

Are We Family? Inspecting the Influence of Taiwanese People's Country, Nation, Culture, and Civil Identification on the Perception of Relationship with “China”

Chengshan Frank Liu
Institute of Political Science
National Sun Yat-Sen University
Kaohsiung City, Taiwan

This is the first draft to be presented in WPSA Annual Meeting, Seattle, April 17-19, 2014.

Abstract

The Taiwanese government's and people's preferences about “unification” with the Mainland China has been identified as a salient issue in the dynamics of interaction between Washington, Beijing, Tokyo, and Taipei. Factors behind this politically sensitive preference, however, have not been comprehensively and systematically examined. This study proposes a theoretical model that incorporate important explanatory variables of unification/independence preferences, including generation as well as country, nation, party, culture, and civil identifications. Six sets of hypotheses drawn from Taiwan studies are tested against empirical data collected in Taiwan in 2013 and 2014. The series of analysis updates our understanding about Taiwan's identity politics and sheds light on the discussion about Taiwan's political future.

Keywords: Taiwan, identity, democracy, unification, independence

Introduction

The majority of Taiwanese people may have kept their positive evaluation of the Mainland China until 1995, when they stunningly witnessed that Beijing launched a large scale military practice against the Republic of China (ROC)'s present Lee Teng-hui who informally visited Cornell Univeristy as an alumni, or until 1996 when Beijing escalated the scale of practice and launched two missiles within two weeks before ROC's first direct presidential election. The purpose of military practice was well known by Washington and Taipei as the strongest warning that Taiwanese voters should not support Lee Teng-hui as a potential “separatist” of the People's

Republic of China (PRC). This military action seemed backfired: Lee was elected as the first direct-elected president in ROC history and Taiwanese awareness soared.

Beijing's action against Taiwan in 1995-1996 can be seen as the second round of national movement that catalyzed changes of identity mindset of people living in Taiwan. The first was what Kuomintang (KMT, or Guomingdan, GMD, the Chinese nationalist) did after its lost of the civil war in the Mainland China to Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and retreated to Taiwan. More than 20,000 Taiwanese people, particularly elites, were excited, murdered, or blindly killed around 1945-1948 due to KMT's restrict ruling policy and its fear of being destroyed in Taiwan (see, Kerr (1976) This historical event (2-28 event) caused the first wave of identity change, particularly undermined Taiwanese people's country identification with ROC and national identification with Chinese.

Stories behind historical events that shape Taiwan's issue have been well documented. Scholars calming historical events have shown that the nature of Taiwan's issue is political, cultural and psychological. This paper cannot go beyond what history scholars and political watchers have summarized in their works of providing meaning of such events. But this paper contributes to this stream of observation by transforming such political, cultural and psychological factors into a theoretical model that help systematically understanding how Taiwanese people think about their country and their unforgettable neighbor, the Mainland China.

Among numerous empirical puzzles concerning Taiwan's political identity, this study focuses on three critical sets: First, what are the determinant factors that influence Taiwanese people's identification with the country/state, the nation, and the relationship with PRC? To answer this question requires clearer definitions of the concepts, more accurate measurements, and a more carefully specified models that are examined with more updated data. Second, how do people in Taiwan think about themselves in terms of nation and country and how do they think about the relationship between them and the mainland? While we don't expect that Taiwanese people will grow more friendly toward the mainland given negative impressions about “China” imprinted over the past decades, its is important to know what the imagined relationship—enemies, friends, or family—is and what factors of driving them to feel so are. Third, how do Taiwanese think

about future? That is, do Taiwanese people prefer to see unification of ROC and PRC? If not, who, and why do they resist the idea of unification with the Mainland China? Will they become willing so if PRC becomes a democratic regime? How do people of different generations see this issue?

All of these questions to be answered require a provision of a set of hypotheses, serving to focus our attention on key causal relationships, formulated on the basis of clearly defined concepts and well designed measures. As there has not been a scholarly consensus about how each concept should be measured to achieve validity, the measurement to be used in this study should be seen exploratory and pilot. Even though, analysis results to be presented in nine tables, which are organized into three sections below, some of which are consistent with previous studies, debunk some spurious relationships and provide new prospectives.

The following sections present organized literature, ended with hypotheses, with respect to (1) country identification: ROC identity vs. Taiwan (Republic) identity, (2) pan-national identification (greater-Chinese identification), national identification (Taiwanese, Chinese, or Both), and culture identification (pride about Chinese cultural), (3) civil identification (prejudice about and confidence in Taiwan's democracy) and preferences about unification, and (4) generation differences. The section of method, next, specifies the model and introduces the data sets. The results, presented as three studies, are organized in the way consistent with the order of literature review. The conclusion and discussion section will summarize hypotheses that are supported and not supported by empirical data, patterns found other than these hypotheses, and their meanings for better understand Taiwan's public opinion, party politics, and political choices for the future.

Taiwanese Identity Politics and Hypotheses

Since the 1990s there has been strong consciousness of Taiwan sovereignty; “Taiwanization” (*bentuhua*) has penetrated deeply within the Taiwan body politic in the early 2000s (Hsiao 2005; Rigger 2006). Besides the dramatic democratization process, such as student movement in 1991 for Congress reform, the 1996 missile crisis across the Taiwan straight stimulated Taiwanese

people to further distinguish Taiwan from the Mainland China (Garver 2011), Taiwan's identity issue is mixed with country or state identification (Sustaining ROC or establishing Taiwan as a state), national identification (remaining being a Chinese or rejecting Chinese identity and simply claiming Taiwanese), culture identification (remaining proud or not of being the leader of Chinese conventional culture), and civil identification (being proud of the democracy of Taiwan). To study how multi-layers of identification influence each other and whether they independently influence one's unification preference, we need to clarify concepts and measurements. This task should be taken along with the review of literature on Taiwan politics.

Isn't Taiwan China? ROC vs. Taiwan

It is acknowledged that inspecting the distribution of voters on Taiwan's identity issue is critical to understand Taiwan's Mainland China policy (Hsieh 2004; Rigger 2006). The distribution of Taiwanese voters' opinion about unification and independence, however, has been difficult to interpret because the concepts of country identifications and national identifications have been exchangeably used for interpreting Taiwan's politics.

It is not new that the majority of people identify themselves as Taiwanese. As Rigger (2006) comments on a survey showing that 80 percent of the respondent saying that “our country” (*women de guojia*) is Taiwan (only), “Taiwanese [identifiers] are not interested in unification; they believe they are citizens of a state (the survey cleverly avoids the issue of what it should be called) that exists only on Taiwan. On the other hand, they challenge the notion that Taiwanese no longer see themselves or their island as meaningfully connected to ‘China’” (p.23).

A minor problem of earlier research of this stream is that the concept of “country” was vaguely defined, which can easily group together those identifying ROC only and those pursuing creating a new country. There are two major issues that have been addressed in Taiwan's country identification.

First, it has been well acknowledged that Taiwan is not (yet) a nation-state, but the term “nation identification” has been widely used as “state/country identification.” Scholars, journalists, and policy makers assuming so tend to equalize the distribution of Taiwan's national identity (*minzu*

renton) to the one of Taiwanese people who seek independence from China (PRC).

For example, Wakabayashi (2006) adopts Nai-de Wu's definition and defines nationalism with country identification: "Independent Taiwan" (support for Taiwan independence). The problem is tautological: using such defined nationalism to describe country identification.

Christopher Hughes (1997) is one of few scholars that first point out this problem:

"From a longer historical perspective, this argument may be seen as the continuation of attempts to adapt Chinese vocabulary to the discourse of a world of nation-states. This has been seen throughout this work in the case of a term such as *minzu*, used as the equivalent of 'nation', or the adaptation of *Zhongguo* (Central Kingdom(s)) to 'China'. The term *guo* is a similar case. For thousands of years this pictogram has consisted of symbols representing a population and a sword within a wall, as it still is in Taiwan.

The term *guo* is a similar case. For thousands of years this pictogram has consisted of symbols representing a population and a sword within a wall, as it still is in Taiwan. It has come to be rendered into English in a variety of ways, including 'state', 'country' and sometimes 'nation'. What should be clear from this work, however, is that the matching of Chinese vocabulary to English terms is a political activity in itself. As part and parcel of the attempt to adapt Chinese thinking to the categories of the EuropeanAmerican tradition of thought, this allows for a degree of creativity in interpretation. It has been shown above that, when looked at in terms of the different demands it is trying to satisfy in dealing with the Taiwan problem, the idea of the *guo* has been stretched to contain a cluster of meanings which it is difficult to catch in English translations. Perhaps the notion of a 'post-nationalist identity in an intermediate state' is the closest it is possible to get to catching Taiwan's identity and status as they have come to exist within the context of the Chinese *guo* at the end of the twentieth century" (Hughes 1997, 162).

Unfortunately, this fundamental issue has not been widely addressed in studies on the Taiwan identity issue. Take another example:

"Modern concepts of citizenship are premised on the concept of sovereignty. As far as the issue of national identity is concerned, Taiwan lacks the framework that would enable its citizens to reconcile themselves to one another as members of a "community of fate."

The essential condition for establishing a more “civil” society—in which internal issues such as ethnic equality can be patiently addressed—is lacking. This is a major problem that Taiwan has encountered in the past and remains a key impediment if the process of indigenization in politics and culture is to continue” (Hsiau 2005, 272).

What the problem to which Hsiau refers is not the conflict between going independent from PRC and reunifying with PRC. Instead, it refers to how difficult it is to find balance between two distinct country identifications within Taiwan, that is, either sustaining ROC or transforming it to a new country called Taiwan.

This nation-state assumption can lead one to agree a commonly accepted statement like this: the fundamental gap between Taiwan and China in their perception about the cross-straight issue is that Taiwan insists that it is a sovereign entity, not autonomy, while China thinks Taiwan as autonomy like Hong Kong (see, Bush, 2013). Although such observation is very true in terms of international relationship, strategy, and security regarding the Taiwan issue, one can easily neglect to observe the two types country identification to which “Taiwan's sovereignty” refers, i.e., transforming ROC to Taiwan or creating a new country called Taiwan within ROC.

Thinking from this perspective, the second point can be made clear: the term “independence” (*duli*) has multiple meanings. A commonly adopted meaning of it is Taiwan's establishing a new sovereign state out of PRC. The other meaning is Taiwan's establishing a new sovereign state out of ROC.

In both Chinese and English “independence” can mean dignity, sovereignty, and/or being able to make own decisions. Survey respondents in Taiwan usually won't doubt the trueness of the statement in Chinese “Taiwan *shi* yige zhuquan duli de guojia,” meaning that “Taiwan is a country that has dignity and sovereignty, and it can makes its own policies and decisions.” Both respondents who have acknowledge the legitimacy of ROC and those who seek transforming this political entity to Taiwan Republic are likely to agree with this statement. Hence, the distribution of the answers to this question can be easily interpreted as that the majority of Taiwanese people are seeking independent from China (PRC) (e.g., Jacobs, 2006). In effect, indepenence from m PRC has not been a real issue in Taiwan. As Rigger (2006) and Su (2008) observe, Chen

Shui-bian of his DPP comrades woefully misread Taiwan's public opinion by equating growing Taiwan identity with growing support for independence.

Even that the term “independent” is used to refer specifically to its narrower meaning, that is “independent from a country,” in Taiwan that country will only be ROC but not PRC. Similarly, the term “unification” won't be used as “reunification” (with PRC) in Taiwan but as a remote option regarding the relationship with the Mainland China under the constitutional framework of ROC. As Bush (2005) keenly observes, even in Li Deng-hui and Chen Shui-bian's era (2000-2008) “independence” from PRC (or even ROC) was not an issue. At that time, “Taipei's goal has not been to avoid being a part of China, as Beijing sought to frame it. Rather, the issue was how Taiwan might be part of China—or more precisely, how the governing authority in Taipei would be part of the state called China” (Bush 2005, 81).

Those who already identify themselves as ROC citizens will reject the concept of “Taiwan independence”. Agreeing that Taiwan has its sovereignty does not mean that they agree that Taiwan separates from ROC. Therefore, a better measurement should avoid the logically problematic term “independence” but focusing emotional attachment to nation (Taiwanese) and county (Taiwan or ROC). See also Liu (2012).

Given the clarification of the meaning of country identification and unification, two hypotheses can be formulated here:

- H1a: country identification with ROC positively influences one's attitudes toward future unification with the Mainland China.
- H1b: country identification with (a future) Taiwan (Republic) negatively influences one's attitudes toward unification with the Mainland China.

Imagined China: National, Pan-National, and Culture identity

National and Pan-national Identification

National identification (*minzu renting*) refers to one's psychological attachment to a group of people living in a political entity, including one imagined, and feeling of of them. Such group identity can get self-strengthened through selective and psychological process (Klandermans

2014). To a nation-state, “national identification” means one's psychological attachment to a group of people living *in the same state/country*. As stated above, however, Taiwan is a proper case of a non-nation-state; therefore, the two concepts should be dealt separately. Following this definition, sayings like “I am a Taiwanese” or “I am a Chinese” should be measurement of national identification instead of country identification.

Through decades of historical and political education, Taiwanese people, particular the elder generations have been familiar with the slogan that we are offsprings of the Chinese great emperors Yandi and Huangdi of 5,000 years ago (*yanhuan zusen*). This historical sense of being a Chinese can play a role of bridging two versions of nationalism across the Strait.

Pan-national identification (pan-Chinese identification) means beliefs that “we belonging to the same greater Chinese nation” (*zhonghua minzu*). Pan-national identification refers to “the extent to which people in one place would regard people in various other places as belonging to the same, larger nation” (Liu and Lee 2013, 1115). This concept specifically refers to the greater-Chinese identity that is held by Chinese identifiers in societies out of the Mainland China, including Taiwan and Hong Kong. A saying like “you in the Mainland China and I in Taiwan are all Chinese” can be seen as an indicator of this identification.

This pan-national identification with the greater Chinese nation gradually lists its ground in Taiwan. As Wakabayashi (2006) observes, the Chineseness of Taiwanese intellectuals was isolated since Japanese colony because Taiwan's direct connect with Japan economically. The Mainland China did not acknowledge the awareness of being Chinese, or Taiwanese-made Chineseness, after 1945 (Wakabayashi 2006, 9–10). Mover, the emergence of Taiwanese nationalism further undermines both Chinese nationalism and pan-national identification. Taiwaneseeness was distinguished from ROC through three critical waves. One is the 2-28 Incident in 1947 in which around 20,000 Taiwanese dead or missing. The second wave is the ROC's being expelled from the United Nation in 1979, the shock that undermined the established ROC Chineseness though education, such as labeling economic success as “the Taiwan Miracle” (p.12-13). The third is the non-KMT (*dangwai*) movement in the 1970s against KMT in which “the pursuit of a particular Chineseness deployed by their predecessors against Japanese colonial rule was reinterpreted as actually that of a unique Taiwaneseeness” (Wakabayashi 2006, 14).

As this narrowly defined Chinese identification has lost its ground in Taiwan, one should expect that the proportion of voters identifying themselves as Chinese is small today and can continue to decline. Taiwanese identity began to out-number those with Chinese identity by mid-1990s and the gap continued to widen in the late 1990s. Chinese and Taiwanese identity” at roughly the same height and “Chinese identity” distinctly lower in the opinion spread (Su 2008, 285).

Even though, pan-national identification is expected to play a role of bridging people of the two sides of the Taiwan Strait. As Liu and Lee (2013) observe based on 2011 data, pan-Chinese nationalism, not necessarily as defined by the CCP, but in its broadest definition, can influence Taiwanese to perceive that Hong Kong people are fellows belong to the same Chinese nation and Hon Kong people to perceived that Taiwanese people are fellows belong to the same community. In other words, one could expect that this identification positively influence attitudes toward unification.

Dual national identification, on the other hand, has become a critical term to describe those people who do not reject Chinese national identity, inclined to claim Chinese in its narrow definition, and wants to be accepted in Taiwanese society. Chang and Wang (2005) observed that Taiwanese identification with Chinese shifted to dual national identity, i.e. both Chinese and Taiwanese between 1994-2002. As this trend continues, one should expect growth in dual national identity along with the growth of Taiwanese national identity (Liu and Lee 2013).

Based on the literature we draw three hypotheses regarding national and pan-national identification:

- H2a: Chinese national identity positively influence attitudes toward unification
- H2b: Taiwan national identity negatively influences attitudes toward unification.
- H2c: pan-national identification positively influences attitudes toward unification.

Culture Identification

Culture identification refers to psychological attachment to a set of symbolic cultural elements of a nation [not necessary a nation-state]. It is usually accompanied with pride about own culture.

As culture identification is an element of national identification and a critical part of pan-national identification, one could expect that people in Hong Kong and Taiwan share similar Chinese culture identification. Scholars expect that: the concept of “one China” will only become meaningful to Taiwanese people in terms of culture identification (Wang and Chang 2005; Wang and Liu 2004). Identifying culturally with traditional Chinese culture explains pride in ROC and ambivalence with respect to country identification (Liu and Lee 2013).

Culture identity as an “ancestral connections with mainland China” was used by KMT as a means to plant the Chinese nation-state ideology in Taiwan in the 1950s. As Rigger (1997) writes,

“The Kuomintang carried these deeply contradictory impulses with it to Taiwan. A belief in the superiority and assimilative potential of Confucian culture; a desire to create a modern nation-state whose boundaries could enfold territories beyond China's cultural heartland; and an instinctual respect for blood-ties: each of these contributed to the Republic of China's ambiguous notion of *minzu*. On Taiwan, the KMT was determined to propagate all three impulses in the service of two fundamental objectives: the establishment of a Chinese government on Taiwan after 50 years of Japanese colonization, and the recovery of Mainland China. The ROC government held that Taiwan was Chinese territory under all of the possible definitions. Culturally, its inhabitants were heirs to the Confucian tradition. Politically, it was part of China's sovereign sphere. Ancestrally, its population originated in China and belonged to China's traditional clans.” (Rigger 1997, 316)

As Chinese national identification in Taiwan has been weakened over the past decades, it is expected that Chinese culture identification has declined, too. As Makeham (2005) observes, the connection between country identification and Confucianism, which is an important part of Chinese culture identification, from 1980s to early 2000s “has been seriously eroded due to the lack of a sustained, politically enforced program of ‘Confucian enculturation’. The significance of attempts by Confucian revivalists to find a voice for Confucianism in indigenization discourse should be understood as a reaction to this situation” (p.208). He also points out a fundamental problem of those identifying with Chinese culture: although confucianism has been indigenized

into ‘Taiwanese Confucianism,’ for the Confucian culturalists Taiwanese (national) identity remains subordinated to Chinese (national) identity and that there has not been a culturally hybrid form of Confucianism that can be identified as Taiwanese Confucianism.

Given the above review of studies, three hypotheses can be drawn to examine the role of culture identification and to correspond the inquiry of Chang and Wang (2005): “is the dual [national] identity based primarily on cultural orientations? Or, does this identity have both cultural and political connotations?” (P.44)

- H3a: culture identification positively influences one's acceptance of Hong Kong.
- H3b: culture identification positively influences one's preference about unification.
- H3c: culture identification positively influences the adoption of dual national identity.

Partysanship and Policy Choices

The ecology of political parties in Taiwan has been evolving from the KMT-dominant system since 1945 to a two-party like system today—the pan-blue camp lead by KMT and the pan-green camp led by Democratic Progressive Party (DPP).

Studies of the history of recent Taiwan politics has shown that the rise of DPP is based on opposition mainly to KMT and secondly to the ROC constitutional tradition. The use of Taiwanese nationalism for electoral campaign is usually discussed as DPP’s main strategy to win elections (Horowitz and Tan 2007; Horowitz and Tan 2007; Rigger 2001) The most recent salient events regarding the development of Taiwan's political party system occurred between 2000 and 2008—DPP won the presidency first time in 2000 (and 2004 the second time) and KMT comes back to the power in 2008 (and 2012 the second time). Both political parties by now have two terms of presidency: Chen Shui-bian (2000-2008) and Ma Ying-Jeou (2008-2016).

As DPP is more associated with one's Taiwan national identification, KMT is more associated with one's country identification. As the KMT's campaign commercials in 2012 shows, KMT's strategy to mobilize supporters and attract votes has shifting from its strength in economic policies, particularly those associated with the Mainland China, to the call of one's loyalty to ROC and the “status quo” (the current ruling of ROC that brings peace to the Taiwan Strait).

Commercials were full of ROC symbols, including the flag song and flags. Although there has no published study showing that such strategy guarantees KMT's winning of the election, the result indirectly justifies its strategy; at least, it worked for mobilizing KMT loyalties and independent who have mild country identification with ROC to go out to vote. The ROC's national flag, while has been acknowledged representing both ROC and current Taiwan, has not welcomed by DPP loyalties for its association with China. Therefore, such kind of “symbolic” war about ROC flags will be continued in future elections.

Drawn from this conventional wisdom and observation, two intuitive hypotheses will reflect what most Taiwanese people view about the two political parties regarding the idea of “China”.

- H4a: KMT supporters imagine about a greater China.
- H4b: DPP supporters seek “Taiwan independence” (including transform ROC to Taiwan or separating Taiwan from ROC).

Democratic Prejudice and Confidence

The history of Taiwan's democratization has been well documented. Most studies agree that Taiwan's history of democratization is a driving force of Taiwanese people's Taiwan consciousness, country identification, and national identification, although these concepts may influence each other.

The association between the concept of democracy itself and one's identification, however, has been understudied. Shih (2007) is one of the exceptional scholars touching this issue. He argues that the role of democratization in the rise of Taiwan consciousness or Taiwan's image of democratic state is neither guided by liberalism nor stimulated by anti-communist nationalism. “Liberalism is an ideology of universal application. By adopting it, the practice was able to distract independence advocates from pursuing separate statehood for Taiwan. The focus may be shifted to demanding a liberal state of China which includes Taiwan” (p.714). Therefore, he implies the existence of other factors that drives the rise of Taiwan country identification.

Li (2014) proposes a picture that both sides have developed their own social experiences—Taiwan's based on democracy and China's on nationalism. However, Li does not

clarify how Taiwan's social experiences of democracy is associated with the call for “independence”. Such democracy-independence claims, in effect, is composed of numerous sub-hypotheses that worth examination. Because relationships as such are mixed up with the concepts of country, national, culture, and party identifications listed above, the influence of identification with Taiwan's democracy on country identification can be spurious relationships given all other strong factors are considered.

Identifying with democracy is a vague concept because democracy is hardly an ideology in Taiwan, as Shih (2007) argues, but we think that democracy has become a life style. Therefore, to study this most important aspect of civil identification (others include respect for equality, tolerance, etc.), it is important to look into the two dimensions of concept: prejudice in democracy and confidence in democracy.

The first dimension of civil identification with democracy is prejudice about Taiwan's democracy against the Mainland China's system (non-democracy). This way of thinking suggests that Taiwan's democratization experiences are unique, not replicable, and superior to the current political system practiced in the Mainland China. The second dimension of civil identification with democracy is confidence that Taiwan's democracy can become a shield for her safety, by which Taiwan can win supports from other sister democratic allies, as well as a leverage to stimulate democracy in the Mainland China.

These two definitions of civil identification with democracy can lead to opposite expectations. If one prejudices about Taiwan's democracy, he or she may take democracy as a wall between Taiwan and the Mainland China; if one is confident in Taiwan's democracy, he or she may feel safe to reach out for interaction with the Mainland China. As such reasoning has not been tested in previous studies, I formulate the following hypotheses for examination.

- H5a: Prejudice about the superiority of democracy makes Taiwanese people to distinguish themselves from the Mainland China.
- H5b: Prejudice about the superiority of democracy enhances one's national identification with Taiwanese.
- H5c: Confidence in democracy increases one's willingness to negotiate with the Mainland

China.

Generation Politics

Generation is one of important factors that are recently found to explain shifts of Taiwan's identity (Rigger 2006; Wang and Chang 2005) Chang and Wang (2005) identify four generations and find that the second, third, and the fourth generations, compared to the first generation, are more likely to have dual national identification. We follow Chang and Wang (2005) and Rigger (2006) for their descriptions of the first four generations, make adjust meant for the fourth generation, and add two more generations to the framework.

- The first generation: born by 1931. They entered the formative years before 1949 and witnessed the social conflicts between ethnic groups.
- The second generation: born between 1932 and 1953. They entered the formative years between 1949 and 1971 and witnessed the diplomatic difficult time of ROC.
- The third generation: born between 1954 and 1968. They entered the formative years between 1972 and 1986 and witnessed Taiwan's economic boom.
- The fourth generation: born between 1969 and 1978. They entered the formative years between 1986 and 1996 and witnessed the era of student social movement for Congressional reform the establishment of DPP.
- The fifth generation: born between 1979 and 1988. They entered the formative years between 1997 and 2006 and witnessed the missile crisis in 2006 and experienced transfer of power from KMT to DPP in 2000.
- The sixth generation: born after 1989. They entered the formative years after 2007 and witnessed transfer of power from DPP to KMT in 2008 and the debates and signing of Cross-Straits Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement (ECFA) between 2010 and 2013.

It is expected that there is little generation differences regarding country and national identification. “The younger generations in Taiwan are more likely to display characteristics of Taiwanese nationalism or a pro-Taiwan identity, but a substantial number of mainlanders, traditionally staunch supporters of greater Chinese nationalism, now also exhibit similar identities” (Wang and Liu 2004, 586). However, it should be expected that the fifth and the sixth

generation, particularly the sixth, are more likely to think differently from their elder fellows because they were born in the era where Taiwan has been geographically separate from China and that the fruit of democracy is ready for harvest. To test and update this view about generation differences regarding their identities about the Mainland China, three hypotheses about generations can be drawn here:

- H6a: Senior generations are more attached to the great China concept.
- H6b: Younger generations are more alienated from the great China concept.
- H6c: Younger generations are likely to be Taiwan nationalists.

Research Methods

This research project is designed to employ two telephone survey data sets, which are used for three studies that mutually supplemental to each other. The first study focuses on factors of county identification, the second on national and pan-national identification, and the third on unification/independence preferences.

Model Specification

Analysis using binomial logistic regression will be applied to these three studies. These studies will share the same theoretical framework in which national, pan-national, country, culture, civil identification are included as explanatory variables. Besides the key explanatory variables, these models include the following control variables: experiences in the Mainland China (whether the respondent has been to the Mainland China within recent two years) and demographics (gender, education, and generations).

Each concept has multiple measurements. They are included into the models after a check for collinearity, that is, we make sure that those variables that are included into the models and that they are not highly correlated. Country identification is measured by country name choice, establishing own country, and becoming one country with the Mainland China:

- Some people say that our country's name is Taiwan. Do you agree?
- Some people say that our country's name is Republic of China. Do you agree?
- Some people say that we should be proud of being a citizen of Republic of China. Do you

agree?

- Some people say that Taiwanese should establish own country. Do you agree?
- Some people say that Hong-Kong and Shang-Hai are foreign cities. Do you agree?
- Do you hope that one day ROC changes its name to Taiwan or Republic of Taiwan?
- Do you hope that Taiwan and the Mainland China become one country?

National Identification is measured with “Some people say they are Taiwanese, some say Chinese, and some say both. What about you?” Pan-national identification is measured by the the following question:

- Some people say that Taiwanese and Chinese in Mainland China belong to the same nation (minzu). Do you agree?
- Some people say that Hong Kongers and Chinese in Mainland China belong to the same nation (minzu). Do you agree?
- Some people say that people in Mainland China are our compatriots/fellows. Do you agree?

Culture identification is measured by one question “Some people say that our culture is authentic/orthodox Chinese culture. Do you agree?” Civil identification is measured by two questions: one question of prejudice about Taiwan's democracy, “Some people said that our democracy is better than the Mainland China's political system. Do you agree?” and one of confidence in Taiwan's democracy, “Do you believe that our democracy and freedom can change the Mainland China?”

Three questions are used for probing preferences about (future) unification with the Mainland China:

- If both China's and Taiwan's political system are democratic, do you like to see the unification of Taiwan and China?
- Some people say that the two sides of the Strait ultimately will be come one country. Do you agree?
- Do you hope that Taiwan and the Mainland China become one country?

The variable age is recoded into five dummy variables: the first generation (born by 1931), the second generation (born between 1932 and 1953), the fourth generation (born between 1969 and 1978), the fifth generation (born between 1979 and 1988), and the sixth generation (born between 1989 and 1993). The third generation (born between 1954 and 1968) is taken as the base of comparison. We think that it represents the “core” of the electorate who are likely to be parents and professionals who have established in their domain knowledge, particularly those who are in the leader positions in the government and business.

Data

We acknowledge that one single telephone survey cannot include all of the above survey questions. Therefore, we distributed the questions to two surveys that share most key questions but each has its own focus. The one conducted in 2013 was designed to include most conceptual questions and the one conducted in 2014 was designed to include one or few identity questions and to focus on asking preference questions, particularly the question about perceived relationship between Mainland China and Taiwan and the question about the ownership of Diaoyutai (Senkaku) Islands. By doing this we like to (1) test hypotheses with data collected in different years, and (2) exploring patterns with the newest data set. Appendixes 1 and 2 provide details about the coverage of the variables, question wording, original questions in mandarin Chinese, and frequency distribution.

The 2013 dataset was collected from January 23 to February 4, 2013 by a telephone survey center of a research university in Taiwan, a democracy that has a two-party system similar to the U.S. The population of the electorate was eligible voters above 20 and sampling was based on the telephone book published by Chung-Hua Telecom in 2010. The computer assisted telephone interview (CATI) system removed the last two digits of all telephone numbers and replaced them with a full set of 100 double-digit figures from 00 to 99. Specific numbers were then randomly selected from the database by computers. The 1,078 interviews were completed for the survey. The response rate was 21.56% following American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) response rate formula 2. Based on population information from 2012, raking weights were applied to the sample and it was ensured that the distributions of sample age, gender, and education levels did not substantially differ from the population.

The 2014 dataset was collected from January 10 to 24, 2014 by the same institute (N=1,072). The response rate was 23.9% following American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) response rate formula 2. Based on population information from 2012, raking weights were applied to the sample and it was ensured that the distributions of sample age, gender, and education levels did not substantially differ from the population.

Findings

Study 1: Taiwan vs. ROC

The findings drawn from the two surveys are organized into three studies, each of which serves better understanding of the complexity of Taiwanese identity. The first study is composed of two sets of analysis and focuses on country identification and depicts a picture about how Taiwanese people struggle to deal with their political future.

Country Identification

[Table 1 is about here]

Table 1 gives an overview of the respondents' country identification with an imagined country named Taiwan, with the concurrent country name Republic of China, or with both. The measurements of the dependent variables of the first two models are “Some people say that our country's name is Taiwan. Do you agree with that?” and “Some people say that our country's name is Republic of China (zhonghuamingguo). Do you agree with that?” where 1 denotes “agree” and “strongly agree”; 0 denotes “neutral”, “disagree”, and “strongly disagree”. In the third model 1 denotes respondents who are coded 1 in both of the questions, otherwise 0.

The comparison across the three models show four results consistent with a previous study based on 2011 data (see, Liu and Lee 2013). First, country identification with ROC and with Taiwan are not mutually exclusive. Those who are proud of being citizens of ROC and those who agree that Taiwanese should establish own country approve the alternative option. Second, those identifying themselves as Chinese, KMT supporters, or those of higher education levels are unlikely to tolerate Taiwan as a name of a country. Neither are they likely to give both names

equal weight. Such objection of the use of “Taiwan,” however, does not lead these group of people to be more likely to favor the name of ROC. Third, younger voters are likely to adopt ROC and to give ROC and Taiwan equal weights. What Table 1 adds to our knowledge are two points: (1) culture identification is not found to have positively influence on one's propensity to giving equal weights to both names; (2) the sixth generation (compared to the third generation) is likely to giving equal weights to both names.

Name Change and Democracy

[Table 2 is about here]

Country identification. Table 2 presents a model probing into factors of the fundamental meaning of country identification: country creation. The majority of respondents agrees or strongly agrees to a straightforward question “Some people say that Taiwanese should establish own country. Do you agree?” (37.01% strongly agree, 30.15% agree, 2.32% neutral, 15.49% disagree, and 9% strongly disagree). This pattern is not influenced by culture identification and (surprisingly) party identification. (Hypotheses 4a and 4b are not supported.)

The variance of the will to establish a new country for Taiwanese is explained by country identification (the acknowledgement of Taiwan as country's name), national identification (I am a Taiwanese), and civil identification (Taiwan's democracy is better than main China's political system). Additionally, people holding pan-national identification (people in Mainland China are our compatriots) and of a higher education level are likely to reject this thought that Taiwanese should establish a new country. Moreover, the second and the fifth generations, compared to the third generation are likely to support the zeal of creating a new country.

This finding indirectly supports Hypothesis 5a (Prejudice about the superiority of democracy makes Taiwanese people to distinguish themselves from the Mainland China), rejects Hypothesis 6a (Senior generations are more attached to the great China concept), and indirectly supports Hypothesis 6c (Younger generations are likely to be Taiwan nationalists). After all, this pattern

generates few a few empirical puzzles requires more elaboration.

Inspecting the factors of this aspect of civil identification, the second model in Table 2 shows that people who have adopted Taiwan as the name for the country, who have a clear perception of Taiwan's territory (not covering the Mainland China), and who have a higher education level are likely to generate such prejudice. Interestingly, the sixth generation, compared to their parent's generation, feels less prejudice.

In sum, one's willingness to see Taiwan becomes a normal country is not influenced by his or her partisanship but by these three factors: (1) Taiwanese national identity, (2) the perception that Taiwan has been a political entity with its name and territory, and (3) the prejudice that Taiwan's democracy is superior to Mainland China's political system.

Study 2: Are We Family? Pan-National and National Identification

The second study, composed of three sets of analysis, focuses on the topic “are we family?” and presents how pan-national identification and national identification shapes one's imagination about Taiwan-China relationship.

Pan-National Identification

[Table 3 is about here]

Table 3 provides comparison across three models of pan-national identification, including (1) people in Taiwan and people in Mainland China belong to the same nation, (2) people in Hong Kong and people in Mainland China belong to the same nation, and (3) people in the Mainland China are our compatriot fellows (*tongbao*), meaning that we share the same national blood.

First, all models show that Taiwanese national identity is a force that weakens pan-national identity. It is unlikely that those who claim themselves Taiwanese will see themselves part of the China legacy. Education does, as expected, enhance pan-national identity, whose role on dual identity will be discussed below and in the next section. Female voters appear to be less likely to

than their male counterparts to adopt the great Chinese concept. Second, when it comes to Hong-Kong, Taiwanese people who identify with ROC are likely to see Hong-Kong people and people in the mainland belong to the same nation, the finding consistent with an earlier study (Liu and Lee 2013). In Taiwan's education and constitution, Hong-Kong, Taiwan, and Mainland China are all parts of ROC.

Second, regarding hypotheses testing, we find that culture identification with traditional Chinese culture plays a role of distinguishing Hong Kong people from mainland Chinese, a clear support for the Hypothesis 1a. Evidence for the role of generation is mixed. It is not found that the senior generations (the first and second) are more likely than the third generation to maintain the great China ideal (Hypothesis 6a). We do find that, however, the youngest generation of voters, compared to the third generation, are more able to distinguish Hong Kong people from mainland Chinese, which supports Hypothesis H3a.

Third, in the third model where the focus is on factors of Taiwanese pan-national identification, we find that three out of the five country identification factors (being proud of ROC, that Taiwan should establish own country, and perception of Taiwan's territory), partisanship, education, and generation explain. Except that the emotion of being proud of ROC positively influence the formation of pan-national identification, the other factors impair the imagination: thinking that Taiwan should establish own country, confirming that Taiwan's territory excludes Hong-Kong and Shang-Hai, supporting DPP, better educated, or born after 1979 (the fifth and sixth generations).

The contradictory role of education in the first and the third model needs further explanation. Voters who are consciously aware that they and those people from Mainland China share the same national and historical legacy may not see the mainlanders like fellows living on the same land. Therefore, Taiwanese voters of higher education level are more aware of the similarity between people across the straits in terms of culture, language, and customs, but they are also aware that people from the mainland are more like “tourists” or “guests” than neighbors or villagers.

National Identification

[Table 4 is about here]

The above analysis shows that Taiwanese pan-national identification is primarily (negatively) influenced by their Taiwanese national identification. Table 4 presents models that further inspect factors of Taiwanese national identification, Chinese identification, and dual national identification. Consistent with Liu and Lee's 2011 findings, the comparison across the three models show three points. First, Taiwanese identifiers are likely to be those who take Taiwan as a country name and those who reject pan-Chinese identity. KMT supporters are unlikely identify themselves Taiwanese. Second, Chinese identification is driven by none of the variables listed in the model, but it is negatively influenced by "Taiwan" as a name of the country. Individuals in Taiwan who refuse changing the name of ROC or refuse to acknowledge Taiwan's de facto statehood are likely to claim themselves Chinese. Third, people of dual national identity are likely to be KMT supporters, those acknowledging the legitimacy of ROC, rejecting the idea of creating another country Taiwan within the framework of ROC, or those seeing people in the Mainland China are compatriots.

Table 4 provides three new points to the above documented pattern. First, none of culture identification, civil identification, or generation explain the formation of dual identity. This pattern provides little support for Hypothesis H3c (Culture identification influence the formation of dual identity) (Wang and Liu 2004) and suggests that culture identification influences neither the formation of Chinese identity nor dual national identity. Prejudicing Taiwanese democracy is not likely to lead one to claim either Taiwanese or both Taiwanese and Chinese (Therefore, Hypothesis 5b is not supported). Additionally, there is no evidence showing that the younger generations (4th, 5th, or 6th generations) are more likely than the third generation to identifying themselves as Taiwanese.

Second, education is found to play a role in the model of dual national identification. As Taiwan's education system has reformed since 2001 and the textbook market has become diversified in terms of ideology and political perspectives, students are forming dual identities as

they grow and are exposed to diverse historical and political perspectives.

Third, KMT supporters have long been recognized the group of people rejecting Taiwanese national identification (see Liu and Lee 2013). Table 4 shows that this was not a case in 2013, implying that national identification of KMT supporters have become more diversified between 2011 and 2013.

Analyzed Relationships with Mainland China

[Table 5 is about here]

How do Taiwanese people analyze the their relationship with people in the Mainland China? Table 5 provides three models that helps explore factors of such imagination of enemies, friends, and family. The most striking pattern is that none of country identification, national identification, and party identification influences the perception of the relationship, except that those who prefer using Taiwan over ROC in international affairs are unlikely to see mainlanders as family. This can be seen as evidence reflecting the memory of PRC's unfriendly treatment of Taiwan's application to international organizations in early 2000.

The lower half of Table 5 provides better explanatory factors for the imaged relationships, including preference of future unification, gender, and generation. First, respondents who hope future unification with the Mainland China are unlikely to see Mainland China as enemy but families. Second, those who are confident that Taiwan's democracy can change the political system of the mainland are unlikely to see Mainland China as enemy. This provides indirect support for Hypothesis 2b (confidence in democracy can make Taiwanese people be able to cooperate with China). Respondents who are confident in Taiwan's democracy are more able to avoid hostile attitudes toward Mainland China.

Third, female respondents, compared to male counterparts, are likely to picture Mainland China as friends but not family. Forth, people of higher education are unlikely to see Mainland China as friends. Fifth and the most interestingly is about the role of generation. The first and the second

generation, compared to the third generation, see the Mainland China as family but not friends, which indirectly supports Hypothesis 6a (Senior generations are more attached to the great China concept.). The younger generation who are in their early 40s or younger are more likely than the third generation to see Mainland China as enemy. This finding indirectly supports Hypothesis 6b (Younger generations are more alienated from the great China concept).

Study 3: Policy Preferences

The third study is composed of four sets of analysis. The analysis of preferences is based on the first two studies that present the extent to which pan-national, national, country, civil, and culture identifications influence the process of identify formation. This section extends the focuses from theoretical perspectives to policy choices for the future, including establishing a country, unification with the mainland, and stances about the ownership of Diaoyutai (Sankaku) islands.

Future Unification with the Mainland China

[Table 6 is about here]

Unification with the Mainland China has been a goal KMT and ROC pursue, but how do Taiwanese people's preferences fit into this scenario? The 2013 data reveals that in responding to the question “If both China's and Taiwan's political system are democratic, do you like to see the unification of Taiwan and China?” 43.88% of the respondents agree and 45.29% disagree. When asked a more sensitive question, “Some people say that the two sides of the Strait ultimately will be come one country. Do you agree?” 28.57% of respondents agree and 60.67% disagree. Apparently, unification is a controversial issue for Taiwanese voters.

Table 6 presents factors that explain the variance of the two variables of future unification. First, in the model of unification under democracy none of country identification (ROC or Taiwan), party identification DPP or KMT), culture identification, and democratic pride is found to have any statistically significant influence on preference of democratic unification. (These finding provides no support for Hypotheses 1a, 1b, 3b, 4a, and 4b.)

Pan-Chinese identification, but not Chinese national identification, is found to have positive influence on attitudes about democratic unification (supporting Hypotheses 2c but not 2a). Female, comparing to male, respondents and those holding Taiwanese national identity are likely to hold negatively attitudes toward democratic unification (Hypothesis 2b that Taiwan national identity negatively influence attitudes toward unification is supported).

In the model of inevitable unification, the findings show that people who strongly resist this passive tone about Taiwan's future are those who wants to establish a new country, who see themselves Taiwanese (and neither Chinese nor both), and who prejudice Taiwan's democracy. These findings partially supports Hypotheses 1b and 5a and give full support for H2b.

Unificaiton-Independence Preferences

[Table 7 is about here]

The 2014 survey asked respondents two sensitive questions about their prospective about Taiwan's political future and the distributions are consistent with those of the two dependent questions of Table 6. In the first 5-point scale question “Do you hope that Taiwan and the Mainland China become one country?” proportions of the answers, from “hope not very much” to “hope so very much” are 18.84%, 26.68%, 17.44%, 15.49%, and 16.32%. The missing rate is 5.22%. For the second question “Do you hope that Taiwan and the Mainland China become one country?” the distribution is 44.50%, 30.69, 11.47%, 6.53%, and 3.64%. The missing rate is 3.64%.

The influence of Chinese identification on accepting unification with the Mainland China is not found (not supporting H2a), consistent with the finding shown in Table 6. What is new to address is the significant, negative influence of Taiwanese identification on accepting the option of unification (supporting H2b).

Similarly, the influence of party identification with DPP on accepting the option of unification,

which is not found in the 2013 data (Table 6), is negatively significant in the 2014 data (Table 7). The second model of Table 7 further suggests that DPP supporters welcome proposals about country name change from ROC to Taiwan. This finding can be seen as an indirect support for Hypothesis 4b that DPP supporters seek creating a new country (including transform ROC to Taiwan or separating Taiwan from ROC).

Country Name Choice

[Table 8 is about here]

Name choice for the country in the international world is another controversial issue that reflects the divided policy choices in Taiwan where none is satisfied with using a compromised name such as Chinese Taipei. The survey asked “Which name do you prefer to use when we apply for a membership of an international organization, Taiwan or ROC?” Polarized, the result shows that 47.67% prefer Taiwan and 43.28% prefer ROC, and 9.05% refuse to answer.

As presented in the single model in Table 8, factors that positively influence the choice of Taiwan rather than ROC (and vice versa) are country identification, national identification, and party identification with DPP. Note that KMT supporters' partisanship has no statistically significant influence on their preferences, a pattern consistent with previous analysis of this study that KMT supporters have grown diverse in terms of their national identification (Table 4).

Voters the age between 26 and 35 (the fifth generation) are found to be thinking in a homogeneous way and significantly different from their parents' (third) generation on this issue. That they prefer Taiwan to ROC in international affairs corresponds to the pattern shown in Table 2 that this generation prefers establishing own country.

Stance on the Diaoyutai Islands

[Table 9 is about here]

The last analysis of this series of studies comes to the most sensitive issue in East China Sea: The ownership of Diaoyutai (Senkaku) Islands. Although the international community well acknowledges that Taiwan is one of the important claimers of the islands and that Taiwan has little leverage on this issue, Taiwan is such an actor that holds strong and legitimate evidence of the ownership.

Taiwanese voters have diverse responses to this issue. In the 2014 survey respondents were asked, “Regarding who owns the Diaoyutai Islands, could you tell me your perspectives?” Respondents were given time to talk about their thoughts over phone. Their answers were summarized by respondents into one of the following categories: (1) They belong to Taiwan, neither to PRC nor to Japan, (2) They belong to ROC, neither to PRC nor to Japan, (3) They belong to both China and Taiwan, (4) They belong to both Japan and Taiwan, (5) They belong to PRC, (6) They belong to Japan, and (7) No Preference. The proportions of these answers are 50.84%, 12.03%, 1.96%, 1.21%, 2.71%, 6.16%, and 11.94%. The missing rate is 13.15%.

Table 9 presents results of analyzing the three major categories of answers: belong to Taiwan, belong to ROC, and no preference. There are five patterns that can be drawn from the comparison across the three models: First, respondents who prefer using “Taiwan” in international affairs are likely to respond that Diaoyutai belongs to “Taiwan” but not to ROC. Note that respondents who say “Belong to Taiwan” may not necessarily mean that Diaoyutai belong to the imagined Taiwan Republic, as evidenced by the insignificant coefficients of the name change variable across the three models.

What this discrepancy suggests is that respondents who have been aware of the international difficulties of using ROC will tend to choose Taiwan as a straight-to-the-point way of claiming sovereignty over Diaoyutai. This reasoning helps us understand why there is no *negative* significant relationship between KMT partisanship and the statement that Diaoyutai belongs to Taiwan.

Second, KMT supporters are more likely than non-KMT supporters to claim that Diaoyutai

belongs to ROC. KMT supporters are the group of people who are willing to express their stances on this issue, implying that this is a salient issue to them but may not be to the rest. This pattern also implies that KMT supporters are very likely ROC defenders, even though over half of them say that Diaoyutai belong to Taiwan.

Third, females are more likely than male respondents to say that Diaoyutai belongs to Taiwan instead of saying the islands belong to ROC. This can be explained by the China factor found in other models of this study: female respondents are of less passion about the pan-China or great Chinese ideal (Table 1), and they are less likely than their male counterparts to see the Mainland China as family (Table 3). Therefore, female respondents are likely to use the name Taiwan as a means to dispel China factors, which saying ROC has.

Fourth, education plays a role of balancing, if not confusing, students' perspectives about the statehood of Taiwan. Respondents who have a higher education level are unlikely to say that Diaoyutai belongs to Taiwan—either because they know Taiwan is not a recognized country or even that she has not been born, or because textbooks have been saying that ROC owns Diaoyutai—and to skip the choice by saying “no preference.”

Fifth, respondents around 20 years old (the sixth generation who are mostly students) are unlikely to obey what textbooks taught about the relationship between ROC and Diaoyutai islands. To them, as the results show, it is probably too early to take a stance on this international issue, but compared to the third generation who are believing in such relationship and defending it internationally, this youngest generation of voters have shown their rejection to the standardized statement.

Conclusion & Discussion

This study serves as the first study in the field of Taiwan studies that provides a model for systematic analysis of Taiwanese people's opinions and preferences about their political future. By testing six sets of hypotheses drawn from theory and historical analysis of the Taiwan identity issue, this study presents the extent to which country, national, pan-national, culture, civil, and party identifications influences the preferences about creating new country “Taiwan,”

about unification with the Mainland China, as well as perceptions about the relationship with the Mainland China and about the ownership of the disputed Diaoyutai (Senkaku) islands.

As a reader is suggested to revisit the key messages of analysis presented in the findings section, primary findings drawn from the nine tables can be reorganized into two parts: hypotheses testings of conventional wisdom and patterns found beyond the hypotheses. First, hypotheses testing results confirms some conventional wisdom but call some into question. Four hypotheses are supported, including:

1. Pan-national identification positively influence attitudes toward unification (H2a, see Table 6)
2. Taiwan national identity negatively influence attitudes toward unification (H2b, see Table 6)
3. Culture identification positively influences one's acceptance of Hong Kong. (H3a, see Table 3)
4. Younger generations are alienated from the great China concept. (H6b, see Table 1; indirectly supported in Table 5 where the 4th, 5th, and 6th generations see the Mainland China as enemy).

Five hypotheses are partially or indirectly supported:

1. Strong country identification with Taiwan (Republic) negatively influences one's attitudes toward unification with the Mainland China. (H5a, see Tables 2 and 6)
2. Prejudice about the superiority of democracy makes Taiwanese people to distinguish themselves from the Mainland China. (H5b, see unification models of Tables 2 and 6)
3. Confidence in democracy increases one's willingness to negotiate with the Mainland China. (H5c, see the unification model of Table 7)
4. Senior generations are more attached to the great China concept (H6a. Not supported in terms of pan-national identification, see Table 1; indirectly supported in terms of imagined relationship, see Table 3; note that generation 2 turn to support new country development, see Table 5)
5. Younger generations are likely to be Taiwan nationalists. (H6c. Not supported in the unification models in Table 6, but it is indirectly supported in Table 2 where the 5th generation prefer creating own country)

Seven hypotheses are not supported, including:

1. Country identification with ROC positively influences one's attitudes toward future unification with the Mainland China. (H1a, see Table 6)
2. Chinese national identity positively influence attitudes toward unification (H2a, see Table 6)
3. Culture identification positively influences one's preference for unification. (H3b, see Tables 2 and 5)
4. Culture identification positively influences the formation of dual national identity. (H3b, see Table 4)
5. KMT supporters imagine about a greater China. (H4a, Tables 6 and 7)
6. DPP supporters seek creating a new country (including transform ROC to Taiwan or separating Taiwan from ROC). (H4b, see Tables 2 and 6, but this hypothesis is indirectly supported in the unification model of Table 7)
7. Prejudice about the superiority of democracy enhances one's national identification with Taiwanese. (H5b, see Table 2)

In sum, these findings of hypotheses testing jointly draw a picture of Taiwan's identity politics: national identification and country identification are the primary and consistent driving force of opinions about unification with the Mainland China. Generation gaps regarding attitudes toward the Mainland China exist. Attitudes toward Taiwan's democracy also matters in one's attitudes toward unification—prejudice about Taiwan's democracy leads one to favor independence, while confidence in Taiwan's democracy leads to cooperation. However, one should be aware of the empirically unsupported myths, including (1) identifying with ROC as a country and Chinese as a nation does not influence attitudes favoring unification; (2) (Chinese) culture identification does not influence the formation of dual national identification (country identification and pan-national identification does); (3) KMT supporters are not necessary pro-unification and DPP supporters cannot be simply labelled as pro-independence (or “separatists”).

These findings disagree two points of Wakabayashi (2006): First, Wakabayashi predicts that, “although Taiwanese nationalism is rising, the Taiwanese have been only hesitantly changing

[country] identity” (p.15). In effect, this causal relationship is not supported by data (Table 1). Instead, (Taiwanese) national identification positively influences the will of creating own country (Table 2) and the choice of Taiwan as country name (compared to ROC) (Table 8). Second, Wakabayashi thinks, “Taiwanese nationalists who reached a 'historical compromise' with a democratized and Taiwanized Republic of China are confronting unexpected challenges that have to impact that identity of Taiwanese” (p.16). It is true for those who already identify with ROC and KMT, but not true for those who have identified with Taiwan as a country name. In other words, when these people become comfortable of seeing Taiwan country name, they are likely to switch their national identity to Taiwanese, just like how those identifying with Chinese entered the group of dual national identity.

Beyond the tested hypotheses, there are few more patterns that help deepen our prospectives about Taiwan's identity politics. First: generation matters. The generation of retirement (between 60 and 80) seems have given up the idea of unification and turns to support creating a new country (Table 2). Generations younger than 45, compared to the third generation, have started to form new opinions regarding Taiwan's future: The fourth generation and younger have started to feel hostile to the Mainland China (Table 5), the fifth generation and the younger have rejected the concept of Mainland China compatriot (*dalu tongbao*) (Table 3), and the sixth generation has distinguished Hong Kong from the Mainland China in terms of national identity.

The fifth generation seems very confused regarding their country identification: Compared to the third generation, they prefer using Taiwan on the international stage (Table 8) but they seem very hesitate to formally change the country's formal name from ROC to Taiwan (Table 7). They are eager for international recognition, but they are aware of the high cost of country name change or establishing a new country that can be labeled as “separatists”: PRC's opposition and the threat of an immediate war across the Strait, followed by the lost of the life they have been enjoying.

There are more features about the youngest generation: they exhibit less prejudice than the third generation about the superiority of Taiwan's political system to the CCP-lead system of the mainland. They have witnessed the positive and negative sides about Taiwan's polarized party system and diversified opinions about the country, therefore they are the group of respondents

who are likely to give equal weights of ROC and Taiwan as country names. Even though, they are more likely than their parents to reject using ROC when they go abroad or introducing their own country.

Second: education matters. People with higher education level in Taiwan seem conservative regarding country identification. They are proud of Taiwan's democracy, but they tend to reject using names associated with Taiwan. They are likely to refuse proposals associated with creating a new country out of ROC; even though, they are not as likely to accept using ROC but are likely to express “no preferences” regarding the ownership of Diaoyutai islands. Regarding national identification, they are likely to see the national connection between people in Taiwan and those in the Mainland China and saying that I am both Chinese and Taiwanese, but they are unlikely to see Chinese mainlanders as friends or compatriots.

Third: gender matters. Female respondents seem to see quite different from their male counterparts regarding Chinese people. Females are unlikely to agree that Taiwanese and people from the Mainland Chinese belong to the same (Chinese) nation. To females the Mainland China is a more alienated concept. One explanation is that they feel “unsafe,” because because most opportunities of jobs, as well as affairs, provided in the Mainland China are for for men. It is also possible that female respondents politely pick up the “friends” option in avoidance to using a more offensive term “enemy.” Although this pattern demands more study and explanation in future research, it is clear that Taiwanese females are not big fan of the idea of unification with the mainland, even if PRC becomes a democracy.

Forth: democratic dilemma. Taiwan's democracy is not guided by liberalism (Shih 2007); it's been perceived as properties earned by Taiwanese people or Taiwanized ROC that enjoys de facto independent statehood (Table 5). Although confidence in Taiwan's democracy is found to be the only factor that has positive influence on attitudes toward unification (Table 7), one should be aware that the mix of prejudice about the fruits of democratization and Taiwanese national identification would result in firm rejection of the idea of ultimate unification (Table 6).

Fifth: party politics. Although supporters of the two political camps are not so different regarding

their imagination about the relationship with the Mainland China (Table 5) and unification (Table 6) in early 2013, DPP supporters have become stronger in their country identification in early 2014 (Tables 7 and 8). This can be seen as a reflection of their opposition to the ECFA trade treaties proposed and signed by KMT and Ma Ying-Jeou's administration. From here we see a “minus politics” — KMT and its supporters will continue to reject country and national identity of Taiwan (Tables 1 and 4), while DPP and its supporters will continue to reject concepts and proposals related to the Mainland China.

Sixth: war and peace. All of the above findings agree with the conclusion of a learner study: “With Taiwan-centered national [country] identities on the rise, the prospect of peaceful unification will become increasingly remote. An unresolved cross-strait impasse will only prolong the dispute over the legal status of the island and encourage the emergence of Taiwan as an independent nation [country] in all but name [Republic of China]. If this in turn triggers more aggressive behavior by an increasingly desperate China, Taiwan's citizens may unite around formal independence as the only way to preserve their shared national [country] identity” (Wang and Liu 2004, 588).

Beijing's patience is critical to the maintenance of peace across the Taiwan Strait (Bush 2013), and the base of such patience is a belief that Taiwanized Chinese are still “Chinese” in terms of both national and cultural identification (Zheng 2012). This expectation serves PRC's own need of a completed Chinese national identity (Dittmer 2006). While China's desire for completing the holy task of rebuilding the broken national identity is like a pressure cooker of war, Taiwanese people's desire, as shown in this study, of international recognition for her de facto statehood is another pressure cook. Taiwan's democracy may not guarantee that Taiwan is a stable system seeking only for peace, as evidenced by the hostile foreign policies in the Chen Shui-bian administration (2000-2004) (Su 2008). Therefore, sustaining peace across the Taiwan Strait requires wisdom and a better mutual understanding about each other's need.

The findings of this study suggest that the base or assumption of PRC's hope about Taiwanese people is eroded. Therefore, it is a critical time for both Beijing and Washington D.C. to acknowledge that (1) *the “independence” issue is more ROC's business than PRC's* (so there is no immediate threat to Beijing as long as ROC is still recognized by her people on Taiwan) and

that (2) “unification” will not be considered by the majority of Taiwanese people for a long time (and it is not necessary to consider as an option, either, as long as ROC on Taiwan remains its constitutional structure and keeps “China” in her name and PRC continues his “one China” policy in world politics).

Limits of this study

Two major limits of this study prohibit us from making further interpretation of the results. First, the measurement for the concepts, particularly culture and civil identification, are pilot and need more examination. Second, the high proportions of respondents who did not reveal their party identification, including those claiming that they are “independent voters” (over 60% in the 2013 survey and over 25% in the 2014 survey), can blur our understanding about the influence of partisanship.

Future studies

Extracted from this study, some topics can be interesting to scholars of identity studies and Taiwan studies. First, confused and ambivalent voters may switch or defect their party identification. In the 2013 survey data of this study 42 respondents of the sample (3.9%) claim that they are Blue camp supporters but thinking themselves Taiwanese *and* preferring creating as a new country Taiwan. Although they are the minority (19.5%) among the Blue camp supporters, they can play critical role as a tipping point in future close elections. In other words, they are very likely to switch their votes, if not their party identity, to DPP if they find the campaign of KMT cannot help solve their anxiety about such cognitive discordance.

Second, Taiwanese voters' may reconsider their political preferences after taking into account their understanding of geo-politics and the position of the U.S. on the Taiwan issue. As national and country identification of Taiwanese people, particularly intellectuals, are influence by events associated with the U.S. (Wei 2012), it is important to continue to observe and examine the influence of the U.S. and the level of awareness of Taiwan's role in the triangle.

Third, “friends,” the most frequently chosen analogy of the Taiwan-Mainland China relationship may have more than one meaning. Future research, particular social and gender studies, is encouraged to explore multiple meanings of this concept and its association with gender, class,

and other demographic variables. Forth, Taiwan's independent movement may not be linked to liberalism, but it may be associated other streams of democratic thoughts, such as radical democracy and civic nationalism (e.g., Geertz 1963, Lecours 2000, Ortner 1999, and Trend 1963).

This project presents that Taiwan is one of many non-nation-states that struggle for better understanding of their people's country identification and national identifications. It initiates a systematic way of examining Taiwanese people's political identities, echoes to the development of identity studies in the field of political psychology, and corresponds to a growing demand to debunk spurious causal relationships. We hope that evidence presented in this paper not only enhances mutual understanding between Taipei, Beijing, and Washionton D.C., but also provides explanations of mechanism to the development of political psychology.

References

- Bush, Richard C. 2005. *Untying the Knot Making Peace in the Taiwan Strait*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=137531> (March 25, 2014).
- Bush, Richard C. 2013. *Uncharted Strait: The Future of China-Taiwan Relations*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Dittmer, Lowell. 2006. "Taiwan as a Factor in China's Quest for National Identity." *Journal of Contemporary China* 15(49): 671–86.
- Garver, John W. 2011. *Face Off: China, the United States and Taiwan's Democratization*. Seattle, WA, USA: University of Washington Press.
<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/alltitles/docDetail.action?docID=10468615> (March 25, 2014).
- Geertz, Clifford. 1963. *Old Societies and New States*. y First printing edition. Free Press.
- Horowitz, Shale, and Alexander C. Tan. 2007. "Rising China versus Estranged Taiwan." In *Identity and Change in East Asian Conflicts: The Cases of China, Taiwan, and the Koreas*, eds. Shale Asher Horowitz, Uk Heo, and Alexander C. Tan. Gordonsville, VA, USA: Palgrave Macmillan, 115–30.
<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/alltitles/docDetail.action?docID=10171518> (March 25, 2014).
- Hsiau, A-Chin. 2005. "Bentuhua: An Endeavor for Normalizing a Would-Be Nation-State?" In *Cultural, Ethnic, and Political Nationalism in Contemporary Taiwan: Bentuhua*, eds. John Makeham and A-Chin Hsiau. Gordonsville, VA, USA: Palgrave Macmillan, 261–76.
<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/alltitles/docDetail.action?docID=10135717> (March 25, 2014).
- Hsieh, John Fuh-Sheng. 2004. "National Identity and Taiwan's Mainland China Policy." *Journal of Contemporary China* 13(40): 479–90.
- Hughes, Christopher. 1997. *Taiwan and Chinese Nationalism: National Identity and Status In International Society*. New York: Routledge.
- Jacobs, J. Bruce. 2006. "One China, Diplomatic Isolation and a Separate Taiwan." In *China's Rise, Taiwan's Dilemmas and International Peace*, ed. Edward Friedman. London: Routledge, 85–109.
- Kerr, George H. 1976. *Formosa Betrayed*. New York: Da Capo Press.
<http://homepage.usask.ca/~llr130/taiwanlibrary/kerr/kerr.pdf>.
- Klandermans, P. G. 2014. "Identity Politics and Politicized Identities: Identity Processes and the Dynamics of Protest." *Political Psychology* 35(1): 1–22.
- Lecours, André. 2000. "Ethnic and Civic Nationalism: Towards a New Dimension." *Space and Polity* 4(2): 153–66.

- Li, Yitan. 2014. "Constructing Peace in the Taiwan Strait: A Constructivist Analysis of the Changing Dynamics of Identities and Nationalisms." *Journal of Contemporary China* 23(85): 119–42.
- Liu, Frank C. S., and Francis L. F. Lee. 2013. "Country, National, and Pan-National Identification in Taiwan and Hong Kong: Standing Together as Chinese?" *Asian Survey* 53(6): 1112–34.
- Liu, Frank Cheng-Shan. 2012. "When Taiwan Identifiers Embrace ROC: The Complexity of State Identification in Taiwan." *Issues & Studies* 48(2): 1–34.
- Makeham, John. 2005. "Indigenization Discourse in Taiwanese Confucian Revivalism." In *Cultural, Ethnic, and Political Nationalism in Contemporary Taiwan: Bentuhua*, eds. John Makeham and A-Chin Hsiau. Gordonsville, VA, USA: Palgrave Macmillan, 187–220. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/alltitles/docDetail.action?docID=10135717> (March 25, 2014).
- Ortner, Sherry B, ed. 1999. *The Fate of "Culture": Geertz and Beyond*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rigger, Shelley. 1997. "Competing Conceptions of Taiwan's Identity: The Irresolvable Conflict in Cross-strait Relations." *Journal of Contemporary China* 6(15): 307–17.
- . 2001. *From Opposition to Power: Taiwan's Democratic Progressive Party*. Boulder: L. Rienner Publishers.
- . 2006. *Taiwan's Rising Rationalism: Generations, Politics, and "Taiwanese Nationalism"*. <http://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/3494> (March 25, 2014).
- Shih, Chih-yu. 2007. "Constituting Taiwanese Statehood: The World Timing of Un-Chinese Consciousness." *Journal of Contemporary China* 16(53): 699–716.
- Su, Chi. 2008. *Taiwan's Relations with Mainland China: A Tail Wagging Two Dogs*. 1 edition. Routledge.
- Trend, David, ed. 1996. *Radical Democracy: Identity, Citizenship, and the State*. New York: Routledge.
- Wakabayashi, Masahiro. 2006. "Taiwanese Nationalism and the 'Unforgettable Others.'" In *China's Rise, Taiwan's Dilemmas and International Peace*, ed. Edward Friedman. London: Routledge, 3–21.
- Wang, Fu-Chang. 2005. "Why Bother about School Textbooks? An Analysis of the Origin of the Disputes over Renshi Taiwan Textbooks in 1997." In *Cultural, Ethnic, and Political Nationalism in Contemporary Taiwan: Bentuhua*, eds. John Makeham and A-Chin Hsiau. Gordonsville, VA, USA: Palgrave Macmillan, 55–102. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/alltitles/docDetail.action?docID=10135717> (March 25, 2014).

- Wang, T. Y., and G. A. Chang. 2005. "Ethnicity and Politics in Taiwan: An Analysis of Mainlanders' Identity and Policy Preference." 41(4): 35–66.
- Wang, Te-Yu, and I.-Chou Liu. 2004. "Contending Identities in Taiwan: Implications for Cross-Strait Relations." *Asian Survey* 44(4): 568–90.
- Wei, C. X. George. 2012. "U.S.-China Relations and Its Impact on the Reconstruction of National Identity in Taiwan." In *Taiwan and the Rise of China: Cross-Strait Relations in the Twenty-First Century*, eds. Baogang Guo and Chung-Chian Teng. Lanham: Lexington Books, 51–72.
- Zheng, Shiping. 2012. "Ethnic Peace in the Taiwan Strait." In *New Thinking about the Taiwan Issue*, eds. Jean-Marc F Blanchard and Dennis V. Hickey. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 71–91.

Table 1: Binary Logistic Regression Models of Country Identification (2013)

	Country Name TAIWAN		Country Name ROC		Either	
	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>
(Intercept)	1.098	0.929	-1.319	1.207	-3.073***	0.791
Country Identification						
Our country's name is Republic of China	-0.453**	0.132	--	--	--	--
Our country's name is Taiwan	--	--	-0.315*	0.133	--	--
I am proud of Republic of China	-0.006	0.128	1.182***	0.111	0.695***	0.085
Taiwanese should establish own country	0.398***	0.072	-0.178	0.138	0.269***	0.068
Hong-Kong and Shang-Hai are foreign cities	0.273**	0.084	-0.145	0.147	0.137	0.078
Pan-National and National Identification						
Chinese and Taiwanese belong to the same nation	-0.158	0.095	0.152	0.110	-0.097	0.077
People in mainland are our compatriots	0.134	0.091	0.027	0.121	0.081	0.077
I am a Taiwanese	0.129	0.219	-0.532	0.352	-0.125	0.198
I am a Chinese	-1.366**	0.434	-0.496	0.786	-1.329**	0.428
Cultural Identification						
Our culture is authentic Chinese culture	0.121	0.073	-0.016	0.107	0.023	0.062
Party Identification						
I support for the Pan-Blue Camp (KMT)	-0.697**	0.227	0.646	0.505	-0.572**	0.212
I support for the Pan-Green Camp (DPP)	0.664*	0.323	-0.179	0.311	0.118	0.232
Civil Identification						
Our political system (democracy) is better than mainland China's	0.114	0.098	0.157	0.127	-0.018	0.085
Control Variables						
I am more politically knowledgeable than other family and friends	-0.057	0.092	0.052	0.132	-0.011	0.080

I have been to mainland China within 2 years	-0.126	0.224	0.004	0.339	-0.135	0.199
Female	0.230	0.202	-0.100	0.277	0.109	0.174
Education	-0.517***	0.142	-0.090	0.186	-0.387**	0.119
Generations (compared to the 3 rd generation, born 1954~1968)						
1 st generation (born by 1931)	-1.256	1.216	12.785	570.883	-0.634	1.095
2 nd generation (born 1932~1953)	-0.254	0.314	0.478	0.432	-0.213	0.262
4 th generation (born 1969~1978)	0.249	0.255	0.154	0.355	0.192	0.220
5 th generation (born 1979~1988)	0.234	0.295	0.142	0.384	0.343	0.254
6 th generation (born 1989~1993)	0.316	0.397	1.671*	0.702	0.785*	0.362
Observations	776		776		778	
-2 Log-Likelihood	717.109		415.793		911.196	
AIC	761.109		459.793		953.196	

Source: the author;

Notes:

1. The measurements of the dependent variables of the first two models are “Some people say that our country's name is Taiwan. Do you agree with that?” and “Some people say that our country's name is Republic of China (*zhonghuamingguo*). Do you agree with that?” where 1 denotes “agree” and “strongly agree”; 0 denotes “neutral”, “disagree”, and “strongly disagree”. In the third model 1 denotes respondents who are coded 1 in both of the questions, otherwise 0.
2. * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Table 2: Binary Logistic Regression Models of Creating a New Country (2013)

	Create New Country		Proud of Democracy	
	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>
(Intercept)	-0.309	0.940	-3.490***	0.756
Country Identification				
Our country's name is Taiwan	0.393***	0.071	0.175**	0.065
Our country's name is Republic of China	-0.124	0.123	0.105	0.086
I am proud of Republic of China	0.139	0.125	0.113	0.092
Taiwanese should establish own country	--	--	0.086	0.067
Hong-Kong and Shang-Hai are foreign cities	0.098	0.087	0.154*	0.073
Pan-National and National Identification				
Chinese and Taiwanese belong to the same nation	-0.050	0.100	0.134	0.072
People in mainland China are our compatriots	-0.221*	0.093	-0.097	0.073
I am a Taiwanese (neither Chinese nor both)	1.106***	0.218	-0.015	0.187
I am a Chinese (neither Taiwanese nor both)	-0.173	0.393	-0.253	0.369
Culture Identification				
Our culture is authentic Chinese culture	-0.085	0.073	0.086	0.058
Party Identification				
I support for the Pan-Blue Camp (KMT)	-0.402	0.227	0.350	0.208
I support for the Pan-Green Camp (DPP)	0.523	0.336	0.328	0.216
Civil Identification				
Our political system is better than mainland China's	0.242*	0.099	--	--
Control Variables				
I am more politically knowledgeable than others	-0.001	0.093	0.062	0.075
I have been to mainland China within 2 years	0.193	0.231	-0.029	0.188
Female	-0.253	0.207	-0.241	0.163
Education	-0.425**	0.144	0.283*	0.112

Generations (compared to the 3rd generation, born 1954~1968)

1 st generation (born by 1931)	0.474	1.185	1.250	1.175
2 nd generation (born 1932~1953)	0.757*	0.337	0.109	0.246
4 th generation (born 1969~1978)	0.286	0.249	0.073	0.207
5 th generation (born 1979~1988)	0.605*	0.304	-0.162	0.238
6 th generation (born 1989~1993)	0.517	0.418	-0.795*	0.330
Observations	776	776		
-2 Log-Likelihood	701.281	1004.113		
AIC	745.281	1048.113		

Source: the author;

Notes:

1. The measurements of the dependent variables are “Some people say that Taiwanese should establish own country, do you agree?” and “Some people say that our political system (democracy) is better than Mainland China's, do you agree?” where 1 denotes “agree” and “strongly agree” and 0 denotes “neutral”, “disagree”, and “strongly disagree”.
2. * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Table 3: Binary Logistic Regression Models of Pan-National Identification (2013)

	TW-CN People Same Nation		HK-CN People Same Nation		Chinese Our Compatriots	
	<i>Reg. Coif.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Reg. Coif.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>
(Intercept)	-1.663	0.974	0.640	0.899	2.604**	0.782
Country Identification						
Our country's name is Taiwan	-0.036	0.091	-0.069	0.083	0.097	0.073
Our country's name is ROC	0.134	0.098	0.227*	0.093	-0.025	0.092
I am proud of ROC	-0.050	0.108	-0.209	0.107	0.374***	0.101
Taiwanese should establish own country	-0.103	0.100	-0.173	0.090	-0.239**	0.078
Hong-Kong and Shang-Hai are foreign cities	0.082	0.102	0.140	0.092	-0.211*	0.086
Pan-National and National Identification						
People in mainland are our compatriots	0.645***	0.086	0.269**	0.079	-	-
I am a Taiwanese	-1.023***	0.257	-0.592**	0.223	-1.174***	0.198
I am a Chinese	0.534	0.788	1.037	0.764	-0.450	0.441
Culture Identification						
Our culture is authentic Chinese culture	0.005	0.078	-0.155*	0.073	-0.007	0.066
Party Identification						
I support for the Pan-Blue Camp (KMT)	0.200	0.317	0.010	0.274	-0.024	0.240
I support for the Pan-Green Camp (DPP)	-0.065	0.241	-0.086	0.237	-0.870***	0.228
Civil Identification						
Our political system (democracy) is better than mainland China's	0.096	0.099	0.040	0.094	0.032	0.088
Control Variables						
I am more politically knowledgeable than other family and friends	0.096	0.099	0.068	0.093	-0.119	0.084
I have been to mainland within 2 years	0.411	0.265	0.468	0.247	0.298	0.212
Female	-0.461*	0.211	-0.368	0.195	-0.134	0.180

Education	0.392**	0.144	0.236	0.134	-0.305*	0.124
Generations (compared to the 3 rd generation, born 1954~1968)						
1 st generation (born by 1931)	-0.372	1.576	-1.328	1.220	0.231	1.238
2 nd generation (born 1932~1953)	-0.080	0.317	-0.081	0.307	-0.481	0.282
4 th generation (born 1969~1978)	-0.004	0.277	0.007	0.255	-0.426	0.235
5 th generation (born 1979~1988)	-0.087	0.301	-0.205	0.281	-0.759**	0.262
6 th generation (born 1989~1993)	-0.042	0.388	-0.819*	0.353	-1.311***	0.355
Observations	776		749		778	
-2 Log-Likelihood	663.878		749.138		843.914	
AIC	707.878		793.138		885.914	

Source: the author;

Notes:

1. The measurements of the dependent variables are “Do you agree that Taiwanese and Chinese belong to the same nation?” “Do you agree that Hong Kongers and Chinese belong to the same nation?” and “Do you agree that people in mainland China are our compatriots (*tongbao*)?” where 1 denotes “agree” and “strongly agree” and 0 denotes “neutral”, “disagree”, and “strongly disagree”.
2. * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Table 4: Binary Logistic Regression Models of Taiwanese National Identification (2013)

	Taiwanese		Chinese		Both	
	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>
(Intercept)	1.021	0.865	0.102	1.763	-2.397**	0.845
Country Identification						
Our country's name is Taiwan	0.176*	0.073	-0.435**	0.144	-0.042	0.070
Our country's name is ROC	-0.226*	0.105	0.076	0.267	0.212*	0.103
I am proud of ROC	-0.090	0.116	0.107	0.271	0.060	0.112
Taiwanese should establish own country	0.456***	0.076	-0.187	0.142	-0.363***	0.071
Hong-Kong and Shang-Hai are foreign cities	0.152	0.088	-0.156	0.142	-0.078	0.082
Pan-National Identification						
People in mainland China are our compatriots	-0.479***	0.078	0.120	0.181	0.427***	0.076
Culture Identification						
Our culture is authentic Chinese culture	-0.006	0.070	-0.136	0.136	0.022	0.067
Party Identification						
Support for the Pan-Blue Camp (KMT)	-0.552*	0.234	-0.278	0.419	0.531*	0.219
Support for the Pan-Green Camp (DPP)	0.493	0.271	-0.759	0.804	-0.503	0.269
Civil Identification						
Our political system (democracy) is better than mainland China's	-0.025	0.095	-0.195	0.161	0.089	0.091
Control Variables						
I am more politically knowledgeable than other family and friends	-0.027	0.089	0.311	0.168	-0.064	0.085
I have been to mainland within 2 years	0.059	0.220	0.108	0.415	-0.052	0.210
Female	0.051	0.189	-0.119	0.405	-0.014	0.182
Education	-0.253	0.130	-0.465	0.260	0.340**	0.126
Generations (compared to the 3 rd generation, born 1954~1968)						

1 st generation (born by 1931)	0.048	1.274	0.279	1.379	-0.619	1.104
2 nd generation (born 1932~1953)	-0.135	0.310	-0.148	0.535	0.095	0.295
4 th generation (born 1969~1978)	-0.141	0.240	0.053	0.458	0.153	0.230
5 th generation (born 1979~1988)	-0.317	0.275	-0.838	0.806	0.394	0.265
6 th generation (born 1989~1993)	0.536	0.379	-0.546	1.093	-0.446	0.374
Observations	778	778	778	778	778	778
-2 Log-Likelihood	784.115	243.768	243.768	243.768	835.947	835.947
AIC	824.115	283.768	283.768	283.768	875.947	875.947

Source: the author;

Notes:

1. The measurement of the dependent variable for the models is “Some call themselves Taiwanese, some Chinese and some both. What about you?” The three options are used to create three binary dependent variables where 1 denotes the category and 0 otherwise.
2. * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Table 5: Binary Logistic Regression Models of Relationship with Mainland China (2014)

	Enemies		Friends		Family	
	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>
(Intercept)	-2.356**	0.855	0.548	0.508	-1.066	0.551
Prefer using name Taiwan	0.342	0.269	0.231	0.187	-0.586**	0.206
Want to change ROC to Taiwan	0.084	0.089	-0.124	0.066	0.043	0.075
I'm a Taiwanese	0.819	0.639	0.222	0.307	-0.330	0.319
I'm both a Taiwanese and a Chinese	0.095	0.658	0.125	0.300	0.059	0.308
Support for the Pan-Blue Camp (KMT)	-0.060	0.342	-0.245	0.206	0.402	0.216
Support for the Pan-Green Camp (DPP)	0.371	0.234	-0.060	0.190	-0.154	0.222
Hope Taiwan and PRC become one country	-0.408**	0.138	-0.046	0.075	0.246**	0.079
Our democracy can change the mainland	-0.190*	0.082	0.025	0.055	0.118	0.061
Female	0.065	0.209	0.628***	0.150	-0.894***	0.167
Education	0.003	0.044	-0.076*	0.031	0.029	0.034
Generations (compared to the 3rd generation, born 1954~1968)						
1 st & 2 nd generation (born by 1953)	0.377	0.320	-0.763**	0.221	0.556*	0.231
4 th generation (born 1969~1978)	1.079***	0.298	-0.255	0.209	-0.139	0.238
5 th generation (born 1979~1988)	0.758*	0.338	0.030	0.238	-0.277	0.276
6 th generation (born 1989~1993)	1.245**	0.363	-0.383	0.283	-0.163	0.314
Observations	800		800		800	
-2 Log-Likelihood	625.763		1055.369		896.115	
AIC	655.763		1085.369		926.115	

Source: the author;

Notes:

1. The measurement for the dependent variables is “What does our relationship with the mainland look like, father-son, brothers, couples, friends, or enemies?” where in the first model 1 denotes enemies, and 0 denotes the rest; in the second model 1 denotes friends and 0 the rest; in the third model 1 denotes family (including father-son, brothers, and couples), and 0 the rest.
2. * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Table 6: Binary Logistic Regression Models of Future Unification (2013)

	Unification Under Democracy		Inevitable Unification	
	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>
(Intercept)	0.92	0.84	-0.75	0.91
Country Identification				
Our country's name is Taiwan	-0.06	0.07	-0.06	0.07
Our country's name is Republic of China	-0.05	0.09	-0.03	0.11
I am proud of Republic of China	0.03	0.10	0.08	0.11
Taiwanese should establish own country	-0.14	0.07	-0.21***	0.07
Hong-Kong and Shang-Hai are foreign cities	-0.19*	0.08	-0.16	0.08
Pan-National and National Identification				
Chinese and Taiwanese belong to the same nation	0.24***	0.08	0.32***	0.10
People in mainland China are our compatriots	0.29***	0.08	0.22*	0.09
I am a Taiwanese (neither Chinese nor both)	-0.62***	0.19	-0.59***	0.21
I am a Chinese (neither Taiwanese nor both)	0.18	0.43	-0.16	0.40
Culture Identification				
Our culture is authentic Chinese culture	-0.06	0.07	-0.09	0.07
Party Identification				
I support for the Pan-Blue Camp (KMT)	-0.01	0.22	0.09	0.23
I support for the Pan-Green Camp (DPP)	-0.13	0.24	-0.01	0.27
Civil Identification				
Our political system is better than mainland China's	-0.10	0.09	-0.20*	0.09
Control Variables				
I am more politically knowledgeable than others	0.01	0.08	0.15	0.09
I have been to mainland China within 2 years	-0.11	0.21	-0.11	0.22
Female	-0.40*	0.18	-0.26	0.19
Education	0.03	0.12	0.20	0.13

Generations (compared to the 3rd generation, born 1954~1968)

1 st generation (born by 1931)	-0.97	1.26	-0.22	1.10
2 nd generation (born 1932~1953)	-0.12	0.28	0.15	0.30
4 th generation (born 1969~1978)	-0.07	0.22	-0.00	0.24
5 th generation (born 1979~1988)	-0.28	0.26	-0.04	0.28
6 th generation (born 1989~1993)	-0.52	0.36	-0.05	0.39
<hr/>				
Observations		744		740
-2 Log-Likelihood		873.148		770.263
AIC		919.148		816.263

Source: the author;

Notes:

1. The measurements of the dependent variables are “If both China’s and Taiwan’s political system are democratic, do you like to see the unification of Taiwan and China?” and “Some people say that the two sides of the Strait ultimately will be come one country. Do you agree?” where 1 denotes ”agree” and ”strongly agree” and 0 denotes ”neutral”, ”disagree”, and ”strongly disagree”.

2. * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Table 7: Binomial Logistic Regression Models of Choosing Taiwan's Future (2014)

	Become One Country with Mainland China		Prefer Name Change from ROC to Taiwan	
	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>
(Intercept)	0.948*	0.461	-2.414***	0.575
Prefer using name Taiwan	-0.180	0.182	2.068***	0.207
Willingness to change name ROC to Taiwan	-0.082	0.065	--	--
I am a Taiwanese (neither Chinese nor both)	-0.980**	0.309	0.686	0.426
I am both a Taiwanese and a Chinese	-0.185	0.312	-0.060	0.442
I support for the Pan-Blue Camp (KMT)	0.224	0.209	-0.434	0.277
I support for the Pan-Green Camp (DPP)	-0.622**	0.191	1.009***	0.205
Believe that democracy can change China	0.128*	0.056	0.008	0.066
Female	-0.145	0.150	-0.219	0.178
Education	-0.014	0.031	0.004	0.036
Generations (compared to the 3 rd generation, born 1954~1968)				
1 st & 2 nd generation (born by 1953)	0.104	0.217	0.241	0.254
4 th generation (born 1969~1978)	0.363	0.213	-0.285	0.253
5 th generation (born 1979~1988)	0.199	0.240	-0.602*	0.286
6 th generation (born 1989~1993)	0.291	0.278	0.508	0.320
Observations	843		862	
-2 Log-Likelihood	1066.057		816.579	
AIC	1094.057		842.579	

Source: the author;

Notes:

1. The measurements for the dependent variables are "Do you hope that Taiwan and the Mainland China become one country?" where 1 denotes strongly hope so and hope so and 0 denotes the rest; and "Do you hope that one day ROC changes its name to Taiwan or Republic of Taiwan?" where 1 denotes "strongly hope so" and "hope so" and 0 denotes the rest.
2. * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Table 8: Binomial Logistic Regression Model of County Name Choice When Joining International Organizations (2014)

	Prefer using Taiwan (vs. ROC)	
	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>
(Intercept)	-3.552***	0.570
Willingness to change name ROC to Taiwan	0.841***	0.075
I am a Taiwanese (neither Chinese nor both)	2.298***	0.423
I am both a Taiwanese and a Chinese	1.277**	0.433
I support for the Pan-Blue Camp (KMT)	-0.388	0.239
I support for the Pan-Green Camp (DPP)	0.744**	0.238
Female	-0.062	0.177
Education	-0.068	0.037
Generations (compared to the 3 rd generation, born 1954~1968)		
1 st & 2 nd generation (born by 1953)	0.115	0.266
4 th generation (born 1969~1978)	0.341	0.246
5 th generation (born 1979~1988)	0.637*	0.277
6 th generation (born 1989~1993)	-0.421	0.314
Observations	898	
-2 Log-Likelihood	834.734	
AIC	858.734	

Source: the author;

Notes:

1. The measurement for the dependent variable is “Which name do you prefer to use when we apply for a membership of an international organization, Taiwan or ROC?” where 1 denotes Taiwan and 0 denotes ROC.

2. * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Table 9: Binary Logistic Regression Models of Taiwanese' Stance on the Diaoyutai (Senkaku) Islands (2014)

	Belongs to Taiwan		Belongs to ROC		No Preference	
	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Reg. Coef.</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>
(Intercept)	0.583	0.467	-0.609	0.687	-3.667***	0.787
Prefer using "Taiwan" in international affairs	0.635**	0.194	-2.069***	0.402	0.084	0.270
Willingness to change name ROC to Taiwan	-0.129	0.070	-0.167	0.121	0.134	0.097
I am a Taiwanese (neither Chinese nor both)	0.531	0.296	-0.598	0.367	0.526	0.568
I am both a Taiwanese and a Chinese	-0.093	0.290	-0.120	0.334	0.913	0.560
I support for the Pan-Blue Camp (KMT)	-0.009	0.210	0.545*	0.266	-0.949*	0.383
I support for the Pan-Green Camp (DPP)	0.116	0.199	-0.628	0.474	-0.215	0.263
Believe that democracy can change China	0.062	0.059	0.107	0.090	-0.152	0.086
Female	0.411**	0.156	-0.824**	0.247	0.164	0.219
Education	-0.105**	0.033	0.050	0.052	0.121*	0.050
Generations (compared to the 3 rd generation, born 1954~1968)						
1 st & 2 nd generation (born by 1953)	0.068	0.224	-0.306	0.336	-0.173	0.366
4 th generation (born 1969~1978)	0.107	0.215	-0.667	0.348	0.081	0.294
5 th generation (born 1979~1988)	0.199	0.252	-0.760	0.445	0.354	0.320
6 th generation (born 1989~1993)	0.510	0.302	-1.443*	0.646	0.068	0.395
Observations	771		771		771	
-2 Log-Likelihood	989.574		453.459		588.205	
AIC	1017.574		481.459		616.205	

Source: the author;

Notes:

- The measurement for the dependent variables is "Regarding who owns Diaoyutai islands, could you tell me what you think? The answers are categorized in to three options. In the first model 1 denotes belonging to Taiwan (not to PRC) and 0 the rest, in the second model 1 denotes belonging to ROC (not PRC) and 0 the rest. In the third model 1 denotes expressing no preferences while 0 denotes the rest.
- * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Appendix 1. Variable Description of the 2013 Dataset

Constructs / Variables	Measurement / Question Wording	Options	Freq.	%
Country	Some people say that our country's name is	Strongly Disagree	117	10.85
Identification:	Taiwan. Do you agree?	Disagree	195	18.09
Taiwan	(V28. 有人說,「臺灣」是我們國家正式的名字。請問您同不同意?)	Neutral	20	1.86
		Agree	300	27.83
		Strongly Agree	404	37.48
		Missing	42	3.90
Country	Some people say that our country's name is	Strongly Disagree	89	8.26
Identification:	Republic of China (<i>Zhonghuaminguo</i>). Do	Disagree	80	7.42
Republic of China	you agree?	Neutral	10	0.93
	(V14. 有人說,我們國家正式的名字是「中華民國」請問您同不同意?)	Agree	391	36.27
		Strongly Agree	476	44.16
		Missing	32	2.97
ROC Pride	Some people say that we should be proud of	Strongly Disagree	60	5.57
	being a citizen of Republic of China. Do	Disagree	101	9.37
	you agree?	Neutral	15	1.39
	(V15. 有人說,我們應該以身為中華民國的國民為榮。請問您同不同意?)	Agree	339	31.45
		Strongly Agree	538	49.91
		Missing	25	2.32
Willingness to	Some people say that Taiwanese should	Strongly Disagree	97	9.00
Create a New	establish own country. Do you agree?	Disagree	167	15.49
Country	(V23. 有人說,臺灣人應該建立起自己的國家。請問您同不同意?)	Neutral	25	2.32
		Agree	325	30.15
		Strongly Agree	399	37.01
		Missing	65	6.03
Geographic	Some people say that Hong-Kong and	Strongly Disagree	44	4.08
Perception about	Shang-Hai are foreign cities. Do you agree?	Disagree	110	10.20
Country Boundary	(V31. 有人說,到香港或是到上海算是出國。請問	Neutral	11	1.02

	您同不同意?)	Agree	511	47.40
		Strongly Agree	370	34.32
		Missing	32	2.97
Pan-National Identification: Taiwan	Some people say that Taiwanese and Chinese in mainland China belong to the same nation (<i>minzu</i>). Do you agree?	Strongly Disagree	82	7.61
		Disagree	144	13.36
		Neutral	15	1.39
	(V30. 有人說，臺灣人跟中國大陸人屬於同一個民族。請問您同不同意?)	Agree	491	45.55
		Strongly Agree	322	29.87
		Missing	24	2.23
Pan-National Identification: Hong Kong	Some people say that Hong Kongers and Chinese in mainland China belong to the same nation (<i>minzu</i>). Do you agree?	Strongly Disagree	69	6.40
		Disagree	180	16.70
		Neutral	8	0.74
	(V30. 有人說，香港人跟中國大陸人屬於同一個民族。請問您同不同意?)	Agree	441	40.91
		Strongly Agree	304	28.20
		Missing	76	7.05
National Identification: Perception of Closeness	Some people say that people in mainland China are our compatriots/fellows. Do you agree?	Strongly Disagree	119	11.04
		Disagree	275	25.51
		Neutral	30	2.78
	(V21. 有人說，大陸人都是我們的同胞。請問您同不同意?)	Agree	456	42.30
		Strongly Agree	161	14.94
		Missing	37	3.43
National Identity	Some call themselves Taiwanese, some Chinese and some both. What about you?	Taiwanese	562	52.13
		Chinese	46	4.27
	(V27. 有人說自己是「臺灣人」，也有人說自己是「中國人」，也有人說都是，您自己覺得呢?)	Both	440	40.82
		Missing	30	2.78
Culture Identification	Some people say that our culture is authentic/orthodox Chinese culture. Do you agree?	Strongly Disagree	137	12.71
		Disagree	421	39.05
		Neutral	49	4.55
	(V11. 有人說，我們的文化才是正統的中華文化。請問您同不同意?)	Agree	240	22.26
		Strongly Agree	159	14.75

		Missing	72	6.68
Party Identification	Do you support any political party? (V33. 請問您有沒有支持某一個政黨?)	KMT	118	10.95
		DPP	141	13.08
		New Party	1	0.09
		PFP	2	0.19
		TSU	6	0.56
		Pan-Blue	94	8.72
		Pan-Green	57	5.29
		Green Party	1	0.09
		Others	2	0.19
		Missing	656	60.85
Civil Identification (Prejudice about Taiwan's democracy)	Some people said that our democracy is better than the mainland China's political system. Do you agree? (V13. 有人說，我們的民主制度比大陸的制度要 好。請問您同不同意?)	Strongly Disagree	22	2.04
		Disagree	88	8.16
		Neutral	18	1.67
		Agree	351	32.56
		Strongly Agree	575	53.34
		Missing	24	2.23
Policy Preferences: Unification with the mainland China under Democracy	If both China's and Taiwan's political system are democratic, do you like to see the unification of Taiwan and China? (V32. 如果臺灣和大陸的政治制度都是民主制 度，請問您願不願意和大陸統一?)	Strongly Disagree	270	25.05
		Disagree	229	21.24
		Agree	326	30.24
		Strongly Agree	147	13.64
		Missing	106	9.83
Policy Preferences: Expectation about Ultimate Unification with the mainland China	Some people say that the two sides of the Strait ultimately will be come one country. Do you agree? (V37. 有人說，兩岸終究要成為一個國家。請問您 同不同意?)	Strongly Disagree	371	34.42
		Disagree	283	26.25
		Neutral	22	2.04
		Agree	238	22.08
		Strongly Agree	70	6.49
		Missing	94	8.72
Subjectively Evaluated Political	Do you think that you are more politically knowledgeable than other family and	Strongly Disagree	107	9.93
		Disagree	403	37.38

Knowledge	friends? (V4. 請問您跟身旁的親友比起來有沒有更瞭解政治或選舉?)	Neutral	222	20.59
		Agree	169	15.68
		Strongly Agree	88	8.16
		Missing	89	8.26
China Experiences	Have you been to mainland China within these two years? (V38. 請問您這兩年內有沒有去過大陸?)	Yes	834	77.37
		No	240	22.26
		Missing	4	0.37
Gender		Male	502	46.57
		Female	576	53.43
		Missing	0	0.00
Education		~Junior high	147	13.64
		Senior high	334	30.98
		College	491	45.55
		Graduate~	99	9.18
		Missing	7	0.65
Generation	1st generation	(born by 1931)	11	1.02
	2nd generation	(born 1932~1953)	182	16.88
	3rd generation	(born 1954~1968)	373	34.60
	4th generation	(born 1969~1978)	256	23.75
	5th generation	(born 1979~1988)	162	15.03
	6th generation	(born 1989~1993)	65	6.03
		Missing	29	2.69

Note: Data collected via CATI from January 23 to February 4, 2013. N=1,078.

Appendix 2. Variable Description of the 2014 Dataset

Constructs / Variables	Measurement / Question Wording	Options	Freq.	%
Preferred Country Name in International Affairs	When we are applying for a membership of an international organization, do you prefer using the name of ROC or Taiwan? (V9. 您希望我國申請加入國際組織時用的名稱是「中華民國」還是「台灣」呢?)	ROC	464	43.28
		Taiwan	511	47.67
		Missing	97	9.05
Willingness to Change Country's Name	Do you hope that one day ROC changes its name to Taiwan or Republic of Taiwan? (r10. 請問您希不希望有一天中華民國改名為台灣國或是台灣共和國?)	Hope not very much	202	18.84
		Hope not	286	26.68
		Neutral	187	17.44
		Hope so	166	15.49
		Hope so very much	175	16.32
		Missing	56	5.22
Prospective on Future Unification with the mainland China	Do you hope that Taiwan and the mainland China become one country? (r11. 請問您希不希望台灣與大陸合為一個國家?)	Hope not very much	477	44.50
		Hope not	329	30.69
		Neutral	123	11.47
		Hope so	70	6.53
		Hope so very much	39	3.64
		Missing	34	3.17
National Identification	Some people say they are Taiwanese, some say Chinese, and some say both. What about you? (r12. 在我們社會上有人說自己是臺灣人，有人說自己是中國人，也有人說都是。請問您認為自己是臺灣人、中國人，或者都是?)	Taiwanese	631	58.86
		Chinese	76	7.09
		Both	331	30.88
		Others but non-PRC	16	1.49
		Missing	18	1.68
Party Identification	Which political party's position is closer to yours? (V1. 請問國內哪一個政黨的主張跟您的比較接近呢?)	Independent	367	34.24
		KMT	138	12.87
		DPP	163	15.21
		PFP	5	0.47
		NP	2	0.19
		TSU	11	1.03
	Pan-Blue	51	4.76	

		Pan-Green	44	4.10
		Others	4	0.37
		No party affiliation	210	19.59
		Support none	67	6.25
		Missing	10	0.93
Civil Identity: Confidence in Taiwan's Democracy	Do you believe that our democracy and freedom can change the mainland China? (r15. 請問您相不相信我們的民主和自由可以改變大陸?)	Not at all	337	31.44
		Do not believe	316	29.48
		Neutral	39	3.64
		Believe so	263	24.53
		Strongly believe so	64	5.97
		Missing	53	4.94
Perspectives on the cross-Strait Relationship / Perceived relationship between mainland China and Taiwan	How do you see our relationship with the mainland China, is it more like father and son, brothers, couples, friends, or enemies? (r18. 您覺得我們和大陸是什麼關係，是父子、兄弟、夫妻、朋友，還是敵人？(01)父子 (02)兄弟 (03)夫妻 (04)朋友 (05)敵人 (06)其他____ (07)亦敵亦友 (08)國與國)	Father-Son	40	3.73
		Brothers	277	25.84
		Couples	11	1.03
		Friends	454	42.35
		Enemies	147	13.71
		Others	30	2.80
		Enemies & Friends	13	1.21
		Country to Country	16	1.49
		Missing	84	7.84
		Policy Preferences: The Ownership of Diaoyutai Islands	Regarding who owns the Diaoyutai Islands, could you tell me your perspectives? (let respondents talk and the interviewer pick up the best answer from the below options) (V30. 關於釣魚台屬於那一國的，可否簡單說一下您的看法？(由受訪者自己說，訪員依回答勾選最接近的答案) 1. 釣魚台是我們的(強調台灣)，不是大陸(中華人民共和國)的，也不是日本的。 2. 釣魚台是我們的(強調中華民國)，不是大陸(中華人民共和國)的，也不是日本的。 3. 釣魚台是兩岸共有的 4. 釣魚台是日本和台灣的 5. 釣魚台是大陸(中華人民共和國)的 6. 釣魚台是日本的 7. 沒感覺、沒關係、都可以	They belong to Taiwan, neither to PRC nor to Japan.
They belong to ROC, neither to PRC nor to Japan	129			12.03
They belong to both China and Taiwan	21			1.96
They belong to both Japan and Taiwan	13			1.21
They belong to PRC	29			2.71
They belong to Japan	66			6.16
No Preference	128			11.94
Missing	141			13.15
Sex		Male	503	46.92

		Female	569	53.08
		Missing	0	0.00
Education Level		Illiteracy	12	1.12
		Literate but no school	5	0.47
		Elementary school (incomplete)	16	1.49
		Elementary school	70	6.53
		Junior high (incomplete)	13	1.21
		Junior high	81	7.56
		Senior high (incomplete)	19	1.77
		Senior high	291	27.15
		College (Incomplete)	16	1.49
		College	155	14.46
		University (Incomplete)	32	2.99
		University	282	26.31
		Graduate school	74	6.90
		Missing	6	0.56
Generation	1st generation	(born by 1931)	4	0.37
	2nd generation	(born 1932~1953)	230	21.46
	3rd generation	(born 1954~1968)	419	39.09
	4th generation	(born 1969~1978)	186	17.35
	5th generation	(born 1979~1988)	132	12.31
	6th generation	(born 1989~1993)	83	7.74
		Missing	18	1.68

Note: Data collected via CATI from January 10 to 24, 2014. N=1,072.