The Impact of Cross-Cultural Differences on College Students' Lifestyles: A Case Study of China and the United States

Shuyu Zhu
Milton International School, Qingdao, Shandong, China

Abstract: This thesis examines the impact of cross-cultural differences upon everyday lives of university students in China and in America. On the basis of Hofstede's cultural parameters [15], Hall's high- and low-context model of communication [14], and Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital and habitus [4], this thesis critiques cultural beliefs, arrangements of institutions, and agency's impact upon everyday practices. In accordance with an interpretivist ideology and deductive, mixed-methods design, this study makes use of a survey database, semi-structured interviews, and secondary sources, employing thematic analysis [5] and methodology triangulation [10] in order to heighten validity. They uncover five fundamental lifestyle aspects: academic practices, leisure consumption, social interaction, intimacy, and time management. Chinese students show more structured and collectivist-oriented daily habits, as heavily influenced by educational institutions and family obligations, compared with American students who focus on independence, flexibility, and more extensive social circles. Yet, both groups exhibit agency in terms of negating cultural expectations, yielding hybrid identities that overcome cultural determinism. Conceptually, the research makes a contribution to cross-cultural sociology by breaking down lifestyle into tangible aspects and applying Bourdieu's work in a digital age. In practice, it provides recommendations to international education policy-makers and university leaders in planning culturally-sensitive programs and building cross-cultural awareness. In general, the work gives insight into the interaction of culture, structure, and agency in the formation of students' lifestyles and sees intercultural competence as critical in a globalized world.

Keywords: Cross-Cultural Differences; Student Lifestyles; Cultural Capital; Hybrid Identities; Individualism-Collectivism; Higher Education

1. Introduction

Cultural Dimensions Theory by Geert Hofstede provides us with a baseline model of cross-cultural behavior. Based on a massive IBM worker sample in 70 nations, it specifies six dimensions: Power Distance, Individualism/Collectivism, Uncertainty Avoidance, Masculinity/Femininity, Long-Term/Short-Term Orientation, and Indulgence/Restraint [15]. The Individualism/Collectivism and Long-Term Orientation scales are particularly valuable in comparing American and Chinese university students. The U.S., with higher individualism, values independence in studies and personal achievement. China, with strong collectivism and long-term orientation, cherishes group harmony and planning ahead. Those cultural norms pervasively impact daily decisions, such as social action, behavior in studies, and time expenditure [28]. Based on Hofstede's model, this work analyzes Chinese and American students' differences in lifestyle, focusing on cultural-level, not personal-level, explanations.

2. Literature Review

Several decades of studies on cross-cultural groups of students have provided us with considerable insight into how cultural norms and value systems influence ways of life. Here, "lifestyle" includes daily practices, social actions, habits of staying healthy, learning strategies, leisure activities, communicative practices, and relations among individuals. Comparing Chinese and American university students can shed partial light on how abstract cultural ideas—like collectivism versus individualism, high-context versus low-context communicative practices, and varying educational expectations—translate into students' daily lives.

Two theoretical frameworks are salient in this

area. Firstly, Hofstede's cultural dimensions are one of the most-highly cited in cross-cultural studies. China is generally marked by strong power distance (acceptance of hierarchy), strong collectivism, and long-term orientation. Conversely, the U.S. is low in power distance and high in individualism [15]. Such basic disparities underlie divergent behavior in campus and social life. Secondly, Hall's theory of High- versus Low-Context Cultures suggests that Eastern cultures (e.g., China) value implicit, nonverbal expression and contextual interpretation, while Western cultures (e.g., U.S.) value explicit, direct talk [14]. The difference bears great influence on interpersonal communication, conflict negotiation, and social integration.

These models are typically used in conjunction with ideas such as social identity theory to describe how students manage cultural expectations. Studies suggest that Chinese students tend to display more teacher-centered, memorization-based learning strategies and stick to rigid study schedules because of exam-driven pressures [36]. American students, in contrast, favor discussion-based, participatory learning and spend more flexible time partitioned among academics, work, and leisure [2]. Socially, Chinese students tend to develop small, tight-knit trust-based groups [33], while American students develop larger, more low-key networks out of diverse activity [11]. Mental illness affects both groups, though support systems and coping strategies differ markedly [1][37], , a point also highlighted in studies on international student adjustment [35].

Despite this literature, there are also a few gaps. Hofstede's model, though valuable, is prone to over-simplifying complicated cultures [27]. Most studies center on elite urban institutions without accounting for regional and socioeconomic variations. In addition, over-dependency on survey-based studies necessitates more qualitative, ethnographic studies and longitudinal studies to assess changes over time, as suggested by longitudinal educational research frameworks [24][29].

3. Methodology
It takes an interpretive approach, acknowledging that social reality is relative and constructed in human communication [6]. The approach is appropriate in studying culture and lifestyle because it prefers to comprehend phenomena by terms of participants in their cultural settings, without over-simplifying.

It utilizes a deductive methodology, placing pre-existing theories [15][14] against student lifestyle data. For example, it asks whether China's higher level of collectivism is reflected in more group-oriented activity and whether U.S. individualism is associated with autonomous activity.

A mixed-methods design [9] was employed in order to yield both qualitative and quantitative data. The structured online questionnaire among 150 students in each of the countries collected the primary data, covering topics of demographic aspects, academic behavior, social life, habits regarding health, and beliefs about cultures. Later, semi-structured interviews of 10 students in each of the countries sought to explore personal perceptions regarding lifestyle choices as well as cultural influence. Journal-based secondary data and official statistics provided contextual background. This approach follows established mixed-methods research guidelines [26].

Descriptive and inferential statistics (e.g., t-tests) in SPSS quantified data numerically, revealing substantial differences. Qualitative data in the form of interviews underwent thematic analysis [5] to reveal repeated themes and underlying cultural implications. Triangulation of methods [10] provided credibility by cross-verification of results of surveys, interviews, and literature.

Its major limitations are that there is small generalizability of sample, there is potential bias in self-reporting, and its cross-sectional design will only show a snapshot of time. Ethical clearance was gained, and there was a guarantee of anonymity with informed consent by all participants [7].

Cross-Cultural Differences; Student Lifestyles; Cultural Capital; Hybrid Identities; Mixed-Methods Research

4. Key Findings

4.1 Cultural Values Set Academic Priorities
These results suggest that cultural beliefs play a significant role in determining the extent to which students in China and America value academic life. Chinese students tend to value collective success, discipline, and long-run educational objectives. This corresponds to Hofstede's (2001) measure of the dimension of collectivism [15] and Triandis' (1995) perception

of interdependent cultural orientations [30]. Conversely, American students exhibit more agency in academic decisions, and this corresponds to the dimension of individualism that Hofstede (2001) referred to [15]. The variations reveal that cultural models direct how students manage education in tandem with other aspects of life.

4.2 Lifestyle Differences in Social Interaction and Well-being
It becomes clear that there exist strong variations in students' style of approaching social interaction and mental health. Chinese students prefer structured peer groups and studies-oriented interactions, reproducing previous research by Guo and Chase (2011) [13], who comment that cultures of collective orientation prefer closely interconnected social networks. Conversely, American students value informal, flexible friendships and liberty in social life, reproducing previous research in cultures of individualistic orientation [30]. Finally, behaviour related to staying healthy also diverges: Chinese students highlight equilibrium and discipline in diet and daily schedule, while American students value more convenience and personal liberty [34]. Those variations in lifestyle illustrate how norms in society impact physical as well as psychological well-being. Media consumption patterns, such as smartphone and social media use, also differ significantly between the two groups and relate to these lifestyle divergences [21][25].

4.3 Cross-cultural Exposure Enhances Adaptability
It also finds that exposure to a cross-cultural educational setting can increase adaptability and resilience among students. Both American and Chinese students gain from intercultural exchange, although in varying manners. Chinese students become more confident in autonomous decision-making, while American students develop further appreciation of communal responsibility. This confirms the interpretive and thematic analysis approach taken in the research, in which adaptability emerged as a repeated theme across both interviews and survey questionnaires. This corresponds with Ward and Kennedy (2001) [32], who contend that intercultural encounter stimulates cultural learning and psychological adaptation. Similar processes of professional and social adaptation

have been noted among educators and students in transnational contexts [17].

5. Key Analysis

5.1 Academic Practices and the Cultural Lens of Cultural Dimensions
Academic practices remain a significant visible cross-cultural difference. Hofstede's (2001) model of cultural dimensions is a useful lens with which to consider why Chinese students value academic discipline, exam results, and collective academic progression [15]. Chinese educational institutions reinforce this emphasis in terms of systemic arrangements such as gaokao and extremely centralized course structures, which inculcate long periods of study and vertical teacher-student roles [18]. Such environments can sometimes inhibit spontaneous classroom discourse [20]. American students, by comparison, usually face more decentralized systems, with a strong focus upon freedom of course choices and involvement in class. This reflects Hofstede's (2001) low power distance [15] and Triandis' (1995) individualism [30], both of which prize independence in learning. National surveys of student engagement in the U.S. consistently highlight the value placed on active and collaborative learning [22].

But it would be too simplistic to assert such practices to be explicable by cultural determinism alone. The students are not passive products of cultural paradigms; students actively negotiate learning strategies. Chinese students in American universities, for example, adopt seminar-style discussion so as to build confidence in public speech, while American students in China are instructed to adapt to more rigid discipline and test structures. Such adaptations signal hybrid identities whereby students blend both educational customs. Hybridity also shows agency: students opt to internalize practices that further personal agendas. Ward and Kennedy (2001) [32] offer that intercultural movements forge new learning identities, as seen in how students reinterpret study habits under institutional pressures. This agency is evident even within highly structured systems, as students navigate pre-college backgrounds and initial college experiences to shape their academic paths [24].

5.2 Consumerism and Leisure in Globalisation

Consumption and leisure exhibit the dynamic between cultural tradition and international capitalist pressures. Chinese students will typically adopt group-centered leisure, such as karaoke, group eating, and organized sporting events, that reinforce collectivistic norms of harmony and blending in [13]. American students will often prefer more individualistic leisure, such as gym exercising, solitary activities, or small excursions. That suggests consumerist cultures in which independence and freedom of choice are paramount.

Yet globalisation makes this distinction complex. The global spread of international consumer brands such as Starbucks, Apple, and Nike has generated a communal cultural space for Chinese and American youth identities [34]. They not only offer commodities, but also symbolic capital. For Chinese consumers, global consumption can be a claim of cosmopolitan belonging, while among American consumers, consumption of such products asserts individuality by means of lifestyle branding. The driving force in this case is global consumer capitalism, which promotes both convergence as well as differentiation in leisure practices. Media use patterns among youth also reflect this blend of global influence and local adaptation [25].

Important in this respect is that students exhibit agency in managing such consumer cultures. Chinese students adopt Western brands while recasting them in culturally appropriate terms, such as going to Starbucks as a group activity as opposed to a personal activity of having a cup of coffee. American students in China engage in group leisure events in an attempt to solidify group relations, although such behaviors may not be compatible with home culture. That shows how cultural differentiation and global capitalist institutions converge to create hybrid consumption practices.

5.3 Institutional Mechanisms and Social Interaction

Social networks reveal how institutional setups impact cultural practices. Chinese dormitory setups and class-based cohorts institutionalize collectivism by encouraging students to create close-knit groups, which frequently persist throughout university life [18]. Such setups duplicate Hofstede (2001) [15] in revealing a collectivist dimension, superimposing social interaction in academic life. On the other hand,

American students work in hybrid settings that take cues from fraternities, sororities, and elective clubs. Such institutions reveal individualism, as students are free to choose networks that suit personal interests. Student engagement surveys underscore the importance of such out-of-class interactions for American students' development [22].

Nonetheless, students show agency in dealing with such arrangements. Overseas Chinese students tend to forge heterogeneous friendships, not only among compatriots, but among host students, seeking independence as well as expanded horizons. American students in China internalize ordered peer groups, sometimes engaging in collaborative rites such as communal feasting or festival celebrations. The practices show that interaction is more than a fixed representation of norms, being instead a negotiation of institutional pressures as well as individual choices. This process mirrors the adaptation challenges and strategies documented in studies of international student adjustment [35].

This negotiation provides the basis of Bhabha's (1994) "third space" [3], as students forge hybrid selves by combining inter-actional forms of both collectivism and individualism. Such hybridity ruptures fixed oppositions of East-West and emphasizes agency in communal life.

5.4 Intimacy and Hybrid Identities

It is heavily regulated by cultural scripts, though also regulated by student agency. In Chinese settings, intimacy is traditionally defined by family obligations and long-term commitment. Preparation for marriage might be understood as a mode of dating, and open discussion of sexuality is constrained by norms [19]. Cultural paradigms of America focus on openness, experimentation, and short-term exploration in relationships, which reflect principles of individualism.

Institutional arrangements also support such norms. Chinese universities, for example, typically enforce curfews or gender-segregated dormitory arrangements, which govern intimacy by official means. The American university, by contrast, will usually authorize co-ed housing arrangements and more personal freedom. The arrangements differ as means of governing lifestyles of university students. Theories of student retention and engagement also recognize the role of social and intimate integration in the

university experience [29].

But intimate practices also show that students are negotiators in action, not passive cultural objects. Overseas Chinese students typically test more permissive forms of courtship, as a result of exposure to Western practices. American students in China might take more conservative forms, as a consequence of institutional guidelines and peer norms. Hybrid identities in such accommodation show that students reinterpret intimacy by both cultural scripts and personal inclinations. Bhabha's "third space" (1994) [3] helps to expound such hybridity, revealing that cross-cultural contexts open up opportunities for recasting intimacy. Successful navigation of these intimate domains can be a key factor in overall psychosocial adjustment abroad [35].

5.5 Time Management and the Discipline of Institutions

Time management throws into relief the crossroads of culture, structure, and agency. Chinese students are under tight timetabling, extensive periods of study, and discipline-based routines, mirroring both Confucian cultural practices and exam-based institutional mechanisms [18]. American students, by contrast, enjoy more freedom, typically combining academic work with after-work part-time jobs and extracurricular activities. This indicates individualistic cultures and non-structured institutional systems. The impact of part-time work on time use and academic outcomes is a noted consideration in such contexts [23].

But in this American case also, autonomy is constrained by structural processes, such as the utilization of credit hours and working part time due to financial considerations. Multitasking and compartmentalized time use ensues, coupled with stress. The China situation, on the other hand, sees stability in systems at the price of inflexibility. Research on student engagement suggests that how students allocate time across academic, work, and social activities is significantly influenced by their initial college experiences and institutional expectations [24].

Students respond to such pressures with agency. Overseas Chinese students take up flexible planning, becoming accustomed to interleaving leisure and work in daily life. American students in China take up more fixed schedule habits in response to institutional expectations. The

practices reveal negotiated lives, in which students take agency in balancing institutional discipline with personal concerns.

6. Discussion

This study finds that its results open up new prospects of understanding cross-cultural differences in Chinese and American university students' lives, including lives at university, leisure consumption, social behaviors, love lives, and allocation of time. Adopting Hofstede's (2001) theory of cultural dimensions [15], Bourdieu's (1986) concepts of cultural capital and habitus [4], and Giddens' (1991) structuration theory [12], this work not only confirms portions of mainstream theoretical claims, but rejects and complements some research directions.

First, with regard to support, the findings support Hofstede's postulations about differences in individualism-collectivism. American students value autonomy and efficiency, while Chinese students are more under the influence of collective arrangements and social pressures [15]. In addition, Bourdieu's notion of "habitus" receives support, as Chinese students' practices are conditioned by educational establishment and family culture, exemplifying how "social structures are internalised into individual practices" [4]. This internalization process is evident in the persistence of certain learning styles and social behaviors, as noted in comparative studies [31].

Second, in challenge, this work defies stereotypes. Contrary to the assumption that Chinese students are passive, there is much initiative and strategic agency in cross-cultural encounters, recasting "hybrid identities" via online platforms and clubs. That defies "cultural determinism" and portrays cross-cultural actors as complex. This aligns with critiques of oversimplified cultural models [27] and highlights the importance of agency in student retention and success models [29].

Third, regarding extension and renewal, this work makes clear the extent of applying Bourdieu's theory in the digitized age. Online platforms and social media not only reproduce culture, but also open up new avenues of "hybrid identity." American students, for example, use Instagram to display individuated ways of life, while Chinese students use WeChat groups to maintain group connections. This shows that digitization is at one and the same time both a

site of cultural reproduction as well as a space of hybridity and innovation [8]. This mediated reality intersects with lifestyle choices in areas like media consumption [25] and smartphone use [21].

There are three theoretical implications: it brings forth new empirical evidence by deconstructing "lifestyle" into concrete dimensions; it opens up the dynamic interdependence of culture, social structure, and agency; and it extends Bourdieu's "habitus" to the age of virtuality.

In practice, it is of value to international program builders in education (e.g., "differential support"), university administrators (e.g., creating cross-cultural sites out of the classroom), and in building cross-cultural competency (e.g., in "hybrid identities").

Of course, there are limitations in methodology, scope of theory, and possible bias of researcher in this research. Future studies should attempt methodological extension (longitudinal studies), diversification of sample (by major, background), and integration of quantitation (e.g., integration of surveys and social media data).

7. Conclusion

This research, by cross-culturally comparing Chinese and American university students' lives, finds deep differences along five axes: academic practices, leisure consumption, social interaction, intimate relationships, and time management. The differences are not superficial cultural opposition, but rather a consequence of the interplay of social structures (e.g., educational systems, scholarship policies), cultural dimensions (e.g., individualism-collectivism), and agency at the level of individuals. The research shows that students are not so much determined by culture in passive ways, but rather show hybrid identities and strategic options in multicultural settings. This understanding is crucial for designing effective international student support systems [35] and for recognizing the evolving nature of learning cultures [16].

In theory, it extends the scope of application of Bourdieu's "habitus" and "cultural capital," especially new expressions of them in digital zones of social fields. In practice, it provides positive implications for international education policy-makers and university administrators, underscoring that there should be diversified development of cross-cultural support systems and interactive spaces.

In brief, understanding differences in Chinese and American university students' lifestyles is not only a scholarship task, but also a catalyst to develop cross-cultural understanding and collaborative potential in response to globalization. Through collaborative action at both institutional and personal levels, cross-cultural understanding in a literal sense can be cultivated, opening up avenues to global-oriented education of future global citizens.

References

[1] American College Health Association (2022) National College Health Assessment. Maryland: ACHA.

[2] Astin, A. W. (1999) 'Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education', Journal of College Student Development, 40(5), pp. 518-529.

[3] Bhabha, H. K. (1994) The location of culture. London: Rout.

[4] Bourdieu, P. (1986) 'The forms of capital', in Richardson, J. G. (ed.) Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education. New York: Greenwood, 241-258.

[5] Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) 'Using thematic analysis in psychology', Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), pp. 77-101.

[6] Bryman, A. (2016) Social research methods. 5th edn. Oxford: Oxford University.

[7] Chen, Y. and Bozeman, B. (2018) 'Publish or impoverish: An investigation of the monetary reward system of science in China', Science and Public Policy, 45, (1) pp. 128-140.

[8] Couldry, N. and Hepp, A. (2017) The mediated construction of reality. Cambridge: Polity Press.

[9] Creswell, J. W. and Plano Clark, V. L. (2018) Designing and conducting mixed methods research. 3rd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

[10] Denzin, N. K. (1978) The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods. 2nd edn. New York: McGraw-H.

[11] Fowler, J. H. and Christakis, N. A. (2008) 'Dynamic spread of happiness in a large social network: Longitudinal analysis over 20 years in the Framingham Heart Study', BMJ, 337, a2338.

[12] Giddens, A. (1991) Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

[13] Guo, S. and Chase, M. (2011) 'Internationalisation of higher education: Integrating international students into Canadian academic environment', Teaching in Higher Education, 16(3), pp. 305-318.

[14] Hall, E. T. (1976) Beyond culture. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

[15] Hofstede, G. (2001) Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations. 2nd.edn. Thousand Oaks, CA.

[16] Jin, L. and Cortazzi, M. (2006) 'Changing practices in Chinese cultures of learning', Language, Culture and Curriculum, 19(1), pp. 5-20.

[17] King, R. and Lewin, A. (2016) 'The professional adaptation of foreign-trained Teachers in Canada', Comparative and International Education, 45(1), Article 4.

[18] Li, J. (2016) Cultural foundations of learning: East and West. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[19] Liu, F. (2018) 'Dating, intimacy and identity in Chinese student culture', Sexualities, 21(3), pp. 309-327.

[20] Liu, N. F. and Littlewood, W. (1997) 'Why do many students appear reluctant to take part in classroom learning discourse?', System, 25(3), pp. 371-384.

[21] Lu, J. and Liu, X. (2020) 'Smartphone addiction and its associated factors among Chinese university students', Psychology Research and Behavior Management, 13, pp. 855-864.

[22] National Survey of Student Engagement (2014) Bringing the institution into focus: Annual results 2014. Bloomington: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.

[23] Owens, A. (2014) 'The influence of part-time work on student academic achievement', Journal of Education and Work, 27(5), pp. 534-556.

[24] Pike, G. R., Hansen, M. J. and Lin, C. H. (2015) 'The influence of students' pre-college characteristics, high school experiences, and initial college experiences on learning and development in the first year of college', Research in Higher Education, 56(3), pp. 243-267.

[25] Rideout, V. (2015) The common sense census: Media use by tweens and teens. San Francisco: Common Sense Media.

[26] Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2019) Research methods for business students. 8th edn. Harlow: Pearson Education.

[27] Smith, P. B., Fischer, R., Vignoles, V. L. and Bond, M. H. (2016) Understanding social psychology across cultures: Engaging with others in a changing world. 2nd edn. London: Sage.

[28] Taras, V., Kirkman, B. L. and Steel, P. (2010) 'Examining the impact of Culture's Consequences: A three-decade, multilevel, meta-analytic review of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions', Journal of Applied Psychology, 95(3), pp. 405-439.

[29] Tinto, V. (1993) Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition. 2nd edn. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[30] Triandis, H. C. (1995) Individualism and collectivism. Boulder, CO:.

[31] Wang, W. and Shan, X. (2007) 'A comparative study of learning styles between Chinese and American students', US-China Education Review, 4(3), pp. 56-60.

[32] Ward, C. and Kennedy, A. (2001) 'Coping with cross-cultural transition', Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32(5), pp. 636-642.

[33] Yan, K. and Berliner, D. C. (2011) 'Chinese international students in the United States: Demographic trends, motivations, acculturation features and adjustment challenges', Asia Pacific Education Review, 12(2), pp. 173-184.

[34] Yan, Z. and FitzPatrick, K. (2016) 'Acculturation and health behaviors among international students: A qualitative study', Journal of International Students, 6(1), pp. 216-233.

[35] Zhang, J. and Goodson, P. (2011) 'Predictors of international students' psychosocial adjustment to life in the United States: A systematic review', International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35(2), pp. 139-162.

[36] Zheng, X. (2015) 'Chinese overseas students and intercultural learning: An empirical study on the role of prior international sojourn experience', Journal of Studies in International Education, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 461-477.

[37] Zhou, Y., Jindal-Snape, D., Topping, K. and Todman, J. (2019) 'Theoretical models of

culture shock and adaptation in international students in higher education', Studies in Higher Education, 44(12), pp. 2293-2307.