A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS BETWEEN FINNS AND CHINESE:

HOW COMMUNICATION TRAITS AFFECT SELF-DISCLOSURE IN

INTERCULTURAL FRIENDSHIPS?

Xuejun Cui

Master's Thesis

Intercultural Communication

Department of Communication

June 2016

University of Jyväskylä

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

Tiedekunta - Faculty	Laitos - Department
Faculty of Humanities	Department of Communication

Tekijä – Author
Xuejun Cui

Työn nimi – Title
A comparative analysis between Finns and Chinese: how communication traits affect self-disclosure in intercultural friendships?

Oppiaine - Subject	Työn laji - Level
Intercultural Communication	Pro Gradu - Thesis

Aika - Month and year	Sivumäärä - Number of pages
June 2016	63+12

Tiivistelmä – Abstract

   Self-disclosure, or the process revealing personal information about oneself to another, plays a vital role in friendship formation and maintenance, and cultured self-disclosure has been proven to be a powerful factor influencing intercultural friendships. Substantial cross-cultural research has shown self-disclosure differs among different cultural groups, but little research has examined what factors facilitate or impede self-disclosure in intercultural friendships. This research answers this call from a communication traits perspective.

   The focus of this research is to compare similarities and differences between Finns and Chinese in dimensions of self-disclosure in intercultural friendships, and to examine how self-perceived communication competence (SPCC) and willingness to communicate (WTC) affect the five dimensions of self-disclosure. This study was conducted in a quantitative research method, and all the data was collected among Finns and Chinese through questionnaires.

   Results revealed there are no significant differences in the amount, positive-negative, and honesty-accuracy of self-disclosure among Finnish and Chinese respondents in intercultural friendships. WTC is positively correlated with SPCC among both samples. Additionally, WTC and SPCC are positively correlated with amount of self-disclosure among Finnish respondents; while among their Chinese counterparts, WTC is found to be positively correlated with all three dimensions of self-disclosure, and SPCC is positively correlated only with the amount of self-disclosure.

Muita tietoja - Additional information

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION

The relationship between self-disclosure and friendship development has been studied substantially during recent years (Bauminger, Finzi-Dottan, Chason, & Har-Even, 2008; Kito, 2005; Lee, 2006; Matsushima & Shiomi, 2002; Samter, 2003), however, the earliest theoretical work can be traced back to Altman and Taylor's social penetration theory in 1973. Altman and Taylor pointed out that revealing personal feelings, thoughts, and experiences to another person can improve the intimacy level between friends. Thus, self-disclosure is a critical indicator of the quality and the length of friendships (Altman & Taylor, 1973), and overall relational satisfaction (Kito, 2005).

There are many individual, social, and cultural factors influencing the self-disclosure process in friendships, but cultural factors have attracted the most attention from scholars (Gareis, 1999a; Kudo & Simkin, 2003; Lee, 2006; Omarzu, 2000). Substantial research has explored how dimensions and topics of self-disclosure differ across different cultures (Chen, 1995; Chen & Nakazawa, 2009; Lee, 2006; Schug, Yuki & Maddux, 2010), however, most of the previous research has been conducted in the United States or between the US and Eastern cultures (Chen, 1995; Chen & Nakazawa, 2009; Kito, 2005; Maier, Zhang & Clark, 2013). There hasn't been much attention given to self-disclosure and friendship in other cultures, like the Finnish culture.

Although cross-cultural studies have confirmed that self-disclosure differs among different cultural groups, little research has been done to explore what variables facilitate or hinder self-disclosure in intercultural friendships. Individual's religion and social identity are important factors that have been shown to influence the extent of and the types of self-disclosure

(Croucher, Faulkner, Spencer, & Long, 2012; Croucher, Faulkner, Oommen, & Long, 2010; Hargie, Tourish & Curtis, 2001).   Chen and Nakazawa (2009) examined the influence of individualism-collectivism and relational intimacy on topics and dimensions of self-disclosure in intercultural friendships and found that relational intimacy was positively correlated with all six topics and four dimensions of self-disclosure, and that individualism was a significant predictor of all five dimensions of self-disclosure.   Early research by Wheeless, Nesser, and McCroskey (1986) examined the relationship between individual's communication apprehension (CA) level and disclosiveness/dimensions of self-disclosure.   The results revealed that apprehension was related primarily to one's general disclosiveness and secondarily to the amount, depth, and honesty-accuracy of self-disclosure.   CA, or the fear of or the anxiety derived from real or anticipated oral communication with other people (McCroskey, 1977), is one of the three communication traits that have been studied extensively to explain individuals' predispositions to approach or to avoid communication with others based on a series of theories from McCroskey (1997).   However, the other two communication traits closely related to CA--willingness to communicate (WTC) and self-perceived communication competence (SPCC), have yet to be studied in relation to self-disclosure.

Therefore, the research reported here is concerned with how individuals' willingness and self-perceived ability of communication, instead of the fear or anxiety of communication, affect their self-disclosure behavior.   Although CA is not a variable investigated in this study, related concept and research will be presented to help readers gain a better understanding of WTC and SPCC.   Also, previous research about CA and self-disclosure can be beneficial for connecting

WTC/SPCC to self-disclosure.

This study seeks to examine the influence of culture (Finnish and Chinese) and communication traits (WTC and SPCC) on self-disclosure behavior in intercultural friendships. The present study is important for two reasons.   Firstly, communication scholars (e.g., Barnlund, 1989; Croucher et al., 2010; Wheeless, Erickson, & Behrens, 1986) have called for more studies on self-disclosure from a non-US perspective.   Northern European countries, as a whole, haven't attracted much attention from communication scholars, at least among the available English literature.   As one of the Nordic countries, Finland has its own uniqueness. Finns share a lot of Western European values, for instance, democracy, equality for women, and human rights, but on the other hand they are introverted, value silence and distrust big talkers. Finns, as communicators, are worth examining.   Thus, a study on self-disclosure in an under-researched culture like Finland would give a better understanding of how culture impacts self-disclosure.   Furthermore, its comparison with the Chinese might provide new insights to previous research.

Secondly, knowledge about cultural differences, communication traits, and behaviors between Finns and Chinese in intercultural friendships may provide practical information for people from these two cultures.   For example, they could learn about how similar or different they are when communicating with intercultural friends, and what is the actual disclosure pattern to a foreign friend in each other's culture.   I believe this will eventually help them to understand the expectations of intercultural friendship in each other's culture as well. Additionally, both cultural and business encounters between Finland and China have been

growing fast in the past years, and a better understanding of cultural similarities/differences on

self-disclosure and communication traits could also contribute to the development and

maintenance of friendship between people from the two cultures, and further facilitate

collaborations on a macro-level between the two nations.

2. JUSTIFICATION OF THIS STUDY

2.1 Cultural Values in Finland and China

Culture is a complex concept.   There are many definitions of culture where some focus on the functions of culture, while others focus on the structure of culture.   For the purpose of this study, the concept defined by West and Turner (2009) was found to be the most relevant. According to West and Turner, culture is shared by one nation and its representatives inherit some certain values, beliefs and norms through cultural socialization.   In general, national or regional culture imposes itself on behavior, and from this process arises the so-called labels of "true Americans", "real Finns" or "a typical Chinese".

Hofstede's (1980, 1991) theory explains cultural differences from certain dimensions, such as power distance, individualism vs. collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity vs. femininity.   Among all these dimensions of culture, however, Individualism-Collectivism (I-C) has been the most popular aspect when it comes to cultural differences.   Although generalizing culture at the national level has received some criticism in previous research, I-C still remains one of the most used structures to measure and to compare cultures and is widely discussed in research (e.g., Cai, Wilson, & Drake, 2000; Chen & Nakazawa, 2009; Gudykunst et al., 1996).

I-C is defined as the extent to which individuals integrate into groups (Hofstede, 2008). In individualistic cultures, interpersonal connections between people are weak and personal goals, autonomy, privacy, competitiveness, and aggressive creativity are emphasized (Azevedo, Drost & Mullen, 2002).   In collectivistic cultures, however, social structure is relatively tight and individuals distinguish between in-groups and out-groups, and stay close to their collective

groups (Triandis, 1995).   Furthermore, people place great emphasis on duty, loyalty, obligation, hierarchy, respectfulness, and mutual dependence (Chen & Nakazawa, 2009).   According to Hofstede's (1980, 1991) cultural dimension measurement, Finland scored 63 on Individualism while China scored 20, suggesting that Chinese culture, as a whole, is much more collectivistic than Finnish culture.   In this study, I-C will not be measured individually, but as a potential factor affecting individuals' communication traits, self-disclosure, and even personal relationships.

2.2 Communication Styles in Finland and China

According to widely held stereotypes, Finns are perceived as silent, timid, shy and introverted (Lehtonen & Sajavaara, 1985; Sallinen-Kuparinen, 1986).   Early research also suggested that Finns maintain such communicator portraits and had a low communicator image of themselves (Lehtonen, 1990; Sallinen-Kuparinen, Asikainen, Gerlander, Kukkola & Sihto, 1987).   In Sallinen-Kuparinen's (1986) study of Finnish communication reticence, 80% of respondents rated their skills as average or worse.   However, later studies show there has been changes in Finnish communication culture, especially among young people.   In a study among Finnish high school students, Valkonen (2003) found students' self-evaluated communication skills were often higher than their teachers' or outsiders' assessments.   Furthermore, Sallinen (2000) revealed that the image of Finns as communicators has turned in a better direction due to internationalization of the country and rising educational levels in Finland.   Although changes have happened, Finns still are not described as talkative or willing to communicate with others. As Wilkins and Isotalus (2008) summarized in their book *Speech Culture in Finland,* Finns still

appreciate and actually need silence.   They further concluded that the Finnish communication

style of being direct and being matter-of-fact can be interpreted as reliability and punctuality.

Generally, Finns would prefer to maintain harmony than argue directly with people.   Similarly,

Lewis (2005, p. 67) also described Finnish communication characteristics as "reticence, use of

silence, humbleness, good listening without interruptions, long pauses between speech turns,

concealment of feelings, and the belief that statements are promises".   Previous studies have

confirmed that all of these characteristics can be found in all interpersonal and public

communications no matter if the context is domestic or intercultural (Wilkins & Isotalus, 2008).

The typical Chinese communication style, according to Hall's (1976) high vs. low

context culture categorization, is largely high-context.   In a high-context culture, not

everything is explicitly stated in writing or when spoken.   Numerous studies have been done to

study Chinese culture and the Chinese communication style (e.g., Chen, 2008, 2009a, 2009b;

Chen & An, 2009; Fang & Faure, 2011; Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998; Gao, Ting-Toomey &

Gudykunst, 1996; Hofstede, 1980, 1991, 2001).   Among these studies, Gao and her colleagues

put forward five distinctive characteristics of Chinese communication (Gao & Ting-Toomey,

1998; Gao et al., 1996): implicit communication (*hanxu*), listening-centered communication

(*tinghua*), polite communication (*keqi*), insider-communication (*zijiren*), and face-orientated

communication (*mianzi*).

Hanxu suggests an implicit and indirect Chinese way of communication where one does

not need to speak plainly but rather leaves somethings for the listeners to interpret (Gao &

Ting-Toomey, 1998).   *Tinghua* can be literally translated as "listen talks".   "To Chinese, there

are conditions associated with speaking, and not everyone is entitled to speak.   Thus, a spoken

'voice' is equated with seniority, authority, age, experience, knowledge, and expertise.   As a

result, listening becomes a predominant mode of communication" (Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998:

42).   *Keqi* can be translated as "polite" or "courteous", which is considered the basic rule of

communication for Chinese in interpersonal relationships.   *Keqi* also embodies the modesty

and humbleness in Chinese culture (Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998).

    Zijiren literally means "insiders".   Chinese culture, as a predominantly collectivistic

culture, emphasizes in-group and out-group.   It is natural and comfortable for Chinese to get

highly involved in conversation with people they know ("insiders"), but on the other hand, it's

hard for them to initiate a conversation with strangers, who are subconsciously perceived as

outsiders (Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998).   *Mianzi* literally can be translated as "face", which not

only refers to a person's "decency" or "high moral reputation", but also involves the extra

reputation gained by personal achievement (Hu, 1944).   For the sake of saving face, Chinese

usually prefer to maintain harmony instead of arguing with people directly.   The above

five-point framework provides a comprehensive guideline to understand Chinese

communication features from the point of Confucian philosophy.

    Clearly, Finns and Chinese actually have a lot in common regarding communication

styles.   Just as Lewis describes in his book *Finland, cultural lone wolf,* Finns are a group of

people who "have Western European values cloaked in an Asian communication style" (Lewis,

2005, p.67).

2.3 Current Cooperation between Finland and China

Finland and China have enjoyed a longstanding traditional relationship since the 1950s, when the two countries established diplomatic relations.   Nowadays, there are more and more connections between the two countries, especially in bilateral trade and investment, technology and innovation, as well as education and teacher training.

Trade and investment. On bilateral trade and investments, China is Finland's largest trade partner in Asia and is Finland's most important export market in Asia, as well as the biggest import origin outside Europe.   According to the Chinese Embassy in Finland (2011), Finland is now China's second largest trade partner and important source of technology import among the Nordic countries.   According to data from the Embassy of Finland in China, "In 2012, the trade between Finland and China reached to more than seven billion euros.   There are more than 300 Finnish companies in China and Finns have invested at least 10 billion euros in China."   Finnish investments in China are mostly concentrated in IT, forestry, paper and machinery industries, and more and more SMEs are eager to explore Chinese market as well.

Technology and innovation. Continuously increasing cooperation between the two countries also embodies research, development, and innovation.   The combination of large manufacturing capability and relatively low cost has made China a world factory in the past decades, but with the development and transition of China's economy, this role will not be enough for China in future (Kaarlejärvi & Hämäläinen, 2012).   China has started focusing on modernizing its innovation system, which makes China a great opportunity for closer high-tech cooperation between Finland and China.

Under this trend, quite a few associations/alliances/organizations have been set up to

support mutual cooperation, for example, the China – Finland Strategic ICT Alliance.   The

Alliance, founded in 2009, aims to promote research and development as well as industrial and

governmental cooperation in ICT between Finland and China in related areas.   Their current

three focus areas are: smart city and urbanization collaboration, senior services and smart home,

as well as education solutions and services.

      Education and teacher training. Education is another field that has aroused intensive

attention in recent years in both Finland and China.   Finland's successful education system has

come into sight ever since after Finland topped the Programme for International Student

Assessment (PISA) rankings for three times in the years from 2000 to 2006.   Actually, the

Finnish education system has frequently been regarded as the best in the world since the

implementation of its education reforms 40 years ago, while Chinese education, characterized

by an emphasis on standardized testing, competition, memorization, and hard work, is in

desperate need of reform (Zhao, 2014).

      Under this trend, cooperation in education between Finland and China is inevitable and

has been growing rapidly in recent years.   In April 2009, the Center for International Mobility

(CIMO) opened a branch in Shanghai to help Finnish institutions of higher education to work

with Chinese institutions in terms of coordination and organization of educational events.   The

University of Jyväskylä and Shanghai Municipal Education Commission (SMEC) started their

cooperation at the beginning of 2010s.   In September 2015, they furthered their collaboration

by signing a cooperation agreement aiming to establish the Centre for Shanghai Teacher

Training and Collaboration in Jyväskylä.   Additionally, Finland has turned out to be one of the

favorite destinations for higher education for many Chinese students in recent years.

According to the latest data from the Center for International Mobility, China continuously

ranked the first place in Top 10 Place of Origin for Full-Degree students in Finland from 2007

to 2012, with an average number of 2,115 students per year coming to Finland for further

education.

Thus, it's not hard to conclude from the above-stated facts that interactions between

Finns and Chinese have increased drastically in recent years.   This study on communication

traits and self-disclosure in intercultural friendships between Finns and Chinese would be

beneficial in giving them a better understanding of each other's communication patterns, and

further facilitating collaborations on a macro-level between the two nations.

3. FRIENDSHIP

3.1 Culture and Friendship

In the West, friendships are broadly defined as voluntary, unconstrained, and spontaneous relationships with reciprocated warm and caring feelings (Fehr 1996; Gareis, 1995; Pahl, 2000).   However, the definition of friendship is constructed within cultural groups and might differ among different cultural contexts (Collier, 1996; Gareis, 1999b).   For example, in the United States, the term *friend* is used to describe various interpersonal relationships, from those who are even closer than families to casual acquaintances.   Self-interests and self-concerns are the main focuses in friendships for Americans (French, Bae, Pidada & Lee, 2006).   As a typical example of an individualistic and low-context culture, Americans value independence and openness and generally have a high level of willingness to communicate and self-disclosure (Knutson, Komolsevin, Chatiketu, & Smith, 2002).

Not much research about Finns' friendships has been found in English literature. According to Lewis's (2011) cultural categories of communication and Western vs. Eastern values, Finnish values are in line with Western values like those of Americans, while their communication styles are similar to Eastern communication.   McHugh (2002) in his comparative study about self-disclosure to a same-sex friend between Finns and Japanese revealed that Finns more closely resembled native English-speakers' disclosure patterns than Japanese counterparts, and they may openly and almost equally express their personal opinions to various levels of interpersonal relationships.   Japanese, however, probably give this privilege only to their life-long close friends.   This research also found, unlike Japanese, Finns reported high levels of free choices in establishing and terminating a same-sex friendship.

Contrary to the scant research on friendship in Finland, friendship in Chinese/Taiwanese culture has received relatively more attention.   Chinese culture is considered as predominantly collectivistic, where people emphasize duty, loyalty, obligation, and mutual dependence. Under implications of this typical collectivistic culture, Chinese value more sincerity, spirituality, and practicality, but less verbal communication in interpersonal relationships (Gao &Ting-Toomey, 1998; Gareis, 1995; Yum, 1988).   In Gareis'(1995) case studies of five Taiwanese-American friendship experiences, Taiwanese international students were found to be cautious, introverted, less impulsive and aggressive, disapproved of open disagreement, and less expressive of emotions.

In this study, friendship will be operationalized as one specific type—intercultural friendship, which is characterized as having cultural differences between individuals. Misunderstandings, uncertainties, frustration, and conflicts may arise during the process due to different cultural values, language barriers, stereotypes, and divergent meaning systems processed by various cultural groups (Barnett & Lee, 2002).

3.2 Intercultural Friendship

Although previous research on intercultural friendships is far from comprehensive, some factors have been identified to affect friendship formation across cultures.   The focus is mainly on the following three aspects: cultural similarity, personality and identity, and intercultural communication competence.

   Cultural similarity. Cultural similarity helps to explain and predict behaviors in initial encounters of people with different cultural backgrounds, which paves the way for deeper

understanding and involvement (Kim, 1991; Searle & Ward, 1990).   Particularly,

individualism and collectivism have been identified as influential factors in intercultural

friendship development.   Ting-Toomey (1989) found that individuals with a collectivistic

orientation tend to emphasize cultural or social role attributes in potential friends, while people

with an individualistic orientation are more likely to focus on desirable personal attributes.

Friendships in different cultures might share a core of valued traits, for example, mutual

affection, trustworthiness in sharing confidences, and support (Argyle, Henderson, Bond, Iizuka,

& Contarello, 1986; Gareis, 1995).   However, culture also shapes the manifestations of these

traits and the degree of their importance.   Self-disclosure, for example, is a common

characteristic of friendship in many cultures, but research has shown it's more important for

Brazilians than Australians (Morse, 1983).   Another study revealed, compared with Japanese,

Finns disclosed more personal information and were more likely to express their opinions to a

same-sex friend (McHugh, 2002).

Personality and identity. Research has shown cultural empathy, open-mindedness,

emotional stability, social initiative, and flexibility have positive effect on intercultural

encounters (Van Oudenhoven & Van der Zee, 2002).   Closely related to personality is the

identity (Gareis, 2012).   Strom (1988) found individuals who define their identities by cultural

dimensions are more likely to focus on their own culture and usually won't have as much

intercultural friendship as those who are personal identifiers.   In addition to individual's own

identity, the relational identity in a friendship is crucial as well.   Research has shown the

balance of individual's own identity with the newly emerging relational identity is very

important for friendship development (Collier, 2002; Lee, 2008).

      Intercultural communication competence. Intercultural communication competence is another factor affecting intercultural friendship formation and development, especially in the initial stage of relationship development and the more stable stage of interpersonal involvement (Gudykunst, 1985).   Previous research has shown cross-cultural knowledge (Gudykunst, 1991), communicative adaptability (Chen, 1992; Gareis, Merkin, & Goldman, 2011), and language proficiency (Gareis et al., 2011; Sias et al., 2008; Ward & Masgoret, 2004) were all correlated with intercultural friendship development.   Sias et al. (2008) demonstrated that although intercultural friends share some certain similarities, they have to communicate them through cultural differences, which emphasizes the important role of communication in intercultural friendships.

      Self-disclosure, as one of the major communicative activities, has been identified as a critical indicator of intercultural friendship formation (Kudo & Simkin, 2003).   Altman and Taylor's (1973) social penetration theory provides theoretical support on the relations between self-disclosure and relationship development.   Thus, in the following part, an extensive review of literature about self-disclosure will be presented.

4. SELF-DISCLOSURE

4.1 Definition and Dimensions

Self-disclosure, or the process of revealing personal information about oneself to another, is one of the most important parts in the development of intimate intercultural relationships (Barnlund, 1989; Gareis, 1999a; Kudo & Simkin, 2003).   Self-disclosure has been studied in previous research in terms of various topics (e.g., attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, work or studies, money, personality, and body) and dimensions (e.g., intention, breadth, depth, amount, positivism-negativity, and honesty-accuracy) (Jourard & Lasakow, 1958; Wheeless & Grotz, 1976).   For the purpose of this study, the concept of self-disclosure is operationalized in terms of different dimensions of self-disclosure.

With regards to the dimensions of self-disclosure, one of the benchmark studies is Wheeless and Grotz's Revised Self-disclosure Scale (RSDS), which involves 31 items to show 5 major dimensions of self-disclosure (Wheeless, 1978): (1) intended disclosure; (2) amount of disclosure; (3) positive/ negative disclosure; (4) control of depth in disclosure; and (5) honesty and accuracy in disclosure.   Regarding intention of self-disclosure, some people may be willing to disclose to anyone, while some may carefully choose the target person.   The amount of disclosure may differ based on the target (Cozby, 1973).   Self-disclosure is guided by the norm of reciprocity (Barnettpearce, Sharp, Wright, & Slama, 1974; Won-Doornink, 1985), which means one's self-disclosure would increase with the partner's disclosure.

Culture, including ethnic identities and individualism/collectivism, has been examined to have a huge influence towards the process of disclosing private information to others (Chen, 2002; Croucher et al., 2010).   As Hastings (2000) demonstrated "a culturally situated study of

self-disclosure may lead to insights about important variables affecting decisions to disclose" (p.

86).

4.2 Self-disclosure and Nationality

Previous research has examined self-disclosure in various intercultural or cross-cultural

settings, and indicated that cultural/national settings do impact individual's self-disclosure

behaviors.   Americans appeared to be the most popular study target in many of the comparative

studies, and they were found to be more open in self-disclosure than individuals from East Asian

nations.   For example, Wheeless, Erickson and Behrens (1986) compared non-Western and

Western cultures on self-disclosure, and found that the students from Western cultures tend to

disclose more, while students from non-Western cultures were more likely to disclose in greater

depth.   Kito (2005) confirmed that Japanese college students engaged in lower levels of

self-disclosure than Americans in both romantic relationships and friendships.   Schug et al.

(2010) also found Americans were more likely to disclose than Japanese.

However, in comparison with Latin Americans, Americans tend to disclose less than them.

Horenstein and Downey (2003) compared self-disclosure among Americans and Argentineans,

and found Argentineans scored higher on self-disclosure than Americans.   Possible

explanations given by the researchers were differences in family structure *(familismo)*,

interpersonal trust, and personal space.

In many other cases, however, culture was found to work in a more complex way along

with other variables influencing self-disclosure, which might bring about unexpected findings.

In a recent study, Maier et al. (2013) examined self-disclosure among Americans and

Romanians.   The results showed that Americans disclosed to friends with greater intent than

Romanians, but the two cultures did not differ in other dimensions of self-disclosure.   The

researchers attributed this result to a complex mix of Romanian culture with Latin heritage, and

a societal transformation after the fall of Communism to a more liberal and individualistic

society.   Similarly, in a comparative study about self-disclosure in Americans and Indians,

Croucher et al. (2012) revealed that Americans scored significantly lower than Indians on four

of the five dimensions of self-disclosure, which was also attributed to the tight-knit family

structure in India, where multi-generational homes prevalently exist.

To summarize, cultural/national settings play an important role in influencing individual's

self-disclosure behaviors, but it seems that no universal patterns exist of how exactly they shape

people's self-disclosure patterns.

4.3 Self-disclosure and Individualism-Collectivism

The Individualism-collectivism dimension of culture is most often used to understand

cultural differences in self-disclosure in different nations and between individuals within the

same nation (e.g., Chen, 1995; Fitzpatrick, Liang, Feng, Crawford, Sorell, & Morgan-Fleming,

2006).   Previous research has revealed individuals from cultures regarded as predominantly

individualistic tend to be more open, expressive, direct, and to disclose more but to have less

depth of disclosure than individuals from traditionally collectivistic cultures (Allen, Long,

O'Mara, & Judd, 2003; Hall, 1976; Wheeless, et al., 1986; Chen, 2006).

Instead of theorizing culture at the national level when examining culture's influence on

self-disclosure, in some other studies, I-C was treated as part of individual personality and was

measured individually.   For instance, Chen and Nakazawa (2009) examined the relationship

between I-C and self-disclosure in intercultural/interracial friendships.   The results showed that

individualism was positively correlated with intent, depth, and honesty-accuracy of

self-disclosure, while collectivism was positively related to intended and honesty-accuracy of

self-disclosure.   Moreover, individualism significantly predicted the five dimensions of

self-disclosure as a whole, while collectivism did not.   A possible explanation for this result

might be that the study was conducted in the US where the individualistic culture is

predominant.

　　　　According to Hofstede's (1980, 1991) cultural dimension measurement, Chinese culture

as a whole is much more collectivistic than Finnish culture.   I-C will not be measured

individually in this study, but will be analyzed as a potential factor affecting individuals'

self-disclosure behaviors.

4.4 Self-disclosure Studies Concerning Chinese and Finns

　　　　There are not many studies concerning self-disclosure about mainland Chinese.

However, Taiwanese have been studied constantly by communication scholars, especially in

comparison with Americans.   Taiwanese and mainland Chinese share the same origin of

culture and the same language, thus I believe they have a lot in common concerning

communication patterns.

　　　　In a comparison study examining US American students and Taiwanese international

students in the U.S, Chen (1995) found that US Americans self-disclosed more than Taiwanese

on topics such as interests, opinions, work, personality, and body.   The author attributed this

difference to the value discrepancies on individualism-collectivism and low-high context cultures between the US and Taiwan.   However, a later study done by Hsu (2007) found some controversial results showing that the amount and depth of self-disclosure were actually higher among Taiwanese than Americans.   The author then explained that the different results of these two studies might be due to the fact that this study surveyed students living in Taiwan rather than students studying in the U.S.   In a recent comparative analysis conducted by Chen and Nakazawa (2012), cultural backgrounds such as language and social settings were found to influence patterns of self-disclosure in intercultural friendships and the effect varied depending on the degree of friendships.   Friendship ratings were found to be positively correlated with the amount and intensity of self-disclosure from both sides (Wong & Bond, 1999).

All these above-mentioned studies have shown that self-disclosure is a complex behavior and it can be influenced by various factors like culture, language, self-disclosure target and even the degree of friendships.   In addition to all these different influential factors, the motives of self-disclosure have been explored as well.   Anderson, Martin, and Zhong (1998) explored motives for Chinese to communicate with families and friends.   The results revealed Chinese adults tend to disclose more to friends than to others, including their parents.   The motives for communicating and disclosing to close friends include inclusion needs, expressive needs, increasing intimacy, alleviating loneliness, similarities in attitudes and behaviors, pleasure, and affection.

These studies have revealed some features in Chinese/Taiwanese' self-disclosure patterns, but not examined dimensions of self-disclosure among mainland Chinese.

Regarding self-disclosure studies about Finns, only one study was found among English literature.   McHugh (2002) compared Finns and Japanese on self-disclosure to same-sex friends from the same culture.   The results showed, compared with Japanese, that Finns disclosed more personal information and were more likely to express their opinions and felt less difficult to freely establish and to stop contact with a same-sex friend.

In light of the lack of research in both mainland China and Finland, a comparison about self-disclosure dimensions between people from the two countries is the focus of this study. Hence, the follow research question is proposed:

RQ1: To what extent do Chinese and Finns differ on self-disclosure (i.e., intent, breadth, depth, positivity-negativity, and honesty-accuracy) in intercultural friendships?

5. COMMUNICATION TRAITS

5.1 Definitions and Relations

During the past years, three communication traits have been studied extensively to explain individuals' predispositions to approach or to avoid communication with others based on a series of theories from McCroskey (1997). They are communication apprehension (CA), willingness to communicate (WTC), and self-perceived communication competence (SPCC). As stated earlier in the introduction part, communication apprehension (CA) is not a testing variable but a linking variable in this research, as what the author is interested in and aims to examine is how individuals' willingness and self-perceived competence to communicate affect their self-disclosure patterns. To better understand WTC and SPCC, definition of and related research about CA will be presented in this chapter. Previous research about CA and self-disclosure, specifically, is very helpful for building connections between WTC/SPCC and self-disclosure.

CA is a trait involving "broad-based fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated [oral] communication with another person or persons" (McCroskey, 1977, p. 78). WTC indicates individual's readiness to initiate communication with others (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). SPCC is an individual's view about his own ability to communicate (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1988). These three communication traits have been studied extensively in recent years and are correlated. Individuals with higher levels of WTC are more likely to have lower levels of CA and higher levels of SPCC, and thus are more willing to initiate communication with others (Hashimoto, 2002; Mansson & Myers, 2009). This research, however, will mainly focus on WTC and SPCC.

5.2 Previous Research

WTC focuses on communication taking place in interpersonal, small group, meeting, and public speaking contexts, with strangers, acquaintances, and friends (McCroskey, 1992). Cross-cultural research has explored to what extent cultural backgrounds influence individuals' WTC. An early comparison study by Sallinen-Kuparinen, McCroskey, and Richmond (1991) showed Finnish students are substantially less willing to communicate with friends than Americans (J. C. McCroskey & L. L. McCroskey, 1986), Swedes (McCroskey, Burroughs, Daun, & Richmond, 1990), Australians (Barraclough, Christophel, & McCroskey, 1988), and Micronesians (Burroughs & Marie, 1990). Later cross-cultural studies found Taiwanese (Hsu, 2007) and Swedish (Mansson & Myers, 2009) students are less willing to communicate than U.S Americans.

The focus of SPCC is communication taking place with strangers, acquaintances, and friends in interpersonal, small group, and public speaking contexts (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1988). SPCC levels may differ largely in different cultural backgrounds. Cross-cultural comparison studies have shown that American students tend to have higher levels of SPCC than non-American students (Hsu, 2007; Mansson & Myers, 2009).

Previous research has found individualism-collectivism is a factor to affect communication traits. Individuals, who scored higher on collectivism or from a typical collectivistic culture, such as Taiwan, were more likely to focus more on harmony and advice, and thus had lower levels of WTC and SPCC (Croucher, 2013; Hsu, 2004). Even in the same cultural settings, communication traits can also vary largely due to different religions. Croucher (2013) demonstrated that French Catholics had higher SPCC and WTC than French

Muslims. He further pointed out due to their political, economic, and social standing, religious minorities within a country tended to have lower levels of SPCC and WTC (Croucher, 2013).

Although WTC and SPCC levels can differ due to different cultural backgrounds or religions, the positive correlation between SPCC and WTC is consistent within a single culture in most of the previous research (Burroughs, Marie, McCroskey, 2003; Donovan & MacIntyre, 2004; Croucher, 2013). However, the only direct research that can be found about Finns' SPCC and WTC (Sallinen-Kuparinen et al., 1991) revealed SPCC is not a strong predictor for WTC, and SPCC is much less predictive of WTC for Finns than it is for Americans. The possible reason explained in the article was that in a culture with such tolerance for silence, the perceptions of individuals' communication competence are not predominantly based on their verbal behaviors. The author also pointed out that Finns are not particularly similar to any other groups.

However, such results can be questionable. First of all, the validity of this study is questionable. Since all the respondents in this study were from one single university in Finland, how can these limited subjects truly represent the whole population? Furthermore, this is not a direct comparative study in the sense that data was obtained by comparing Finnish data (collected in 1991) with previous data from the U.S in 1986(J. C. McCroskey & L. L. McCroskey, 1986) and other cultures. Therefore, the comparative result is not persuasive at all and the validity of the findings is accordingly reduced.

Secondly, it's been 25 years since the previous research was conducted, Finns might have changed dramatically during these past years. Actually, 10 years after the research was

done, the same researcher claimed later in his study that the image of Finns as communicators

has turned in a better direction due to internationalization of the country and the rising

educational levels in Finland (Sallinen, 2000).

Therefore, based on the relationships between WTC and SPCC demonstrated by previous

research, the following hypotheses are put forth:

Ha: Self-perceived communication competence is positively correlated with willingness to

communicate among Finns.

Hb: Self-perceived communication competence is positively correlated with willingness to

communicate among Chinese.

Previous studies have examined the relationship between CA and self-disclosure.   A

significant negative correlation between CA and self-disclosure was found by Hamilton in 1972.

In his study, self-disclosure was indicated by the proportion of individual's use of

self-references to the total amount of oral contributions in a small group setting.   McCroskey

and Richmond (1977) investigated the relationship between CA and five dimensions of

self-disclosure and found that people with high levels of CA tended to disclose less, have less

conscious intent to disclose, disclose more negative information, and be less honest in disclosure.

Among those, the amount and positive-negative self-disclosure were the primary variables

associated with CA.   These results can be explained by the notion of withdrawal and decreased

self-esteem accompanied with high levels of CA (McCroskey & Richmond, 1977).   However,

there was no significant correlation found in his study between the depth of disclosure and CA.

Later research by Wheeless, Nesser, and McCroskey (1986) further investigated not only the

relationship between CA and self-disclosure, but also CA and general disclosiveness.   Their

results showed that the amount, depth and honesty-accuracy of self-disclosure were the primary

variables correlated with CA, and these results generally supported the overall conclusion of

previous research, that is, individuals with higher levels of CA tend to withdraw and avoid

communication in general, thus will have less amount and less depth of disclosure.   Similarly,

since individuals with higher levels of CA tend to have lower levels of self-esteem, they are

more likely to disclose less positive and less honest information.

   CA has been shown to correlate with some dimensions of self-disclosure, yet the

relationships between WTC/SPCC and self-disclosure are still left undiscovered, at least among

English literature. Thus the following research questions are put forward:

   RQ2: How WTC correlates with the dimensions of self-disclosure (i.e., intent, breadth,

   depth, positivity-negativity, and honesty-accuracy) in intercultural friendships among both

   Finns and Chinese?

   RQ3: How SPCC correlates with the dimensions of self-disclosure (i.e., intent, breadth,

   depth, positivity-negativity, and honesty-accuracy) in intercultural friendships among both

   Finns and Chinese?

6. METHODOLOGY

6.1 Procedures

Data was collected from February to October 2015 through an online survey, which was distributed to the participants either through private messages on Facebook or by emails.   All of the participants (Finns and Chinese) were recruited either through direct contacts or indirectly through a snowball sampling method of referral from the author's colleagues and friends. Such a sampling technique is standard and has been used in many intercultural or cross-cultural communication studies.   Prior to their voluntary participation, the participants were informed of the topic and purpose of the study and were given no financial incentive for the participation. Some of the survey respondents were found through the help of the author's supervisor by giving his students a small amount of extra credit for their participation.   Most of the Finnish respondents are currently living in Finland, while the Chinese counterparts include both Chinese living in China and residing abroad.

All surveys were administered in Chinese or Finnish.   The survey was first created in English and then translated into Chinese and Finnish separately by four native speakers (two Finns and two Chinese).   After that, two Finnish versions and two Chinese versions were compared and finalized respectively.   Reliabilities for the translated survey were: Finnish version $k = .83$ and Chinese version $k = .70$.   All items were then revised when inconsistencies were identified between English and the other two versions.

The survey consisted of four parts and required approximately 15 minutes to finish. The survey was laid out in the following format: (1) Self-perceived Communication Competence scale; (2) Willingness to Communicate scale; (3) Revised Self-Disclosure scale;

and (4) Six demographic questions. All items were randomly arranged in the third part of the survey, and before it, two questions were added for the purpose of this study: (a) What is your friend's nationality? (Write nationality in the blank provided) _____; and (b) How long have you been friends? (Write number of years in the blank provided) _____. Therefore, in this study, intercultural friendship was defined for the participants as a friendship between individuals from different counties of origin. With a specific friend in mind, the participants were instructed to respond to a series of statements regarding their communication with that particular person.

6.2 Participants

To conduct a cross-cultural comparison study, two samples ($n = 190$) were used in this study. The Finnish sample consisted of 70 participants ($n = 70$, 30 men and 40 women), who ranged in age from 15 to 68 years ($M = 30.20$, $SD = 9.80$). The sample's educational level was diverse: 4.3 % ($n = 3$) high school diploma or the equivalent, 20% ($n = 14$) technical or vocational training diploma, 28.6% ($n = 20$) bachelor's degree, 38.6% ($n = 27$) master's degree, 8.6% ($n = 6$) doctorate degree. The participants' current professions were quite diverse as well, among which students occupied the largest proportion of 32.9% ($n = 23$).

The Chinese sample consisted of 120 participants ($n = 120$, 48 men and 72 women). Their educational level distribution was: 2.5% ($n = 3$) middle school, 0.8% ($n = 1$) high school diploma or the equivalent, 3.3% ($n = 4$) technical or vocational training diploma, 31.7% ($n = 38$) bachelor's degree, 48.3% ($n = 58$) master's degree, 13.3% ($n = 16$) doctorate degree. Their ages ranged from 16 to 44 years ($M = 27.12$, $SD = 4.0$). Regarding their current professions,

student accounted for the biggest proportion of 40% ($n = 48$).

6.3 Instruments

Three self-report measurements are utilized in this study.

The Willingness to Communicate scale (WTC) is a 20-item (with 8-filler items) scale

that measures the participants' willingness to initiate communication with strangers,

acquaintances, and friends in four contexts (i.e., interpersonal, groups, meetings, and public

speaking) (McCroskey, 1992).   The scale ranges from 0 (*never)* to 100 (*always)*. Sample items

include: "Talk with a gas station attendant", "Talk in a small group of strangers", "Talk in a

large meeting of acquaintances", "Present a talk to a group of friends".   Alpha reliabilities for

the scale used in past studies have ranged from .83 to .95 (Hsu, 2007; Mansson & Myers, 2009;

McCroskey, 1997).   While in this study, since WTC will be analyzed as one variable to show a

person's general willingness to communicate with others, the combined alpha for WTC was .94

among Finns and .92 among Chinese.

The Self-perceived Communication Competence scale (SPCC) is a 12-item scale

measuring a person's perceptions of his/her communication competence when communicating

with strangers, acquaintances, and friends (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1988).   The scale ranges

from (0) *not at all competent*, to (100) *completely competent.*   Sample items include: "Present a

talk to a stranger", "Talk in a small group of friends", "Talk in a large meeting of

acquaintances", "Talk with a friend". Previous studies using this instrument have reported

reliability coefficients ranging from .87 to .93 (Burroughs et al., 2003; Donovan & MacIntyre,

2004; Hsu, 2007).   In this study, SPCC will be treated as one variable to show a person's

general self-perceived communication competence, and the combined alpha was .91 among

Finns and .86 among Chinese.

Wheeless's (1978) 31-item Revised Self-Disclosure scale (RSDS) was used to assess

messages an individual communicates to another.   The RSDS measures five dimensions of

self-disclosure: (a) Intent to Disclose, (b) Amount of Disclosure, (c) Positive-Negative Nature of

Disclosure, (d) Honesty/Accuracy of Disclosure, and (e) Depth Control of Disclosure.

Wheeless et al. (1986) confirmed the five-factor structure of the RSDS.   Responses for the

RSDS were obtained using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1(*strongly disagree*) to 7

(*strongly agree*).   Sample items include: "I do not often talk about myself", "I intimately

disclose who I really am, openly and fully in my conversation", "I am not always honest in my

self-disclosures", "Once I get started, my self-disclosure last a long time", "On the whole, my

disclosures about myself are more positive than negative".   Reliabilities for the RSDS have

ranged from .65 to .90 in previous research.

In addition to the original 31-item RSDS, some modified versions of RSDS have been

utilized in recent research as well.   For instance, Chen and Nakazawa (2009) used a shortened

version of RSDS to prevent fatigue and to make sure that the questionnaire could be completed

within 20-25 minutes.   20 items from a previously validated 31-items were submitted to

confirmatory factor analysis.   In the end, a shortened 13-item revised RSDS measuring one's

own dimensions of self-disclosure, and a shortened 10-item revised RSDS measuring one's

perception of one's friend's dimensions of self-disclosure both had a good model fit.   The

remaining items were measured with a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to

5 (*strongly agree*).

Another modified version of RSDS was firstly developed by Croucher, et al. (2010) to measure self-disclosure in culturally diverse India for the first time.   It includes 24 items retained after a confirmatory factor analysis, and it still includes the original 1978 five dimensions of self-disclosure.   Reliabilities for the modified 2010 version ranged from .67 to .89.   It was used again in a later comparative study between the US and India (Croucher, et al., 2012).

For the purpose of this study, the original 31-item RSDS was utilized.   The reliability coefficient for each sample is shown in Table 1.   As indicated, reliabilities for Intent to Disclose and Depth Control of Disclosure in the Chinese sample were both below .70 and reliability coefficients did not improve when problematic items were removed.   Therefore, two dimensions (intent and depth control) were deleted.   Thus, 22 of the original 31 items were retained for final analysis.

Table 1

Reliabilities for Sub-scales of the Revised Self-Disclosure Scale

Subscale-Finns	Reliability
Intended disclosure	.79
Disclosure amount	.82
Positive-negative	.86
Control/depth	.77
Honesty-accuracy	.78
Subscale-Chinese	Reliability
Intended disclosure	.63
Disclosure amount	.71
Positive-negative	.77
Control/depth	.66
Honesty-accuracy	.78

6.4 Statistical Analysis

To test *RQ1*, an independent samples *t*-test was conducted.   The independent variable

was nationality, and the dependent variables were breadth, positivity-negativity, and

honesty-accuracy of self-disclosure.   To test *Ha* and *Hb,* one-tailed Pearson correlation was

used, and two-tailed Pearson correlation was conducted for *RQ2* and *RQ3*.   See Table 2 for the

means, standard deviations, and correlations among all study variables.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlations for Study Variables

Variable-Finns	M	SD	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1) WTC	59.93	20.70	-				
(2) SPCC	65.72	18.53	.94††	-			
(3) Disclosure amount	4.19	1.09	.37**	.35**	-		
(4) Positive-negative	4.81	1.01	.16	.10	.16	-	
(5) Honesty-accuracy	4.78	.95	.23	.23	.33**	.22	-
Variable-Chinese	M	SD	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1) WTC	57.35	18.61	-				
(2) SPCC	63.67	16.83	.89††	-			
(3) Disclosure amount	3.97	.93	.29**	.30**	-		
(4) Positive-negative	4.97	.98	.19*	.15	-.05	-	
(5) Honesty-accuracy	4.80	.93	.22*	.18	.21*	.17	-

Note: * $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. † $p < .05$, one-tailed. †† $p < .01$, one-tailed.

7. RESULTS

The *RQ1* explored the extent to which Chinese and Finns differed on the dimensions of self-disclosure in intercultural friendships.   The independent samples *t*-test revealed that there are no significant differences in all three dimensions of self-disclosure to a foreign friend between these two groups.   The detailed results are as follows: disclosure amount, t (188) = 1.48, $p > .05$ (Chinese: $M = 3.97$, $SD = .93$, Finns: $M = 4.19$, $SD = 1.09$); positive-negative disclosure, t (188) = -1.10, $p > .05$ (Chinese: $M = 4.97$, $SD = .98$, Finns: $M = 4.81$, $SD = 1.01$); honesty-accuracy of disclosure, t (188) = -.14, $p > .05$ (Chinese: $M = 4.80$, $SD = .93$, Finns: $M = 4.78$, $SD = .95$).   Hence, the Finnish and the Chinese respondents do not differ in breadth, positivity-negativity, and honesty-accuracy of self-disclosure to a foreign friend.

Ha predicted SPCC to be positively correlated with WTC among Finns, and *Hb* predicted SPCC to be positively correlated with WTC among Chinese.   As shown in Table 2, Pearson correlations revealed SPCC is positively correlated with WTC both among the Finnish respondents ($r = .94$, $p < .01$) and the Chinese respondents ($r = .89$, $p < .01$).   Thus, *Ha* and *Hb* were supported, which means a positive relation between WTC and SPCC exists among both the Finnish and the Chinese respondents.

RQ2 inquired about what kinds of relationships exist between WTC and dimensions of self-disclosure among both Finns and Chinese.   As shown in Table 2, two-tailed Pearson correlation results showed that in the Finnish sample, WTC is positively correlated with the amount of disclosure ($r = .37$, $p < .01$), but not correlated with positive-negative disclosure ($r = .16$, $p = $ ns) and honesty-accuracy of self-disclosure ($r = .23$, $p = $ ns).   While in the Chinese sample, WTC is positively correlated with all three dimensions of self-disclosure: amount of

disclosure ($r = .29$, $p < .01$), positive-negative disclosure ($r = .19$, $p < .05$), and

honesty-accuracy of self-disclosure ($r = .22$, $p < .05$).

RQ3 asked about what kinds of relations exist between SPCC and dimensions of

self-disclosure among Finns and Chinese.   As shown in Table 2, in the Finnish sample, a

positive correlation is found between SPCC and the amount of disclosure ($r = .35$, $p < .01$), but

not with positive-negative disclosure ($r = .10$, $p =$ ns) and honesty-accuracy of self-disclosure ($r = .23$, $p =$ ns).   As for the Chinese sample, SPCC is positively correlated with the amount of

disclosure ($r = .30$, $p < .01$), but not with positive-negative disclosure ($r = .15$, $p =$ ns) nor with

honesty-accuracy of self-disclosure ($r = .18$, $p =$ ns).

8. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

8.1 Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was threefold: to find out if any differences exist between Finns and Chinese in dimensions of self-disclosure to a foreign friend; to explore the relationships between WTC and SPCC among Finns and Chinese; and to explore what kind of relations exist between WTC/SPCC and dimensions of self-disclosure among both Finns and Chinese. The main findings are as follows: (a) There are no significant differences in the amount of self-disclosure, positive-negative self-disclosure, and honesty-accuracy of self-disclosure to a foreign friend among both Finnish and Chinese respondents; (b) WTC is positively correlated with SPCC among both Finnish and Chinese respondents; (c) WTC is found to be highly positively correlated with the amount of self-disclosure among both the Finnish and the Chinese respondents; but it only positively correlates with honesty-accuracy of self-disclosure and positive-negative self-disclosure among the Chinese sample, not among their Finnish counterparts; (d) SPCC is only found to be highly positively correlated with the amount of self-disclosure among both the Finnish and the Chinese respondents, but not with the other two dimensions of self-disclosure in both groups.

8.2 Self-disclosure and Culture

Previous research has shown that culture has a significant impact on dimensions of self-disclosure (Horenstein & Downey, 2003; Croucher et al., 2010; Maier et al., 2013). A significant difference has been shown to exist especially between Western and non-Western cultures (Wheeless, Erickson & Behrens, 1986; Chen, 2002; Kito, 2005; Croucher et al., 2012; Schug et al., 2010). However, this study suggests that there is no significant difference

between Finnish and Chinese cultures, which seems a bit surprising.

There can be various reasons contributing to such results.   First of all, these results are likely attributed to the unique features Finns have.   Like Americans and other Western Europeans, Finns value democracy, self-determinism, equality of women, work ethic, human rights, and ecology, but at the same time they are introverts, modest, and they distrust big talkers, dislike interruptions, and appreciate silence.   As Lewis (2005, p.67) summarized, "The dilemma of the Finns is that they have Western European values cloaked in an Asian communication styles."   Therefore, it's not surprising that in terms of self-disclosure patterns, Finns share more similarities with Chinese than Americans or Western Europeans.

The second reason might be the intercultural nature of the target of self-disclosure. Target is a big variable to impact self-disclosure patterns (Cozby, 1973).   Research has shown that we disclose more to those whom we initially like or feel comfortable with (Certner, 1973; Collins & Miller, 1994).   Previous research has also shown friendship types (i.e., intercultural vs. intracultural) influence patterns of self-disclosure (Chen & Nakazawa, 2012).   Likewise, Chinese might disclose more to their Chinese friends than to their foreign friends.   Future research needs to investigate how target's cultural background impacts self-disclosure patterns. Another possible factor influencing intercultural self-disclosure might be the language (i.e., native language vs. foreign language) they use, and the level of their language proficiency. This warrants further research as well.

Another important reason that might contribute to such results is the different data sources.   Majority of the Chinese respondents are those who have been living in Europe (either

studying or working) for a couple of years, while most of the Finnish respondents are currently

living within their home country.   Years of living in Europe may have a huge influence on

Chinese people's beliefs and thoughts, and make them Europeanized to some extent.   Thus

they could be more likely to be more open to intercultural friendships, and thus disclose more

than those who reside in their home country.

Another potential reason for such results might be the subjective nature of self-reporting

RSDS.   Self-reports are often used in communication research (Oetzel, 1998) to measure

interpersonal traits such as argumentativeness (Infante & Rancer, 1982) and organizational

dissent (Kassing, 1998).   Self-report measures have been criticized for not being the most

reliable indicators of individual's actual communication behaviors, especially in comparison to

other-report measures (Oetzel, 1998; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986).   However, two recent

empirical examinations provided new insights to this issue.   Croucher, Kassing, and

Diers-Lawson (2013) examined the viability of using the Organizational Dissent Scale (ODS)

(Kassing, 1998), and the results indicated that ODS performed as reliably as an other-report, but

showed some tendency for social desirability.   Similarly, Croucher et al. (2015) examined the

reliability of self-reports of argumentativeness, and they "did not find individuals over or

under-estimating their level of argumentativeness, and self-over and under estimating has

limited impact on the self-reporting of argumentativeness".   Thus, self-reports are not always

biased after all.   However, questions in RSDS ask individuals to discuss really private issues,

which might make participants to have a tendency to answer questions in a way to get a better

impression of themselves.   Some researchers have already pointed out a potential limitation of

the RSDS as a self-report measurement (Chen & Nakazawa, 2009; Croucher et al., 2010).   But

so far, there is no examination about the reliability of self-reporting RSDS yet.   Future research

should examine the reliability of RSDS empirically to ensure that the subjective nature of

self-reporting or the influence of social desirability has a limited impact on research outcome.

8.3 WTC and SPCC

The data indicated that WTC was highly positively correlated with SPCC among both

the Chinese and the Finnish respondents.   These results replicate and extend previous research

on American samples (Barraclough et al., 1988; Burroughs et al., 2003; Donovan & MacIntyre,

2004; Hsu, 2007; Mansson & Myers, 2009; McCroskey et al., 1990; Teven, Richmond,

McCroskey, & McCroskey, 2010) by demonstrating this relationship among Finns and Chinese.

There is a lot of WTC and SPCC research in various cultural contexts, but not much of this has

been done in Europe and Finland.   Therefore, these findings will further our theoretical

understanding and support previous research.

It's worth mentioning here that this particular result about Finns' SPCC and WTC

appears to contradict previous research findings, which concluded that SPCC was much less

predictive of WTC for Finns than it was for Americans, and that Finns were not similar with any

other cultures (Sallinen-Kuparinen et al., 1991).   Except the reasons concerning the validity of

this earlier research which was mentioned in the literature review, it is believed that people

change with time, and people's way of communication changes as well.   There have been

wild-held stereotypes about Finns as communicators, especially that Finns value silence in

conversations.   It can be traced back to an article published in 1985 by Lehtonen and Sajavaara

talking about the issue of the silent Finn.   Since then, the concept of Finnish silence has been

widely spread and even regarded as a national character.   A recent critique by Olbertz-Siitonen

and Siitonen (2015) challenged this concept and contended that the notion of the silent Finn is

built on shaky grounds and lacks empirical evidence.   The author believes this needs to be

examined further because as time has passed people might have changed dramatically, and no

matter if the notion of the silent Finn was a good summary back then, or merely an exaggerated

stereotype, it can be outdated.   What we can get from this particular study is very limited and it

only proves the positive relation does exist between WTC and SPCC among Finns, just like in

many other cultures.   Finns might not be as special as most people thought.

8.4 WTC, SPCC and Self-disclosure

The findings from this research showed that only the amount of self-disclosure was

found to be positively correlated with both WTC and SPCC among both the Finnish and the

Chinese respondents.   This means that for both samples, people with higher levels of

willingness to communicate and higher levels of self-perceived communication competence also

tend to disclose a larger amount to a foreign friend.   It's probably due to the fact that people

who are more willing to communicate, or perceive themselves with better ability of

communication usually have lower levels of communication anxiety, and higher levels of

confidence, thus they disclose more to their foreign friends.

The other two dimensions---positive-negative self-disclosure and honest-accurate

self-disclosure, however, were only found to be positively correlated with WTC among the

Chinese respondents.   *Face* issue could be one possible explanation for this.   *Face* permeates

every aspect of interpersonal relationships in Chinese communication because Chinese culture is relation orientated (Gao et al., 1996).   Maintaining relationship is an important part of Chinese communication and it's true that "the primary functions of Chinese communication are to maintain existing relationships among individuals, reinforce role and status differences, and to preserve harmony within the group"(Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998: 37).   In a typical collectivistic culture like China, social structure is relatively tight and people value respectfulness and mutual dependence (Chen & Nakazawa, 2009).   Therefore, Chinese who are more willing to talk with people are more likely to share positive and honest information for face-saving and also for relationship maintenance.   Under intercultural friendship context, negative self-disclosure will lose one's face in front of a foreign friend, and fake information in self-disclosure will only harm the friendship.

As a first attempt to examine relationships between WTC/SPCC and dimensions of self-disclosure in the context of intercultural friendships, these results confirmed that WTC positively correlates with the amount of self-disclosure among both Finns and Chinese, and also positively correlates with positive-negative and honest-accurate self-disclosure among Chinese; SPCC positively correlates with the amount of self-disclosure among both Finns and Chinese. Future research is encouraged to further investigate these relationships in other cultures and in other contexts as well.

To summarize, findings from this study were a bit unexpected in a way.   It's surprising to see how similar Finns and Chinese actually are in self-disclosure patterns to a foreign friend although they share very different culture values.   However, further research about Finnish

communication traits and behaviors still need to be done to get a more comprehensive

understanding about the Finnish communication characteristics.

The other important findings from this study were that the relationships between

dimensions of self-disclosure and WTC/SPCC were proved.   They filled the research gap of

lacking research on relationships between self-disclosure and WTC/SPCC.   However, these

relationships still need to be further examined by future research.

9. IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTION

This study is a first attempt to examine relationships between dimensions of

self-disclosure and WTC/SPCC in intercultural friendship context.   It also extends the previous

self-disclosure research by comparing two under-researched cultures---Finland and mainland

China.

Given that self-disclosure, WTC and SPCC have rarely been studied in Finnish context,

the findings of this study shed light on understanding Finnish communication characteristics.

Findings from this study also raise intriguing questions to the existing relationship between

culture and communication patterns.   Future research should give more attention to Finnish

culture or even the whole Nordic culture and communication style, which might lead to a series

of surprising findings.   This study further encourages future comparative research between the

Nordic culture and the East Asian cultures as they might share more similarities than expected.

This study is also a first attempt to explore the extent to which WTC and SPCC relates to

dimensions of self-disclosure in intercultural friendships.   Findings from this study confirm

that people's communication behaviors are guided by communication traits.   However, these

relationships need to be further examined in other cultural settings and in other interpersonal

relationships.   Due to the limitations of this study, future studies need to investigate how

self-disclosure target's cultural background impacts individual's self-disclosure behaviors. Also,

the reliability of Revised Self-disclosure Scale needs to be examined.

Future study about self-disclosure is also encouraged to be conducted using other

methods than self-report data, as it might "offer confirmation of existing stereotypical views"

(Olbertz-Siitonen & Siitonen, 2015).   This will potentially provide a deeper and a more

comprehensive understanding about self-disclosure in those under researched, non-U.S. cultures,

like Finland.

10. LIMITATIONS

 Four limitations need to be addressed for this study.

The first two limitations involve the sample.   Firstly, the sample size is relatively small. Data collection was the most difficult part during the whole process.   It was very hard for the author to get enough Finns to answer the survey, as the response rate was really low from the Finns the author sent the survey.   Therefore, data collection for Finnish sample took a lot more time than expected.   The relatively large quantity difference between the two samples (70 Finns, 120 Chinese) might also affect the research results.   Another thing that also made the data collection difficult was the length of the survey.   It contains 71 questions in total and takes on average 15 minutes to finish.   The Chinese survey website showed there were 120 responses out of 399 unique visits, which means only 30% of the visitors finished the survey.   Although there might be some technical problems involved, it's also reasonable to contribute it to the length of the survey, which was also consistent with the feedback from some participants.

The second limitation is the composition of each sample.   Most of the Finnish participants are currently living in Finland, but a large amount of the Chinese participants are actually studying or living abroad.   The experience of living abroad may influence people's beliefs and ideas about things, or even alter their communication traits and behaviors gradually, might finally be making them less typical Finnish or Chinese.   Thus it might have a crucial potential influence on the final results.   Closely related to this issue is the extremely high average education level of the Chinese sample.   93.3% of Chinese respondents have higher education degrees including Bachelor's, Master's and Doctorate degrees (this number among Finnish sample is 75.8%).   Unfortunately, this number is much higher than the average of the

Chinese population.   This should be noted for future researchers in terms of generalizing these

results.   Additionally, there might be some potential limitations about convenient samples,

which could also cause this study to lack generalizability.

The third limitation of this study is the straight application of the scales originally

developed in English in the US into Finnish and Chinese versions.   Although each translated

version was done by two different native speakers of each language, in order to maximize

equivalence, it was really difficult to get complete conceptual and semantic equivalence for the

translation, and some expressions or contexts were rather awkward or even confusing when

translated into Finnish or Chinese.   This could be one important potential factor affecting the

results as well.

Fourthly, the participants were not given extra instructions on how to define a *friend*

when choosing a self-disclosure target.   People have different perceptions about the word

friend.   It can refer to a casual acquaintance, a close friend, or a best friend.   Chen &

Nakazawa (2009) argued that relational intimacy was positively correlated with all dimensions

of self-disclosure except positive-negative self-disclosure.   Thus, the lack of providing

unanimous definition about *friend* for the participants might have a potential impact on the

research results as well.

11. References

Allen, J., Long, K., O'Mara, J., & Judd, B. (2003). Verbal and nonverbal orientations toward communication and the development of intracultural and intercultural relationships. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 32*, 129-160.

Altman, I., & Taylor, D. (1973). *Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships.* New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Argyle, M., Henderson, M., Bond, M., Iizuka, Y., & Contarello, A. (1986). Cross-cultural variations in relationship rules. *International Journal of Psychology, 21,* 287-315.

Azevedo, A., Drost, E. A., & Mullen, M. R. (2002). Individualism and collectivism: Toward a strategy for testing measurement equivalence across culturally diverse groups. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal, 9*, 19-29.

Barnettpearce, W., Sharp, S. M., Wright, P. H., & Slam, K. M. (1974). Affection and reciprocity in self-disclosing communication. *Human Communication Research, 1*, 5-14.

Barnlund, D. C. (1989). *Communicative styles of Japanese and Americans: Images and realities.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Barraclough, R. A., Christophel, D. M., & McCroskey, J. C. (1988). Willingness to communicate: A cross-cultural investigation. *Communication Research Reports, 5*, 187-192.

Barnett, G. A., & Lee, M. (2002). Intercultural communication. In W. B. Gudykunst & B. Mody (Eds.), *Handbook of international and intercultural communication* (2nd ed., pp. 275-294). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Bauminger, N., Finzi-Dottan, R., Chason, S., & Har-Even, D. (2008). Intimacy in adolescent

friendship: The roles of attachment, coherence, and self-disclosure. *Journal of Social and

Personal Relationships, 25*, 409-428.

Burroughs, N. F. & Marie, V. (1990). Communication orientations of Micronesians and

American students. *Communication Research Reports, 7*, 139-146.

Burroughs, N. F., Marie, V., & McCroskey, J. C. (2003). Relationships of self-perceived

communication competence and communication apprehension with willingness to

communicate: A comparison with first and second languages in Micronesia.

Communication Research Reports, 20, 230–239.

Center for International Mobility. (n.d.). *International Students in Finland.* Available from

http://www.iie.org/Services/Project-Atlas/Finland/International-Students-In-Finland

Certner, B. C. (1973). Exchange of self-disclosures in same-sexed groups of strangers. *Journal

of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 40,* 292- 297.

Chen, G. (1992). Communication adaptability and interaction involvement as predictors of

cross-cultural adjustment. *Communication Research Reports, 9,* 33-41.

Chen, G. (1995). Differences in self-disclosure patterns among Americans versus Chinese: A

comparative study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 26,* 84-91.

Chen, G. (2008). Bian (change): A perpetual discourse of I Ching. *Intercultural

Communication Studies, 17*, 7–16.

Chen, G. (2009a). Beyond the dichotomy of communication studies. *Asian Journal of

Communication, 19*, 398-411.

Chen, G. (2009b). Toward an I Ching model of communication. *China Media Research, 5*, 72-81.

Chen, G., & An, R. (2009). A Chinese model of intercultural leadership competence. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence* (pp. 196-208). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chen, Y., & Nakazawa, M. (2009). Influences of culture on self-disclosure as relationally situated in intercultural and interracial friendships from a social penetration perspective. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 38*, 77-98.

Chen, Y., & Nakazawa, M. (2012). Measuring patterns of self-disclosure in intercultural friendship: Adjusting differential item functioning using multiple-indicators, multiple-causes models. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 41*, 131-151.

Chen, Y. (2006). Intercultural friendship from the perspectives of East Asian international students. *China Media Research, 2*, 43-58.

Chen, Y., & Nakazawa, M. (2009). Influences of culture on self-disclosure as relationally situated in intercultural and interracial friendships from a social penetration perspective. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 38*, 77-98.

Collier, M. J. (1996). Communication competence problematics in ethnic friendships. *Communications Monographs, 63*, 314-336.

Collier, M. J. (2002). Intercultural friendships as interpersonal alliances. In J. N. Martin, T. K. Nakayama, & L. A. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in intercultural communication: Experiences and contexts* (pp. 301-310). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Collins, N. L., & Miller, L. C. (1994). Self-disclosure and liking: a meta-analytic review. *Psychological bulletin*, *116*, 457-475.

Cozby, P. C. (1973). Self-disclosure: A literature review. *Psychological Bulletin, 79*, 83-91.

Croucher, S. M., Faulkner, S. L., Spencer, A. T., & Long, B. (2012). A comparative analysis of the relationship between religion and self-disclosure in the US and India. In Croucher, S. M., & Harris, T. M. (Eds.), *Religion & communication: An anthology of extensions in theory, research, & method*. (pp. 23-34) New York: Peter Lang.

Croucher, S. M. (2013). Communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate: A French analysis. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication, 6*, 298-316.

Croucher, S. M., Faulkner, S. L., Oommen, D., & Long, B. (2010). Demographic and religious differences in the dimensions of self-disclosure among Hindus and Muslims in India. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 39*, 29-48.

Croucher, S. M., Kassing, J. W., & Diers-Lawson, A. (2013). Accuracy, Coherence, and Discrepancy in Self and Other Reports: Moving Toward an Interactive Perspective of Organizational Dissent. *Management Communication Quarterly, 27,* 425-442.

Croucher, S. M., DeMaris, A., Diers-Lawson, A., & Roper, S. (2015). Self-reporting and the Argumentativeness Scale: An empirical examination. *Argumentation, 29,* 1-21.

Donovan, L. A., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2004). Age and sex differences in willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, and self-perceived communication competence. *Communication Research Reports, 21*, 420–427.

Economic and Commercial Counsellor's Office of the Embassy of China in Finland. (2011).

    Finland-China trade in 2010. Available from

    http://fi2.mofcom.gov.cn/article/bilateralcooperation/inbrief/201105/20110507546719.sh

    tml

Embassy of Finland. (n.d.). Available from

    http://www.finland.cn/public/default.aspx?nodeid=35186&contentlan=2&culture=en-US

Fang, T., & Faure, G. O. (2011). Chinese communication characteristics: A yin yang perspective.

    International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35, 320-333.

Fehr, B. (1996). *Friendship processes.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fitzpatrick, J., Liang, S., Feng, D., Crawford, D., Tsorell, G., &Morgan-Fleming, B. (2006).

    Social values and self-disclosure: A comparison of Chinese native, Chinese resident (in

    U.S.) and North American spouses. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies,37*, 113-127.

French, D. C., Bae, A., Pidada, S., & Lee, O. (2006). Friendships of Indonesian, South Korean,

    and US college students. *Personal Relationships, 13*, 69-81.

Gao, G., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1998). *Communicating effectively with the Chinese.* Thousand

    Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gao, G., Ting-Toomey, S., & Gudykunst, W. B. (1996). Chinese communication processes. In

    M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The handbook of Chinese psychology* (pp. 280-293). Hong Kong:

    Oxford University Press.

Gareis, E. (1995). *Intercultural friendship: A qualitative study.* Lanham, MD: University Press

    of America.

Gareis, E. (1999a). Rhetoric and intercultural friendship formation. *International and*

Intercultural Communication Annual: Rhetoric in Intercultural Contexts, 22, 91–117.

Gareis, E. (1999b). Adult friendship: Examples of intercultural patterns. In M. E. Roloff (Ed.),

Communication Yearbook (Vol. 22, pp. 430-468). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gareis, E., Merkin, R., & Goldman, J. (2011). Intercultural friendship: Linking communication

variables and friendship success. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 40,*

155-173.

Gareis, E. (2012). Intercultural Friendship: Effects of Home and Host Region. *Journal of*

International & Intercultural Communication, 5, 309-328.

Gudykunst, W. B. (1985). A model of uncertainty reduction in intercultural encounters. *Journal*

of Language and Social Psychology, 4, 79-98.

Gudykunst, W.B. (1991). *Bridging differences: Effective intergroup communication.* Newbury

Park, CA: Sage.

Gudykunst, W. B., Matsumoto, Y., Ting-Toomey, S., & Nishida, T., Kim, K., & Heyman, S.

(1996). The influence of cultural individualism-collectivism, self construals, and

individual values on communication styles across cultures. *Human Communication*

Research, 22, 510-543.

Hall, E. (1959). *The silent language.* New York: Doubleday.

Hall, E. (1976). *Beyond culture.* New York: Doubleday.

Hamilton, P. R. (1972). The effects of risk-proneness on small group interaction,

   communication apprehension, and self-disclosure. Unpublished Master's thesis, Illinois

   State University.

Hargie, O. D., Toursih, D., & Curtis, L. (2001). Gender, religion, and adolescent patterns of

   self-disclosure in the divided society of Northern Ireland. *Adolescence, 36*, 665–679.

Hashimoto, Y. (2002). Motivation and willingness to communicate as predictors of reported L2

   use: The Japanese ESL context. *Second Language Studies, 20*, 29-70.

Hastings, S. O. (2000). Asian Indian "self-suppression" and self-disclosure enactment and

   adaptation of cultural identity. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 19*, 85-109.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values.*

   Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1991). Levels of culture. *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (pp.

   3-19). Maidenhead, UK: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. (2008). *A summary of my ideas about national culture. http://*

   feweb.uvt.nl/center/hofstede/page3.htm. (retrieved 20.2.2008).

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and*

   organizations across nations (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Horenstein, V. D., & Downey, J. L. (2003). A cross-cultural investigation of self-disclosure.

   North American Journal of Psychology, 5, 373-386.

Hsu, C. F. (2004). Sources of differences in communication apprehension between Taiwanese

   and Americans. *Communication Quarterly, 52*, 370-389.

Hsu, C. F. (2007). A cross-cultural comparison of communication orientations between

    Americans and Taiwanese. *Communication Quarterly, 55*, 359-374.

Hu, H. C. (1944). The Chinese concepts of "face". *American Anthropologist, 46*, 45-64.

Infante, D. A., & Rancer, A. S. (1982). A conceptualization and measure of argumentativeness.

    Journal of Personality Assessment 46, 72–80.

Jourard, S. M., & Lasakow, P. (1958). Some factors in self-disclosure. *Journal of Abnormal and*

    Social Psychology, 56, 91-98.

Kaarlejärvi, J., & Hämäläinen, M., (2012) *New opportunities for China-Finland R&D&I*

    cooperation. Retrieved from http://www.tekes.fi/

Kassing, J. W. (1998). Development and validation of the Organizational Dissent Scale.

    Management Communication Quarterly, *12*, 183-229.

Kito, M. (2005). Self-disclosure in romantic relationships and friendships among American and

    Japanese college students. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 145*, 127-140.

Kim, H.J. (1991). Influence of language and similarity on initial intercultural attraction. In S.

    Ting- Toomey & F. Korzenny (Eds.), *Cross-cultural interpersonal communication* (pp.

    213-229). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Knutson, T., Komolsevin, R., Chatiketu, P., & Smith, V. (2002). A comparison of Thai and US

    American willingness to communicate. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*

    Research, 31, 3-12.

Kudo, K., & Simkin, K. A. (2003). Intercultural friendship formation: The case of Japanese

    students at an Australian university. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 24*, 91-114.

Lehtonen, J., & Sajavaara, K. (1985). The Silent Finn. In D. Tannen, & M. Saville-Troike (Eds.),

    Perspectives on Silence (pp. 193–201). New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Lee, P. (2006). Bridging cultures: Understanding the construction of relational identity in

    intercultural friendship. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 35*, 3-22.

Lee, P.-W. (2008). Stages and transitions of relational identity formation in intercultural

    friendship: Implications for identity management theory. *Journal of International and*

    Intercultural Communication, 1, 51-69.

Lehtonen, J. (May, 1990). *The role of national stereotypes in intercultural communication.* Paper

    presented at the 9th world congress of Applied Linguistics, Athens.

Lehtonen, J. & Sajavaara, K. (1985). The silent Finn. In D. Tannen & M. Saville-Troike (Eds.),

    Perspectives on Silence (pp. 193-201). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Lewis, R. (2005). *Finland, cultural lone wolf.*   UK: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Maier, G. A., Zhang, Q., & Clark, A. (2013). Self-disclosure and emotional closeness in

    intracultural friendships: A cross-cultural comparison among US Americans and

    Romanians. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 42*, 22-34.

Mansson, D. H., & Myers, S. A. (2009). A reexamination of Swedish and American college

    students' communicative attributes. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research,*

    38, 9-22.

Martin, Carolyn M Anderson Matthew M, & Zhong, M. (1998). Motives for communicating

    with family and friends: A Chinese study. *Howard Journal of Communication, 9*,

    109-123.

Matsushima, R., & Shiomi, K. (2002). Self-disclosure and friendship in junior high school

students. *Social Behavior and Personality, 30*, 515-526.

McCroskey, J. C. & McCroskey, L. L. (May, 1986). *Predictors of willingness to communicate-:*

Implications for screening and remediations. Paper presented at the annual convention of

International Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

McCroskey, J. C, & Richmond, V. P. (1977). Communication apprehension as a predictor of

self-disclosure. *Communication Quarterly, 25*, 40-43.

McCroskey, J. C, & Richmond, V. P. (1987). Willingness to communicate. In J. C. McCroskey

and J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Personality and interpersonal communication,* (pp. 129-156),

Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McCroskey, J. C., & McCroskey, L. L. (1988). Self-report as approach to measuring

communication competence. *Communication Research Reports, 5,* 108–113.

McCroskey, J. C, Burroughs, N. F., Daun, A. & Richmond, V. P. (1990). Correlates of quietness:

Swedish and American perspectives. *Communication Quarterly, 38*, 127-137.

McCroskey, J. C. (1992). Reliability and validity of the willingness to communicate scale.

Communication Quarterly, 40, 16-25.

McCroskey, J. C. (1997). Self-report measurement. In J. A. Daly, J. C. McCroskey, J. Ayres, T.

Hopf, & D. M. Ayres (Eds.), *Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and*

communication apprehension (2nd ed., pp. 191-216). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

McHugh, C. (2002). Japanese less open than Finns toward a same-sex friend. *Intercultural*

Communication Studies, 11, 89-106.

Morse, S.J. (1983). Requirements for love and friendship in Australia and Brazil. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 35*, 469-476.

Oetzel, J. G. (1998). The effects of self-construals and ethnicity on self-reported conflict styles. *Communication Reports*, *11*, 133-144.

Olbertz-Siitonen, M., & Siitonen, M. (2015). The Silence of the Finns. Exploring the Anatomy of an Academic Myth. *Sosiologia 52,* 318-333.

Omarzu, J. (2000). A disclosure decision model: Determining how and when individuals will self-disclose. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4,* 174-185.

Pahl, R. (2000). *On friendship.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, *12*, 531-544.

Sallinen-Kuparinen, A. (1986). *Finnish communication reticence: Perceptions and self-reported behavior.* Jyvaskyla: University of Jyvaskyla.

Sallinen-Kuparinen, A., Asikainen, S., Gerlander, M. Kukkola, A. & Sihto, M. (1987). A cross-cultural comparison of instructional communication: Evaluation of an American, a Russian, a German, and a Finnish teacher's communicator style. In A. Sallinen-Kuparinen (Eds.), *Perspectives on instructional communication* (pp. 71-95). Jyvaskyla: University of Jyvaskyla.

Sallinen-Kuparinen, A., McCroskey, J., & Richmond, V. (1991). Willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, introversion, and self-reported communication

competence: Finnish and American comparisons. *Communication Research Reports*, *8*, 55-64.

Sallinen, A. (2000). Suomalainen viestintäkulttuuri eurooppalaisessa kontekstissa. *Nykytietoa Puheviestinnän Opetuksesta. Jyväskylä Yliopiston Viestintätieteiden Julkaisuja, 20*.

Samter, W. (2003). Friendship interaction skills across the life span. In J. O. Greene & B. R. Burleson (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Schug, J., Yuki, M., & Maddux, W. (2010). Relational mobility explains between- and within-culture differences in self-disclosure to close friends. *Psychological Science, 21*, 1471-1478.

Searle, W., & Ward, C. (1990). The prediction of psychological and sociocultural adjustment during cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 14*, 449-464.

Sias, P.M., Drzewiecka, J.A., Meares, M., Bent, R., Konomi, Y., Ortega, M., & White, C. (2008). Intercultural friendship development. *Communication Reports, 21*, 1-13.

Strom, W.O. (1988). Cross-cultural friendships on the university campus: Testing the functional and identity validation models (Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 49,* 3204A.

Teven, J.J., Richmond, V.P., McCroskey, J.C., & McCroskey, L.L. (2010). Updating relationships between communication traits and communication competence. *Communication Research Reports, 27,* 263-270.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism.* Boulder, CO: Westview.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1989). Identity and interpersonal bonding. In M.K. Asante & W.B.

Gudykunst (Eds.), *Handbook of international and intercultural communication* (pp.

351-373). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Valkonen, T. (2003). Puheviestintätaitojen arviointi. näkökulmia lukioikäisten esiintymis-ja

ryhmätaitoihin.-Assessing speech communication skills: perspectives on presentation and

group communication skills among upper secondary school students. *Jyväskylä Studies in*

Humanities,7, 1459-4331.

Van Oudenhoven, J.P., & Van der Zee, K.I. (2002). Predicting multicultural effectiveness of

international students: The multicultural personality questionnaire. *International Journal*

of Intercultural Relations, 26, 679-694.

Ward, C., & Masgoret, A.M. (2004). *The experiences of international students in New Zealand:*

Report on the results of the national survey. New Zealand: International Policy and

Development Unit, Ministry of Education.

West, R., & Turner, L. H. (2009). *Understanding interpersonal communication: Making choices*

in changing times (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Wheeless, L. R. (1978). A follow-up study of the relationships among trust, disclosure, and

interpersonal solidarity. *Human Communication Research, 4*, 143-157.

Wheeless, L. R., Erickson, K. V., & Behrens, J. S. (1986). Cultural differences in disclosiveness

as a function of locus of control. *Communications Monographs, 53*, 36-46.

Wheeless, L. R., Nesser, K., & McCroskey, J. C. (1986). The relationships of self-disclosure

and disclosiveness to high and low communication apprehension. *Communication Research Reports, 3,* 129–134.

Wheeless, L. R., & Grotz, J. (1976). Conceptualization and measurement of reported self-disclosure. *Human Communication Research, 2*, 338-346.

Wilkins, R., & Isotalus, P. (2008). *Speech culture in Finland*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Won-Doornink, M. J. (1985). Self-disclosure and reciprocity in conversation: A cross-national study. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 48*, 97-107.

Wong, S. C., & Harris Bond, M. (1999). Personality, self-disclosure and friendship between Chinese university roommates. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 2*, 201-214.

Yum, J. O. (1988). The impact of Confucianism on interpersonal relationships and communication patterns in East Asia. *Communications Monographs, 55*, 374-388.

Zhao, Y. (2014). *Who's afraid of the big bad dragon: Why China has the best (and worst) education system in the world.* CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Appendix

Survey - English Version

Survey

This survey consists of three parts. It takes about 15 minutes to finish it.

PART 1

Instructions: Below are 12 situations in which a person might choose to communicate or not. Presume you have completely free choice. Indicate the percentage of times you would choose to communicate in each situation using 0 = never to 100 = always.

1. Present a talk to a stranger.   ____
2. Talk with an acquaintance.   ____
3. Talk in a large meeting of friends.   ____
4. Talk in a small group of strangers.   ____
5. Talk with a friend.   ____
6. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.   ____
7. Talk with a stranger.   ____
8. Present a talk to a group of friends.   ____
9. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.   ____
10. Talk in a large meeting of strangers.   ____
11. Talk in a small group of friends.   ____
12. Present a talk to a group of acquaintances.   ____

PART 2

Instructions: Below are 20 situations in which a person might choose to communicate or not. Presume you have completely free choice. Indicate the percentage of times you would choose to communicate in each situation using 0 = never to 100 = always.

1. Talk with a gas station attendant.   ____
2. Talk with a physician.   ____
3. Present a talk to a group of strangers.   ____
4. Talk with an acquaintance while standing in line.   ____
5. Talk with a salesperson in a store.   ____
6. Talk in a large meeting of friends.   ____
7. Talk with a police officer.   ____
8. Talk in a small group of strangers.   ____
9. Talk with a friend while standing in line.   ____
10. Talk with a waiter/waitress in a restaurant.   ____

11. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.   ____
12. Talk with a stranger while standing in line.   ____
13. Talk with a secretary/receptionist.   ____
14. Present a talk to a group of friends.   ____
15. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.   ____
16. Talk with a garbage collector.   ____
17. Talk in a large meeting of strangers.   ____
18. Talk with a spouse (or girl/boyfriend).   ____
19. Talk in a small group of friends.   ____
20. Present a talk to a group of acquaintances.   ____

PART 3
Instructions: The following 31 statements reflect how you communicate with a foreign friend. Before you start answering these questions, choose one foreign friend.
What is your friend's nationality? (Write nationality in the blank provided) _____
How long have you been friends? (Write number of years in the blank provided) _____

Now indicate the degree to which the following statements reflect how you communicate with this person by marking whether you (7) strongly agree, (6) agree; (5) moderately agree, (4) are undecided, (3) moderately disagree, (2) disagree, or (1) strongly disagree. Record the number of your response in the space provided. Work quickly and just record your first impressions.

1. I do not often talk about myself.   ____
2. I usually disclose positive things about myself.   ____
3. When I wish, my self-disclosures are always accurate reflections of
      who I really am.   ____
4. My statements of my feelings are usually brief.   ____
5. I often reveal more undesirable things about myself than
      desirable things.   ____
6. Once I get started, my self-disclosure last a long time. ____
7. I can not reveal myself when I want to because I do not know
      myself thoroughly enough.   ____
8. I often discuss my feelings about myself.   ____
9. I normally "express" my good feelings about myself. ____
10. I feel that I sometimes do not control my self-disclosure of personal
      or intimate things I tell about myself.   ____
11. I am not always honest in my self-disclosures.   ____
12. I often talk about myself.   ____
13. When I reveal my feelings about myself, I consciously intend to do
      so.   ____
14. I usually disclose negative things about myself.   ____
15. I often disclose intimate, personal feelings about myself without

hesitation.   ____

16. I am always honest in my self-disclosures.   ____

17. Only infrequently do I express my personal beliefs and opinions.

                                                              ____

18. When I am self-disclosing, I am consciously aware of what I am

       revealing.   ____

19. On the whole, my disclosures about myself are more positive than

       negative.   ____

20. I am often not confident that my expressions of my own

       feelings, emotions, and experiences are true reflections of

       myself.   ____

21. I intimately disclose who I really am, openly and fully in my

       conversation.   ____

22. My statements about my feelings, emotions, and experiences are

       always accurate self-perceptions.   ____

23. I usually talk about myself for fairly long periods at a time.   ____

24. Once I started, I intimately and fully reveal myself in my self

       -disclosures.   ____

25. I do not always feel completely sincere when I reveal my own

       feelings, emotions, behaviors or experiences. ____

26. On the whole, my disclosures about myself are more negative than

       positive.   ____

27. When I express my personal feelings, I am always aware of what I

       am doing and saying.   ____

28. My self-disclosures are completely accurate reflections of who I

       really am.   ____

29. My conversation lasts the least time when I am discussing myself.

                                                              ____

30. I normally reveal "bad" feelings I have about myself.   ____

31. I always feel completely sincere when I reveal my own feelings

       and experiences.   ____

Before finishing this survey, I would kindly ask you to answer the following demographic questions.

1. What is your sex? Please circle the appropriate answer: Male   Female

2. What is your age? ____

3. What is your highest level of education? *If currently studying, please choose the one you are going to achieve after graduation.* Please write the appropriate answer in the space provided

_____
  (1) High school diploma or the equivalent
  (2) Technical/vocational training diploma
  (3) Bachelor's degree
  (4) Master's degree
  (5) Doctorate degree

4. What is your current profession? Please write in the space provided _____

5. In Part 3, regarding the foreign friend you chose, what is the common language you share? Please write in the space provided _____

6. What do you think is your proficiency level in this language? Please answer ranging from *(1) not proficient at all to (5) native speaker* in the space provided _____

Thank you very much for your participation! :)

Survey- Finnish Version

Kysely

Tämä kysely koostuu kolmesta osiosta. Vastaamiseen menee noin 15 minuuttia.

Osio 1

Ohjeet: Alta löydät 12 tilannetta, joissa henkilö saattaisi joko päättää kommunikoida, tai olla kommunikoimatta. Oleta, että voit valita täysin vapaasti. Osoita prosentuaalisesti kuinka usein päättäisit kommunikoida kussakin tilanteessa käyttäen asteikkoa väliltä 0 = ei koskaan ja 100 = aina.

1. Pidät puheen tuntemattomalle.
2. Puhut tuttavan kanssa.
3. Puhut suuressa kaveriporukassa.
4. Puhut pienessä tuntemattomien porukassa.
5. Puhut kaverille.
6. Puhut suuressa tuttavaporukassa.
7. Puhut tuntemattoman kanssa.
8. Pidät puheen kaveriporukalle.
9. Puhut pienessä tuttavaporukassa.
10. Puhut suuressa tuntemattomien porukassa.
11. Puhut pienessä kaveriporukassa.
12. Pidät puheen tuttavaporukalle.

Osio 2

Ohjeet: Alta löydät 20 tilannetta, joissa henkilö saattaisi joko päättää kommunikoida, tai olla kommunikoimatta. Oleta, että voit valita täysin vapaasti. Osoita prosentuaalisesti kuinka usein päättäisit kommunikoida kussakin tilanteessa käyttäen asteikkoa väliltä 0 = ei koskaan ja 100 = aina.

1. Puhut huoltoaseman virkailijan kanssa.
2. Puhut lääkärin kanssa.
3. Pidät puheen tuntemattomien porukalle.
4. Puhut tuttavan kanssa seisoessasi jonossa.
5. Puhut myyjän kanssa kaupassa.
6. Puhut suuressa kaveriporukassa.
7. Puhut poliisin kanssa.
8. Puhut pienessä tuntemattomien porukassa.
9. Puhut kaverin kanssa seisoessasi jonossa.
10. Puhut tarjoilijan kanssa ravintolassa.

11. Puhut suuressa tuttavaporukassa.

12. Puhut tuntemattoman kanssa seisoessasi jonossa.

13. Puhut sihteerille/vastaanottovirkailijalle.

14. Pidät puheen kaveriporukalle.

15. Puhut pienessä tuttavaporukassa.

16. Puhut roskakuskille.

17. Puhut suuressa tuntemattomien porukassa.

18. Puhut puolison (tai tyttö/poikaystävän) kanssa.

19. Puhut pienessä kaveriporukassa.

20. Pidät puheen tuttavaporukalle.

Osio 3

Ohjeet: Alla olevat 31 toteamusta kuvaavat kuinka kommunikoit ulkomaalaisen ystävän kanssa. Ennen kuin alat vastaamaan kysymyksiin, valitse yksi ulkomaalainen ystävä.
Mikä on ystäväsi kansallisuus? (Kirjoita kansallisuus tyhjään tilaan) ____
Kuinka kauan olette olleet ystäviä? (Kirjoita vuosien lukumäärä tyhjään tilaan) ___

Osoita kuinka tarkasti toteamukset kuvaavat kommunikointikäytäntöjäsi kyseisen ystävän kanssa merkitsemällä joko (7) vahvasti samaa mieltä, (6) samaa mieltä, (5) jokseenkin samaa mieltä, (4) en osaa sanoa, (3) jokseenkin eri mieltä, (2) eri mieltä, tai (1) vahvasti eri mieltä. Merkitse sopiva numero tyhjään tilaan. Työskentele nopeasti ja merkitse vain ensimmäiset mielikuvasi.

1. En puhu itsestäni usein.

2. Tuon yleensä esille positiivisia asioita itsestäni.

3. Kun haluan, itseäni koskevat paljastukset ovat aina tarkkoja pohdiskeluja siitä kuka todella olen.

4. Tunteitani koskevat toteamukset ovat yleensä vähäsanaisia.

5. Paljastan usein enemmän epämieluisia asioita itsestäni kuin mieluisia.

6. Alkuun päästyäni paljastan itsestäni paljon asioita.

7. En voi paljastaa sisintäni niin halutessani, koska en tunne itseäni tarpeeksi hyvin.

8. Keskustelen usein itseäni koskevista tunteistani.

9. Ilmaisen normaalisti itseäni koskevat positiiviset tunteet.

10. Tunnen usein etten hallitse itseäni koskevia henkilökohtaisia tai intiimejä paljastuksiani.

11. En ole aina rehellinen itseäni koskevissa paljastuksissa.

12. Puhun usein itsestäni.

13. Kun paljastan itseäni koskevia tunteitani, teen sen tietoisesti.

14. Paljastan yleensä negatiivisa asioita itsestäni.

15. Paljastan usein intiimejä ja henkilökohtaisia tunteita itsestäni ilman epäröintiä.

16. Olen aina rehellinen itseäni koskevissa paljastuksissa.

17. Ilmaisen henkilökohtaisia uskomuksiani ja mielipiteitäni vain harvoin.

18. Kun paljastan asioita itsestäni, olen tietoinen siitä mitä olen paljastamassa.

19. Kaiken kaikkiaan itseäni koskevat paljastukset ovat enemmän positiivisia kuin negatiivisia.

20. Usein olen epävarma vastaavatko omat tunteitani ja kokemuksiani koskevat ilmaisuni todellisuutta.

21. Paljastan intiimisti kuka todella olen, täysin ja avoimesti keskustelussa.

22. Tunteitani ja kokemuksiani koskevat ilmaukseni ovat aina tarkkoja havaintojani.

23. Puhun yleensä itsestäni melko pitkiä aikoja.

24. Päästyäni alkuun sisimpäni avaamisessa paljastan itseni intiimisti ja täysin.

25. En aina tunne itseäni täysin rehelliseksi kun paljastan omia tunteitani, käytöstäni tai kokemuksiani.

26. Kaiken kaikkiaan itseäni koskevat paljastukset ovat enemmän negatiivisia kuin positiivisia.

27. Kun ilmaisen henkilökohtaisia tunteitani, olen aina tietoinen siitä mitä olen tekemässä ja sanomassa.

28. Itseäni koskevat paljastukseni ovat täysin tarkkoja pohdiskeluja siitä kuka todella olen.

29. Keskusteluni ovat lyhimmillään puhuessani itsestäni.

30. Paljastan tavallisesti "huonoja" tuntemuksiani itsestäni.

31. Tunnen itseni aina täysin rehelliseksi paljastaessani omia tunteitani ja kokemuksiani.

Ennen kuin lopetat kyselyn täyttämisen, pyytäisin vielä ystävällisesti vastaamaan seuraaviin demografisiin kysymyksiin.

1. Mikä on sukupuolesi? Ole hyvä ja ympyröi sopiva vastaus: Mies   Nainen

2. Kuinka vanha olet? ____

3. Mikä on korkein tutkintosi? *Jos opiskelet tällä hetkellä, ole hyvä ja valitse tutkinto jota suoritat tällä hetkellä. Ole hyvä ja kirjoita sopiva vastaus tyhjään tilaan* _____

   1. Ylioppilas
   2. Ammatillinen perustutkinto
   3. Alempi korkeakoulututkinto
   4. Ylempi korkeakoulututkinto
   5. Tohtorin tutkinto

4. Mikä on tämän hetkinen ammattisi? Ole hyvä ja kirjoita tyhjään tilaan ____

5. Osiossa 3 valitsit ulkomaalaisen ystävän. Mitä yhteistä kieltä puhutte? Ole hyvä ja kirjoita vastaus tyhjään tilaan ___

6. Mikä on mielestäsi kielitaitosi tässä kielessä? Ole hyvä ja vastaa väliltä *(1) ei ollenkaan hyvä ja (5) äidinkieli* tyhjään tilaan ___

Kiitos paljon osallistumisestasi! :)

Survey- Chinese Version
调查问卷

本问卷由三部分组成，完成整个问卷大概需要 15 分钟。

第一部分
说明：在以下 12 种情景中，人们会选择是否进行交谈。 假设你有完全的选择自由。 请填写一个数字来描述你会在每种情景中交谈的可能性， 0 表示"从不"， 100 表示"总是"。

1. 对一个陌生人发表演讲。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
2. 和一个认识的人交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
3. 和一大群朋友一起时，与他人交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
4. 和几个陌生人一起时，与他人交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
5. 和一个朋友交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
6. 在和一大群认识的人一起时，与他人交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
7. 和一个陌生人交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
8. 对一群朋友发表演讲。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
9. 和几个认识的人一起时，与他人交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
10. 和一大群陌生人一起时，与他人交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
11. 和几个朋友一起时，与他人交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
12. 对一群认识的人发表演讲。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿

第二部分
说明: 在以下 20 种情景中，人们会选择是否进行交谈。 假设你有完全的选择自由。 请填写一个数字来描述你会在每种情景中交谈的可能性， 0 表示"从不"， 100 表示"总是"。

1. 与加油站的服务员交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
2. 与医生交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
3. 对一群陌生人发表演讲。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
4. 在排队的时候与认识的人交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
5. 在商店里与售货员交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
6. 在和一大群朋友一起时，与他人交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
7. 与警察交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
8. 和几个陌生人一起时，与他人交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
9. 在排队时和朋友交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
10. 在餐厅与服务员交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
11. 和一大群认识的人一起时，与他人交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
12. 在排队时与陌生人交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
13. 与秘书或前台人员交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
14. 对一群朋友发表演讲。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
15. 和几个认识的人一起时，与他人交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿
16. 与清洁工交谈。 ＿＿＿＿＿＿

17. 和一大群陌生人一起时，与他人交谈。 _____
18. 与自己的配偶（或者男/女朋友）交谈。 _____
19. 和几个朋友一起时，与他人交谈。 _____
20. 对一群认识的人发表演讲。 _____

第三部分

说明： 以下 31 个表述反映你是如何和一个外国朋友交流。在你作答之前，请选定你将要谈论的外国朋友。

你朋友的国籍？（请在横线处写出国籍的名字） _____
你们成为朋友多长时间了？（请在横线处填写年数） _____

现在请根据以下关于你与这位外国朋友之间交流的表述来回答你的同意程度： *(7)*十分同意， *(6)*同意，*(5)*勉强同意，*(4)*不确定， *(3)*勉强不同意， *(2)*不同意，*(1)*十分不同意。 请将你回答的数字填写在之后的空白处。 请根据你的第一印象快速作答。

1. 我不经常谈论我自己。 _____
2. 我经常表露关于自己正面的信息。 _____
3. 当我愿意的时候，我的自我表露总能准确地反映真实的
自我。 _____
4. 我对于自己情绪的谈论通常简短。 _____
5. 在通常状况下，我透露关于自己的不受欢迎的事物比
受欢迎的事情多。 _____
6. 一旦开始，我的自我表露会持续很长时间。 _____
7. 当我想表露自己的时候，我也没办法做到。因为我对自
己的了解并不那么彻底。 _____
8. 我经常讨论我对自己的感受。 _____
9. 我通常表达我对自己的好的感觉。 _____
10.我感觉我有时候不能控制我对自己个人比较隐私的事
情的自我批露。 _____
11. 在自我批露的时候我并不总是很诚实。 _____
12. 我经常谈论我自己。 _____
13. 当我透露我对自己的自我感觉时，我都是有意识的这
么做。 _____
14. 我经常表露关于关于自己负面的信息。 _____
15. 我经常毫不犹豫地表露关于自己很隐私的、个人的感
受。 _____
16. 在自我批露中，我通常很诚实。 _____
17. 我只在很少情况下才发表个人的想法和观点。 _____
18. 当我在自我批露时，我有意识的知道我在批露什么。 _____
19. 总体来说，我在关于自己的自我披露中正面信息会多
于负面信息。 _____

20. 我常常不确信我对于自己感情，情绪和经历的表达是不是反映了真正的自我。

21. 与他人的交谈中，我会坦率和充分地披露最真实的自己。

22. 我对于自己感受，情绪和经历的表达总是真实的自身感受。

23. 我每次会花比较长的时间来谈论我自己。

24. 一旦开始自我批露，我就会亲切地地完全地表达自己。

25. 在我表达自己的个人感受、情绪、行为或经历的时候，我并不总是觉得自己完全坦诚。

26. 总体来说，我在披露关于自己的事情时，负面信息会多于正面信息。

27. 当我表达自己的个人感受时，我是有意识的知道我在做什么，我在说什么。

28. 我的自我披露是完全真实的自我反映。

29. 在所有的交谈中，谈论我自己的对话总是持续时间最短的。

30. 我通常展示自己对自己的不好的感觉。

31. 当我在表达关于自己感情，情绪和经历时，我总是觉得我是完全真诚的。

在问卷最后，请填写有关您的个人信息

1. 性别：男　女　（请圈出合适的答案）

2. 年龄_____

3. 您的最高学历是什么？*如果您现在正在学习，请选择您毕业即将取得的学历。请在横线处做出选择。*_____
（1）　高中或同等学历
（2）　职业技术/专科学历
（3）　本科
（4）　硕士
（5）　博士

4. 您现在的职业是什么？请在横线处填写答案:_____

5. 在问卷的第三部分中，关于您所选择的外国朋友，你们之间用何种语言进行交谈？请在横线处填写答案：_____

6. 你认为你对于这门语言的运用程度如何？请在（1）至（5）之间选择一个数字，（1）代表"*完全不会*"，（5）代表"*母语使用者*"。请在横线上填写答案：_____

非常感谢您的参与！