

THE TWAIN HAVE MET: SELF-DISCLOSURE IN THE FORMATION AND  
DEVELOPMENT OF INTERCULTURAL FRIENDSHIPS IN THE CASE  
OF TAIWANESE VERSUS NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS

Yea Wen Chen, B.A.

Thesis Prepared for the Degree of  
MASTER OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

August 2006

APPROVED:

Pratibha Shukla, Major Professor  
Lori Byers, Committee Member  
Karen Anderson, Committee Member  
John Gossett, Chair of the Department of  
Communication Studies  
Sandra L. Terrell, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse  
School of Graduate Studies

Chen, Yea Wen. *The twain have met: Self-disclosure in the formation and development of intercultural friendships in the case of Taiwanese versus native English speakers*. Master of Arts (Communication Studies), August 2006, 200 pp., 18 tables, references, 197 titles.

Grounded in a social penetration perspective, this exploratory study aspires to examine the impact of self-disclosure on intercultural friendship development between Taiwanese and native English speakers by a section of the following populations: (a) Taiwanese sojourning in the US, (b) native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan, and (c) Taiwanese in Taiwan. This research employed a triangulation of quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews to answer the proposed research questions and hypothesis regarding four dimensions and six topics of self-disclosure. Consistent with the quantitative results, the five themes that emerged from the qualitative analysis indicate both unique challenges in self-disclosing to intercultural friends and a positive association between self-disclosure and cultural adaptation. Additionally, this study highlights the role of self-disclosure in the four identified stages of intercultural friendship development. Finally, findings from this study have implications for the social penetration theory, anxiety/uncertainty management theory, and theory of adaptation in intercultural dyads.

Copyright 2006

by

Yea Wen Chen

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my thankfulness and gratefulness to all the people who assisted the completion of this thesis in various and important ways. First, I would like to express my sincere gratitude and indebtedness to Dr. Pratibha Shukla, Dr. Lori Byers, and Dr. Karen Anderson for their guidance, insight, time, and suggestions in the production of this thesis. In particular, Dr. Pratibha Shukla who served as my major professor deserves extra appreciation for her brilliance and her infinite aid, time, patience, and support.

I would also like to pay tribute to Mr. Keith B. Landry for his moral, emotional, and financial support, affection, and wisdom throughout my academic journey in the United States. I also wishes to acknowledge the unconditional love, support, and understanding from my parents, Cheng-Tsai Chen (陳承財) and Hstu-Kuang Wu (吳秀況), my cousin, Hsiu-Yi Chen (陳秀宜), and my two brothers. Moreover, I would like to thank all the faculty, staff, students of the Department of Communication Studies for their inspiration, friendship and participation in my education. Finally, I would like to express my thanks to the Toulouse School of Graduate Studies at the University of North Texas as well as the sojourners whose kindness and participation made this study possible.

This paper is dedicated to the experiences of those who have crossed the cultural boundaries and have come to appreciate learning and looking at the world from different cultural lenses. It is also dedicated with the greatest love to the ones whose endorsement supports this sojourner's growth and acculturation: my parents, Cheng-Tasi Chen (陳承財) and Hstu-Kuang Wu (吳秀況), my grandfather, Chen Chien (陳乾), and my deceased grandmother, Chen Chien (陳檢).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction	
Statement of the Problem	
Rationale	
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	12
Interpersonal Relationships across Cultures	
Interpersonal Relationships/Friendships in Taiwanese Culture	
Friendships in Western Cultures	
Self-Disclosure	
Friendship Development	
Social Penetration Theory	
Research Questions	
3. METHODOLOGY.....	30
Procedures and Research Instruments	
Quantitative Survey	
Qualitative Interview	
Research Participants	
Sample Universe	
Sample Size	
Analysis	
Quantitative Analysis	
Qualitative Analysis	
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	40
Quantitative Results	
Internal Reliability	
Construct Validity	
Dimensions of Self-Disclosure in Intracultural versus Intercultural Friendships	
Topics of Self-Disclosure in Intracultural versus Intercultural Friendships	

Self-Disclosure in Intracultural Intimate Friendships and Intercultural Intimate Friendship	
Self-Disclosure and Intercultural Friendship Formation and Development	
Hypothesis 1	
Qualitative Results	
Issues Affecting Self-Disclosure in Intercultural Friendships	
English Language Skills	
Differing Cultural Values and Norms	
Communication Styles and Competence	
Power Difference and Unearned Privilege	
Self-Disclosure among Sojourners	
Communal Institutions for Sojourners	
Disclosing in Mother Tongue	
Shared Cultural Background	
Personal and Social Needs	
Self-Disclosure and Stages of Intercultural Friendship Development	
The Orientation and Initial Attraction Stage	
The Exploratory Exchange Stage	
The Pendulum Stage	
The Stability Exchange Stage	
Friendship Closeness and Topics of Self-Disclosure	
Cultural Values and Nonintimate Topics	
Cultural Values and Intimate Topics	
Topic Avoidance	
Self-Disclosure and Cultural Adaptation	
Summary	
5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	132
Summary and Conclusions	
Limitations	
Implications	
APPENDICES.....	160
REFERENCES.....	186

## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Cronbach's Alpha for Scales.....	140
2	Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Sojourning Taiwanese Communicating with Strangers who are native English Speakers.....	141
3	Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Sojourning Taiwanese Communicating with Casual Friends who are native English Speakers.....	142
4	Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Sojourning Taiwanese Communicating with Good Friends who are native English Speakers.....	143
5	Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Sojourning Taiwanese Communicating with Good Taiwanese Friends.....	144
6	Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Sojourning Native English Speakers Communicating with Taiwanese Strangers.....	145
7	Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Sojourning Native English Speakers Communicating with Casual Taiwanese Friends.....	146
8	Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Sojourning Native English Speakers Communicating with Good Taiwanese Friends.....	147
9	Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Sojourning Native English Speakers Communicating with Good Friends from One's Own Culture.....	148
10	Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Taiwanese in Taiwan Communicating with Taiwanese Strangers.....	149
11	Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Taiwanese in Taiwan Communicating with Casual Taiwanese Friends.....	150
12	Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Taiwanese in Taiwan Communicating with Good Taiwanese Friends.....	151

13	Follow-up Univariate Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) of Dimensions of Self-disclosure among the Three Groups.....	152
14	Follow-up Univariate Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) of Topics of Self-disclosure among the Three Groups.....	153
15	Comparison of Sojourning Native English Speakers (n = 56) and Sojourning Taiwanese (n = 49) on Various Dimensions and Topics of Self-disclosure.....	154
16	Follow-up Univariate Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) of Dimensions and Topics of Self-disclosure and Intercultural Friendship Development.....	156
17	Means and Standard Deviations for Amount and Depth of Self-disclosure Variables.....	158
18	Spearman Correlation of Sojourning Taiwanese' Grand Amount and Depth of Disclosure.....	159



## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

In this modern era of globalization, people travel across ethnic, geographical, national, and cultural boundaries more frequently than ever. Visitation, sojourning, and immigration alike have brought individuals of different cultural backgrounds into contact at an unprecedented rate. Not to disagree with Rudyard Kipling, but it seems that East is no longer purely East, nor is West simply West after the democratization of technology, finance and information beginning in the late 1960s (Friedman, 2000). As to the twain in Kipling's *Ballad of East and West*, they have met in spite of Kipling. However, even though some of the fortunate twains have managed to become friends, the majority still struggle to overcome both the visible and invisible barriers.

The latest communication technology of computers, e-mail, MSN messenger, high-speed Internet, teleconferencing and various new forms of software have enabled the phenomenon of outsourcing to take place at a global level (Friedman, 2005). American firms now make greater profit by outsourcing tax returns to local Indian firms, and Japanese firms hire Chinese software engineers and set up call centers in China at a much lower price than hiring Japanese engineers to do the same job. Similarly, radiologists in the US can outsource the reading of computed axial tomography (CAT) scans to doctors in Australia or India overnight. However, despite globalization and the leveling of world markets, research on intercultural communication is still limited (Morgan & Arasaratnam, 2003).

In general, there are several approaches in the existing literature to address the issue of cultural diversity in the international and intercultural communication processes. The first approach as demonstrated in cross-cultural research is to compare and contrast similarities and differences between two to several cultures for the purpose of identifying communication

barriers that could attribute to relationship differences (Andrew, Rancer & Lim, 2003; Cahn, 1984; Jourard, 1971; Kito, 2005). From the perspectives of intercultural relationship communication, the second approach assumes that intercultural communication is a unique aspect of communication and requires special attempts at theorizing and research (Chen, 2002). Furthermore, researchers like Gudykunst (1985a) advocate and argue that “one major focus of research in intercultural communication should be upon extending findings and theorizing from interpersonal (intracultural) communication to intercultural setting” (p. 270). Finally, researchers like Ting-Toomey (1991) conclude that intercultural relationships tend to move from the intercultural level to the interpersonal level as the relationships develop and stabilize, and thus promote the use of a process approach to examine intercultural-interpersonal relationship development. Once intercultural relationships became established or reached maintenance stages, cultural differences were often diluted by interindividual and relational factors. In short, as the word ‘diversity’ entails, various theoretical perspectives and more rigorous conceptualizations need to be pursued in both cross-cultural and intercultural communication research to study intercultural-interpersonal relationship development (Ting-Toomey, 1991).

One of the many areas of intercultural communication that is just beginning to be explored concerns the study of intercultural friendship (Gareis, 1995). Few people would question that friendship constitutes a significant portion of a person’s social life from early childhood all the way through to late adulthood (Fehr, 1996; Pahl, 2000; Rawlins, 1992). However, not many sociologists and psychologists would agree on one specific definition of friendship. Different theoretical positions would yield different conceptualizations of what defines friendship. Some researchers have taken a perspective of attributes to describe friendship in terms of a list of typical attributes such as fidelity, solidarity, trust, affection, confiding, receiving assistance,

reliable alliance and so forth (Davis & Todd, 1985; Pahl, 2000). Others have operationalized friendship by putting it into contexts or by discussing it in terms of the friendship process (Adams & Allan, 1998; Fehr, 1996). In general, friendships are voluntary personal relationships that provide intimacy and assistance, and characterized by equity, liking, shared activity and mutual involvement (Fehr, 1996; Rawlins, 1992). Last but not least, the most important key concept in trying to define friendship is the notion that ideas and expectations about what friendship is as well as what friends should and should not do are socially and culturally constructed (Collier, 1996).

It is crucial to note that several researchers have indicated that the formation of friendship is influenced by the combination or convergence of environmental, individual, situation and dyadic factors (Fehr, 1996) or factors at personal environmental, network, community, and societal levels (Adams & Allan, 1998). Bearing in mind the key is that friendships are rooted and embedded in cultures as previously stated, Gareis (1995) specifically identified 12 factors that influence the formation of intercultural friendship: (a) culture, (b) personality, (c) self-esteem, (d) friendship element, (e) expectations, (f) adjustment stage, (g) cultural knowledge, (h) communicative competence, (i) external variables, (j) proximity, (k) factors associated with living in the US, and (l) chemistry. Therefore, it should not be surprising that cross-cultural or intercultural friendships can be onerous to initiate, develop and maintain resulting from the interplay of a wide range of potential variables: values, interests, personality traits, network patterns, communication styles, cultural knowledge, and relational and intercultural communication competence, intergroup attitudes, and so forth (Aberson & Tomolillo, 2004; Collier, 1996; Gareis, 1995; Gudykunst, 1979; Mcdermott, 1992; Olanrian, 1996; Yamaguchi & Wiseman, 2003; Zimmermann, 1995;).

The topic of self-disclosure has received continuous attention from scholars of psychology and interpersonal communication. Also, self-disclosure is one of the most critical factors affecting the development and the quality of close relationships (Altman & Taylor, 1973; Berg, 1984; Derlega et al., 1987; Hendrick, Hendrick, & Alder, 1988; Kito, 2005; Matsushima & Shiomi, 2002; Rubin & Shenker, 1978). Self-disclosure has been widely studied in contexts of acquaintances (Planalp & Benson, 1992; Shaffer & Ogden, 1986), romantic relationships (Cramer, 1998; Hendrick, 1981; Hendrick, Hendrick, & Alder, 1988; Kito, 2005), roommates (Berg, 1984; Rubin, Shenker, 1978; Wong & Bond, 1999), adolescent friendships (Matsushima & Shiomi, 2002; Tschann, 1988), peer friendships in the workplace (Sias & Cahill, 1998), and both same-sex and cross-sex adult friendships (Kito, 2005). In addition, researchers have focused on the effects of culture on self-disclosure among Westerners (Gudykunst, 1985b; Jourard, 1971; Rosenfeld, 1979; Wheelless, 1978), cross-cultural comparison between Americans and Japanese (Cahn, 1984; Gudykunst & Nishida, 1983; Kito, 2005), international students in the US (Chen, 1993; Chen & Isa, 2003), and intercultural friendships formation (Kudo & Simkin, 2003). Although many researchers have examined self-disclosure in various types of relationships and in several different cultures, no one has yet investigated self-disclosure among the Chinese or the Taiwanese population. Also, there are no studies that have directly examined self-disclosure and the development of intercultural friendships.

In the contexts of intercultural friendships, self-disclosure is not only the third major factor in intercultural friendship formation (Kudo & Simkin, 2003) but also a crucial and defining factor for the development of close friendships (Matsushima & Shiomi, 2002). Besides, self-disclosure is also one of the seven crucial elements in communication competence (Chen, 1992). In intercultural studies on uncertainty and anxiety management, self-disclosure is one of

the major interactive uncertainty reduction techniques commonly utilized to develop relationships (Gudykunst, 1985b & 1996). However, despite self-disclosure being one of the most important factors in the development of close friendships, little is known about how people communicate and monitor self-disclosure of personal information during the course of developing intercultural friendships, and little has been done to investigate the relationships between self-disclosure and culture. Barnlund (1989) even argues that self-disclosure is a Western concept and traditional Japanese friendship patterns seldom involve intimate self-disclosure. In short, for the purpose of this study, friendship is examined in relation to self-disclosure as an ongoing process that changes as individuals and friendships develop over time.

Therefore, considering (a) the limited number of research on intercultural friendships, (b) the lack of studies on self-disclosure in Eastern cultures, and (c) the significant role of self-disclosure in the development of intercultural and interpersonal relationships, the present study aims to examine the correlation between self-disclosure and intercultural friendship development between Taiwanese and native English speakers.

#### Statement of the Problem

For sojourners, making friends with the members of the host culture is just as important, if not more, as for people who live in their own cultures in need of friends for help, social support and common interests (Argyle & Henderson, 1985). However, research suggests that the formation of cross-cultural friendships between foreign students and host US students is difficult, challenging, and problematic (Collier, 1996; Gareis, 1995; Verkuyten & Masson, 1996; Zimmerman, 1995). Many empirical studies had not only identified but also examined adaptation

problems and social alienation among international students in the US (Collier, 1996; Furnham & Alibhai, 1985; Gareis, 1995; Mcdermott, 1992; Neuliep & Ryan, 1998; Olaniran, 1996; Owie, 1992; Yamaguchi & Wiseman, 2003). Several cross-cultural adjustment studies have reported that foreign students in the US suffered degrees of anxiety, confusion, helplessness, loneliness, insecurity, psychological depression, and social isolation or alienation (Mcdermott, 1992; Olaniran, 1996; Yamaguchi & Wiseman, 2003; Zimmermann, 1995). Some researchers pointed out the pivotal role of communication competence in international students' adaptation to their lives in the US (Mcdermott, 1992; Witteborn, 2003; Yamaguchi & Wiseman, 2003; Zimmermann, 1995). Others emphasized that international students who had dissatisfying or a complete lack of friendships with host US students often experienced social difficulties or alienation (Olaniran, 1996; Zimmermann, 1995).

The US hosts the largest number of foreign students from diverse backgrounds with the majority of them coming from collectivistic cultures in Latin America and Asia (Chen, 2000; Ying, 2002; Zimmerman, 1995). Unlike individualistic cultures where there are loose ties between individuals in a society, collectivistic cultures pertain to societies that integrate people into cohesive groups from birth and expect them to stay loyal and responsible for their group members throughout their lifetime (Hofstede, 1991; Triandis, 1995). Thus, individualistic societies stress individual goals, individual achievement, independence, competition and personal identity while collectivistic cultures place great emphasis on group goals, group achievement, cooperation, duty, family, harmony, interdependence and relationships (Hofstede, 1991; Triandis, 1995). Bearing in mind such fundamental differences between individualism and collectivism, it should not be surprising that international students from collectivistic cultures have been found to experience not only higher levels of obstacles initiating and developing

friendships with US students but also lower probabilities of smooth adjustments compared with those from individualistic cultures similar to the host US culture (Chen, 1993; Olaniran, 1996).

In addition to the individualistic-collectivistic differences, East Asian cultures such as China, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan are heavily influenced by Confucianism and Buddhism and are further distinguished from Western cultures (Chen & Chung, 1994; Yum, 1988). The impact of Confucian doctrines permeates all aspects of East Asian cultures from interpersonal relationships to communication patterns. For instance, communication patterns in East Asian cultures are process-oriented and receiver-centered, emphasize indirect communication, and differentiate linguistic codes; in contrast, North American patterns of communication are outcome-oriented and sender-oriented, and stress direct communication (Yum, 1988). Also, China, Japan, South Korea and Taiwan are among the top nations that send their students to study in the US (World Journal, 1999). Since very little is known about the patterns of self-disclosure in East Asian cultures, this study will focus on exploring and understanding how such communication patterns have influenced and regulated the patterns of self-disclosure in those cultures. Specifically, the present study will focus on examining the impact of self-disclosure patterns on the development of intercultural friendships in relation to the adaptation and adjustment problems facing foreign students from East Asian countries.

### Rationale

The focus on self-disclosure and intercultural friendship is an important task for several reasons. First, the study of intercultural friendships is significant from a pragmatic perspective (Gudykunst, 1985a). Research has discovered that frequent contact with US American students and forming intercultural friendships, especially best-friend relationships, with members of the

host cultures can greatly facilitate and assist sojourners' adaptation and adjustment in the foreign countries (Olaniran, 1996; Ying, 2002; Zimmermann, 1995). Therefore, research on intercultural friendship can serve practical functions to assist the formation of positive intercultural encounters on US American campuses and help alleviate the adaptation problems facing foreign students, especially from East Asian countries.

The majority of research on international students in the US tends to focus solely on aspects of (intercultural) communication competence, communication apprehension or social communication skills without taking into account the process of intercultural relationship development; thus, our understanding of the development and formation of intercultural relationships is still rudimentary (Allen, Long, O'Mara & Judd, 2003; Kudo & Simkin, 2003) On one hand, such findings are rarely applied to the examination of interpersonal relationships in intercultural settings as Gudykunst (1985a) advocated. On the other hand, as Ting-Toomey (1991) pointed out the importance of using a process approach in examining intercultural interpersonal relationships, studies like these seldom acknowledge and incorporate the fact that intercultural communication is also an ongoing process and embedded in relational contexts. Also, very little is known about how communication competence and factors directly affects the formation of intercultural friendship.

Second, researchers have argued that the study of intercultural friendships can serve theoretical significance in extending findings of intercultural theories to intercultural settings (Gudykunst, 1985a). In terms of research endeavors on intercultural friendship, it is still at its early stages. Research on intercultural friendship is still scarce, rudimentary, unsystematic and limited in its theoretical, methodological as well as cultural perspectives (Kudo & Simkin, 2003; Morgan & Arasaratnam, 2003). Specifically, in terms of methodological approaches, amid the



paucity of studies focusing on intercultural friendships, researchers mostly explored intercultural friendships from a qualitative perspective (Gareis, 1995, 1999 & 2000; Kudo & Simkin, 2003).

In terms of research themes or topics, the majority of research focused on exploring the formation of intercultural friendship (Gareis, 1995, 1999 & 2000; Kudo & Simkin, 2003) and others examined the comparison between close intracultural and intercultural friendships (Gudykunst, 1985a), communication competence (Collier, 1996), and sensation seeking factors in making friends with someone from different cultures (Morgan & Arasaratnam, 2003). In short, there are only very limited theoretical and methodological perspectives that have been adopted to examine different facets and dimensions of intercultural friendships. Thus, the focus on self-disclosure and intercultural friendship development will initiate and enable the application and expansion of theories and findings on self-disclosure and interpersonal relationship development to one type of intercultural relationships.

Third, even though there are at least 176 different national cultures in the world, only intercultural friendships between very few cultures have been studied in isolation. US is the biggest host of international or foreign students from diverse cultural backgrounds with the majority of international students from Asia (Chen, 2000; Zimmermann, 1995). Unfortunately, existing literature often treat international students as a haphazard, gigantic, and homogeneous entity without recognizing and taking cultural differences into consideration. In addition, Olaniran's (1996) study provides support for the crucial role of culture in intercultural relationships as well as cultural adaptation. The study revealed that international students experienced greater social difficulties when they were from cultures different from the host cultures, such as Asian cultures. Specifically, both the masculinity-femininity and power distance

measures of Hofstede's (1991) cultural similarity were correlated with intrapersonal social difficulty while power distance was also associated with interpersonal social difficulty.

Numerous researchers have voiced the need of testing communication frameworks on understudied populations other than the dominant white, middle-class North Americans (Gudykunst & Nishida, 1985; Love & Powers, 2002). Sarti (1981) emphasizes the necessity to study each country individually in its own context and conditions. Miike (2002) advocates the need to study Asian modes of communication from an Asiacentric paradigm. Hence, the study of intercultural friendships on one understudied culture that is different from the US culture will be a good start to fill this void.

Lastly, as research reveals that friendships progress in phases (Korn & Nicotera, 1993), communication among friends differs based on factors such as intimacy and levels of closeness. In intercultural studies on uncertainty and anxiety management, self-disclosure is one of the major interactive uncertainty reduction techniques commonly utilized to develop intercultural relationships (Gudykunst, 1985b & 1996). Undoubtedly, types of relationships and interpersonal salience between the interlocutors influence the levels of uncertainty and anxiety both parties feel, which in turn affect self-disclosure. However, how individuals monitor and moderate their self-disclosure in various levels of friendships with people from a different cultural background such as Taiwan has not yet been investigated.

Theoretically, Altman and Taylor's (1973) social penetration theory provides the link between self-disclosure, intimacy, and the development of interpersonal relationships such as friendships. The basic assumptions of this theory assert that as interpersonal relationships develop over time, individuals engage in increasingly intimate self-disclosure. However, despite the significant role of self-disclosure in relationship development, whether or not the

assumptions of social penetration theory would apply to intercultural relationships has not yet been examined and therefore not known.

To sum up, it is not only pragmatically but also conceptually important to apply findings and theories in both self-disclosure and interpersonal relationship development to the intercultural setting of intercultural friendships (Gudykunst, 1985a). Also, it is essential to test communication frameworks on understudied populations (Gudykunst & Nishida, 1985; Love & Powers, 2002) and to study each culture in its own conditions and contexts (Sartis, 1981). Finally, there is the need to encourage Asiacentric scholarship that deals with Asian modes of communication (Miike, 2002). One of the cultures in Asia that match all the criteria mentioned above is Taiwanese culture: (a) it is understudied, (b) it is rarely examined its own cultural context, and (c) studying it can help illuminate our knowledge of East Asian modes of communication. Thus, this study aims to explore and examine how self-disclosure affects the development of friendships between Taiwanese and native English speakers in relation to Altman and Taylor's (1973) social penetration theory and Gudykunst's (1985 & 1996) uncertainty and anxiety management. Since little is known about the patterns of disclosure among Taiwanese people, the method proposed here is the combination of quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews for exploratory purposes as well as in-depth understanding. Also, Taiwan is one of the top nations that send many of their students to study in the US (World Journal, 1999), hopefully such focus will be able to assist future Taiwanese international students' adjustment and adaptation to US American campuses.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In the following section, first, literature on interpersonal relationships across cultures is reviewed and presented. Next, presentation of key characteristics of both Taiwanese interpersonal relationship/friendship patterns is followed by a brief review on Western friendship patterns to enable the examination of basic similarities and differences. Third, summaries of related studies on self-disclosure and interpersonal relationship development are presented. Finally, based on such review of literature, research questions and hypothesis are introduced.

#### Interpersonal Relationships across Cultures

Developing interpersonal relationships with someone from another culture is not an easy task, because people from different cultures are less likely to share the same worldviews, have the same patterns of beliefs, and observe the same verbal and nonverbal norms or scripts than members of the same culture. Thus, research on communication in interpersonal relationships across cultures has taken different approaches and focused on various topics to study communication and culture. Theoretically, there are two major approaches to examine communication in interpersonal relationships across cultures: emic approaches and etic approaches (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1996). Basically, emic approaches study cultures from within the system and usually tend to examine only one culture. Examples of indigenous emic approaches include anthropological, sociolinguistic or ethnographic research. Those examples of indigenous approaches describe and examine a culture or the use of language within a culture as the members of that particular culture understands it. In studies of Chinese interpersonal relationships, Gao (1996) utilized a Chinese perspective of conceptualizing the self and other to

examine principles of interpersonal relationships within the Chinese culture. Gao and Ting-Toomey (1998) analyzed characteristics and functions of Chinese communication and personal relationships based on the pervasive Chinese cultural premises such as *mian zi* (face), *bao* (reciprocity), *xiao* (filial piety), *ke qi* (politeness) and so forth.

In contrast, etic approaches study cultures from a position outside the cultural system and often compare many cultures with predetermined universal criteria. Essentially, etic approaches aim to understand similarities and differences in communication in interpersonal relationships across cultures. In studies of interpersonal relationships between Chinese and North Americans, Chen (1993) contrasted three domains of consciousness in Chinese and North American cultures: (a) time and space, (b) human and nature, and (c) ego and society. The goal was to locate and relate the cultural discrepancy to common difficulties in intercultural communication between Chinese and North Americans. Furthermore, focusing on Chinese and American romantic relationships, Gao and Gudykunst (1995) compared (a) attributional confidence, (b) perceived similarity, and (c) network involvement in the two specified cultures in order to fill the gap of culture and the development of romantic relationships.

Generally, a scarcity of studies has explored the different types of cross-cultural relationships such as colleagues, romantic partners and friends, but they have covered a variety of inconsistent topics. Some researchers examined some aspect of the formation and development of intercultural relationships (Allen et al., 2003; Gudykunst, 1985a; Kudo & Simkin, 2003; Ying, 2002). Others focused on issues related to sojourners' social, mental and psychological adaptation and adjustment (Chen, 2000; Fong, 1998; Mcdermott, 1992; Olaniran, 1996; Yamaguchi & Wiseman, 2003; Zheng & Berry, 1991; Zimmermann, 1995). Still others concentrated on the theorizing and testing of intercultural communication competence (Chen,

1992; Gudykunst, 1979; Witteborn, 2003) Other miscellaneous issues examined included the effects of surprising events (Sodetani & Gudykunst, 1987), sensation seeking factors (Morgan & Arasaratnam, 2003; Smith & Downs, 2004), implicit bias and contact with ethnic minority groups (Aberson & Tomolillo, 2004) and the effects of perceptions of social appropriateness and liking on response to a friend's query about personal prospects (Bresbahan et al., 2002).

In short, at this age of globalization, our current understanding of how individuals from different cultural backgrounds develop interpersonal relationships with one another is still circumscribed, inconsistent and unsystematic. In order to arrive at a complete understanding of interpersonal relationships across cultures, a combination of theoretical approaches and systematic analysis is needed. As culture plays a pivotal role in interpersonal relationships, I will first review the literature on the underlying cultural influences on Taiwanese interpersonal relationships in its own light before examining the role of communication in intercultural relationships.

#### Interpersonal Relationships/Friendships in Taiwanese Culture

At its core, Taiwanese society and culture is fundamentally Chinese. That being said, Taiwan has been quick to embrace and incorporate Western influences during the process of internationalizing its market and economy and also due to political isolation from Mainland China. However, interpersonal relationships in Taiwan have not undergone radical changes as the technology has transformed its economy. At most, social changes in Taiwan are still at the early stage. Ma and Smith (1992) states that previous research has revealed that Confucianism, the core of Chinese culture, provides the foundation for a variety of personal attributes that promotes Taiwan's economic achievements. In addition, research has shown evidence of Taiwan's

institutional efforts to indigenize foreign or imported cultural products (Tsang & Wang, 1990). Thus, social rules and expectations for interpersonal relationships basically follow the old Chinese traditions. Though Taiwan differs politically and economically from Mainland China, Taiwanese culture shares the very essence of Chinese culture. In other words, Taiwanese interpersonal relationship patterns observe similar patterns that Chinese interpersonal relationships do, including friendships.

In the cultural individualism-collectivism continuum at the national level, Chinese/Taiwanese culture belongs at the collectivistic end. As Triandis (1995) points out in his analysis of individualism and collectivism, collectivistic cultures are societies in which (a) individuals think of themselves as parts of their collective groups, (b) they place the goals of the group above their personal goals, (c) individuals are trained to obey authority and to be good members of their groups, (d) great emphasis is placed on duty, loyalty, obligation, respectfulness, hierarchy, and mutual dependence, (e) distinctions between ingroups and outgroups are important, and finally (f) individuals stay closely tied to their collective groups throughout their lives. More importantly, Triandis further distinguishes different attributes of collectivism/individualism among cultures. Therefore, it is important to consider Chinese/Taiwanese culture as a collectivistic culture in its own social and cultural contexts with specific implications for its interpersonal relationships.

Specifically, Gao (1996) and Gao and Ting-Toomey (1998) synthesize four important characteristics of Chinese/Taiwanese interpersonal relationships. First of all, what this signifies is that the needs, values, attitudes, and goals of the groups that an individual are part of have to be prioritized before those of the individual. Secondly, the collectivistic consciousness leads to the conceptualization of the other-oriented self. The other-oriented self connotes three core values

towards others: tolerance, harmony and solidarity. Thirdly, such group-oriented collectivism results in the clear dichotomy of insiders and outsiders based on levels of interpersonal interactions and the we-identity as opposed to the individualistic I-identity. For example, in the case of close friendships, Chinese/Taiwanese tend to treat their close/best friends as one of the siblings or family members. Fourthly, Chinese/Taiwanese interpersonal relationships follow a strictly hierarchical structure in which social roles are fixed and guided by rules of propriety. In addition, all those four collectivistic traits correlate with the four characteristic of Chinese beliefs about communication indicated in Gao and Ting-Toomey's (1998) work: (a) implicit communication (*han xu*), (b) politeness (*ke qi*), (c) communication with a focus on insiders (*zi ji ren*), and (d) listening-centered orientation (*ting hua*).

When talking about East Asian cultures like Chinese/Taiwanese culture, it is impossible not to mention the greatest teacher in Chinese history, Confucius, and his legacy. The four principals in Confucianism, namely humanism (*jen*), faithfulness (*i*), propriety (*li*) and wisdom (*chih*), permeate all aspects of Chinese/Taiwanese interpersonal relationships and communication patterns. These four dominating principals translate into (a) indirect orientation, (b) receiver-centered communication, and (c) differentiated linguistic codes depending on the social hierarchy in communication terms (Yum, 1988), which match the findings of Gao (1996) and Gao and Ting-Toomey (1998) mentioned above. Moreover, the emphasis on initiating, developing and maintaining social relationships in Confucian philosophy leads to another characteristic of communication in Chinese/Taiwanese society: process-oriented rather than outcome-oriented communication (Yum, 1988).

Another important avenue or medium of understanding Chinese/Taiwanese culture and its interpersonal relationships is through the Chinese language itself. Huang and Jia (2000) examine



the Chinese kinship terms in relation to their cultural connotations as well as their communicative functions. Not surprisingly, the Chinese language has more kinship terms than the English language. For example, the Chinese language has five distinct terms for the English word “uncle”: *bo fu* (father’s elder brother), *shu fu* (father’s younger brother), *gu fu* (father’s sister’s husband), *jiu fu* (mother’s brother), *yi fu* (mother’s sister’s husband). More importantly, the Chinese kinship terms highlight certain important characteristics of the Chinese/Taiwanese interpersonal relationships: (a) they are family-centered influenced by the family-based economy in Chinese tradition; (b) they emphasize the rule-governed system of respect for the older generation, and (c) they stress hierarchical interpersonal relationships and distinguish insiders and outsiders of the family.

Similarly, empirical research supports that traditional Chinese/Taiwanese interpersonal relationships place less emphasis on verbal communication and great premium on sincerity, spirituality and practicality. Cheng (1987) reveals that interaction and communication among Chinese/Taiwanese people follow a natural and spontaneous pattern, in which communication skills and interpersonal relationships are regarded as something that normally cannot be forced or taught in contrived contexts, and interpersonal relationships are viewed as closely tied to the development of the society as a whole. Also, in Gareis’ (1995) descriptive case studies of five Taiwanese-American friendship experiences, the researcher observes that communication of the participating Taiwanese international students appear cautious, introverted, less impulsive and less aggressive, disapprove of open disagreement, and in general inhibit expression of emotions.

However, under the forces of modernization, westernization, and globalization, Chinese/Taiwanese interpersonal relationships in Taiwan inevitably are experiencing changes. Gareis (1995) discovers that all five Taiwanese international students in her study report intense

self-disclosure of deep feeling to close intercultural friendships that is traditionally reserved for the family. Also, Chang and Holt (1996) examines themes in interpersonal communication books in Taiwan during the summer of 1994, and contends that those popular communication books signify the adoption of a new way of viewing communication and communication skills, which have traditionally been rendered unimportant by the Chinese/Taiwanese culture. The differing views on the extent to which globalization and Western values impact Taiwanese interpersonal relationships further highlight the need to investigate Taiwanese interpersonal relationships.

Therefore, in light of both the traditional views on Chinese/Taiwanese interpersonal communication as well as the proposal of a potential changing definition of interpersonal communication in Taiwanese culture, the present study has the capacity to both bridge the gap of knowledge on Taiwanese friendship patterns and also help illustrate the interplay between tradition and modernization. Before tackling the task of investigating critical factors influencing intercultural friendships between Taiwanese and native English speakers, it is imperative to review patterns of Western adult friendships.

### Friendships in Western Cultures

From the Western perspective, unlike romantic relationships or kinships, friendships do not have formal institutional support such as marriage or family law that functions to keep friends together (Gareis, 1995; Pahl, 2000). Since Western friendships are not formalized, there is little common agreement on what counts as being a true friend and what are the specific duties or obligations of being a friend. Broadly defined, Western friendships are considered voluntary, unconstrained and spontaneous personal relationships with reciprocated warm and caring feelings (Fehr, 1996; Gareis, 1995; Pahl, 2000). Even though there is no one agreed-upon

definition or meaning of friendship, no one would question the importance of friendship. Bell (1981) even argues that friendship is increasingly gaining importance in the US American society as many of the kinship ties gradually weaken. Despite the difficulty in defining it, friendship has its defining attributes or qualities.

In general, companionship, affection, proximity, support, trust, honesty, loyalty, intimacy, sincerity, and openness of self are common qualities related to friendships from the Western perspective. For instance, from a psychological perspective, Bell (1981) analyzes that some of the important qualities of friendship include sociability, self-confirmation, similarity, trust, intimacy, closeness, and willingness to forgive. On the other hand, taking an intercultural view to examine American friendship patterns, Gareis (1995) concludes that affection, support, trust, honesty, and loyalty are the often mentioned elements of US American friendship. Furthermore, based on a sample of predominantly middle-class and middle-aged adults in a midwestern American city., Johnson's (2001) study reveals that characteristics predictive of adult friendship include being perceived as friendly, pleasant, polite, and easy to talk to as well as having similar values, interests, and background.

In terms of friendship patterns, researchers discover that Western friendships, formed on the basis of similarities and shared interests, are more vulnerable and more susceptible to termination due to fewer expectations, lack of institutional ties, and available alternatives (Cramer, 1988; Blieszner & Adams, 1992; Sias & Cahill, 1998). For example, Argyle & Henderson, 1985 indicate that Westerners tend to treat friends as primarily for socializing, activity-sharing and fun-seeking. Similarly, Sias and Cahill's (1998) study on peer friends in the US workplaces reveals that the top four reasons for forming friendships are: (a) proximity, (b) perceived similarity, (c) shared work-related activities, and (d) perceived common ground in the

workplaces. Furthermore, Johnson et al.'s (2004) study on 162 undergraduates reveals the following reasons for friendship dissolution without much gender difference: (a) less affection, (b) change of the friend or self, (c) termination of shared activities or spending time together, and (d) increase in distance. In addition, consistent with previous research, many of the common turning points in this study are associated with network or circumstantial reasons.

In short, friendships in Western cultures tend to prioritize self-concerns and interests and play a more social and casual role, which is different from the more long-term oriented friendships based on sincerity and spirituality in the collectivistic East Asian cultures such as Taiwanese culture (Yum, 1988). For example, US Americans are more open and receptive to contact with strangers (Barnlund, 1989) and tend to have many friends of low intimacy (Triandis, 1995); in contrast, Taiwanese tend to form close and intimate bonds with relatively few friends (Gareis, 1995). However, little scholarship has examined how such culture-specific trends, traits or orientations may impact the development of intercultural friendships between individuals from individualistic cultures and those from collectivistic cultures, such as between native English speakers and Taiwanese people. One of the salient factors impacting the role communication in intercultural relationships is self-disclosure.

### Self-Disclosure

Self-disclosure, the process of revealing and sharing personal information about oneself to another, is one of the most important factors in the development of close friendships and intimacy, including the formation of intercultural friendships (Derlega et al., 1987; Matsuchima & Shiomi, 2002; Kudo & Simkin, 2003; Barnlund, 1989). For the purpose of this study, the

concept of self-disclosure is operationalized in terms of two dimensions: (a) the various topics of self-disclosure, and (b) the intention, depth, amount, positivism or negativity of self-disclosure.

In regards to topics of self-disclosure, one of the benchmark studies is Jourard and Lasakow's (1958) research on topic-based factors in self-disclosure. Their contribution is the widely-used Jourard-Lasakow Self-Disclosure questionnaire consisting of 60 self-report items that asks respondents to report their disclosure to a specific person under six general subject areas: (a) attitudes and opinions, (b) tastes and interest, (c) work or studies, (d) money, (e) personality, and (f) body. Numerous researchers agree on the validity of the SD-60 scale for measuring past disclosure to a specific targeted person (Tardy, 1988). Another study regarding topics in self-disclosure is Hosman's (1987) study of 101 US undergraduate students on the relationship between topic reciprocity in low-intimacy and high-intimacy messages. In terms of low-intimacy messages, both intimacy reciprocity and topic reciprocity receive positive social attractiveness evaluations. On the other hand, in terms of high-intimacy messages, only topic reciprocity receives positive evaluations. With regard to topics of self-disclosure and cross-cultural comparison of US and Japanese friendship patterns, Gudykunst and Nishida (1983) find that in terms of the depth and frequency of topics of self-disclosure, Americans tend to talk more about topics such as marriage, love, and emotions while Japanese tend to talk more about topics such as interests/hobbies, school/work, biographical matters, and physical activities. Cahn (1984) reviews and concludes that since Americans discuss more intimate topics while Japanese discuss more superficial topics, when establishing intercultural friendships, it is of great importance to respect cultural differences in the depth and scope of conversational topics.

The concept of self-disclosure is also multidimensional, which makes it one of the most widely explored and extensively studied research areas in the communication discipline. In

addition to Jourard and Lasakow's (1958) work, another benchmark study on self-disclosure is Wheelless and Grotz's Revised Self-disclosure Scale (RSDS) which is composed of 31 items to reflect five major dimensions of self-disclosure (Wheelless, 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. With respect to the association between attributions and self-disclosure, Derlega et al.'s (1987) study of experimental role-playing supports that positive attributions and interest in initiating new relationships with strangers foster and increase self-disclosing behaviors. Other researchers in the West have examined the association between avoidance, proximity, friendship, sex differences and self-disclosure (Rubin & Shenker, 1978; Rosenfeld, 1979).

Rubin and Shenker (1978) investigate proximity, friendship and self-disclosure patterns in both male and female freshman roommates and hallmates at Harvard and Radcliffe universities dormitories through questionnaires after they had lived together for four months. They discover that disclosure is more positively associated with proximity in non-intimate contexts than in intimate contexts in those roommate friendships, and also that the positive correlation between friendships and intimate disclosure is higher among female participants than among their male counterparts. Regarding self-disclosure avoidance, Rosenfeld's (1979) study reveals sex differences in self-disclosure avoidance. Men do so to gain control over their relationships while women do so for the purpose of avoiding personal hurt and problems.

Furthermore, self-disclosure is believed to be an ongoing and dialectical process that changes as individuals and relationships develop (Dindia, 1997). For instance, Gudykunst' (1985b) study on 400 university students in the US confirms that self-disclosure is influenced by (a) self-monitoring, (b) the degree of cultural similarity, and (c) the type of relationships. More

importantly, this study concludes that the only differences between culturally similar and dissimilar friends are their attributional confidence and shared communication networks. In other words, cultural dissimilar backgrounds are becoming less and less significant in established intercultural relationships. Similarly, Berg's (1984) study on previously unacquainted roommates shows that self-disclosure along with reward, equity, and comparison level for alternatives affect the development of friendship between roommates that changes in a qualitative way over time. In contrast, another study on 454 junior high friendship relationships in Japan reveals that self-disclosure positively relates to the breadth of friendship rather than the hypothesized depth of friendship (Matsushima & Shiomi, 2002). On one hand, these three studies highlight the important role that self-disclosure plays in the development of relationships. On the other hand, they also point out that the transactional process of self-disclosure may differ from culture to culture.

Considering the association between self-disclosure and culture, Wheelless et al.'s (1986) examination of 411 US American and international students reveals that students from non-western cultures are correlated to greater depth of disclosiveness while western cultures are correlated to greater amount. Analyzing self-disclosure and Asian students' abilities to cope with social difficulties in the US, Chen's (1993) research shows a consistent lack of emphasis on amount and depth of self-disclose among Asian students even though there is no statistically significant relationship between self-disclosure and social difficulties. In cross-cultural comparison of Korean and American college students' intercultural willingness to communicate find that the Korean participants are less willing to initiate and engage in intercultural communication (Lin, Rancer & Lim, 2003). Comparing interpersonal relationships in the US and Japan, Cahn (1984) concludes that US American prefer to talk about intimate topics such as

marriage, love/dating/sex, and emotions while Japanese tend to talk about superficial topics such as interests/hobbies, school/work, biographical matters, and physical activities; Kito's (2005) study reveals that Japanese college students engage in lower level of self-disclosure than their US American counterparts in both romantic relationships and friendships.

With respect to self-disclosure studies focusing on the Chinese population, researchers have analyzed self-disclosure patterns, motives for communication and personality, self-disclosure and friendship (Anderson, Martin & Zhong, 1998; Chen, 1995; Wong & Bond, 1999). Compared with US American students, Chinese university students from Taiwan not only engage in lower degree of self-disclosure to the target persons but also self-disclose less on topics of opinions, interests, work, financial issues, personality, and body (Chen, 1995). Anderson et al.'s (1998) study on 120 Chinese students, staff and faculty members discovers that Chinese people tend to communicate and self-disclose to best friends for reasons such as inclusion needs, similarity in personality and interests, increasing intimacy, alleviating loneliness, pleasure and affection. Moreover, they also find that Chinese people tend to disclose more to friends than to others. As to Wong and Bond's (1999) research on 131 Chinese university roommates, their findings support the positive correlation between the respondents' friendship rating and the respondents' amount and intensity of self-disclosure as well as that of their roommates'.

Lastly, among the paucity of research on intercultural friendship, Kudo and Simkin (2003) analyze the intercultural friendship formation of Japanese students in Australia. They find self-disclosure to be the third major factor in friendship formation. Both depth and width of self-disclosure indicate closeness in the friendships, and self-disclosure in intercultural friendships is affected by the foreign students' spoken English skills as well as their openness of communication. However, there is still a dearth of research exploring the relationship between



self-disclosure and the development of intercultural friendship, and also little research has been done to investigate the concept of self-disclosure in non-western cultures.

### Friendship Development

Relationships are conceptualized to progress in phases or stages toward higher degrees of intimacy. However, the majority of research on relationship development focuses on romantic relationships rather than friendships. Those researchers interested in friendship formation tend to focus their analysis on the underlying dimensions of friendship formation, such as trust, support, and helping behavior, rather than the processes (Cushman & Cahn, 1985). Also, relationship development models are rarely applied to cross-cultural or intercultural samples (Korn & Nicotera, 1993). The few studies that do touch upon friendship development tend to examine either stages of development in friendships or levels of closeness in friendships (Korn & Nicotera, 1993; Finn & Powers, 2002; Johnson et al., 2003; Chan & Cheng, 2004).

In Korn and Nicotera's (1993) review on conceptualization of friendship levels, they highlight Parks' model of ten levels from acquaintances to intimate friends as well as LaGaipa's model of four levels from social acquaintances to best friends in friendship research. Specifically, LaGaipa's (1977) four distinct levels of friendships are (a) acquaintances, (b) casual friends, (c) good friends, and (d) best friends. Similarly, Johnson et al. (2003) examine friendships of three intimacy levels: casual, close and best friends.

On the other hand, in Finn and Powers' (2002) research, they choose the classification system of four types of friendships: non-unit (acquaintance), pre-unit (testing friendship potential), unit (friend), and super-unit (special friend). Finally, Chan and Cheng (2004) investigate offline and online friendship qualities at different stages of relationship development

as in initiating, experimenting, intensifying, integrating and bonding without indicating any specific classification.

When discussing the role of self-disclosure in relationship development, Altman and Taylor's (1973) social penetration theory provides the theoretical framework to analyze the role of self-disclosure as relationship progresses. Thus, before investigating the role of self-disclosure in the development of intercultural friendships, it is necessary to review Altman and Taylor's seminal work first.

### Social Penetration Theory

Last but not least, social penetration theory (Altman & Taylor, 1973; Taylor & Altman, 1987) serves as the bridge between the discussions on relationship development and the process of self-disclosure. Basically, social penetration is both the overt behavior of interpersonal exchange and the internal subjective processes that gradually progresses from superficial to more intimate layers of the selves (Altman & Taylor, 1973). In a nut shell, the theorists state that relationship development is based on levels of self-disclosure. In other words, communication elevates from relatively shallow to greater depth of personal disclosure as relationships develop. Specifically, Altman and Taylor (1973 & 1987) identify four stages of relationship development based on the exchange of communication: (a) orientation, (b) exploratory affective exchange, (c) affective exchange, and (d) stable exchange. The two basic underlying assumptions of this theory are that (1) since relational partners aim to maximize gains and minimize losses, the overall relationship outcome would be determined by the differences between rewards and costs, and (2) the norm of reciprocity or the obligations to return disclosures is moderated by levels of intimacy, properties of the context, and characteristics of the communicators. However, it is not yet known whether or

not the same predictions can apply to the development of intercultural friendships since cultural differences and expectations have not been taken into account in this theory.

### Research Questions

As noted earlier, Taiwanese culture is heavily immersed in the Confucian philosophical doctrines of humanism, faithfulness, propriety, and wisdom. As a result, such core value systems foster indirect communication patterns that distinguish between insiders and outsiders, stress the act of preserving face for one another, and emphasize the implicit, context, hierarchy, relationships, sincerity, politeness, listening and appropriateness (Yum, 1988). Thus, for the Taiwanese people, their self-disclosure will largely depend on the contexts as well as the levels of relationships. However, no scholarship that I am aware of has yet explored how Taiwanese people self-disclosure themselves similarly or differently from native English speakers. Also, little is known if and/or how sojourning in individualistic cultures such as the US may affect Taiwanese people's patterns of self-disclosure. Thus, the following research questions are proposed:

- RQ1: How do the following three groups of individuals, (a) Taiwanese sojourning in the US, (b) native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan, and (c) Taiwanese people who primarily socialize with other Taiwanese, vary on the four dimensions of self-disclosure, namely intention, amount, depth, and positive-negative?
- RQ2: How do the following three groups of individuals, (a) Taiwanese sojourning in the US, (b) native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan, and (c) Taiwanese people who primarily socialize with other Taiwanese, differ or are similar in their topics of self-disclosure?

My (Chen, 2005) earlier research attempt on intercultural friendship between Taiwanese international students in the US and US Americans finds that Taiwanese international students' ( $n = 22$ ) self-disclosure do not significantly increase with the levels of intimacy and closeness.

However, it is hasty to conclude that this is an indication that Taiwanese international students often do not establish intercultural friendships as close as their intracultural friendships with their Taiwanese friends. Therefore, the following research question is proposed to compare the relationship between close intercultural friendships and close intracultural friendships for better understanding of the development of close intercultural friendships:

RQ3: How is an individual's self-disclosure similar or different in intimate intercultural friendships as opposed to intimate intracultural friendships?

As indicated above, in the development of close relationships, self-disclosure plays a major and defining role (Matsushima & Shiomi, 2002). It is also the third critical factor after frequent contact and similarity in the formation of intercultural friendships (Kudo & Simkin, 2003). However, still very little is known about the development of intercultural friendship patterns, no systematic attempts have been made to explore the relation between self-disclosure and culture. In addition, Taiwanese people are an understudied population, and no efforts have yet been made to investigate the patterns of self-disclosure among Taiwanese people. Therefore, the following research question is proposed:

RQ4: To what extent does self-disclosure affect the formation and development of intercultural friendships between (a) Taiwanese sojourning in the US and native English speakers, and (b) native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan and Taiwanese?

As mentioned above, the high-context collectivistic communication styles do not place great value on verbal openness and verbal communication (Yum, 1988; Irwin, 1996). Some researchers reveal that international students' self-disclosure is influenced by their spoken English skills and openness of communication (Kudo & Simkin, 2003); others find that Asian international students' amount and depth of self-disclosure is not significantly correlated to their social difficulties (Chen, 1993); still others discover that the depth and the amount of

self-disclosure discriminates between American and non-Western international students in that Americans engage in great amounts of self-disclosure while international students from non-Western culture disclose in greater depth (Wheless, Erickson & Behrens, 1986). Hence, it is logical to argue that sojourning Taiwanese in the US would self-disclose in greater depth but in a lesser amount.

H1: In intercultural friendships with native English speakers, sojourning Taiwanese people tend to self-disclose in greater depth but in lesser amount than sojourning native English speakers.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

This study aspires to explore and investigate the relationship between self-disclosure and the intercultural friendship development between native English speakers and Taiwanese. To answer the proposed research questions and hypothesis, this study employed a triangulation of quantitative and qualitative approaches both to increase the validity of data collection and to enhance more in-depth understanding of the phenomenon in question (Frey et al., 1991). There are three reasons that support and validate such a methodological choice.

The literature review shows a dearth of research on the patterns of self-disclosure among Taiwanese people calls for the use of both quantitative and qualitative approaches in the present study. In addition, the construction of self-disclosure has never been examined on non-Western populations. Some researchers even argue that self-disclosure is very much a Western concept (Barnlund, 1989) while others contend that self-disclosure might not have an equivalent in Asian cultures where communication is indirect and does not place value on verbal communication (Yum, 1988). Secondly, empirical studies that are exploratory in nature benefit through triangulation of quantitative and qualitative approaches (Chen, 2000). Lastly, based on my previous study on self-disclosure in intercultural friendships between Taiwanese international students and US Americans (Chen, 2005), the use of quantitative approaches alone presented limitations in the understanding of self-disclosure in intercultural friendships. The employment of surveys alone not only fails to reflect and honor the experiences of the research participants but also prevents the exploration of such unexamined phenomenon in depth as well as in breadth.

Also, in order to assess the impact of self-disclosure on intercultural friendship development between Taiwanese and native English speakers, this task calls for a comparative examination of

friendships between Taiwanese international students and native English speakers in the US as opposed to the friendships between native English speakers living in Taiwan and Taiwanese people. Ellingsworth's (1996) theory of adaptation in intercultural dyads provides the theoretical rationale for this comparative proposal. Adaptation theory proposes that territorial advantage or "owning the turf (p. 276)" is one of the major factors that conditions adaptation. Specifically, because the participant with a territorial advantage has both physical and psychological control of the environment, the responsibility of adaptation then usually falls on the shoulders of the other party, the foreigner, and requires him/her to display an increase in adaptation. Therefore, it is argued here that the foreigners' adjustment of their self-disclosure has more impact on the development of the intercultural friendships. Hence, it is more critical and crucial to examine the foreigners' experiences of disclosing themselves when making friends with members of the host culture. In sum, this study will examine the dimensions and topics of self-disclosure among three groups of participants for comparison and contrast: (a) Taiwanese sojourning in the US, (b) native English speakers living in Taiwan, and (c) Taiwanese people who primarily socialize with other Taiwanese.

Prior to conducting this research, to ensure and secure the rights of the research participants as well as this project, I first underwent online training for human participant protection education for research and then applied and obtained an approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the university with which I am affiliated. The data were collected after obtaining informed consent from the participants. Additionally, since this project involved respondents from or in Taiwan who may not be familiar with the English language, I used a Chinese version of the consent form which was also approved by the Institutional Review Board in order to protect and ensure the rights of the Taiwanese respondents.

## Procedures and Research Instruments

Sojourning Taiwanese living in the US, sojourning native English speakers living in Taiwan, and Taiwanese in Taiwan who primarily socialize with other Taiwanese were recruited through direct contact. In addition, a snowball sampling procedure, “commonly used in studies of difficult-to-locate populations” (Blee, 1998, p. 385), was also employed. Sojourning Taiwanese, sojourning native English speakers, and Taiwanese in Taiwan who expressed an interest in participating were asked if they had established close friendships with members of the dominant culture in which they live in, and additionally those who participated in the qualitative portion of this study were asked if they were willing to be tape-recorded during the interview.

### *Quantitative Survey*

I developed a survey questionnaire consisting of four identical scale items to assess the relationship between thirteen dependent variables of self-disclosure (four dimensions of self-disclosure, six topic areas of self-disclosure, comfortability, language, and culture) and three levels of intercultural friendships (strangers, casual friends, and good friends) plus one level of intimate intracultural friendships along with several independent demographic variables. Specifically, the selected four dimensions of self-disclosure were based on Wheelless' (1978) Revised Self-disclosure Scale (RSDS), namely (a) intended disclosure, (b) amount of disclosure, (c) positive-negative disclosure, and (d) control of depth. RSDS has been found to be reliable for the selected dimensions: intent, .85; amount, .88; positiveness/negativeness, .91, and depth, .84 (Wheelless, 1978). On the other hand, the focused 6 topic areas were derived from the Jourard-Lasakow Self-Disclosure questionnaire (1958), namely (1) attitudes and opinions, (2) tastes and interests, (3) work or studies, (4) money, (5) personality, and (6) body and appearance.



With respect to the development of intercultural friendship, it was operationalized based on the levels of intimacy and closeness into three distinct categories: (a) strangers, (b) causal friends, and (c) good friends. In addition, one level of intimate intracultural friendship was added for comparison and contrast with intercultural friendships with good friends. In total, the survey consisted of 66 scale items and 11 demographic questions. Lastly, the survey questionnaire asked the participants to rank all the statements on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 5 (*strongly agree*) to 1 (*strongly disagree*).

Moreover, there were three versions of the survey for each of the three specified groups. In the case of Taiwanese people who do not speak English, an equivalent version of the survey in Chinese was translated, proofread and checked by a native Chinese speaker who does not speak any other language. Additionally, a bilingual individual fluent in both Chinese and English read the Chinese version of the survey and translated the items back into English to check semantic connotations of the word choices as it is customarily done with translated surveys (Lin & Harwood, 2003).

### *Qualitative Interview*

Except for a few respondents who only participated in the interview alone, all the respondents who completed the survey were invited to participate in the qualitative portion of this study. Prior to the actual interview, the respondents were informed of their voluntary participation as well as the use of audio tapes for the convenience of transcription and subsequent analysis. Since the primary objective of this study is to explore and identify how self-disclosure influence intercultural friendship development, it is crucial to elicit open-ended response during interviews. Therefore, the most suitable interview design for this study is that of respondent interviews (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). Essentially, the interview required the

participants to answer a series of identical questions and provide personal accounts or anecdotes based on their experiences of making friends with members of the host culture.

The setting of the interview was left to the discretion of the respondent. Most interviews were conducted in a public setting such as a coffee shop, a restaurant, a park, or a university office while a few interviews were held in either the homes of the participants or the home of the author. Interviews ranged from 30 minutes to 90 minutes. Primarily, the interview required each respondent to answer a series of identical questions and provide personal accounts or anecdotes based on their experiences. Specifically, the respondents were asked general and open-ended questions regarding friendship development, self-disclosure in general, and topics of self-disclosure. For each sojourning Taiwanese and sojourning native English speakers, they were asked the following questions:

1. Do your intercultural friendships develop in a different way or at a different pace compared with your intracultural friendships? Please describe and explain in detail.
2. In terms of sharing and disclosing personal information, do your friendships with casual intercultural friends differ or are they similar with your friendships with good intercultural friends?
3. Similarly, how do you self-disclose similarly or differently in intimate intercultural friends as opposed to intimate intracultural friends?
4. In terms of topics of self-disclosure, what kinds of topics do you usually discuss with your intercultural friends?
5. Are there certain topics that you would only discuss with intercultural friends but not with friends from your own culture? On the other hand, are there certain topics you would rather share with friends from your own culture instead?

On the other hand, as a comparison group, each Taiwanese in Taiwan participating in the qualitative portion of this study were asked questions such as the ones listed below:

1. In your experiences, how does the friendship development with casual (Taiwanese) friends differ from that with good (Taiwanese friends)? In addition, please briefly describe how your friendships with good (Taiwanese) friends develop and explain what the key factors contributing to such development of close friendships are.
2. When conversing with casual (Taiwanese) friends as opposed to good (Taiwanese) friends, are there differences in terms of your voluntary self-disclosure of personal information? If yes, why? On the contrary, if no, why not?
3. What topics do you usually talk about with casual (Taiwanese) friends and good (Taiwanese) friends respectively? Are there certain topics you only discuss with your good (Taiwanese friends) and why? Also, are there certain topics you only discuss with your casual (Taiwanese) friends and why?

## Research Participants

### *Sample Universe*

The population for the present study was comprised of (a) sojourning Taiwanese residing in a large metropolitan area in the Southwestern US, (b) sojourning native English speakers residing in a large city in Northern Taiwan, and (c) Taiwanese people in Taiwan who primarily socialized with other Taiwanese. The primary criteria for the selection of participants were their experiences in making friends as well as their cultural backgrounds.

### *Sample Unit*

Each participant was at least 18 years of age as specified in the IRB-approved consent form. Also, each sojourning Taiwanese and sojourning native English speaker had developed both close intercultural friendships with members of the host culture and intimate intracultural friendships while each Taiwanese in Taiwan had developed intimate friendships with other Taiwanese people.

### *Sample Size*

The nature of purposeful sampling in this study concerning the development of intimate intercultural friendships involved the difficulty of gaining access to the selected populations of sojourning individuals except for the control group of the Taiwanese living in Taiwan. Thus, this study was comprised of a total of 172 surveys and 62 interviews from the three specified groups to enable meaningful statistical analysis.

*Quantitative Sample Size:* In the quantitative portion of this study, 49 sojourning Taiwanese with an average age of 28.02 years (ranging from 20 to 60 years), 56 sojourning native English speakers with an average age of 29.87 years (ranging from 22 to 51), and 67 Taiwanese in Taiwan with an average age of 26.59 years (ranging from 18 to 53) participated in this study. For the sojourning Taiwanese, 32.7% were males while 67.3% were females. In terms of education levels, 26.5% of the sojourning Taiwanese were undergraduate students, 40.8% were post graduate students, 14.3% were doctoral candidates, and 18.4% were not in school. On average, the sojourning Taiwanese had lived in the US between 2 years and 30 months ( $m = 4.32$ ;  $sd = .32$ ) with an average of 1 to 5 US American friends ( $m = 1.95$ ;  $sd = .17$ ) and an average of 11 to 15 Taiwanese friends in the US ( $m = 3.00$ ;  $sd = .22$ ).

For the 56 sojourning English speakers who filled out a quantitative survey, 69.6% were males while 30.4% were females. With respect to their nationalities, 46.4% of the participants were from the US, 26.8% from Canada, 8.9% from the United Kingdom, 1.8% from Australia, 14.3% from New Zealand, and 1.8% from South Africa. The majority (69.6%) of the sojourning native English speakers in this study came to Taiwan to work with 3.6% holding a high school diploma, 58.9% a bachelor's degree, 23.2% a master's degree, and 3.6% a doctoral degree. On average, the participants had lived in Taiwan between 2 years and 30 months ( $m = 4.10$ ;  $sd = .32$ )

with an average number of 6 – 10 Taiwanese friends ( $m = 2.42$ ;  $sd = .18$ ) and an average number of 6 – 10 friends from their own cultures ( $m = 2.83$ ;  $sd = .20$ ).

For the 67 Taiwanese in Taiwan who participated in the quantitative surveys, 38.8% were males while 61.2% were females. In terms of the respondents' educational levels, 14.9% had a high school diploma, 53.7% had a bachelor's degree, 19.4% had a master's degree, and 11.9% indicated other. In addition, 49.3% of the respondents were students at the time of the research while 50.7% were not. On average, the Taiwanese in Taiwan in this study had 1 – 5 Taiwanese friends that they socialized with on a regular basis.

*Qualitative Sample Size:* A total of 61 sojourning Taiwanese ( $n = 21$ ) in the US, sojourning native English speakers ( $n = 20$ ), Taiwanese in Taiwan ( $n = 21$ ) participated in the qualitative portion of this study. For the 21 sojourning Taiwanese whom the researcher interviewed, their average age was 26.57 (ranging from 20 to 36 years) with an average sojourning time of 38.61 months or an equivalent of 3 years and 3 months ( $sd = 43.78$ ) in the US. In terms of sex distribution, 33.3% were males while 66.7% were females. With respect to occupation and education level, the vast majority of 21 sojourning Taiwanese in the qualitative portion of this study were international students except for one working professional. At the time of this research, 28.6% were undergraduate students, 38.1% were master graduate students, 9.5% were doctoral candidates, and 19.0% were studying at intensive English language programs.

For the 20 sojourning native English speakers whom the researcher interviewed, their average age was 34.55 (ranging from 22 to 65 years) with an average sojourning time of 33.25 months or an equivalent of 2 years and 9 months ( $sd = 24.92$ ) in Taiwan. In terms of sex distribution, 90.0% were males while 10.0% were females. With respect to occupation and education level, all of 20 sojourning native English speakers in the qualitative portion of this

study were working professionals teaching English as a foreign language in Taiwan. At the time of this research, 30.0% of the participants taught English at the kindergarten/elementary school level, 5.0% at the high school level, 25.0% at the 4-year university/college level, and 40.0% taught English at cram schools to a mixture of adults and teenagers.

For the 21 Taiwanese in Taiwan who participated in the qualitative portion of this study, their average age was 26.28 (ranging from 19 to 31 years). In terms of sex distribution, 52.4% were males while 47.6% were females. With respect to occupation and education level, 9.5% were working professionals with an associate's degree, 47.6% were working professionals with a bachelor's degree, 19.0% were working professionals with a master's degree, 9.5% were undergraduate students, 14.3% were graduate students during the time of the interview.

## Analysis

### *Quantitative Analysis*

In terms of quantitative statistical testing, the third research question was answered using paired-samples T-tests; the remaining research questions were answered using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). Significant findings were probed using follow-up analysis of variance (ANOVA). On the other hand, the hypothesis was tested using repeated measures ANOVA comparing sojourning Taiwanese' four levels of amount and depth of self-disclosure.

### *Qualitative Analysis*

For the qualitative data, the interviewees' comments were first transcribed, translated if the interviews were not conducted in English, and then coded according to factors and themes associated with self-disclosure and relational development. In terms of analysis, the data were analyzed from an interpretive perspective that focuses on pattern recognition (Lindlof & Taylor,

2002), and allows researchers to make subjective decisions based on evidence from the phenomenon of interest (Potter, 1996). Empirically, interpretive research has also become very common in intercultural communication since the late 1980s, because it enables researchers to “focus on reciprocal and emergent relationships between communication and culture” (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002, p. 23).

The process of analysis began with the researcher thoroughly examining, reviewing, and comparing all the transcribed statements in order to identify emerging patterns and themes. I coded the transcriptions according to corresponding patterns to allow categories to emerge identifying and classifying pertinent ideas in the data. For the purpose of recognizing patterns distinct and unique to each of the three specified groups, the data from the three specified groups were first coded separately. Subsequently, I labeled the overarching themes that emerged from comparing and contrasting the patterns derived from the three groups. Finally, the results were discussed in relation to three theories: (a) the social penetration theory (Altman & Taylor, 1973), (b) the anxiety/uncertainty management theory (Gudykunst & Hammer, 1987; Gudykunst, 1995 & 1996), and (c) a theory of adaptation in intercultural dyads (Ellingsworth, 1996).

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results of the data analysis to demonstrate how the research questions and hypothesis raised in this study were answered. The results of the quantitative analysis are followed by the results of the qualitative analysis of the interviewees' comments. Finally, general results of both the quantitative and qualitative findings will be presented.

#### Quantitative Results

Before conducting quantitative analysis to answer the proposed research questions and hypothesis, the research instrument first went through statistical pre-testing for internal reliability, and construct validity. The results are presented below:

##### *Internal Reliability*

Cronbach's alphas measuring the reliability of the internal consistency of respondents' responses of the three surveys were .78 for Taiwanese sojourning in the US ( $n = 49$ ), .81 for native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan ( $n = 56$ ), and .90 for Taiwanese in Taiwan who primarily socialized with other Taiwanese ( $n = 67$ ) (see Table 1). Overall, the reliability of the survey data was relatively high.

Additionally, Cronbach's alphas for the subscales within each of the three surveys were also calculated (see Table 1). Firstly, Cronbach's alphas of all three subscales for the Taiwanese in Taiwan who primarily socialized with other Taiwanese remained quite high: .78 for communication with Taiwanese strangers, .85 for communication with casual Taiwanese friends, and .81 for communication with good Taiwanese friends. Secondly, Cronbach's alphas of all four subscales for Taiwanese sojourning in the US were acceptable: .67 for communication with



strangers who are native English speakers, .72 for communication with casual friends who are native English speakers, .61 for communication with good friends who are native English speakers, and .51 for communication with good Taiwanese friends. Thirdly, Cronbach's alphas for three of the four subscales for native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan were acceptable while one was below expectations: .67 for communication with Taiwanese strangers, .72 for communication casual Taiwanese friends, .43 for communication with good Taiwanese friends, and .56 for communication with good friends from one's own culture.

There are two potential explanations for the low reliability of the subscale focusing on the native English speakers' communication with good Taiwanese friends in Taiwan. One potential explanation is that the low reliability could possibly be due to the effects of fatigue as the subscale was arranged as the second to last in the survey. However, the fact that the Cronbach's alpha for the last subscale was higher rather than lower leaves room for another supposition. Thus, this could also be interpreted that they, as native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan, simply varied greatly in their self-disclosure with good Taiwanese friends since they were from six different English speaking countries.

### *Construct Validity*

Factor analysis was conducted on all 11 subscales in the three surveys for the three groups respectively. To begin with, for sojourning Taiwanese communicating with strangers who are native English speakers, a factor analysis produced a five-factor solution accounting for 69.3% of variance (see Table 2). Factor I labeled Comfortable Topics was comprised of five scale items that assessed topics that were easier and more comfortable to self-disclose to strangers. Factor II Amount of Self-disclosure was made up of two scale items measuring literally the amount of self-disclosure. Factor III Deep Topic comprised of three scale items assessing the topic of a

more personal nature and thus was the least likely to be disclosed in depth to strangers. Factor IV Positive-Negative Self-disclosure was made up of two scale items measuring the tendency to self-disclose either positively or negatively. Finally, factor V Intention to Self-disclose comprised of two scale items measuring as the name implies one's intent to disclose personal information.

Next, for sojourning Taiwanese communicating with casual friends who are native English speakers, a factor analysis produced a six-factor solution accounting for 71.9% of variance (see Table 3). Factor I labeled Comfortable Topics was comprised of five scale items. Factor II Deep Topic was made up of three scale items. Factor III Intention to Self-disclose comprised of two scale items. Factor IV Positive-Negative Self-disclosure was made up of two scale items. Factor V Amount of Self-disclosure was comprised of three scale items. Finally, factor VI labeled Intimate Topic was comprised of one scale item assessing the topic of an intimate nature that one was not likely to disclose to casual friends.

Furthermore, for sojourning Taiwanese communicating with good friends who are native English speakers, a factor analysis produced a three-factor solution accounting for 63.6% of variance (see Table 4). Factor I labeled Comfortable Topics was comprised of five scale items. Factor II Positive-Negative Self-disclosure was made up of two scale items. Finally, Factor III labeled Intimate Topic was comprised of four scale items assessing the topic that one only intended to disclose in great amount to close friends.

Regarding the self-disclosure instrument for sojourning Taiwanese communicating with good Taiwanese friends, a factor analysis produced a five-factor solution accounting for 74.1% of variance (see Table 5). Factor I labeled Superficial Topics was comprised of four scale items measuring casual topics that one could easily disclose in depth. Factor II Positive-Negative Self-disclosure was made up of three scale items. Factor III "Comfortable Topics" was

comprised of four scale items. Factor IV Intention to Self-disclose was made up of two scale items. Finally, factor III labeled Intimate Topic was comprised of two scale items.

On the other hand, with respect to the self-disclosure instrument for sojourning native English speakers communicating with Taiwanese strangers, factor analysis produced a three-factor solution account for 62.9% of variance (see Table 6). Factor I labeled Comfortable Topics was comprised of four scale items. Factor II Positive-Negative Self-disclosure was made up of three scale items, and Factor III Amount of Self-disclosure was comprised of three scale items. Secondly, for sojourning native English speakers communicating with casual Taiwanese friends, factor analysis produced a four-factor solution account for 73.4% of variance (see Table 7). Factor I labeled Comfortable Topics was comprised of five scale items. Factor II Depth of Self-disclosure was made up of two scale items assessing literally the depth of disclosing personal information. Factor III Language and Culture was comprised of two scale items that assessed the relation between language, culture, and self-disclosure. Lastly, Factor IV Intention to Self-disclose was made up one scale item.

Moreover, for sojourning native English speakers communicating with good Taiwanese friends, factor analysis produced a five-factor solution account for 75.3% of variance (see Table 8). Factor I labeled Comfortable Topics was comprised of four scale items. Factor II Amount of Self-disclosure was made up of two scale items. Factor III Language and Culture was comprised of two scale items. Factor IV labeled Often-disclosed Topics was made up of two scale items assessing topics that one often disclosed to good friends. Finally, Factor V Intimate Topic was comprised of one scale item.

Regarding the self-disclosure instrument or sojourning native English speakers communicating with good friends from one's own culture, factor analysis produced a five-factor

solution account for 73.8% of variance (see Table 9). Factor I Comfortable Topics was comprised of five scale items. Factor II Positive-Negative Self-disclosure was made up of two scale items. Factor III Deep Topics was comprised of three scale items. Factor IV Amount of Self-disclosure was made up of two scale items. Lastly, Factor V Intention to Self-disclose was comprised of two scale items.

Finally, with respect to the three self-disclosure instruments for Taiwanese in Taiwan, for Taiwanese in Taiwan communicating with Taiwanese strangers, factor analysis produced a four-factor solution account for 73.6% of variance (see Table 10). Factor I Intimate Topics was comprised of five scale items. Factor II Amount of Self-disclosure was made up of two scale items. Factor III Positive-Negative Self-disclosure was comprised of two scale items. Factor IV Intention to Self-disclose was made up of two scale items. Secondly, for Taiwanese in Taiwan communicating with casual Taiwanese friends, factor analysis produced a three-factor solution account for 65.0% of variance (see Table 11). Factor I Intimate Topics was comprised of five scale items. Factor II Intention to Self-disclose was made up of three scale items. Factor III Amount of Self-disclosure was made up of two scale items. Finally, for Taiwanese in Taiwan communicating with good Taiwanese friends, factor analysis produced a four-factor solution account for 69.9% of variance (see Table 11). Factor I Comfortable Topics was comprised of eight scale items. Factor II Intention to Self-disclose was made up of two scale items. Factor III Amount of Self-disclosure was made up of two scale items, and, lastly, Factor IV Positive-Negative Self-disclosure was comprised of two scale items.

#### *Dimensions of Self-Disclosure in Intracultural versus Intercultural Friendships*

The first research question inquires how the following three groups of individuals, (a) Taiwanese sojourning in the US, (b) native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan, and (c)

Taiwanese people who primarily socialize with other Taiwanese, vary on the four dimensions of self-disclosure, namely intention, amount, depth, and positive-negative. This question was answered using a series of 3 (group)  $\times$  3 (friendship level) between-subject multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were calculated on eight dependent variables: (a) two variables on intention to self-disclose, (b) two variables on amount of self-disclosure, (c) two variables on depth of self-disclosure, and (d) two variables on positive-negative self-disclosure.

The MANOVAs revealed that a significant difference exists between the three groups with respect to their intention (*Wilk's Lambda*(12, 328) = 2.64,  $p < .01$ ) and amount of self-disclosure (*Wilk's Lambda*(12, 328) = 5.21,  $p < .001$ ). Follow-up univariate ANOVAs revealed significant differences for intention and amount of self-disclosure with strangers among the three groups (see Table 13). Generally, sojourning native English speakers in Taiwan ( $m = 3.98$ ) were more intentional in their self-disclosure with strangers than sojourning Taiwanese in the US ( $m = 3.89$ ) and Taiwanese in Taiwan ( $m = 3.53$ ). On the contrary, for both scale items on the amount of self-disclosure, Taiwanese in Taiwan ( $m_1 = 3.71$ ;  $m_2 = 3.82$ ) reported the greatest amount of self-disclosure with strangers than sojourning Taiwanese in the US ( $m_1 = 3.32$ ;  $m_2 = 3.20$ ) and sojourning native English speakers in Taiwan ( $m_1 = 2.57$ ;  $m_2 = 2.67$ ). Otherwise, the three groups did not differ significantly in the other two dimensions of self-disclosure across the three levels of friendships: positive-negative self-disclosure and depth of self-disclosure.

#### *Topics of Self-Disclosure in Intracultural versus Intercultural Friendships*

The second research question asks how the following three groups of individuals, (a) Taiwanese sojourning in the US, (b) native English speakers sojourning Taiwan, and (c) Taiwanese people who primarily socialize with other Taiwanese, differ or are similar in their topics of self-disclosure. This question was answered using a series of 3 (group)  $\times$  3 (friendship

level) between-subject multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were conducted on six dependent variables: (a) attitudes and opinions, (b) tastes and interests, (c) studies or work, (d) money, (e) personality, and (f) body and appearances. The MANOVAs revealed that a significant difference exists between the three groups in the following four topics of self-disclosure: tastes and interests (*Wilk's Lambda*(6, 334) = 5.11,  $p < .001$ ), studies or work (*Wilk's Lambda*(6, 334) = 8.12,  $p < .001$ ), personality (*Wilk's Lambda*(6, 334) = 4.58,  $p < .001$ ), and body and appearances (*Wilk's Lambda*(6, 334) = 2.68,  $p < .05$ ).

First, in terms of self-disclosure with strangers, follow-up univariate ANOVAs revealed significant differences among the three groups in 3 topics: tastes and interests ( $F(2,169) = 8.54$ ,  $p < .01$ ), studies or work ( $F(2,169) = 19.34$ ,  $p < .01$ ), and personality ( $F(2,169) = 10.66$ ,  $p < .01$ ) (see Table 14). Generally, sojourning native English speakers in Taiwan disclosed more personal information regarding their tastes and interests ( $m = 3.89$ ), studies or work ( $m = 4.07$ ), and personality ( $m = 3.30$ ) to strangers than sojourning Taiwanese in the US ( $m = 3.48$ ;  $m = 3.61$ ;  $m = 3.12$ ) followed by Taiwanese in Taiwan ( $m = 3.11$ ;  $m = 3.00$ ;  $m = 2.44$ ).

Second, in terms of self-disclosure with casual friends, follow-up univariate ANOVAs revealed significant differences among the three groups in 3 topics: tastes and interests ( $F(2,169) = 13.44$ ,  $p < .01$ ), studies or work ( $F(2,169) = 16.35$ ,  $p < .01$ ), and personality ( $F(2,169) = 11.43$ ,  $p < .01$ ) (see Table 14). Generally, sojourning native English speakers in Taiwan disclosed more personal information regarding their tastes and interests ( $m = 4.21$ ), studies or work ( $m = 4.32$ ), and personality ( $m = 3.76$ ) to casual friends than sojourning Taiwanese in the US ( $m = 4.00$ ;  $m = 4.02$ ;  $m = 3.61$ ) followed by Taiwanese in Taiwan ( $m = 3.50$ ;  $m = 3.52$ ;  $m = 3.01$ ).

Third, in terms of self-disclosure with good friends, follow-up univariate ANOVAs revealed significant differences among the three groups in 2 topics: studies or work ( $F(2,169) = 3.54$ ,  $p$

< .05), and body and appearances ( $F(2,169) = 7.46, p < .01$ ) (see Table 14). Generally, sojourning native English speakers in Taiwan disclosed more personal information regarding their studies or work ( $m = 4.44$ ) to good friends than sojourning Taiwanese in the US ( $m = 4.26$ ) followed by Taiwanese in Taiwan ( $m = 4.08$ ). However, when it comes to the topic of body and appearances, Taiwanese in Taiwan ( $m = 3.55$ ) disclosed more personal information to good friends than sojourning Taiwanese ( $m = 2.95$ ) followed by sojourning native English speakers in Taiwan ( $m = 2.92$ ). Lastly, the three groups did not differ significantly in their self-disclosure regarding the topics of their attitudes and their financial concerns across the three levels of friendships.

#### *Self-Disclosure in Intracultural Intimate Friendships and Intercultural Intimate Friendships*

The third research question inquires how an individual's self-disclosure is similar or different in intimate intercultural friendships as opposed to intimate intracultural friendships. To answer this question, a series of paired-samples T-tests were calculated to comparing the mean scores of the four dimensions and six topics of self-disclosure between intercultural friendships and intracultural friendships among two groups: (a) Taiwanese sojourning in the US, and (b) native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan. In the group of native English speakers living in Taiwan, the results indicate no statistical significance in terms of their self-disclosure with good Taiwanese friends as opposed to their self-disclosure with good friends from their own culture.

On the other hand, in the group of Taiwanese sojourning in the US, 2 of the 15 paired scale items reached statistical significance. Specifically, for the first scale item labeled Intention 1 (When I wish, my self-disclosure are always accurate reflections of who I really am.), the paired-samples T-test comparing the means scores of (a) sojourning Taiwanese's intention to self-disclose to good friends who are native English speakers and (b) sojourning Taiwanese's

intention to self-disclose to good Taiwanese friends found a significant difference between the means of the two groups ( $t(48) = -2.372, p < .05$ ) (see Table 15). The means of sojourning Taiwanese' intention to self-disclose to good Taiwanese friends was higher ( $m = 4.26, sd = .670$ ) than their intention to self-disclose to good friends who are native English speakers ( $m = 4.02, sd = .628$ ).

Similarly, for the second scale item labeled Intention 2 (When I express my personal feelings, I am always aware of what I am doing and saying.), the paired-samples T-test comparing the means scores of (a) sojourning Taiwanese's intention to self-disclose to good friends who are native English speakers and (b) sojourning Taiwanese's intention to self-disclose to good Taiwanese friends found a significant difference between the means of the two groups ( $t(48) = -3.005, p < .05$ ) (see Table 15). The means of sojourning Taiwanese' intention to self-disclose to good Taiwanese friends was higher ( $m = 4.34, sd = .804$ ) than their intention to self-disclose to good friends who are native English speakers ( $m = 4.04, sd = .789$ ). Generally, sojourning Taiwanese in the US had a stronger intent to disclose to good Taiwanese friends, their intimate intracultural friends, than to good US American friends, their intimate intercultural friends.

#### *Self-Disclosure and Intercultural Friendship Formation and Development*

The fourth research question inquires about the extent to which self-disclosure affects the formation and development of intercultural friendships between (a) Taiwanese sojourning in the US and native English speakers, and (b) native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan and Taiwanese. A series of  $2$  (group)  $\times$   $4$  (friendship level) between-subject multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were performed to answer this research question. The MANOVAs revealed that a significant difference exists between the two groups with respect to their intended



self-disclosure ( $Wilk's\ Lambda(8, 96) = 2.27, p < .05$ ) and their self-disclosure regarding the topic of one's attitudes, opinions, and beliefs ( $Wilk's\ Lambda(4, 100) = 2.50, p < .05$ ). First, regarding the intended self-disclosure, follow-up univariate ANOVAs revealed a significant difference among the two groups regarding the second scale item for intended self-disclosure, which states "I often disclose intimate and personal things about myself without hesitation.", with good friends from one's own culture ( $F(1,103) = 5.21, p < .05$ ) (see Table 16). Generally, sojourning Taiwanese in the US ( $m = 4.34$ ) were more intentional in their self-disclosure with their good Taiwanese friends than sojourning native English speakers in Taiwan ( $m = 3.89$ ).

Second, with respect to self-disclosure in the topic regarding attitudes, opinions, and beliefs, follow-up univariate ANOVAs revealed significant differences among the two groups in their self-disclosure in this topic with intercultural strangers ( $F(1,103) = 6.12, p < .05$ ) and also with good friends from one's own culture ( $F(1,103) = 4.19, p < .05$ ) (see Table 16). Generally, sojourning native English speakers in Taiwan disclosed more personal information regarding their attitudes, opinions, and beliefs both with Taiwanese strangers ( $m = 3.50$ ) and with good friends from their own culture ( $m = 4.48$ ) than sojourning Taiwanese in the US with strangers who were native English speakers ( $m = 2.97$ ) and with their good Taiwanese friends ( $m = 4.08$ ).

### *Hypothesis 1*

H1 predicts that sojourning Taiwanese would self-disclose in greater depth but in lesser amount than sojourning native English speakers. A series of four repeated measures ANOVAs were performed comparing sojourning Taiwanese' amount as well as depth of self-disclosure to friends at four different intimate levels: (a) with strangers who were native English speakers, (b) with causal friends who were native English speakers, (c) with good friends who were native English speakers, and (d) with good Taiwanese friends.

First, for the scale item labeled Amount One (I do not often talk about myself.), a one-way repeated measures ANOVA using the Greenhouse-Geisser sphericity correction revealed a significant interaction effect among sojourning Taiwanese's amount of self-disclosure at the four friendship levels ( $F(3,144) = 8.32, p < .001$ ). Follow-up protected  $t$  tests revealed that scores decreased significantly from level (a) disclosing to strangers who were native English speakers ( $m = 3.32, sd = 1.16$ ) to level (b) disclosing to casual friends who were native English speakers ( $m = 2.81, sd = .97$ ), from level (b) to level (c) disclosing to good friend who were native English speakers ( $m = 2.48, sd = .84$ ), and again from level (a) to level (d) disclosing to good Taiwanese friends ( $m = 2.57, sd = 1.19$ ). It appears that as the levels of intercultural intimacy increased, sojourning Taiwanese in this study tended to disclose more.

Second, for the scale item labeled Amount Two (My conversation lasts the least time when I am discussing myself.), a one-way repeated measures ANOVA using the Greenhouse-Geisser sphericity correction was calculated. No significant interaction effect among the four friendship levels was found ( $F(3,144) = 3.91, p > .001$ ). No significant differences exists among sojourning Taiwanese' self-disclosure to (a) strangers who were native English speakers ( $m = 3.20, sd = .97$ ), (b) casual friends who were native English speakers ( $m = 3.10, sd = .91$ ), (c) good friends who were native English speakers ( $m = 2.73, sd = .99$ ), and (d) good Taiwanese friends ( $m = 2.81, sd = 1.13$ ). Contrary to the finding for Amount One, this indicates that sojourning Taiwanese's amount of self-disclosure did not differ with the intimacy of intercultural friendships.

Third, for the scale item labeled Depth One (I intimately disclose who I really am openly and fully in my conversation.), a one-way repeated measures ANOVA using the Greenhouse-Geisser sphericity correction revealed a significant interaction effect among sojourning Taiwanese's depth of self-disclosure at the four friendship levels ( $F(3,144) = 31.24, p$

< .001). A follow-up protected *t* tests revealed that scores increased significantly from level (b) disclosing to casual friends who were native English speakers ( $m = 3.34, sd = .92$ ) to level (c) disclosing to good friend who were native English speakers ( $m = 4.08, sd = .64$ ), and also from level (a) disclosing to strangers who were native English speakers ( $m = 3.08, sd = 1.16$ ) to level (d) disclosing to good Taiwanese friends ( $m = 4.28, sd = .70$ ). This signifies that as the levels of intercultural intimacy increased, sojourning Taiwanese in this study tended to disclose in greater depth.

Fourthly, for the scale item labeled Depth Two (I often disclose intimate and personal things about myself without hesitation.), a one-way repeated measures ANOVA using the Greenhouse-Geisser sphericity correction revealed a significant interaction effect among sojourning Taiwanese's depth of self-disclosure at the four friendship levels ( $F(3,144) = 49.12, p < .001$ ). Follow-up protected *t* tests revealed that scores increased significantly from (a) disclosing to strangers who were native English speakers ( $m = 2.24, sd = 1.03$ ) to level (b) disclosing to casual friends who were native English speakers ( $m = 2.93, sd = .92$ ), and from level (b) to level (c) disclosing to good friend who were native English speakers ( $m = 3.75, sd = .85$ ), and again from level (a) to level (d) disclosing to good Taiwanese friends ( $m = 3.77, sd = 1.00$ ). Consistent with the finding for Depth One, this indicates that as the levels of intercultural intimacy increased, sojourning Taiwanese in this study tended to disclose in greater depth.

Additionally, in terms of sojourning Taiwanese' grand total of Depth and Amount, Grand Depth was negatively associated with Magazines as a Major Source of News and Time Take to Make Friends with Native English Speakers at the .01 significance level (see Table 18). Also, Grand Depth was negatively associated with Grand Amount at the .05 significance level (see

Table 18). Overall, H1 which predicted that sojourning Taiwanese would self-disclose in greater depth but in lesser amount is ported.

### Qualitative Results

Five primary themes emerged from the data analysis. These themes were labeled as follows:

(a) Issues Affecting Self-disclosure in Intercultural Friendships, (b) Self-disclosure among Sojourners, (c) Self-disclosure and Stages of Intercultural Friendship Development, (d) Friendship Closeness and Topics of Self-disclosure, and (e) Self-disclosure and Cultural Adaptation. The themes will now be discussed in detail next.

#### *Issues Affecting Self-Disclosure in Intercultural Friendships*

The first major theme emerging from the data revolved around the two groups of sojourning interviewees' comments on the factors that affected their self-disclosure when conversing with members of the host culture. First, the uniqueness of the factors emerged was supported by their mere absence in the data from the comparative group of local Taiwanese participants in Taiwan. Secondly, the universality of these factors derived from their permeating influence throughout the stages of intercultural friendship development.

The four categories comprising this theme included: (a) English Language Skills, (b) Differing Cultural Values and Norms, (c) Communication Styles and Competence, and (d) Power Difference and Unearned Privilege.

*English Language Skills:* The category describes the prevailing influence of individuals' English language skills on the development of intercultural friendships and self-disclosure between Taiwanese and native English speakers both in the US and in Taiwan. As foreigners in an English-speaking country, sojourning Taiwanese in the US and the host US Americans almost

without exceptions communicated in English. On the other hand, since the overwhelming majority of the sojourning native English speakers in this study had minimum to nonexistent Chinese language skills, the conversations between the English speaking sojourners and Taiwanese without much choice were mostly in English as well. Besides, the dominance of English as the common international language further assists the diffusion of English around the globe and elevates its status in intercultural communication (Martin & Nakayama, 2003), including intercultural encounters on Taiwanese soil as one sojourning native English speaker commented:

Many of the Taiwanese people are open to wanting to know English, because in Taiwan there is a very strong emphasis placed on learning English. I think many parents kind of almost push their children to have relationships with foreigners. Sometimes parents are kind of like push their teenage children in my direction and say “Speak to him, speak to him.” (Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 9 months sojourning)

Furthermore, Kachru (1998) proposes that English be considered an Asian language as it is in demand and is gradually acquiring a dominant status in the whole Asian region. This notion of Asian English conveys not only the colonial dimension of the English language in Asia but also the accompanying constructs of identities across cultures. More importantly, the prevalence of using English in Asia as well as in intercultural encounters has significant implications. First, as the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis suggests, the choice of language can confine and determine the range of meanings one can express. Second, the dominance of English helps to introduce cultural values of the English language into other cultures. As a result, the lexical items of other languages grow as their cultures grow (Hadley, 1997). Third, English as the world language of today creates power differences and issues of unearned privilege between native English speakers and non-native English speakers (Collier, 1998), which will be discussed in detail later.

First, in terms of intercultural friendship development, English competency among all the variables had the most influence especially during the initial stages of friendship development, as one participant remarked that “I think the biggest obstacle is the language barrier, and I believe it will get easier once I become fluent in English (Male/ 28/ sojourning Taiwanese/ 4.5 months sojourning).” Specifically, it determined the pace of intercultural friendship development as well as the potentially achievable level of friendship closeness as illustrated in the following two excerpts:

(1) If a Taiwanese person speaks only marginal English, then it does take a lot longer to develop relationships with them, because you want to say something. And I’ve been in a situation many times that I want to say something but I don’t know how to say it in Chinese and when I say it in English, they won’t know what I am talking about. (Male/ 38/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 months sojourning)

(2) It is just that in the first couples of years, if a Taiwanese doesn’t speak English, we couldn’t be best friends. (Male/ 27/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 3 years sojourning)

Thus, sojourning Taiwanese fluent in English stood better chances of establishing intimate intercultural friendships with US Americans compared with those who were still struggling with the English language. Similarly, sojourning native English speakers who only spoke English could only become good friends with Taiwanese fluent in English. All the local Taiwanese with whom the sojourning native English speakers were good friends demonstrated high levels of English competency as one participant responded:

I probably would disclose more to my Taiwanese friends primarily because if I think of any on the top of my head, generally they speak, their language skills are better. So, there would be more understanding and they could relate to what I am saying stronger, in a better way, or more effectively. (Male/ 39/ Sojourning Native English Speaker/ 1 year and 8 months sojourning)

Second, the amount, the depth, and the available topics of self-disclosure were largely dependent on the shared level of English competency among the intercultural dyads other than the two out of the forty-one cases where the sojourning native English speakers spoke moderate to fluent Chinese. Conceptually, Fehr (1996) categorizes self-disclosure as one of the dyadic

factors influencing friendship formation dependent on the interaction and reciprocity between the conversing partners' disclosing competence. When applying it to intercultural friendship formation, this author argues that the formation of friendship in intercultural dyads is not only dependent on both parties' disclosing competence but also on the non-native speakers' language competency.

In terms of amount of self-disclosure, English competency either directly influenced the amount of self-disclosure or it first affected the levels of apprehension that in turn influenced the amount of disclosure, which is consistent with Kudo and Simkin's (2003) finding, as one participant commented:

It takes longer to observe, because language barrier is still an issue for me and I am not that familiar with the English language yet. Whenever I don't understand something, I just smile and they think that I understand, so that they can keep talking to avoid awkwardness. (Female/ 36/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 5 months sojourning)

Furthermore, Taiwanese people's English language skills either sojourning or local also influenced the depth of self-disclosure with respect to disclosing intellectual capacity and inner emotions. One participant remarked that "With Taiwanese with limited English, certainly our conversations cannot develop into the same intellectual and philosophical depth in discussion (Male/ 52/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 5 years sojourning)." Another participant commented on her inability to make highly personal remarks to describe her inner emotions:

I find the biggest difference is that no matter how fluent your English is, it is still your second language, so you can never describe how you feel inside accurately. For instance, when I describe how I feel with good Taiwanese friends, we both can feel my emotions and sometimes make both of us feel so touched that we would cry. But, with American friends, I can describe to them the details of what happened to me but I find it hard to describe how I truly feel inside. (Female/ 26/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 1 year and 7 months sojourning)

Intimate levels of exchange such as intellectual exchange and emotional disclosure have to deal with more advanced levels of English vocabulary and comprehension. Accordingly, such exchange would not be feasible without a certain level of English competency. The quality of

message exchange as in self-disclosure is largely dependent upon non-native speakers' competence in the language employed for intercultural communication (Kudo & Simkin, 2003).

Finally, English competency of the Taiwanese people determined the available topics of disclosure. Basically, the more English the Taiwanese people knew, more topics would be available for disclosure and exchange. Thus, when conversing with a Taiwanese person with limited English, the available topics for discussion and disclosure were often limited to the common, highly visible, and superficial things that could easily be substituted and explained by nonverbal cues as the following excerpt illustrates:

In Taiwan, we talk about things that are easy to talk about. Maybe even if we don't know each other, we talk about how I look because that is all we have in common. So, because of limited vocabulary, that's all we can talk about. So, it's like "what I think about work" and "how I look" because that's all we can talk about. (Female/ 22/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 months sojourning)

Additionally, it appeared much harder for more senior sojourning native English speakers to make friends with Taiwanese people of their own age since generally it is the younger Taiwanese people who spoke better English. This again points to the importance that English competency holds for forming intercultural friendships. As the eldest sojourning English speaker in this study commented:

It is definitely more difficult to make friends with Taiwanese people my age, First, there are not many Taiwanese people my age whose English is good enough for us to form friendships. Also, the opportunity is not there. It is difficult to meet Taiwanese people my age because of the nature of my job. (Male/ 65/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 3 years sojourning)

In general, the shared level competency in a language employed for communication among any intercultural dyads is a highly conspicuous factor affecting the development of intercultural friendship and self-disclosure (Kudo & Simkin, 2003). In most cases whether or not the intercultural encounters take place in an English-speaking country, the language employed is English. Thus, the development of intercultural friendship and self-disclosure is often dependent



on the English language skills of the non-native English speakers. In addition, research has shown that when a native speaker has to make greater speech accommodation, it decreases the native speaker's attraction to the non-native English speaker (Kim, 1991). Thus, Taiwanese whether sojourning or local with high English competency are more likely to self-disclose and develop intimate intercultural friendships with native English speakers.

*Differing Cultural Values and Norms:* The second category comprising this theme was labeled "Differing Cultural Values and Norms." This category represents account made by participants on how the divergent cultural values and norms between Taiwan and Western English-speaking countries in general affected the development of intercultural friendship and self-disclosure.

To begin with, the underlying cultural value that had the most prominent impact on the development of intercultural friendships between Taiwanese and native English speakers is their respective cultural values concerning formality and informality. As a hierarchical culture, Taiwanese value formality and symmetrical relationships among people; on the contrary, as non-hierarchical cultures, native English speakers value informality and complementary relationships among people (Javidi & Javidi, 1991). When applying such diverging cultural values regarding formality and informality to the formation of intercultural friendship and self-disclosure in this study, its influences were evident in (a) the sojourners' preferences for formal as opposed to informal social avenues, (b) the sojourners' levels of comfort concerning the formality or informality of intercultural encounters, and (c) the sojourners' self-disclosure in formal versus informal social contexts.

In terms of preferences for social avenues, all 21 sojourning Taiwanese in this study tended to develop intercultural friendships with people they met through more formal or socially

prescribed channels. Overall, the available social avenues through which the sojourning Taiwanese met their intercultural friends were (a) schools, (b) churches, (c) workplace, (d) through living arrangements such as sharing a house or an apartment, (e) through connections, and (f) affiliated organizations. Among the six avenues, only three were mentioned more than one time: schools, churches, and through living arrangements. Given the fact the majority of sojourning Taiwanese in this study were international students, it is not surprising that workplace did not emerge as a prominent social avenue as it otherwise would have. Even though school was the most frequently mentioned avenue, more than half of the intercultural friendships formed through it remained acquaintance-like to causal relationships as one participant stated “The US Americans I came to know through school are more like acquaintances (Female/ 26/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 1 year and 7 months sojourning).” The most promising avenue emerged were churches as one participant recommended:

Usually I meet my American friends at church. It is a good way to make friends with Americans. In addition to Bible Church, I also participate in another church called Christ Church. If I have time like last semester, I try to attend both churches every week. Usually the church people they have patience and they listen to you, so it is good place to train yourself. (Male/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 9 months sojourning)

Once taken into account that church goes demonstrated more functional adaptive behavior than school students (Ellingsworth, 1996), it then is not surprising that churches were more friendly and accommodating places for sojourning Taiwanese to form intercultural friendships with members of the host culture. A more detailed discussion on self-disclosure and cultural adaptation will be presented later.

On the other hand, consistent with the overarching cultural values on informality, sojourning native English speakers were able to make friends with the local Taiwanese people through a wider range of both formal and informal social avenues: (a) schools or workplace, (b)

in social setting or through connections, (c) met by chance, (d) the Internet, (e) matching-making, (f) entrepreneur business, and (g) affiliated organizations. Since all of the sojourning native English speakers in this study taught English as a foreign language in Taiwan, one of the most prevalent channel for them to make friends with Taiwanese people was through the schools they worked for such as their boss, colleagues, and students as reflected in the following excerpt:

In terms of Taiwan and Taiwanese people, Taiwanese culture, first in relation to my job, I generally teach English. I work in a main language school here in Taipei. It has been a great experience. It gives me really good opportunities to meet a lot of Taiwanese people, different background. Of course, there are my co-workers. (Male/ 30/ Sojourning Native English Speaker/ 9 months sojourning)

When discussing the environmental factors that influence friendship formation, the workplace is identified as an important setting (Fehr, 1996). Workplace, however, was not the social avenue where most sojourning native English formed the most intimate intercultural friendships with the locals. It was actually in more informal social avenues such as night clubs and bars where most sojourning native English speakers were most comfortable and relaxed that the formation of intercultural friendships could take place.

Equally if not more prevalent, the sojourning native English speakers in this study also made friends with the local Taiwanese people through all other kinds of informal social avenues such as bars, house parties, on the train, being approached on the street, and all other imaginable avenues. The two excerpts below illustrated all kinds of possibilities:

(1) I am friends with this Taiwanese woman, Fan. She is about 35 and I just met her on the train going back to live where I am north of Taipei in Tamshui. I knew she was studying for an English examination, I believe it is the SAT or may have been the GRE, and I just looked over and started talking to her. She was very friendly and we continued to chat and we got off the train and I got her phone number and I met up with her. (Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 9 months sojourning)

(2) I met people through many occasions. I met people through friends, I met people in the dating scenes, I become friends with people in unusual situations such as talking to someone and they may just say get in touch with me or something like that. That's very rare, but that has happened. Basically, social situations and randomly. (Male/ 39/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 1 year and 8 months sojourning)

Overall, all sojourning native English speakers in this study were able to form intercultural friendships with the Taiwanese in any social contexts where they were most comfortable. Some preferred colleagues; others preferred Taiwanese people at night clubs and bars; still others preferred activity partners such as Kung-Fu partners.

With respect to the manners in which sojourners approached intercultural friendships, the overarching cultural values concerning formality dictated that sojourning Taiwanese would be more comfortable approaching intercultural relationships with certain formality. Thus, they often perceived it as cultural barrier or their lack of cultural knowledge when they felt there was no formality available to guide their interaction with members of the host culture. As one participant commented,

When I first came here, one thing that confuses me is “should I shake hand.” And they use different ways to shake hands. So, when you see people, should I hug or should I shake hand. And they have very different ways to shake hands, this...this...this... very different ways. Sometimes you are kind of nervous about which one should I use. Even Americans they have many different ways. (Male/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 9 months sojourning)

At other times, sojourning Taiwan regarded some aspects of the informality in the host individualistic culture as advantageous that had been comprised by the formality in Taiwanese culture. Additionally, sojourning in an individualistic culture allowed traditionally other-oriented Taiwanese individuals (Gao, 1996) more personal freedom and demand for privacy, which was perceived by some as liberating as shown in the following excerpt:

With good American friends, they are different from Taiwanese friends in the sense that they won't try to control you as much, so they can be really good listeners because they don't normally tell you what to do. (Female/ 25/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 3 years sojourning)

The issue of inclusion and relational control is also evident in this excerpt. The prevalence and the impact of relational control on the development of intercultural friendships will be explored in greater detail later.

On the contrary, for sojourning native English speakers who were used to the informality back home, their reactions to having to interact with Taiwanese people within the cultural formality varied depending on the stages of intercultural sensitivity they were in (Bennett, 1993). For example, some at the ethnorelative stage were able to recognize, accept, and adapt their behavior when interacting with Taiwanese people as one participant reported:

I approach the relationships with my Taiwanese friends with a degree of formality but much less of a degree of formality that I used to approach my relationships with my Japanese friends. Compared with my relationships with Dave, my British buddy, we approach the relationship very informally, extremely so. Generally speaking, Westerners approach Westerners very informally. (Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 9 months sojourning)

Similarly, others adapted by being more cautious and careful in order not to offend the local culture. However, in the extreme opposite of the ethnocentric end, some sojourning native English speakers tried to minimize cultural differences or avoided interacting usually with Taiwanese men and discredited them as ‘standoff fish’ as represented in the following example:

Both of my good Taiwanese friends are females, because I’d rather spend time with attractive women than guys. Perhaps I find Taiwanese males to be more standoff fish. Generally, Taiwanese guys are not that open-minded and they are more judgmental and they don’t like me going out with their women. (Male/ 35/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 2 years sojourning)

Overall, the degrees of formality to which sojourning Taiwanese and sojourning native English speakers were accustomed to impacted their comfort levels in interacting with their intercultural friends. Ultimately, those who adjusted better to the degrees of formality or informality required to facilitate intercultural interactions stood better chances of initiating and maintaining intercultural friendships with the locals.

In terms of the cultural values concerning formality versus informality on sojourners’ self-disclosure, Taiwanese people, whether sojourning or living in Taiwan, tended to worry more about the propriety of self-disclosure especially in formal social contexts as well as with casual

friends. Chen's study (1993) exploring Chinese meeting with North Americans supports that Chinese people are not used to causal self-disclosure, because context and experience play a crucial role in the typical Chinese way of learning about someone. As a result, the sojourning Taiwanese felt more ambivalent and apprehensive about whether or not to self-disclose as well as what to disclose beyond the superficial topics. As one participant commented, "With American friends at school, I can communicate with them but I often don't know how to chat with them besides talking about school work (Female/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 4 years sojourning)."

For the sojourning native English speakers, experiences taught some to be more cautious with what to self-disclose for fear of unintentionally offending the local culture while others still maintain an informal approach to self-disclosure. On the one hand, the excerpt below illustrated the consideration of propriety in self-disclosure.

I think some of the experiences I had have taught me to be more careful about who and what I say to people here because usually they are not trying to do me harm but it is part of the differences in character that they interpreted if different than what my meaning was. (Male/ 42/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 years sojourning)

On the other hand, the ensuing excerpt demonstrated causal self-disclosure.

My self-disclosure depends on who I am talking to, what we are doing at the moment such as drinking, what they appear to me, and it also depends on what kinds of moods I am in. (Male/ 28/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 3 years sojourning)

Second, the differing cultural norms also affected the sojourners' preferences for socializing activities that in turn had significant impact on the development of intercultural friendships.

Basically, each culture assigns meaning to what constitutes legitimate socializing activities as opposed to illegitimate ones, which often vary from culture to culture depending on the socially constructed cultural norms. For instance, between Taiwan and English-speaking countries, Taiwanese people tend to perceive 'drinking at bars,' 'clubbing into the wee hours' and 'smoking pot' as associated with illegal criminal activities, which people with propriety should refrain

from doing as dictated by Confucianism. Thus, most Taiwanese people label such social activities as illegitimate or at least unhealthy social activities and are not willing to engage in such activities. As one respondent reported,

I think that one factor that among most North Americans if you were to smoke pot or joint, oh, that doesn't matter. Everybody does it. Even if it is not something they do regularly. But most Taiwanese people they don't have that perception. They are areas in Taiwan that .....but I think overwhelming the Taiwanese society is still quite conservative, and I don't think they understand that. Even if someone is a college graduate in a society, they may have smoked pot or used drug some time in their lives. There is a very strong phobia among Taiwanese people about that. I don't think a lot of people here socially understand that. (Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 9 months sojourning)

However, going to bars to relax and socialize played a dominant role in most sojourning native English speakers' social life, while most Taiwanese people preferred socializing through going to movies, chatting in coffee shops, going out to eat, or going singing. Thus, this has pertaining relevance to relational development because it is through socializing activities that dyadic self-disclosing and bonding take place. In addition, empirical research shows that the frequency of exposure alone causes positive evaluation and even liking (as cited in Fehr, 1996). Without shared common social activities, intercultural friendships would never have the opportunity to develop. The following excerpt illustrates how the lack of shared social activities among intercultural dyads could impede the development of intercultural friendships.

What I like to do is go and see live performances, and there are a lot of opportunities to do that in Taiwan. I haven't found any Taiwanese people who like to do that as much as I do. So, like drinking and dancing by yourself. It is something I really really enjoy doing but Taiwanese people don't enjoy as much. And I don't like going to movies, but most Taiwanese people like to go to movies and sing at KTV. (Male/ 27/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 3 years sojourning)

Another respondent expressed how lack of opportunities presented difficulty in meeting Taiwanese people:

Like I know there are a lot of Taiwanese people who wouldn't like to go to bars. Because going to bars is such a big thing for me and that's what I do. That's my job. So, maybe it's harder for us to become close friends. I naturally become close friends with people who are

here (the sojourner's coffee shop) and at Fly (the sojourner's newly opened bar). (Male/ 25/ Sojourning native English speakers/ 4 years sojourning)

In short, cultural values and norms not only govern the degree of formality in approaching friendships but also prescribe the socially appropriate channels for the development of friendship. For instance, the importance of friendships based on the social context of having been classmates is a type of *guan-xi* or *kuan-hsi* (relations) is significantly more stressed in Chinese/Taiwanese culture than in Western cultures (Chang & Holt, 1991; Smart, 1999). Thus, differing cultural values and norms on formality as opposed to informality can pose additional challenges and restrictions to the development of intercultural friendship between Taiwanese and native English speakers if such cultural differences cannot be reframed or overcome.

*Communication Styles and Competence:* Communication competence is integrally tied to the interaction process and is a key factor influencing intercultural friendship formation (Collier, 1996; Gareis, 1995). However, the role of communication in Chinese/Taiwanese friendship formation differs from that in its Western counterparts. To varying extents, all sojourners in this study commented or at least mentioned the different communication styles or competence they observed between their intercultural friends and themselves.

Overall, the sojourning Taiwanese comparatively reported higher levels of uncertainty and anxiety expressing themselves while the sojourning native English speakers found their Taiwanese friends more uncomfortable or apprehensive communicating especially during initial orientations. One sojourning Taiwanese respondent remarked,

Basically, when interacting with Americans, I have a lot of struggles. There are things I do want to ask them, but I can't ask and I don't know what else to ask, but I do try hard to think of topics to discuss with them (Female/ 36/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 5 months sojourning).

Part of the sojourning Taiwanese' anxiety was associated with the pressure to verbalize and communicate oneself because of living in individualistic cultures (Triandis, 1995). Generally, the



Chinese/Taiwanese communication pattern is natural and spontaneous with greater premium placed on nonverbal and contextual cues and long-term interaction (Chen & Jensen, 1994; Cheng, 1987). As discussed earlier, other sources of anxiety for the sojourning Taiwanese included their English language skills and their need for formality in more casual social interactions.

The sojourning native English speakers consistently observed that their Taiwanese friends had higher levels of communication apprehension but tended to gradually relax after an extended period of interacting. The three excerpts below jointly illustrate this process. The first excerpt demonstrates the awkwardness and ambivalence with the initial intercultural encounters:

Taiwanese people won't speak to me right away but would keep looking at me and hope that I would speak to them. (Female/ 24/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 years sojourning)

The second excerpt highlights Taiwanese people's anxiety and apprehension towards communicating in English with sojourning native English speakers:

Most Taiwanese a little bit intimidated by foreigners. Even though they want to say everything, unless they say it perfectly, they won't. They are just intimidated maybe by our culture. (Male/ 39/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 years sojourning)

The third excerpt presents the contrast between the Taiwanese who were self-conscious and the Taiwanese people who were at ease as the intercultural friendships developed:

The Taiwanese are more self-conscious. They are not comfortable showing their personalities to people. But, once you get to know them and you get to really know them, it is almost like turning a page. Then, they are more relaxed and reveal more about themselves. (Male/ 28/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 3 years sojourning)

Besides the increasing level of comfort and self-disclosure accompanying relationship development (Altman & Taylor, 1973), two master scripts in Chinese culture also provide explanations for such drastic differences in communication. Specifically, the two Chinese phrases of *nei wai you bie* (insider-outsider distinctions) and *you shu zhi qin* (moving from being distant to being close) imply the embedded knowledge of the differentiated ways of interacting

with one's circle of friends and those outside that circle (Ye, 2004). Several studies also reveal that Chinese/Taiwanese people employ greater communicative skills and intense self-disclosure in intimate social relationships or close intercultural friendships (Chang & Holt, 1991; Chang & Holt, 1996; Gareis, 1995).

Additionally, interviews with Taiwanese in Taiwan provide insight into how Taiwanese people differentiate their self-disclosure in causal friendships as opposed to intimate friendships. The findings in this study showed that Taiwanese in Taiwan generally self-disclosed significantly less in causal friendships than in intimate friendships. In terms of the depth of self-disclosure, Taiwanese people in general disclose more surface and superficial information to causal friends while they engage in more intense and heart-felt self-disclosure with good friends as one participant explained:

I self-disclose differently with casual friends and good friends. The difference lies in that with good friends I disclose more details. For example, speaking of my new job, I told casual friends that I just got a new job working for a travel agency. I told good friends that my new job only paid \$21,000 N.T. dollars a month and I also disclosed my emotional ups and downs in the process. (Female/ 22/ Taiwanese in Taiwan)

Also, it is acceptable to disclose secrets and what is normally considered inappropriate to good friends because good friends has social obligations towards each other. One participant candidly remarked that:

Good friends disclose more and in greater depth. Oh, my younger school sister even told me that she had hemorrhoids. Good friends disclose their personal secrets, including things that people normally could not imagine. (Female/ 28/ Taiwanese in Taiwan)

In terms of the amount of self-disclosure, Taiwanese people normally did not self-disclose details to causal friends and hence less amount of self-disclosure to casual friends. With respect to positive-negative self-disclosure, Taiwanese people mostly reserve negative self-disclosure such as personal problems, worries, concerns, or misfortunes for good friends. Moreover,

Taiwanese people in general have much higher intention to self-disclose honestly and accurately to good friends. The following excerpt exemplifies all three dimensions:

I disclose less to casual friends. With good friends, as soon as you open your mouth, you talk about the things that have touched your heart recently. You talk about what's inside your heart directly. You talk about your feelings without pretense. For instance, you will never tell casual friends about your breakup or that your girlfriend betrayed you during your military training. But if something bad happened to me today, I would open my heart and bear my soul with good friends. (Male/ 26/ Taiwanese in Taiwan)

There were two additional dimensions of self-disclosure that emerge from the interviews with the Taiwanese in Taiwan, which has not yet been discussed in research on dimensions of self-disclosure. They were (a) the active-passive dimension of self-disclosure and (b) the formal-colloquial dimension of self-disclosure. In this study, the Taiwanese in Taiwan were more passive in their self-disclosure with causal friends. They usually did not self-disclose to casual friends unless being asked as the following excerpt illustrates:

With causal friends, unless I am being asked, I will not disclose personal information; on the contrary, with good friends, I initiate my self-disclosure as long as I think of things to say. Also, because good friends know me as a person better, it is easier for me to disclose to them. (Male/ 25/ Taiwanese in Taiwan)

In contrast, they were more likely to initiate self-disclosure with good friends as the excerpt below demonstrates:

I only take the initiative to share personal information with good friends, simply because they are also more willing to actively share what's inside their hearts with me. (Male/ 24/ Taiwanese in Taiwan)

In terms of the formality of self-disclosure, the Taiwanese in Taiwan were more likely to use informal and colloquial words or diction to the extent of swearing with good friends as one participant commented:

With good friends, the way I talk is much more colloquial such as 'F\*\*\* blah blah,' but with casual friends I would never talk to them that way. I would just say 'today blah blah.' (Male/ 31/ Taiwanese in Taiwan)

There was also the element of tacit understanding in intimate Taiwanese friendship. With good Taiwanese friends, there were times when verbal communication could be easily replaced by tacit understanding, which is consistent with the Chinese belief in *han xu* (implicit communication) (Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998).

In comparison, the Taiwanese people in this study exhibited less self-disclosure to causal friends, but most sojourning native English speakers tended to take a more direct approach to self-disclosure. Some sojourning native English speakers even disclosed the same information to both causal and good Taiwanese friends as one participant stated:

This is personally my own style. I disclose intimate personal information to my good Taiwanese friends and causal ones as well, because it's what you do to break the ice and open up relationship. Because if one doesn't start off showing all the cards, then it is going to be a slow game of poker. (Male/ 39/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 years sojourning)

Taiwanese people and native English speakers seem to have different preferences for self-disclosure since their cultures defined the appropriateness of self-disclosure in varying terms. In spite of preferences, self-disclosing behavior is greatly influenced by the attributions generated by the recipient (Derlega et al., 1987). Positive attributions lead to more self-disclosure. Also, the ability to self-disclose has been found to be one important element in intercultural communication competence (Chen, 1992).

Overall, the sojourning native English speakers found the Taiwanese communication style to be comparatively more indirect, polite, and other-oriented. Analyzing Chinese/Taiwanese communication orientations based on the four principles of Confucianism, namely humanism, faithfulness, propriety, and wisdom, Yum (1988) supports the indirect and receiver-centered communication orientations in Chinese/Taiwanese culture. One participant observed such different communication styles between his Taiwanese friends and himself:

Taiwanese people tend to be less overt if something affects them and they don't like it. They might not contact you, but they might not say why or they might not get hold of you. I also think my Taiwanese friends tend to be less self-centered although I have a close Taiwanese friend who is very self-centered. In general, I find them to be less self-centered and the focus tends to be on me. And out of kindness and interest in them, they are interested in me. I find that often sort of odd that I don't know that much about this person. I have realized that they have been directing the questions towards me and I don't know much about them. That's one thing. And Canadians tends to be more balanced when it comes to that. (Male/ 39/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 1 year and 8 months sojourning)

Ultimately, the different communication orientations and styles between Taiwanese and native English speakers could pose challenges and restrictions on the process of their intercultural interaction, which in turn could impact the development of intercultural friendships between them. Empirically, Bresnahan et al. (2002) found that Americans exhibited a significant preference for direct communication style compared to Japanese. In this study, some sojourning native English speakers interpreted Taiwanese people's indirect communication style as unwillingness to 'tell the real story of what's going on' and thus refrained from future interaction with certain Taiwanese people. On the other hand, some sojourning Taiwanese in this study interpreted their American friend's direct communication style as impatience and perceived it as an obstacle to the development of their friendships.

*Power Difference and Unearned Privilege:* Power difference and power struggle are salient, important, and ever-present issues in intercultural encounters and communication (Collier, 1998; Chang & Holt, 1997). Based on past research, Collier (1998) proposes the recognition of power difference and unearned privilege as an emergent issue in intercultural friendships. From a dialectical perspective of privilege and disadvantage, Martin and Nakayama (2003) recognize the role of power in intercultural communication, which either makes people simultaneously privileged and disadvantaged or privileged in some contexts and disadvantaged in others. In the context of intercultural training for expatriates, Chang and Holt (1997) urge the inclusion of issues concerning power inequality and politics in intercultural training programs. In this study,

power disparity was evident in the sojourners' accounts of their friendships with members of the host culture. Factors that accentuated the power differences in this study involved (a) language choice, (b) social relationships and roles, (c) cultural superiority, and (d) political as well as historical contexts.

First, the use of English as the de facto language of intercultural communication creates a problem of linguistic hegemony that involves power difference and unearned privilege (Tsuda, 1999). As discussed earlier, the individuals' English language skills had the prevailing influence on the development of intercultural friendships in this study because predominantly English was the choice of language for communication whether in the US or in Taiwan. Thus, the participants' English language skills became a source of power and privilege that defined whose voice would be heard. For the sojourning Taiwanese, their English language ability determined how much voice they had, particularly in their less intimate intercultural friendships. The sojourning Taiwanese were expected to express themselves fluently in English as one respondent commented:

Usually Americans don't have patience, because you speak too slow and you cannot involve their content in talk. You need to be better than them. If you want to participate, you need to be strong in your skills. You need to be good. So, I am only casual friends with those Americans. (Male/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 9 months sojourning)

For the sojourning native English speakers in Taiwan, their ability to speak their native tongue became an empowering source of power that granted them voices as well as privileges. Some of the privileges were unprecedented because they emerged out of simply being a native English speaker in Taiwan, in which there were no equivalents for the sojourning Taiwanese. The privileges included being able to selectively make intercultural friends on foreign soil in one's native tongue, capable of earning an affluent living teaching English overseas, enjoying a social status due to the sociopolitical power granted by speaking English, and so forth. For instance, it

is relatively easy for native English speakers to acquire a teaching job in Taiwan within days of arriving in the country because a degree in English is not necessary (Swagler & Jome, 2005). If focusing on the power issue involving speaking English as a native speaker alone, two dimensions emerged from the data. One was a socioeconomic dimension of making a living teaching English as one respondent stated:

I think it is different because in New Zealand I never had a job. I lived on the street and did shows. So I had a lot more time and I lived with my friends. We lived together and cooked together for three years. We were already poor. Now I work. (Male/ 28/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 3 years sojourning)

The other was a linguistic dimension of not having to learn Chinese as the excerpt below demonstrates:

In America, they all expect you to speak McDonald's (English) and understand how to go out and be American because you are in their culture. But you guys don't expect that of us here. (Male/ 39/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 years sojourning)

Similarly, Lummis (1976) observed American teachers in Japan, and stated that English teaching had the reputation of being considered relatively easy money among the foreign community. Specifically, the attitude shared by both the host and the expatriates is that "being in the presence of an American for an hour a week is in itself a privilege worth paying for" (p. 4). On the flip side, the privileges of not having to learn Chinese also prevented some sojourning native English speakers from making friends with intelligent Taiwanese people who didn't speak English and gaining insight into the Taiwanese culture.

Second, there was another unique power issue related to the culturally constructed social status for teachers in Taiwanese society. In general, teachers have high status in Chinese/Taiwanese society due to their primary role as moral cultivators (Hui, 2005). Since all the twenty sojourning native English speakers interviewed were working professionals teaching

English in Taiwan, their social position of being a teacher alone also granted them privilege and respect from the Taiwanese society as one participant candidly remarked:

I think that sometimes they (Taiwanese people) give me too much respect. I think that I am gonna fight or run away from that. On a different level, it is almost like an overwhelmingly sense of respect. You are an English speaker, and you are from America. Sometimes I think I am given too much respect. That is the basis of Taiwanese society. You are the teacher.  
(Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 9 months sojourning)

As teachers of English, native English speakers in general are treated with an enormous amount of respect in Taiwan just as the way Taiwanese treat their teachers whom they refer to as *Lao Shi* (old master), an honorific used to express respect from the speaker. In fact, Confucius' Birthday, September 28th, also known as Teacher's Day is an institutionalized holiday in Taiwan to honor teachers for their knowledge and contribution to society.

In addition, the hierarchical nature of Chinese/Taiwanese interpersonal relationships (Yum 1988) further explains the power and privilege issue that existed between native English speakers in this study and their Taiwanese students or friends. According to Confucian ethics, one should always take into account status and hierarchy when dealing with people. Chuang's (1998) study of cluster analyses on Taiwanese adults and college students revealed similar emphasis on constructing role norms in terms of dominance-submission. On the one hand, as authority figures, teachers in Taiwan have certain power (Hui, 2005). Power in general is conceived by the Chinese as directly tied to its possessors and resting in the individuals rather than the offices they hold (Ng, 2000). Thus, this explains why the power and privilege the native English speakers in this study enjoy as teachers is often carried over into other social contexts outside the classrooms.

One participant explained:

As far as students are concerned, I work in adult settings so I try to make a policy not to become friends with students outside classroom, because I think it may interfere with us professionally in terms of grades and perceptions. On the other hand, students recently, because of the end of term, gave me gifts or wanted to invite me out to coffee and stuff. I



don't want to be rude or anything like that. (Male/ 39/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 1 year and 8 months sojourning)

On the other hand, the Taiwanese people are socialized from birth to obey authority for the purpose of achieving social harmony and order. What this means for the individuals is that they are thus able to find personal security in accepting and obeying authority (Ng, 2000). This partly explains why it was much more common and socially acceptable for Taiwanese people to seek friendships or even romantic relationships with their native English teachers as one participant commented:

If you want to meet someone of the opposite sex who is of a different culture, the safest way to do is through a teacher, and they go to like Starbucks or something in public and they don't feel threatened at all and they can express themselves. (Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 10 months sojourning)

Because of the respect and obedience granted to teachers as authority of knowledge, it was evident the Taiwanese people felt more secure initiating and establishing personal relationships with sojourning native English speakers who taught English in Taiwan. They also felt a sense of security in disclosing to them as well.

The third factor that accentuated the power differences in this study was associated with the cultural hegemony of Anglo-American cultures over Taiwanese culture. Antonio Gramsci conceptualized the idea of cultural hegemony to address the relation between culture and power under capitalism (as cited in Lears, 1985). Reinforced by globalization, dominance of the English language results in globalization of English products that gives rise to the cultural dominance of English-speaking countries such as the US, United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand (Tsuda, 1999). Among the intercultural dyads in this study, there were seldom reciprocated interests or efforts trying to understand each other's culture. Because of the cultural hegemony of Anglo-American cultures, it was more often the Taiwanese that were more interested in learning about their English-speaking friends' culture. On the one hand, the sojourning Taiwanese were

expected to learn and acculturate into the dominant culture in the US while very few host members were interested in learning Chinese/Taiwanese culture. One participant stated:

Actually, I ask some Americans to eat Chinese food, but they don't like other cultures. They just care about America and think that is enough. They tell me that they don't like Chinese food and they don't like rice. (Male/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 9 month sojourning)

On the other hand, on top of the cultural hegemony, the fact that the Taiwanese in Taiwan clearly outnumbered sojourning native English speakers made it even more enticing for the Taiwanese to initiate friendships with the foreigners available as the two excerpts below illustrates:

I think some Taiwan people are really really friendly. And also because I am a foreigner, they are quite interested in being friends straight away. (Male/ 26/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 years sojourning)

Additionally, the color of the native English speaker's skin also potentially played a role in the Taiwanese people's perceptions towards his/her culture. It appeared that the Taiwan people did not receive all native English speakers with the same hospitality and enthusiasm as one participant remarked:

My skin is white and more or less blond hair. I think my experiences might have been different if I were Black or Korean or Indian living here, because I might be seen differently. (Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 9 months sojourning)

In short, the perceived cultural hegemony of Anglo-American cultures over Taiwanese culture created a power difference in relating between the Taiwanese and the native English speakers. Specially, the Taiwanese demonstrated more positive regard towards intercultural alliance with the native English speakers than the native English speakers towards the Taiwanese, because learning the Anglo-American cultures and the English language empowered the Taiwanese more in this age of globalization. Research shows that one's intention to value and affirm an individual as a member of a culturally different group impacts the development of intercultural alliance (Collier, 1998).

Finally, the last source of power differences between Taiwanese and native English speakers was rooted in contextual issues based on international politics and history. From a system perspective, the historical contexts and international relations at the macro level can exert influence on the micro level in intercultural interactions at the interpersonal level. Specifically, both Taiwan's political and military dependence on the US and Taiwan's colonial history affected the interpersonal relationships between Taiwanese and native English speakers in this study.

As a country striving for democracy and political independence, Taiwan is faced with political and military threats from China and thus is increasingly dependent on international alliance. In particular, the US plays a pivotal role in the US-Taiwan-China relations (Chang, 2004; Elleman, 2005; Kelly, 2004). Under the Taiwan Relations Act (1979) along with the Shanghai communiqué (1972), the US-PRC normalization communiqué, and the US-PRC communiqué on arms sales to Taiwan (1982), the US is committed to help Taiwan meet its self-defense so that Taiwan is more capable of engaging in political dialogue with the P.R.C. (Elleman, 2005; Kelly, 2004). It was evident in this study that Taiwan's political and military dependence on the US affected the interpersonal interaction between Taiwanese and the Westerners in Taiwan especially US Americans since it could be onerous for Taiwanese people to distinguish US Americans from Canadians, English, Australians, and New Zealanders. One participant explained how the international relations between the US and Taiwan impacted his relationships with Taiwanese people:

It seems that for a long time because of the economic cooperation and how that relates to I think the interaction between foreigners and Taiwanese people. I think the fact that Taiwan is a very political motivated country is a big factor in this situation. Interestingly, a friend of mine was living here in 1999 before George Bush and the Iraq war and said that he used to have people stop him on the street. Taiwanese people just stopped him on the street and talked to him for 20 minutes about how great the US was and how great America was. He says now in 2005 that never happens. Amidst the Iraq war, the Afghanistan conflict, the war on terror and all that, in Middle East, Europe, and many parts of the world Americans are

not perceived in a very positive light. Taiwan is sort of the exception where I still feel 100% comfortable being an American and I can walk around and it's okay. (Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 9 months sojourning)

It is also important to recognize the relevance of history and past experiences of oppression or discrimination on the power dynamics in intercultural friendships (Collier, 1998). Due to the colonial legacy, the perceptions of Westerners carrying the vestige of colonial mentality impacted the interpersonal dynamics between the Taiwanese and native English speakers in this study.

Throughout Taiwan's four hundred years of history, it had been occupied and ruled by European settlers for at least four separate occasions according to the [www.taiwandc.org](http://www.taiwandc.org) website. The Dutch were the first European settlers in Taiwan. Around 1590, the Portuguese came and gave Taiwan its unofficial name – Ilha Formosa (a beautiful island). Then, the Dutch occupied and ruled Taiwan for a short period from 1624 to 1662. Two hundred years later, the French came and controlled the northern part of Taiwan for a total of nine months between 1884 and 1885.

Defining expatriates as the sojourners from affluent countries residing abroad for purposes of business, mission, teaching, or leisure, Cohen (1977) states that 'in many ex-colonial countries the white expatriates inherited a lofty elite status from their colonial predecessors' (p. 19-20). In this study, the legacy of the European colonial invasion instilled a sense of superiority in some sojourning native English speakers who took for granted their privileged status as native English speakers in a developing country like Taiwan. Thus, carrying the vestige of colonialism robbed sojourning native English speakers of their sensitivity and flexibility to adjust to the host culture psychologically and socioculturally. Even though not all sojourning native English speakers were insensitive and unwilling to engage in cross-cultural experiences in Taiwan, those who were not subject to the colonial mentality had to combat the baggage of negative perceptions resulting from the legacy of those who were as one respondent remarked:

Westerners have a reputation here, particularly boys, that they come in here pillaging and going home. And that's not my approach. I want to kill them all, because that's not right. They are abusing that Asian license I spoke to you about. And that's because they have never had such respect most of them before in their lives. Because they get a social standing here that they don't at home. And I can guarantee you that one. For example, my present partner or my fiancé had a Western boyfriend also from my English culture, and she was afraid that I am just going to go. It didn't matter how much we spoke and how close we got. That part of her coming back to my culture is: Is he still going to leave me? Because that's the reputation Westerners have here: Come, and take and go. Because history has proven that's what Westerners do in Asia. (Male/ 39/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 years sojourning)

The above excerpt demonstrates how the legacy of colonial histories conditioned the interactions and communication between Taiwanese and sojourning native English speakers.

The data used to illuminate the foregoing theme partially answers the first research question which seeks to understand how the following three groups of individuals, (a) Taiwanese sojourning in the US, (b) native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan, and (c) Taiwanese people who primarily socialize with other Taiwanese, vary on the four dimensions of self-disclosure, namely intention, amount, depth, and positive-negative.. In essence, the data reflect the unique issues that are characteristic of the challenges facing individuals' self-disclosure in intercultural friendships. Specifically, the data demonstrate how English language skills, cultural values and norms, communication styles and competence, as well as power difference impacted individuals' ability to self-disclose and subsequently influenced the development of intercultural friendships between Taiwanese and sojourning native English speakers.

The data highlighted in this theme underscores the salient role of self-disclosure in the development of intercultural friendships (Barnlund, 1989; Derlega et al., 1987; Kudo & Simkin, 2003; Matsuchima & Shiomi, 2002). Also, the issues affecting self-disclosure in intercultural friendship that emerged in this study correspond to the relationships of second language competence and shared networks in reducing anxiety and uncertainty in intergroup

communication as proffered by the anxiety/uncertainty management theory (Gudykunst, 1996). Finally, in the context of intercultural friendships between native English speakers and non-native English speakers, the author argues that the power dimension associated with the linguistic hegemony of English as the world language should be incorporated into the discussion on second language competence and anxiety reduction.

### *Self-Disclosure among Sojourners*

The second major theme constructed from the data is labeled Self-disclosure among Sojourners. This theme is characterized by statements that depict both Taiwanese and native English-speaking sojourners' self-disclosure with their fellow sojourners. Furthermore, this theme highlights factors that influence how sojourners self-disclose to one another.

Both the sojourning Taiwanese in the US and the sojourning native English speakers in Taiwan formed distinctive communities of their own isolated from the host society. Since the majority of the sojourning Taiwanese in this study were foreign students while all the sojourning native English speakers were working professional teaching English in Taiwan, the two groups of sojourners encountered distinctive problems imposed by their roles of students or teachers. Also, the sojourning native English speakers as white expatriates enjoyed certain privileges and a high social status (Cohen, 1977) that were not prescribed for the sojourning Taiwanese. Other than those differences, there were several similarities that were characteristic of the transient communities or clusters of sojourners.

This theme highlights the statements that expound on the factors influencing self-disclosure among sojourners. This theme is comprised of four categories: (a) Communal Institutions for Sojourners, (b) Disclosing in Mother Tongue, (c) Shared Cultural Background, and (d) Personal and Social Needs. These categories are discussed next.

*Communal Institutions for Sojourners:* Three types of institutions emerged from the sojourners' accounts that provided communal services and functioned as social contexts where sojourners were able to maintain lifestyles to their liking. The first type was organizations or associations that Taiwanese sojourners established primarily for sojourning Taiwanese students. The second type was religious institutions that Taiwanese sojourners co-established with other Chinese-speaking sojourners such as Chinese language churches. The last type was expatriate pubs or bars that sojourning native English speakers established or patronized, because those pubs or bars catered solely or primarily to their needs as one participant explained:

When I lived in Tai-Chung, that's quite a social thing there. It's quite centralized there. There were a couple of places on the weekend that a lot of foreigners would go to. So, it is very easy to meet other foreigners, which is the first time that my friends and I went to a foreign pub. We were amazed, because we thought it might be a handful of foreigners in Tai-Chung, but in one pub that we walked into, there were at least a couple hundreds. We went crazy, and we were asking for e-mail addresses and telephone numbers. (Male/ 26/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 2 years sojourning)

The foreign pub in the excerpt above is better reworded as a Western pub, because it is mostly patronized by Westerners rather than all foreigners such as Filipinos and Japanese in Taiwan. One explanation is that Taiwanese people tend to be more receptive to Westerners than to Filipinos (Swagler & Jome, 2005). Also, white expatriates are more capable of creating institutions or facilities to maintain the lifestyle to their liking especially in developing countries (Cohen, 1977).

Depending on the size, the structure, and the cohesiveness of the communal institutions as well as the sojourners' dependence on those institutions, the communal institutions in general functioned to fulfill the sojourners' cultural, social, and personal needs (Cohen, 1977). When asked why he considered some sojourners his good friends, one participant stated that "I ask them to help to take me to the airport and we hang out with each other sometimes or go to see a

movie together” (Male/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 9 months sojourning). At the initial adjustment stage, the communal institutions provided sojourners with activities that helped them to orient, such as picking them up at the airport, assisting them with moving in or finding housing, helping food shopping, providing transportation system and so forth (Lin & Yi, 1997). At the on-going adjustment stage, networking with other sojourners from the same country or similar cultures helped sojourners to maintain their cultural identities (Lin & Yi, 1997). The impact of shared cultural background on self-disclosure will be analyzed in detail later.

When the communal institutions for sojourners are self-sufficient and exclusive to members of the host culture, they allow sojourners to live their accustomed way of life with minimum interaction and relatively minor adjustment to the host environment (Cohen, 1977). In this study, the sojourners varied in their interactions with other sojourners in the communal institutions. Thus, their satisfaction with their friendships with other sojourners also varied. Some were more invested in their intracultural friendships with other sojourners than others as the following two excerpts demonstrate:

(1) After staying here for a while, I feel the friendships with Taiwanese people that I have established here are worth treasuring, because we all help one another. Living overseas, we all have been through a lot together, and our friendships are based on that mutual assistance. So, such friendships mean a lot to me. (Female/ 26/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 2 years and 6 months sojourning)

(2) Sometimes people from the same country will gather together, not because they like each other or they are from the same group, but just because they are from the same country. So, sometimes you know the person and you spend a lot of time with each other, but it doesn't mean you are going to match each other but just because you are put into the same vase at this moment. (Female/ 24/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 1 year and 6 months sojourning)

As those communal institutions were the primary social contexts for sojourners to meet and spend time together, the nature of the institutions to certain extents governed the sojourners' self-disclosure to one another. Since the social meaning of bars was different from that of churches or school organizations, generally what sojourners would disclose to one another within



the confinement of those social contexts varied. In addition, alcohol may have played a role in disclosure such as accelerating the speed of disclosure due to the imbibing of alcohol. The different topics of disclosure will be discussed in greater detail later. Regardless of the areas of disclosure, overall the depth of the sojourners' disclosure was dependent on the levels of relationship intimacy.

*Disclosing in Mother Tongue:* A number of sojourners in this study reported more self-disclosure to other sojourners, mainly because language was not an issue. Specifically, the sojourners' first language competency was associated with (a) their higher comfort levels, (b) larger amount of time spent together, and (c) more satisfaction with telling jokes such as using sarcasm without the bother of translation or misunderstanding.

First, language difficulty, the inability to speak the host language fluently, is not only one of the catalysts for excessive anxiety and stress but also a primary inhibitor to social involvement in the host culture among foreign or international students (Hayes & Lin, 1994; James, 1992). Among sojourners in this study, the absence of such language difficulty was often replaced by greater comfort and ease as one sojourning Taiwanese and one sojourning native English speaker remarked respectively:

- (1) It's always easier to become good friends with people who share the same language and backgrounds with you for you two will have lots to talk about with little confusion and misunderstanding. Yet, it always requires more time to get to know the American before you two can develop a further relationship. (Female/ 35/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 2 years sojourning)
- (2) I kind of still even though I have been in Asia a long time I still feel more comfortable hanging out with people from my culture. It has nothing to do with whether I like or dislike Taiwan. Actually, I do I like Taiwan a lot, and I like where I lived before, Japan. I had some amazing experiences and met some amazing people. I think it boils down to language. (Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 9 months sojourning)

Also, shared linguistic codes facilitated the development of intracultural friendships among sojourners and determined the depth or amount of self-disclosure as one respondent reported:

I try to be honest but I don't tell them as much compared with my Canadian friends. I tell them more because language isn't an issue and I can relate with them more and we have more in common. (Female/ 22/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 months sojourning)

Second, some sojourners spent more time with other sojourners probably due to the feelings of comfort and ease associated with first language competency. The sojourning Taiwanese in particular were more like to self-disclose to people with whom they spent more time together. One possible explanation is the stereotypical non-assertive communication style out of emphasis on harmony and respect for authority that Lin and Yi (1997) discuss in their study as one of the common stressors among Asian international students in the US. Thus, sojourning Taiwanese disclosed more when not under the pressure of time as one participant commented:

I often go out with Taiwanese friends and we spend more time together, so our friendships develop faster. .... I self-disclose more with Taiwanese friends, because we often chat and talk. While we are chatting, I naturally disclose my personal information with them. (Female/ 26/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 2 years and 6 months sojourning)

As for the sojourning native English speakers, their motivations or purposes of going to Taiwan played a crucial role in their decision to socialize more with other sojourner or the local Taiwanese. When asked what made the difference between sojourners who had a lot of Taiwanese friends and sojourners who primarily socialized with others sojourners, one participant responded:

I come to Taiwan to teach, to learn Chinese, to meet Chinese people, to try and understand Chinese culture a bit. One of the major reasons that I came here is because I have no experience with Asia. The culture here is completely different from anywhere else that I have traveled, and I find it fascinating and I want to understand it more. The motivation for me is that I want to learn about the culture, and the best way to do that is from the people. And I think that my motivation to learn about the local culture probably has made the difference. (Male/ 38/ Sojourning native English speaker / 4 months sojourning)

Instrumental purposes such as coming on a job or mission engender little motivation in expatriates in the contemporary world to adapt to the host society (Cohen, 1997). Similarly, in Swagler and Jome's (2005) study on the effects of personality and acculturation on the adjustment of North American sojourners in Taiwan, they found that the Canadian participants

reported significantly greater difficulty adjusting possibly because they were more motivated by economic factors and thus not necessarily motivated to engage in cross-cultural experiences with the locals.

Lastly, another dimension of the first language competency that emerged in this study was the linguistic ability to tell and comprehend jokes, including the use of sarcasm. Some sojourners preferred to spend time with other sojourners simply because they found it much easier to relax and joke around with them as one participant stated:

When there are English people involved, we start the comedy routine. We start saying things after we meet someone for 5 minutes. . . . . Like English people you can be at a bar and you joke and you have too much of what you say total routine and less sophisticated, because you get silly. You can talk seriously and you can have a great conversation and intelligent conversation, but it can be great but it can also be stupid. (Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 10 months sojourning)

Jokes invoke laughter, help relieve tension, and build connection among people. Typically, people are drawn to those who reward them such as laughing at their jokes or perceiving them as humorous; in addition, people who are perceived as more humorous are also seen as socially attractive (Wanzer et al., 1996). Because of the language barrier, sojourners in most cases perceived themselves and were perceived as more humorous around other sojourners from the same country or similar culture.

Additionally, since jokes are culturally bound, it is oftentimes difficult to translate them into another language without losing part of the original meanings or without having to explain all the references. The translation issue is further complicated by the differences in the reliance on contextual cues between high-context Taiwanese culture and low-context Western cultures (Triandis, 1995; Yum, 1988). For instance, Chinese jokes often enact relational/conversational histories and embody Chinese cultural values/ideologies such as hierarchical interpersonal relationships, in-group versus out-group, and so on (Chang, 2005). Thus, some sojourners in this

study felt less satisfied and less comfortable not being able to crack jokes or use sarcasm as they normally did with their intercultural friends. The following excerpt illustrates that:

Part of that is because most Taiwanese don't understand sarcasm or have such different sense of humor but it's hard to, but not to be as satisfied, but to be laid back with them. (Female/ 24/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 years sojourning)

In general, disclosing in mother tongue was related to first language competency, comfort levels, time spent together, and use of humor in this study.

*Shared Cultural Background:* Networking with other sojourners from the same country or similar cultures is also important, because it provides a setting where ethnic and cultural values can be rehearsed and expressed and helps sojourners maintain their culture of origin (Lin & Yi, 1997). Moreover, Tierney (as cited in Al-Sharideh & Goe, 1998) contends that international students undergo disruptive cultural experiences upon their entry to American universities because American universities reflect, promote, and reinforce the dominate white American cultures. Also, when cultural similarity between the host culture and the culture of the sojourner decreases, the sojourner's interpersonal social difficulty increases (Olaniran, 1996). In the case of collectivistic Taiwanese culture and individualistic English-speaking cultures, the dissimilarity between the cultures outweighs the perceived cultural similarity. Therefore, a number of sojourners in this study adopted the strategy of responding to the disruptive cultural experiences and social difficulty through establishing relationships with other sojourners of similar cultural backgrounds (Al-Sharideh & Goe, 1998).

First, shared cultural backgrounds in this study contributed to the ease of arriving at mutual understanding, greater trust, and a stronger sense of closeness that facilitated self-disclosure and the development of friendships between the sojourners. First, shared cultural backgrounds meant shared norms, scripts, and references; thus, it was much easier to reach mutual understanding

operating under certain shared cultural knowledge. Also, the natural flow of communication would not be interrupted because of having to explain the cultural differences or references. As one sojourning Taiwanese and one sojourning native English speaker observed:

(1) With the Taiwanese, it is always easy for me to make new friends. We don't really need to know each other very deep because we are from the same country and have the same background. (Female/ 24/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 1 year and 6 months sojourning)

(2) A common cultural background is another factor because you don't have to...if you make a joke or if you make a reference to something, you don't have to fully explain it. (Male/ 36/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 months sojourning)

Due to the greater cultural dissimilarity between Taiwanese culture and Western English-speaking cultures, it appeared that explanations of cultural differences and references were often necessary. Specifically, analyzing cross-cultural differences in the process of forming interpersonal bonding between Western cultures and Eastern cultures, Javidi and Javidi (1991) categorizes the following six value differences: (a) Self-concept versus group-concept, (b) doing versus being, (c) equality versus inequality, (d) informality versus formality, (e) uncertainty reduction, and (f) acceptance of a person based on an area of common interest versus acceptance of the whole person. Therefore, similarity of cultural background can generate perceived similarity that plays a crucial role in the initial selection of friends and further friendship development, but similarity of cultural background itself does not necessarily lead to the development of friendships (Gudykunst, 1985a).

Second, shared cultural background alleviated the fear of cross-cultural misunderstanding; knowledge of cultural norms reduced the anxiety of unknowingly making mistakes and being perceived in a less than desirable light, and hence similarity of cultural background allowed one to feel greater ease in self-disclosing and greater trust in simply being oneself. One participant commented:

You tend to disclose more information about yourself or you talk about yourself more with friends from your own culture. You are more trusting. You know that by speaking clearly to that person or even if you say something crazy, you know that person would be more permitting. You know how to excuse yourself in case you make some mistakes. When it comes to your international friends, such as friends from Taiwan, it is much more difficult to explain. "Oh, I am sorry!" "I didn't mean that." It would take a long time to understand what you are saying whereas your Canadian friends would say "Yeah, I know what you mean, man." (Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 1 year sojourning)

Finally, shared cultural background also entails a set of shared beliefs and values. Some sojourners in this study self-disclosed more to other sojourners because of the assumption of greater understanding based on shared cultural beliefs and values. Consistent with the assumptions of Altman and Taylor's (1973) social penetration process progressing from initial orientation to stable exchange, the sojourners' greater personal disclosure to one another led to a great sense of relational closeness. As one sojourning Taiwanese and one native English speaker acknowledged:

(1) I disclose more to Taiwanese friends because of our similar thoughts, opinions, affections, and culture. Also, I feel much closer to my Taiwanese friends. (Female/ 24/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 1 year sojourning)

(2) I do have to think about the cultural differences. But if I were to talk about personal things with my American friends, it would be easier for them to understand because of our shared cultural backgrounds. In Taiwan, a lot of people would have not experienced about that or maybe they wouldn't feel comfortable to respond. (Male/ 42/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 years sojourning)

In short, because of the cultural dissimilarity between Taiwanese culture and Western English-speaking cultures, shared cultural background greatly facilitated the development of intracultural friendships among the sojourners. Similarity of cultural background contributed to greater ease of assuming understanding, trust, and self-disclosure, and greater self-disclosure facilitated the development of relational closeness.

*Personal and Social Needs:* When achieving a high degree of institutional self-sufficiency, both the expatriate communities and the ethnic communities for international students function as social support systems that help sojourners deal with personal and social problems that may

arise from the host social environment (Cohen, 1977; Al-Sharideh & Goe, 1998). Besides networking with host nationals that help sojourners participate in the new culture, Lin and Yi (1997) argues that international students also need to have networks of friends and acquaintances for purely recreational companionship and to learn the social skills of their culture of origin. It was evident in the accounts from both groups of sojourners in this study that their networks with other sojourners to a certain extent fulfilled their personal and social needs. However, the sojourning Taiwanese and sojourning native English speakers seemed to vary in their dependence on expatriate or ethnic communities for assistance especially in times of emergency.

Besides the ease of disclosing in one's mother tongue and shared cultural backgrounds, the sojourners in this study also self-disclosed to other sojourners because of their common and newly-formed identity as sojourners on foreign soil. They perceived one another as going through similar situations and facing similar stressors. The perceived similarity of being sojourners played an important role in their selection of other sojourners as friends as one sojourning Taiwanese and one sojourning native English speaker reflected:

- (1) I don't know why we become good friends, but we came here at the same time or in the same term. Even though we were not classmates, we came to America in the same term. I guess maybe because we meet the same problem, the same situation, the same feelings, so maybe it is easy to get together. (Male/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 9 months sojourning)
- (2) I found that it is easier to make friends with an expatriate as an expatriate like in a foreign setting where we were the minority than it is to make friends when you feel that you are maybe in the majority like if you are a Canadian in Canada. . . . .For foreigners, I also make lots of foreigner friends, including Canadians here easier than I would in Canada, because we are facing similar pressures and similar situations. (Male/ 39/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 1 year and 8 months sojourning)

Also, the perceived similarity of being sojourners facilitated self-disclosure in order to fulfill personal and social needs as the two following excerpts illustrate:

- (1) I talk in much greater depth with my Taiwanese friends. We talk a lot about our feelings, relationships with people here, and experiences here. Also, we talk more about what we did in Taiwan and issues related to Taiwan. So, there are many more topics we can talk about. (Male/ 28/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 4.5 months sojourning)

(2) I think there is transience even within the expatriate community or people that I would discuss emotional issues with. (Male/ 39/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 1 year and 8 months sojourning)

Another dimension related to social support was the dependence on the social networks with other sojourners for help or assistance as one sojourning Taiwanese and one sojourning native English speaker stated:

(1) Basically, at times of emergency when I have to deal with something urgent, since I am closer to my Taiwanese friends, I naturally turn to them for help. I feel that Americans don't understand our situations and also they have never been in our conditions. Also, the conditions that they have to face are not the same as the ones required of us. It is not that I don't want to share with them, but that when it comes to solving problems, I know turning to my Taiwanese friends will be of immediate and direct assistance to my problems. It is not that I don't want to talk to them about my problems, but that I don't think they can be of help. (Female/ 36/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 5 months sojourning)

(2) With the female Western friends, they are different. Women friends are different. A few tend to like to have someone to complain to, so I help them by giving them balance and perspective. (Male/ 35/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 2 years sojourning)

Overall, the similar experiences and perspectives shared by sojourners not only made it easier to self-disclose and become friends but also made it easier to ask for assistance. Similarly, Maundeni (2001) found that the African international students' social networks largely composed of other African students provided both helpful information and many kinds of social support such as emotional, recreational, financial, and spiritual support.

However, the sojourning Taiwanese and the sojourning native English speakers in this study were not entirely similar in the strategy they utilized to fulfill their personal and social needs. They differed in the extent they turned to their intracultural or intercultural friends for assistance to fulfill those needs. In general, there was a greater sense of social obligation among the sojourning Taiwanese to assist other sojourning Taiwanese when they were in need as one participant commented:

When living abroad on foreign soil, people from the same nationality often feel obliged to take care of one another. For the US Americans, they live within their own culture and territory, so they cannot imagine what kind of difficulties foreigners have to face or overcome. Also, because of our alien identity, there are certain things that are more difficult



for us that are not required of Americans. (Female/ 26/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 1 year and 7 months sojourning)

One explanation for such social obligation comes from the collectivistic cultural dimension of the Taiwanese culture (Triandis, 1995; Yum, 1988), because Taiwanese people are socialized to be group-oriented. On the other hand, there was greater transaction of assistance between the sojourning native English speakers and their Taiwanese friends as one participant observed:

A lot of times here, friendships have to start with exchange of favors, and in the West, it starts with self-disclosure. . . . . You meet people also who just want to get you into their network. The only payback is in the favor of economy. Then, it gets close to mutual use. It is useful but not nutritional. (Male/ 45/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 9 years sojourning)

It appeared that some local Taiwanese people might be willing to assist their English-speaking friends not just for the sake of friendship but also for opportunities to practice their English. On the flip side, some sojourning native English speakers also befriended Taiwanese people for reasons other than just friendships. As one sojourning native English speaker commented, “In Taiwan, I try to be friends with them even though we don’t have that much in common. So, even if we don’t like the same things, I will try to be their friends for help and Taiwanese culture (Female/ 22/ 4 months sojourning).”

With respect to cultural adaptation, it is important to note that the sojourners’ social networks with other sojourners can play both supportive and non-supportive roles in their adjustment (Maundeni, 2001). This study has demonstrated that sojourners’ communal institutions provide avenues for self-disclosure with relative ease and comfort, for rehearsing and expressing cultural values and identity (Lin & Yi, 1997), and for social support such as fulfilling personal and social needs (Cohen, 1977). However, members of such social networks could also potentially be perceived as sources of stress (Maundeni, 2001). Also, highly self-sufficient and isolated networks could hinder sojourners’ participation and acculturation into the host culture

(Cohen, 1977). Al-Sharideh and Goe (1998) found that when an international student's network with other coculturals reached the threshold of 32 people, such ties became negatively associated with the student's self-esteem.

The data illuminated in this theme partially answers the third research question which inquires how individuals' self-disclosure is similar or different in intimate intercultural friendships as opposed to intimate intracultural friendships. In essence, the data in the forgoing theme highlights the major variables that characterized the sojourners' self-disclosure in their intracultural friendships with other sojourners from the same country or similar cultures.

The data in this theme underscores the important role of perceived similarity in both intercultural and intracultural friendship selection and development (Gudykunst, 1985a; Osbeck et al., 1997; Urgerg et al., 1998). Theoretically, it largely supports the social penetration process in close friendships (Altman & Taylor, 1973). However, it also highlights the transient nature of friendships among sojourners (Cohen, 1977). In addition, it seems generally sojourners develop friendships with other sojourners from the same culture much faster than they usually do with friends back home.

#### *Self-Disclosure and Stages of Intercultural Friendship Development*

The third theme that emerged from the data is labeled Self-disclosure and Stages of Intercultural Friendship Development. The statements that characterize this theme demonstrate how the sojourners in this study self-disclosed differently or similarly to the host nationals, which were dependent on their levels of friendship closeness. Specifically, based on Altman and Taylor's (1973) four stages of the social penetration process and Martin and Nakayama's (2003) cultural differences in relational development, this theme breaks down into four categories: (a) the Orientation and Initial Attraction Stage, (b) the Exploratory Exchange Stage, (c) the

Pendulum Stage, and (d) the Stability Exchange Stage. The categories are discussed in detail below.

*The Orientation and Initial Attraction Stage:* This category reflects sojourners' willingness to reveal personal information as well as disclosing of superficial personal information in the earliest stages of intercultural interaction. Moreover, principles of relational attraction determine with whom sojourners enter into relationships in the starting relationship stage with strangers. Specifically, the data in this study revealed four factors that impacted the sojourners' rate of self-disclosure and attraction to strangers and acquaintances in the host society: (a) openness and receptiveness towards strangers, (b) perceived advantage, (c) perceived similarity, and (d) physical attraction.

First, in terms of openness and receptiveness towards strangers in the host society, generally the sojourning native English speakers found the local Taiwanese to be less open and receptive towards strangers while the sojourning Taiwanese were pleasantly surprised at the friendliness they received from strangers. The following excerpt is representative of the sojourning native English speakers' view on the critical role of Taiwanese people's openness and receptiveness in the development of intercultural friendship between them:

I think probably like anything, like how open and receptive that Taiwanese person is to know another person from another culture..... To make a long story short, I think it's how open and receptive that person is, and I think that makes a big difference in how close I get to that person. (Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 9 months sojourning)

When discussing openness and receptiveness towards strangers in an intercultural context, it becomes important to note that there are actually two integrated dimensions involved: one is the dimension towards strangers and the other is the dimension towards people from different cultures. In Eastern cultures governed by the collectivistic and long-term orientations, people do not perceive strangers as sources of potential relationships but pay more attention to their

backgrounds (Javidi & Javidi, 1991). For instance, Barnlund (1989) found that the US American students talked to strangers in many different contexts while the Japanese students talked to significantly fewer strangers than did their US American counterparts over the same period. Thus, for individuals from collectivistic cultures, initial encounters in the starting stage of the relationship with new members outside of the collectivist circles would be relatively more rigid and difficult (Batonda & Perry, 2003).

The sojourning Taiwanese who are socialized to treat members inside and outside their collectivistic circles differently are surprised at how friendly and verbally expressive the strangers in the host society are. As one sojourning Taiwanese reflected:

When I first came here, strangers would say hello to me. They would say “How’s it going?” “What’s up?” like this. When I first came here, I was surprised about this. I didn’t know him, but he asked me “What’s up.” I didn’t know how to respond. I think I can understand that Americans think Asians are rude. They usually think that we don’t smile. But I don’t think they are superficial, I think it is a kind of polite. I like this feeling. They like their way to say hello to even stranger. It makes you feel comfortable. In Taiwan, nobody do that. In Taiwan, sometimes you walk on the streets and you pretend that someone will attack you. I don’t know. I feel more comfortable here on campus. (Male/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 9 months sojourning)

Additionally, when analyzing the self-disclosure of the sojourning Taiwanese and the Taiwanese in Taiwan, it was evident that the self-disclosure dimension was associated with the concept of revealing personal information to others. It seemed that Taiwanese in general were not willing to disclose personal information to superficial friends or acquaintances let alone strangers as one Taiwanese respondent in Taiwan explained the prevalence of other-people conversations in superficial friendships:

With casual friends, we talking superficial thing like other people blah blah. It is always about other people. We gossip or we talk about work and about ‘who just has another child’ ‘who just moved’ ‘who just bought a whatever car’ ‘who makes how much money’ ‘who just opened a new clinic’ or ‘who just bought a diamond.’ (Female/ 28/ Taiwanese in Taiwan)

This corresponds to the documented phenomenon of guarded self-disclosure in Asian cultures (as cited in Barry, 2003). Barry's (2003) study revealed that East Asian immigrants in the US reported greater guarded self-disclosure especially among those who had stronger ethnic identity. As a result, the sojourners' openness and receptiveness towards strangers in the host society had enormous impact on their rate of self-disclosure in the orientation and initial attraction stage.

In general, people of low-context and horizontal Western cultures value self-disclosure more than people of high-context and vertical Eastern cultures (Javidi & Javidi, 1991). In this study, the sojourning native English speakers tended to self-disclose more to the local Taiwanese strangers and acquaintances. However, the sojourning native English speakers' voluntary and relatively high disclosure in initial intercultural encounters is not always evaluated positively. Some sojourning native English speakers monitor their self-disclosure or choose not to develop relationships with strangers and acquaintances whom they perceived to be less open and receptive in disclosure. The following excerpt demonstrates how the negative responses sojourners received led them to monitor their self-disclosure:

I can just think of something in general where I found out that somebody thought negatively about something I said. So, I think of some experiences I had have taught me to be more careful about who and what I say to people here because usually they are not trying to do me hard but is it part of the difference in character that they interpreted it differently than what my meaning was. (Male/ 42/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 years sojourning)

Research shows that in Chinese culture people tend to rate high-disclosure episodes more negative than do Americans (Wolfson & Pearce, 1983). Also, Lance and Grove (1981) suggest that recipients of high disclosure in the initial interactions are highly aroused but interpret this high arousal negatively.

Additionally, perceived advantage functions as an extra incentive for self-disclosure and verbal communication or tolerance for unreciprocated or unequivocal self-disclosure with strangers and acquaintances in the host society especially at the orientation and initial attraction stage. Specifically, the perceived advantage of having opportunities to practice or improve English caused the sojourning Taiwanese to evaluate the friendly English-speakers strangers' or acquaintances' self-disclosure positively and even reciprocate self-disclosure to them. The following excerpts illustrate the effect of perceived advantage:

(1) When I first came, I found it very easy to make friends with Americans. I don't know why maybe because of my attitudes. I was more naive. When I first came, I made a lot of American friends, we said hi to each other on the street and we exchanged numbers. Sometime I called them or they called me. I guess when I first came, I had stronger motivations to make friends with Americans, because I didn't know anybody here and I wanted to practice my English. (Female/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 4 years sojourning)

(2) I like to make friends with Americans. However, maybe it is more than just making friends because I could practice my English. Making friends with Americans is a very good way to practice and improve my English. (Female/ 24/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 6 months sojourning)

The perceived advantage of acquiring necessary everyday life assistance substituted or ameliorated the lack of reciprocal self-disclosure for the sojourning native English speaker as one sojourning native English speaker explained his relationship with this Taiwanese man whose shop he patronized for convenience:

For me, personally the food here is great, but it is extremely difficult for me to order stuff. And the Chinese menu is like 7 pages long but the English menu is only a page. I do a lot of pointing, or I will go to My Guy. That's around where I live. And I will just pick a line or he will make something while I am waiting and I will ask "What was that?" and I will take that later. (Male/ 36/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 6 months sojourning)

Theoretically, Thibaut and Kelly's social exchange theory provides support for the effect of perceived advantage in relationship development and maintenance. The core components of the social exchange theory examine the satisfaction of a relationship in terms of costs versus benefits as well as the maintenance of a relationship in terms of the availability of alternatives (as cited in

Dainton & Zelle, 2005). Basically, rewards play a crucial role in attraction according to social exchange theory (as cited in Fehr, 1996). Social exchange theory has also been applied to examine self-disclosure and interpersonal rewards as well as attraction (as cited in Ellingson & Galassi, 1995). Therefore, when the sojourners in this study perceived that the benefits of obtaining the advantages of improving English or acquiring everyday life assistance were higher than the costs of unreciprocated self-disclosure or over self-disclosure, the outcome of satisfaction made the intercultural relationship attractive enough to develop.

Based on the perspective of similarity-attraction, perceived similarity has been found to play a role primarily in the orientation and exploratory stages of intercultural relationship formation (Chen, 2002; Gudykunst, 1985a). Specifically, Chen reports an interactive process between similarity and intercultural relationship formation in which “greater similarity facilitates a communicative relationship; interaction, once started, may lead to perception of greater similarity or convergence of partners’ behavior, or both” (p. 244). In this study, besides the effects of language similarity, the perceptions of similar values and interests emerged as important for intercultural interactions between the sojourning native English speakers and their Taiwanese friends.

Specifically, several sojourning native English speakers reported their amazement of how having a shared interest or hobby greatly accelerated mutual disclosure and facilitated the development of relationships with Taiwanese strangers as the following excerpt illustrates:

The thing best always is common interests. You can talk to a stranger about common interests, such as the F-1. I met some people at the time, and now they are acquaintances. At the time, I met them on Sunday at a bar. I had seen them before two guys and two girls. They watch F-1 and are big Ferrari fans, so I started to talk to one of them at the bar. They had a Ferrari out there. From there, the conversation is all about common interests. They invited to come out to a game with them and talked them more. Now they invite me to watch the next race with them. They become acquaintances. I don’t know them personally

that much but through common interests. (Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 10 months sojourning)

Similarities and shared interests have been found to be the basis for friendship formation in the Western cultures (Bell, 1981; Bliszaner & Adams, 1992; Cramer, 1988; Johnson, 2001; Sias & Cahill, 1998). However, interviews with the Taiwanese in Taiwan highlight the important role of having shared likes, dislikes, and interests as one of the key elements in the formation of friendships in Taiwanese culture. The following excerpt is representative of the eight Taiwanese interviewees who commented on the pivotal role of similarity in the formation of their friendships:

Most of my good friends are friends with whom I share the same interests, such as playing basketball or volleyball together, going to Internet café together, and going on excursions, going out with girls from nearby universities or colleges or stuff. Because we share the same interests, we keep in touch regularly and spend more time together. Then, we seem to get along well, so that's why we are good friends. (Male/ 27/ Taiwanese in Taiwan)

In contrast, none of the sojourning Taiwanese mentioned having shared interests with strangers and acquaintances in the host society. In the orientation and initial attraction stage, sojourning Taiwanese tended to maintain superficial, formulaic, and polite interaction without much disclosure as one participant observed:

Most Americans they are not that patient to us international students. So, you just need some more time to explain what you are talking about or you just need some more time to understand what they are talking about, but they are not that patient. Anyway, I will still try to be friendly and polite. I will try to say something about the weather, something nonsense, but nothing important. (Female/ 24/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 1 year and 6 months sojourning)

Also evident in the excerpt above, the lack of functional adaptive behaviors (Ellingsworth, 1996) may have hindered the sojourning Taiwanese's disclosure of their interests and tastes with strangers and acquaintances from the host culture. Besides English language skills, cultural barriers may be another factor that impeded the discussion of common interests and tastes as one respondent commented:



There is one thing that doesn't interest me and I find it difficult to discuss: American television programs. I don't watch TV and it doesn't interest me as much. I love variety shows but with American variety shows I don't get them. When I hear the laugh track, I don't understand what's funny. Also, when Americans start discussing a certain program or a certain actor, I have a hard time participating in the conversations. (Female/ 25/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 3 years sojourning)

Finally, physical attraction emerged as a filter of friendships between male sojourning native English speakers and Taiwanese females in this study. The overwhelming majority of sojourning native English speakers interviewed had far more female Taiwanese friends than male Taiwanese friends. Moreover, the sojourning native English speakers reported that the Taiwanese females were more open-minded and interesting, spoke better English, were more willing to assist them, and had stronger desires to spend time socializing with them than did Taiwanese males.

The following excerpts exemplify such gender differences:

(1) There seems to be a mutual sense of attraction among Taiwanese women and foreign men. Of course, that often leads to a lot of cultural conflict and misunderstanding. I have seen a lot of dysfunctional relationships simply based upon sexual gratification. If I meet a group of Taiwanese men and women, I probably am going to hone my interest on getting some phone numbers of some Taiwanese girls. There is inevitably that I am definitely not innocent of basing my desire on something may be seen as shallow interests. I don't think I am dumb guy but I am susceptible of being shallow. (Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 9 months sojourning)

(2) I guess I found living abroad. Usually it's the opposite sex that help each other out whether friendship or more. (Male/ 42/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 years sojourning)

Consistently, research on opposite-sex friendship reveals that men and women initiate and select opposite-sex friendship for different reasons (Bleske-Rechek & Buss, 2001).

Bleske-Rechek & Buss' (2001) study indicates that, compared with women, sexual attraction and gaining short-term sexual access are more important reasons for men to initiate and select female friends. With respect to providing social support, Derlega et al.'s (1994) laboratory-based study suggests that men may choose not to or are less expected to display supportive behaviors even though men are equally capable of behaving supportively as women. Lastly, besides sex differences, individualism and collectivism at the national level has been found to influence

communication values in friendships. Specifically, Mortenson (2005) reports that people in Chinese culture view problem-focused support and instrumental communication such as persuasiveness and referential skills as significantly more important for friends to embody than US Americans.

In short, besides English language skills, (a) openness and receptiveness, (b) perceived advantage, (c) perceived similarity, and (d) physical attraction emerged as important factors that affected intercultural friendships in the orientation and initial attraction stage. Also, overall in this stage the sojourning native English speakers' self-disclosure were superficial and limited to the public areas of their selves (Altman & Taylor, 1973) while the sojourning Taiwanese comparatively revealed far less personal information possibly due to language difficulty or the Taiwanese cultural norms of guarded self-disclosure (Barry, 2003).

*The Exploratory Exchange Stage:* This category describes sojourners' willingness to disclose personal information to the kinds of relationships between casual friends in the beginning stages of relationship development. Three factors played a role in the sojourners' rate and levels of self-disclosure to casual friends from the host culture were identified. There are (a) time or opportunities to socialize, (b) similar backgrounds or experiences, and (c) reciprocity and patterns of self-disclosure.

First, spending time or having opportunities to socialize was associated with the development of casual intercultural friendships in the exploratory exchange stage. Not surprisingly, part of the shared time or opportunities to socialize was based on proximity. All sojourning Taiwanese and sojourning native English speakers in this study had developed at least casual or friendly relationships because of proximity to the host nationals such as working, living,

taking courses, or working out together. The two following excerpts were representative of the impact of proximity on the formation of casual intercultural friendship:

(1) I have become friends with a few colleagues. We are 'friendly,' but I wouldn't consider them sort of deep friends. They are good colleagues. (Male/ 39/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 1 year and 8 months sojourning)

(2) I don't think I have a lot of American friends. Most of them are classmates or the tutors at the writing lab. (Female/ 36/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 5 months sojourning)

Research also suggests that proximity and contact frequency can increase the likelihood of positive intercultural relationships and foster changes in both cognition and affect (Gareis, 1999). Lindgren and Yu (1975) suggest that increased exposure to the host culture can enhance cultural understanding. Zimmerman (1995) even found that frequency of contact or interaction was an important factor in international students' adjustment.

Other than shared time and/or opportunities due to proximity, spending time or having opportunities to chat and get to know one another further assisted self-disclosure thereby facilitating the development of intercultural friendships. One sojourning Taiwanese and one sojourning native English speaker remarked:

(1) My Taiwanese friends here in Taiwan, a lot of the friendships develop out of having spent a certain amount of time together through working relationships or through mutual friends and going out together. I think the development of the friendship is pretty much along the same lines through spending a certain amount of time together and getting to know people. (Male/ 27/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 3 years sojourning)

(2) If we take the same course or are put together in certain situations, it becomes easier to establish friendships with them. For example, with one of my good friends from last semester, because we took the same course, we had more topics to talk about like our studies and schoolwork. So, slowly we started talking on the phone, meeting privately, and socializing outside of school. So, generally, when there are things that we need to ask one another or have opportunities that tie us to one another, it is easier to become friends that way. (Female/ 25/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 3 years sojourning)

The contact theory posits, it is voluntary and nonsuperficial cross-cultural contact that offers people opportunities to get to know one another and thus allows friendships to be established (as cited in Stephan & Stephan, 2002). Similarly, Jonathan's (2005) study on self-disclosure in established heterosexual male friendships reveals that "men who disclose to one another also

spend a significantly greater amount of time together” (p. 14). Additionally, research supports the importance of spending time together as a relationship maintenance strategy (as cited in Fehr, 1996).

Second, similar backgrounds or similar past experiences also facilitate the sojourners’ self-disclosure and the development of casual intercultural friendships in the exploratory exchange stage. Specifically, it was the perceived similarity in cultural knowledge and experiences that contributed to the increased self-disclosure and friendship development. As one sojourning Taiwanese and one sojourning native English speaker explained:

(1) Like my surfer guy friend, he had nineteen years of experiences in California, which probably helped quite a bit. But, we were sitting around drinking and talking. There was never no ‘you were Taiwanese.’ Like in Canada, it was kind of like, oh, it’s your birthday. Oh, oh, let me buy you a drink. (Male/ 36/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 6 months sojourning)

(2) With Sophie and some of my casual American friends at church, we talk more about ourselves and care about one another, but we are still at the stage of learning and getting to know each other. For instance, Sophie often talks about her thesis with me because she is working on her thesis right now, and I talk about my concerns for the GMAT examination and choosing future graduate program. Interestingly, some of the Americans from church have traveled to China or Taiwan in the past. So are some of the teachers at my language institute. Like my teacher friend, Sophie, had taught English in China for several years before. (Male/ 28/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 4.5 months sojourning)

Perceived similarity has been found to play a role not only in the orientation stage but also the exploratory stage of intercultural relationship formation (Chen, 2002; Gudykunst, 1985a). The data in this study suggests that having previously engaged in intercultural contact such as living abroad indirectly contributed to the increased disclosure and friendship development in the exploratory stage through the mediation of the perceived similarity in shared cultural knowledge and experiences. Gareis (1999 & 1995) states that cultural knowledge and awareness is an essential factor in decreasing misunderstanding and making intercultural interaction attractive. Similarly, Gudykunst (1979) found that participants in the Intercultural Communication Workshop that had previous intercultural contact were no longer susceptible to attitude change.

Gudykunst (1979) argued that previous engagement in intercultural contact could help subjects to develop positive attitudes.

Reciprocity and patterns of self-disclosure is the third factor that impacts self-disclosure and casual friendship development at the exploratory stage. Generally, self-disclosure at this stage centers on the exchange of superficial and nonintimate personal information. Moreover, the reciprocity of self-disclosure between the sojourners and the host nationals appeared difficult to achieve at this stage due to the differing styles of communication and norms of self-disclosure in Taiwanese culture as opposed to Western English-speaking cultures.

Specifically, the native English speakers were more open and less guarded in their self-disclosure than the Taiwanese. In other words, the native English speakers tends to disclose more than the Taiwanese. Research suggests that Americans disclose more than other national groups (as cited in Won-Doornink, 1985). Barnlund (1989) states that there is a significant difference in the rate of self-disclose of Americans and Japanese, and Japanese friendship rarely involves self-disclosure. Won-Doornink's (1985) cross-cultural study concludes that Korean cross-sex dyads exhibited lower rates of topical reciprocity of self-disclosure.

This study found that the reciprocity of self-disclosure was not the norms in the exploratory exchange stage. As one sojourning native English speaker and one sojourning Taiwanese commented,

(1) When I got something on my mind, I would generally say it. I am not going to keep those things to myself. So, to a large extent, I would self-disclose to my casual Taiwanese friends. (Male/ 26/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 2 years sojourning)

(2) Most of my American friends are more dominant speakers. I'm usually the listener. I have somewhat fewer chances to share my life with American friends than Taiwanese friends. Americans and Taiwanese have different ways of thinking. I feel the conversation doesn't always go the direction I anticipated and American friends usually have the lead on the talking. (Female/ 28/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 3 years and 5 month sojourning)

Part of it stemmed from the different communication styles between native English speakers and Taiwanese as discussed earlier. Another explanation was the language dissimilarity between English and Chinese. Last but not least, guarded self-disclosure (Barry, 2003) was still evident in the sojourning Taiwanese's accounts of their disclosure to causal American friends as one participant articulated and encapsulated:

At the beginning, we often talk about everyday stuff. But when it comes to serious matters or things that trouble me, I don't want to share with friends at random, because I am not sure about how close we are. Sometimes I don't know what kinds of people my friends are not in the sense that I think they would harm me, but what if we stop being friends some day and they know certain things about me. I just don't like people knowing too many things about me. So, with casual friends, we talk about superficial things in our everyday lives such as parking but not things specifically related to me. Like it is okay to say "I have been busy with school recently" to causal friends. But I don't share with causal friends problems I have with my family or my friends or personal things. I worry that if my friendships with someone didn't develop the way I thought it would, I would feel insecure knowing that they knew exactly what I did in my everyday life and how I thought and felt inside. (Female/ 25/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 3 years sojourning)

The unequivocal self-disclosure in the exploratory exchange stages seemed to present obstacles to the development of intercultural friendships in this study. Literature in self-disclosure and reciprocity suggests that liking, social attraction, positive affect, or positive evaluations often accompanies reciprocal self-disclosure that either occurs in response to the partner or to the perceived reciprocity norms (Brewer & Mittelman, 1980; Chaikin & Derlega, 1974; Vittengl & Holt, 2000).

Overall, the rate and the level of self-disclosure in the exploratory exchange stage in this study was influenced by (a) time or opportunities to socialize, (b) similar backgrounds or experiences, and (c) reciprocity and patterns of self-disclosure. Specifically, the native English speakers tended to disclose more than the Taiwanese. However, there was higher reciprocity of nonintimate self-disclosure mediated by the perceived similarity in cultural knowledge and the voluntary and nonsuperficial contact that focused on getting to know each other.

*The Pendulum Stage:* This category demonstrates sojourners' disclosure of personal information to the host nationals with whom they have established friendships, but the friendships have not evolved into the typically close friendships. The pendulum stage is a stage vacillating between the previous exploratory exchange stage and the following stability exchange stage. On a continuum of levels of personality and relationship intimacy, Altman and Taylor (1973) argue that 'from this schema one can derive any number of "stages"' (p. 136). For instance, Batonda and Perry (2003) investigating the role of culture in inter-firm network development conceptualizes five stages of relationship development: (a) relationship searching stage, (b) relationship starting stage, (c) relationship developing stage, (d) relationship maintenance stage, and (e) relationship termination stage. Foeman and Nance's (2002) study on interracial couples consider four stages of relationship development: stage 1: racial awareness, stage 2: coping, stage 3: identity emergence, and stage 4: maintenance.

Based on the sojourning participants' accounts, I posit the conceptualization of a distinct stage between the relationship development stage and relationship maintenance stage: the pendulum stage. Specifically, intercultural friendship at this stage is what one participant referred to as "special friends."

In terms of friends who I can talk comfortably with, I have about 2-3 American friends like that. I don't think they are my good friends but I consider them "my special friends," because it is rare that even though we have only known each other for such a short period of time, I feel very comfortable discussing anything I want to discuss with them, including asking questions about things that I am not sure whether or not they are appropriate for me to ask. So, I have about 2-3 friends like that. (Female/ 36/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 5 months sojourning)

These friendships were characterized by transience and insurmountable barriers that stymied the intercultural friendships from further development such as conditional self-disclosure, conditional transaction of assistance, and insufficient or lack of friendship maintenance behavior.

The following two separate accounts encapsulate intercultural friendships in the pendulum stage that ceased to develop further:

(1) When making friends with Americans, at the beginning, it is very easy to start chatting with them. However, once we have chatted for a while and our friendships have reached a certain stage, things seem to stop moving forward. (Female/ 25/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 3 years sojourning)

(2) The people you choose to socialize with share a certain quality regardless of culture and language ability. Certainly, it makes it easier if the language is not a barrier. For instance, I have 5 or 6 relatively close Taiwanese friends whose English is not that great and my Mandarin is nonexistent, but we share time, experiences, activities, and have fun. Because of the language barrier, my friendships with them cannot develop into the same depth as my friendships with other Taiwanese friends who speak English fluently. (Male/ 52/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 5 years sojourning)

To begin with, the conditional self-disclosure at this stage was symbolic of the insurmountable language barrier and cultural barriers between the collectivistic Taiwanese culture and the individualistic Western cultures. One sojourning Taiwanese and one sojourning native English speaker remarked:

(1) I think it is a lot easier to be with like casual friends with Americans. Americans are more open than Taiwanese. But it is really hard to become good friends with them. They say hi to you and talk to you, but it is really hard for them to talk from their heart like what they are really thinking. (Male/ 20/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 4 years sojourning)

(2) I do have to think about the cultural differences. But if I were to talk about personal things with my American friends, it would be easier for them to understand because of our shared cultural backgrounds. In Taiwan, a lot of people would not have experiences about that or maybe they wouldn't feel comfortable to respond. (Male/ 42/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 years sojourning)

Research in intercultural friendship patterns suggests that cultures distribute and constellate public and private personality layers differently which concerns both perceived social distance and compartmentalization (Gareis, 1999). For example, findings of Lewin's (as cited in Gareis, 1999) study reveal that even though American and German cultures have the same number of personality layers, the two cultures differ in the extent to which the outer area is more or less permeable. Americans consider all but the central innermost layer are public domain whereas Germans consider only the outermost first layer public information.



Second, the conditional transaction of assistance, on the one hand, made such intercultural friendships special and, on the other hand, was an indicator that such friendships were not yet fully developed. The following two accounts demonstrate the conditional transaction of help at this stage:

(1) With my Taiwanese friend, Danielle, I'm just interested in her friendship. We help each other out. She helped me a little with Chinese language and I helped her with some difficult English, a bit of a language exchange. (Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 9 months sojourning)

(2) Both of my relatively good American friends are my classmates. We are the kind of friends who are more likely to care about each other. Once we go home, it is just okay. Occasionally, we help each other out with our schoolwork or studies. Overall, our interaction is centered on school since I spend a lot of time at school. We seldom discuss personal matters. We did try to ask each other out a couple of times in the past, but it never happened. To me, they are good but not very close friends. Our friendships are somewhere between those of casual and close friends. (Female/ 26/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 2 years and 6 months sojourning)

Helping behavior plays a crucial role in friendship development (Argyle & Henderson, 1985). Research suggests that collectivistic societies place more emphasis on reciprocal help than individualistic societies (Gonzalez et al., 2004). Additionally, helpfulness is not only the critical factors that help Chinese roommates become friends (Lee & Bond, 1998) but also one of the three major motives associated with functional communicative behaviors in Chinese culture (Anderson et al., 1998). Therefore, as Taiwanese culture positions helping behavior different from Western individualistic cultures, the cultural differences pose obstacles to the future development of intercultural friendships between Taiwan and native English speakers.

Finally, intercultural friendships in the pendulum stage were marked by insufficient friendship maintenance behavior or the lack of efforts to maintain the friendships probably due to the voluntary nature of friendships, uncertain prospect of future interaction, time constraints, and other potential barriers. The following two excerpts illustrate the lack of friendship maintenance behavior:

(1) Usually, I make friends with Taiwanese people very quickly. It takes about three or four meetings to be sort of close, but the friendship usually doesn't last long, because of time restraints. Taiwanese people general work long hours and don't have time for maintaining friendships. (Male/ 35/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 2 years sojourning)

(2) In terms of friendship maintenance, with American friends, we won't spend time together after our classes end. But with Taiwanese friends, I know even after they graduate from here, we may still keep in contact. I don't know why that is. Or maybe even if they go back to Taiwan, I still have something in common with them. But, with Americans, besides school and work, we don't have much in common unless we are church friends. (Female/ 36/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 5 months sojourning)

In short, the data in this study suggest the existence of a distinct stage between casual and good intercultural friendships. The working definition 'the pendulum stage' is characterized by conditional self-disclosure, conditional transaction of assistance, and insufficient or lack of friendship maintenance behavior, which are symbolic of the insurmountable barriers and obstacles in the development of intercultural friendships.

*The Stability Exchange Stage:* This category entails relatively intimate and greater self-disclosure in intercultural friendships in the stability exchange stage that are as satisfying and close as developed intracultural friendships. Other than the common traits in intimate friendships, the distinct characteristics of self-disclosure at this stage were (a) the effect of unfamiliarity, (b) the safe sounding board effect, and (c) friendship closeness overriding the ethnicities of the friends.

First, the greater amount of self-disclosure in intimate intercultural friendships at this stage was due to great unfamiliarity between communicating patterns and cultures. The following accounts from one sojourning Taiwanese and one sojourning native English speaker are representative of the effect of unfamiliarity on great amount of self-disclosure:

(1) I think good friends back in New Zealand they know me quite well, so a lot of times I don't have to self-disclose quite so much. I quite often express how I feel even not verbally. Good friends back home kind of know and know me quite easily. Often those kinds of things don't need to be said so much, but here I still say them. It is more a feeling that I don't need to say a lot to my good, good friends. It is almost like a knowing thing. (Male/ 26/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 2 year sojourning)

(2) Sometimes I even tell more to Kelly, because you know we are human beings and we need privacy, so we need to keep a little bit of space in our heart for ourselves. But for Kelly,

she is just my new friend and everything happens so fast within one year. And I feel comfortable in front of her and I know she cares about me, so I feel comfortable to tell her everything that happens to me or what's going on in my mind I don't care about that. (Female/ 24/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 1 year and 6 months sojourning)

Research also supports this view of the unfamiliarity effect. Gudykunst and Nishida (1984)

indicate that communicators in initial intercultural encounters are likely to have higher levels of self-disclosure than in first meetings with a stranger from the same culture. Lee and Boster (as cited in Chen, 2002) state that the greater amount of self-disclosure in intercultural encounters is simply due to greater unfamiliarity.

Additionally, the safe sounding board effect also contributed to the higher levels of self-disclosure in the stability exchange stage is probably due to the perceived safe cultural distance and lower relational control in intimate intercultural friendships as opposed to intimate intracultural friendships. Such effect was especially prominent in the sojourning Taiwanese' accounts and supported by the sojourning native English speakers' descriptions of perceiving themselves as safe sounding boards for their Taiwanese friends. The two excerpts below illustrate the safe sounding board effect:

(1) With my good American friends, if I disclose certain personal matters with them, since Americans usually don't think much about things as Taiwanese people do, they naturally forget what you said later on. In the US, the Taiwanese circles are really small, so, if you tell someone a certain personal matter, you don't know if everyone else will know about it, too. So, with matters like these, I find it better to disclose to American friends. Also, my American friends usually don't tell me what to do if I disclose certain personal problems to them. Americans just don't pay that much attention to details. (Female/ 26/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 1 year and 7 months sojourning)

(2) I find that Taiwanese self-disclose to me more, because I am old and I am a foreigner. They find it safer. For example, they disclose their personal relationships, such as boyfriend-girlfriend stuff, they want stuff, and future goals and dreams. I am safe sounding board. (Male/ 65/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 3 years sojourning)

Thibaut and Kelly (as cited in Indvik & Fitzpartrick, 1986) defines control as the ability to influence behaviors in interpersonal relationships as well as the available range of relational outcomes. Indvik and Fitzpartick's (1986) study on five types of interpersonal relationships

found that best friends had more in common with the intimates in romantic relationships than with Friends. Also, both the intimates and best friends were defined by a control component: the legitimacy of making demands. Examining the perceptions of the friend's locus of control, Morry and Harasymchuk (2005) discovered that locus of control was an important predictor of one's own relational satisfaction for both men and women. However, there is no available study on control factors or locus of control in intimate intercultural friendships. In this study, the emergence of the safe sounding board effect in intimate intercultural friendships suggests that intimate intercultural friendships differ from intimate intracultural friendships both in the perceptions of the friend's locus of control and in the some elements of relational control.

Finally, the sojourners' high levels of self-disclosure in intimate intercultural friendships were facilitated by their perceptions that friendship closeness overrode the ethnicities of the friends. A number of sojourning native English speakers and sojourning Taiwanese in this study commented that they perceived no distinctions between their good intercultural friends and their good intracultural friends simply based on their ethnicities or nationalities.

(1) I lump people in terms of how close the friendship is not in terms of the ethnicity of the friendship. There are some things that I wouldn't talk about and there are some things I wouldn't be so tight-lipped about in terms of the closeness of the friendship. (Male/ 27/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 3 years sojourning)

(2) Both of them are good friends to me, and I don't treat or see them differently. I don't differentiate my self-disclosure based on their nationalities. In my mind, I don't think there are certain topics I only disclose to Taiwanese friends and other topics only to American friends. I don't do that. For example, my friends may give me different feedback because of their age or other factors, which is not necessarily culture. (Female/ 32/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 6 years sojourning)

Because "a good friend is a good friend whether Taiwanese or American (Male/ 24/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 1 year and 6 months sojourning)."

Gudykunst's (1985) study supports the parallel patterns with respect to the social penetration process in close intracultural and intercultural friendships. Additionally, research

buttresses the disappearance of group or ethnic memberships in close friendships. Altman and Taylor (1973) argue that group memberships appear to have little effect on relationships in the full affective exchange stage because the majority of interaction in close relationships focuses on personalistic exchanges. Consistently, Bell (as cited in Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988) proffers that friendship is developed out of private negotiations and is not imposed through cultural values and norms.

The data highlighted in this theme comprehensively answers the fourth research question which asks how self-disclosure impacts the formation and development of intercultural friendships between (a) Taiwanese sojourning in the US and native English speakers, and (b) native English speakers in Taiwan and Taiwanese. In essence, the data illuminated in this theme deconstructs the role of self-disclosure in the distinct stages of intercultural friendship development progressing from relationship orientation, relationship development, to relationship maintenance. Specifically, the researcher argues for the inclusion of a separate stage between relationship development and relationship maintenance called the pendulum stage, which symbolizes the transience and insurmountable barriers in the development of intercultural friendships. Also, the data in the forgoing theme analyzes the specific factors that influenced the sojourners' self-disclosure in the four distinct stages.

The data in this theme highlights the patterns and values placed on self-disclosure across cultures (Barnlund, 1989; Barry, 2003; Batonda & Perry, 2003; Won-Doornink, 1985) and underscores the correlation between reciprocal self-disclosure and positive affect across the stages of friendship development (Brewer & Mittelman, 1980; Chaikin & Derlega, 1974; Vittengl & Holt, 2000). Also, it points to the significant role of guarded self-disclosure in Asian cultures in intercultural friendships between Asians and native English speakers (Barry, 2003).

Theoretically, this theme supports the social penetration process and the critical role that self-disclosure plays in relationship development (Altman & Taylor, 1973).

#### *Friendship Closeness and Topics of Self-disclosure*

The fourth theme that emerged from the data is labeled Friendship Closeness and Topics of Self-disclosure. The statements that feature in this theme demonstrate how the sojourners as well as the Taiwanese in Taiwan in this study were similar or differed in their topics of self-disclosure to casual friends as opposed to good friends. Also, this theme illustrates the impact of cultural and social values on the topics of self-disclosure in relation to the relational closeness of friendships. This view is supported by existing literature. Researchers indicate that the intimacy of topics of self-disclosure also positively correlates with the relational closeness of friendships (Dolgin & Kim, 1992; Rubin & Shenker, 1978). Also, cross-cultural research reveals that categories and preferences for conversation for friends differ from culture to culture (Korn, 1993; Cahn, 1984)

Specifically, this theme describes the clustering of topics of self-disclosure based on the intimacy levels of the friendships, the scope and the depth of topics appropriate for discussion, and topic avoidance in cross-cultural friendships as opposed to intracultural friendships. The theme breaks down into three categories: (a) Cultural Values and Nonintimate Topics, (b) Cultural Values and Intimate topics, and (c) Topic Avoidance. The categories are discussed in detail next.

*Cultural Values and Nonintimate Topics:* This category describes cultural values and the disclosure of nonintimate or superficial topics both cross-culturally and intraculturally. In general, topics of low intimacy involve lower personal risks and thus are considered appropriate for both casual and close friendships, especially for the former. Also, research suggests that responses to

low intimacy messages that reciprocate both intimacy level and topics receive the most positive evaluations (Hosman, 1987). The data in this study revealed that cultural values and cultural differences influenced the disclosure of nonintimate topics in three ways: (a) nonintimate topics appropriate across cultures, (b) nonintimate topics unique to intercultural encounters, and (c) different cultural preferences of nonintimate topics.

First, in spite of the differences in the levels of self-disclosure among the sojourners and the Taiwanese in Taiwan on certain topics, the nonintimate or superficial topics appropriate for discussion across cultural boundaries in this study included: (a) tastes and interests, (b) studies or work, and (c) everyday life issues. The emergence of these topics was based on repeated cross-section comparisons among the three groups. Two of the three nonintimate topics areas that emerged in this study correlate with Jourard and Lawakow 's (1958) low disclosure cluster including (1) attitudes and opinions, (2) tastes and interests, and (3) work. Other than the topics on attitudes and opinions which were only predominant in the sojourners' accounts, this study suggests a correspondence between nonintimate topics and high disclosure topics. However, no research that the author is aware of has yet examined the correlation between superficial topics and high disclosure topics.

In terms of disclosing on the topics of tastes and interests, overall more sojourning native English speakers mentioned self-disclosing or talking about tastes and interests than did the sojourning Taiwanese and the Taiwanese in Taiwan in this study. The following three excerpts represent the respondents' comments in the topic area of tastes and interests:

(1) With casual Taiwanese friends, I talk about my interests, my preferences, my favorite drink, and what I did over the weekend. We also talk about what they are interested in. Some Taiwanese guys like to talk about basketball. A lot of Taiwanese males like basketball. (Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 1 year sojourning)

(2) I think I share pretty much the same things in terms of my hobbies, interests and tastes with both my casual and good American friends, such as working out and basketball. (Male/ 20/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 4 years sojourning)

(3) With casual friends, I talk about my interests, things I came across at work, my studies, or what I saw on TV today, and some everyday life stuff. (Female/ 22/ Taiwanese in Taiwan)

Similarly, in Horenstein and Downey's (2003) cross-cultural study between Latin Americans and North Americans, 'tastes and interests' emerged as high disclosure topics in both ethnic groups. Also, in Barnlund's (1987) investigation on topic priorities between Japanese and Americans found that 'tastes and interests' were the most favored topics for conversation. Chen's (1995) comparative study on self-disclosure patterns provides support for the different levels of self-disclosure on 'tastes and interests' found in this study both quantitatively and qualitatively, Chen (1995) argues that Americans consistently show higher levels of disclosure than the Chinese on topics such as interests, opinions, work, financial issues, personality, and body. However, the data in this study did not suggest 'tastes and interests' as the most favored topics as Barnlund (1987) did, which may be due to the cultural differences between Japan and Taiwan or the time lapse between Barnlund's study and this study.

In terms of disclosing on the topics of studies or work, most sojourning Taiwanese in this study mentioned disclosing or talking about school-related topics with their American friends while a number of sojourning native English speakers commented on being asked about or disclosing work-related issues. Also, the topics related to work or studies were prevalent in the accounts of the Taiwanese in Taiwan depending on their status as students or employees. The following three excerpts are representative of the participants' responses:

(1) With casual Taiwanese friends, we usually talk about school or work or "Are you busy?" "How was your weekend?" and relationships like "How is your boyfriend?" We talk about boyfriends and that kinds of things like what kinds of movies they watch and what have they bought. (Female/ 22/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 months sojourning)

(2) I talk about exam, school work or studies with my casual American friends. (Female/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 1 year sojourning)



(3) I talk about work-related things and ordinary things with causal friends. (Female/ 30/ Taiwanese in Taiwan)

However, it is important to note that even though topics of studies or work emerged as one of the nonintimate topics appropriate for self-disclosure across cultural boundaries, the Taiwanese in general had higher regards and preferences for school or work-related topics than the native English speakers as one participant commented “work is so much more important for a Taiwan person than it is for a New Zealand person. Time and social things are so much more important for a New Zealand person than for a Taiwan person I think” (Male/ 26/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 years sojourning). In a similar vein, Cahn’s (1984) study concludes that work is one of the topics that Japanese are more in favor of disclosing when communicating with Americans.

Everyday life issues emerged as the last category of nonintimate topics of self-disclosure appropriate across cultures. Specifically, topics of everyday life issues encompassed all aspects of action-oriented daily life and involved the periphery of personality, maybe including but not exclusive of elements of tastes, interests, and studies or work. The representative excerpts of this category are reported below:

(1) With casual Taiwanese friends, conversations tend to be about doing activity-focused, such as “Do you want to go hiking?” “Do you want to go play sports?” “Do you want to go for a movie?” or something like that. It tends to be more quite functional and then there is the opportunity to socialize so then we may talk about more broader issues such as “What’s happening in your social life?” or “What’s happening at work?” But it tends not to be too deep. It tends to be sort of activity-focused and sort of pragmatic and day-to-day based.

(Male/ 39/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 1 year and 8 months sojourning)

(2) With causal friends in general whether American or Taiwanese, you talk about general things and stay away from the more private and sensitive stuff. So, you talk about daily life, work, family, news, current events, hobbies, and the likes. (Male/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 5 years and 6 months sojourning)

(3) With casual friends, I talk about the formulaic and superficial stuff, such as gossip, current events, weather, some perfunctory stuff, or you try to talk about the commonality between each other. (Male/ 26/ Taiwanese in Taiwan)

Also, this category emerged dependent on its predominance and pervasiveness in the participants' accounts in all three groups. Additionally, the creation of this category was based on its distinctively perfunctory and pragmatic nature.

Additionally, the unique contexts of intercultural encounters engendered and stimulated certain topics in causal intercultural friendships that were not found in casual intracultural friendships. The nonintimate topics unique to intercultural encounters that emerged in this study were: cultural exchange at the personal level, including culture shock. These were exclusive topics concentrating on the cultural layers or aspects of the self that remained latent in intracultural friendships but became salient in intercultural friendships. Thus, this researcher advocates that inclusion of the cultural layers of the self in the construction of personality structure in self-disclosure research (e.g. Altman & Taylor, 1973) will significantly aid the currently limited understanding of the self in intercultural encounters.

The following two accounts represent self-disclosure on the topics of cultural exchange at the personal level that highlighted the cultural layers of the self salient in intercultural encounters:

(1) Taiwanese friends often want to talk about differences in culture and the experiences I had in Taiwan as opposed those that I had in other countries. With a lot of casual Taiwanese friends, it is a lot about cultural exchanges. It's culture. But at the same time, a lot of other things come up, like "what's going on the world". And we talk about what's going on in their lives and with their work. That's the way the conversation develops. (Male/ 27/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 3 years sojourning)

(2) I ask them about the cultural differences and also ask them about how they view us. Only by asking them can I have first-hand information on how they look at us and our culture. Also, I would like to talk to them about the cultural differences between the US and Taiwan, such as their educational systems and family relationships, because I want to have the first-hand information on that. (Female/ 36/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 5 months sojourning)

In addition, it is evident that self-disclosing on the topics of cultural exchange or cultural differences provide sojourners with opportunities not only to explore, reflect, and comprehend

the cultural impact on what they are but also to learn different approaches and perspectives on constructing the self in a different culture.

A distinct subcategory in the topics of cultural exchange was the topic of culture shock as one participant explained:

Americans in general often ask me about my experiences of culture shock here. Americans generally are interested in this topic. They are curious about how we feel about living here and the way Americans do things. In terms of personal experiences such as culture shock, when I discuss culture shock with Americans, I only focus on the positive sides. With Taiwanese friends, when we talk about culture shock, we often complain and discuss the negative aspects of culture shock. (Male/ 28/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 4.5 months sojourning)

Culture shock forms a distinct subcategory because it often occurs early in the intercultural encounters and appeared to happen more often to sojourners in their first few months of sojourning. Also, topics on culture shock seem to be more one-sided cultural exchange with a focus on the host culture.

In general, this author argues that self-disclosure on the topics of cultural exchange focus on the cultural layers of the self. However, cultural exchange topics may not seem appealing to all sojourners because they involved interests in cultures, relatively complex mental processing, and sometimes unpredictable outcomes. In this study, interest in cultures comes across as a big factor in promoting and engaging in topics of cultural exchange. In a similar vein, Gareis' (1995) qualitative study on Taiwanese-American friendships argues that international interest on part of the Americans is an important factor hindering or aiding the development of friendship. Morgan and Arasaratnam's (2003) study found that the personality trait of sensation seeking associated with the need for novelty correlated with the pursuit of intercultural friendships. Furthermore, Smith and Downs's (2004) study suggests that intercultural partners who match in their level of sensation seeking are more likely to expect and thus have positive intercultural experiences.

Lastly, culture not only influences verbal styles of self-disclosure (Chen, 1995) but also determines preferences and norms of topics appropriate for self-disclosure (Cahn, 1984; Horenstein & Downey, 2003). In disclosing to causal friends, Taiwanese were in favor of such practical topics as work or studies, marital status, financial concerns especially money, while native English speaker were in favor of such topics as tastes and interests, opinions and attitudes, and personality.

The Taiwanese' preferences for practical matters were not only evident in their own accounts but also observed by the sojourning native English speakers. First, as discussed earlier, the Taiwanese associate higher regards for school or work-related topics than the native English speakers. Second, regarding practical topics of a personal nature such as money matters and marital status, both sojourning Taiwanese and Taiwanese in Taiwan stated only discussing and disclosing such personal topics to good friends. However, several sojourning native English speakers mentioned having to self-disclose such matters to causal Taiwanese friends upon their inquiry. The following excerpts illustrate the Taiwanese's preference for financial concerns and marital status:

(1) With good friends, we never talk about the formulaic nonsense. We talk about money such as if we have been making or losing money in the stock market or the lottery. We talk about our romantic relationships such as if any of us is planning on getting married. We also talk about our plans for the future or we complain about our jobs and bear our souls. (Male/ 31/ Taiwanese in Taiwan)

(2) We talk about everything, including work, interests and tastes, money issues with their family or husband because they are things happening to you in your everyday life. I ask my close American friends about their views on money and how they manage money within their households. (Female/ 32/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 6 years sojourning)

(3) In Canada, people wouldn't ask you questions like "How much do you make?" "Are you married?" But Taiwanese friends often ask more specific questions regarding money. Hm... and Taiwanese friends would talk about their tastes but seldom discuss their attitudes. (Male/ 28/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 3 years sojourning)

It appears that topics of a personal nature such as financial concerns and marital status are considered more intimate topics and are usually rendered appropriate in serious friendships

rather than causal ones. The sojourning native English speakers' being asked about their financial and marital status by casual Taiwanese could only be attributed to (a) curiosity on the part of the Taiwanese, (b) different interpretations of the relationship definition among intercultural friends, or (c) the knowledge of safety created the cultural distance between Taiwanese and English-speaking cultures.

On the other hand, native English speakers had higher preferences for such topics as tastes and interests, opinions and attitudes, and personality in casual friendships as the following excerpts illustrate:

(1) I think that I am very interested in different perspectives. I would be very willing to talk about my personality, because I would like to hear their opinions. I would like to hear friends from different cultures' perspectives. Yes, I would discuss my personality openly.

(Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 1 year sojourning)

(2) I really like discussing politics with all my friends, but the Taiwanese tend to be apolitical. They usually don't know nor care that much about politics. So, we usually talk about the politics of business. (Male/ 35/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 2 years sojourning)

Such preferences on the part of the native English speakers are supported by research which indicate that the foundation of Western friendships patterns are similarities, shared interests, shared activities, and perceived common ground (Argyle & Henderson, 1985; Blieszner & Adams, 1992; Cramer, 1988; Sias & Cahill, 1988). Also, Chen's (1995) comparative study supports Americans' high levels of self-disclosure on topics such as opinions, interest, work, and personality as opposed to the Chinese.

In contrast, the Taiwanese respondents' accounts suggest that Taiwanese people typically reserve self-disclosure on topics of opinions and attitudes for intimate friendships as one participant remarked that "I only disclose ..... and personal subjective opinions to good friends because of trust, and also because good friends understand my thinking better" (Female/ 19/ Taiwanese in Taiwan). Additionally, research suggests that relationships in non-Western cultures

do not depend on common or shared interests as much as those in Western cultures (Javidi & Javidi, 1991). Therefore, it seems that Western cultures place more emphasis on self-disclosure on topics of ‘attitudes and opinions’ and ‘tastes and interests’ in casual friendship than Taiwanese culture.

*Cultural Values and Intimate Topics:* This category demonstrates cultural values and the disclosure of intimate topics both cross-culturally and intraculturally. In general, topics of high intimacy involve the inner layers and private areas of personality and occur in the stable exchange stage of the social penetration process (Altman & Taylor, 1973). In this study, the respondents’ statements revealed more similarities than differences in their topics of disclosure in close friendships across the three groups. Specifically, two subcategories emerged explaining the impact of cultural values on the disclosure of intimate topics: (a) intimate topics appropriate for disclosure across cultures, and (b) preferences of disclosure of intimate topics in close intercultural friendships as opposed to intracultural friendships.

First, based on the participants’ responses to the question of what kinds of topics they usually discuss in the targeted intercultural or intracultural friendships, the intimate topic appropriate for disclosure across cultural boundaries emerged in this study were: (a) emotions, and (b) family and relationships. Some sojourners and Taiwanese did consider topics of money or financial concerns, body and appearance, and personality as intimate topics only appropriate for close friendships. However, due to the inconsistency across all three groups, they were not included as exclusively intimate topics.

In terms of emotional disclosure, the following three excerpts from each of the three groups under investigation are representative of disclosing feeling and emotions in close friendships:

(1) Good Taiwanese friends talk more personally like about how I am feeling, how they are feeling, what is going on in their lives, what problems they are having and this kind of things. Generally of a more personal nature. Often it seems like more so with good Taiwanese friends they are more egoistic to get things off their chest and often get quite long and kind of monologue about the past three weeks' emotional ups and downs in terms of what has been happening with their partners and whatever. I often find myself listen a lot to that kind of lengthy disclosure. With New Zealand friends, we are more wary about being too windy. It is pretty similar. (Male/ 26/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 2 years sojourning)

(2) With my good American friend from church, we talk about my emotions, my feelings, and the difficulties I encounter in my life. In general, with good American friends, I don't have to careful and we talk about everything like why I am in a bad mood and so on. (Female/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 4 years sojourning)

(3) I mostly only talk about emotional life and my feelings, because I want to get a sense of recognition from them. (Male/ 25/ Taiwanese in Taiwan)

The discovery of intimate emotional disclosure in close friendships is supported by the crucial role of friendship in providing social support despite gender differences, especially emotional support in times of need or stress (Derlega et al., 1994; in Fehr, 1996). In particular, the disclosure of either intense or negative emotions is considered intimate and is usually not appropriate with casual acquaintances (Howell & Conway, 1990). Also, the first excerpt above seemed to reveal that Taiwanese people comparatively disclosed more and even showed higher levels of disclosure than native English speakers in close friendships. Part of it could be attributed to the sojourning native English speakers' ability to speak Chinese, part of it could possibly be because of the emphasis on emotional interdependence in collectivistic cultures (Ow & Katz, 1999), and finally could probably be due to the important distinctions Taiwanese tend to make between 'just friends' and 'good friends' (Chen et al., 2001) based on the cultural concepts of ingroups and outgroups (Yum, 1988).

In terms of disclosure on topics of family and relationships, the following excerpts are representative of self-disclosure related to family and relationships:

(1) There are lots of things I would talk about with my good Taiwanese friends. It could be anything: relationships, feelings, anything really. There aren't really anything that I wouldn't share with my good Taiwanese friends. We talk about family and money. With casual friends, no, but money and finances you wouldn't mind sharing with your good

friends because they are confidential. You can trust each other. (Male/ 29/ Australian/ 4 years sojourning)

(2) With my good American friends, we always talk about our relationships with our girlfriends. I tell them the fights I have with my girlfriend and ask them to be the judge to judge who is right and who is wrong. Usually they are smart enough not to get into it. Because if you really do, that would be a really big disaster. But some things you just can't tell them. (Male/ 20/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 4 years sojourning)

(3) I only talk about family with good friends, because I feel that family matters are very private issues and sometimes very hard to explain to casual friend who don't know me well. (Male/ 24/ Taiwanese in Taiwan)

In spite of the differences in cultural values regarding family, most participants in this study across all three groups treated disclosure on the topics of family and personal relationships as private information that were inappropriate in casual friendships. Empirically, Goodwin's (1990) comparative study on British and Chinese subjects not only confirmed disclosure on family matters as intimate topics but also found that most taboo topics in close friendships were associated with family matters as well as hurt feelings in both cultures. Additionally, governed by the Chinese cultural beliefs in saving face and the fear of stigma or social isolation, Chinese families tend to keep distressful information such as illness a secret and only selectively disclose such family secrets to non-family members (Ow & Katz, 1999).

Second, with respect to preferences of disclosure of intimate topics in close intercultural friendships as opposed to intracultural friendships, sex topics were the only intimate topics that emerged in which the cultural backgrounds of the close friends determined the propriety, scope, and depth of self-disclosure. Overall, most sojourning participants felt more comfortable disclosing sex topics to close friends of Western cultural backgrounds while the word 'sex' had never appeared in any of the 21 interviews with the Taiwanese in Taiwan. The following excerpts are from one male sojourning Taiwanese, one female sojourning Taiwanese, and one male sojourning native English speaker:

(1) Probably sex. I tend to discuss sex with my American friends in greater depth and with more details. I also talk about sex with my Taiwanese friends but we would never go into details. (Female/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 5 months sojourning)



(2) I treat most of my friends equally with less preference to race or nationality. However, ironically, there are some topics I'm more willing to talk to good American friends about. Like the topic of sex, which is still pretty taboo in Taiwanese culture. (Male/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 5 years and 6 months sojourning)

(3) Good Western friends talk about sex. It is a topic that we can talk about and joke about. The self-disclosure is pretty complete. But I am not 20 years old anymore. There is no longer such need to compare with other people and to see what the range of human sexual experience is like. And I think it is very positive. That total self-disclosure is very positive for young people for just getting out there and see that lots of people do lots of things. It gets a sense of where to place yourself. And that's why I think it is good for younger people. (Male/ 45/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 9 years sojourning)

The implications are that the differences in cultural values and openness towards sex talk rendered native English speakers much better targets for sexual self-disclosure. There are also the potential effects of moral judgment imposed by members of one's own culture. Research supports the view that topics concerned with sexual behaviors and sexual activities are personal issues, especially for females (Snell et al., 1992; Solano, 1981).

Such a finding is not surprising for the following reasons. First, governed by Confucian's doctrines of propriety and the cultural norms for conformity, sexual topics in general are considered inappropriate for disclosure or discussion in Taiwanese/Chinese culture. Thus, native English speakers are comparatively more open and comfortable discussing sex-related topics. Secondly, Weinberg (as cited in Smith, 1980) asserts that sexual modesty and embarrassment are specific to high context cultures. Thirdly, empirical research confirms the significance of (a) target person's sexual attitudes, (b) perceived similarity of target's values, and (c) target comfortableness in discussing sexual topics as predictors of sexual self-disclosure (Herold & Way, 1988).

*Topic Avoidance:* This category features an analysis of topic avoidance or the perceptions of taboo topics in either intercultural or intracultural friendships. Generally, the sojourning Taiwanese respondents exhibited more avoidance in both their intercultural and intracultural friendships than the sojourning native English respondents followed by the Taiwanese in Taiwan.

Research supports the view that there are more friendship taboo topics and taboo behaviors in Chinese culture than in English/British culture (Goodwin & Lee, 1994). Thus, it is not surprising that the sojourning Taiwanese reported more avoidance than did the sojourning native English speakers.

However, contrary to what Goodwin & Lee (1994) suggest, the Taiwanese in Taiwan interviewed almost all remarked that they felt comfortable baring their souls and discussing almost 'everything and anything (Female/ 22/ Taiwanese in Taiwan)' with good Taiwanese friends. One possible explanation for such contradiction is that the Taiwanese respondents in Taiwan were commenting on the general perceptions and desires of disclosing their true selves to good friends rather than the actuality of disclosing practically everything or anything possible. Another possible explanation is that the subjects engaged in identity management and avoided reporting any negative avoidance due to the limitation of measuring self-disclosure through self-reports and interviews (Lombardo & Berzonsky, 1979). Still another possible explanation consistent with the sojourners' account is that the overwhelming majority of the topic avoidance in this study was based on the overcharging differing views between Taiwanese culture and Western cultures.

Overall, there were more disagreements than agreements in the two groups of sojourners' accounts regarding specific taboo topics or topic avoidance in either intercultural or intracultural friendships due to either different individual personalities towards disclosure or varying dyadic relational closeness. However, after applying Afifi and Guerrero's (2000) motivational perspective to analyze topic avoidance, an overarching factor emerged behind topic avoidance: differing cultural views regarding self and privacy, relationship closeness, and high quality information. Specifically, all the three types of motivations behind topic avoidance in this study

were attributed to the perceptions of differing cultural views: (a) individual-based motivations, (b) relationships-based motivations, and (c) information-based motivations.

First, individual-based motivations behind topic avoidance were strategic avoidance to either bolster one's identity or to protect one's privacy against harm and/or negative judgments because of the differing cultural views as the following two excerpts illustrate:

(1) I will never ask American friends things like how to get a green card. Maybe I will ask them one day, but now I think they don't like this kind of question. I am not sure. I feel like they will judge me if ask them these kinds of question. It's like if they know you want to stay here, they will feel that everything you do is for staying in America. (Male/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 9 months sojourning)

(2) I guess the certain, say negative aspects, of here. I tend to, or I will talk more to my Canadian friends about that than I will to Taiwanese people. For myself, I try to put a positive spin on things. I try not to worry about things that I can't control. You know, so, but there are things that are just crazy. And sometimes if you talk to them, they will... You can't believe what happened to me today or I saw this person doing this....or I got this, this is just too nuts. And to explain it to a Taiwanese person, they may not understand my problem and what that is. And they might take it the wrong way. (Male/ 36/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 6 months sojourning)

Typically, sojourners avoided disclosure of any criticism of the host culture or behaviors that were not considered socially inappropriate in the host societies such as drug abuse and sexual activities that were mentioned earlier to members of the host nationals to protect their self positive image or identity. Afifi and Guerrero (1998) even argue that "self-presentation is the primary motivator underlying topic avoidance in friendships" (p. 241).

Second, relationship-based motivations behind topic avoidance were intentional avoidance in order to protect relationships or prevent conflict due to the differing cultural views. The first account below is topic avoidance in intercultural friendships for the sake of preserving the friendship while the second account is topic avoidance in intracultural friendships due to the concept of relational control especially in Chinese culture discussed earlier:

(1) There is some information that I never share with my Taiwanese friends, such as money. I never share this kind of issue with my Taiwanese friends and I am more careful with my Taiwanese friends than with my western friends from other cultures, because I am concerned about my Taiwanese friends' feelings. I am more sensitive towards them because

of some fundamental differences in our cultures such as family. If I want share this with them, that would ruin our friendships. (Male/ 30/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 1 year sojourning)

(2) I don't disclose to my Taiwanese friends things here that I know they would not approve such as my transferring and how I really feel deep down. And I feel more comfortable disclosing my emotions to my good American friend from..... However, I don't disclose my intimate emotions to my Taiwanese friends here. They think it is shameful to be too emotional. To be too emotional is like a flaw of our personality, so we should and we can conquer the flaws of our personalities. But I do feel comfortable discussing my emotions with one of my good friends in Taiwan. (Female/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 4 years sojourning)

It was evident that the sojourner's disclosure was influenced by the relational rules, cultures, and intimacy of their friendships. What was appropriate for self-disclosure in one friendship may be rendered inappropriate in another. However, more sojourning Taiwanese mentioned avoidance for fear of disapproval or control from their Taiwanese friends. Overall, topic avoidance seems to indicate levels of relational intimacy and relational satisfaction (Dailey & Palomares, 2004; Knobloch & Carpenter-Theune, 2004). Knobloch and Carpenter suggest that relational uncertainty is positively correlated with topic avoidance, which subsequently mediates the association between intimacy and topic avoidance. In a similar vein, the research found that there were great relational uncertainty and topic avoidance in intercultural friendships as opposed to intracultural friendships due to the differing cultural views between Taiwanese culture and Western cultures.

Finally, information-based motivations behind topic avoidance were mindful avoidance so as to avoid futile or uninteresting information exchange based on the differing cultural views and preferences as one sojourning native English speaker and one sojourning Taiwanese commented:

(1) It kind of depends on what kind of groups of friends. In the youth group we talk quite a bit about studies through religions and kind of experiences that have to do with the group in the past or beliefs or ideas that have to do with religion. We don't talk about money or fashion or kind of girls or boys that type of things. (Male/ 26/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 2 year sojourning)

(2) Generally, I normally wouldn't discuss things specifically dealing with Taiwan or Taiwanese culture with my American friends, because I don't think they would be interested or have any knowledge of such subject matter. (Female/ 27/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 1 year and 7 months sojourning)

The information-based avoidance takes place on the perceptions and interpretations of the futility and quality of information to the target friends. Most of the information-based avoidance in this study was dependent on the distinct cultural preferences whether it was at the individual, relational, or national level.

The data illuminated in this theme comprehensively answers the second research question which inquires how (a) Taiwanese sojourning in the US, (b) native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan, and (c) Taiwanese people who primarily socialize with other Taiwanese differ or are similar in their topics of self-disclosure. In essence, the data highlighted in this theme illustrate both similarities and differences in the three focused groups' topics of self-disclosure as well as the impact of cultural values on topics of self-disclosure. In terms of similarities, all three groups of participants differentiated nonintimate topics as opposed to intimate topics dependent on friendship closeness. Specifically, 'tastes and interests' and 'studies or work' were nonintimate topics appropriate for disclosure among all three groups, while 'emotions' and 'family and relationships' were intimate topics appropriate for disclosure across cultural boundaries.

On the other hand, there were four differences found among the three groups. First, cultural exchange emerged as the nonintimate topic unique to intercultural encounters. Second, Taiwanese people whether sojourning or not preferred nonintimate topics such as work or studies, marital status, financial concerns or money matters, while sojourning native English speakers were in favor of topics such as tastes and interests, opinions and attitudes, and personality. Third, both groups of sojourners preferred to disclose such intimate topics as sex topics to close friends of Western cultural backgrounds. Lastly, differing cultural views between Taiwanese cultures and Western cultures was the overarching factor behind topic avoidance.

The data in this theme underscores the impact of both friendship closeness and cultural values on topics of self-disclosure (Barnlund, 1987; Cahn, 1984; Chen, 1995; Dolgin & Kim, 1992; Horenstein & Downey, 2003; Rubin & Shenker, 1978). In particular, based on the highlighted topic of self-disclosure unique to intercultural encounters, this author advocates the inclusion of the cultural layers of the self in the construction of personality structure in addition to the public self as opposed to the private self (e.g. Altman & Taylor, 1973).

#### *Self-disclosure and Cultural Adaptation*

The last category constructed from the data is labeled Self-disclosure and Cultural Adaptation. This category highlights the role of self-disclosure in sojourners' adaptation into the host culture through the mediation of forming close friendships with the host nationals. Empirical support for the conceptualization of this category is twofold. On the one hand, research on foreign students' cultural adaptation unanimously points out that networking and forming relationships with host nationals plays a crucial role in the foreign students' adaptation and adjustment (Lin & Yi, 1997; Olaniran, 1996; Zimmermann, 1995). On the other hand, research on self-disclosure suggests a correlation between high self-disclosure or self-disclosure flexibility and social adjustment (Chen, 1993; Starr, 1975; Winum & Banikiotes, 1983). This study proposes a positive association between self-disclosure and adaptation in sojourners mediated through the formation of close friendships with domestic host nationals.

Specifically, the data in this study invariably underscores the connection between self-disclosure and cultural adaptation. It was evident in the sojourners' accounts that once the challenges facing self-disclosure, such as language difficulties, unreciprocated self-disclosure and so forth, were overcome, the formation of friendship assisted their adaptation particularly

because it provided them with the assistance they needed to acculturate into the host culture as one participant commented:

Probably because I keep my close friends very close, and I don't have time for too many people. I find it not necessarily with my Taiwanese friends, but I find it is much easier to bond with them (my close Taiwanese friends). They are more willing to help you out, and they give you more reasons to understand certain Taiwanese people. (Male/ 27/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 3 years sojourning)

The linkage between self-disclosure and acculturation has been documented especially among immigrants from collectivistic cultures such as Greece (Koutrelakos, 2004) and Mexico (Franco et al., 1984). However, it would be too presumptuous to think that the process of cultural adaptation is a smooth one and only a matter of time.

Additionally, this study highlights the role of sojourners' self-efficacy in adapting their styles of self-disclosure in order to form close friendships with the host nationals as one sojourning native English speakers and one sojourning Taiwanese remarked:

- (1) With close Taiwanese friends, with some of them, those from work, it develops differently. At first, we only talk about work. Then, I would share either good things or bad things about myself or I don't want to say something that is too un-American, then I would change the subject. I wouldn't wanna say something to them that they would be shocked at or turned off by it. So, it takes longer to develop closer friendships with a Taiwanese person, but it can still develop. (Female/ 24/ Sojourning native English speaker/ 4 years sojourning)
- (2) I think it is I who has been different and my English ability. When I first arrived, I was not confident of myself and was very shy about speaking in English. Now that I am more confident about speaking in English, I try to think of topics to chat with them. So, I don't think it is that they have changed; it is I who has been different. (Female/ 26/ Sojourning Taiwanese/ 1 year and 7 months sojourning)

It seemed to be a mutual process that both the sojourners as well as their intercultural friends needed to be willing to adapt and adjust to one another. For the sojourners, their self-efficacy, the perceived level of confidence in their capability, was important because it seemed to tie into their self-disclosure flexibility. This view is supported by Zhang's (2004) study, which found that the sojourning Chinese students' general self-efficacy was correlated positively and significantly with their overall intercultural adaptation to US universities. Also, Harvey and Omarzu (1997)

assert that mutual self-disclosure governed by being mindful facilitates the process of achieving relational closeness.

The data in this theme adds insight into the fourth research question which inquires how self-disclosure influences the formation and development of intercultural friendships. In essence, the data illuminated in this theme highlights the role of self-disclosure in cultural adaptation mediated through the development of close intercultural friendships. It also points out the importance of the sojourner's self-efficacy in making efforts to enhance their self-disclosure flexibility. Theoretically, the view supports the significance of adaptive behaviors in terms of self-disclosure on the part of the sojourners in a theory of adaptation (Ellingsworth, 1996).

### Summary

This section will discuss the general results of this study in the order of the research questions and hypothesis posed. The first research question asks how the following three groups of individuals, (a) Taiwanese sojourning in the US, (b) native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan, and (c) Taiwanese people who primarily socialize with other Taiwanese, vary on the four dimensions of self-disclosure, namely intention, amount, depth, and positive-negative. The quantitative analysis indicated that sojourning native English speakers in Taiwanese were more intentional in their self-disclosure with strangers than sojourning Taiwanese in the US and Taiwanese in Taiwan. In terms of the amount of self-disclosure, the quantitative results revealed that Taiwanese in Taiwan reported the greatest amount of self-disclosure with strangers than sojourning Taiwanese in the US and sojourning native English speakers in Taiwan. Additionally, the first theme of the qualitative analysis, *Issues Affecting Self-disclosure in Intercultural Friendships*, supported that both groups of sojourners' amount of self-disclosure to strangers



were hindered by the following factors: (a) English language skills, (b) differing cultural values and norms, (c) communication styles and competence, and (d) power difference and unearned privilege.

The second research question asks how the following three specified groups of individuals differ or are similar in their topics of self-disclosure. The quantitative analysis demonstrated that sojourning native English speakers in Taiwan disclosed more information regarding their ‘tastes and interests,’ ‘studies or work,’ and ‘personality’ to both strangers and causal friends than did sojourning Taiwanese in the US followed by Taiwanese in Taiwan. The quantitative analysis also highlighted that in disclosure to good friends, sojourning native English speakers disclosed more personal information regarding their studies or work than sojourning Taiwanese in the US followed by Taiwanese in Taiwan while Taiwanese in Taiwan disclosed more personal information concerning their body and appearance than did sojourning Taiwanese followed by sojourning native English speakers in Taiwan. In addition, the fourth theme of the qualitative analysis, Friendship Closeness and Topics of Self-disclosure, discovered that both sojourning Taiwanese in the US and Taiwanese in Taiwan people preferred nonintimate topics such as work or studies, marital status, financial concerns or money matters, while sojourning native English speakers were in favor of topics such as tastes and interests, opinions and attitudes, and personality.

The third research question inquires how an individual’s self-disclosure is similar or different in intimate intercultural friendships as opposed to intimate intracultural friendships. The quantitative analysis indicated that sojourning native English speakers disclose similarly to both good Taiwan friends and good friends from their own culture(s). In contrast, sojourning Taiwanese in the US had greater intention to disclose to good Taiwanese friends than to good US

American friends. Largely, the third theme of the qualitative analysis, Self-disclosure among Sojourners, added that sojourner's self-disclosure in intracultural friendships was facilitated by the following variables: (a) communal institutions for sojourners, (b) disclosing in mother tongue, (c) shared cultural background, and (d) personal and social needs.

The fourth research question asks of the extent to which self-disclosure affects the formation and development of intercultural friendships between (a) Taiwanese sojourning in the US and native English speakers, and (b) native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan and Taiwanese. Furthermore, both the third theme of the qualitative analysis, Self-disclosure and Stages of Intercultural Friendship Development, and the fifth theme, Self-disclosure and Cultural Adaptation, provided additional information.

Specifically, four stages of intercultural friendship development emerged from the data: (a) the orientation and initial attraction stage, (b) the exploratory exchange stage, (c) the pendulum stage, and (d) the stability exchange stage. First, four factors were found to impact self-disclosure in the orientation and initiation attraction stage: (1) openness and receptiveness toward strangers, (2) perceived advantage, (3) perceived similarity, and (4) physical attraction. Second, three factors played a role in self-disclosure in the exploratory exchange stage: (1) time or opportunities to socialize, (2) similar backgrounds or experiences, and (3) reciprocity and patterns of self-disclosure. The third pendulum stage of vacillation was characterized by transience and insurmountable barriers that stymied intercultural dyads from achieving the relational closeness of intimate friendships. Lastly, the distinctive characteristics marked self-disclosure at the stability exchange stage were: (1) the effect of unfamiliarity, (2) the safe sounding board effect, and (3) friendship closeness overriding the ethnicities of friends.

Finally, hypothesis I posits that sojourning Taiwanese self-disclose in greater depth but in lesser amount and was largely supported by the quantitative analysis.

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents the summary and conclusions drawn from the present research. The chapter includes three sections. The first section, summary and conclusions, will present an overview of the study followed by outlining the conclusions from the study. The second section, limitations, will address the scope of the study and the attendant constraints. The chapter concludes with a section describing the implications of the study and directions for future research. The three sections will be discussed next.

#### Summary and Conclusions

Grounded in the social penetration perspective, this exploratory study examined the role of self-disclosure in the development of intercultural friendship between Taiwanese and native English speakers by a section of the following populations: (a) Taiwanese sojourning in the US, (b) native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan, and (c) Taiwanese who primarily socialize with other Taiwanese. Specifically, the present research employed a triangulation of quantitative surveys and qualitative respondent interviews to investigate four dimensions (intent, amount, depth, and positive-negative) and six topic areas (attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, work or studies, money, personality, and body and appearance) of self-disclosure in the focused intercultural friendship.

The sample was selected based on purposeful sampling, which allowed me to keep opt for participants with specific friendship experiences and cultural backgrounds within the premise of this study. In the quantitative portion of this study, 49 Taiwanese sojourning in the US, 56 native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan, and 67 Taiwanese in Taiwan completed the surveys. In

additional to the surveys, the researcher interviewed 21 Taiwanese sojourning in the US, 20 native English speakers sojourning in Taiwan, and 21 Taiwanese in Taiwan.

Four research questions and one hypothesis were raised in this study seeking to understand how self-disclosure impacted the development of intercultural friendship between Taiwanese and native English speakers. Theoretically, three theories, the social penetration theory, anxiety/uncertainty management theory, and theory of adaptation in intercultural dyads were extended in this study. The social penetration theory (Altman & Taylor, 1973; Taylor & Altman, 1987) was utilized to understand the role of self-disclosure in the distinct stages intercultural friendship development progressing from relationship orientation, relationship development, to relationship maintenance. The anxiety/uncertainty management theory (Gudykunst, 1995 & 1996) was applied to explain how second language competence and shared networks impacted the role of self-disclosure in reducing anxiety and uncertainty in intercultural contexts, especially in the initial orientation and attraction stages of friendship development. The theory of adaptation in intercultural dyads (Ellingsworth, 1996) was used to illustrate the functionality of self-disclosure as adaptive behavior in assisting cultural adaptation.

Findings from this study were consistent with the three theories applied to explain the role of self-disclosure in the formation and development of intercultural friendship between Taiwanese and native English speakers. In terms of self-disclosure and the social penetration process, the findings underscore the crucial and salient role of self-disclosure in intercultural friendship development (Barnlund, 1989; Derlega et al., 1987; Kudo & Simkin, 2003; Matsuchima & Shiomi, 2002). At the same time, it also highlights the overarching influences of cultures on the concept and patterns of self-disclosure. Most importantly, the findings in this study demonstrate that Taiwanese people in general exhibited significantly less self-disclosure

significantly less in casual friendships than in intimate friendships as supported by the concept of guarded self-disclosure in Asian cultures (Barry, 2003).

With respect to factors influencing self-disclosure in the stages of relationship development, the findings indicate individual, dyadic, and situational variables. Specifically, at the individual level, the prevailing influence on self-disclosure discovered in this study included: (a) non-native English speakers' English language skills, (b) individual personality traits (van Oudenhoven et al., 2003; Swagler & Jome, 2005), (c) motivations for sojourning, and (d) the cultural script of guarded self-disclosure in Asian culture (Barry, 2003).

At the dyadic level, the results support the following emergent issues: power differences (Collier, 1998; Chang & Holt, 1997), perceived similarity (Chen, 2002; Gudykunst, 1985a; Osbeck et al., 1997; Urgerg et al., 1998), reciprocity of self-disclosure (Brewer & Mittelman, 1980; Chaikin & Derlega, 1974; Vittengl & Holt, 2000), the effect of unfamiliarity (Gudykunst & Nishida, 1984). Additionally, the findings uncover the effect of perceived advantage, the safe sounding board effect, and the perception of friendship closeness overriding ethnicities of friends.

At the situational level, the results indicate that the diverging cultural values regarding formality and informality (Javidi & Javidi, 1991) had the most paramount impact on the preferences of social avenues and social activities which in term governed the propriety of self-disclosure. Also, the findings reveal the need to reconsider the issue of the territorial advantage suggest by the theory of adaptation (Ellingsworth, 1996) especially in the context of Westerners sojourning in past colonialized countries in Asia and Africa.

The findings in the study also suggest the need to examine self-disclosure among the sojourners in expatriate communities in isolation due to the unique characteristics of such

transient communities (Cohen, 1977). Also, the results point to the value of investigating cultural adaptation in conjunction with patterns of self-disclosure.

Conceptually, the results indicate a distinct stage in intercultural friendship development between casual and good intercultural friendships, which was characterized by conditional self-disclosure and insufficient friendship maintenance behaviors that were symbolic of the insurmountable barriers and obstacles in the development of intercultural friendships. Moreover, the findings also point to the conceptualization of the cultural layers of self that remained latent in intracultural friendships but became salient in intercultural friendships.

Overall, this exploratory study has created an understanding of how self-disclosure influenced the formation and development of intercultural friendship between Taiwanese and native English as well as the issues and factors facing such challenging but unique friendships. The findings in this study are a fairly robust foundation for future communication research on intercultural friendship.

#### Limitations

Several methodological limitations in this study should be noted. First, the subjects used in this study were mostly overseas Taiwanese students and an overwhelming number of native English speakers teaching English as a foreign language in Taiwan. Besides the demographic differences between the two groups of sojourners, the sample represented a small range of socioeconomic backgrounds and age groups that may bias the nature of intercultural friendship. Moreover, as teachers of English, the sojourning native English speakers were more likely to be surrounded by Taiwanese who were interested in Western cultures and thus may not have been required to adapt in the same manner required for business or missionary work. Also, it should be noted that almost any native English speaker is eligible to teach English in Taiwan; thus, it

attracts a wide variety of native English speakers whether qualified to teach English or not and a wide range of eccentricities among the expatriate population.

Second, measuring self-disclosure through self-reports is open to a number of biases, among which is a tendency to either underreport or overestimate levels of disclosure with friends for reasons of impression management. In addition, the time frame within which the data were collected was too short to grasp the entire process of intercultural friendship development. Also, there was lack of reciprocal data from the sojourners' intercultural friends for verification and cross examination of the dyadic nature of self-disclosure. A longitudinal study with multiple methods of data collection or an experimental study involving pairs of intercultural friends for cross examination is recommended for future to capture a more comprehensive picture of the development of intercultural friendship and the role of self-disclosure in it.

Third, the unique characteristics and patterns of self-disclosure in Taiwanese culture that emerged in this study did not have equivalents in the traditional Western conceptualization of self-disclosure. Furthermore, the data in this study highlighted distinct patterns and topics of self-disclosure in intercultural friendship, which the Revised Self-disclosure Scale (Wheless, 1978) and the Jourard-Lasakow Self-Disclosure questionnaire (1958) did not capture. Thus, the findings in this study suggest the need to develop better scales to explore intercultural friendships in greater detail.

Another limitation of the study was the difficulty experienced in recruiting sojourning participants because of time and resources constraints. Thus, this study was not able to control for variables such as the sojourners' self-reported English or Chinese language ability and the length of time sojourning. Finally, this study was limited in the small number of female native English speakers sojourning in Taiwanese and also little was known about the experiences of



non-Caucasian native English speakers sojourning or living in Taiwan. Despite the methodological limitations, this study is an exploratory attempt that gives voice to and sheds light on an understudied yet valuable phenomenon in this age of globalization.

### Implications

In this modern era of globalization, the number of intercultural dating, marriages, and friendships continues to rise as people from different cultural backgrounds come into contact more frequently than ever. The changing demographics as well as the increasing diversity in the workplace and societies around the globe underscore the urgent need and necessity to investigate intercultural interpersonal communication. This study serves up practical functions to assist the formation of positive intercultural relationships between individualistic Westerners such as native English speakers and collectivistic Easterners such as Taiwanese. This study also addresses the feasibility of applying a process approach to examine intercultural interpersonal relationships.

Additionally, this study has potential practical implications for designers of intercultural communication intervention, training, programs and services particularly for Western expatriates in the East and Asians in the US. Specifically, this study raises the issue of cultural influences as critical factors in developing needed programs and services for sojourners and immigrants. It is crucial for international and overseas program designers to be sensitive to the cultural idiosyncrasies on relationship development and communication. Findings from this study indicate that the role of self-disclosure in relationship development differs from culture to culture.

Findings in this study demonstrate how deep-rooted cultural norms, beliefs, and values direct and impact individuals' behaviors, patterns, and expectations of self-disclosure that could trigger systematic miscommunication and become problematic in building intercultural

relationships. International and overseas program designers need to be aware of the cultural influences on how individuals from different cultures communicate and relate.

Similarly, results from this study reveal emergent issues of power, perceptions, and language competence in building intercultural relationships, which could lead to extreme consequences in either the failure or the success of intercultural contacts. International and overseas program designers should be sensitive to such emergent issues and incorporate preventative measures in the design of such programs.

In methodological terms, I not only address the need to explore intercultural friendships from a quantitative perspective but also highlight the utility of applying multiple methodological approaches to examine intercultural relationships. Future research should continue to investigate intercultural friendships from various methodological lenses such as narrative paradigms, focus group discussions, and ethnographical fieldwork.

In theoretical terms, the present research highlights the feasibility of studying the development of intercultural friendships from the theoretical perspective of social penetration theory (e.g. Altman & Taylor, 1973). This study also has implications for social penetration and self-disclosure research to seek to understand how cultural backgrounds influence the process of using self-disclosure to build intimate relationships. Furthermore, this study supports the view expressed by Asiatic scholarship to investigate Asian modes of communication (Miike, 2002). In a nut shell, Asiaticity advocates and insists on the need to view Asian communication phenomena from the standpoint of Asians in terms of Asian values and ideals. This research not only validates such emphasis but also highlights the need to examine Asian relationship development from the Asian modes.

For the anxiety/uncertainty management theory, this study indicates the prevalence of the hegemony of English (Tsuda, 1999) in helping to reduce or increase anxiety and uncertainty in the initial stages of intercultural encounters between native English speakers and non-native English speakers. Hence, this research suggests the recommendation of taking into account the factor of the hegemony of English in the anxiety/uncertainty management theory.

For the theory of cultural adaptation in intercultural dyads, the colonial mental and legacy that emerged in this study begs the reconsideration of the issues of territorial advantage in the theory of adaptation. This view is supported by the dialectic perspective between the history-past and the present-future (Martin et al., 1998).

In conclusion, findings in this exploratory study have provided evidence that self-disclosure plays a pivotal role in intercultural friendship development. At the same time, this study demonstrates that culture has paramount impact on self-disclosure. In addition, this study shows the existence of a distinct stage of intercultural friendship development influenced by individual, dyadic, and situational factors salient in intercultural contexts. Finally, findings from this study are consistent with intercultural scholarship that underscores both the uniqueness and complexity of intercultural communication and research.

Table 1

*Cronbach's Alpha for Scales*

	Cronbach's Alpha
I. Taiwanese sojourning in the United States	.783
Subscales	
Communication with Strangers who are Native English Speakers	.667
Communication with Casual Friends who are Native English Speakers	.611
Communication with Good Friends who are Native English Speakers	.692
Communication with Good Taiwanese Friends	.510
II. Native English Speakers sojourning in Taiwan	.810
Subscales	
Communication with Taiwanese Strangers	.673
Communication with Casual Taiwanese Friends	.721
Communication with Good Taiwanese Friends	.430
Communication with Good Friends from One's Own Culture	.560
III. Taiwanese in Taiwan who primarily socialized with other Taiwanese	.907
Subscales	
Communication with Taiwanese Strangers	.788
Communication with Casual Taiwanese Friends	.855
Communication with Good Taiwanese Friends	.814

Table 2

*Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Sojourning Taiwanese Communicating with Strangers Who Are Native English Speakers*

	<i>Factors</i>				
	<i>CT</i>	<i>AM</i>	<i>DT</i>	<i>PN</i>	<i>IN</i>
	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>V</i>
01. Intention 1	.24	-.25	-.08	.16	<b>.76</b>
02. Intention 2	.08	.11	.37	-.11	<b>.78</b>
04. Amount 2	-.39	<b>.76</b>	.06	.15	.10
05. Positive-Negative 1	-.26	.01	-.15	<b>.79</b>	.28
06. Positive-Negative 2	.08	.14	.19	<b>.83</b>	-.18
07. Depth 1	.36	-.11	<b>.44</b>	.36	.14
08. Depth 2	.18	-.22	<b>.77</b>	-.20	.07
09. Topic 1 Attitude	<b>.57</b>	-.48	.27	-.03	.12
10. Topic 2 Tastes and Interests	<b>.76</b>	-.09	.24	-.13	.03
11. Topic 3 Studies or Work	<b>.75</b>	.19	-.26	.17	.16
13. Topic 5 Personality	<b>.78</b>	-.06	.19	-.14	.02
14. Topic 6 Body and Appearance	.06	.04	<b>.59</b>	.15	.08
15. Comfortability	<b>.64</b>	-.07	.21	.09	.41
17. Cultural Differences	.26	<b>.80</b>	-.16	.03	-.19
Eigenvalue	3.93	1.88	1.60	1.17	1.10
Percentage of variance explained	28.13	13.49	11.44	8.41	7.90

Note 1: CT= comfortable topics; AM= amount of self-disclosure; DT= deep topic; PN= positive-negative self-disclosure; IN= intention to self-disclose.

Note 2: Primary loadings are italicized and in bold face.

Table 3

*Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Sojourning Taiwanese Communicating with Casual Friends Who Are Native English Speakers*

	<i>Factors</i>					
	<i>CT</i>	<i>DT</i>	<i>IN</i>	<i>PN</i>	<i>AM</i>	<i>IT</i>
	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>VI</i>
18. Intention 1	.17	-.19	<b>.77</b>	.18	-.18	-.16
19. Intention 2	-.06	.22	<b>.81</b>	-.02	.11	.22
20. Amount 1	-.27	-.13	.04	.13	<b>.77</b>	-.08
21. Amount 2	-.03	-.05	.34	.37	<b>.51</b>	.07
22. Positive-Negative 1	-.03	-.20	.25	<b>.72</b>	.14	.15
23. Positive-Negative 2	-.00	.30	-.08	<b>.87</b>	-.09	-.05
24. Depth 1	.13	<b>.79</b>	.11	.05	-.03	.02
25. Depth 2	.13	<b>.82</b>	-.04	.01	-.13	.23
26. Topic 1 Attitude	<b>.80</b>	.03	-.07	-.04	-.23	.05
27. Topic 2 Tastes and Interests	<b>.77</b>	.33	.01	-.05	-.06	.14
28. Topic 3 Studies or Work	<b>.66</b>	.43	.18	-.00	.14	-.22
29. Topic 4 Financial Concerns	.34	<b>.74</b>	-.09	-.01	-.07	-.00
30. Topic 5 Personality	<b>.71</b>	.11	-.00	.07	.01	.23
31. Topic 6 Body and Appearances	.05	.15	.06	.07	.05	<b>.91</b>
32. Comfortability	<b>.71</b>	.10	.07	-.03	-.05	-.03
34. Cultural Differences	.10	-.01	-.33	-.29	<b>.70</b>	.18
Eigenvalue	4.10	2.12	1.71	1.45	1.11	1.00
Percentage of variance explained	25.67	13.27	10.71	9.08	6.95	6.28

Note 1: CT= comfortable topics; DT= deep topic; IN= intention to self-disclose; PN= positive-negative self-disclosure; AM= amount of disclosure; IT= intimate topic.

Table 4

*Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Sojourning Taiwanese Communicating with Good Friends Who Are Native English Speakers*

	<i>Factors</i>		
	<i>CT</i>	<i>PN</i>	<i>IT</i>
	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>
35. Intention 1	.40	.33	<b>.61</b>
36. Intention 2	.26	.05	<b>.78</b>
38. Amount 2	-.01	.02	<b>.62</b>
39. Positive-Negative 1	.05	<b>.92</b>	-.07
40. Positive-Negative 2	.00	<b>.90</b>	.06
41. Depth 1	<b>.79</b>	.11	-.07
42. Depth 2	<b>.79</b>	-.15	.18
43. Topic 1 Attitude	<b>.83</b>	-.01	.17
47. Topic 5 Personality	<b>.77</b>	.02	-.01
48. Topic 6 Body and Appearances	-.06	-.27	<b>.49</b>
49. Comfortability	<b>.72</b>	.18	.15
Eigenvalue	3.70	1.85	1.44
Percentage of variance explained	33.71	16.89	13.08

Note 1: CT= comfortable topics; PN= positive-negative self-disclosure; IT= intimate topics.

Note 2: Primary loadings are italicized and in bold face.

Table 5

*Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Sojourning Taiwanese Communicating with Good Taiwanese Friends*

	<i>Factors</i>				
	<i>ST</i>	<i>PN</i>	<i>CT</i>	<i>IN</i>	<i>IT</i>
	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>V</i>
52. Intention 1	.18	-.01	.16	<b>.83</b>	-.06
53. Intention 2	.20	.04	.06	<b>.84</b>	.14
54. Amount 1	.12	<b>.59</b>	-.51	-.11	.11
55. Amount 2	-.11	.42	-.13	.07	<b>.73</b>
56. Positive-Negative 1	-.02	<b>.90</b>	.14	.03	.08
57. Positive-Negative 2	-.04	<b>.88</b>	.19	.05	.22
58. Depth 1	.17	-.11	<b>.65</b>	.25	.52
59. Depth 2	<b>.75</b>	-.13	.20	.09	.39
60. Topic 1 Attitude	<b>.85</b>	-.06	-.06	.16	.08
61. Topic 2 Tastes and Interests	<b>.83</b>	-.03	.18	.27	.02
62. Topic 3 Studies or Work	.10	.19	<b>.79</b>	.09	-.03
63. Topic 4 Financial Concerns	.31	.09	<b>.44</b>	-.05	-.15
64. Topic 5 Personality	<b>.74</b>	.24	.39	.15	-.05
65. Topic 6 Body and Appearances	.42	.22	.05	-.04	<b>.68</b>
66. Comfortability	.26	.03	<b>.58</b>	.38	.37
Eigenvalue	4.75	2.56	1.54	1.16	1.08
Percentage of variance explained	31.72	17.11	10.30	7.74	7.22

NOTE 1: ST=superficial topics; PN= positive-negative self-disclosure; CT= comfortable topics; IN= intention to self-disclose; IT= intimate topics.

NOTE 2: Primary loadings are italicized and in bold face.



Table 6

*Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Sojourning Native English Speakers  
Communicating with Taiwanese Strangers*

	<i>Factors</i>		
	<i>CT</i>	<i>PN</i>	<i>AM</i>
	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>
03. Amount 1	-04	-.25	<b>.84</b>
04. Amount 2	-.16	-.43	<b>.63</b>
05. Positive-Negative 1	.09	<b>.88</b>	.07
06. Positive-Negative 2	.25	<b>.83</b>	.08
07. Depth 1	<b>.71</b>	.09	.00
09. Topic 1 Attitude	<b>.69</b>	.06	-.25
10. Topic 2 Tastes and Interests	<b>.77</b>	.22	.04
14. Topic 6 Body and Appearances	.13	<b>.46</b>	-.17
15. Comfortability	<b>.78</b>	.19	-.12
17. Cultural Differences	-.07	.24	<b>.77</b>
Eigenvalue	3.34	1.61	1.34
Percentage of variance explained	33.42	16.13	13.40

Note 1: CT= comfortable topics; PN= positive-negative self-image; AM= amount of self-disclosure.

Note 2: Primary loadings are italicized and in bold face.

Table 7

*Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Sojourning Native English Speakers  
Communicating with Casual Taiwanese Friends*

	<i>Factors</i>			
	<i>CT</i>	<i>DE</i>	<i>LC</i>	<i>IN</i>
	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>
18. Intention 1	.16	-.01	-.22	<b>.84</b>
24. Depth 1	.33	<b>.85</b>	-.05	.08
25. Depth 2	.21	<b>.89</b>	-.07	-.05
26. Topic 1 Attitude	<b>.70</b>	.19	-.04	.00
27. Topic 2 Tastes and Interests	<b>.82</b>	.11	.00	-.08
28. Topic 3 Studies or Work	<b>.49</b>	-.01	-.26	-.65
30. Topic 5 Personality	<b>.71</b>	.38	-.04	-.07
32. Comfortability	<b>.63</b>	.22	-.10	.33
33. Language Ability	.16	-.25	<b>.83</b>	.04
34. Cultural Differences	-.34	.13	<b>.80</b>	-.19
Eigenvalue	3.50	1.50	1.21	1.11
Percentage of variance explained	35.08	15.08	12.11	11.16

Note 1: CT= comfortable topics; DE= depth of self-disclosure; LC= language and culture; IN= intention to self-disclose.

Note 2: Primary loadings are italicized and in bold face.

Table 8

*Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Sojourning Native English Speakers  
Communicating with Good Taiwanese Friends*

	<i>Factors</i>				
	<i>CT</i>	<i>AM</i>	<i>LC</i>	<i>OT</i>	<i>IT</i>
	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>V</i>
35. Intention 1	<b>.58</b>	-.14	-.15	.22	-.15
37. Amount 1	-.13	<b>.85</b>	.01	-.01	.08
38. Amount 2	-.07	<b>.88</b>	.09	-.03	-.05
39. Positive-Negative 1	<b>.83</b>	.09	.00	-.03	.13
40. Positive-Negative 2	<b>.86</b>	.04	.03	.00	.11
41. Depth 1	<b>.74</b>	-.17	-.23	-.09	.24
43. Topic 1 Attitude	<b>.55</b>	-.48	-.14	-.12	.02
44. Topic 2 Tastes and Interests	<b>.65</b>	-.39	-.34	.21	-.04
45. Topic 3 Studies or Work	.02	-.44	-.01	<b>.75</b>	.21
46. Topic 4 Financial Concerns	.13	.39	-.15	<b>.73</b>	-.17
47. Topic 5 Personality	<b>.83</b>	-.17	-.17	.17	-.06
48. Topic 6 Body and Appearances	.14	.00	.01	.01	<b>.95</b>
49. Comfortability	<b>.84</b>	-.11	-.17	.07	-.09
50. Language Ability	-.09	-.02	<b>.93</b>	.01	-.09
51. Cultural Differences	-.31	.18	<b>.75</b>	-.02	.16
Eigenvalue	5.64	1.98	1.54	1.08	1.03
Percentage of variance explained	37.65	13.23	10.26	7.25	6.92

Note 1: CT= comfortable topics; AM= amount of self-disclosure; LC= language and culture; OT= often-disclosed topics; IT= intimate topic.

Note 2: Primary loadings are italicized and in bold face.

Table 9

*Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Sojourning Native English Speakers  
Communicating with Good Friends from One's Own Culture*

	<i>Factors</i>				
	<i>CT</i>	<i>PN</i>	<i>DT</i>	<i>AM</i>	<i>IN</i>
	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>V</i>
52. Intention 1	.24	-.04	.04	-.12	<b>.83</b>
53. Intention 2	.13	.29	.11	.08	<b>.63</b>
54. Amount 1	-.26	.10	-.01	<b>.88</b>	-.08
55. Amount 2	.04	-.06	-.23	<b>.90</b>	.05
56. Positive-Negative 1	.18	<b>.93</b>	-.03	-.02	.06
57. Positive-Negative 2	.16	<b>.89</b>	.07	.07	.14
58. Depth 1	.13	.09	<b>.49</b>	-.03	.09
60. Topic 1 Attitude	<b>.71</b>	.02	.23	-.01	.43
61. Topic 2 Tastes and Interests	<b>.87</b>	.25	-.04	-.14	.15
62. Topic 3 Studies or Work	<b>.60</b>	-.14	.21	-.05	-.44
63. Topic 4 Financial Concerns	.24	.08	<b>.83</b>	.00	-.09
64. Topic 5 Personality	<b>.69</b>	.27	.24	-.04	.15
65. Topic 6 Body and Appearances	-.03	-.20	<b>.77</b>	-.29	.14
66. Comfortability	<b>.68</b>	.39	.20	-.12	.37
Eigenvalue	4.43	2.21	1.30	1.24	1.15
Percentage of variance explained	31.65	15.80	9.29	8.90	8.22

Note 1: CT= comfortable topics; PN= positive-negative self-disclosure; DT= deep topics; AM= amount of self-disclosure; IN= intention to self-disclose.

Note 2: Primary loadings are italicized and in bold face.

Table 10

*Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Taiwanese in Taiwan Communicating with Taiwanese Strangers*

	<i>Factors</i>			
	<i>IT</i>	<i>AM</i>	<i>PN</i>	<i>IN</i>
	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>
01. Intention 1	.01	.04	.18	<b>.90</b>
02. Intention 2	-.05	-.15	.15	<b>.87</b>
03. Amount 1	-.11	<b>.89</b>	-.13	.03
04. Amount 2	-.28	<b>.86</b>	.04	-.17
05. Positive-Negative 1	.07	-.11	<b>.84</b>	.24
06. Positive-Negative 2	.10	.01	<b>.89</b>	.12
08. Depth 2	<b>.70</b>	.03	-.03	.02
11. Topic 3 Studies or Work	<b>.73</b>	-.24	.29	-.05
12. Topic 4 Financial Concerns	<b>.84</b>	-.06	-.06	-.02
13. Topic 5 Personality	<b>.73</b>	-.20	.27	-.08
14. Topic 6 Body and Appearances	<b>.64</b>	-.33	.03	.06
Eigenvalue	3.61	2.15	1.31	1.02
Percentage of variance explained	32.85	19.56	11.93	9.28

Note 1: IT= intimate topics; AM= amount of self-disclosure; PN= positive-negative self-disclosure; IN= intention to self-disclose.

Note 2: Primary loadings are italicized and in bold face.

Table 11

*Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Taiwanese in Taiwan Communicating with Casual Taiwanese Friends*

	<i>Factors</i>		
	<i>IT</i>	<i>IN</i>	<i>AM</i>
	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>
16. Intention 1	.06	<b>.89</b>	-.07
17. Intention 2	.11	<b>.79</b>	.11
18. Amount 1	.04	.03	<b>.93</b>
19. Amount 2	-.19	-.05	<b>.88</b>
20. Positive-Negative 1	.13	<b>.74</b>	-.07
23. Depth 2	<b>.68</b>	-.04	-.02
26. Topic 3 Studies or Work	<b>.64</b>	.27	-.26
27. Topic 4 Financial Concerns	<b>.78</b>	.12	.10
28. Topic 5 Personality	<b>.74</b>	.05	-.05
29. Topic 6 Body and Appearances	<b>.69</b>	.18	-.10
Eigenvalue	3.17	1.75	1.56
Percentage of variance explained	31.78	17.55	15.68

Note 1: IT= intimate topics; IN= intention to self-disclose; AM= amount of self-disclosure.

Note 2: Primary loadings are italicized and in bold face.

Table 12

*Factor Analysis of the Self-Disclosure Instrument for Taiwanese in Taiwan Communicating with Good Taiwanese Friends*

	<i>Factors</i>			
	<i>CT</i>	<i>IN</i>	<i>AM</i>	<i>PN</i>
	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>
31. Intention 1	.20	<b>.89</b>	-.11	.07
32. Intention 2	.11	<b>.93</b>	.02	.09
33. Amount 1	-.12	-.16	<b>.86</b>	-.08
34. Amount 2	-.01	.04	<b>.90</b>	-.00
35. Positive-Negative 1	.13	.00	-.07	<b>.92</b>
36. Positive-Negative 2	.04	.17	.00	<b>.91</b>
38. Depth 2	<b>.40</b>	.05	.24	.16
39. Topic 1 Attitude	<b>.61</b>	.34	-.20	.11
40. Topic 2 Tastes and Interests	<b>.75</b>	.08	-.31	.03
41. Topic 3 Studies or Work	<b>.75</b>	.17	-.38	-.04
42. Topic 4 Financial Concerns	<b>.81</b>	.12	-.00	.12
43. Topic 5 Personality	<b>.62</b>	.06	.02	-.05
44. Topic 6 Body and Appearances	<b>.73</b>	-.14	.24	.10
45. Comfortability	<b>.73</b>	.36	-.15	.09
Eigenvalue	4.74	1.86	1.74	1.43
Percentage of variance explained	33.90	13.32	12.47	10.22

Note 1: CT= comfortable topics; IN= intention to self-disclose; AM= amount of self-disclosure; PN= positive-negative self-disclosure.

Note 2: Primary loadings are italicized and in bold face.

Table 13

*Follow-up Univariate Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) of Dimensions of Self-disclosure among the Three Groups*

Self-reported Self-disclosure	Means			<i>F</i>
	SNEST	STUS	TIT	
<b>Intention 2</b>				
With Strangers	3.98	3.89	3.53	3.51*
With Casual Friends	3.83	4.02	3.85	.86
With Good Friends	4.00	4.04	4.29	2.44
<b>Amount 1</b>				
With Strangers	2.57	3.32	3.71	16.02***
With Casual Friends	2.50	2.81	2.86	2.39
With Good Friends	2.57	2.48	2.17	2.95
<b>Amount 2</b>				
With Strangers	2.67	3.20	3.82	19.94***
With Casual Friends	2.87	3.10	2.98	.73
With Good Friends	2.62	2.73	2.49	.88
<b>Depth 1</b>				
With Strangers	2.58	3.08	2.43	4.65*
With Casual Friends	3.26	3.34	3.11	.80
With Good Friends	4.00	4.08	4.16	.61

Note: SNEST= sojourning English speakers in Taiwan; STUS= Sojourning Taiwanese in the United States; TIT= Taiwanese in Taiwan

\*  $p < .05$

\*\*  $p < .01$

\*\*\*  $p < .001$



Table 14

*Follow-up Univariate Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) of Topics of Self-disclosure among the Three Groups*

Self-reported Self-disclosure	Means			<i>F</i>
	SNEST	STUS	TIT	
Topic 1 Attitudes, Opinions, and Beliefs				
With Strangers	3.50	2.97	3.16	3.64*
Topic 2 Tastes and Interests				
With Strangers	3.89	3.48	3.11	8.54***
With Casual Friends	4.21	4.00	3.50	13.44***
With Good Friends	4.44	4.28	4.25	1.18
Topic 3 Studies or Work				
With Strangers	4.07	3.61	3.00	19.34***
With Casual Friends	4.32	4.02	3.92	16.35***
With Good Friends	4.44	4.26	4.25	3.54*
Topic 5 Personality				
With Strangers	3.30	3.12	2.44	10.66***
With Casual Friends	3.76	3.61	3.01	11.43***
With Good Friends	4.23	4.10	3.88	2.90
Topic 6 Body				
With Strangers	1.98	2.16	2.40	2.41
With Casual Friends	2.48	2.48	2.83	2.26
With Good Friends	2.92	2.95	3.55	7.46**

Note: SNEST= sojourning English speakers in Taiwan; STUS= Sojourning Taiwanese in the United States; TIT= Taiwanese in Taiwan

\*  $p < .05$

\*\*  $p < .01$

\*\*\*  $p < .001$

Table 15

*Comparison of Sojourning Native English Speakers (n = 56) and Sojourning Taiwanese (n = 49) on Various Dimensions and Topics of Self-disclosure*

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>
Communicating with Intercultural Strangers					
Amount of Self-disclosure (1)					
Native English Speakers	2.57	1.30	-3.11	103	.002
Taiwanese	3.32	1.16	-3.13	102	.002
Amount of Self-disclosure (2)					
Native English Speakers	2.67	1.16	-2.48	103	0.14
Taiwanese	3.32	.97	-2.51	102	0.13
Depth of Self-disclosure (1)					
Native English Speakers	2.58	1.29	-2.03	103	.044
Taiwanese	3.08	1.16	-2.05	102	.043
Topic of Self-disclosure (1) Attitude					
Native English Speakers	3.50	1.11	2.47	103	.015
Taiwanese	2.97	1.03	2.48	102	.014
Topic of self-disclosure (3) Studies or Work					
Native English Speakers	4.07	.87	2.52	103	0.13
Taiwanese	3.61	.99	2.49	96	0.14

*(table continues)*

Table 15 (*continued*).

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>
Communicating with Casual Intercultural Friends					
Topic of self-disclosure (3) Studies or Work					
Native English Speakers	4.32	.78	2.03	103	.045
Taiwanese	4.02	.72	2.04	102	.044
Communicating with Good Intracultural Friends					
Intention to self-disclose (2)					
Native English Speakers	3.89	1.17	-2.28	103	.024
Taiwanese	4.34	.80	-2.33	97	.021
Topic of Self-disclosure (1) Attitude					
Native English Speakers	4.48	.78	2.49	103	.014
Taiwanese	4.08	.86	2.47	97	.015
Topic of Self-disclosure (3) Studies or Work					
Native English Speakers	4.53	.78	2.07	103	.041
Taiwanese	4.24	.63	2.10	102	.038

Table 16

*Follow-up Univariate Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) of Dimensions and Topics of Self-disclosure and Intercultural Friendship Development*

Self-reported Self-disclosure	Means		<i>F</i>
	SNEST	STUS	
Intention 1			
With Intercultural Strangers	3.44	3.12	2.41
With Intercultural Casual Friends	3.66	3.69	.03
With Intercultural Good Friends	4.14	4.02	.72
With Intracultural Good Friends	4.00	4.26	1.90
Intention 2			
With Intercultural Strangers	3.98	3.89	.20
With Intercultural Casual Friends	3.83	4.02	1.18
With Intercultural Good Friends	4.00	4.04	.05
With Intracultural Good Friends	3.89	4.34	5.21*
Topic 1 Attitudes, Opinions, and Beliefs			
With Intercultural Strangers	3.50	2.97	6.12*
With Intercultural Casual Friends	3.78	3.48	2.81
With Intercultural Good Friends	4.33	4.08	3.06
With Intracultural Good Friends	4.48	4.08	6.19*
Topic 3 Studies or Work			
With Intercultural Strangers	4.07	3.61	6.35*
With Intercultural Casual Friends	4.32	4.02	4.12*
With Intercultural Good Friends	4.44	4.26	1.53
With Intracultural Good Friends	4.53	4.24	4.29*

*(table continues)*

Table 16 (*continued*).

Self-reported Self-disclosure	Means		<i>F</i>
	SNEST	STUS	
Amount 1			
With Intercultural Strangers	2.57	3.32	9.68*
Amount 2			
With Intercultural Strangers	2.67	3.20	6.18*
Depth 1			
With Intercultural Strangers	2.58	3.08	4.15*

Note: SNEST= sojourning English speakers in Taiwan; STUS= Sojourning Taiwanese in the United States

\*  $p < .05$

\*\*  $p < .01$

Table 17

*Means and Standard Deviations for Amount and Depth of Self-disclosure Variables*

Dependent Variables	S		CF		GF		OCGF	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<b>Sojourning Taiwanese in the United States</b>								
Amount 1	2.32	1.16	2.81	.97	2.48	.84	2.57	1.19
Amount 2	3.20	.97	3.10	.91	2.73	.99	2.81	1.13
Depth 1	3.08	1.16	3.34	.92	4.08	.64	4.28	.70
Depth 2	2.24	1.03	2.93	.92	3.75	.85	3.77	1.00
<b>Sojourning Native English Speakers in Taiwan</b>								
Amount 1	2.57	1.30	2.50	1.09	2.57	.89	2.64	1.22
Amount 2	2.67	1.16	2.87	1.02	2.62	.90	2.83	1.18
Depth 1	2.58	1.29	3.26	1.16	4.00	1.00	4.76	5.59
Depth 2	2.35	1.31	2.98	1.21	3.75	1.11	3.80	1.25
<b>Taiwanese in Taiwan</b>								
Amount 1	3.74	.91	2.86	.86	2.17	1.05		
Amount 2	3.82	.86	2.98	.92	2.49	1.02		
Depth 1	2.43	1.01	3.11	.86	4.16	.75		
Depth 2	1.88	1.00	2.65	.84	3.74	.94		

Note: S= strangers; CF= casual friends; GF= good friends, OCGF= one cultural good friends

Table 18

*Spearman Correlation of Sojourning Taiwanese' Grand Amount and Depth of Disclosure*

	1	2	3	4
(1) Sources of News: Magazines	1	.28*		-.37**
(2) Time take to make friends		1		-.37**
(3) Grand Amount			1	-.28*
(4) Grand Depth				1

\*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

APPENDIX A  
IRB APPROVAL



# UNIVERSITY<sub>of</sub> NORTH TEXAS

*Office of Research Services*

November 30, 2005

Yea Wen Chen  
Department of Communication Studies  
University of North Texas

Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research  
(IRB) RE: Human Subject Application #05-019

Dear Ms. Chen:

The IINT IRB has received your request to modify your study now titled "The Twain Have Met! Investigating Crucial Indicators for Intercultural Friendship Levels between Native English Speakers, Sojourning Taiwanese in the United States and Taiwanese in Taiwan." As required by federal law and regulations governing the use of human subjects in research projects, the UNT IRB has examined the requested modification. The modification to this study is hereby approved for the use of human subjects. **Approval for this project is February 8, 2005 through February 7, 2006.**

Enclosed is the consent document with stamped IRB approval. Please copy and **use this form only** for your study subjects.

It is your responsibility according to U.S. Department of Health and Human Services regulations to submit annual and terminal progress reports to the IRB for this project.

Please mark your calendar accordingly. The IRB must also review this project prior to any other modifications made. **Federal policy 21 CFR 56.109(e) stipulates that IRB approval is for one year only.**

Please contact Shelia Bourns, Research Compliance Administrator, at (940) 565-3940, or Boyd Herndon, Director of Research Compliance, at (940) 565-3941, if you wish to make changes or need additional information.

Sincerely,

~"

Scott Simpkins, Ph.D.  
Chair  
Institutional Review  
Board

APPENDIX B  
CONSENT FORM

University of North Texas  
Institutional Review Board  
**Research Consent Form**

**Subject Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Title of Study: The Twain Have Met! Investigating Crucial Indicators for Intercultural Friendship Levels between Native English Speakers, Sojourning Taiwanese in the United States, and Taiwanese in Taiwan**

Principal Investigator **Yea Wen Chen**

You must be 18 years of age or older to participate in this research study. Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the proposed procedures. It describes your right to withdraw from the study at any time.

Start Date of Study 2/25/2005

End Date of Study 2/07/2006

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to examine and further understand the extent to which individuals' willingness to talk about themselves affects the development of intercultural friendship between Taiwanese and native English Speakers.

**Description of the Study**

This study uses both survey questionnaires and interviews to examine and investigate crucial indicators for intercultural friendship levels between native English speakers, sojourning Taiwanese in the United States, and Taiwanese in Taiwan.

**Procedures to be used**

The procedures for data collection involve your answering 5 general questions and filling out a survey questionnaire for approximately 15-20 minutes. In both the interview and the questionnaire, you will remain anonymous. In fact, it is advised that you delete any form of personal information from any data you provide.

**Description of the foreseeable risks**

There are no foreseeable risks.

**Benefits to the subjects or others**

Intercultural friendship between Taiwanese international students and native English speakers is under studied. This study may assist future international students from Taiwan adjust to an American campus and may foster greater intercultural understanding of friendship development between Taiwanese and native English speakers.

**Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records**

Please understand that your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are free to stop answering any questions at any time, as well as not answer any question(s) if you choose. No names will be used and your responses will be kept confidential.



APPENDIX C  
CONSENT FORM TRANSLATED IN CHINESE

美國北德州大學 (University of North Texas)  
學術審查機構 (Institutional Review Board)  
研究同意表格 (Research Consent Form)

姓 名： \_\_\_\_\_

日 期： \_\_\_\_\_

研究名稱： 東方和西方已經相遇了！調查台灣人和英語系國家國民之間跨國友情的發展

主要研究人員： 陳雅雯

首先，你必須十八歲以上才可以參與這項研究計畫。在同意參與此研究計畫之前，你一定要先閱讀並了解以下所提議的研究程序與步驟。以下描述你有權益在任何時候退出此研究計畫。

研究開始日期 2/25/2005

研究終止日期 2/07/2006

#### 研究目的

此研究計畫的主要目的是要研究並進一步了解個人主動揭露私人消息的意願如何影響台灣人和英語系國家國民之間跨國友情的發展。

#### 研究具體描述

此研究計畫使用一對一面談和問卷調查這兩種方式來了解和研究在台英語系國家國民，在美台灣人和台灣當地人之間友情發展的階段。

#### 研究步驟

研究資料收集的步驟分成兩個步驟：先回答五個面談問題，然後花 15 到 20 分鐘填寫問卷。不管面談或問卷，你都是保持匿名的。事實上，我們建議你最好不要問卷或面談中留下個人資料。

#### 研究可能涉及到的風險

此研究不涉及到任何可以預期得到的風險。

#### 研究計畫對研究參與者或其他人的利益以及好處

一則台灣人和英語系國家國民之間的跨國友情很少人注意和研究。二則本研究計畫有助於未來到美國留學的台灣學生適應美國校園，而且進一步可以促進對台灣人和英語系國家國民之間跨國友情的了解。

#### 維護研究參與者個人機密的程序

請注意你的參與本研究計畫是完全自願的。任何時候你都可以停止回答任何問題，或選擇不回答某些問題。沒有真實姓名會被使用，而且你的答案絕對會被保持機密的。

#### 審查機構保護研究參與者的權益

本研究計畫已經經過北德州大學的學術審查機構 (the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB)) 的審查和核准。你如果有任何關於研究參與人權益的疑問都可以聯絡北德州大學的學術審查機構 (940) 565-3940 or [sbourns@unt.edu](mailto:sbourns@unt.edu)。



APPENDIX D  
QUANTITATIVE SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS  
SOJOURNING IN TAIWAN



# The Twain Have Met!

## Investigating Crucial Indicators for Intercultural Friendship Levels between Taiwanese and Native Speakers of English

*Instructions:* The following statements are directed at understanding how native speakers of English living in Taiwan make friends with Taiwanese people. Your time and cooperation are deeply appreciated. **Please make the following statements to reflect how you communicate with (a) Taiwanese strangers, (b) casual Taiwanese friends, (c) good Taiwanese friends, and (d) good friends from your own culture respectively.** Indicate the degree to which the following statements reflect how you communicate with this person by circling whether you **(1)strongly disagree, (2)moderately disagree, (3)are undecided, (4)moderately agree, or (5)strongly agree.** Record the number of your response in the space provided. Work quickly and just record your first impressions.

### When Communicating with Taiwanese Strangers

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
1. When I intend to, my self-disclosures are always accurate reflections of who I really am.	1	2	3	4	5
2. When I express my personal feelings, I am always aware of what I am doing and saying.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I do not often talk about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My conversation lasts the least time when I am discussing myself.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I often disclose positive things about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I normally express good feelings about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I intimately disclose who I really am openly and fully in my conversation.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I often disclose intimate and personal things about myself without hesitation.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I frequently express my personal attitudes, beliefs and opinions.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I am often willing to talk about my tastes and interests.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I am often willing to talk about things related my studies (or work).	1	2	3	4	5

12. I am often willing to talk about money and my financial concerns.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I often freely share many aspects of my personality.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I often initiate conversations regarding my body and appearances.	1	2	3	4	5
15. In the normal course of a conversation, I generally feel comfortable talking and sharing.	1	2	3	4	5
16. My Chinese language ability often creates confusion in the conversations.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Cultural differences often hinder understanding in my conversations.	1	2	3	4	5

### When Communicating with Casual Taiwanese Friends

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
18. When I intend to, my self-disclosures are always accurate reflections of who I really am.	1	2	3	4	5
19. When I express my personal feelings, I am always aware of what I am doing and saying.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I do not often talk about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
21. My conversation lasts the least time when I am discussing myself.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I often disclose positive things about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I normally express good feelings about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I intimately disclose who I really am openly and fully in my conversation.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I often disclose intimate and personal things about myself without hesitation.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I frequently express my personal attitudes, beliefs and opinions.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I am often willing to talk about my tastes and interests.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I am often willing to talk about things related my studies (or work).	1	2	3	4	5
29. I am often willing to talk about money and my financial concerns.	1	2	3	4	5

30. I often freely share many aspects of my personality.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I often initiate conversations regarding my body and appearances.	1	2	3	4	5
32. In the normal course of a conversation, I generally feel comfortable talking and sharing.	1	2	3	4	5
33. My Chinese language ability often creates confusion in the conversations.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Cultural differences often hinder understanding in my conversations.	1	2	3	4	5

### When Communicating with Good Taiwanese Friends

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
35. When I intend to, my self-disclosures are always accurate reflections of who I really am.	1	2	3	4	5
36. When I express my personal feelings, I am always aware of what I am doing and saying.	1	2	3	4	5
37. I do not often talk about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
38. My conversation lasts the least time when I am discussing myself.	1	2	3	4	5
39. I often disclose positive things about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
40. I normally express good feelings about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
41. I intimately disclose who I really am openly and fully in my conversation.	1	2	3	4	5
42. I often disclose intimate and personal things about myself without hesitation.	1	2	3	4	5
43. I frequently express my personal attitudes, beliefs and opinions.	1	2	3	4	5
44. I am often willing to talk about my tastes and interests.	1	2	3	4	5
45. I am often willing to talk about things related my studies (or work).	1	2	3	4	5
46. I am often willing to talk about money and my financial concerns.	1	2	3	4	5
47. I often freely share many aspects of my personality.	1	2	3	4	5
48. I often initiate conversations regarding my body and appearances.	1	2	3	4	5

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 49. In the normal course of a conversation, I generally feel comfortable talking and sharing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 50. My Chinese language ability often creates confusion in the conversations.                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 51. Cultural differences often hinder understanding in my conversations.                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

### When Communicating with Good Friends from Your Own Culture

- |   | Strongly<br>Disagree |   |   |   | Strongly<br>Agree |
|---|----------------------|---|---|---|-------------------|
| 52. When I intend to, my self-disclosures are always accurate reflections of who I really am. | 1                    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |
| 53. When I express my personal feelings, I am always aware of what I am doing and saying.     | 1                    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |
| 54. I do not often talk about myself.   | 1                    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |
| 55. My conversation lasts the least time when I am discussing myself.                         | 1                    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |
| 56. I often disclose positive things about myself.  | 1                    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |
| 57. I normally express good feelings about myself.  | 1                    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |
| 58. I intimately disclose who I really am openly and fully in my conversation.                | 1                    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |
| 59. I often disclose intimate and personal things about myself without hesitation.            | 1                    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |
| 60. I frequently express my personal attitudes, beliefs and opinions.                         | 1                    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |
| 61. I am often willing to talk about my tastes and interests.                                 | 1                    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |
| 62. I am often willing to talk about things related my studies (or work).                     | 1                    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |
| 63. I am often willing to talk about money and my financial concerns.                         | 1                    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |
| 64. I often freely share many aspects of my personality.                                      | 1                    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |
| 65. I often initiate conversations regarding my body and appearances.                         | 1                    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |
| 66. In the normal course of a conversation, I generally feel comfortable                      | 1                    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                 |

talking and sharing.

**Background Information**

67. Sex (circle):                      Male                      Female
68. Nationality: \_\_\_\_\_
69. Age: \_\_\_\_\_
70. Education level: Currently, I am a (circle)  
High school student      Undergraduate student      Graduate student (Master /Doctorate)  
Other: \_\_\_\_\_ (Please indicate!)
71. What do you think your Chinese ability is? (Please circle!)  
Fluent                      Very good                      Good                      Fair                      Poor
72. How long have you studied Chinese? Your answer here: \_\_\_\_\_
73. What are your major sources of news (circle all that apply)? Please indicate the language of your sources of news as well!  
Television (Chinese / English)                      Internet (Chinese / English)  
Newspaper (Chinese / English)                      Magazines (Chinese / English)  
Radio (Chinese / English)                      Word of Mouth (Chinese / English)
74. Length of time living in Taiwan. (circle):  
Less than Six months                      Six months to less than one year  
One year to less than 18 months                      18 months to less than two years  
Two years to less than 30 months                      30 months to less than three years  
Three years and more than three years
75. Approximate number of Taiwanese friends that you socialize with or have in Taiwan. (circle):  
1 – 5                      6 – 10                      11 – 15                      16 – 20                      More than 20
76. Approximate number of friends from your own culture that you socialize with or have (circle):  
1 – 5                      6 – 10                      11 – 15                      16 – 20                      More than 20
77. Generally, how long would it take for you to make a Taiwanese friend out of a Taiwanese acquaintance (circle)?  
Less than 2 months      2 to less than 4 months                      4 to less than 6 months  
More than 6 months

APPENDIX E  
QUANTITATIVE SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR TWIWANESE SOJOURNING IN THE  
UNITED STATES

# The Twain Have Met!

## Investigating Crucial Indicators for Intercultural Friendship Levels between International Students from Taiwan and U.S. Americans

*Instructions:* The following statements are directed at understanding how individuals from Taiwan make friends with Americans here in the United States. Your time and cooperation are deeply appreciated. **Please make the following statements to reflect how you communicate with American strangers, casual American friends, good American friends, and good friends from your own culture respectively.** Indicate the degree to which the following statements reflect how you communicate with this person by circling whether you **(1)strongly disagree, (2)moderately disagree, (3)are undecided, (4)moderately agree, or (5)strongly agree.** Record the number of your response in the space provided. Work quickly and just record your first impressions.

### When Communicating with American Strangers

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
1. When I wish, my self-disclosures are always accurate reflections of who I really am.	1	2	3	4	5
2. When I express my personal feelings, I am always aware of what I am doing and saying.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I do not often talk about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My conversation lasts the least time when I am discussing myself.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I often disclose positive things about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I normally express good feelings about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I intimately disclose who I really am openly and fully in my conversation.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I often disclose intimate and personal things about myself without hesitation.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I frequently express my personal attitudes, beliefs and opinions.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I am often willing to talk about my tastes and interests.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I am often willing to talk about things related my studies (or work).	1	2	3	4	5
12. I am often willing to talk about money and my financial concerns.	1	2	3	4	5

13. I often freely share many aspects of my personality.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I often initiate conversations regarding my body and appearances.	1	2	3	4	5
15. In the normal course of a conversation, I generally feel comfortable talking and sharing.	1	2	3	4	5
16. My English language ability often creates confusion in the conversations.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Cultural differences often hinder understanding in my conversations.	1	2	3	4	5

### When Communicating with Casual American Friends

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
18. When I wish, my self-disclosures are always accurate reflections of who I really am.	1	2	3	4	5
19. When I express my personal feelings, I am always aware of what I am doing and saying.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I do not often talk about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
21. My conversation lasts the least time when I am discussing myself.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I often disclose positive things about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I normally express good feelings about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I intimately disclose who I really am openly and fully in my conversation.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I often disclose intimate and personal things about myself without hesitation.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I frequently express my personal attitudes, beliefs and opinions.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I am often willing to talk about my tastes and interests.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I am often willing to talk about things related my studies (or work).	1	2	3	4	5
29. I am often willing to talk about money and my financial concerns.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I often freely share many aspects of my personality.	1	2	3	4	5



31. I often initiate conversations regarding my body and appearances.	1	2	3	4	5
32. In the normal course of a conversation, I generally feel comfortable talking and sharing.	1	2	3	4	5
33. My English language ability often creates confusion in the conversations.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Cultural differences often hinder understanding in my conversations.	1	2	3	4	5

### When Communicating with Good American Friends

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
35. When I wish, my self-disclosures are always accurate reflections of who I really am.	1	2	3	4	5
36. When I express my personal feelings, I am always aware of what I am doing and saying.	1	2	3	4	5
37. I do not often talk about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
38. My conversation lasts the least time when I am discussing myself.	1	2	3	4	5
39. I often disclose positive things about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
40. I normally express good feelings about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
41. I intimately disclose who I really am openly and fully in my conversation.	1	2	3	4	5
42. I often disclose intimate and personal things about myself without hesitation.	1	2	3	4	5
43. I frequently express my personal attitudes, beliefs and opinions.	1	2	3	4	5
44. I am often willing to talk about my tastes and interests.	1	2	3	4	5
45. I am often willing to talk about things related my studies (or work).	1	2	3	4	5
46. I am often willing to talk about money and my financial concerns.	1	2	3	4	5
47. I often freely share many aspects of my personality.	1	2	3	4	5
48. I often initiate conversations regarding my body and appearances.	1	2	3	4	5

49. In the normal course of a conversation, I generally feel comfortable talking and sharing.	1	2	3	4	5
50. My English language ability often creates confusion in the conversations.	1	2	3	4	5
51. Cultural differences often hinder understanding in my conversations.	1	2	3	4	5

### When Communicating with Good Friends from Your Own Culture

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
52. When I wish, my self-disclosures are always accurate reflections of who I really am.	1	2	3	4	5
53. When I express my personal feelings, I am always aware of what I am doing and saying.	1	2	3	4	5
54. I do not often talk about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
55. My conversation lasts the least time when I am discussing myself.	1	2	3	4	5
56. I often disclose positive things about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
57. I normally express good feelings about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
58. I intimately disclose who I really am openly and fully in my conversation.	1	2	3	4	5
59. I often disclose intimate and personal things about myself without hesitation.	1	2	3	4	5
60. I frequently express my personal attitudes, beliefs and opinions.	1	2	3	4	5
61. I am often willing to talk about my tastes and interests.	1	2	3	4	5
62. I am often willing to talk about things related my studies (or work).	1	2	3	4	5
63. I am often willing to talk about money and my financial concerns.	1	2	3	4	5
64. I often freely share many aspects of my personality.	1	2	3	4	5
65. I often initiate conversations regarding my body and appearances.	1	2	3	4	5
66. In the normal course of a conversation, I generally feel comfortable talking and sharing.	1	2	3	4	5

### Background Information

67. Sex (circle):                      Male                      Female
68. Nationality: \_\_\_\_\_
69. Age: \_\_\_\_\_
70. Education level: Currently, I am a (circle)  
High school student      Undergraduate student      Graduate student (Master / Doctorate)  
Other: \_\_\_\_\_ (Please indicate!)
71. What do you think your English ability is? (Please circle!)  
Fluent                      Very good                      Good                      Fair                      Poor
72. How long have you studied English? Your answer here: \_\_\_\_\_
73. What are your major sources of news (circle all that apply)? Please indicate the language of your sources of news as well!  
Television (English / Native Language)                      Internet (English / Native Language)  
Newspaper (English / Native Language)                      Magazines (English / Native Language)  
Radio (English / Native Language)                      Word of Mouth (English / Native Language)
74. Length of time living in the U.S. (circle):  
Less than Six months                      Six months to less than one year  
One year to less than 18 months                      18 months to less than two years  
Two years to less than 30 months                      30 months to less than three years  
Three years and more than three years
75. Approximate number of American friends that you socialize with or have in the U.S. (circle):  
1 – 5                      6 – 10                      11 – 15                      16 – 20                      More than 20
76. Approximate number of friends from your own culture that you socialize with or have (circle):  
1 – 5                      6 – 10                      11 – 15                      16 – 20                      More than 20
77. Generally, how long would it take for you to make an American friend out of an American acquaintance (circle)?  
Less than 2 months                      2 to less than 4 months                      4 to less than 6 months  
More than 6 months

APPENDIX F

QUANTITATIVE SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR TAIWANESE IN TAIWAN

# 東方和西方已經相遇了！

## 調查台灣人和美國人之間跨國友情的發展

研究員：陳雅雯 (電話：0952-918-964)

研究目的：此問卷是要藉由了解台灣人和台灣人之間友情的發展，再經過進一步的對照與比較後，進而了解台灣人和美國人之間跨國友情的發展，最終以幫助未來到美國留學的台灣學生適應美國校園生活。

指導語：請選擇最接近您現在想法或情況的答案，並依照您同意下列分別所描述與 (a) 陌生人、(b) 普通朋友和 (c) 好朋友之間交談情形的程度，挑選最適合的答案。1 代表「非常不同意」，2 代表「不同意」，3 代表「介於不同意和同意之間」，4 代表「同意」，最後 5 代表「非常同意」。只要在下列提供的空間內圈選您的答案即可。請快速作答並紀錄下您的第一反應。感謝您寶貴的時間與您的配合！

### 在與「陌生人」溝通交談的時候

	非常 不同意					非常 同意
1. 與陌生人交談時，當我主動透露自己對自己的感覺，我是意識清楚地打算這麼做。	1	2	3	4	5	
2. 與陌生人交談時，當我表達我個人感覺的時候，我總是清楚地意識到我在做什麼或說什麼。	1	2	3	4	5	
3. 與陌生人交談時，我「不」常談論我自己。	1	2	3	4	5	
4. 與陌生人交談時，我談論我自己的時間最短。	1	2	3	4	5	
5. 與陌生人交談時，我常透露關於我自己正面的訊息。	1	2	3	4	5	
6. 與陌生人交談時，我在正常情況下常表達對於我自己好的感覺。	1	2	3	4	5	
7. 與陌生人交談時，我親暱地在我的談話中公開地與徹底地主動透露真正的我。	1	2	3	4	5	
8. 與陌生人交談時，我常常毫不猶豫地主動透露關於我自己隱密與私人的事情。	1	2	3	4	5	
9. 與陌生人交談時，我總是誠實地透露關於我自己的訊息。	1	2	3	4	5	

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. 與陌生人交談時，我談話中主動透露關於我自己的訊息是完全正確地反映出真實的我。  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. 與陌生人交談時，我常常表達我個人的態度、信念與意見。              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. 與陌生人交談時，我常常主動談論我的嗜好與興趣。                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. 與陌生人交談時，我常常願意主動談論我的課業(或工作)。             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. 與陌生人交談時，我常常願意主動談論金錢或我的財務考量。             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. 與陌生人交談時，我常常公開地談論我很多樣的人格個性。              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. 與陌生人交談時，我常常公開地主動討論我的身體與外表。              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. 與陌生人交談時，在一般正常的對話過程中，我總可以感覺舒適自在地交流對話和討論。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

#### 在與「普通朋友」溝通交談的時候

- |   | 非常<br>不同意 |   |   |   | 非常<br>同意 |
|---|-----------|---|---|---|----------|
| 18. 與普通朋友交談時，當我主動透露自己對自己的感覺，我是意識清楚地打算這麼做。     | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5        |
| 19. 與普通朋友交談時，當我表達我個人感覺的時候，我總是清楚地意識到我在做什麼或說什麼。 | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5        |
| 20. 與普通朋友交談時，我「不」常談論我自己。                      | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5        |
| 21. 與普通朋友交談時，我談論我自己的時間最短。                     | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5        |
| 22. 與普通朋友交談時，我常透露關於我自己正面的訊息。                  | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5        |
| 23. 與普通朋友交談時，我在正常情況下常表達對於我自己好的感覺。             | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5        |
| 24. 與普通朋友交談時，我親暱地在我的談話中公開地與徹底地主動透露真正的我。       | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5        |
| 25. 與普通朋友交談時，我常常毫不猶豫地主動透露關於我自己                | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5        |

隱密與私人的事情。

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26. 與普通朋友交談時，我總是誠實地透露關於我自己的訊息。               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. 與普通朋友交談時，我談話中主動透露關於我自己的訊息是完全正確地反映出真實的我。  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. 與普通朋友交談時，我常常表達我個人的態度、信念與意見。              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. 與普通朋友交談時，我常常主動談論我的嗜好與興趣。                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. 與普通朋友交談時，我常常願意主動談論我的課業(或工作)。             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 31. 與普通朋友交談時，我常常願意主動談論金錢或我的財務考量。             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 32. 與普通朋友交談時，我常常公開地談論我很多樣的人格個性。              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33. 與普通朋友交談時，我常常公開地主動討論我的身體與外表。              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 34. 與普通朋友交談時，在一般正常的對話過程中，我總可以感覺舒適自在地交流對話和討論。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

#### 在與「好朋友」溝通交談的時候

- |  | 非常<br>不同意 |   |   |   |   | 非常<br>同意 |
|--|-----------|---|---|---|---|----------|
| 35. 與好朋友交談時，當我主動透露自己對自己的感覺，我是意識清楚地打算這麼做。     | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |          |
| 36. 與好朋友交談時，當我表達我個人感覺的時候，我總是清楚地意識到我在做什麼或說什麼。 | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |          |
| 37. 與好朋友交談時，我「不」常談論我自己。                      | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |          |
| 38. 與好朋友交談時，我談論我自己的時間最短。                     | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |          |
| 39. 與好朋友交談時，我常透露關於我自己正面的訊息。                  | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |          |
| 40. 與好朋友交談時，我在正常情況下常表達對於我自己好的感覺。             | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |          |
| 41. 與好朋友交談時，我親暱地在我的談話中公開地與徹底地                | 1         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |          |

主動透露真正的我。

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 42. 與好朋友交談時，我常常毫不猶豫地主動透露關於我自己<br>隱密與私人的事情。      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 43. 與好朋友交談時，我總是誠實地透露關於我自己的訊息。                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 44. 與好朋友交談時，我談話中主動透露關於我自己的訊息<br>是完全正確地反映出真實的我。  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 45. 與好朋友交談時，我常常表達我個人的態度、信念與意見。                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 46. 與好朋友交談時，我常常主動談論我的嗜好與興趣。                     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 47. 與好朋友交談時，我常常願意主動談論我的課業(或工作)。                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 48. 與好朋友交談時，我常常願意主動談論金錢或我的財務考量。                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 49. 與好朋友交談時，我常常公開地談論我很多樣的人格個性。                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 50. 與好朋友交談時，我常常公開地主動討論我的身體與外表。                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 51. 與好朋友交談時，在一般正常的對話過程中，我總可以<br>感覺舒適自在地交流對話和討論。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

### 背景資料

52. 性別(請圈選):            男            女
53. 年齡:                    \_\_\_\_\_
54. 最高學歷(請圈選):  
小學畢業                    國中畢業                    高中畢業                    五專畢業  
二技畢業                    大學畢業                    碩士學位                    博士學位
55. 您目前還是學生嗎(請圈選)?                    是                    不是
56. 您固定定期聚會見面的朋友人數大約有(請圈選):  
1 到 5 人                    6 到 10 人                    11 到 15 人                    16 到 20 人  
20 人以上



57. 個性(請圈選)：

害羞

含蓄

隨何

外向

健談

其他：\_\_\_\_\_ (請註明)

## REFERENCES

- Aberson, C. L., & Tomolillo, C. (2004). Implicit bias and contact: The role of interethnic friendships. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 144*, 335-347.
- Adams, R. G., & Allan, G. (1998). Contextualising friendship. In R. G. Adams & G. Allan (Eds.), *Placing friendship in context* (pp. 1-17). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Afifi, W. A., & Guerrero, L. K. (1998). Some topics are better left unsaid II: Topic avoidance in friendships. *Communication Quarterly, 46*, 231-249.
- Afifi, W. A., & Guerrero, L. K. (2000). Motivations underlying topics avoidance in close relationships. In S. Petronio (Eds.), *Balancing the secrets of private disclosure* (pp. 165-179). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Allen, J. L., Long, K. M., O'Mara, J., & Judd, B. B. (2003). Verbal and nonverbal orientations toward communication and the development of intracultural and intercultural relationships. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 32*, 129-160.
- Al-Sharideh, K. A., & Goe, W. R. (1998). Ethnic communities within the university: An examination of factors influencing the personal adjustment of international students. *Research in Higher Education, 39*, 699-725.
- Altman, I., & Taylor, D. (1973). *Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Anderson, C. M., Martin, M. M., & Zhong, M. (1998). Motives for communicating with family and friends: A Chinese study. *The Howard Journal of Communications, 9*, 109-123.
- Argyle, M., & Henderson, M. (1985). *The anatomy of relationships: And the rules and skills needed to manage them successfully*. London: Heinemann.
- Ayres, J. (1979). Uncertainty and social penetration theory expectations about relationships communication: A comparative test. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 43*, 192-200.
- Barry, D. T. (2003). Cultural and demographic correlates of self-reported guardedness among East Asian immigrants in the U.S. *International Journal of Psychology, 38*, 150-159.
- Batonda, G., & Perry, C. (2003). Influence of culture on relationship development process in overseas Chinese/Australian networks. *European Journal of Marketing, 37*, 1548-1574.
- Barnlund, D. C. (1987). Verbal self-disclosure: Topics, targets, depth. In L. F. Luce, & E. C. Smith (Eds.), *Readings in cross-cultural communication: Toward internationalism* (2nd ed., pp. 147-165). U.S.A.: Newbury House.

- Barnlund, D. C. (1989). *Communicative styles of Japanese and Americans: Images and realities*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Bell, R. R. (1981). *Worlds of friendship*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Eds.), *Education for the intercultural experience* (pp. 90-112). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Berg, J. H. (1984). Development of friendship between roommates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *46*, 346-356.
- Berger, C. R., & Calabrese, R. J. (1975). Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research*, *1*, 99-112.
- Blee, K. M. (1998). White-knuckle research: Emotional dynamics in fieldwork with racist activists. *Qualitative Sociology*, *21*, 381-399.
- Bleske-Rechek, A. L., & Buss, D. M. (2001). Opposite-sex friendship: Sex differences and similarities in initiation, selection, and dissolution. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*, 1310-1323.
- Blieszner, R., & Adams, R. G. (1992). *Adult friendship*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bresnahan, M. J., Shearman, S. M., Lee, S. Y., Park, C. Y., Mosher, D., & Ohashi, R. (2002). Responding to a friend: Perceptions of social appropriateness and liking in Japan, Korea, and the United States. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *31*, 127-145.
- Brewer, M. B., & Mittelman, J. (1980). Effects of normative control of self-disclosure on reciprocity. *Journal of Personality*, *48*, 89-102.
- Cahn, D. D. (1984). Communication in interpersonal relationships in two cultures: Friendship formation and mate selection in the U.S. and Japan. *Communication*, *13*, 31-37.
- Cargile, A. C. (1998). Meanings and modes of friendship: Verbal description by native Japanese. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, *9*, 347-370.
- Chaikin, A. L., & Derlega, V. J. (1974). Liking for the norm-breaker in self-disclosure. *Journal of Personality*, *42*, 117-129.
- Chan, D. K.-S., Cheng, G. H.-L. (2004). A comparison of offline and online friendship qualities at different stages of relationship development. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *21*, 305-320.

- Chang, Y. (2005). *Joking, relationships, and culture: Building intimacy through talk*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of International Communication Association, New York.
- Chang, H.-C., & Holt, G. R. (1991). More than relationship: Chinese interaction and the principle of *kuan-his*. *Communication Quarterly*, 39, 251-271.
- Chang, H.-C., & Holt, G. R. (1996). The changing Chinese interpersonal world: Popular themes in interpersonal communication books in modern Taiwan. *Communication Quarterly*, 44, 85-94.
- Chang, H.-C., & Holt, G. R. (1997). Intercultural training for expatriates: Reconsidering power and politics. In A. Gonzalez & D. V. Tanno (Eds.), *Politics, communication, and culture* (pp. 207-230). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.
- Chang, J.-L. J. (2004). New dimensions of U.S.-Taiwan relations. *American foreign policy interests*, 26, 309-315.
- Chen, G.-M. (1989). Relationships of the dimensions of intercultural communication competence. *Communication Quarterly*, 37, 22-34.
- Chen, G.-M. (1992). A test of intercultural communication competence. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 2, 1-20.
- Chen, G.-M. (1993). Self-disclosure and Asian students' abilities to cope with social difficulties in the United States. *Journal of Psychology*, 6, 603-610.
- Chen, G.-M. (1995). Differences in self-disclosure patterns among Americans versus Chinese: A comparative study. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 26, 84-91.
- Chen, G.-M., & Chung, J. (1994). The impact of Confucianism on organizational communication. *Communication Quarterly*, 42, 93-105.
- Chen, L. (1993). Chinese and North Americans: An epistemological exploration of intercultural communication. *Howard Journal of Communication*, 4, 342-357.
- Chen, L. (2002). Communication in intercultural relationships. In W. B. Gudukunt & B. Mody (Eds.), *Handbook of international and intercultural communication* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 241-257). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chen, L., & Isa, M. (2003). Intercultural communication and cultural learning: The experience of Japanese visiting students in the U.S.. *The Howard Journal of Communication*, 14, 75-96.
- Chen, T. C., Drzewiecka, J. A., & Sias, P. M. (2001). Dialectical tensions in Taiwanese international student friendships. *Communication Quarterly*, 49, 57-65.

- Chen, Y.-W. (March 5, 2005). *Self-disclosure in intercultural friendship development between Taiwanese International Students and U.S. Americans*. Paper presented at the New Voices, New Perspectives Student Conference, Denton, Texas.
- Chen, Z. J. (2000). International students' preparation for and adaptation to the American higher education system: A study of cross-cultural communication. *World Communication, 29*, 25-48.
- Cheng, C.-Y. (1987). Chinese philosophy and contemporary human communication theory. In D. L. Kincaid (Eds.), *Communication theory: Eastern and Western perspectives* (pp.23-43). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Chuang, Y.-C. (1998). The cognitive structure of role norms in Taiwan. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 1*, 239-251.
- Cohen, E. (1977). Expatriate communities. *Currently Sociology, 24*, 5-76.
- Collier, M. J. (1996). Communication competence problematic in Ethnic friendships. *Communication Monographs, 63*, 314-336.
- Collier, M. J. (1998). Intercultural friendships as interpersonal alliances. In J. N. Martin, T. K. Nakayama & L. A. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in intercultural communication: experiences and contexts* (2nd ed., pp. 301-310). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Cramer, D. (1998). *Close relationships: The study of love and friendship*. New York: Arnold.
- Cushman, D. P., & Cahn, D. D. (1985). *Communication in interpersonal relationships*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dailey, R. M., & Palomares, N. A. (2004). Strategic topic avoidance: An investigation of topic avoidance frequency, strategic used, and relational correlates. *Communication Monographs, 71*, 471-496.
- Dainton, M., Zelle, E. D. (2005). *Applying communication theory for professional life: A practical introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Davis, K. E., & Todd, M. J. (1985). Assessing friendships: Prototypes, paradigm cases and relationship description. In S. Duck & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Understanding personal relationships: An interdisciplinary approach* (pp. 17-38). London: Sage.
- Derlega, V. J., Barbee, A. P., & Winstead, B. A. (1994). Friendship, gender, and social support: Laboratory studies of supportive interactions. In B. R. Burleson, T. L. Albrecht, & I. R. Sarason (Eds.), *Communication of social support* (pp. 50-70). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Derlega, V. J., Winstead, B. A., Wong, P. T. P., & Greenspan, M. (1987). Self-disclosure and relationship development: An attributional analysis. In M. E. Roloff & G. R. Miller (Eds.), *Interpersonal processes: New directions in communication research* (pp. 172-187). Newbury Park, NJ: Sage.
- Dindia, K. (1997). Self-disclosure, self-identity, and relationship development: A transactional/dialectical perspective. In S. Duck (Eds.), *Handbook of personal relationships: Theory, research and interventions* (pp. 411-426). Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dolgin, K., & Kim, S. (1992). Adolescents' disclosure to best and good friends: The effects of gender and topic intimacy. *Social Development, 3*, 146-517.
- Elleman, B. (2005). At cross purposes: U.S.-Taiwan relations since 1942. *Naval War College Review, 58*, 161-163.
- Ellingson, K. T., & Galassi, J. P. (1995). Testing two theoretical explanations for the attraction-enhancing effects of self-disclosure. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 73*, 535-541.
- Ellingsworth, H. W. (1996). A theory of adaptation in intercultural dyads. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 259-279). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- 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 residents (in U.S.) and North American spouses. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 37*, 113-127.
- Finn, A., & Powers, W. G. (2002). The value of instrumental and affective communication skills in different relational stages. *Communication Quarterly, 50*, 192-203.
- Foeman, A., & Nance, T. (2002). Building new cultures, reframing old images: Success strategies of interracial couples. *The Howard Journal of Communication, 13*, 237-249.
- Fong, M. (1998). Chinese immigrants' perceptions of semantic dimensions of direct/indirect communication in intercultural compliment interactions with North Americans. *Howard Journal of Communication, 9*, 245-262.
- Franco, J. N., Malloy, T., & Gonzalez, R. (1984). Ethnic and acculturation differences in self-disclosure. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 122*, 21-32.
- Frey, L. R., Botan, C. H., Friedman, P. G., & Kreps, G. L. (1991). *Investigating communication: An introduction to research methods*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Friedman, T. L. (2000). *The Lexus and the olive tree: Understanding globalization*. New York: Anchor books.
- Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Furnham, A., & Alibhai, N. (1985). The friendship networks of foreign students: A replication and extension of the functional model. *International Journal of Psychology, 20*, 709-722.
- Gareis, E. (1995). *Intercultural friendship: A qualitative study*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.
- Gareis, E. (1999). Adult friendship: Examples of intercultural patterns. *Communication Yearbook, 22*, 431-468.
- Gallois, C., Franklyn-Stokes, A., Giles, H., & Coupland, N. (1996). Communication accommodation in intercultural encounters. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 157-185). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gao, G. (1996). Self and other: A Chinese perspective on interpersonal relationships. In W. B. Gudykunst, S. Ting-Toomey & T. Nishida (Eds.), *Communication in personal relationships across cultures* (pp. 81-101). Thousand oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gao, G., & Gudykunst, W. B. (1995). Attributional confidence, perceived similarity, and network involvement in Chinese and American romantic relationships. *Communication Quarterly, 43*, 431-460.
- Gao, G., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1998). *Communicating effectively with the Chinese*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gonzalez, Y. S., Moreno, D. S., & Schneider, B. H. (2004). Friendship expectations of early adolescents in Cuba and Canada. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 35*, 436-445.
- Goodwin, R. (1990). Taboo topics among close friends: A factor-analytic investigation. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 130*, 691-692.
- Goodwin, R., & Lee, I. (1994). Taboo topics among Chinese and English friends: A cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 25*, 325-338.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1979). The effects of an intercultural communication workshop on cross-cultural attitudes and interaction. *Communication Education, 28*, 179-187.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1985a). An exploratory comparison of close intracultural and intercultural friendships. *Communication Quarterly, 33*, 270-283.

- Gudykunst, W. B. (1985b). The influence of cultural similarity, type of relationship, and self-monitoring on uncertainty reduction progress. *Communication Monographs*, 52, 203-217.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1995). Anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM) theory: Current status. In R. L. Wiseman (Eds.), *Intercultural Communication Theory* (8-58). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1996). Uncertainty and anxiety. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 123-156). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Hammer, M. R. (1987). Strangers and host: An uncertainty reduction based theory of intercultural adaptation. In M. F. Ansante & W. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Handbook of interaction and intercultural communication* (pp. 17-49). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (1983). Social penetration in Japanese and American close friendships. In R. N. Bostrom & B. H. Westley (Eds.), *Communication yearbook 7* (pp. 592-610). Beverly Hill, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (1984). Individual and cultural influences on uncertainty reduction. *Communication Monographs*, 51, 23-36.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1996). Communication in personal relationships across cultures: An introduction. In W. B. Gudykunst, S. Ting-Toomey & T. Nishida (Eds.), *Communication in personal relationships across cultures* (pp. 3-16). Thousand oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B., Ting-Toomey, S., & Chua, E. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hadldy, G. (1997). Lexis and culture: Bound and determined? *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 26, 483-496.
- Harvey, J. H., & Omarzu, J. (1997). Minding the close relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 1, 224-240.
- Hayes, R. L., & Lin, H.-R. (1994). Coming to America: Developing social support systems for international students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 22, 7-16.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1981). Self-disclosure and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 1150-1159.
- Hendrick, S. S., Hendrick, C., & Alder, N. L. (1988). Romantic relationships: Love, satisfaction, and staying together. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 980-988.



- Herold, E. S., & Way, L. (1988). Sexual self-disclosure among university women. *The Journal of Sex Research, 24*, 1-14.
- Horenstein, V. D.-P., & Downey, J. L. (2003). A cross-cultural investigation of self-disclosure. *North American Journal of Psychology, 5*, 373-386.
- Hosman, L. A. (1987). The evaluational consequences of topic reciprocity and self-disclosure reciprocity. *Communication Monographs, 54*, 420-435.
- Howell, A., & Conway, M. (1990). Perceived intimacy of expressed emotion. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 130*, 467-476.
- Huang, S., & Jia, W. (2000). The cultural connotations and communicative functions of Chinese kinship terms. *American Communication Journal, 3*(3). Retrieved July 25<sup>th</sup>, 2005 from [http://acjournal.org/holdings/vol3/Iss3/spec1/huang\\_jia.html](http://acjournal.org/holdings/vol3/Iss3/spec1/huang_jia.html).
- Hui, L. (2005). Chinese cultural schema of education: Implications for communication between Chinese students and Australian educators. *Issue in Educational Research, 15*, 17-36.
- Indvik, J., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1986). Perceptions of inclusion, affiliation, and control in five interpersonal relationships. *Communication Quarterly, 34*, 1-13.
- Irwin, H. (1996). *Communicating with Asia: Understanding people and customs*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- James, G. (1992). Overseas students in the United States: The quest for socio-cultural and linguistic models. *American students International, 30*, 88-108.
- Javidi, A., & Javidi, M. (1991). Cross-cultural analysis of interpersonal bonding: A look at East and West. *The Howard Journal of Communications, 3*, 129-138
- Johnson, A. J., Wittenberg, E., Villagran, M. M., Mazur, M., & Villagran, P. (2003). Relational progression as a dialectic: Examining turning points in communication among friends. *Communication Monographs, 70*, 230-249.
- Johnson, A. J., Wittenberg, E., Haigh, M., Wigley, S., Becker, J., Brown, K., & Craig, E. (2004). The process of relationships development and deterioration: Turning points in friendships that have terminated. *Communication Quarterly, 52*, 54-67.
- Johnson, M. A. (2001). Variables associated with friendship in an adult population. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 129*, 379-390.
- Jonathan, B. (2005). Self-disclosure and relational closeness in established heterosexual male friendships. Paper presented at International Communication Association Convention, New York, NY.

- Jourard, S. M. (1971). *Self-disclosure: An experimental analysis the transparent self*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Jourard, S. M., & Lasakow, P. (1958). Some factors in self-disclosure. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *56*, 91-98.
- Kelly, J. A. (2004). Overview of U.S. policy toward Taiwan. *DISAM Journal of International Security Assistance Management*, *26*, 64-73.
- 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.
- Kito, M. (2005). Self-disclosure in romantic relationships and friendships among American and Japanese college students. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *145*, 127-140.
- Knobloch, L. K., & Carpenter-Theune, K. E. (2004). Topic avoidance in developing romantic relationships. *Communication Research*, *31*, 173-205.
- Korn, C. J. (1993). Friendship formation and development in two cultures: Universal constructs in the United States and Korea. In A. M. Nicotera (Eds.), *Interpersonal communication in friend and mate relationships* (pp. 61-78). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Korn, C. J., & Nicotera, A. M. (1993). Friend and mate relationship literature, empirical propositions, and methodology. In A. M. Nicotera (Eds.), *Interpersonal communication in friend and mate relationships* (pp. 13-42). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Koutrelakos, J. (2004). Acculturation of Greek Americans: Change and continuity in cognitive schemas guiding intimate relationships. *International Journal of Psychology*, *39*, 95-105.
- Kuchru, B. B. (1998). English as an Asian language. *Links & Letters*, *5*, 89-108.
- 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.
- LaGaipa, J. J. (1977). Testing a multidimensional approach to friendship. In S. Duck (Eds.), *Theory and practice in interpersonal attraction* (pp. 249-270). London: Academic Press.
- Lance, J. I., & Grove, T. G. (1981). Sociometric and autonomic response to three levels of self-disclosure in dyads. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication*, *45*, 355-362.
- Laurenceau, J.-P., & Barrett, L. F. (1998). Intimacy as an interpersonal process: The importance of self-disclosure, partner disclosure, and perceived partner responsiveness in interpersonal exchanges. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 1238-1251.

- Lears, T. J. J. (1985). The concept of cultural hegemony: Problems and possibilities. *American Historical Review*, 90, 567-593.
- Lee, R. Y., & Bond, M. H. (1998). Personality and roommate friendship in Chinese culture. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 1, 179-190.
- Lin, J.-C. G., & Yi, J. K. (1997). Asian international students' adjustment: Issues and program suggestions. *College Student Journal*, 3, 473-479.
- Lin, M.-C., & Harwood, J. (2003). Accommodation predictors of grandparent-grandchild relational solidarity in Taiwan. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 20, 537-563.
- Lin, Y., Rancer, A. S., & Lim, S. (2003). Ethnocentrism and intercultural willingness to communicate: a cross-cultural comparison between Korean and American college students. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 32, 117-128.
- Lindgren, H. C., & Yu, R. (1975). Cross-cultural insight and empathy among Chinese immigrants to the United States. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 96, 305-306.
- Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2002). *Qualitative communication research methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lombardo, J. P., & Berzonsky, M. D. (1979). Sex differences in self-disclosure during an interview. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 107, 281-282
- Love, D. E., & Powers, W. G. (2002). Communicating under uncertainty: Interaction between Arab students and Western instructors. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 31, 217-231.
- Lummis, D. (1976). English conversation as ideology. In Y. Kurokawa (Eds.), *Essays on language* (pp. 1-26). Tokyo: Kiriara Shoten.
- Ma, L.-C., & Smith, K. (1992). Social correlates of Confucian ethics in Taiwan. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 132, 655-659.
- Martin, J. N., & Nakayama, T. K. (2003). *Intercultural communication in contexts* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Martin, J. N., Nakayama, T. K., & Flores, L. A. (1998) A dialectical approach to intercultural communication. In J. N. Martin, T. K. Nakayama & L. A. Flores (Eds.), *Readings in intercultural communication: experiences and contexts* (2nd ed., pp. 3-13). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Matsushima, R., & Shiomi, K. (2002). Self-disclosure and friendship in junior high school students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 30, 515-526.

- Maundeni, T. (2001). The role of social networks in the adjustment of African students to British society: Students' perceptions. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 4*, 253-276.
- Mcdermott, S. (1992). Communication factors in alienation among foreign students. *World Communication, 21*, 41-50.
- Miike, Y. (2002). Theorizing culture and communication in the Asian context: An assumptive foundation. In G.-M. Chen (Eds.), *Culture and Communication: An East Asian perspective* (pp. 1-21). San Antonio, TX: International Association for Intercultural Communication studies.
- Miller, L. C., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). Reciprocity of self-disclosure at the individual and dyadic levels: A social relations analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 713-719.
- Morgan, S. E., & Arasaratnam, A. (2003). Intercultural friendships as social excitation: Sensational seeking as a predictor of intercultural friendship seeking behavior. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 3*, 175-186.
- Morry, M. M., & Harasymchuk, C. (2005). Perceptions of locus of control and satisfaction in friendships: The impact of problem-solving strategies. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22*, 183-206.
- Mortenson, S. T. (2005). Toward communication values in friendship: Self-construal and mediated differences in sex and culture. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 34*, 88-107.
- Nahemow, L., & Lawton, M. P. (1975). Similarity and propinquity in friendship formation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32*, 205-213.
- Neuliep, J. W., & Ryan, D. J. (1998). The influence of intercultural communication apprehension and socio-communicative orientation on uncertainty reduction during initial cross-cultural interaction. *Communication Quarterly, 46*, 88-99.
- New Taiwan Ilha Formosa: The website for Taiwan's history, present, and future. (n.d.) *Taiwan's 400 years of history: Important milestones from the early 1600s to the present*. Retrieved April 1, 2006 from <http://www.taiwandc.org/hst-1624.htm>
- Ng, R. M.-C. (2000). The influence of Confucianism on Chinese conceptions of power, authority, and the rule of law. In D. R. Heisey (Eds.), *Chinese perspectives in rhetoric and communication* (pp. 45-55). Stamford, CT: Ablex.
- Olaniran, B. A. (1996). Social skills acquisition: A closer look at foreign students on college campuses and factors influencing their levels of social difficulty in social situations. *Communication Studies, 47*, 72-88.

- Osbeck, L. M., Moghaddam, F. M., & Perreault, S. (1997). Similarity and attraction among majority and minority groups in a multicultural context. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 21, 113-123.
- Ow, R., & Katz, D. (1999). Family secrets and the disclosure of distressful information in Chinese families. *Families in Society*, 80, 620-628.
- Owie, I. (1982). Social alienation among foreign students. *College Student Journal*, 16, 163-165.
- Pahl, R. (2000). *On friendship*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Planalp, S., & Benson, A. (1992). Friends' and acquaintances' conversations I: Perceived Differences. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 9, 483-506.
- Potter, W. J. (1996). *An analysis of thinking and research about qualitative methods*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rawlins, W. K. (1992). *Friendship matters: Communication, dialectics and the life course*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Rosenfeld, L. B. (1979). Self-disclosure avoidance: Why I am afraid to tell you who I am. *Communication Monographs*, 46, 63-74.
- Rubin, Z., & Shenker, S. S. (1978). Friendship, proximity, and self-disclosure. *Journal of Personality*, 46, 1-22.
- Sarti, I. (1981). Communication and cultural dependency: A misconception. In E. G. McAnany, J. Schnitman, & N. Janus (Eds.), *Communication and social structure: Critical studies in mass media research* (pp. 317-334). New York: Praeger.
- Shaffer, D. R., & Ogden, J. K. (1986). On sex differences in self-disclosure during the acquaintance process: The role of anticipated future interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 92-101.
- Sias, P. M., & Cahill, D. J. (1998). From coworkers to friends: The development of peer friendships in the workplace. *Western Journal of Communication*, 62, 273-299.
- Smart, A. (1999). Expressions of interest: Friendship and *guanxi* in Chinese societies. In S. Bell & S. Coleman (Eds.), *The anthropology of friendship* (pp. 119-136). Oxford: Berg.
- Smith, H. W. (1980). A modest test of cross-cultural differences in sexual modesty, embarrassment and self-disclosure. *Qualitative Sociology*, 3, 223-241.

- Smith, R. A., & Downs, E. (2004). Flying across cultural divides: Sensation seeking and engagement in intercultural communication. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 33*, 223-230.
- Snell, W. E., Hampton, B. R., & McManus, P. (1992). The impact of counselor and participant gender on willingness to discuss relational topics: Development of the relationship disclosure scale. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*, 409-416.
- Sodetani, L. L., & Gudykunst, W. B. (1987). The effects of surprising events on intercultural relationships. *Communication Research Reports, 4*, 1-6.
- Solano, C. H. (1981). Sex differences and the Taylor-Altman self-disclosure stimuli. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 1981*, 287-288.
- Starr, P. D. (1975). Self-disclosure and stress among Middle-Eastern university students. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 97*, 141-142.
- Stephan, C. W., & Stephan, W. G. (2002). Cognition and affect in cross-cultural relations. In W. B. Gudykunst & B. Mody (Eds.), *Handbook of international and intercultural communication* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 127-142). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Swagler, M. A., & Jome, L. M. (2005). The effects of personality and acculturation on the adjustment of North American sojourners in Taiwan. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 527-536.
- Tardy, C. H. (1988). Self-disclosure: Objectives and methods of measurement. In C. H. Tardy (Eds.), *A handbook for the study of human communication: Methods and instruments for observing, measuring, and assessing communication processes* (pp. 323-346). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Taylor, D. A., & Altman, I. (1987). Communication in interpersonal relationships: Social penetration processes. . In M. E. Roloff & G. R. Miller (Eds.), *Interpersonal processes: New directions in communication research* (pp. 257-277). Newbury Park, NJ: Sage.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1991) Cross-cultural interpersonal communication: An introduction. In S. Ting-Toomey & F. Korzenny (Eds.), *Cross-cultural interpersonal communication* (pp. 1-8). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ting-Toomey, S., & Oetzel, J. G. (2001). *Managing intercultural conflict effectively*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder: Westview.
- Tsang, K.-J., & Wang, G. (1990). Indigenizing foreign culture: The case of Taiwan. *Xin Wen Xue Yan Jiu, 43*, 117-133.

- Tschann, J. M. (1988). Self-disclosure in adult friendship: Gender and Marital Status Differences. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5, 65-81.
- Tsuda, Y. (1999). The hegemony of English and strategies for linguistic pluralism: Proposing the ecology for language paradigm. In M. Tehranian (Eds.), *Worlds apart: Human security and global governance* (pp. 153-167). London: I. B. Tauris.
- Urberg, K. A., Degirmencioglu, S. M., & Tolson, J. M. (1998). Adolescent friendship selection and termination: The role of similarity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 15, 703-710.
- Van Oudenhoven, J. P., Mol, S., & Van der Zee, K. I. (2003). Short note: Story of the adjustment of Western expatriates in Taiwan ROC with the multicultural personality questionnaire. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 6, 159-170.
- Verkuyten, M., & Masson, K. (1996). Culture and gender differences in the perception of friendship by adolescents. *International Journal of Psychology*, 31, 207-217.
- Vittengl, J. R., & Holt, C. S. (2000). Getting acquainted: The relationships of self-disclosure and social attraction to positive affect. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 17, 53-66.
- Wheless, L. R. (1978). A follow-up study of the relationships among trust, disclosure and interpersonal solidarity. *Human Communication Research*, 4, 143-157.
- Wheless, L. R., Erickson, K. V., & Behrens, J.S. (1986). Cultural differences in disclosiveness as a function of locus of control. *Communication Monographs*, 53, 36-46.
- Winum, P. C., & Banikiotes, P. G. (1983). The effects of similarity and actual levels of self-disclosure and self-disclosure flexibility on perceptions of interpersonal attraction and adjustment. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 11, 17-22.
- Witteborn, S. (2003). Communicative competence revisited: An emic approach to studying intercultural communicative competence. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 32, 187-203.
- Wolfson, K., & Pearce, W. B. (1983). A cross-cultural comparison of the implications of self-disclosure on conversational logics. *Communication Quarterly*, 31, 249-256.
- Won-Doornink, M. J. (1985). Self-disclosure and reciprocity in conversation: A cross-national study. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 48, 97-107.
- Wong, S. C. H., & Bond, M. H. (1999). Personality, self-disclosure and friendship between Chinese university roommates. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 2, 201-214.

- Wood, J. T., & Inman, C. C. (1993). In a different mode: Masculine styles of communicating closeness. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 21, 279-295.
- World Journal. (1999). People's Republic of China ranks first and Taiwan fifth in size of international students sent to study in the United States (p. 1). Milbrae, CA: World Journal.
- Yamaguchi, Y., & Wiseman, R. L. (2003). Locus of control, self-construals, intercultural communication effectiveness, and the psychological health of international students in the United States. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 32, 227-245.
- Ye, Z. (2004). Chinese categorization of interpersonal relationships and the cultural logic of Chinese social interaction: An indigenous perspective. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 1, 211-230.
- Ying, Y.-W. (2002). Formation of cross-cultural relationships of Taiwanese international students in the United States. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 30, 45-55.
- Yum, J. O. (1988). The impact of Confucianism on interpersonal relationships and communication patterns in East Asia. *Communication Monographs*, 55, 374-388.
- Zheng, X., & Berry, J. W. (1991). Psychological adaptation of Chinese sojourners in Canada. *International Journal of Psychology*, 26, 451-470.
- Zimmermann, S. (1995). Perceptions of intercultural communication competence and international student adaptation to an American campus. *Communication Education*, 44, 321-335.
- Zorn, T. E., & Gregory, K. W. (2005). Learning the ropes together: Assimilation and friendship development among first-year male medical students. *Health Communication*, 17, 211-231.