or to refer to very close friendships. Chinese people may use one of these three terms when referring to interpersonal "closeness". One purpose of this study is to examine the definitions of "intimacy" in American and Chinese culture.

Cultural Norms in Interpersonal Behaviors

Research suggests that Chinese culture has different normative expectations of social behavior within relationships than American culture (Chiu, 1989). American cultural norms emphasize individuals' rights, values, freedom, enhancement and fulfillment (Johnson, 1985) whereas Chinese cultural norms emphasize gentleness, modesty, patience, reserve, and social sensitivity (Fong, 1973). The notion of individualism affects the balance of family relationships and obligations in the U.S.; however, adopting these notions of self-reliance and individual choice could create conflicts in the Chinese family because interpersonal relationships and maintaining harmony are important values in Chinese society (Fong, 1973). Under the influence
of Confucius, an individual is a social being and is not conceived of as an isolated separate entity (Tu, 1985). Chinese people may not have strong needs for self identity or separation and individuation because of their collective values (Dien, 1983); American people, on the other hand, are socialized to be obedient to rules which protect the rights of self and others, and are also encouraged to develop independence (Johnson, 1985).

Individuals "adapt to normative values and integrate cultural ideas that operate" and identify with "normative values in addition to personality dispositions" (Lei, 1992, p. 113). Personality, therefore, could also influence individuals' concepts. Compared to their American counterparts, studies suggest that Chinese university students are "less autonomous, more conforming, more persuadable by messages attributed to mass media", and tend toward "cohesiveness of judgment under authoritarian leadership" (Yang, 1981a, p. 160). They are also "more introverted, more restrained, more withdrawn, more cautious, less impulsive, less social, emotionally less stable, less dominant and less aggressive" (Hwang, 1982).

Chinese people are taught to return favors when they receive one; they think of others in a reciprocal manner and show sympathetic concern for others. Therefore, in conflict situations, a Chinese individual (the small me) is expected to sacrifice personal interests for the welfare of others (the big me) to achieve harmony in society (Dien, 1983). Therefore, Chinese people are often situation-oriented and directed by other's opinions (Hsu, 1972). Yang (1981a, p. 160) indicated that social-oriented individuals tend to behave according to the expectations of the social norms
so as to protect their social self and function as an integral part of the social network. Their behavior patterns are "social conformity, non-offensive strategy, submission to social expectations and worry about external opinions in an attempt to achieve reward attainment, harmony maintenance, impression management, face protection, social acceptance, and avoidance of punishment, embarrassment, conflict, rejection, ridicule, and retaliation in a social situation" (Yang, 1981a, p. 159).

Taiwanese society has changed rapidly over the past few years due to industrialization, the convenience of mass transportation and the growth of media (Yang, 1981b). Yang (1981b) also pointed out that this modernization may be leading to changes in Chinese people's world view to value action and achievement, individual self-orientation and independence. Thus, the individual's "space" may have been extended with the increasing influence of Western individualistic values. Some traditional values may persist because the "changes did not start at the same time nor are they moving with a uniform speed, and they do not, at any given time, arrive at the same point on the scale of modernization" (Hwang, 1982). Therefore, whether American and Chinese females are more alike than different in their concepts of intimate relationships is an area for research.

The Timing and Nature of Intimate Relationships

Adolescence and the young adult period are seen as times to experiment with different types of interpersonal relationships. Forming intimate relationships with significant others is the normative expectation for young adults (Levinson et al. 1978). Developmentally, for heterosexual young adults, an individual's intimate experiences
move from relationships with family members to relationships with same-sex friends, and from friendship relationships with opposite-sex friends to romantic ones; new relationships may supplement (not necessarily replace) the old ones but the experiences gained in these old relationships may be applied to new relationships (Steinberg, 1989). However, the timing of these intimate experiences may vary from culture to culture; as a result, the concepts of intimacy may also vary depending on the types of relationships.

In American culture, an adolescent is primarily centered in the family and in peer groups. Many girls start dating around age 13 or 14 but sexual feelings are usually discussed and explored within same-sex friendships (Steinberg, 1989). During late adolescence (17-18), girls lessen the intensity of emotional commitment in same-sex friendships and apply important qualities of same-sex friendships to heterosexual friendships and relationships (Dickens and Perlman, 1981). For many young people, experimentation with sex and intimacy continues well into late adolescence. Steinberg (1989) points out that about 75 percent of high school students in the U.S. have become steadily involved with someone of the opposite gender by the end of high school.

Young adults in their twenties are in the process of separating from parents and developing a sense of self, and defining goals, values and life structure (Levinson et al., 1978). They make their choices, such as marriage, occupation, residence and living style. Love and work seem to be two main concerns at this phase of the human life cycle (Levinson et al., 1978). After young adults leave home for college or
work, the family is removed from the center of their lives, thus beginning the process of change that will lead to new home bases for living as young adults (Levinson et al., 1978).

In Chinese culture, people are expected to maintain a close bond with their families throughout their life cycle even after marriage (Hwang, 1982). Chinese pre-adolescents are centered around family and peers, especially peers of the same gender. However, Chinese cultural norms discourage forming close relationships with members of the opposite sex, especially before college. School is the central activity for Chinese adolescents because of the current educational system in Taiwan. Chinese people value education very highly; anyone who wishes to be admitted into a university has to pass an annual university entrance examination. Chinese parents believe that going out with members of the opposite sex will cause a "spilt heart", which means take away their concentration in studying. Therefore, Chinese parents strongly discourage their children from dating before college.

Because of these parental pressures, and the stress from endless examinations and cultural expectations, Chinese adolescents who are now in college, male or female, are not likely to begin dating until late adolescence or early young adulthood. Even if Chinese society is changing, it is likely that Chinese adolescents' first dating experiences happen later than those of their American counterparts.

It is also reasonable to assume that Chinese women have different dating attitudes than their American gender counterparts. Chinese young adults have fewer opportunities to get to know members of the opposite sex because many middle and
high schools in Taiwan are gender segregated. They are discouraged from forming opposite sex relationships and have limited dating experiences prior to entering the university. However, they are also expected to be married in their young adulthood. Therefore, many Chinese young women might view dating as an activity for finding a potential husband especially when they are considering engaging in pre-marital sex. Most Chinese people probably don’t believe that men and women can have "pure" friendships because Chinese culture discourages such relationships.

Another important concept of intimate relationships is the meaning of "Yuan" in Chinese. Many Chinese people believe that things are the result of "fate"; two people meet as the result of a very special acquaintance process - called "Yuan". According to the Buddhist idea, "Yuan" is one’s destiny, luck as conditioned by one’s past. It also means the "good luck to meet and natural affinity among friends" (Lin, 1972, p. 1423). In Chinese, there is a saying "if two people have "Yuan", they will meet even if they are thousands of miles away; if they don’t have "Yuan", they will run across each other but won’t know each other". Therefore, in relationships, one should try to cherish and care about this special opportunity. Research shows that 80% of Taiwan Chinese believe in "Yuan"; concepts of "Yuan" apply to relationships between opposite-sex friends, spouses, classmates and same-sex friends (Yang, 1982). Given this belief in "Yuan", it might be interesting to examine the relationships between the belief in "Yuan" and intimate relationships in Taiwan Chinese, especially its effect on the acquaintance process and decisions about breaking up.
This study argues that Chinese people will have intimate relationships with their families and strong relationships with same-sex friends throughout their life span whereas Americans will tend to switch intimate relationships from family and same-sex relationships to romantic ones when reaching young adulthood. Further, when there are conflicts between parental expectations and personal interests, Chinese people may act according to societal pressure whereas American people may stress an individual’s choices.

Summary of Cultural Differences in Concepts of Intimacy

In summary, the intimate relationships of Taiwan Chinese and their American counterparts differ in several ways: linguistics, cultural expectations, the concept of "Yuan", family relationships and dating experiences.

Linguistically, Chinese people may think of intimate relationships as relationships with families, friends, and lovers while Americans may think mostly in terms of romantic ones. Further, because Chinese culture discourages children’s independence from their parents, Chinese people will have intimate relationships with their families throughout their life span while Americans might switch intimate relationships from their families to romantic ones when reaching young adulthood. Because of the concept of "Yuan", Chinese people tend to believe in fate and the concept of "Yuan" might influence their attitudes toward acquaintances and decisions about breaking up. Because most Chinese young adults start dating in their late teens but are expected to get married in their twenties, their attitudes toward dating might be very different from those of their American counterparts. Finally, because
Chinese individuals are part of a social system and because their cultural norms emphasize harmony and interdependence, they will tend to understand themselves through the eyes of others (in order to maintain harmony), which requires perspective taking abilities. The next part of the paper will review research on perspective taking abilities.

Perspective Taking Abilities

Perspective taking/role taking ability is defined as "the ability to put oneself in another’s place, to take another’s perspective and to view the world from that person’s eyes" (Byrne, 1974, p. i). Most studies on perspective taking abilities examine (A) the process by which one generates information about other people or situations using his or her cognitive abilities, and (B) the structural "level of inference (structure) and coordination among viewpoints" (Shantz, 1983, p. 541). It is hypothesized that the individual can generate information about other people by (A) "knowing what most people do, feel, or think"; or "the use of specific classes of people to infer normative causal attributes"; (B) making inferences about another based on his/her "past behaviors, preferences, attitudes, thoughts, or feelings in general or in a particular situation", where the individual develops "abilities to abstract regularities in a person’s behavior and ... construct[s] an implicit personality theory of relating traits [which] form part of the basis for judging another’s psychological response and future behavior"; or (C) making "generalizations from the self and generating substantial information about the other" (Shantz, 1983, p. 540).
Individuals, therefore, should be able to demonstrate their perspective taking abilities through the norm-appropriate tasks that both American and Chinese subjects may experience or observe.

Selman (1980) conducted one of the most comprehensive investigations of qualitatively different structural levels of inference in the social domain. Selman (1980) proposed five levels (level 0 to level 4) of perspective taking abilities. He hypothesized that the development of perspective taking levels is universal, invariant, ontogenetic, and predictable and that each level is qualitatively distinct from but hierarchically related to the prior level. The sequence of perspective taking stages represents increasing levels of differentiation and integration and is significantly correlated with age (Selman, 1977, 1980). Each level was shown to be qualitatively different from the previous level (Selman, 1980). Selman (1980, p. 74) hypothesized that "the development of social concepts can be organized into a series of universal and invariant developmental stages, or modes of organization, by which the child progressively structures social experience as he or she experiences it". Selman's model of perspective taking abilities has been tested and validated in the American culture (Selman, 1974, 1977, and 1980) and generated both cross-sectional and longitudinal evidence (Gurucharri, Phelps, and Selman, 1984; Selman, 1980). Its applicability to Chinese culture is also being tested (Lin, J.C.G., 1990; Lin, W.N., 1990).

According to Selman (1980, p. 38-39), an average 7-to 12-year-old will reach Level 2, "Self-Reflective/Second Person and Reciprocal Perspective Taking"; an
average 16-year old should already be in "Level 3, Third-Person and Mutual Perspective Taking Level" (most reach this level by 12 to 15 years of age) and some of them could be in Level 4 (about age 12 to adulthood), the "In-Depth and Societal-Symbolic Perspective Taking Level". Theoretically, average American young adults should be able to not only recognize self and others, but should also be able to step outside of the self and coordinate the perspectives between self and others (Selman, 1980). Some young adults will be able to incorporate multi-level needs from a societal perspective, some will be able to coordinate different needs simultaneously, and others will merely be able to see other peoples' needs through their own needs (self interests).

Cultural Differences in Perspective Taking Abilities

It is hypothesized that there is a close relationship between "what is in the culture" and "how individuals behave" (Turiel, 1983a, p. 54). Therefore, cultural norms influence people's judgments and behaviors. For example, people in an individualistic society (such as America) may behave according to their own personal wishes and may make judgments based on what they think is right or wrong, or on what the law orders. Individuals in a collective society (such as Taiwan) may do what they think is best for society. Chinese children are often asked to think about the consequences of their behaviors, to maintain harmony, to avoid conflicts, to be sensitive to other people's needs as if they were in the other's position, to sacrifice the small self for the larger society and to behave according to societal expectations. Chinese children are often asked to think of the consequences of their behavior so as
to maintain harmony in conflict situations. In order to perform the above behaviors, individuals require at least perspective taking level 2 abilities (reciprocal and self-reflective). Although this paper is not geared toward examining the perspective taking abilities of children or pre-adolescents, it argues that the majority of Chinese people will reach perspective taking level 2 at an earlier age compared to their American counterparts. Further, in order to be sensitive to others, individuals require abilities to put themselves in the other’s position, which requires Perspective taking level 3 abilities (third-person and mutual). In order to behave according to the social norms and to sacrifice oneself for the welfare of the larger society, individuals require perspective taking level 4 abilities (in-depth and societal). Therefore, Chinese people will be able to demonstrate similar, if not higher, perspective taking abilities than their American counterparts.

The Relationship between Concepts of Intimacy and Perspective Taking Abilities

In a structural-developmental point of view of the relationship between concepts of intimacy and perspective taking abilities, perspective taking abilities reflect one aspect of an individual’s cognitive abilities and represent the basic structures underlying the individual’s concepts of social relations in at least four interpersonal relationships: concepts of individuals, friendships, peer relations, and parent-child relations (Selman, 1980). Selman (1977, 1980) also proposed that the attainment of each perspective taking level (structure) is logically "necessary but not sufficient" for the demonstration of a structurally parallel stage in the development of
concepts of social relations (content area). Therefore, this study also provides an opportunity to test Selman’s model; it also extends Selman’s (1980) research to a cross-cultural comparison of female young adults.

Selman (1980) conducted a structural analysis to assess stages of concepts of intimacy based on the theoretical levels of perspective taking. His model assessed the development of different issues based on the underlying structure of the perspective taking levels (e.g., trust, jealousy, conflict resolution and intimacy issues in friendship) and conducted models of interpersonal understanding in four types of relationships. For example, in the friendship relationship, parallel to equivalent levels of perspective taking, stage 2 is "Close friendship as fair-weather cooperation"; stage 3 is "Close friendship as intimate and mutual sharing", and stage 4 is "Close friendship as autonomous interdependence" (for details see Selman, 1980). The "level x issue" is a model of interpersonal understanding in which the issue development is hypothesized to proceed through these levels in an ordered sequence (Gurucharri and Selman, 1982).

In Selman’s (1980) view, subjects can demonstrate both a particular level of perspective-taking and the equivalent stage of concepts of relations; or show a particular perspective taking level but not the parallel concepts or relations stage; however, "there can be no subject at a given concepts of relations stage who does not also have the parallel perspective taking level" (Selman, 1977, p. 4). A perspective taking level may develop before or with interpersonal reasoning, but not after; and it does not cause the same stage development of concepts of relations.
Perspective taking abilities serve as "a feedback system, in which interpersonal experience stimulates interpersonal reasoning which in turn stimulates and is itself stimulated by restructuring of perspective taking level" (Selman, 1977, p. 4). He speculated that an individual's past social experiences may foster the reorganization and development of perspective taking abilities. In other words, perspective taking abilities "provide the means for the reinterpretation (assimilation) of social experience at a level that makes sense" for the individual (they represent what social knowledge the individual does know). "Relevant social experiences that do not quite make sense at a particular level provide the elements" for the individual to "change his or her organizational structure (to accommodate), to one that is more advanced cognitively"; and thereby to interpret greater complexities of social organization (to become) (Selman, 1980, p. 79). The concepts of intimacy proceed through perspective taking levels; and the level sequence formulated from content areas could vary depending on the content - the type of relationships (Selman, 1980).

However, Selman's (1980) model was constructed from empirical studies on American people, and he suggested that people who strive for independence are at a higher stage than those who value intimate others as part of one another. This study argues that those Chinese young adults who demonstrate their highest level perspective taking abilities might not develop their "highest stage" in concepts of intimacy according to Selman's (1980) model because of their collective cultural norms and world views and differences in the timing of their intimate relationships.
Depending on their cultural norms and experiences, some people, especially young women, may not develop the highest concepts of relations (CR 4), according to Selman's model. Women may have different developmental experiences and different ways of understanding themselves and their relationships with others (Belenky, Clinichy, Goldberger, and Tarule, 1986; Gilligan, 1982). Women also tend to be more connected in relationships while men tend to be more separated and individuated (Gilligan, 1982). Since Chinese cultural norms discourage "independence" (one concept in CR 4 in Selman's model) either from the family or in relationships in general (Tseng, 1992), more Chinese females will not reach the "highest stages" in concepts of intimacy even if their capacities to do so are evident (even if the same level of perspective taking abilities is demonstrated).

Since the relationship between content and structure still needs empirical support, the author conducted a pilot study according to the subjects' age and cultural norms in the areas of intimate relationships to examine perspective taking levels and concepts of relations separately in American and Chinese female university students (Lin, J.C.G., 1990). The results showed that both American and Chinese female young adults demonstrated perspective taking abilities as described in Selman's (1980) model; and that all subjects' perspective taking levels were higher or equal to parallel concepts of relations stages. However, the Chinese woman who demonstrated perspective taking level 4 only showed stage 3 concepts of relations. Further, not all concepts of relations data were described in Selman's (1980) model. Certain Chinese
concepts of relations (e.g. concepts of "Yuan", dating attitudes) were not described in Selman's model.

Selman's model of friendship and peer relationships was also applied in Lin's study (Lin, W.N., 1990) of sixth-grade male students in Taiwan. He found that the highest stages of concepts of friendships were higher than concepts of peer relationships within the same subjects and that certain issues elicited more varied responses than others. For example, issues such as formation, trust, and intimacy-closeness resulted in more varied responses among his Taiwan Chinese subjects than those of jealousy, conflict resolution, and termination (Lin, W.N., 1990). He attributed these results to the different nature of the dilemmas and the subjects' abilities and experiences in understanding these dilemmas. He suggested that the dilemmas ought to be modified according to subjects' age and culture so that subjects could relate to the situations, thus allowing the researcher to get more data.

In summary, this study examined the stages of concepts of relations and the level of perspective taking separately. If the necessary but not sufficient condition hypothesis is true, then the individual's perspective taking level should always be higher or equal to the parallel stages of concepts of relations in a given domain. Assuming the above hypothesis is true, (that $PT \geq CR$), then not all subjects would demonstrate the same level of perspective taking abilities and stage of concepts of intimacy and not all people who do demonstrate the highest level of perspective taking abilities will have already developed their highest stage of concepts of intimacy. This is because cultural norms may determine the level of intimacy appropriate in a
relationship (Hinde, 1979). The implications of the results could either confirm or force reconsideration of Selman's (1980) hypothesis of the relationship between the structure and the content area.
Method

Subjects

Twenty-four female university students, twelve white Americans from the U.S. and twelve Chinese from Taiwan, participated in this study. An effort was made to match subjects from each cultural group to minimize demographic differences such as age, educational level, and gender. However, the subjects might have different religious beliefs and come from different ethnic groups as part of the "white" American and the "Taiwan Chinese" culture.¹

All subjects were 18 to 23 years old (freshmen to seniors). The American subjects were all white female students of different ethnic backgrounds (Swiss-German, Italian, Italian-Polish, Portuguese-Canadian French, Norwegian, English, Indian-Italian, Portuguese, and four who did not specify), religions (Catholic, Protestant, and none), majors (Comparative Literature, English, Political Science, Urban Forestry, Hotel and Restaurant, Human Service, Physical Education, Music Therapy, Elementary Education, Early Childhood Education), and residences of origin (one from Ohio, the rest from different parts of Massachusetts). All were attending the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, at the time of the interviews.

¹ Selman (1980, p. 183) pointed out that his model is less concerned with the sub-cultural differences among individuals but with the "universal" "sequenced qualities" of "social thought" in the "natural" or "normal" age-range of children and adults. Further, he found no significant difference in the effects due to race or the interaction between race and social class in his sample (p. 188). He also failed to find gender difference in his sample, after matching age, race, and social class (t, (45) = 1.49, p = .20) but he pointed out that future studies should examine gender differences more carefully, selecting from across age ranges and social experiences.
The Chinese subjects were from four different universities, three in Taipei and one in Taichung, Taiwan. They had different majors (Sociology, Social Work, Educational Psychology, German and Agriculture), religions (Buddhist, Catholic, Protestant, and none), and original residences (from north of Taiwan to south of Taiwan). Although all of the Chinese subjects were born in Taiwan, some of their parents had lived in mainland China before 1949. All the subjects were volunteers, referred either by their instructors or self-referred by an announcement posted at their universities.  

Instruments

Selman’s (1980) work on interpersonal closeness in the concepts of friendship domain was modified for the purposes of this study. Appendix C contains information on the development of the instruments. Based on the structure of Selman’s (1980, p. 322-323) "friends dilemma" (adolescent and adult version), and based on the results of a pilot study, four relationship dilemmas were developed in English and then translated into Chinese for this study. These dilemmas included situations involving a same-sex relationship, an opposite-sex relationship, a boyfriend-girlfriend relationship and a mother-daughter relationship (see Appendix D).

After consulting with experts familiar with both Chinese and American culture as well as developmental theories, these dilemmas were believed to contain

---

2 Even though many subjects were in education or a sociology related major, none of the American and Chinese subjects were familiar with Selman’s model.
appropriately ambiguous and problematic situations which often occur among female college students in American culture and in Taiwan Chinese society. In each dilemma, "elements of intimacy" described by Perlman and Fehr (1987, p. 17) were also incorporated. Each dilemma was followed by five or six specific questions and ten general questions at the end (see Appendix D). These questions were similar to those Selman used to probe for "factors which made for close and affectionate friendships" (Selman, 1980, p. 323) and perspective taking abilities.

Each dilemma was presented to the subject on a separate sheet of paper. The subject was asked to read the story. After reading, standardized questions were asked by the interviewer. The dilemma constructs are described below in the order in which they were administered.

**Same-sex Dilemma**

Becky and Jane are both 18 years old, university freshmen. Both are from the same small town. Becky and Jane have been good friends; they have played and done things together for years. They often talk about personal matters and provide support for each other.

At the present time, Becky and Jane go to the same university and are roommates. They also take a couple of classes together. Becky values education very much and she studies very hard. On the other hand, Jane views going to college as an opportunity to meet a nice young man.

Recently, Jane missed a few morning classes because of late dates. She hasn’t been going to the library or eating in the dining common with Becky like she used to. Becky was worried about Jane and advised Jane not to stay out late and miss classes but Jane would not listen to Becky.

Now, there is a mid-term examination coming. Jane asks Becky to lend her the class notes and help her to prepare for the examination. Becky tells Jane that unless Jane promises to "behave" herself, not to miss
class again and date late, she will not help her. Jane is upset and tells Becky that she is not her mother and she must be jealous that she has gone out with boys. Jane further tells Becky that she won’t need her help and she will not be her friend anymore.

Same-sex intimacy elements were built into this dilemma (e.g., sharing privacy, providing support, coming from the same town, knowing each other for a long time, doing a lot of things together, being roommates). Many freshmen leave home for the first time and try out new lifestyles. Differing goals (e.g. studying vs. partying) related to college life are common among university freshmen. Also, in Chinese society, students may take their grades more seriously than do their American counterparts. They may therefore be more willing to lend out their notes to their friends under conditions (e.g. behave yourself...) or depending on the nature of the relationship (lend to intimate friends but not to acquaintances). Therefore, both American and Chinese subjects should be able to relate to this dilemma and express their reasoning during the follow-up questions. Cultural differences in their concepts of intimacy were expected.

The subjects were likely to have had personal experiences of this kind or to know someone who has had similar experiences, providing a frame of reference to stimulate the expression of their thoughts. For example, they may express that the "intimacy elements" described in the dilemma are not sufficient to make an intimate same-sex relationship and may describe their ideal intimate relationship. They may refer to people they know, or to their own experiences, or discuss what they think the
problems are in this dilemma. From the responses, the researchers can discern their underlying reasoning and assign an appropriate CR or PT score.

The standardized questions following the dilemmas concern Becky’s thinking about what she will do, how she thinks the relationship will be affected after what has happened, and whether Jane meant what she said. These are used to elicit expressions of perspective taking abilities. Other questions are concerned with concepts of intimacy between same-sex friends.

Opposite-sex Dilemma

Kathleen, 19, and Jim, 20, are good friends because they both have been playing music in the band since they were in high school. Now they both go to the same university and continue playing music. Sometimes, Jim will come to Kathleen’s house to practice music after school. Jim has a sense of humor and he always makes Kathleen laugh.

Jim recently started going out with a girl, Lisa, who Kathleen doesn’t approve of. Kathleen thinks Lisa is manipulative, jealous, and distrustful and she thinks that Lisa is not good for Jim. Kathleen cares about Jim. She doesn’t know whether she should tell Jim what she thinks of Lisa.

This dilemma can be a tricky one. Such characteristics as having common interests and sharing similar personality traits are considered important in intimate relationships. This dilemma should provide good information concerning concepts of jealousy and conflict resolution.

In both American and Chinese culture, the cultural stereotypical images (e.g. in televisions and films) do not foster the idea that opposite-sex friends can be
intimate without being romantically involved. Therefore, this dilemma construct offers the subjects an opportunity to express their assumptions about what kind of relationship Jim and Kathleen have and why Kathleen uses such strong words about Lisa even though Jim just started going out with her (e.g. Kathleen might be jealous; or Kathleen cares about Jim and she is worried about Jim getting hurt because people in love cannot see what they are getting into; or Kathleen has more feelings toward Jim than she is aware of).

Subjects were asked to predict what Kathleen will do. In this dilemma, another person, Lisa, is added to the scenario. Subjects at a higher PT level might choose to compare and contrast different sets of perspectives (from the three people and their triangular relationship). Other questions concern concepts of intimacy between opposite-sex friends.

Boyfriend-Girlfriend Dilemma

John and Tina are both 24. They met in their freshman year in college and have been seeing each other ever since. They do a lot of things together but they don't usually talk about their feelings with each other. Sometimes, they talk about their future but they never really plan anything.

After graduating from the university, John found a good job. John has a close relationship with his family so he still lives at home. Tina went on to graduate school and she lives near the university. She usually visits John on weekends.

Now, Tina is finishing up her graduate school. She has a job offer near her parents' home but it is several hundred miles away from John. The job is something she always wanted but she also cares about her relationship with John very much. She doesn't know what to do.
Young adults in their twenties are in the process of separating from parents and developing a sense of self, goals, values and life choices (Levinson et al., 1978). They are making their first major independent decisions regarding issues such as marriage, occupation, residence and living style. In this constructed scenario, Tina and John have been going out for perhaps five or six years but they don’t really talk about their feelings and do not have definite plans for their future. Talking about feelings could be one of the most private and important things that a boyfriend and a girlfriend do. However, this may not be true for Chinese people since Chinese cultural norms do not encourage people to express their feelings. Choosing between love and career is always difficult when both individuals have invested in education but are pursuing different career goals. In addition, 24-year-old Chinese females are usually under some pressure to find a husband. John is close to his family but the constructed dilemma does not include information on whether Tina is also close to hers. Since relationships with family of origin and with a lover are always big issues in young adulthood, this dilemma is expected to elicit responses demonstrating the subjects’ concepts of intimacy. Culturally different responses are expected since Chinese people have different dating attitudes and expectations; Chinese women are also traditionally expected to value marriage over their careers.

This dilemma offers an opportunity to probe the subjects’ concepts of decisions on nurturing or breaking up a long-term relationship, and on their ideal partner and ideal relationship. It may also provide some information about cultural differences regarding what female Chinese and American young adults value and how they will
go about making a decision (e.g. based on one person’s decision or on mutual decisions; directly confront John with what he wants; confirm the level of intimacy and the type of commitment they have; or indirectly ask John’s opinions so as to guess John’s thoughts). Subjects (females) were asked to predict what Tina (a female) will do. Again, subjects might express one perspective or coordinate all perspectives (e.g. Tina’s wishes, John’s wishes, Tina’s and John’s relationship, and their respective relationships with their own families). Other questions concern concepts of intimacy between boyfriend and girlfriend.

Mother-daughter Dilemma

Dianne is a college sophomore and lives a couple of hours away from home. She recently met Ken at a party. Ken is an art major. He likes drawing and hopes to be an artist someday. After a few dates, Dianne perceives Ken as a very hard working and intelligent young man with lots of potential in art. However, Dianne also knows that her mother won’t like Ken because she is never approving of artists. Her mother believes artists cannot make a living.

Dianne is the only child at home. Dianne’s father divorced her mother when Dianne was 10. Dianne’s mother worked very hard to raise Dianne and borrowed money to send Dianne to college. Dianne knows that her mother hopes Dianne will find a man who can provide well for her so that her life won’t be as difficult as her mother’s in the past. Therefore, Dianne didn’t tell her mother about Ken.

One day, Dianne’s mother has to travel on business near Dianne’s college so she stops by for a surprise visit. When she arrives, Dianne’s roommate tells her that Dianne is out at her boyfriend Ken’s senior art

---

3 The researchers (the experts and the author) believe that by designing a character that the subjects can relate to most, it is likely to stimulate their perspective taking abilities. In this case, we considered the character’s age, gender (ask female about a female), and university environment.
exhibition. Her mother is very angry. After Dianne comes back, she confronts Dianne on her deception and accuses her of betraying her mother's trust.

Dianne is torn. Her mother was always there for her when she needed help. However, she also likes Ken very much. She doesn't know what to do.

The mother-daughter relationship always creates an interesting dynamic. A certain degree of generational gap exists within the parent-child relationship. Choosing between one's own wishes and a mother's expectations is especially difficult if the mother has "sacrificed" herself for her daughter. Some parents apply their own values to their children's behaviors and choices while others are more open-minded. This dilemma allows us to assess the concepts of mother-daughter relationships and cultural differences regarding how young adults might balance their own dating choices with their parents' opinions.

This dilemma may also provide the best opportunity within this study to probe the subjects' highest developmental stages. Among all their interpersonal relationships, people usually "know" their parents the longest. They go through different life experiences with their family. Striving for some distance from their family of origin is an appropriate norm for young adults but it may play out differently in different cultures.

The subjects were asked to predict what Dianne will do since the subjects were all daughters of some kind. Other questions concern concepts of intimacy between mothers and daughters. This process should allow the subjects to express their ideas
of intimate relationships in different interpersonal contexts. We can use this method to assess how cultural norms might impact development and examine the relationship between concepts of intimacy and perspective taking abilities.

General Interview Questions

1. What are the differences between intimate relationships and non-intimate relationships? Which is better - one intimate friend or a group of non-intimate friends?

2. What's the importance of intimate relationships?

3. What makes a good intimate relationship? What makes it last? How is intimacy lost in relationships?

4. What kind of person makes a good partner in an intimate relationship? Why? What kind of person do you not want to have an intimate relationship with? Why not? Is it better to have intimate others similar to you or different from you? Why?

5. Is trust important in an intimate relationship? What is trust anyway?

6. What does it mean to be jealous in an intimate relationship? What does jealousy do in an intimate relationship? How can jealousy hurt an intimate relationship?

7. How do people in intimate relationships resolve conflicts?

8. In your experience, are there different kinds of intimate relationships? What are they? How are they different? What is intimacy in your opinion?

9. With whom do you feel most intimate with right now? Who is the person in relation to you? (questionnaire)

10. Is there anything I didn’t ask you about understanding intimate relationships which you think is important?

The general interview questions are concerned with concepts of intimacy: the differences between intimate and non-intimate relationships; the importance of
intimate relationships, and how intimate relationships last or are lost; who the ideal partner is in intimate relationships; and issues such as trust, jealousy, and conflict resolution in intimate relationships. The study also allows subjects to supplement their answers with information about what they think is important in intimate relationships. These questions offer an opportunity for the subjects to "summarize" their thoughts on relationships. They allow non-verbal or lower PT level subjects to express their general thoughts on intimacy. They may also discriminate CR 3 and CR 4 subjects (e.g. by allowing CR 4 subjects to express the "quantitative" vs. "qualitative" differences in intimate relationships and to compare and contrast the different types of intimate relationships).

Procedures

American subjects were interviewed during the spring and fall of 1991 and the Chinese subjects were interviewed during the fall of 91. Each interview took place in a private room. English was used to interview the American subjects and Mandarin Chinese was used to interview the Chinese subjects. Prior to the interview, each subject was told that this interview might take one to two hours and that this was a study comparing how people from different cultures understand the relationship problems of others. Each subject was also told the procedure of the interview: four stories will be shown to them; there would be some questions after each story (the dilemmas were presented as stories); at the end, some general questions will be asked. They were also told that these questions were standard and there were no
right or wrong answers. Although the interviews would be audiotaped and transcribed, their confidentiality was assured; the purpose of transcribing the audiotapes was to help the author to analyze the data for future study but they may stop any time they wish during the interview. The nature and purposes of this study were explained after the interview. A written consent form (see Appendix D) explaining the above procedure was signed by the subjects and by the author, and a copy was kept by each person. The author's address and phone number were included in case the subjects had further questions.

The American subjects read each dilemma in English and the Chinese subjects read them in Chinese. The presentation sequence was the same for both groups: same-sex intimate relationship (D1), opposite-sex intimate relationship (D2), boyfriend-girlfriend intimate relationship (D3) and mother-daughter intimate relationship (D4). None of the instruments included a title. Perspective taking and interpersonal issue questions were asked after each dilemma and the general interpersonal issue questions (GQ) were asked at the end. Not including the time to discuss the background of this study, American subjects were generally more verbal than the Chinese subjects. Chinese subjects took an average of 40-60 minutes and American subjects took about 50-75 minutes for the interviews. After the interviews, the subjects were asked to fill out the demographic data (see the last part of Appendix D). At the end, their participation was acknowledged, the purposes of this study were shared, and their feedback of the interview was solicited.
Data Analysis

Data were first coded by two independent raters, using Selman's (1979, 1980) model, and then analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitative data analysis investigated cultural differences in concepts of intimate relations stages and perspective taking levels of the coded American and Chinese data. The qualitative data analysis contained information on the content analysis on concepts of intimacy between the Chinese and American groups. It analyzed the cultural similarities and differences between the American and Chinese data including those non-storable data which might be culture specific within each group. The following sections describe the scoring manuals and scoring procedures.

Scoring manual

The qualitative analysis on concepts of relations was derived from the Close Friendship Manual in Assessing Interpersonal Understanding: an interview and scoring manual in five parts constructed by the Harvard-Judge Baker Social Reasoning Project (Selman et al., 1979). The qualitative analysis on perspective taking levels was described in The Growth of Interpersonal Understanding: Development and Clinical Analysis (Selman, 1980). In addition, half stages of concepts of relations and transitional levels of perspective taking were used in order to discriminate the subjects' protocols as much as possible. The half-stages and transitional levels employed here are similar to Selman's transitional scores (Selman, 1974). Concepts of relations stage scores could range from CR 0 to CR 4 with half stage score discrepancies. A half stage score such as CR 2/3 represents a transitional CR score
between concepts of relations stage 2 and stage 3. Perspective taking level scores could range from PT 0 to PT 4 with half level score discrepancies. A half level score such as PT 2+ represents a transitional PT score between perspective taking level 2 and level 3.

A full-stage score was given if the subject demonstrated enough evidence on any concept of the CR stage described in Selman’s (1979) manual. A half-stage score was assigned if the subject showed enough evidence above a full stage but not enough evidence for the next stage. In other words, if the subject was able to demonstrate she understands Stage 2 concepts of relations and also showed some signs of understanding CR 3 concepts without evidence she fully understands CR 3, she was assigned a CR score of 2/3. The same rules were applied to other half-stage scores in concepts of relations and transitional scores in perspective taking levels. Appendix E contains more detailed scoring examples on the Same-sex dilemma using the revised scoring manual.

The quantitative data obtained were analyzed by applying T-tests, Chi Square, and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients. Although the use of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients assumes quantitatively continuous variables for concepts of relations stages and perspective taking levels (whereas concepts of relation stages and perspective taking levels are assumed to be qualitatively distinct), the addition of a number of transitional stages/levels in the scoring procedures makes the scores more closely approximate to a continuum scale. This method was used as
a preliminary approach until more appropriate assessments for qualitative changes became available (Byrne, 1974).

The quantitative data analysis contained information on: (1) the demographic differences between the Chinese and American group (2) the number of the scorable concepts of relation data (Bits) (3) the reliability estimated for CR and PT (4) cultural differences on the range of and on concepts of relation stages (5) cultural differences on the range of and on perspective taking levels (6) the frequency distributions of concepts of relations stages and perspective taking levels between American and Chinese data (7) the concepts of relations stage scores and perspective taking level scores between American and Chinese data (8) the relationship between concepts of relations stages and perspective taking levels, and (9) the relationships between age and the developmental measures.

Scoring procedure

American interviews were transcribed in English and Chinese interviews were transcribed in Chinese after all the interviews were completed. The demographic data were examined and no major differences were found. The demographic data were put aside from the interview protocols/data so that the data could be blind scored. The scorable data were marked on concepts of relations on each issue (referred this score to bits) in each dilemma and on the general questions (D1-GQ as 5 domains in CR analysis).4 On concepts of relations, one question could have more than one scorable

4 The terms "concepts of relations", "concepts of intimate relationships", "concepts of intimacy" and "CR" are used interchangeably in this paper.
bit and also some unscorable data. Some other unscorable data were "culturally specific" and will be discussed in the qualitative data analysis. Some subjects, especially Chinese subjects, did not want to answer some of the questions again because they felt they had previously discussed similar topics. This happened because the standard questions were similar in structure in each domain. As a result, the Chinese data had less scorable units (bits) than the American data.

Since there were an unequal number of scorable CR data (bits) between subjects in both groups, the subjects’ highest, average and lowest score in each dilemma and in the general questions was used for data analysis. The highest score represented the best of the subject’s performance; average scores represented the average performance across levels (the mean of the total scorable bits) within each dilemma and general questions; and lowest scores represented the worst performance by the subjects.

To determine the reliability of the revised scoring procedures, two sets of American interview data (one high and one low) were initially selected to be scored independently by the two raters (by an expert and the author). CR bits were scored first and then the PT levels were scored. Each scorable CR bit within each domain was independently scored in terms of the CR stage it represented; each scorable PT level in each dilemma was also independently scored in terms of the PT level it represented. By examining the data, transitional CR scores and PT scores were defined by reference to Selman’s scoring manuals (1979, 1980). The scoring manual
was revised in that half stages CR and half levels PT were added in order to discriminate the data as much as possible.

When computing reliability or other aspects of quantitative analysis, a concepts of relations stage 2 was treated as CR 2 (score 2 in CR); concepts of relations stage 2/3 was treated as CR 2.5 (score 2.5 in CR), continuing with other stages. A perspective taking level 2 was treated as PT 2 (score 2 in PT); a perspective taking level 2+ was treated as PT 2.5 (score 2.5 in PT), continuing with other levels.

Selman (1980) gave one PT score for each dilemma. Therefore, in this study, the researchers also only gave the highest evidenced PT score in each dilemma. There were no perspective taking questions asked on General Questions (GQ); therefore, no PT score was given in GQ. One highest evidenced PT score was given in the four interpersonal domains independently after the completion of scoring bits of data. Therefore, there were 48 PT scores in each group (12 subjects x 4 dilemmas).

After the two raters had a satisfactory discussion about the use of the revised instrument, they used the same procedures to score the other 10 American interview protocols. One rater only gave 46 PT scores for the American data; therefore, only 38 scores (8 out of 46 were used to examine the revised manual as previously mentioned) were computed for inter-rater reliability on PT.

After examining the inter-rater reliability on CR and PT scores of the American data, the author scored the Chinese data following the same procedures and using the same scoring manual described above. Test-retest reliabilities of 20% of the Chinese data (the first dilemma - Same-sex dilemma) after three months were
employed for the reliability of the Chinese data because the author could not find someone who had established reliability in Selman’s (1980) model and who was also familiar with Chinese culture to run inter-rater tests. Since the author was one of the raters involved in the inter-rater reliabilities in the American data, she assumed that her errors within herself should be "stable". After the reliability scores were established, quantitative and qualitative data analysis were examined as described in the results session.
Results

Quantitative Analysis

The quantitative data were analyzed using the T-test method, the Chi Square method, and the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient procedure. A .05 level of significance was used as the critical value for all statistical decisions. However, the actual significance levels obtained will also be reported when appropriate.

The T-test method was employed to test whether the American and Chinese subjects were from the same age populations and whether there were differences between American and Chinese female college students in the attainment of the stages of concepts of relations and levels of perspective taking abilities. As previously mentioned, since the subjects in each group had different numbers of scorable concepts of relations bits, the highest, lowest, and average scores in each domain and across domains (total sample) were used.

The Chi Square method was used to examine the frequency distributions of the concepts of relations stages and perspective taking levels between American and Chinese data.

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations were employed to analyze the following reliabilities of this study: (1) the inter-rater reliabilities between two raters in the American data and the test-retest reliabilities after three months in the Chinese data; (2) the relationship between concepts of relations stages and perspective taking levels; (3) the subjects' highest concepts of relations scores and highest perspective taking
scores; and (4) the subjects’ ages and their corresponding concepts of relations stages and perspective taking levels.

**Differences in the Demographic Data**

The results show that the American subjects’ age (M = 20.83) did not differ significantly from the Chinese subjects (M = 20.75), (t(22) = .13, p < .90). These two groups were also similar in their gender and educational level. They were females ranging in age from 18 to 23, from freshman to senior in university settings. Therefore, pooled variances were used to compare the differences between American and Chinese CR and PT scores.

**Differences on Number of Scorable CR Data**

Although Selman’s (1979) methods seemed applicable for scoring the Chinese data, the Chinese data had less scorable CR bits than the American data. The scorable data were described in Selman’s (1979) scoring manual. Table 2.1 summarizes the information on the scorable concepts of relations data for American and Chinese subjects. The Chinese subjects each had 9 to 26 scorable CR bits across domains with an average of 16.25 scorable bits, whereas American subjects had 16 to 38 scorable CR units with an average of 23.58 scorable CR bits. In general, the Opposite-sex and Mother-daughter dilemmas had fewer scorable bits than the other domains for both Chinese and American subjects because the subjects were less expressive in these two dilemmas. It is possible that the instrument was less stimulating; or, that these experiences were less salient for American and Chinese subjects.
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Table 2.1

Concepts of Relations: Number of Scorable Bits
Produced by Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>GQ</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: D1 refers to Same-sex dilemma; D2 refers to Opposite-sex dilemma; D3 refers to Boyfriend-girlfriend dilemma, D4 refers to Mother-daughter dilemma; GQ refers to General Questions; and Total refers to the total scorable units (bits) of Concepts of Relations data in the total interviews.

Each interview produced multiple scorable units. 12 American and 12 Chinese female university students were interviewed. There are 283 scorable units (bits) for the interviews of American students, but only 223 were scored for inter-rater reliability (10 interviews).
Reliabilities

inter-rater reliability on the American data. Ten out of twelve American interview protocols (83.33% of the total American data) were scored on concepts of relations stage scores and on perspective taking level scores by two independent raters. Two types of reliability estimates were employed: exact agreement and the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient.

Table 2.2 contains a summary of information on the exact coding agreements of concepts of relations stage scores (CR) and perspective taking level scores (PT) between the two independent raters. These data were computed on all scorable CR bits and on overall PT scorable dilemmas. Results showed that the two raters tended to agree about 94% within half CR stages and to agree about 87% within half PT levels.

Table 2.3 contains a summary of information on the Pearson Product-Moment Correlations for data on Concepts of Relations for highest (High), average (Average), and lowest (Low) and total scorable bits (Bits) within each domain and across the five domains (total sample). The reliability ranges from \( r = .92 \) to \( r = .42 \). Overall, there were positive relationships between the two independent raters' scores on

1 According to Gurucharri's and Selman's (1982), previous studies on the same scoring procedures, the inter-coder reliability ranged from 82% to 93% for exact agreement of raters' interpersonal issues scores. Exact agreement is defined as no more than .25 score differences.

The inter-rater reliability between an original score and a blind scoring 6 months later was .91 with a range from .64 to .93 across issues in friendship domains (Selman, 1980).
Table 2.2

Inter-rater Reliability: Exact Agreement
in the American Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>CR Stages (%) (by Bits)</th>
<th>PT Levels (%) (by Dilemmas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exact Agreement</td>
<td>62.23 (n = 139)</td>
<td>57.89 (n = 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within ± 1/2</td>
<td>94.17 (n = 210)</td>
<td>86.84 (n = 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within ± 1</td>
<td>100 (n = 223)</td>
<td>97.36 (n = 37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within ± 1 1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (n = 38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n indicates number of scorable units produced in the interviews which were coded by two independent raters.
### Table 2.3

Inter-rater Reliability: Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients on Concepts of Relations Scores between Raters in the American Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Concepts of Relations Scores</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bits</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Reliability</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 223)</td>
<td>(n = 50)</td>
<td>(n = 50)</td>
<td>(n = 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma 1</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 43)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma 2</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 27)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma 3</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 52)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma 4</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 29)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Questions</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.92**</td>
<td>.86*</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 72)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .001

Note: There are unequal numbers of scorable bits of Concepts of Relation in each dilemma.
concepts of relations (CR) \( (p < .05) \) except for the reliability on the lowest scores (Low) on dilemma 2 and General Questions.

Table 2.4 contains a summary of information on the Pearson Product-Moment Correlations on highest PT scores for each dilemma as well as across the four dilemmas. The result showed that there were strong positive relationships between the two independent raters \( (r = .82 \) to \( r = .92) \).

In summary, the inter-rater reliability estimates on the American concepts of relations and perspective taking data were adequate. The two raters had high agreements on the revised scoring manuals.

test-retest reliability on the Chinese data. The Same-sex dilemma, accounting for 20% of the total Chinese data, was rescored three months after the initial scoring to examine the test-retest reliability of concepts of relations (CR) stage scores and perspective taking (PT) level scores.

The exact agreement between test-retest reliability interval for the Chinese CR scores is 88.57%. The exact agreement within half stages is 100%. The exact agreement on test-retest reliability for Chinese PT scores is 83.33%, with 100% agreement within half levels.

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations were computed between the initial scorable units on concepts of relations in Dilemma 1 (Same-sex relationship) and after three months. A strong positive relationship was found \( (r = .94; df = 68; p < .001) \). Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed between the initial perspective taking scores in Dilemma 1 and between the same PT scores
Table 2.4

Inter-rater Reliability: Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients on Perspective Taking Scores between Raters in the American Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective Taking Scores</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Dilemma 1</th>
<th>Dilemma 2</th>
<th>Dilemma 3</th>
<th>Dilemma 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Highest PT scores by Dilemmas)</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.86*</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>(n = 38)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>(n = 9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .001

Note: There is only one PT score (the highest evidenced score) given in each dilemma.
after three months. A strong positive relationship was also found (r = .93; df = 10; p < .001).

The test-retest reliability estimates on the Chinese CR and PT data showed a very high positive relationship on the rater’s scoring, suggesting that she was stable on her scoring.

To conclude, the reliabilities on this study were acceptable. The exact agreements on the Chinese data were similar to other studies using Selman’s methods; however, some of the exact agreements on the American data were a bit lower than those reported in other studies. In this study, however, half CR stages and half PT levels were added to Selman’s original methods and the agreements within half-stages were more satisfactory than those of exact agreements. The first rater seemed to be reliable on the American data and stable on the Chinese data; therefore, the errors in this study may be random. Cultural differences between concepts of relations and perspective taking scores were examined as followed.

**Differences on Concepts of Relations**

There were variations within most subjects’ CR scores within each domain as well as across domains. American subjects’ concepts of relations stages ranged from CR 1/2 to CR 4. Chinese subjects’ concepts of relation stages ranged from CR 2 to CR 4. Table 2.5 contains the T-test results on the differences in means of concepts of relations scores on highest (High), average (Average) and lowest (Low) CR scores within each domain (D1, D2, D3, D4 and GQ) and across domains (All) between the American and Chinese groups. Significant difference was found on (Low) on (GQ)
Table 2.5

Differences of Means of Concepts of Relations Scores
between American (N = 12) and Chinese (N = 12) Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>American Means</th>
<th>Chinese Means</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GQ</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GQ</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GQ</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>-2.31</td>
<td>.031*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>-2.13</td>
<td>.045*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

Note: D1 refers to Same-sex dilemma; D2 refers to Opposite-sex dilemma; D3 refers to Boyfriend-girlfriend dilemma, D4 refers to Mother-daughter dilemma; GQ refer to General Questions. All refers to mean of four dilemmas and General Questions.
\( t (22) = -2.31, p < .031 \), and on (Low) on (ALL) \( t (22) = -2.13, p < .045 \).

The inter-rater reliability on (Low) on (All) was \( r = .73, df = 48, p < .001 \), two tailed, and was \( r = .42, df = 8; p < .23 \), two tailed) on (Low) on (GQ). Except for the Opposite-sex dilemma (D2), the Chinese data had a mean larger than CR 3 on their highest (High) CR scores while for American subjects only the Boyfriend-Girlfriend dilemma (D3) and Mother-Daughter dilemma (D4) had a mean larger than CR 3. The results suggested that Chinese subjects as a group had higher means on their lowest (Low) CR scores across domains (All) and possibly also on General Questions (GQ) compared to their American counterparts.

Table 2.6 contains the frequency distributions of concepts of relations stages of American and Chinese data. Significant differences were found on the distributions of the scorable concepts of relations bits between American and Chinese data \( \chi^2 = 38.40, df = 5, p < .001 \). American data produced proportionally more data scored at the lower stages than the Chinese data (see figure 1). Approximately 49.82\% of the total scorable American CR bits \( n = 141, N = 283 \), compared to about 25.64\% of the total of Chinese scorable bits \( n = 50, N = 195 \), were scored CR stage 2/3 or lower. Although the mode of CR bits for both American and Chinese fell into CR 3, the results suggested that more Chinese gave "CR 3" analogous answers and that more American subjects gave "CR 2" or "CR 2/3" analogous answers.

To conclude, the Chinese group had higher means on their concepts of relations scores compared to their American counterparts within domains and across
Table 2.6
Frequency Distribution of Concepts of Relations Stages between American and Chinese Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CR 1/2</th>
<th>CR 2</th>
<th>CR 2/3</th>
<th>CR 3</th>
<th>CR 3/4</th>
<th>CR 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>(n=54)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(38.89%)</td>
<td>(22.22%)</td>
<td>(25.93%)</td>
<td>(11.11%)</td>
<td>(1.85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>(n=47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(10.64%)</td>
<td>(19.15%)</td>
<td>(48.94%)</td>
<td>(12.76%)</td>
<td>(8.51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>(n=38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.63%)</td>
<td>(47.37%)</td>
<td>(18.42%)</td>
<td>(18.42%)</td>
<td>(7.89%)</td>
<td>(5.26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>(n=25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(40%)</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>(n=64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(6.25%)</td>
<td>(37.5%)</td>
<td>(43.75%)</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>(n=45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(22.22%)</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(35.55%)</td>
<td>(35.55%)</td>
<td>(6.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>(n=38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(13.16%)</td>
<td>(36.84%)</td>
<td>(28.95%)</td>
<td>(15.79%)</td>
<td>(5.26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>(n=29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
<td>(13.79%)</td>
<td>(27.58%)</td>
<td>(20.69%)</td>
<td>(31.03%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>(n=89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(1.12%)</td>
<td>(29.21%)</td>
<td>(41.57%)</td>
<td>(14.61%)</td>
<td>(4.49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>(n=49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(2.04%)</td>
<td>(22.45%)</td>
<td>(53.06%)</td>
<td>(16.33%)</td>
<td>(6.12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>(N=283)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.35%)</td>
<td>(20.14%)</td>
<td>(29.33%)</td>
<td>(34.28%)</td>
<td>(12.72%)</td>
<td>(3.18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>(N=195)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(6.15%)</td>
<td>(19.49%)</td>
<td>(42.56%)</td>
<td>(21.03%)</td>
<td>(10.77%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1

Frequency Distributions of Concepts of Relations Stages between American and Chinese Data

- • - American Data (ALL)
- △ - Chinese Data (ALL)
domains. Significant difference was found on (Low) on General Questions and across domains. Significant differences were found on the frequency distributions between American and Chinese concepts of relations stages. More Americans gave "CR 2" or "CR2/3" answers; more Chinese gave CR 3 answers.

Differences on Perspective Taking Abilities

The American and Chinese groups' perspective taking levels ranged from PT 2 to PT 4. Table 2.7 contains information on differences of means on perspective taking level scores between the American and Chinese data. Both the American and Chinese group demonstrated their highest perspective taking levels (PT 3 and higher) on the Mother-daughter dilemma (Dilemma 4). In addition, Chinese subjects also demonstrated PT > 3 on the Boyfriend-girlfriend dilemma (Dilemma 3). Further, the mode for PT fell in PT 3+ in the Chinese data (n = 14) and in PT 3 in the American data (n = 17). For both Chinese and American subjects together, the mode of PT fell in Level 3 (n = 28). Although these results showed that the subjects in the Chinese group in general had higher means compared to their American counterparts, there was no significant difference found on the Perspective Taking level scores between American and Chinese subjects at the (p < .05) level.

Table 2.8 contains the frequency distributions of perspective taking levels between American and Chinese data. Although proportionally the Chinese data had higher PT scores, the results failed to find significant differences (at the .05 level) in the distributions of perspective taking levels between the two group (\( \chi^2 = 7.54, df = 4 \)) (see figure 2).
Table 2.7

Differences of Means of Perspective Taking Scores between American (N = 12) and Chinese (N = 12) Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>American Means</th>
<th>Chinese Means</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma 1</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma 2</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma 3</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma 4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: D1 refers to Same-sex dilemma; D2 refers to Opposite-sex dilemma; D3 refers to Boyfriend-girlfriend dilemma; D4 refers to Mother-daughter dilemma.
Table 2.8

Frequency Distribution of Perspective Taking Levels between American and Chinese Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PT2</th>
<th>PT2+</th>
<th>PT3</th>
<th>PT3+</th>
<th>PT4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1</strong> American (n=12)</td>
<td>4 (33.33%)</td>
<td>2 (16.67%)</td>
<td>4 (33.33%)</td>
<td>2 (16.67%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1</strong> Chinese (n=12)</td>
<td>1 (8.33%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>5 (41.67%)</td>
<td>2 (16.67%)</td>
<td>1 (8.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2</strong> American (n=12)</td>
<td>5 (41.67%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (33.33%)</td>
<td>1 (8.33%)</td>
<td>2 (16.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2</strong> Chinese (n=12)</td>
<td>2 (16.67%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (8.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3</strong> American (n=12)</td>
<td>1 (8.33%)</td>
<td>4 (33.33%)</td>
<td>5 (41.67%)</td>
<td>1 (8.33%)</td>
<td>1 (8.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3</strong> Chinese (n=12)</td>
<td>1 (8.33%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (8.33%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (8.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D4</strong> American (n=12)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (41.67%)</td>
<td>4 (33.33%)</td>
<td>1 (8.33%)</td>
<td>2 (16.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D4</strong> Chinese (n=12)</td>
<td>1 (8.33%)</td>
<td>2 (16.67%)</td>
<td>2 (16.67%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>4 (33.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL</strong> American (N=48)</td>
<td>10 (20.83%)</td>
<td>11 (22.92%)</td>
<td>17 (35.42%)</td>
<td>5 (10.42%)</td>
<td>5 (10.42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL</strong> Chinese (N=48)</td>
<td>5 (10.42%)</td>
<td>11 (22.92%)</td>
<td>11 (22.93%)</td>
<td>14 (29.17%)</td>
<td>7 (14.58%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the results suggested that the Chinese group had higher means (p < .05) on their lowest (Low) CR scores across domains (All) and possibly also on the General Questions (GQ) compared to their American counterparts.

American subjects gave a higher percentage of CR 2 and CR 2/3 answers than their Chinese counterparts. The reason that fewer Chinese subjects talked from a fair-weather (CR 2) and Reflective, second person perspective (PT 2) could be differences in language, culture or both. Finally, the Chinese subjects also had higher means on their concepts of relations stage scores and perspective taking level scores.

Significant differences were found on the frequency distributions of concepts of relations stages but not on the perspective taking levels between American and Chinese data.

**Relationship between Concepts of Relations Stage Scores and Perspective Taking Level Scores**

Table 2.9 contains information on the American and Chinese subjects' ages, their highest PT scores and their corresponding CR scores in each dilemma and also across dilemmas (Overall). The results indicated that not all CR scores corresponded to the same PT scores in all ranges; these inconsistent scores appeared in all four dilemmas. All three possibilities (PT < CR; PT = CR; and PT > CR) for the relationship between perspective taking levels and concepts of relation stages were presented in both the American and Chinese data. Therefore, the data did not seem to support the assumption of levels of perspective taking abilities as the "necessary" condition for the same stage of concepts of relations.
Table 2.9

Summary of the Highest PT and the Corresponding CR Scores in the American and Chinese Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Dilemma 1</th>
<th>Dilemma 2</th>
<th>Dilemma 3</th>
<th>Dilemma 4</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PT CR</td>
<td>PT CR</td>
<td>PT CR</td>
<td>PT CR</td>
<td>PT CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>PT CR</td>
<td>PT CR</td>
<td>PT CR</td>
<td>PT CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>18 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>2 2/3</td>
<td>2+ 2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>19 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3/4</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>2+ 2/3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>20 2+ 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3/4</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>20 3 2/3</td>
<td>3 2/3</td>
<td>2+ 3</td>
<td>2+ 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>21 2+ 2/3</td>
<td>2 2/3</td>
<td>2+ 2/3</td>
<td>2+ 2/3</td>
<td>2+ 2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>21 3 2/3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>22 2 2</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>2+ 2/3</td>
<td>2+ 2/3</td>
<td>2+ 2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>22 3 3+</td>
<td>3 2/3</td>
<td>3+ 3/4</td>
<td>3+ 3/4</td>
<td>3+ 3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>22 3+ 4</td>
<td>4 3/4</td>
<td>4 3/4</td>
<td>4 3/4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>23 2 2</td>
<td>2 2/3</td>
<td>2+ 3</td>
<td>3 3/4</td>
<td>3 3/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Subject H had her highest CR (CR 4) in General Questions. General Questions were not listed on this table because no PT score was given on General Questions.
Note: Overall refers to the subject’s highest CR stage in four dilemmas plus general questions and their highest PT level in four dilemmas.

(Continued on the next page)
Table 2.9 (cont.)

Summary of the Highest PT and the Corresponding CR Scores in the American and Chinese data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Dilemma 1</th>
<th>Dilemma 2</th>
<th>Dilemma 3</th>
<th>Dilemma 4</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Overall refers to the subject’s highest CR stage in four dilemmas plus general questions and their highest PT level in four dilemmas.
One of the questions was to examine how American and Chinese subjects in perspective taking level 4 performed on their corresponding concepts of relations stages. The results indicated that the subjects in both groups who demonstrated level 4 perspective taking abilities also showed stage 4 concepts of relations on their "Overall" scores (American subjects A and G and Chinese subjects I, C, H, and A). In addition to the "Overall" performances, two American subjects (subjects A and G) showed PT 4; one of them (subject A) also showed CR 4 on Opposite-sex, Mother-daughter dilemmas, but the other one (Subject G) only demonstrated CR 3/4 in Opposite-sex, Boyfriend-girlfriend and Mother-daughter dilemmas. However, all Chinese subjects (subjects I, C, H, A) who showed PT 4, also showed CR 4 (subjects I, H, and A on Mother-daughter dilemma, subject C on all four dilemmas). In other words, the four Chinese subjects who demonstrated PT 4 all expressed CR 4 on the Mother-daughter dilemma. These subjects expressed wishes of being independent from their mothers.

In examining how CR 4 subjects performed, the results showed that not all subjects in both groups who demonstrated stage 4 concepts of relations manifested level 4 perspective taking abilities. For example, American subject A and Chinese subject K demonstrated PT 3+ on the Same-sex dilemma; Chinese subject I demonstrated PT 3+ on the Opposite-sex dilemma; Chinese subject L also demonstrated PT 3+ on the Boyfriend-girlfriend dilemma; and American subject H demonstrated PT 3 and Chinese subjects L and K demonstrated 3+ on "Overall".
As shown in Table 2.9, the American data contain 19 inconsistent scores between CR and PT scores and 18 of these scores are within a half-level or stage score difference (N = 48; 60.41% exact agreement). The Chinese data contain 9 inconsistent scores and these scores are all within a half-level or stage difference (N = 48; 81.25% exact agreement). The relationship between PT and CR remains unclear in terms of whether structure (PT) is "the necessary but not sufficient" condition of content (CR). Since this study added half stages and levels to the original design, it is unclear whether a half-stage or level is significantly large enough to either confirm or dispute the assumption that PT is the "necessary" condition of CR (PT > CR).

Table 2.10 contains Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients between American and Chinese subjects' highest Concepts of Relations Stage scores and their highest Perspective Taking level scores within each of the four dilemmas and for the two groups combined. The results suggested that there was a very high positive correlation between subjects' perspective taking levels and concepts of relations stages.

The Pearson Product-Moment correlation between the highest CR stage within the five domains and highest PT level score in the four dilemmas across subjects is (r = .88; N = 12) in the Chinese group, (r = .80; N = 12) in the American group, and (r = .85, N = 24) for the two groups combined.

The squared correlation coefficient represents, in percentage terms, the strength of the relationship between the two variables (Welkowitz, Ewen and Cohen,
Table 2.10

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Coefficient between
The Highest Concepts of Relation Score (CR) and
the Highest Perspective Taking level score (PT)
within Each of the Four Dilemmas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PT</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>American</td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table reflects the correlations between subjects' highest CR scores and highest PT scores. Since there is no PT score in General Questions, the highest CR score from the four dilemmas and general questions (five domains) and the highest PT level in four dilemmas were computed.

Note: D1 refers to Same-sex dilemma; D2 refers to Opposite-sex dilemma; D3 refers to Boyfriend-girlfriend dilemma, D4 refers to Mother-daughter dilemma.
Therefore, within each group, the relationship between the highest CR stage and the highest PT level scores was 64% in the American group, 77.44% in the Chinese group, and 72.25% in the two groups combined. These results suggested that the development of concepts of relations stages and perspective taking levels could be inter-related. These results thus raised the question of whether perspective taking levels and concepts of relations stages were two different aspects of measuring the same construct in this study.

To conclude, there were very high positive correlations between American and Chinese subjects' perspective taking levels and concepts of relations stages. Although this study was not designed to test the assumption that perspective taking levels (structure) are prerequisite conditions for concepts of relations (content), the results by implication did not support this assumption. The relationship between perspective taking levels and concepts of relations stages could be that they both measure the same constructs rather than one being a pre-requisite condition for the other. Finally, surprisingly, more Chinese subjects than American subjects demonstrated their need for autonomy or interdependence in their intimate relationships in all four types of intimate relationships, especially in the Mother-daughter intimate relationship.

Relationship Between Demographic Data and Developmental Measures

relationships between subjects' ages and their corresponding Concept of Relations scores. Table 2.11 contains the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients on American and Chinese subjects' ages and their corresponding highest
Table 2.11

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient of Subjects' Ages and their Concepts of Relations Scores in the American and Chinese Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$r_{L}$</td>
<td>prob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma 1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma 2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma 3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma 4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Five</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domains</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$, two-tailed.

Note: Age, educational level, and gender are controlled to be equivalent across cultural groups.
(High), average (Average) and lowest (Low) CR scores in each of the five domains and also across domains (ALL five Domains).

Chinese subjects demonstrated much stronger positive relationships ( p < .05) between their ages and the corresponding CR scores except in one domain (Low on Boyfriend-girlfriend dilemma) while there was no significant relationship found in the American group. Chinese subjects' Boyfriend-girlfriend intimate experiences could be less salient for their ages. The results suggested that between the ages of 18 to 23, age was more salient for the Chinese group than for the American group. Chinese subjects may have had more homogeneous intimate experiences. The data also suggested that American subjects may have had more variabilities in their social experiences and that these heterogenous experiences may not relate to their ages.

Older Chinese students in this study had a few more years of college than younger students. Therefore, college experiences may affect the development of concepts of intimacy for Chinese students but not necessarily for American students. In other words, the development of intimate experiences for Chinese university female students was more homogenous than for their American counterparts.

relationships between subjects' ages and their corresponding Perspective Taking scores. Table 2.12 contains the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients on American and Chinese subjects' ages and their corresponding PT scores. The results showed that the Chinese subjects demonstrated a very positive relationship between their age and their corresponding PT scores ( p < .05) in each dilemma as well as across dilemmas; however, no significant relationship was
Table 2.12

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient on Subjects’ Ages and their PT Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dilemma</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r )</td>
<td>prob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma 1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma 2</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma 3</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma 4</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .05 \), two tailed.

Note: Age, educational level, and gender are controlled to be equivalent across cultural groups.
detected in the American group. Previous studies conducted in the U.S. showed that PT levels were correlated with subjects' ages (Byrne, 1974). However, this study found positive relationships between the development of Perspective Taking abilities and subjects' age in the Chinese group but not in the American group.

To conclude, because the relationship between perspective taking levels and concepts of relationship was not clear, and because the Chinese data suggested a very high positive relationship between the two, it was not surprising to find that Chinese subjects' ages were highly correlated both with CR stage scores and with PT level scores.

relations between subject's current closest intimate relationships and their highest corresponding Concepts of Relation stages and Perspective Taking levels.¹

The American subjects' closest intimate relationships were with boyfriends (n = 7), with same-sex friends (n = 4), with mothers (n = 2) and with an opposite-sex friend (n = 1). The American subjects' highest CR stage scores were in the Boyfriend-girlfriend dilemma (n = 10), the Mother-daughter dilemma (n = 9), the Opposite-sex dilemma (n = 4) and the Same-sex dilemma (n = 2). The American subjects' highest PT level scores were in the Mother-daughter dilemma (n = 10), the Boyfriend-girlfriend dilemma (n = 8), the Opposite-sex dilemma (n = 7) and the Same-sex dilemma (n = 4).

¹ Some of the subjects said they were currently most intimate with more than one person. As a result, there were fourteen most intimate persons in the American group and sixteen in the Chinese group. Also, each subject may show their highest CR stages and PT levels in more than one dilemma as mentioned in the text.
The Chinese subjects’ closest intimate relationships were with same-sex friends (n = 8), with opposite-sex friends (n = 4), with boyfriends and with mothers (n = 2 each). The Chinese subjects’ highest CR stage scores were in the Mother-daughter dilemma (n = 8), in the Boyfriend-girlfriend dilemma (n = 7), the Same-sex dilemma (n = 6), and in the Opposite-sex dilemma (n = 4). The Chinese subjects’ highest PT level scores were in the Mother-daughter dilemma (n = 12), the Boyfriend-girlfriend dilemma (n = 8), the Same-sex dilemma (n = 6) and the Opposite-sex dilemma (n = 5).

These results suggested that there were cultural differences concerning whom the subjects were most intimate with. Seven out of twelve American subjects said that they were most intimate with their boyfriends whereas eight out of twelve Chinese subjects said that they were currently most intimate with their same-sex friends. Seven out of twelve Chinese subjects also said they did not have a boyfriend.

Some of the subjects demonstrated their highest concepts of relation stages and highest perspective taking levels in more than one dilemma. More American subjects showed their highest CR stage scores in the Boyfriend-girlfriend dilemma and more Chinese subjects showed their highest CR stage scores in the Mother-daughter dilemma. Both American and Chinese subjects demonstrated their highest PT level scores in the Mother-daughter dilemma.

The results showed that ten out of twelve American subjects and nine out of twelve Chinese subjects demonstrated their highest concepts of relations stage in their current closest intimate relationship. Further, eight out of twelve American subjects
and eight out of twelve Chinese subjects demonstrated their highest perspective taking levels on their closest intimate relationships. Although not all subjects demonstrated their highest CR stages and PT levels on the persons they were currently most intimate with, there seemed to be a fairly high relationship between highest CR stages and PT levels on their current most intimate relationships.

Summary of Quantitative Data Analysis

The results suggested that Selman’s (1979, 1980) model is applicable in assessing American and Chinese female university students’ concepts of relations stages and perspective taking levels. However, not all data were scorable and some of the non-scorable data (data not described in Selman’s manual) were culture specific (see qualitative data analysis). There were more scorable concepts of relations bits in the American data than in the Chinese data.

Transitional stages of concepts of relations and levels of perspective taking were used as references to Selman’s (1980) model. Inter-rater and test-retest reliabilities on this study were adequate, using the revised scoring manual. The concepts of relations stages ranged from stage 2 to stage 4 in American and Chinese subjects except in one subject who fell into stage 1/2 on the Same-sex dilemma. All subjects’ perspective taking abilities ranged from level 2 to level 4; the predominant PT level (mode) was PT 3+ for the Chinese group, PT 3 for the American group and PT 3 for the Chinese and American subjects together.

Cultural differences were found on their concepts of relations stages in two domains (Low on All and GQ) and on the frequency distributions of the concepts of
relations stages between American and Chinese subjects. The Chinese group had higher means on the lowest Concepts of Relations scores across the total scorable bits in the five domains and possibly on the General Questions. The American subjects had more lower concepts of relations stages than their Chinese counterparts. These differences could result from language factors, cultural factors or both. Since the lowest scores had lower inter-rater reliability on the General Questions, it was also possible that the differences on the General Questions were due to random error.

There was a very strong positive relationship found between concepts of relations and perspective taking levels in this study. The results suggested that the development of concepts of relations stages and perspective taking levels could be inter-related. The implication of Selman's structural-development model, that perspective taking levels (structure) ought to be a prerequisite condition for concepts of relations (content), was not supported in this study. The relationship between perspective taking levels and concepts of relations stages could be that they are two measures of the same constructs rather than one being a pre-requisite condition for the other (the "necessary but not sufficient" assumption). The results thus raised the question of whether perspective taking levels and concepts of relations stages are two different aspects of measuring the same construct in this study.

Chinese subjects seemed to demonstrate strong positive relationships between age and their corresponding CR and PT scores except in one domain (Low on Boyfriend-girlfriend dilemma). However, there was no significant relationship found between subjects' CR and PT scores and their age in the American group. The
results suggested that American subjects' intimate social experiences may be heterogeneous across individuals and that those experiences may not relate to their age. Results also suggested that the Chinese subjects were more homogeneous in the timing of their intimate relationship experiences and that their college experiences may be important for the development of those experiences.

A cultural difference centered on the person with whom the subjects were most intimate with. Many American subjects said that they were most intimate with their boyfriends whereas many Chinese subjects said that they were currently most intimate with their same-sex friends; seven out of twelve Chinese subjects also said they did not have a boyfriend. More American subjects showed their highest CR stage scores in the Boyfriend-girlfriend dilemma and more Chinese subjects showed their highest CR stage scores in the Mother-daughter dilemma. Both American and Chinese subjects had different opinions about the need to be more independent from their family (parents). Surprisingly, more Chinese subjects demonstrated the need for autonomy or interdependence in their intimate relationships than did their American counterparts in all four types of intimate relationships, especially in the Mother-daughter intimate relationship.

More American subjects show their highest PT level scores in the Mother-daughter dilemma and the same was true for the Chinese subjects. Since subjects were likely to have had more experiences with their mothers, it is possible that past experiences could be one of the factors that fostered the development of higher levels of perspective taking abilities (Selman, 1977) and that previous experiences serve as
background knowledge for new levels of development (Dobert and Nunner-Winkler, 1985). Since the relationship between content and structure was not clear in this study, it is open to question whether changes in perspective taking abilities would result in changes in concepts of intimacy. Not all subjects demonstrated their highest perspective taking levels in their most intimate relationship but the majority of the subjects in both groups demonstrated their highest concepts of relations stages in these relationships.

Qualitative Analysis

Using Selman's (1979, 1980) model, the following section describes the similarities and differences between American and Chinese subjects on concepts of relations (concepts of intimacy). It explores cultural similarities and differences in the following concepts: formation of intimate relationships, importance of intimate relationships, ideal partner, closeness-intimacy, trust, jealousy, conflict resolution, and termination.

Content Analysis on Concepts of Intimacy

formation of intimate relationships. Both American and Chinese subjects demonstrated the importance of self-interest in forming relationships, and expressed the belief that compatible personalities are important in the formation of intimate friendships. The subjects expressed the need for time to get to know one another's personality, not only through interactions during the thick and thin of meaningful experiences, but also by observing how the person acts with other people.
I: What makes a good intimate relationship?
C: At the beginning, maybe for no particular reason, there is a sort of feeling between two people. After you feel the outlook between the two are good and compatible, if you both are still willing to go on, then it is an important sharing process. I slowly share my things with you and you share your things with me. Afterward, we have to face the possible conflicts between the two of us and try to resolve them. If those conflicts can be resolved, then the two people's relationship will move into a higher level. If not, it will be stagnant.
I: What kind of stagnation?
C: This kind of stagnation can be a test, a test between how much they trust each other.
I: How so?
C: Maybe at the beginning, when I go out with you. I constantly share your things and know what kind of person you are. At that time, when the relationship is not that deep, I won't really care much. However, gradually, when the feelings go further step by step, you will have higher expectations of the other person. You will hope that the other person can change more or less. Or, two people can compromise. However, at this time, it involves whether we have enough trust. If I make a request, we need to find out if we can communicate about this request or about whatever. I think often, I will try to judge, whether I should or shouldn't say anything. If you put things off, those emotions are still there. So, it will make the relationship stagnant. But, you also go only so far. Therefore, you will just be wondering. Wondering about what you are going to do.

The concept of "Yuan" is culturally specific to Chinese subjects. "Yuan" means "fate". Three Chinese subjects described concepts of "Yuan" as important in their concepts of the formation, maintenance, and break-up of intimate relationships.

I: Is it difficult to have opposite-sex intimate friends?
C: It depends on "Yuan". [If you] meet it is easy; [if you] didn't meet it's difficult.
I: If they have "Yuan" and meet, is it difficult to go on?
C: It still depends on whether they have enough "Yuan".
I: Other than "Yuan", what else?
C: Heart. See if you each have that kind of heart to know each other. It is not enough that one person has that heart go on; both people have to be willing. (Chinese G, age 19, p.7, D2.)

To conclude, there were both similarities and differences in the American and Chinese groups' concepts of intimate relationships formation. For example, both groups expressed the following as important in the formation of intimate relationships: the time to get to know each other's personality, compatible outlook and mutual experiences. However, some Chinese subjects also said that "Yuan" was important in the formation of intimate relationships, a concept which was culturally specific.

importance of intimate relationships. Both American and Chinese subjects said that intimate friends help in time of need or help each other through difficult times; they help to avoid loneliness, share secrets, private thoughts, experiences, and activities; they provide mutual support, respect, and companionship; they tell faults; they help each other feel good; they provide respect; and they help each other grow and/or grow together. Giving and receiving advice were also frequently mentioned by both groups. Both American and Chinese subjects said that the advice received from intimate others was usually valuable because they know each other well. ("Just probably, you know that person well enough. You have a knowledge of that person. You respect their advice. Probably, they're similar to you if you are such good friends with them. You probably have similar views." American C, age 22, p. 3. D1.) Or,
I: So what's the importance of intimate relationships?
A: Well, with an intimate friend, um, they're important because they're always someone you can, like, lean on. Uh. Get support from. Advice. Always count on. You know, you'd tell an intimate friend before you'd tell a regular friend you see, you know, once a month or whatever. Um. You know, if you -- if you need any help, they're -- usually, hopefully they'd be there for you. You can talk about almost anything. That they really know you. So they can give good advice. Um. [pause] More or less, you've probably known this person for quite a long time. Um. So they know a lot of things about you. Um. I mean, they're definitely important, too, just for support, so you don't feel lonely or whatever. Um. There's always somebody to hold onto if you need any help or whatever. [pause] I: So, giving advice is important?
A: .... Yeah. Well, if they ask, or you care about 'em. Um. You know, you -- you want them to make the best decision, um. [pause] Yeah, you just have to want the best for them, if -- if you're a real intimate friend, you want them to be happy. You know, you don't want to see 'em hurt.
I: Why is advice important?
A: Just to see how they think. How -- you know, um, because you don't know everything [small laugh]. Um. It's good to get a bunch of different opinions, views from, you know, other people. Um, and if they're intimate friends, obviously they know you so it's most likely worthwhile advice. Um. You know, maybe you will get a different direction or a different viewpoint.
I: Would that advice you get from friends be different from the advice you get from an elder person, like a teacher or, you know, a parent?
A: Well, I think a close, intimate friend obviously would care more for you. So they would, um, give you more like true advice. They would think about it more. They would mean it. But if you just asked, like, a teacher or friend, they might just, you know, give you anything just to get rid of you. (American F, age 23, p. 28-29. GQ.)

Some other subjects said that getting advice also applies to the Mother-
daughter relationship.

A: I think that once mothers and daughters get past a certain stage... like maybe... after the daughter's been through college or during
the end of college they can finally sort of relate to the mother instead of always opposing the mother. And then the mother can tell about her experiences when she was young and dating or her experiences with her father. They can learn from each other and the daughter can get advice. (American C, age 22, p. 14, D4.)

American subjects generally expressed the importance of expressing and communicating how you feel in intimate relationships while some Chinese subjects thought there were other ways to know how the other person felt. ("If you could talk about the future or even take their opinions into consideration, it is intimate because you didn’t really take advice from a stranger" Chinese 4, age 19, p. 10, D3.). ("By asking his opinions about the job, you will get a feeling......"; "You don’t have to talk about feelings. You probably will feel them." Chinese B, age 21, p. 8, D3.)

Many Chinese subjects talked about intimate relationships as offering a sense of security, belongingness and acceptance more frequently than their American counterparts did. Some Chinese subjects also talked about the "rights and duties" in intimate relationships.

C: The difference is that, in an intimate relationship, they know each other better. You know what kind of person the intimate other is. Therefore, the degree of understanding and accepting between each other is higher [than between people in non-intimate relationships]. Intimate relationships also involve rights and duties; it’s a more obligated relationship. ....... It is a feeling of belongingness. When you are bored or are in trouble, you know who can help you because the other person understands you. If it were regular friends, although you spend time with them and even have fun with them, they don’t really understand the inner and deeper part of you...... It provides a sense of security and a sense of belongingness. (Chinese C, age 22, p. 20, GQ.)
To conclude, both the American and Chinese groups expressed the importance of intimate relationships in avoiding loneliness, providing mutual support, sharing secrets, thoughts, and activities, and receiving advice. Many Chinese subjects talked about intimate relationships as offering a sense of security, belongingness and acceptance more frequently than their American counterparts did. Some Chinese subjects also talked about the importance of "rights and duties" in intimate relationships. The American subjects generally expressed the need for expressing and communicating how you feel in intimate relationships while some Chinese subjects thought there were other ways to know how the other person felt.

ideal partner. Both American and Chinese subjects said that intimate others help each other out, give advice in time of need and express their real concerns. The intimate relationships developed over time and through mutual experiences helped each party to discover personalities, and to become familiar with each other’s interests, views and values. Some viewed intimate others as part of one another. They protected their relationship, and didn’t readily allow others to intrude on it. Intimate friends stand up for each other even if there is no immediate benefit.

Subjects also discussed the qualities that make a person a good friend. The "intimate friend" should have a personality compatible with your own. Some subjects believed that certain qualities were important for intimacy, e.g. trustworthiness, sensitivity, responsibleness, consideration, honesty, insightfulness, respectfulness, caring, tolerance, flexibility, responsiveness and open-mindedness. The intimate other gives
you space, allows you to grow and is willing to grow with you; she/he respects an individual’s space and integrity.

A: [An intimate other] is somebody who is responsive to how I feel, or will listen to what it is I’m thinking and--and respond. And, um, mmm, not play games. ’Cause it--I mean, both men and women can play games, even if they’re your closest friends. And, you know, even I myself play games at--when--you start feeling vulnerable, and you don’t know what the other person’s thinking. Well, it’s not nice--I--I think it’s really important in friendships to not let it get to the point where you start having conversations in your own head and speaking for another person with yourself. Um. So a friend is someone who understands how much--what the lev--what level communication you--you need. And, um, I mean, of course, you have to say these things, too. Because they can’t read your mind. But assuming that you’re intimate friends, they know! (American A, age 22, p. 14, D2.)

Chinese subjects often emphasized the importance of compatibility in intimate friendships in terms of similar background (family background, religious and political beliefs), and common experiences, outlook, views, values and goals in life (e.g. what they want in life in terms of family or career goals). In terms of dating attitudes, Chinese subjects all considered an intimate boyfriend as a potential husband but only one American subject expressed this idea. Therefore, Chinese subjects often said that before becoming involved seriously, they would consider whether he had similar values, family background, and life goals. (“Similar beliefs in career goals, common interests, or similar views. For example, what kind of career he wants in the future. If these are similar, you can support each other more easily. I think it is important to have similar directions toward the future.” Chinese A, age 23, p. 11, D3.) Further, (“In terms of personality, some parts should be similar, some parts should be
supplementary…… Similar values about money are important. One person might pursue only money while the other might believe money is not everything. Some people might think sacrificing family life a little is OK but I think it will affect family life. So, these kinds of differences wouldn’t be good. It is important to have compatible values and views." Chinese A, age 23, p. 16, D4.) In addition, subjects said that it is important to know the boy’s personality as well as his family because a person’s family influences personality, values, and goals.

C: When I make a choice, I remind myself to know the other person and his family. It is because family influences a person a great deal. Then, I have to find out his weaknesses. If I can put up with those shortcomings, I think I then can think about building a family with him. Otherwise I won’t. I think the last generation, it was not only the relationship between the spouses, the whole societal structure also impacts on the family. Like my father’s generation, they are very macho. So, I couldn’t really blame my parents. I couldn’t really say my mother was too weak or something…. I: So you want a more balanced relationship?
C: Yes. I hope the model is that we can respect each other. Then, if I want some space of my own, he should allow that and he should respect my space.
I: Does it take time to get to know the other person?
C: Some things you can tell in a short period of time but some others take a long time to observe. It takes a long time to figure out his personality and what kind of influences the family has on him. (Chinese A, age 23, p. 15. D4.)

To conclude, both American and Chinese subjects expressed the belief that intimate others would help each other out, give advice in time of need and express their real concerns. Both groups expressed the belief that intimate others ought to
have certain qualities, interests, and compatible views, and that intimate others should allow an individual's growth and respect an individual's space.

Chinese subjects placed more emphasis on the importance of compatibility in intimate friendships in terms of similar family background, outlook, and life goals (e.g. their family or career goals) than their American counterparts did. Further, all Chinese subjects said that they considered an intimate boyfriend as a potential husband while only one American subject expressed this concept.

closeness-intimacy. Both American and Chinese subjects showed that they understood intimacy as the coordination with others for the self's interests and benefit or for mutual interests. They understood that both parties need to give and take. ("Well, it’s give and take. Like, for example, maybe Jane is just going through a phase where she doesn’t...Lots of freshmen when they enter college don’t care about studying and maybe Becky realizes this. So, maybe in the long run....You know, it is an intimate relationship and she’s just sort of letting Jane play the field." American C, age 22, p. 1, D1.)

Some subjects also expressed the concepts of mutual support and effort to maintain a relationship. They believed that if one person was willing to sacrifice oneself for another person, then the relationship was intimate either in a fair weather exchange or for mutual support. The concept of time was important because close relations are built on mutual experiences, which affect how persons relate to one another over time. Intimate friendship was seen as the degree to which two persons share intimate personal feelings. ("You share personal feelings with that person...
You tell her things that you wouldn't just tell anyone." American C, age 22, p. 1, D1.) Or, ("I think it's intimate if you can talk about, um, serious, maybe personal things comfortably. Share your feelings." American E, age 21, p. 9, D2.)

Chinese subjects were different in the following ways: not all Chinese subjects stressed the importance of expressing feelings, but said they might do so if it moved the relationship toward making a commitment. With this commitment as a foundation, physical distance might not negatively affect the relationship; living apart could also "be a testing period for real intimate relationships" (Chinese I, age 20, p. 10, D3.) Chinese subjects also think about their intimate others and care for them even if they don't receive the same in return. ("If you think about others and care about them, watch how they are doing and give them confidence and help them when appropriate. Ask yourself if both people are not willing to do that". Chinese F, age 20, p. 19, GQ.) Some Chinese subjects thought that role relationships, such as those between mother and daughter, were part of intimate relationships but that true intimacy required more. ("Other than you are a mother and I am a daughter, if they could have some type of "friendship" relationship that would make them more intimate because children cannot talk about everything with their mothers if her mother only plays a mother's role......" Chinese B, age 21, p. 12, D4.)

Intimate friendships involve commitment as well as a respect for the other person as an individual. Intimate relationships provide mutual support and a sense of security and belongingness; they allow deeper levels of personal growth and development. Intimacy includes a mutual obligation which serves to bind the
affective link between two people (see previous examples). Finally, for the Chinese subjects, intimacy also implied harmony.

I: In your opinion, do you think Dianne's and her mother's relationship is intimate?
C: I feel it is "intense". But, if it is "intimate", I feel this word means their hearts are open and connected [they understand each other from the heart]; but, I don't think her mother knows her very well.
I: For you, what is your definition of "intimacy"?
C: I feel [it means] harmonious. Then they both can have a sense of security. However, "intense" may not describe these two.
I: Anything else?
C: When [they are] together, intimacy makes people feel pleasant, but they also feel some independence. For example, I feel "intimacy" [an intimate relationship] is like two trees; their branches are entwined together but they are still two trees. If it is "intense", it is like one tree is attached to [dependent on] another tree to live. So.
I: So, you feel that an intimate relationship should be like two trees; they are interdependent with each other but they are still two separate trees?
C: Right. (Chinese H, age 23, p 14, D4.)

Concepts of intimacy can change depending on the type of relationship. Both American and Chinese subjects mentioned generational conflicts because parents' beliefs are already established and can be difficult to change. Some subjects in both groups expressed the need to grow with an intimate boyfriend while growing away from their parents. ("I feel that a child should grow apart from her family at a certain age. However, some mothers cannot accept this situation." Chinese H, age 23, p. 15, D4.) Many Chinese subjects hoped that an intimate boyfriend would give advice or even solve problems for them as a way of showing that he cared; they wanted to get advice from their mothers but did not want them to make decisions for
them. Subjects in both groups also may not want to discuss conflicts, deeper thoughts or feelings with non-intimate friends or with their mothers.

A: Because you’re always looked at—you—you will always be your mother’s little girl. And therefore, in spite of all the blunders you’ve made along the way, you will always be innocent and you’ll always be cute and—and younger than your mother. Until you have finally established your, you know, your—you’re life, your situation where you stand, what everything means to you and, you know. So. It’s—mo—relationships are really difficult to talk about, because you may or may not like the relationship your parents have. And you don’t want to hear anything your mom has to say [laugh] about it; you’re still trying to figure out how you relate to people. (American 1, age 22, p. 23, D4.)

Or,

A: ...It is not a heart-and-soul relationship. You know. It’s not somebody you’ll live with the rest of your life. You know, you can deal with them when you want, and when you choose to. You know, if you’re gonna be in a relationship, you’re gonna have to deal with that person. You’re gonna have to deal with that.

(American G, age 22, p. 26, D4.)

Both American and Chinese subjects said that there were gender differences in the types of topics that could be shared. They generally felt it was more difficult to talk about life’s trifles, small secrets, or "girls things" [with opposite-sex friends] and that they usually talked about bigger or more solid topics with males. Further, both American and Chinese subjects agreed that their societies did not "promote" intimacy between opposite-sex friends. In other words, it was difficult to have "pure" intimate opposite-sex friends.
I: In your opinion, can opposite-sex friends have a friendship type of intimate relationship?
C: I feel they can but under the assumption that they both have the same understanding.
I: Then, what will make opposite-sex relationships intimate?
C: You mean friendship type of "chinjihn", "yaw haw"?
I: Yes.
C: I think common interests are important; whether they spend time together is important. In addition, whether there is so-called outside pressure or discerning judgment.
I: Then how is it different from an intimate same-sex friendship?
C: I feel same-sex friends have more competition. Then, the major difference between same-sex and opposite-sex friends is they both need to know where they are because it involves defining friendship vs. love. That is, on one hand, they need to have common agreements; on the other hand, at different phases, [she and he] know one’s feelings toward the other person. I think this is important.
(Chinese H, age 23, p. 6, D2.)

Or,

I: Is it difficult to have intimate opposite-sex friends?
A: Sometimes. It's like some same-sex people I have a hard time with! Ummm . . . I don’t really find it any different for certain people. There are a lot of people that I don't even deal with, who are same-sex, but I don’t deal with opposite-sex. If a relationship's gonna work, you’ve got to take the same dynamics of understanding and talking, and . . . Yes, There’s certain dynamics as far as men and women are concerned that are very different, societal, society-wise...... I think, in general that you will find people who are bound in the traditional female roles and in the traditional male roles. The people in the middle who are more neutral, if they have an intimate relationship--opposite sex--it's going to work for them, because you understand where the other person comes from, and you allow yourself to have some leeway, some working space.
I: What kind of working space?
A: For your beliefs. (American G, age 22, p. 12, D2.)

Family relationships were especially important for the Chinese group. While many subjects in both groups wished to make their own decisions in choosing their life mates, many Chinese subjects said that they would follow their mother's wishes.
to break up with a boyfriend because "You only have one mother but you always can find another boyfriend." (Chinese D, age 19, p. 14, D4.) The Chinese female would also choose the job in the Boyfriend-girlfriend dilemma instead of her own relationship "Because it is closer to home. Family is more important." (Chinese D, age 19, p. 9, D3.)

Finally, some subjects in both groups showed a sense of possessiveness in intimate relationships (see the "jealousy" section).

To conclude, in terms of concepts of intimacy/closeness in intimate relationships, subjects in both groups valued mutual support, sacrifice, a willingness to discuss conflicts, and the sharing of deeper thoughts or feelings and efforts to maintain a relationship. Subjects in both groups expressed the need to grow with an intimate boyfriend while growing away from their parents. Both American and Chinese subjects said there were gender differences in the types of topics that could be shared. They generally felt it was more difficult to talk about life's trifles, small secrets, or "girl things" with opposite-sex friends. Further, both American and Chinese subjects agreed that their societies didn't "promote" intimacy between opposite-sex friends. Subjects in both groups showed a sense of possessiveness in intimate relationships.

Chinese subjects were different in that not all of them stressed the importance of expressing feelings but said they might be willing to do so if it helped to strengthen their commitments. With these commitments as the foundation, physical distance might not negatively affect their relationships. Intimacy also implies harmony. They
also placed more emphasis on obligations, and a sense of security and belongingness. Many Chinese subjects hoped that an intimate boyfriend would give advice or even solve problems for them as a way of showing that he cared; they wanted to get advice from their mothers but did not want them to make decisions for them. Family relationships were especially important in the Chinese group. While many subjects in both groups wished to make their own decisions in choosing their life mates, many Chinese subjects said they would follow their mother’s wishes to break up with a boyfriend. Chinese subjects would also think about their intimate others and care for them even if they did not receive the same consideration in return.

**trust.** Both American and Chinese subjects described trust as intimate friends being able to share private thoughts and have them kept secret. ("She would have to trust that the person would be able to keep a secret, you know?" American D, age 22, p.4, D1.) Subjects said that intimate friends usually have good intentions or motives toward one another and you can predict what they will do. Further, Chinese subjects often defined trust as believing others. This may be because in the Chinese language, "trust" and "believe" share the same word "Shing". ("Trust is building up a belief from their daily life experiences about what she would do and what she would not do." Chinese F, age 20, p. 15-16, D4.) ("Being able to count on someone and not have 'em let you down." American D, age 22, p. 31, GQ.) Trust was also expressed as reciprocity of the intimate sharing of feelings and physical intimacy; it also meant honesty, sincerity, mutual support, understanding, dependability, and stability. ("Trust is that if I say something, you won’t get hurt. You have the right
to accept or reject what I say but you won’t misunderstand what I mean." (Chinese C, age 22, p. 22 GQ.) ("Trust is believing in...It’s knowing that what the other person says is true. It’s knowing that they’re sincere about what they’re saying that they’re feeling. Believing in another person." American C, age 22, p. 20, GQ.) Or, ("You know, if it’s basically giving your feelings to somebody to--to carry around with them. And they choose where to put them and what--what to do with them. And you have to trust somebody to be able to do that, and trust--is intimate, is a big, important part of intimacy...... Physical intimacy is--involves a lot of trust."

American A, age 22, p. 15, D3.) Further,

A: Trust—trust is knowing that your friend will not use your personality or character or your feelings, anything, against you, um, maliciously. Or just because it—it implies honesty. That’s all. Just straightforwardness. They’re pretty high goals and standards, but you know, it’s important. (American A, age 22, p. 35, GQ.)

American subjects also said that it was important to trust one another to do what one wants to do and vice versa and to allow the other to develop independent relationships.

A: ......We trust each other to the point where, um, if another person came along and started bein’ friends with him, I wouldn’t really be jealous because I trust him, that he would assure me that I don’t have to be jealous in any way or feeling bad, you know?

(American D, age 22, p. 23, D3.)
Or,

I: What is trust?
A: What is trust!?! **Trust is knowing somebody, believing what they say, being honest of what they say.** You know, if someone goes on a business trip for three days, and out with their friends that you don’t like, and have a reputation, sexually, with women, and your boyfriend is going with them for three days—you may have to trust that person for them to go! And not to make a big deal about it, you know? You gotta trust them. (American G, age 22, p. 29, GQ.)

To conclude, both American and Chinese subjects expressed trust as the reciprocity of the intimate sharing of feelings; trust also meant honesty, sincerity, mutual support, understanding, dependability, and stability. Chinese subjects often defined trust as believing. This may be because in the Chinese language, trust and believing share the same word, "Shing". American subjects also said that physical intimacy involves trust and allowing others to develop independent relationships. Their Chinese counterparts did not express these concepts.

**jealousy.** Both American and Chinese subjects described jealousy as the self not getting to do something the self wants to do, disappointment at not doing something, and being left out of an interpersonal interaction. Many of them were aware of the conflict between jealousy and growth; some of them saw jealousy as an outgrowth of possessiveness.

I: What does it mean to be jealous in a relationship?
A: Oh, good question? There is such a big difference between **jealousy and possessiveness.** And, I will continuously disagree with my boyfriend about what jealousy is and what possessiveness is. I think jealousy is one thing. What I think is jealousy, he thinks is possessiveness. And vice-versa. So, okay, what do I think of jealousy?
I think jealousy is okay. I think jealousy is a normal, natural feeling. I have this relationship with this person and, if someone else comes up and starts putting their hands through his hair, or . . . I'm gonna get jealous and I'm not going to like it, naturally. How you deal with it is a different situation. If you get possessive, then, and go over and throw a fit, and knock that person out, or let it take over who you are, then your own individuality, what you'd normally do, that's possessive. And that's being grabby, of "this person's mine!" You know, that person isn't yours. That person has a relationship with you, so naturally you get jealous. To be possessive is "mine, mine." You can't just have a person—you can't! Jealousy is natural; possessiveness is not natural.

I: You say "jealousy is natural" What does it do in a relationship?
A: Like, hurt it? It can grow, and it can hurt. It can get to the point of possessiveness, then it hurts a relationship and it pulls it apart. And you know, 'cause you're getting "ownership"-type thing. If you're jealous, it can build a relationship. You know, if you can talk about it. I mean, if you say to someone, "Listen, when that person did such-and-such, I was jealous," that other person knows, and they know the limits, and they can work on it with you, you know, what's okay and what's not okay, depending on the different people in the relationship. It could be different for different people. Touch is one thing. Also, the amount of time that people spend with different people. Be specific, there are a couple times in a relationship that jealousy is gonna happen. It's okay. As long as it doesn't get too possessive. Possessiveness is a pretty dangerous situation. (American G, age 22, p. 32-33, GQ.)

While American subjects viewed jealousy as a normal feeling in relationships, many Chinese subjects were consciously possessive about their intimate relationships and saw jealousy as normal and a way of expressing love and caring. Many subjects saw jealousy as a loyalty toward maintaining and protecting their relationships.

Depending on the relationship, subjects felt that jealousy could be possessive, harmful or have positive influences.
C: Jealousy is harmful. It felt like the third person there will share the other’s person’s love. So, jealousy, felt we were not as close as before because another person was there. Their hearts are shared.

(Chinese G, age 19 p. 19, GQ.)

Or,

I: Will jealousy happen in intimate relationships?
C: I think so. If it were true intimacy, the jealousy should not last too long. It is just a transition.
I: What does it mean to be jealous?
C: It tests two people’s love.
I: Is it harmful?
C: Maybe a little. But this harm can help each other’s growth.

(Chinese F, age 20, p. 20. GQ.)

Or,

C: Many people are possessive [in relationships] whether it’s same-sex or opposite-sex. You feel he or she is yours. If he or she is with other people, then you feel he or she is not yours. If this kind of situation happens, if both people feel the same, that’s OK. Otherwise they cannot maintain their relationship. Because one side might feel you want to control me or he is afraid that I will run away or something…… It’s a strange feeling. I treat others like that but if other people do that to me, I feel pressure. (Chinese B, age 21. p. 16, GQ.)

Or,

C: According to the novel, jealousy should help to improve relationships in a man-and-woman’s relationship. However, it might break up if it was a same-sex relationship.

(Chinese I, age 20, p. 19, GQ.)

To conclude, both American and Chinese subjects viewed jealousy as a normal feeling in relationships and felt that jealousy could encourage growth and improvement in relationships if dealt with appropriately, or could do harm if it became too possessive. However, Chinese subjects, in general, seemed to associate
jealousy with possessiveness and perceived it as natural more frequently than did their American counterparts. It is possible that jealousy was a culturally expected/appropriate behavior in Chinese culture.

**Conflict Resolution.** Both American and Chinese subjects saw that both persons could contribute to a conflict and that conflicts can arise in a moment of anger when a person might say or do something she may not really mean. Giving in, apologizing and not holding a grudge were important. ("Um, somebody would have to give in, I guess. Or realize that, you know, the other person’s right. You know. Or just, you know, take it for what it’s worth and go on, or whatever, you know. Not everything gets resolved all the time." American B, age 20, p. 18, D3.) Or, ("...It can’t just be one person giving in. Both have to work on it. Or you’ve both gotta speak to it, you know." American E, age 21, p. 14, D3.) ("...if they just don’t show a grudge, like, I wouldn’t hold any bad feelings toward you because of something you’ve done to me in the past." American D, age 22, p. 10, D1;) and ("Talk about it. Explain why you did something. Say you’re sorry and mean it. And, try to do something to make up for it." American D, age 22, p. 22, GQ.)

Some subjects thought that if they cared about the relationship, it would help to resolve the conflicts. ("Um, don’t give up so easily. And, you know, listen to what they have to say. And, um, nothing comes easy, I guess. You know.... If their relationship means anything to them, then they’ll try to work on things." American B, age 20, p. 13-14, D2.)
Some subjects viewed mutual satisfaction as important to resolving conflicts; otherwise the resolution would not be a true one even if one person negotiated. ("Conflicts could come from both people. After communication, conflicts may be resolved and the relationship may remain. For example, if there were no communication with her mother, and if Dianne decided to leave Ken, her relationship with her mother might never be the same because she would feel oppressed. Their relationship may be intimate on the surface and it may look peaceful on the superficial level. Deep down, though, Dianne might blame her mother. I don't really think she can be intimate with someone she blames inside." Chinese B, age 21, p. 12. D4.) ("You have to find a compromise that takes both people into consideration, not only one person." Chinese F, age 20, p. 20, GQ.)

Some viewed conflicts as natural and normal rather than problematic and felt that conflicts could help to strengthen the relationship. ("It's [conflict/disagreement] like a natural part of life. People disagree all the time. Sometimes, it, um, can bring you closer together, I think." American E, age 21, p. 10, D2.) Some subjects said that each person should talk about different opinions, communicate, and compromise to find solutions. Some subjects understand that conflicts cannot be "solved" all the time so people in a relationship have to agree to disagree.

I: How do boyfriend and girlfriend resolve conflicts?  
A: How? Sit down and talk about it. They might not be resolved if they are discussed; (they just do not understand, maybe?) You don't always have to--you always have to agree--but you can agree to disagree. Like, you know, "Well, I disagree with you. So, we're just going to have to both agree to disagree." But, as long as we agree to
the disagreement, we are all set. It's like we agree all the time! I:
That's interesting.
A: Right--but to agree, you have to talk about it, and know the
other person's side of the story.
I: So, it is more than just communication?
A: Allow for differences. No one person is going to be like anyone
else. And then you're gonna have differences in personality.
They're not always going to match. (American G, age 22, p. 20,
D3.)

Some subjects also viewed "time out" to be important at times; it allows
people to move out of the conflict to cool off and to get some distance, knowing that
they would come back to try to resolve their conflicts because they have a bond
between them.

I: How do people in intimate relationships resolve conflicts?
A: Oh, gosh. [laugh] Um. Open communication. Sometimes
times--"time-out" because you're both really furious at each other!
A--a "time-out" before the open communication!
I: Why?
A: Calm down!
I: Calm down?
A: Um. I think--and some--some conflicts can't be resolved. Okay?
Um. Sometimes all you can do is come to a compromise. Um.
Where you--you decide that, oh, since you both feel very strongly
about those, what you do is, um, what I'm saying and tell me what you
were saying. And sometimes, too, I would say something that can't
be resolved, that you let it go. And if it's something that you can
both let go, and you're like, "We don't agree on this. We're not
going to be--we're not going to be able to--", and it's okay. "And so
we're going to let it go." Um. And also sometimes there are conflicts,
and you really can't resolve it yourself. Something that's beyond
what you can do. And so, you might turn to counseling. Um.
Professional counseling or a minister. Um. For help. Depending
upon what you choose. Um. I guess some--you just can't do that
yourself and just some kind of a conflict that's, you know, useless."
(American I, age 21, p. 30-31, GQ.)
C: I will still emphasize the importance of communication. It is better to wait to communicate when I am calm rather than when I am still emotional. (Chinese A, age 23, p. 21, GQ.)

Most subjects in both groups emphasized the importance of communication in conflict situations. While most Americans expected to talk their problems out verbally, some Chinese subjects said they would express their real thoughts in an "indirect" way by giving hints or jokes when they talked about them.

I: What do you think Kathleen would do?
C: Kathleen? I think Kathleen is not happy with Lisa. But her relationship with Jim is "yaw haw". So, I think what she would do is give him some hints. For example, she may ask what he thinks of Lisa first. Then during the conversation, she can see how Jim is going to react. When the time is appropriate, she can express her opinions. Not so directly, but she can give some opinions about how she sees Lisa.

I: Why indirect?
C: It's just my feelings. I feel if it were me, I would be afraid to ruin other people's relationship. Since Jim goes out with Lisa, he must like her to a certain degree. I don't really want my subjective opinions to affect their relationships. It felt like I was criticizing/judging them. Since I care about him, I will use a more indirect way. Not so direct or frank. (Chinese C, age 22, p. 6, D2.)

Or,

I: What do you think Kathleen would do?
C: If I were Kathleen, I would tell Jim, in a joking way, not so seriously, that he should get to know Lisa better, to observe her in different situations. (Chinese D, age 19, p. 6, D2.)
Both American and Chinese subjects mentioned using a third person as a way to bring an objective observer into a conflict situation.

A: That's why someone else--you know, if it's not enough that you can just both talk about it, and understand why the other person did something, then bringing somebody else in, maybe, would help you understand it. (American B, age 20, p. 30, GQ.)

Or,

C: It depends on what kind of conflicts. If their conflicts are from within themselves, not from her family or his friends; if they cannot solve it by themselves, they can find a third person to mediate.

I: What's the purpose of the third person?

C: More objective. Because they both are so involved in the situation, they cannot talk about things face to face. (Chinese K, age 23, p. 10, D3.)

Filial responsibilities also influenced some Chinese subjects' conflict resolution strategies. Some subjects believed that an individual's personality decided whether one would perform the filial relationships. ("It depends on Dianne's personality. If she doesn't want to go against our Chinese so called "filial responsibilities", if she is not brave enough to take the blame about those expectations, then she would listen to her mother and stop going out with Ken." Chinese F, age 20, p. 14. D4.) Some Chinese subjects would try to maintain surface harmony with their mothers. ("She [Dianne] would agree with her mother to break up with Ken but still go out with him secretly." Chinese B, age 21, p. 11, D4.) Or, they would find "an alternative way" of solving the problem. ("Maybe Ken will use art as a hobby and find another job. After a while, her mother wouldn't be against it." Chinese E, age 18, p. 13, D4.)
Some Chinese subjects also believed that the bond between mother and daughter would resolve the conflict. ("Their intimate relationship will still be there although they will have some conflicts temporarily. But, that kind of family love is inborn, it will be there no matter what....It's family after all." Chinese F, age 20, p. 16, D4.) Some subjects believed that gender differences influence conflict resolutions strategies.

A: I think it might be different between resolving a conflict with a same-sex friend--I think it [pause]--I don't know if it's easier. I think it's because you--like, I would know better how she's feeling, and how she's reacting to this than I would to how a man, my male friend, would be. Because I know how I'm feeling, and I would assume that she would be feeling kind of the same way. And we could talk about that kind of thing. But I wouldn't really know exactly how he was feeling? And whether he would tell me how he's feeling! And I think it might be a little bit--it might take a little longer. A little bit more questioning, in your mind, as far as how to resolve the conflict. (American H, age 19, p.8, D2.)

To conclude, both American and Chinese subjects said that both persons could contribute to a conflict and that conflicts could arise in a moment of anger when a person might say or do something she or he may not really mean. Most subjects in both groups emphasized the importance of communication in conflict situations. Both American and Chinese subjects said that they might use a third person as an objective observer in a conflict situation. They expressed the belief that giving in, apologizing and not holding a grudge were important. Subjects in both groups expressed the belief that conflicts may not be "solved" all the time. Both parties may have to agree
to disagree. While most Americans expected to talk their problems out verbally, some Chinese subjects said they would express their real thoughts in an "indirect" way by giving hints or joking when they talked about the conflict. Further, Chinese subjects also said they valued filial responsibilities and that some of them may try to maintain harmony with their mothers even if it were only on the surface.

termination. Both American and Chinese subjects gave various reasons why intimate relationships "break up." "Growing apart" was one of the most common responses from both groups. Intimate friends grow apart as people change, and as a result, there is some loss of common interests, differences in views, attitudes, values, personality conflicts, disagreements about ways to relate to each other, and lack of communication. "I think people just change! People's, um, views on life, goals might change. You know, uh, people, you know, wanna move on and other people don't." American F, age 23, p. 16, D3.) Or, ("They have to grow together, I guess. Learn from each other. But basically--usually when things--people don’t work out, it's 'cause they grew apart, you know. Or one of them grew up and the other one didn’t... They're not with each other as much, you know." American B, age 20, p. 20. D3.) Or,

I: Why does the intimate boyfriend and girlfriend break up?
C: Maybe at the beginning, two people may not realize their thoughts are very different until something happens. Or, one person finds better choices.
I: Do those differences exist at the beginning or do they find out about them later?
C: When people first date, they won’t talk on a deep level. Maybe they will just have fun, or something like that. Gradually, they will
face different things. Maybe because their thoughts or the ways they handle things are different can make one person realize that she or he cannot accept these types of differences.

I: So the differences were already there?
C: Ya, they might not find out at the beginning.
I: Could it be possible those differences are developed later on?
C: It might be because during the phases/stages they date, they have different contacts [with people, things or the outside world]. Gradually they develop differently until they cannot find any way to accept the differences. If it is my definition of intimate friend, those differences are not there at the beginning. It is that all people go through a developmental process and some have different development and they finally end up breaking up. (Chinese I, age 20, p. 12, D3.)

Falling out of love was also mentioned by the American group. ("Well, they may not love the person anymore, for whatever reasons. Or maybe choices that have to be made, um, where there are jobs. Or if somebody else--or, um, and, you know, just as a matter of independence and needing to grow, alone. Um. Or it could be as fundamental as not being able to communicate." American A, age 22, p. 21, D3.)

Needs not being met, conflicts of basic trust and being hurt were also reasons for breaking up. ("One slip up about the truth. If someone doesn’t trust you. If you tell someone how you feel honestly, and they go and they use it against you for some reason. Or they hurt you anyway. ... They hurt you physically, emotionally, psychologically, portions of your whole being." American L, age 18, p. 25, GQ.)

Or,

A: I think that if one person’s needs are not being met, then they might leave. If one has been hurt really badly, then I think it will
They will just get out of it. Under circumstances, people are leaving, going separate ways, just want different things. Usually at the college level, they just want space.

I: When you said "being hurt", what do you mean? What kind of things?
A: Like cheating on somebody. Or, if you have agreements not to do something— you know, not to go to a party, you know— and you go, anyway... Things like that. (American J, age 20, p. 14, D3.)

Chinese subjects often attributed breaking up to family, friends or societal pressures, to disagreements on religious or political beliefs or life goals, or to the pressure of a third person involved, or to lack of "Yuan". ("Like personality conflicts. Or, they break up because they know each other too well. Third person.

Or other unavoidable constraints such as their parents disagreeing with the relationship..." Chinese G, age 19, p. 11, D3.) Or,

I: How does an intimate relationship break up?
C: Many reasons will cause breaking up. Some are environmental, like in Taiwan, men have to serve in the army. If one of them is in the army and the other one goes to graduate school. When there are some distances involved; they have to change their ways of being together. When they cannot take such changes, they may break up.
Or, a third person may be involved.
I: Why would the environmental distance break up their relationship?
I: Environmental factors make them think differently; it also may change the goals that an individual's pursuing. Therefore, [they] may not communicate and be congenial. It is because two people grow at different speeds, some faster, some slower. So, their communication becomes difficult, and they break up. (Chinese C, age 22, p.14, D3.)

And,

C: Like I said, an environmental factor is one reason. Or, personalities and values also play important roles. If two people
cannot communicate about their views and cannot accept the other person, then there is no way to go on. What I mean by acceptance is not I have to agree with you or you have to agree with me. It means accept the differences. If you can do that, it will be OK. If not, it will break up; it cannot go on. (Chinese C, age 22, p. 22, GQ.)

To conclude, "growing apart" was one of the most frequently cited reasons for break-up in both groups. Intimate friends grow apart as people change, and as a result, there is some loss of common interests, differences in views, attitudes, and values, personality conflicts, disagreements about ways to relate to each other, and lack of communication.

Falling out of love was also mentioned by the American group. Needs not being met, conflicts of basic trust and being hurt are also reasons for breaking up. Chinese subjects often attributed breaking up to family, friends or society, to disagreements about religious or political beliefs, or life goals, to the presence of a third person involved, or to lack of "Yuan".

Summary of Qualitative Data Analysis

In summary, there are both similarities and differences between American and Chinese subjects' concepts of intimacy in the areas of formation, importance, ideal partner, intimacy, trust, jealousy, conflict resolution and termination. Many of the concepts of intimacy were similar to those described in Selman's model (1979, 1980), but not all data in this study were described in his model. Some data were culturally specific. For example, Chinese subjects mentioned concepts of "Yuan" in forming, maintaining and terminating intimate relationships. Chinese subjects saw an intimate
boyfriend as a potential husband. Chinese subjects all showed they had limited experiences in dating men prior to university age and some of them had never had serious dating relationships. Other differences centered on the degree of emphasis. For example, the American group more frequently mentioned the importance of expressing feelings to intimate others while their Chinese counterparts valued rights, duties and commitments more highly. The Chinese group often associated jealousy with possessiveness and said that jealousy was normal and possessiveness was a way of showing love and care. Although both the American and Chinese groups mentioned the use of a third party to resolve conflicts, Chinese subjects often emphasized the indirect approach. Although subjects in both groups mentioned growing apart and the presence of a third person as major reasons for breaking up, American subjects emphasized falling out of love as a major reason for break-ups. Chinese subjects often mentioned societal pressure, family’s or friends’ influences, and disagreements about life goals, values, and beliefs (e.g. religious or political) as reasons for breaking up.

Finally, Appendix F contains the translated Chinese data (high and low) into English of each dilemma to give some flavor of how Chinese subjects answered the questions.
Conclusions

Summary

The quantitative results of this study indicate that American and Chinese subjects do not differ significantly on their perspective taking levels. Cultural differences were found on their lowest CR scores on general questions and across five domains and on the frequencies distributions of the scorable concepts of relations stages. The qualitative data analysis on the content analysis of concepts of intimacy suggests that both similarities and differences exist in American and Chinese subjects' concepts of intimacy. Some differences on concepts of intimacy may be related to cultural norms. Selman's (1980) model is applicable in this study even though not all data were described in his model; further, traditional concepts of relations stages and perspective taking levels were found. In general, American subjects were more verbal during the interviews.

This study also finds a strong relationship between subjects' age and the corresponding concepts of relations stage and perspective taking levels for the Chinese subjects but not for the American subjects. This finding suggests that American subjects' intimate experiences are heterogeneous and are not related to their ages. On the other hand, the Chinese subjects have unique homogeneous intimate experiences which are not only related to their ages but also to their years of university experience.

Cultural differences were found concerning whom the subjects are most intimate with. Most subjects in both groups demonstrated their highest concepts of
relations stages and perspective taking levels in their most intimate relationships or in the relationships they have most experience with. This may imply that intimate experiences foster the development of concepts of intimacy and perspective taking abilities.

The results of this study do not support Selman’s assumption that perspective taking levels are the "necessary but not sufficient" condition for the same parallel concepts of relations stages because perspective taking levels were not always larger or equal to the corresponding concepts of relations stages. In addition, strong positive relationships were found between perspective taking levels and concepts of relations in both groups. It is possible that perspective taking levels and concepts of relations are two ways of measuring the same underlying constructs.

Discussions And Suggestions For Future Research

Selman’s model can be applied to investigations of American and Chinese female university students’ concepts of intimacy and perspective taking abilities even though many bits of data are not described in Selman’s scoring (1979) manual. Future studies should examine these "non-scorable" data and expand Selman’s model by adding transitional concepts of relations stages and perspective taking levels and by expanding the concepts of the six issues according to age, culture, and gender appropriate norms.

For example, according to Selman’s (1980) model, stage 3 concepts of relations emphasize the concept of "dependence"; stage 4 concepts emphasize the
notion of "inter-dependence" and say that "total independence is not ideal".

Theoretically, between inter-dependence and dependence, there should be a stage in between, which is "independence". Other Social Cognitive Developmental models, such as Kegan’s (1982) model, hypothesize the existence of a stage between "Inter-personal" and "inter-individual", which is "Institutional". The concepts of "institutional" can be applied to the intermediate stage in Selman’s model.

Research also suggests that some Asian cultural norms emphasize "inter-dependence" rather than "dependence" or "independence". Therefore, Chinese young adults and adults, both male and female, might differ from their American counterparts in the concepts of "independence" but show similarities in "dependence" or "inter-dependence". Future studies should examine this hypothesis.

The results find significant differences between American and Chinese subjects’ lowest CR scores in the General Questions and across five CR domains. More American subjects talked from the stage 2 concept of relations, Fair-weather cooperation, than did their Chinese counterparts. This may be the result of differences in their languages and/or cultural norms. It is possible that American subjects are more willing to express CR 2 concepts because these concepts are culturally acceptable due to their individualistic focus. Chinese people may not emphasize CR 2 concepts because of their cultural norms. One of the major concepts of intimacy at CR 2 is viewing relationships as the coordination with others for the self’s interests and for the benefit of the self rather than for mutual interests. In a culture which emphasizes individualism, an individual’s interests and rights may be
highly stressed; the expressing of these ideas may sound like self-interest. Chinese culture emphasizes harmony, connections and cooperation. In order to maintain harmony, individuals in relationships need to offer mutual support, a strengthening of the commitment to the relationship, a harmonious compromise, and mutual conflict resolution strategies. The American group more frequently mentioned the importance of expressing feelings to intimate others (CR 2 or CR 3) whereas their Chinese counterparts spoke more often about rights, duties (not scorables) and commitments (CR 3, CR 3/4 or CR 4). These differences resulted in differences on their Concepts of Relations stage scores.

Theoretically, younger populations should demonstrate more CR 2 like answers. In order to further investigate the extent to which languages and cultural norms influence people’s development on the concepts of intimacy, future studies ought to compare American and Chinese children, pre-adolescents and adolescents. Previous research on Kohlberg’s (1978) model of moral development found that Chinese pre-adolescents demonstrate similar developmental sequences on Kohlberg’s model but show moral development stages at an average of one to three years earlier than people of other cultures (Zhang, 1991). In the same line of reasoning, it is possible that Chinese pre-adolescents will express fewer CR 2 like answers, expressing instead the need to maintain harmony and connections with others. They will thus receive higher CR scores compared to their American counterparts because their cultural norms encourage them to think about others and to maintain harmony. It is also possible that many Chinese pre-adolescents will associate jealousy with
possessiveness and will express the idea that jealousy is normal and that possessiveness is a way of showing love and caring. If Chinese pre-adolescents do express less CR 2 answers compared to their American counterparts, then the following assumption about the process of human development needs to be re-examined: "individuals in all cultures go through the same order or sequence of gross stage development though they vary in rate and terminal point of development" (Kohlberg, 1969, p. 175).

The argument that not all individuals go through the same sequences of gross development is also supported by the culturally specific non-scorable data. This study not only finds that some concepts of intimacy are culturally specific (e.g. concepts of "Yuan" and concepts of "intimate boyfriend as potential husband" in the Chinese data), but also finds that some concepts themselves may not be discriminated using a developmental measure. This is particularly true on concepts of termination. For example, many of the American and Chinese subjects who received the most CR 2 scores, often received a CR 3 score on "termination", on the concepts of "growing apart". This may be because these subjects had more breaking-up experiences so that they received higher CR scores on this concept. It could also mean that "growing apart" is a common concept among all subjects in this age group. Further, the idea that a "third person" could cause a break-up was often expressed by subjects who received other CR scores at all CR ranges even though this concept is not described in any stage of Selman's model. Examining only the above concepts makes it difficult to discriminate the underlying constructs of such reasoning. Other concepts
such as breaking up due to falling out of love (mostly in the American data), societal pressure, family's or friends' influences (mostly in the Chinese data) and lacking "Yuan" (Chinese data only) are also not described in Selman's (1979) scoring manual.

Other "unscorable" examples are "using a third party or being indirect to resolve conflicts", and "having intimate others give advice". Future studies should examine these "unscorable" concepts to expand Selman's model. Future studies should also investigate whether all types of concepts of relations can be discriminated by developmental measurements. This study also finds that cultural norms do affect people's concepts of intimacy (e.g. Chinese people emphasize duties and responsibilities in intimate relationships, which are important concepts of Confucian philosophy).

Ma (1988) proposed that moral development may not be culture free; others suggest that women have different developmental experiences from those of men; women tend to be more care-oriented and connected in relationships (Gilligan, 1982). Even though many American subjects expressed CR 2 concepts, they also expressed concepts of relations stage 3, "a close friendship is as intimate and mutual sharing". CR 3 was also the predominant stage (mode) for both American and Chinese subjects in this study. Since stage 3 concepts of relations emphasize more concepts regarding connectedness (e.g. in a group of two - possessive) than autonomy in relationships, this study again challenges current assumptions about the human development process. From the results of this study, it is argued that concepts of intimacy are not totally "culture free".
As previously mentioned, this study finds that American subjects' intimate social experiences may not be heterogeneous across individuals. Chinese subjects, on the contrary, may be homogeneous in the timing of their intimate relationship experiences; their college experiences may be important for the development of those experiences. Future studies should duplicate the findings on the relationship between Chinese university female students' age and their Concepts of Relations and Perspective Taking levels.

The differences in the timing of intimate experiences between American and Chinese subjects are related to cultural differences concerning the person the subjects were most intimate with. Many American subjects were most intimate with their boyfriends whereas many Chinese subjects were most intimate with their same-sex friends. Many Chinese subjects also said they did not have a boyfriend. Both American and Chinese subjects had different opinions about the need to be more independent from their family (parents). Surprisingly, more Chinese subjects demonstrated the need for autonomy or interdependence in their intimate relationships than their American counterparts in all four types of intimate relationships, especially in the Mother-daughter intimate relationship. The need for autonomy is even more evident in the Mother-daughter intimate relationships in the Chinese data although subjects in both American and Chinese groups expressed different opinions about the need to be more independent from their family (mothers). It is possible that the Chinese subjects who volunteered for this study did not represent "random" samples of the Chinese population (e.g. more than half of the subjects were sociology, social
work, or educational psychology majors). Western psychological theories are introduced in these majors. Cheng's (1991) study on moral development in Chinese culture found that the protocols from students majoring in Chinese literature and philosophy were very difficult to score by Kohlberg's model due to cultural factors. This again implies that culture makes a difference in the development of concepts of intimacy. These differences may be evident depending upon exposure to Chinese culture. Using the same line of reasoning, the type of major may also have an influence on a subject's concepts due to the knowledge imparted; this phenomenon ought to be more evident with years in the university.

Using college students as subjects may be potentially biased because their are more educated than the "norm". Future studies should examine whether differences exist between college students and non-college students (from the general populations) in the same culture. Future studies should also include subjects from the general public to represent a more "random" sample, then examine whether there are cultural differences in their concepts of intimacy.

Chinese female university students' experiences are unique due to their educational system. In Taiwan, the University Entrance Examination is held once a year. It is a very competitive examination and students must pass it to be accepted into a university. Many students are encouraged to "study and not to worry about other things" in order to obtain an opportunity to enter the university. The Same-sex dilemma involves school achievement. Young students are closer to their University Entrance Examination experience and they may be more competitive. Further,
Chinese subjects as a group expressed their lack of experiences with opposite-sex friends prior to entering the university. The opportunity to explore opposite-sex relationships is likely to increase with their years in the university.

Most American subjects said that they were most intimate with their boyfriends whereas most Chinese subjects said that they were most intimate with their same-sex friends. All Chinese subjects indicated that they have opposite-sex friends and while many of them indicated they have had dating experiences, only two indicated they have boyfriends. It is possible that some Chinese females date members of the opposite-sex but don't call a relationship "boyfriend-girlfriend" unless it is serious. In other words, their definition of an intimate boyfriend (e.g. potential future husband) might be different from that of their American counterparts. Chinese females can learn the concepts of Boyfriend-girlfriend relationships by observations or through classroom discussions, novels, televisions or films. American subjects may have more personal experiences. As a result, there is no statistically significant difference found in the American subjects' developmental measurements in the Boyfriend-girlfriend dilemma.

Further, both American and Chinese subjects may change their concepts of intimacy depending on the type of relationship, a possibility which is hypothesized from previous research. For example, many subjects expressed the need to become independent from their mothers and to grow with their boyfriends. Previous studies hypothesized that past experiences could be one of the factors that foster the development of higher levels of perspective taking abilities (Selman, 1977).
the Mother-daughter dilemma had the mode of the highest perspective taking levels in both the American and Chinese data in this study, this study was not designed to investigate this research question. Further, not all subjects demonstrated their highest perspective taking levels in the type of relationship they were currently most intimate in although the majority of the subjects in both groups demonstrated their highest concepts of relations stages in these relationships. Therefore, the extent to which cultural norms and the socialization process influence the process of development remains a research question. The question of how and to what extent individuals acquire and transform the knowledge and skills in one type of intimate relationship to another type of relationship remains unresolved. Culture influences the timing of development but the interaction between the timing of development and the rate of development needs further investigation. Future studies should examine subjects' intimate experiences in greater detail to examine to what extent past experiences, the timing of these intimate experiences, and cultural norms influence the development of concepts of relations. Future studies also should extend the sample of subjects to more majors, in the university setting, as well as to people of all educational backgrounds, social economic status, ages and gender.

There was a very high positive relationship found between concepts of relations and perspective taking levels in this study. The results suggested that the development of concepts of relations stages and perspective taking levels could be inter-related with each other. Further, the hypothesis that perspective taking levels (structure) ought to be a prerequisite condition for concepts of relations (content) - the
"necessary but not sufficient" assumption - was not supported in this study because not all perspective taking levels were larger or equal to the corresponding concepts of relations stages within the same subjects. The relationship between perspective taking levels and concepts of relations stages could be that they are two measures of the same constructs rather than one being a pre-requisite condition for the other. This result thus raises the question of whether perspective taking levels and concepts of relations stages are two different aspects of measuring the same construct in this study.

Limitations of Study

This study has many interesting findings but it also has limitations. The major limitation of this study is the small sample size due to the time and cost involved in interviewing subjects from two cultures. Another limitation is that the subjects are from university populations. University students could be potential bias compare to the general public in terms of whether they "represent" the populations in general because they are usually more educated and can be from a higher social economic level. This study thus may not represent the human developmental process of young adults in these two cultures. Ideally, longitudinal studies, including various age ranges, and social economic status for both genders, in various settings, in various cultures and in various domains of study, should be conducted to assess whether culture makes a difference in the process of development. Longitudinal data can provide information on whether the stage development is invariant and whether each
stage of development is hierarchical and qualitatively different from the previous stage. Longitudinal data also allow us to examine the starting or ending point of development, the direction of development and the rate of developmental changes (Mines, 1986).

The method employed may also have measurement errors. The dilemmas contained the kinds of information desired from the populations examined. However, due to the "hypothetical" approach, it is difficult to determine to what extent this study measured subjects’ concepts and to what extent the dilemmas stimulated the subjects to demonstrate their optimal perspective taking abilities (the same problems exist with self-reflective questions). Open-ended questions demand the subjects’ motivations for responses and non-verbal subjects may not demonstrate their optimal developmental stages. The research design could also be biased because concepts in each domain are collected with the same interview at the same time, and it is possible that concepts in one domain might influence the level of concept in another (Selman, 1980, p. 160).

Other methods that might be used are questionnaires, or real life observations. While questionnaires may allow a large number of subjects to participate, and are less time-consuming than interviews or real life observations, they do not allow follow-up questions to clarify the underlying structure of responses. Real life observation may provide the least amount of measurement error but it is very time consuming and impractical in cross-cultural studies. Even structured observation would be limited to the form, duration, frequencies and events that took place. The interviewing method
was therefore considered the most appropriate tool to investigate the research questions in this study.

A fourth limitation is the inter-rater reliabilities. Two sets of interview data, one high and one low, were used to practice with Selman’s 1979 manual. Intermediate stages were found. The manual was therefore revised in reference to Selman’s model to attain more differentiated scores. Although the revised manual was tested on the same two sets of data again, there were not enough data to develop a thorough scoring manual by issues (the revised scoring rules are available upon written request). As a result, some of the inter-rater reliabilities are acceptable but not ideal (see Appendix G for discussion of the inter-rater reliabilities).

Finally, the author’s first language is Chinese. Therefore, although the author has been in the U.S. for seven years, it is still a limitation for a non-English speaker (from the outside) to score the American data. One way to overcome this potential bias is to translate the Chinese data into English and then have the other rater score the translated Chinese data independently. An inter-rater reliability can then be examined by comparing those results with the author’s Chinese scoring. If similar patterns (both in the American data and in the Chinese data) of the inter-rater reliabilities are found, the reliability is increased in this study because it is likely that the author is stable and the errors could be random.
Implications For Intervention

Selman and others have applied the Social-Cognitive Development model to educational and clinical practice (Yeates, Schultz, and Selman, 1990; Yeates and Selman, 1989). Perspective taking abilities reflect one aspect of social competencies. These abilities can be utilized to resolve interpersonal conflicts (e.g., the developmental model of "Interpersonal Negotiation Strategies" - INS). There are four steps involved in INS: (1) define the problem; (2) generate alternative strategies; (3) select and implement a particular strategy; and, (4) evaluate the outcome (Yeates and Selman, 1989, p. 88). Yeates and Selman (1989) found that "gender, ages and the type of relationship in which conflict occurs" influence the selection of interpersonal strategies (Yeates and Selman, 1989, p. 89). Their major goal is to develop an intervention to promote the development of more sophisticated interpersonal negotiation strategies (which reflect higher levels of perspective taking abilities).

This study suggests that Chinese female young adults demonstrate similar perspective taking abilities as their American counterparts. If future studies also confirm the universal development of perspective taking abilities, this would imply that culturally different people could learn to promote understanding and resolve conflicts by using these interpersonal competencies - perspective taking abilities. By systematic examination of the perspectives and concepts of the parties involved, in counseling and in educational settings, the helper and the educator can create opportunities to increase people's abilities to seek mutual satisfaction in conflict situations. For example, in education, discussing issues (e.g. moral issues) with peers
who are half or one stage higher may promote higher levels of understanding an issue.

In recent years, the increasing awareness of multi-cultural counseling has emphasized helping clients from their own frame of references (Ivey, 1987). Research also shows that culturally different people have different attributions to the same presenting problems; these attributions may also be different from those of their counselors (Carey and Lin, 1991). Therefore, it is important that mental health professionals have sophisticated perspective taking abilities to understand not only how the clients see their problems, but also to help the clients to see how they think other people see the presenting problems (e.g. ask client: "What do you think he was thinking when he said that?") and how other people think they are thinking (e.g. ask client: "What do you think he thinks what you think?")

The Social Cognitive model can also be applied to the developmental model of supervision (Carey, undated), which examines the dynamics between the supervisor and supervisee (the counselor), the counselor and the client, and the supervisor of the client. Supervisors can use the same sets of questions in counseling and supervision by first assessing the developmental stages of the counselors and the clients. The supervisor then can help the supervisee to work more effectively by using the supervisee's cognitive abilities and frames of reference, therefore helping him or her to help their clients. Theoretically, the counselor should have higher perspective taking abilities than his or her clients. Future research could also examine the
relationship between cognitive stages (e.g. perspective taking levels) between counselors and clients and the degree of satisfaction in their counseling relationship.

This study on the concepts of intimacy in Chinese people also has counseling implications. For example, many Chinese people believe that intimate others should give advice and know what the other person wants without telling them. Applying this to the counseling relationship, good counselors (from the perspective of Chinese female young adults) might be resources for "advising"; they ought to perceive what their Chinese clients really want without them telling. Indirectness also seems to be more common in the Chinese group. Indirectness may serve the function of avoiding major conflicts or embarrassment and maintaining harmonious relationships. By asking advice about the situation, subjects could "indirectly" see how important others value them or their relationship. This study also suggests that indirect probing might be an alternative method to working with Chinese people. Counselors, at least initially, could use indirect probing to investigate Chinese clients' conceptions of the nature and causes of problems in order to "maintain harmony" in the counseling relationship and also to help clients to "save face". At times, counselors can be viewed as a third party to mediate the problems for clients.

In cross-cultural counseling, American counselors also should keep in mind how different concepts of dating, family relationships, and decisions about breaking up could play out in Chinese clients' daily lives. American counselors ought not to advise from a Westerner's view. Counselors in the U.S. should keep in mind that there are sub-cultural differences within the American culture (e.g. Irish Americans
vs. Italian Americans vs. African Americans vs. Puerto Ricans; heterosexual vs. homosexual vs. bisexual people; males vs. females; children vs. elderly, Catholic vs. Buddhist; higher social-economic status people vs. lower; more highly educated people vs. less; heavier weight people vs. the average). Not all white Americans value individualism and not all Chinese people value collectivism. Thus, counselors should try not to make assumptions about their clients but should develop a systematic way of examining their clients' realities (concepts). This is a major goal of multicultural and cross-cultural counseling. Culturally competent counselors should have the awareness, knowledge, and skills to work with their culturally different clients to promote successful counseling and to increase the utilization of the mental health system by minorities (Sue, 1981).

Although future research should examine males' concepts of intimacy, this study provides some useful information for couples counseling, including Chinese-American inter-racial couples counseling. Research has found that men and women behave differently and have different ways of communicating as the result of different socialization experiences (Gilligan, 1982). As a result, problems might escalate within the male-female relationship (Tannen, 1990). A developmental model of concepts of intimacy can normalize the experiences as a gender specific issue (e.g. It is not SHE who is possessive, a lot of females tend to be more possessive in their relationships than men; or, women tend to sacrifice for the ones they love because they are taught to do so; they also tend to value their relationships as the whole of their life while many men value relationships as part of their life); as a developmental
task (e.g. people in their early twenties may tend to be more possessive in their relationships but they might want to be more independent when they reach their thirties); or, as a culturally specific issue (e.g. it is not that she doesn’t care about you. As a Chinese female, although she likes you, she might not think it is OK to have pre-marital sex. Even if it is a potential marriage, some Chinese people might still think it is not right). The goal is not to "stereotype" people; rather, making some cultural "generalizations" can normalize an experience and promote interpersonal understanding. There is a fine line between stereotyping and generalizing; therefore, counselors have to be very culturally sensitive and skillful to use their knowledge about cultures (Sue, 1981).

To conclude, this study extends Selman’s (1980) model and also contributes to intimacy research. It is a starting point for future research on the development of concepts of intimacy and perspective taking abilities in American and Chinese people. This study suggests directions for future research and provides implications and applications for counseling. Finally, the applications of this study may enhance interpersonal relationships and promote multi-cultural understanding.
APPENDICES
## APPENDIX A

### THE CHINESE VS. WESTERN PERSPECTIVE OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT
(resource from Ma, 1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Structure</th>
<th>Stage 4 Chinese Perspective</th>
<th>Stage 4 Western Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Social order and prosperity</strong></td>
<td>(i) To maintain the stability and prosperity of the society</td>
<td>(i) To maintain the stability and prosperity of the society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) A collectivistic and affective perspective</td>
<td>(ii) An individualistic and rational perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Consensus, Norm, and propriety</strong></td>
<td>(i) A soft attitude towards resolving conflicts</td>
<td>(i) A less tolerating and compromising attitude toward resolving conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Involuntary kinship bondage throughout the whole life span</td>
<td>(ii) Voluntary kinship bondage, particularly after adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Rigid social norms</td>
<td>(iii) Less rigid and more flexible norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Law abiding</strong></td>
<td>(i) Person-oriented government and loose legal system</td>
<td>(i) Constitutional government and public institutionalized law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Emphasis on Ch‘ing (affection), li (reason) and fa (law)</td>
<td>(ii) Emphasis on li and fa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
Stage 5: Majority rights and individual rights (p. 217)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Structure</th>
<th>Stage 5 Chinese perspective</th>
<th>Stage 5 Western perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic rights and relative rights</td>
<td>(i) Individuals have slightly weaker urge for more political and legal rights</td>
<td>(i) Individuals have slightly stronger urge for more political and legal rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) The group has plenty and rigid relative values, rights and rules because of its long history of tradition and collectivistic perspective</td>
<td>(ii) The group has few and less rigid relative values, rights and rules because of its rational individualistic perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social construct</td>
<td>Based on a natural, autonomous, affective and self-sacrificing altruistic disposition or Confucian concept of Jen (humanity)</td>
<td>Based on rational calculation of overall utility, &quot;The greatest good for the greatest number&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Law-making perspective</td>
<td>(i) Basic rights must be protected regardless of majority opinion</td>
<td>(i) Basic rights must be protected regardless of majority opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) A more disturbing less democratic and institutionalized law-making</td>
<td>(ii) A democratic and institutionalized law-making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conflict between majority's basic rights and individual's basic rights</td>
<td>Resolution based on affective overall utility, &quot;the small-I (i.e. individual) should be sacrificed to support the big-I (i.e. the majority)&quot;</td>
<td>Resolution based on rational overall utility, &quot;to seek the greatest good for the greatest number&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont.)
Stage 6: Universal ethical principles of natural harmony (p. 224)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General structure</th>
<th>Chinese perspective</th>
<th>Western perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Good will</td>
<td>A good will is a natural will that complies with nature harmoniously. It is genuine, peaceful, non-sophisticated and non-disturbing</td>
<td>A good will is good without qualification or restriction. It is not good because of what it affects or accomplishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Autonomy and freedom</td>
<td>Principles are self-chosen by a free and natural will. Tends to achieve the highest degree of autonomy and freedom by few desires, simple human relationships, natural characters and non-valuative judgment</td>
<td>Principles are self-chosen by a free will, not under the external compulsion of consensus, norms, proprieties, laws and majority's welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ethical principles of natural harmony</td>
<td>Taoistic principle of non-valuative judgment: everyone or every group is treated as ethically neutral. Accept and treat everything, every opinion and every habituation in their own rights or in their natural states as equally good and right</td>
<td>Universal ethical principles of justice: (i) people are ends (ii) The right of every person to an equal consideration of his claims in every situation, not just those codified into laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Universality of the principles</td>
<td>The principles are valid for all rational beings and are in accord with Nature</td>
<td>The principles are valid for all rational being and are reversible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Selman (1980, p. 38-39), an average 7-to 12-year-old will reach Level 2, "Self-Reflective/Second Person and Reciprocal Perspective Taking"; an average 16-year-old could already be in "Level 3, Third-Person and Mutual Perspective Taking Level" (most reach this level by 12-15 years of age) and some of them could be in Level 4 (about age 12 to adulthood), the "In-Depth and Societal-Symbolic Perspective Taking Level". For the purposes of this study, Selman's (1980) model from level 2 to level 4 of perspective taking abilities and the parallel stages of concepts of relations will be briefly reviewed here. For a detailed description of Perspective Taking levels and Concepts of Relations stages refer to Selman (1979, 1980).

Level 2: "Self-Reflective/Second Person and Reciprocal Perspective Taking" (about age 7 to 12)

At level 2, "pre-adolescents have the ability to step mentally outside of themselves and take a self-reflective or second-person perspective on their thoughts and actions" (Selman, 1980, p. 38). The pre-adolescent comprehends that other people might have quite different goals, values, ideals, feelings, and thoughts, and "that another's point of view" may be "as correct as one's own". The pre-adolescent knows that one can experience two opposing emotions, and can differentiate thoughts and feelings, thus she/he can understand that a person might do some things that one
didn't intend to do. A person may hide true feelings because he or she is insecure or unhappy (Muuss, 1988).

Stage 2: "Close friendship as fair-weather cooperation."

At stage 2 concepts of relations, a "close friendship" is a "fair-weather cooperation". Intimacy and sharing is understood at this level, but relationships are seen as the coordination with others for "the benefit of the self rather than for mutual interests". The pre-adolescent believes that people "need company and being liked". "A good friend is viewed as someone with whom one can reveal inner feelings, thoughts and secrets" (Selman, 1980, p. 139).

Level 3: "Third-Person and Mutual Perspective Taking" (about ages 10 to 15)

At level 3, the "concepts of persons" are "third-person" and the "concepts of relations" are "mutual". The third-person perspective at level 3 allows the adolescent "to step outside one's own immediate self and simultaneously to act and reflect upon the effects of actions on themselves". In other words, the adolescent can now "coordinate the perspectives of self and others"; he or she has the ability to step outside of his or her own perspective and outside another's perspective and assume the perspective of "a neutral third person". Individuals at this level prefer more lasting relationships in which "thoughts and experiences are mutually shared" (Selman, 1980, p. 39).

Stage 3: "Close friendship as intimate and mutual sharing"

At stage 3 concepts of relations, a "close friendship" is "as intimate and mutual sharing". Because the individual can stand outside the self and the
relationship, "the major focus of friendship" is "on the relationship itself rather than on each or either individual separately" (Selman, 1980, p. 140). Good friendships are seen as developing over time to discover each party’s personalities and mutual interests (Selman, 1979).

Level 4: "In-Depth and Societal-Symbolic Perspective Taking" (about age 12 to adult)

At level 4 of perspective taking, the "concepts of persons" are "in-depth" and "the concepts of relations are societal-symbolic". Some adolescents may move to a higher and more abstract level of perspective taking which involves the coordination of all possible third-person perspectives. At this level, the individual becomes aware that motives, actions, thoughts, and feelings are formed by psychological factors, and the notion of psychological determinants now includes the idea of the "conscious" as well as the "unconscious" processes. The individual also begins to comprehend that personality is a system of "traits, beliefs, values, and attitudes" with its own "developmental history" (Selman, 1980, p. 40).

The individual now can comprehend that the subjective perspective of persons towards each other functions not only on "a level of common expectations and awareness but also exists simultaneously at multidimensional or deeper levels of communication" (Selman, 1980, p. 40). Thus, perspective taking is increased from the level of didactic relationships between people to the level of the general social system. At level 4, the individual can "compare and contrast qualitatively different levels of perspectives". The social issues can now be understood as being interpreted.
by each individual according to that individual's own system of analysis (Selman, 1980, p. 40).

Stage 4: "Close friendship as autonomous interdependence."

At stage 4, a "close friendship" is "autonomous interdependence". The individuals at stage 4 partially reject the close-knit interpersonal orientation (a stage 3 characteristic) when it "impedes autonomous growth and development". Individuals understand that persons have conflicting needs but they can still be friends. Friendships at this level are viewed as helping to provide a sense of personal identity. Individuals at this level value stability in relationships; however, they seem to strive for a balance between independence and dependence. They commit in a friendship but also want to keep a sense of self and they view true friends as helping with the "deeper psychological" needs of others (Selman, 1980, p. 141).

Selman (1980) proposed that stage development implies "qualitative differences", "invariant sequence", "structural wholeness", and "hierarchical integrations" from stage to stage (Selman, 1980 p. 77-78). "Qualitative differences" require a "fundamental restructuring in the way an individual views social relations", not just a "quantitative addition to new social data". Invariant sequence refers to the direction of development as "one-way" without significant regression or skipping from one stage to the next. Each stage of "structured wholeness" "represents a structured whole across a range of concepts" (p. 77-78). In other words, while differences among domains of social cognition are recognized, the similarities among conceptions in each domain ought to be based on specific underlying social-cognitive organization
or structures. Selman (1980) pointed out that the question of whether the individual uses a particular level of reasoning across most social contacts and interactions remains a challenging and critical empirical question (p. 78). The nature of the "hierarchical integrations" between stages is still under investigation. Selman (1980, p. 78) pointed out that some research suggested that "lower stages are rejected once higher levels are attained" (Turiel, 1969, cited in Selman, 1980, p. 78) while others believe that lower stages could still be used when a higher level is not utilized "for reasons of personal stress" (Werner, 1964, cited in Selman, 1980, p. 78).
APPENDIX C

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENTS

Modifying and translating instruments are important considerations in cross-cultural studies. The researcher paid special attentions to these tasks. Four steps were taken. I wrote four dilemmas in English, assuming these dilemmas and questions could pull for concepts of intimacy and perspective taking abilities of 18-to-23-year old university students. After the initial development of the dilemmas, I consulted with my advisor, who is an expert in Social Cognitive Development models. These dilemmas were Father-daughter, Same-sex, Opposite-sex and Boyfriend-girlfriend. I then translated the English dilemmas into Chinese. In the Chinese dilemmas, I used Chinese names rather than English ones but the contents of each dilemma were directly translated. After translation, I reviewed the instrument with another female bilingual Chinese doctoral student. Third, I asked an associate professor in the Human Development Program who is fluent in Chinese and familiar with both American and Chinese culture for feedback about the English-Chinese methodology. Finally, a pilot study was conducted.

Based on the results of the pilot study, the father-daughter dilemma was changed to mother-daughter dilemma because all subjects demonstrated that they were closer to their mothers than their fathers on their demographic data. I hypothesized that the closer the relationships, the better the subjects could demonstrate their abilities in understanding such relationships. The revised dilemmas targeted female university students in the U.S. and in Taiwan from age 18 to 23.
APPENDIX D

INSTRUMENTS

Written Consent Form

I am Jun-chih Gisela Lin, a doctoral candidate in the Counseling Psychology program at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

The purpose of my study is to help me to understand how people from different cultures perceive relationship problems. You are being asked to be a participant in this study.

Four short stories will be presented to you. I will ask your response to several questions following each story and general questions at the end. Then, after noting your responses, I will ask you a few demographic questions. There is no right or wrong answers. Please feel free to respond. The interview might take a couple of hours.

Our interview will be audio-taped, and later transcribed by me or a secretary - complete anonymity is assured. Of course, if at any time during the interview you feel uncomfortable, you are free to withdraw. The purpose of taping and transcribing is to analyze the materials from the interview without losing any of its content. I will use this data for my dissertation.

After the interview, I will be glad to discuss with you more about my study if you are interested. I will also try to answer any questions or address any concerns you might have regarding this study. I would certainly appreciate any feedback from you about what you found interesting or what didn’t make sense to you during the process.

I ask for your signature below to assure me that you understand the purpose of my study and the use of your information. You understand that no monetary value is placed on your responses.

Should you have any questions about this study, I may be reached at 413-586-7471 or at the Counseling Psychology Program, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003, USA.

I, ______________________________________, have read the above statements and agree to participate in this study.

______________________________
Signature of participant

______________________________
Date

______________________________
Interviewer
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Becky and Jane are both 18 years old, university freshmen. Both are from the same small town. Becky and Jane have been good friends; they have played and done things together for years. They often talk about personal matters and provide support for each other.

At the present time, Becky and Jane go to the same university and are roommates. They also take a couple of classes together. Becky values education very much and she studies very hard. On the other hand, Jane views going to college as an opportunity to meet a nice young man.

Recently, Jane missed a few morning classes because of late dates. She hasn’t been going to the library or eating in the dining common with Becky like she used to. Becky was worried about Jane and advised Jane not to stay out late and miss classes but Jane would not listen to Becky.

Now, there is a mid-term examination coming. Jane asks Becky to lend her the class notes and help her to prepare for the examination. Becky tells Jane that unless Jane promises to "behave" herself, not to miss class again and date late, she will not help her. Jane is upset and tells Becky that she is not her mother and she must be jealous that she has gone out with boys. Jane further tells Becky that she won’t need her help and she will not be her friend any more.
Same-sex intimate relationship dilemma (D1):

*1. What do you think Becky will do; will she lend Jane her notes? Why?

2. In your opinion, do you think Becky’s relationship with Jane is intimate? Why/Why not? What makes a same-sex relationship intimate?

3. What sorts of things do same-sex intimate friends have a difficult time discussing? Why? What sorts of things can intimate same-sex friends talk about that they won’t tell others about?

*4. After what Jane told Becky, how do you think their relationship will be affected? Do you think Jane really meant it when she told Becky that she didn’t want to be her friend any more? Why/Why not? Do people say things they don’t mean?

5. Can same-sex friends have differences but still have intimate relationships? Why/Why not?

6. Is it difficult to have same-sex intimate friends? Why/Why not?
Kathleen, 19, and Jim, 20, are good friends because they both have been playing music in the band since they were in high school. Now they both go to the same university and continue playing music. Sometimes, Jim will come to Kathleen’s house to practice music after school. Jim has a sense of humor and he always makes Kathleen laugh.

Jim recently started going out with a girl, Lisa, that Kathleen doesn’t approve of. Kathleen thinks Lisa is manipulative, jealous, and distrustful and she thinks that Lisa is not good for Jim. Kathleen cares about Jim. She doesn’t know whether she should tell Jim what she thinks of Lisa.
Opposite-sex intimate relationship dilemma (Dilemma 2):

*1. What do you think Kathleen will do? Why?

2. In your opinion, do you think Kathleen’s and Jim’s relationship is intimate? Why/Why not? Can opposite-sex friends have intimate friendships? What will make opposite-sex relationships intimate?

3. What sorts of things do opposite-sex friends have a difficult time discussing? What kinds of things do you think opposite-sex friends can talk about that they would not tell others about?

*4. If Kathleen tells Jim her opinions about Lisa and Jim still wants to go out with Lisa, how will it affect their relationship? Can Kathleen still have an intimate relationship with Jim if they have disagreements? Why/Why not?

5. Is it difficult to have opposite-sex intimacy between friends? Why/Why not?
John and Tina are both 24. They met in their freshmen year in college and have been seeing each other ever since. They do a lot of things together but they don’t usually talk about their feelings with each other. Sometimes, they talk about their future but they never really plan anything.

After graduating from the university, John found a good job. John has a close relationship with his family so he still lives at home. Tina went on to graduate school and she lives near the university. She usually visits John on weekends.

Now, Tina is finishing up her graduate school. She has a job offer near her parents’ home but it is several hundred miles away from John. The job is something she always wanted but she also cares about her relationship with John very much. She doesn’t know what to do.
Boyfriend-girlfriend intimate relationship dilemma (Dilemma 3):

*1. What do you think Tina will do? Why?

2. In your opinion, do you think Tina's relationship with John is intimate? Why/Why not? What makes a boyfriend-girlfriend relationship intimate?

3. What sorts of things does a girlfriend have difficulties discussing with an intimate boyfriend? Why? What kinds of things do you think a girlfriend can talk about with an intimate boyfriend that she won't tell others about?

*4. How would it affect their relationship if Tina took the job offer?

5. Is it difficult to have an intimate boyfriend-girlfriend relationship? Why/Why not?

6. What makes an intimate boyfriend-girlfriend relationship last? How does an intimate relationship break up?
Dianne is a college sophomore and lives a couple of hours away from home. She recently met Ken at a party. Ken is an art major. He likes drawing and hopes to be an artist some day. After a few dates, Dianne perceives Ken to be a very hard working and intelligent young man with lots of potential in art. However, Dianne also knows that her mother won’t like Ken because she is never approving of artists. Her mother believes artists cannot make a living.

Dianne is the only child at home. Dianne’s father divorced her mother when Dianne was 10. Dianne’s mother worked very hard to raise Dianne and borrowed money to send Dianne to college. Dianne knows that her mother hopes Dianne will find a man who can provide well for her so that her life won’t be as difficult as her mother was in the past. Therefore, Dianne didn’t tell her mother about Ken.

One day, Dianne’s mother has to travel on business near Dianne’s college so she stops by for a surprise visit. When she arrives, Dianne’s roommate tells her that Dianne is out at her boyfriend Ken’s senior art exhibition. Her mother is very angry. After Dianne comes back, she confronts Dianne on her deception and accuses her of betraying her mother’s trust.

Dianne is torn. Her mother was always there for her when she needed help. However, she also likes Ken very much. She doesn’t know what to do.
Mother-daughter intimate relationship dilemma (Dilemma 4):

*1. What do you think Dianne will do? Why?

2. In your opinion, do you think Dianne's and her mother's relationship is intimate? Why/Why not? What makes a mother-daughter relationship intimate?

3. What sorts of things do mothers and daughters have a difficult time discussing? Why? What sorts of things do you think mothers and daughters can talk about that they will not tell others about?

*4. If Dianne decides to continue seeing Ken, how will that affect her relationship with her mother? Can Dianne have conflicts or disagreements with her mother but still have an intimate relationship with her? Why/Why not?

5. Is it difficult to have an intimate mother-daughter relationship? Why/Why not?
General questions (GQ):

1. What are the differences between intimate relationships and non-intimate relationships? Which is better - one intimate friend or a group of non-intimate friends?

2. What’s the importance of intimate relationships?

3. What makes a good intimate relationship? What makes it last? How is intimacy lost in relationships?

4. What kind of person makes a good partner in an intimate relationship? Why? What kind of person do you not want to have an intimate relationship with? Why not? Is it better to have intimate others similar to you or different from you? Why?

5. Is trust important in an intimate relationship? What is trust anyway?

6. What does it mean to be jealous in an intimate relationship? What does jealousy do in an intimate relationship? How can jealousy hurt an intimate relationship?

7. How do people in intimate relationships resolve conflicts?

8. In your experience, are there different kinds of intimate relationships? What are they? How are they different? What is intimacy in your opinion?

9. With whom do you feel most intimate with right now? Who is the person in relation to you? (questionnaire)

10. Is there anything I didn’t ask you about understanding intimate relationships which you think is important?
Please rate, currently, your relationships with the following persons. 1 is the most intimate, and 7 is the least intimate. Please leave blank if any relationship is not applicable in your life right now.

___ with father
___ with mother
___ with sister
___ with brother
___ with same-sex friend
___ with opposite-sex friend
___ with boyfriend (with girlfriend)

If there is another person you have an intimate relationship with who is not one of the above, who is the person in relation to you? ___________ and where would you rate the person in terms of intimacy using the above 1 to 7 scale ____?

Please provide the following information (the information will be kept confidential and separated from the interview tapes. Please feel free to leave out any question you do not wish to answer):

Personal background:

age _____ gender _______ ethnic background ____________

year in school _______ major ______________

any dating experiences _______ (if yes), are/were they serious relationships

or causal dates _________________ blood type____

birth order _____________ religion __________

Family background:

Mother’s occupation ________ Father’s occupation ________

Parent both living_______ Parents divorced (if yes) when you

were ______ and you live with ______________

home town __________________ years of living there _____

187
書面許可

我叫林潤芝，目前是麻州州立大學諮詢輔導系的博士候選人。此論文係研究不同文化之人，對人際關係的看法。感謝您接受邀請參與此項研究。

我將呈現四個故事給您，在您讀完每個故事之後，我會問一些您對故事內容的看法。之後，是一些概括性問題，最後，再問一些您的背景資料。您的回答沒有對錯，請盡量表達您的看法即可。（此面談約費時一至兩小時）

我將錄下並轉寫我們談話的內容——但您的身份是絕對保密的，如果您因故不願繼續下去，可隨時中止我們的面談。因以後我得紀錄並分析您回答的內容來寫我的博士論文。為了不過濫任何資料，錄音是必要的。

在面談過後，若您有興趣，我願進一步解釋我在研究些什麼，並回答任何您對此研究的有關問題。若您願意，我願聽您對此面談過程的想法；譬如：那些問題很有意思，那些問題您覺得沒有意義。

程序上，請您在下面簽名，以表示您了解此面談的目的，過程以及給予錄音許可。此外，此面談沒有金錢報酬。

若您對此研究有任何疑問，我的聯絡電話是美國：
(413) 586-7471 或寫信至：Jun-Chih Gisela Lin, Counseling Psychology Program, Hills South, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA. 01003, U.S.A.

我，_________讀了以上聲明，並同意參與此研究

-------------------------
參與人簽名
-------------------------
日 期
-------------------------
訪問者
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佩潔和珍珍都是十八歲的大一新生，並来自同一所大學。佩潔和珍珍是好朋友，多年來，他們常常一起做事及玩耍，分享私事並互相支持鼓勵。

目前，佩潔和珍珍上同一所大學，並且是室友。他們一起修一些課。佩潔覺得學業十分重要，因此很用功。然而，珍珍認為上大學正好可以多認識年輕優秀的男孩。

最近，珍珍因約會太晚，爬不起來而跳了一些早上的課。她也不再和佩潔一起上圖書館或吃飯。佩潔十分為珍珍擔心，她勸告珍珍不要太晚上課，不要跳課。但是珍珍聽不進去她的忠告。

現在，期中考快到了。珍珍要求佩潔借她上課的筆記並幫她複習重點，準備考試。佩潔告訴珍珍，除非珍珍答應約束自己，不再跳課，約會早睡，否則她不願幫她忙。珍珍很沮喪，她告訴佩潔說：佩潔不是她媽媽，管不了那麼多，並且又說佩潔一定是妒忌她跟男孩子約會。珍珍更進一步告訴佩潔，她不需要佩潔的幫助，但她再也不不要跟佩潔做朋友了。
同性朋友故事：

1. 您認為佩潔會怎麼做？她會不會借筆記給珍珍？為什麼？

2. 以您看來，您覺得佩潔和珍珍的關係親密、很要好嗎？為什麼？如何才能使同性朋友關係親密呢？

3. 那一類的事情同性朋友很難討論？為什麼？那一類的事又能和同性親密朋友討論？為什麼？

4. 在珍珍告訴佩潔不再做朋友那些話後，您認為他們之間的關係會受到什麼影響？你認為珍珍會不會再跟佩潔做朋友嗎？人們會不會說不自由的話？為什麼？

5. 同性朋友間若有差異是否仍可能十分親密、要好？為什麼？（為什麼不？）

6. 交同性親密朋友難不難？為什麼難？（為什麼不難？）
碧琳，十九歲；俊傑，二十歲；倆人是好朋友，因為他們從高中開始就一起參加學校樂團。現在他們又上同一所大學，並繼續一起參加樂團。有時候，俊傑會在放學後到碧琳家中一起練習樂器。俊傑很有幽默感，常使碧琳大笑。

俊傑最近跟麗珊約會，但碧琳不喜歡麗珊，她認為麗珊十分專制、忌妒、而且令人不可信任。因此，碧琳覺得麗珊配不上俊傑。碧琳十分關心俊傑。她不知道是否該告訴俊傑她對麗珊的看法。
異性朋友故事：

1. 您認為碧琳會怎麼做？為什麼？

2. 以您看來，您認為碧琳和俊傑之間的關係親近嗎？為什麼？（為什麼不？）異性（非男朋友）之間可否有親近關係？如何使異性朋友關係親近？

3. 那一類的事，異性要好朋友很難討論？那一類的事他們通常只會告訴異性要好朋友？

4. 如果在碧琳告訴俊傑她對麗珊的看法之後，但俊傑仍繼續和麗珊約會。那麼，您認為碧琳和俊傑之間的關係會有什麼影響？

5. 交異性好朋友難不難？為什麼？（為什麼不？）
偉強和結雅二人都二十四歲。他們在大一時認識並交往至今。他們常在一起做許多事，但並不常談到感情的事，有時候他們會談到未來，但並未有實際計劃。

大學畢業後，偉強找到很好的工作。因偉強與家人十分親近，所以他仍住家裡。結雅則繼續唸研究所，並住在學校附近。她通常在週末時到偉強家去玩。

現在結雅快從研究所畢業了，有人提供她一個工作機會。此工作靠近她父母家，但離偉強有幾百公里遠。此類工作是結雅一直盼望做的。但她也十分在乎和偉強的關係，她不知該怎麼辦。
男女朋友故事：

1. 您認為雅龍會怎麼做？為什麼？

2. 以你看來，雅龍和偉強的關係是否親密？為什麼？（為什麼不？）使男女朋友關係親密的因素是什麼？

3. 那一類的事，女孩很難和要好的男友討論？為什麼？那一類的事她又只會和親密男友討論而並不妨告路別人？

4. 如果雅龍接受那份工作，那麼她和偉強關係會受到什麼影響？

5. 有親密男女朋友關係難不難？為什麼難？（為什麼不難？）

6. 親密男女朋友關係如何持續？什麼因素造成分手？
淑惠是大二的學生，住校。最近在一個舞會上遇到博文，博文主修美術，將來準備當藝術家。在約會了幾次以後，淑惠覺得博文很勤奮，聰明，且有很高的藝術天份。然而，淑惠也知道她媽媽不會喜歡博文，因她媽媽看不起藝術家。她認為藝術家賺的錢不足以維生。

淑惠是獨生女。她爸爸十歲時與她媽媽離婚。她媽媽工作十分辛勞，並借貸供淑惠上大學。淑惠知道她媽媽希望她能找到一位有錢的如意郎君，如此淑惠的生活不會像她一樣辛苦。因此，淑惠沒有告訴她媽媽有關博文的事。

有一天，淑惠的媽媽要到淑惠學校附近辦事，決定順道看看淑惠，給淑惠一個驚喜。但她媽媽來時，淑惠不在。淑惠的室友跟淑惠的媽媽說：淑惠去看她男朋友的畢業畫展。淑惠的媽媽很生氣。淑惠回來時，她媽媽質問淑惠不誠實的行為，並指控淑惠背叛她媽媽的信任。

淑惠傷心欲絕。她媽媽總是在她遇到困難時無條件幫助她。然而，她真的很喜歡博文。她不知該怎麼辦？
母女關係故事：

1. 您認為淑惠會怎麼做？為什麼？

2. 以您的看法，淑惠和她媽媽關係親近嗎？為什麼？(為什麼不？)使母女關係親近的因素是什麼？

3. 母女之間那些事很難溝通？為什麼？又有那些事通常只有母女才能分享，那些事不會跟他人談起？

4. 如果淑惠仍打算跟博文交往，那麼她跟她媽媽的關係會受到什麼影響？即使淑惠和她媽媽有所衝突或意見不合，她們是否仍十分親密？為什麼？

5. 母女之間是否很難建立親密關係？為什麼？(為什麼不？)
一般性問題：

1. 親密關係和非親密關係的差別在哪？有一群親密朋友較好
    或是一群非親密朋友？

2. 親密關係的重要性為何？

3. 好的親密關係如何造成？如何維持？如何失溫？

4. 那種人是親密關係中的理想伴侶？為什麼？那種人您不
    會願意與之親密？為什麼不？您覺得和類似您或有很大
    差異的人有過親密關係較好？為什麼？

5. 信任在親密關係中扮演什麼角色？什麼是信任？

6. 為什麼忌妒在親密關係中出現？忌妒在親密關係中扮演
    什麼角色？忌妒會如何對親密關係造成傷害？

7. 當親密關係中的人有衝突或意見不合時？他們通常怎麼解
    決這些難題？

8. 在您的經驗當中？有沒有不同種類或典型的親密關係存在
    ？有的話？是那些種類？他們之間彼此有什麼不同？
    以您的看法，『親密』代表什麼意義？

9. 如果我問您目前您和誰關係最親密／要好，那個人是您的
    什麼人？（問下頁之問題）

10. 有什麼我沒問到的可助於了解親密／要好關係？您有沒
    有什麼要補充說明的地方？
下列有一個表，請依照在您目前生活中與這些的關係親密程度以1至7來劃分，1代表最親密，7代表最不親密。不適用的請留空白。

----------------跟爸爸
----------------跟媽媽
----------------跟姐姐或妹妹
----------------跟哥哥或弟弟
----------------跟同性朋友
----------------跟異性朋友
----------------跟男朋友

有沒有那些人，您目前十分親密，但不在上表的那個人與您是什麼樣的關係？____________若仍以1.(最親密)7.(最不親密)
您會給這人多少？____________

請回答以下問題（此資料是絕對保密的，並會與錄音內容分開存放，若有您不願回答的問題，請留白）。

個人背景:
年齡____________，性別____________，籍貫____________。
級別____________，主修____________，有否約會經驗
____________，(若有)是認真的或是朋友而已____________。
血型____________，出生序別____________，宗教信仰____________。

家庭背景:
母親職業____________，父親職業____________。
父母均健在____________，父母親離婚____________。
若是，您跟父親或母親住？____________，居住地____________，
住多久____________。
APPENDIX E

EXAMPLES OF USING REVISED SCORING MANUAL

Using the Same-sex dilemma for example, for the concepts of intimate relations and perspective taking questions, scoring is as follows:

If the subject expresses concepts of "fair weather" and is dominated by only one person's (either Becky's or Jane's) interests, she will get a CR 2 score. A CR 2/3 score will be given if the subjects reject CR 2 concepts. The subject can further demonstrate she understands that both Becky and Jane could contribute to the conflict, and thus they both need to give in (rather than just one); however, at this level, she doesn't show signs of understanding the meaning of mutual support. If the subject talks about both parties needing to make an effort to maintain their relationship, and shows concepts of "in a group of two" (e.g. "I'd feel bad if she fails the test because she has been a friend for so long and is really a good friend."), she will get a CR 3 score. A CR 3/4 score will be given if the subject rejects the "close-knit" concept and shows that she recognizes the importance of individuality and independence. For example, Becky will respect Jane's choice because Jane is her own individual and Becky would help Jane if Jane asked, she would not want to jeopardize the relationship because they knew each other for such a long time (efforts to maintain the relationship vs. fair-weather).

A CR 4 score will be given if the subject is willing to help her friend; at the same time, she also understands that her friend is an individual with her own needs; she will respect her friend's choice (either study hard or flunk out); she further hopes
that her friend will come around but also thinks her friend has to be responsible for the consequences of her choices/behaviors.

A full level PT score will given if the subject demonstrates enough evidence on any concept of the PT levels described by Selman (1980). Using the Same-sex dilemma as an example, the subject is asked to predict what Becky will do under various conditions and what Becky will consider when she makes her decisions.

Scores are given according to the following criteria: If the subject rejects to predict what Becky might do (PT 0-1); if Becky can see Jane’s point of views which could be different from hers (PT 1); if Becky makes her decision based on only her own perspective but cannot reflect upon that decision; she also knows that people sometimes say things they don’t mean but don’t know why (PT 1+); if Becky can see Jane’s point of views which could be different from her own; she can also see her own perspective as if she were Jane (PT 2); if Becky can coordinate the different perspectives (PT 2+) and if these perspectives are sequential (PT 2) or simultaneous (PT 3); if Becky can see what other people in her position might do to compare with what she herself might do; and/or discuss the relationship between Becky and Jane from a third-person perspective (PT 3); and further compare and contrast between the different sets of perspectives (PT 3+) qualitatively in her own system of analysis (PT 4) and/or abstract from the multiple mutual perspectives to a societal or moral perspective (PT 4).

More specifically, if the subject can talk about both Becky’s and Jane’s perspective and about their relationship from a third person’s perspective
simultaneously, she will obtain a PT 3 score. A PT 4 score will be given if the subject not only can coordinate all perspectives involved (e.g. both persons and their relationships) but can compare and contrast different sets and levels of perspectives with her own system of analysis. A transitional score will be given if there is enough evidence that she is above a certain level but there is not enough evidence for a higher level score.
APPENDIX F

CONCEPTS OF RELATIONS OF HIGH AND LOW
IN THE TRANSLATED CHINESE DATA

(Chinese high, Same-sex dilemma)

G: What do you think Becky will do?

I: What Becky will do? I feel Becky probably will insist on her
principles. She will still tell Jane that she [Jane] needs to behave
herself. If she [Jane] cannot, she [Becky] will have to give up being
friends like before.

G: So Becky won’t lend Jane her notes then?

I: Probably not.

G: In your opinion, do you think Becky’s relationship with Jane is
intimate?

I: From this, their closeness exists only because the environment makes
them be together. It is because there is such an opportunity to make
them together. In terms of their thoughts and views, I feel they have
big differences. So, I feel, in my own definition, I feel they are not
there yet to feel that way [to feel intimate].

G: Then what is your definition [of intimacy]?

I: In my definition, two people should share a lot. But, this sharing, it
shouldn’t be only "I tell you, you tell me". I feel it also includes
communication on their views and whether they can reach a certain
level of common understanding. For example, you may tell me [about]
your things, but, I don’t have to do the same things as you do. But I
know what you are doing and I respect you. But, here, I didn’t see
such a situation. It is obvious that their relationship with each other is
not stable from their past [relationship].

G: What else will make a same-sex relationship intimate?
Other than what I just said about communication, I feel, "intimacy", may mean they need to keep some distance/space so as to see [things] clearer. I feel if two people get too close, they are together all the time and they are also roommates, perhaps it is easier to get into problems. Then, it's hard to see [problems] from the whole dynamic. So, I feel maintaining a better relationship, they should keep some distance/space.

G: Then what did you mean by "stable" earlier?

I: I don't have any particular definition. But I feel the foundations of intimate relationships are built and accumulated gradually. It means that before, we are together not because the environment makes us so that we have to be good friends; but it may due to interpersonal attraction, that something makes us be together. Then during the process of being together, we have to experience something together, to face some problems. After resolving the problems, we understand [each other] more. I feel the problems keep arising, [you] keep solving [them], then two people can better understand what kind of person you are and what kind of person I am. Based on such a foundation, then, after they go to the university, they won't suddenly realize that your ideas about university life are so different from mine and we cannot communicate; or even reject communicating and make judgments about their feelings, about whether to continue their relationship before communicating.

G: Is it difficult to have an intimate relationship with same-sex friends?

I: I feel it's difficult.

G: Why?

I: Same-sex friends, up to a certain point, they may be stuck and cannot go further.

G: How so?
I: I often feel that with same-sex friends, up to a certain point, it is difficult to tell your real feelings. Because you go out/become friends for a while, you will think about what the other will feel about what I said. In fact, if the foundation from before is stable, you may say [your real feelings]. But, [I] don't know why, if [the relationship] develops to a certain point, I feel two people both will have such considerations in their mind. Therefore, if they don't keep some distance/space, I feel when they are together, they will feel pain.

G: Is it similar to what you said earlier, you can see the other person more objectively and also maintain the relationship that way?

I: I feel each should have one's own life circle; but also some circles in common. Friends together, it is crucial to have common experiences. We two may do things together; but, other than the time together, each of them needs to develop their own life circle. This way, they will have more things to share and they won't feel too much pressure from each other.

(Chinese 3, age 22, p. 1-5.)
G: What do you think Kathleen will do?

I: I think she will ask Jim why he is with Lisa. Try to understand his opinions first; then tell him her opinions.

G: In your opinion, do you think Kathleen’s and Jim’s relationship is intimate?

I: I think it is not bad; they should consider it as "Yaw Haw".

G: Why?

I: Because they have been together for three or four years now. It feels like high school is an important time for an individual to grow and develop. Then, the friends they make during this time, in my personal experience, will last longer. Then, it also depends on after they enter the university whether they still have common interests and often spend time together.

G: Then do you think if friends from high school last longer, it is because they have a common developmental history?

I: Yeah, but it also depends on afterwards. For example, if Jim goes to college but Kathleen does not, this could affect their relationship heavily.

G: In your opinion, can opposite-sex friends have a friendship type of intimate relationship?

I: I feel they can but under the assumption that they both have the same understanding.

G: Then, what will make opposite-sex relationships intimate?

I: You mean friendship type of "chinchin", "yaw haw"?

G: Yes.

I: I think common interests are important; whether they spend time together is important. In addition, whether there is so-called outside pressure or discerning judgment.
I feel same-sex friends have more competition. Then, the major differences between same-sex and opposite-sex friends are they both need to know where they are because it involves defining friendship vs. love. That is, on one hand, they need to have common agreements; on the other hand, at different phases, [she and he] know one's feelings toward the other person. I think this is important.

What sorts of things do opposite-sex friends have a difficult time discussing?

Like if you have to tell him like in this situation.

What kind of things do you think opposite-sex friends can talk about that they would not tell others about?

Everything is possible as long as they both are willing only to tell each other but no one else.

So, they won't only talk about certain things because of the gender differences?

I feel it is more difficult to talk about life's trifles or small secrets. It is usually bigger or more solid topics. Maybe, some people talk about more special things and some others say nothing.

Earlier you said you will ask Jim what he thinks of Lisa first, why is that?

Because I feel Kathleen's opinions about Lisa are her own subjective views and feelings. There was no information about why Jim is with Lisa in this description. So, I feel before communicating with another person, it is more important to understand the other person.

So, that is a principle of making friends?

Yes.

If Kathleen tells Jim her opinions about Lisa and Jim still wants to go out with Lisa, how will it affect their relationship?

It could become more distant. I feel it will be more distant not only because Jim didn't accept her opinions. But also because he has a
girlfriend now, if he is still getting together with Kathleen, then, for Lisa, there may be some uncomfortable conditions happening.

G: Is it difficult to have opposite-sex intimacy between friends? Why/Why not?

I: I think it is a little difficult for two reasons. One is what I said earlier about the society making judgments. The other is you don't know what kind of relationship the other person wants to have with you.

G: So, societal pressure and common understanding both count.

I: Yes.

(Chinese 8, age 23, p. 5-8.)
What do you think Tina will do?

I think if Tina really cares about her relationship with John, I feel she probably will take a long time to choose, whether she will take that job. It's so hard, I am not sure what kind of relationship Tina has with her family.

Why will her relationship with her family matter?

Because it said that the job is close to her house.

Then could you describe all the possibilities that you are thinking?

I think she may think about this job and her interests; that is, how much this job is attractive to her. The second is her relationship with John, how much are they involved. Third, is what I just said, relationship with the family.

What kind of role does her relationship with her family play in here?

I don't know; but it emphasized that John and his family are close but it didn't mention about Tina [’s relationship with her family]. So, I am thinking, maybe she is not very close to her family. Therefore, she doesn't have so many restrictions. Then she doesn't necessarily have to live close to her family. If so, then she only needs to consider the first two conditions but not this one. But, if her relationship is also as strong as John’s relationship with his family, then she needs to consider her parents.

In your opinion, do you think Tina’s relationship with John is intimate?

I feel it’s hard to tell.

Why hard?

Because here it only said that they often do things together. Sometimes they talk about the future but they don’t talk about their feelings. I feel [try to think] how such a relationship is different from other so called good friendships?

Then, in your opinion, what makes a boyfriend-girlfriend relationship intimate?
I: Intimate relationship? Emotionally, they depend on each other. They probably want to do things together just like friends. That is, I feel, intimate relationships have to have the same prerequisite as regular good friendships; after that, they add their feelings in, the dependency will be particularly strong.

G: Earlier you said that good friends need to keep some distance/spaces. How about with an intimate boyfriend?

I: I feel it [some space] is still needed.

G: They need to be emotionally dependent but also need to keep some space with each other. What kind of situation is that?

I: I think that dependence is a type of spiritual support; it doesn’t mean they need to be together all the time, then call it dependence. That they give each other commitment, make future plans together, set goals together and also limit certain types of things.

G: What sorts of things does a girlfriend have difficulties in discussing with an intimate boyfriend?

I: Very intimate [boyfriend]?

G: Yeah.

I: I feel sex is difficult to talk about.

G: What kinds of things do you think a girlfriend can talk about with an intimate boyfriend that she won’t tell others about?

I: It is so hard to imagine because I don’t have a boyfriend.

G: How would it affect their relationship if Tina took the job offer?

I: I don’t think it will affect much. So, I am thinking that Tina should accept that job.

G: Why?
Because from the description here, they only spend weekends together. She can still visit John on weekends and do her own things on the other times. I feel that it doesn't affect [their relationship] much because I judge from here, they both sound very rational; when they talk about the future, they talk more about their career. If this is a really good job, and if she feels her relationship with John won't affect much, then she will accept the job.

Then do you think a female should have her own career or should she put her boyfriend ahead?

I feel she should have her own career.

Is it difficult to have an intimate boyfriend-girlfriend relationship? Why/Why not?

For me, it is very difficult.

Why difficult?

I feel that fears are important reasons. Like myself, I feel I am afraid to take that kind of responsibility. That is, each has to be responsible for the other's feelings. I feel there is less obligation between friends. But, when they develop into boyfriend-girlfriend relationships, they have a deeper level of relationship compared to regular good friendships. Then they have higher expectations for each other. So, I feel I cannot develop such a relationship.

Did you always think this way or is something happening to you right now to make you think this way?

I probably always thought this way. This belief has always restrained/restricted me. When I meet some male and develop to a certain level, I will consider whether I want to go on any further.

Do you have other goals or other reasons to make you think this way?

No other reasons. I just always feel the whole thing gives me a lot of pressure. It may also come from your previous life environment.

What kind of life environment? What are the things you think influence the most?
I: I feel it comes from the environment I grew up with. It didn't give you clear [ideas/guidance] to justify what kind of relationship with the opposite-sex is OK to have. I feel that after I got into the university and suddenly met so many males; I found it difficult to define how far and what kind of relationship I want to develop. I think that under the "unknown" circumstances, it made me think this way.

G: What makes an intimate boyfriend-girlfriend relationship last?

I: From what I see, they usually will spend more time to care for each other. As a result, they also have things like responsibilities, rights and duties. I don't know. I cannot think of any.

G: How does an intimate relationship break up?

I: Many reasons will cause breaking up. Some environmental, like in Taiwan, men have to serve in the army. If one of them is in the army and the other one goes to graduate school. When there are some distances involved; they have to change their ways of being together. When they cannot take such changes, they may break up. Or, a third person may be involved.

G: Why would the environmental distance break up their relationship?

I: Environmental factors make them think differently; it also may make the goals that an individual's pursuing different. Therefore, [they] may not communicate and be congenial. It is because two people grow at different speeds, some faster, some slower. So, their communication becomes difficult, and they break up.

(Chinese 3, age 22, p. 10-14)
G: What do you think Dianne will do?

I: I feel she should talk to her mother and tell her that she likes Ken very much. I think she should let her mother know that she knows that her mother is thinking about Dianne’s good. However, Dianne can choose her own boyfriend.

G: In your opinion, do you think Dianne’s and her mother’s relationship is intimate?

I: What’s your definition of "intimacy" here?

G: It’s up to your own definition.

I: I cannot tell.

G: Then what makes a mother-daughter relationship intimate?

I: Just like a same-sex relationship. Maybe you will feel strange that I don’t necessarily think that a mother and a daughter have to be intimate. Perhaps a mother has special feelings toward her child; but, I think it is not the same as "intimate". It may be because the mother and daughter think very differently; at least, in the growing process, it’s more difficult to have an intimate relationship. Sometimes, parents know that their child is a certain way and they are willing to accept the way their child is. Sometimes, the child also knows the ways [her/his] parents think and is willing to back off and to accept the parents’ ways of thinking. But, I don’t think that it [the relationship with mother] can be as intimate as with same-sex. It is because she [the mother] has to play a parent role, and it will have some distance.

(Chinese 9, age 20, p. 13)
(Chinese high: Mother-daughter dilemma)

G: What do you think Dianne will do?
I: I think she will leave Ken.
G: Why?
I: Because, it feels like she is attached to/dependent on her mother. In addition, she seems to have an intense relationship with her mother. After reading the description here, I also feel that Dianne is not a person with her own opinions/ideas/principles.

G: What would you do if you were Dianne?
I: I would look at [my] relationship with Ken, which level it is in. Because I feel some people, when they are in love, they [act] on their feelings. Then, I may examine the types of things that Ken wants to accomplish in his life and compare them with mine. I will see whether they can match/fit. Then, of course, I will do so called "communication" with her mother. Because I feel Dianne's mother is very arbitrary/dictatorial.

G: Why do you think Dianne doesn't have her own opinions?
I: "[She was] torn". I feel it doesn't need to be that degree yet.

G: Then, what kind of communication [will she have] with her mother?
I: To understand the factors/reasons that she (her mother) has. If I feel those are not reasonable, then I will insist on my own opinions.

G: Then what makes a mother-daughter relationship intimate?
I: They each can have their own life, be independent and autonomous. But, at the same time, they can care about each other. It's better not to try to do things for the other person. They can often talk or do things they like together.

G: Does this also apply to other types of intimate relationships?
I: It can, with a boyfriend or with same-sex friends, but with opposite-sex friends, it may be faced with some societal pressure.
In your opinion, do you think Dianne's and her mother's relationship is intimate?

I: I feel it is "intense". But, if it is "intimate", I feel this word means their hearts are open and connected [they understand each other from the heart]; but, I don't think her mother knows her very well.

G: For you, what is your definition of "intimacy"?

I: I feel [it means] harmonious. Then they both can have a sense of security. However, "intense" may not describe these two.

G: Anything else?

I: When [they are] together, intimacy makes people feel pleasant, but also feel some independence. For example, I feel "intimacy" [an intimate relationship] is like two trees; their branches are entwined together but they are still two trees. If it is "intense", it is like one tree is attached to [dependent on] another tree to live. So.

G: So, you feel that an intimate relationship should be like two trees; they are inter-dependent with each other but they are still two separate trees?

I: Right.

G: This is an interesting example. What sort of things do a mother and daughter have a difficult time discussing?

I: I feel it will depend on their relationship with each other. For example, in talking about Dianne and her mother, I feel, when Dianne is, well, how should I say this. I feel that a child should grow apart from her family at a certain age. However, some mothers cannot accept this situation. So, it is often difficult for the two to discuss this situation.

G: Why do you think when children grow up, they should grow away from their family?

I: Because I think the family is a place for nurturing and cultivating. Once you reach the age of being mentally mature, you need to take some social responsibilities. Or, you need to be searching for your own individual meanings of life. I feel that we cannot be too dependent on family when doing so.
G: Is it difficult to have an intimate mother-daughter relationship?

I: I have seen those difficult ones. In my personal experience, I also feel it is a little difficult.

G: Why?

I: It may be because of the personality. It feels like sometimes, the mother always sees her children as children. I feel once these kinds of thoughts are there, it is difficult to stand on the other’s heart to look at the other’s things. Then I feel it is difficult to be close to the other person. So, it will affect their relationship.

G: Do you think it is because of the mother role or a generation gap?

I: I feel it depends mainly on their personalities, not so much on the roles.

(Chinese 8, age 23, p. 13-16)
What do you think Becky will do?

You want me to imagine?

If you were Becky, what would you do?

I would ask the teacher.

If you were Becky, would you lend Jane the notes?

If it were me, no.

In your opinion, do you think Becky’s relationship with Jane is intimate?

Yeah.

Why?

Because they have a common background.

What makes a same-sex relationship intimate, other than a common background?

A common background includes school environment and family environment. And, personality. Personality, similar or complementary.

What sorts of things do same-sex intimate friends have a difficult time discussing?

What sorts of things? (She tried to find answers from the story.)

Not necessarily from the story, examples from daily life situation are OK.

When it involves interests/benefits. Conflicts with interests.

What kind of conflicts with interests?

Like if two people like the same boy; or, if [he] was one’s boyfriend; but someone else likes him; it is like betraying her.
G: What sorts of things can intimate same-sex friends talk about that they won't tell others about?

I: Ya, like those "can only tell the girl" [type of] things.

G: Like what? What are they?

I: Like physiological [type of] things.

G: After what Jane told Becky, how do you think their relationship will be affected?

I: Ya, like they feel they used to be such good friends, how did it become like this [situation]?

G: Then?

I: Then the friendship between each other changed.

G: In your opinion, what accounted for these changes?

I: Environment.

G: What kind of environment? How so?

I: After they entered the university, this environment, although it is the same; there also is a different environment within this environment. Then, the things that everyone looks for are different. So they cannot be like before, walk on the same pathway. So, [they are/have become] apart.

G: Do you think Jane really meant it when she told Becky that she didn't want to be her friend any more?

I: Maybe it's out of anger.

G: Do people say things they don't mean?

I: It may be true because she feels so. She [Jane] herself likes socializing; Becky cares more about school. Maybe she was not communicating with Becky and they believed so [what they said].

G: So, is it important to communicate?
I: Ya.

G: Can same-sex friends have differences but still have intimate relationships?

I: What kind of differences?

G: Any kind.

I: It's possible. But they need to be tolerant and considerate of each other. Communication is important.

G: Is it difficult to have same-sex intimate friends?

I: It depends on "Yuan". [If you] met [each other] it is easy; [if you] didn't meet it's difficult.

(Chinese 7, age 19, p. 1-5)
G: What do you think Kathleen will do?

I: (long pause) If I were Kathleen? I feel I would still talk to the teacher. Because I always look for a teacher's help whenever something comes up. Because I feel I cannot resolve it myself.

G: What do you think Kathleen will do?

I: I am not Kathleen.

G: In your opinion, if you were Kathleen, would you tell Jim what you think of Lisa?

I: I probably will.

G: Why?

I: Because it said that Jim is a good friend. If so, telling the truth between good friends is possible.

G: In your opinion, do you think Kathleen's and Jim's relationship is intimate?

I: It should be.

G: Why?

I: (Long Pause) Because [they] know each other and have been together not just for a short time. They also keep maintaining [being together].

G: Can opposite-sex friends have intimate friendships?

I: Maybe. But, maybe one person can; but I don't know whether the other person can accept it [or not].

G: What sorts of things do opposite-sex friends have a difficult time discussing?

I: When other people are involved. Like in this story.

G: Anything else?
I: I don't know. I have few opposite-sex friends.

G: What kind of things do you think opposite-sex friends can talk about that they would not tell others about?

I: (long, long silence) I cannot think of any.

G: If Kathleen tells Jim her opinions about Lisa and Jim still wants to go out with Lisa, how will it affect their relationship?

I: Two possibilities. If Jim accepts and agrees, then the "point" in Kathleen's heart can be resolved. Then they can be close like before. But if Jim doesn't accept, maybe he will wonder whether they are just having "pure" friendship. [He] will feel Kathleen is jealous. Then he is with Lisa, and if he does really like Lisa, then he won't be friends with Kathleen anymore.

G: Is it difficult to have opposite-sex intimacy between friends?

I: It still depends on "Yuan".

G: If they have "Yuan", is it difficult to go on?

I: It still depends on whether they have enough "Yuan".

G: Other than "Yuan", what else?

I: Heart. See if each of them has that kind of heart to know each other. It is not enough just to see one person; both people have to be willing.

(Chinese 7, age 19, p. 6-8)
What do you think Tina will do?
I: (Long long pause). If I were her? I said I will ask the teacher.

What do you think she will do?
I: I don’t know. It’s a choice. It depends on whether she wants to choose the job she likes or wants to choose John.

If you ask the teacher, will you accept one hundred percent of the advice the teacher tells you or just use it as advice?
I: Just as advice.

What’s the function of teachers?
I: To give you advice; teachers know more.

In your opinion, do you think Tina’s relationship with John is intimate?
I: It should be.

Why?
I: They’ve known each other for a long time; it remains so.

What makes a boyfriend-girlfriend relationship intimate?
I: The "intimate relationship", does it mean they are boyfriend-girlfriend already?

It’s up to your definition.

What makes an intimate relationship?
I: Ya.

If I define them as boyfriend and girlfriend; that is they love each other.

What else other than love each other?
(Long pause). They have to spend a lot of time together. Like two people going out, two people have more problems than just one person does. When problems arise, they resolve the problems together. Like the time issue, maybe one person wants to spend a lot of time together but the other person doesn't. In such a conflict, they should be considerate, and tolerant. Otherwise they might break up.

G: How do they usually resolve such conflicts?
I: I don't know. I haven't had any experience.

G: How would other people resolve them?
I: Some of my friends have problems. I told them to communicate. But they said it was useless to talk because each of them insists on their own opinions. One person will say I want to spend time with you because I love you and you should spend more time with me. But because they insist on their own opinions, they think their own ideas are right.

G: If it were you, do you think it's important to spend a lot of time together?
I: (Knock head).

G: How would it affect their relationship if Tina took the job offer?
I: Because of the time and space [it would] increase the distance between them.

G: What sort of things does a girlfriend have difficulties in discussing with an intimate boyfriend?
I: (Long pause) When another person is involved.

G: What else?
I: I cannot think of any.

G: What kinds of things do you think a girlfriend can talk about with an intimate boyfriend that she won't tell others about?
I: If they are very "yaw haw", maybe like with same-sex friends, they can say everything.
G: Is it difficult to have an intimate boyfriend-girlfriend relationship?
I: It depends on "Yuan".
G: What makes an intimate boyfriend-girlfriend relationship last?
I: (Long pause) Tolerate each other, be considerate and love each other.
G: Why does an intimate relationship break up?
I: Many reasons. Like personality conflicts. Or, they break up because they know each other too well. Third person. Or other unavoidable constraints such as their parents disagreeing with the relationship. Or, if one person is going abroad. Or, for example, if the boy drives and hits another car. This girl asked him to be responsible for the rest for her life. Then he cannot marry the other girl he used to know.
G: Is this a story from the novel?
I: Ya, but it might happen.
G: What you just said, is it from TV, novels or personal experiences?
I: From TV and novels. I never have had a boyfriend.

(Chinese 7, age 19, p. 9-11.)
(Chinese low, Mother-daughter dilemma)

G: What do you think Dianne will do?
I: Again, I will say I will consult with teachers.
G: Other than consulting with teachers, what do you think Dianne will do?
I: Tell her mother the truth, that she really likes Ken.
G: Then?
I: Then it depends on the mother’s responses.
G: If Dianne decides to continue seeing Ken, how will that affect her relationship with her mother?
I: If [they are] having good communication, it should be OK.
G: What if her mother still disagrees?
I: Then [Dianne] has to choose to either be a good daughter; or she really likes Ken.
G: Is there any way they both can be happy?
I: It depends on the mother’s understanding.
G: Then it’s difficult to make them both happy?
I: Right.
G: In your opinion, do you think Dianne’s and her mother’s relationship is intimate?
I: Maybe yes and maybe no.
G: How so?
I: Maybe because [Dianne] has lived with her mother since childhood, she knows her mother’s hardship. But she should be good and listen [to her mother]. But I don’t know whether she tells her mother everything. I don’t know in her heart, whether her mother is just a mother or if it’s both a mother and a friend.
G: What makes a mother-daughter relationship intimate?
I: It's both a mother and a friend.
G: What else?
I: That's all.
G: What sorts of things do mothers and daughters have a difficult time discussing?
I: Like now.
G: What else?
I: Like if parents try to arrange what you should do in the future; like they hope you can do something to make money, like being a doctor or a lawyer. But if your interests are not those and you want to study art, or literature. Then when choosing majors, it's difficult. Especially if your parents keep pushing you; you'd feel stressed.
G: What sorts of things do you think mothers and daughters can talk about that they will not tell others about?
I: Like physiological problems during puberty.
G: Can Dianne have conflicts or disagreements with her mother but still have an intimate relationship with her?
I: It depends on whether they have good communication. Maybe they can if it's [their communication] good.
G: So you think communication is the basic way to resolve conflicts?
I: But it's hard.
G: Why?
I: Because of the beliefs. Parents' beliefs are already established. It's difficult to change.
G: Is it difficult to have an intimate mother-daughter relationship?
I: Are you talking about people in general?
G: Or your own experiences; like do you have a brother or sister?

I: I do but I am not close to them.

G: Why not?

I: If [they] lived together since they were young and each other is "Yaw Haw" and understand each other; then they will be close. But if they live apart on their own and develop on their own; like go to study and be away from home, then it may change.

(Chinese 7, age 19, p. 12-15.)
APPENDIX G

ANALYSIS OF INTER-RATER RELIABILITY

A. Concepts of Relations Stage Scores

Although there were some variabilities in the data from both groups, three American and two Chinese subjects were difficult to score with Selman's (1979) scoring method. This was due to many unscorable bits of data (e.g. subjects were less verbal or these data were not described in Selman's model). Although I tried to score as many issues as possible for each dilemma, these scores became problematic when there was disagreement between the raters. Although both raters generally agreed on who was high and who was low, the revised manual was problematic. On the American data, the Concepts of Relation scores between two raters were one stage different in four dilemmas (two in Dilemma 1, and one in Dilemma 2) and were a half stage different in five dilemmas (one in Dilemma 1, two in Dilemma 4 and two in General Questions). After examining the data, I found some patterns of disagreement. For example, in the three one stage different dilemmas, I scored CR 2/3 on all three, but rater two scored them CR 3/4. Reliabilities in dilemma 2 (Opposite-sex dilemma) are generally low due to less scorable units.

On the half stage score differences, I rated scores a half-stage lower than the other rater two except on one dilemma (in GQ I was half stage higher). For example, one subject's conversational style was very "content specific"; as a result, I gave her half stage lower scores than rater two (CR 2) on two dilemmas, although in this case...
both raters agreed that the data were not sufficient to give a CR 3 score. Therefore, although we agreed on eight dilemmas, the reliability on exact agreement was lower than expected and so was the Lowest CR stage score. This type of disagreement would likely decrease if we used Selman's (1979) manual instead of the revised manual. This is because we would have less CRI to score and we would only have to discriminate among four possible scores, rather than eight for each scoring.

B. Perspective Taking levels

Some subjects' PT scores were difficult to score on the PT questions. Therefore, we had to give the highest evidenced PT score for each dilemma. For example, one Chinese subject said she would "ask my teacher what to do" on each perspective taking question. However, after I asked several follow-up questions, she was able to reflect from a second person perspective simultaneously; as a consequence, she received a PT 2 level score. Another example is that one American subject was very verbal. She offered many personal examples and I felt that she could reflect her thoughts and reasoning simultaneously and also showed some signs of talking from a third person perspective. Therefore, I gave her PT2+ for both dilemmas and PT 3 for the other two dilemmas. However, rater two didn't give her any PT score although he did give her PT3 and PT3+ on the other two dilemmas. Another problem area is that I gave PT 2 scores for all subjects who could reflect their reasoning simultaneously even if they only talked from one perspective. The major reason was because I asked only one perspective. However, rater two gave PT 1+ in the same situation.
I adapted one part of Selman's method on Closeness (Intimacy-Different types of friendships) for this study. I didn't use all of Selman's (1980) questions; however, his Perspective Taking Levels were mostly written for use with the whole method (Selman, 1980). Therefore, I suspect that this contributed to the difficulties in scoring some subjects' PT levels. Less information was elicited. Further, one score in each dilemma was problematic because each rater might have looked at different pieces of information when scoring.
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