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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
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.
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 (Barracough, 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 \((n = 70, 30 \text{ men and } 40 \text{ women})\), 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 \((n = 120, 48 \text{ men and } 72 \text{ women})\). 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
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*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent disclosure</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure amount</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive-negative</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control/depth</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty-accuracy</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent disclosure</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure amount</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive-negative</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control/depth</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty-accuracy</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) WTC</td>
<td>59.93</td>
<td>20.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) SPCC</td>
<td>65.72</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>.94††</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Disclosure amount</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Positive-negative</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Honesty-accuracy</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable-Chinese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57.35</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.67</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>.89††</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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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
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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.
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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 with a salesperson in a store. _____
10. Talk in a small group of acquaintances. _____
11. Talk in a large meeting of strangers. _____
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 cannot 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. 
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
3. (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 suuressas kaveripurukassa.
4. Puhut pienessä tuntemattomien porukassa.
5. Puhut kaverille.
6. Puhut suuressa tuttavaporukassa.
7. Puhut tuntemattoman kanssa.
8. Pidät puheen kaveripurukalle.
9. Puhut pienessä tautavaporukassa.
11. Puhut pienessä kaveripurukassa.
12. Pidät puheen tuntavaporukalle.

**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 tuntavan kanssa seisossasi jonossa.
5. Puhut myyjän kanssa kaupassa.
6. Puhut suuressa kaveripurukassa.
7. Puhut poliisin kanssa.
8. Puhut pienessä tuntemattomien porukassa.
11. Puhut suuressa tuttavaporukassa.
13. Puhut sihteerille/vastaanottovirkailijalle.
15. Puhut pienessä tuttavaporukassa.
17. Puhut suuressa tuntemattomien porukassa.
18. Puhut puolison (ta tyttö/poikaystävän) kanssa.
19. Puhut pienessä kaveriporukassa.
20. Pidät puheen tuttavaporukalle.

Osio 3

Ohjeet: Alla olevat 31 toteamusta kuvavat 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 kuvavat 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.
4. Tunteitani koskevat toteamukset ovat yleensä vähäsanaisia.
5. Paljastan usein enemmän epämieluisia asioita itsestäni kuin mieluisia.
6. Alkun paästään paljastan itsestäni paljon asioita.
7. En voi paljastaa sisintäni niin halutessani, koska en tunne itseni tarpeeksi hyvin.
8. Keskestelen usein itseni koskevista tunteistani.
9. Ilmaisen normaalisti itseni koskevat positiiviset tunteet.
10. Tunnan usein etten hallitse itseni koskevia henkilökohtaisia tai intimejä paljastuksiani.
11. En ole aina rehellinen itseni koskevissa paljastuksissa.
15. Paljastan usein intimejä ja henkilökohtaisia tunteita itsestäni ilman epäröintiä.
16. Olen aina rehellinen itseni koskevissa paljastuksissa.
17. Ilmainsen henkilökohtaisia uskomuksiani ja mielipiteitä vain harvoin.
18. Kun paljastan asioita itsestään, olen tietoinen siitä mitä olen paljastamassa.
20. Usein olen epävarma vastaavatko omat tunteitani ja kokemukseteni koskevat ilmainsuni todellisuutta.
22. Tunteitani ja kokemukseteni koskevat ilmainseni ovat aina tarkoja havaintojani.
23. Puhun yleensä itsestään melko pitkiä aikoja.
24. Päästyn alkuun sisimmäni avaaamisessa paljastan itseni intiimisti ja täysin.
25. En aina tunne itseäni täysin rehelliseksi kun paljastan omia tunteitani, käytöstäni tai kokemukseteni.
27. Kun ilmainsen henkilökohtaisia tunteitani, olen aina tietoinen siitä mitä olen tekemässä ja sanomassa.
28. Itseni koskevat paljastukset ovat täysin tarkoja havaintojani siitä kuka todella olen.
29. Keskustelun olen lyhimmillään puhuansani itsestään.
30. Paljastan tavallisesti "huonoja" tunteet ja kokemukseteni itsestään.
31. Tunnen itseriitä aina täysin rehelliseksi paljastaossani omia tunteitani ja kokemukseteni.

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

1. Mikä on sukupuollesi? Ole hyvä ja ympyröi sopiva vastaus: Mies Nainen
2. Kuinka vanha olet? _____
3. Mikä on korkein tutkinto? 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 kielen taidokkuus tässä kielessä? Ole hyvä ja vastaa väliltä (1) ei ollenkaan hyvä ja (5) äidinkieltyhjään tilaan ___

Kiitos paljon osallistumisestasi! :)


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. 和一个陌生人交谈。 ________
7. 对一群朋友发表演讲。 ________
8. 和一个认识的人交谈。 ________
9. 和几个认识的人一起时，与他人交谈。 ________
10. 对一群朋友发表演讲。 ________
11. 和一个朋友交谈。 ________
12. 和一个陌生人交谈。 ________

**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. 和一个认识的人交谈。 ________
2. 和一个朋友交谈。 ________
3. 对一个陌生人发表演讲。 ________
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. 和一群陌生人一起时，与他人交谈。 ________
7. 与警察交谈。 ________
8. 和几个朋友一起时，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. 对一群朋友发表演讲。 ________
12. 在排队时与陌生人交谈。 ________
13. 与秘书或前台人员交谈。 ________
14. 对一个陌生人发表演讲。 ________
15. 和一个认识的人一起时，与他人交谈。 ________
16. 与清洁工交谈。 ________
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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。因为我对自已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已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！