The Effects of Cross-Cultural Experience on Self-Disclosure Among Japanese Female University Students[1)]

Masahide KASAHARA*

The purpose of this article is to examine the influence of cross-cultural experience on self-disclosure among Japanese female university students. Research on Japanese self-disclosure points out that the topics appearing in their conversations are limited, and the depth of their self-disclosure is also restrained (e.g., Barnlund, 1975, 1989). From the point of view of intimacy, even if a Japanese target is a highly intimate person, his/her degree of self-disclosure tends to be more superficial than that of people from other countries (Gudykunst, 1986; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1987; Ting-Toomey, 1991; Gudykunst, et al., 1992). However, the targets who have been socialized, in other words, "acculturated" in other countries should show a higher degree of self-disclosure in terms of the number and the depth of topics showing up in their conversations. The Enomoto Self-Disclosure Questionnaire-45 (henceforth "ESDQ-45"; Enomoto, 1997) was used to research and examine this hypothesis.

Concepts and Hypothesis

Self-Disclosure as a Verbal Communication Style Reflecting Culture

Jourard and Rogers pointed out the significance of the catharsis function among disclosers' mental health by using the term of "self-disclosure" (as cited in Shimotomai, 2001). It is said that it was the first time the term of "self-disclosure" was used in the field of psychology (Uemura, 2002). Jourard (1958) developed the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire based on his clinical experiences. Various types of research on self-disclosure has been conducted in numerous fields of study, such as social psychology, clinical and counseling psychology, interpersonal communication and so forth (Berg & Derlega, 1987).

Altman and Taylor's definition of self-disclosure states that it involves individuals' telling information about themselves to others—information that the other people do not know (as cited in Gudykunst, 1998). Self-disclosure can also be defined "as what individuals verbally reveal about themselves to others (including thoughts, feelings, and experiences), [and] plays a major role in close relationships" (Derlega, Metts, Petronio,

* the Department of Foreign Studies, the School of Cross-Cultural Studies

and Margulis, 1993, p. 1). Stiles (1987) defines the behavior of disclosure as follows: "an utterance (e.g., a sentence or an independent clause) that concerns the speaker's experience and uses the speaker's internal (subjective) frame of reference" (p. 258).

As for the functions of self-disclosure, Derlega, et al. (1993) indicated five functions: emotion expression, self-clarification, social-validation, relationship development, and social control. Ando (1990) added intimacy accommodation to these five functions, and divides the total of six functions into two categories: personal function and interpersonal function. He regards emotion expression, self-clarification, and social-validation as personal functions; relationship development, social control, and intimacy accommodation as interpersonal functions (Fukada, 1998, 1999; Uemura, 2000).

Many researchers have conducted cross-cultural research[2] on self-disclosure; some investigated differences in nationality, some examined racial differences, and others explored ethnic differences (e.g., Jourard, 1961; Jaffee & Polanski, 1962; Jourard, 1963; Plog, 1965; Diamond & Hellcamp, 1969; Wolken, Moriwaki, & Williams, 1973; Littlefield, 1974; Barnlund, 1975, 1989; LeVine & Franco, 1981; Gudykunst, 1986; Gudykunst & Hammer, 1987; Wheeler, Reis, & Bond, 1989; Hecht & Ribeau, 1991; Ting-Toomey, 1991; Gudykunst, et al., 1992; Chen, 1995). On the other hand, it is hard to find intercultural research[3] on self-disclosure. As the range of research indicated above suggests, self-disclosure is a type of universal verbal communication behavior. However, culturally different traits of self-disclosure were found in those research activities. It can be said that culture influences the pattern of self-disclosure. It cannot be avoided.

Cross-Cultural Adaptation as a Process of Socialization

Socialization refers to the process of intentionally and carefully shaping individuals by way of tutelage (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, 1992). In the socialization process, people acquire all the factors and processes to fit in the society and live with others (Kelvin, 1970). The term of "socialization" is used when that process occurs within one's own culture. *Enculturation* is a related term which was defined by Herskovits (1948). Ting-Toomey (1999) refers to enculturation as "the sustained, primary socialization process of strangers in their original home (or natal) culture wherein they have internalized their primary cultural values" (p. 235). Socialization or enculturation is carried out through long term processes from birth to adulthood. Certain traits of the people living in any given country are transmitted over time from one generation to another through that process.

When people enter a new and unfamiliar culture and communicate with the people there, a *re-socialization* process takes place. In that case, the concept of *acculturation* would apply. Berry, et al. (1992) defined acculturation as follows: "cultural and psychological change brought about by contact with other people belonging to different cultures and exhibiting different behaviors" (p. 19). Kim (2001) also mentioned that acculturation is an individuals' process of acquiring some aspects of the host culture.

Similar to enculturation, the process of acculturation needs time for the person to learn cultural elements such as values, beliefs, communication skills and so on. Ting-Toomey (1999) pointed out, referring to the intercultural literature, that acculturation is a long-term changing process.

Kim (2001) explains two types of cross-cultural adaptation: the long-term adaptation, and the short-term adaptation. The long-term adaptation refers to the experience of immigrants, refugees, and others who often permanently stay in a different culture from their own for perhaps the rest of their lives. The short-term adaptation applies to sojourners who stay in a different culture from their own on a temporary basis, just for sightseeing, studying as international students, and so forth. The long-term adaptation has been studied for a long time in the field of social psychology and recently in communication studies. The short-term adaptation, however, was initially studied in connection with overseas volunteer programs such as the Peace Corps, international student exchange programs, multinational business trade, and so on. In other words, the short-term adaptation tends to be for more practical purposes.

Gudykunst and Kim (1997) pointed out that "the adaptation process is the communication process: Adaptation occurs in and through communication" (p. 339). Cultural elements are learned through interpersonal communication with the people living in the target country. Kim (2001) defines the concept of cross-cultural adaptation as follows: "the dynamic process by which individuals, upon relocating to new, unfamiliar, or changed cultural environments, establish (or reestablish) and maintain relatively stable, reciprocal and functional relationships with those environments" (p. 31). Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits defined the concept of intercultural adaptation as the increasing identity-related process of change in sojourners and immigrants in a new environment (as cited in Ting-Toomey, 1999).

Method

Participants

This research was conducted at Sugiyama Jogakuen University, a women's university in central Japan. All participants were necessarily female students. 207 students took part in this research. Of those, 147 were from the School of Cross-Cultural Studies (71.0%), with 99 out of the 147 from the Department of Foreign Studies (49.0%), and 46 from the Department of Modern and Classical Studies (22.8%), and 2 from a department not indicated; 57 students were from the School of Human Relations (27.5%), with 24 out of the 57 from the Department of Human Relations (11.9%), 30 from the Department of Psychology (11.9%), and 3 from a department not indicated; 3 were from the School of Education (1.4%). The range of their ages was from 19 to 22 years old ($M = 19.72$, $Me = 19.0$, $Mo = 19$, $SD = 0.873$). 2 participants did not indicate their ages, but given that the target school years were from the 2nd to the 4th year, it is likely that they

fell within this range as well.

This research focused on the influence of cross-cultural experiences on Japanese self-disclosure, so participants with previous cross-cultural experience were separated out from the others; 21 such participants out of 207 were found (10.1%). Countries where they had stayed and the numbers for each were as follows: 6 were in the United States (2.9%); 3 were in Australia (1.4%); 3 were in Canada (1.4%); 2 were in New Zealand (1 was also in Australia) (1.0%); 2 were in Brazil (1 was also in Portugal) (1.0%); 1 was in France (0.5%); 1 was in Ireland (0.5%); 1 was in Spain (0.5%); 1 was in Peru (0.5%); 1 was in Indonesia (0.5%).

The average period they had stayed in those countries was as follows: 18.83 months in the United States; 6.33 months in Australia; 7.00 months in Canada; 4 months in New Zealand (the one who also spent time in Australia was there for 2 months); 77.00 months in Brazil (the one who also spent time in Portugal was there for 84.00 months); 6.00 months in France; 10.00 months in Ireland; 48.00 months in Spain; 87.00 months in Peru; 12.00 months in Indonesia.

The reasons for the sojourn those countries were as follows: In cases of those in the United States, 4 were there because of their fathers' work, 1 was there for studying abroad, and 1 was there for a reason not stated in the questionnaire; all 3 in Australia were there for studying abroad; all 3 in Canada were there for studying abroad; the 2 in New Zealand were there for studying abroad (the one among them who had also been in Australia was also studying abroad there); the 1 in Brazil was there because of her father's work (this participant had also been in Portugal for the same reason), another was in Brazil because she holds double nationality; the 1 in France was there because of her father's work; the 1 in Ireland was there for studying abroad; the 1 in Spain was there because of her father's work; the 1 in Peru was there because she holds double nationality; the 1 in Indonesia was there because of her father's work.

In order to analyze the participants' experiences from the perspective of cross-cultural experience, the countries where they stayed were categorized by the individualism index and the high- or low-context culture index (i.e., located on scales ranging from individualist to collectivist and high-context culture to low-context culture) from the perspectives of cultural variability based on the frameworks of Hofstede (1980, 1997) and Hall (1977, 1983) respectively. As for individualism—collectivism continuum, the scores below the mean of the individualism index are considered collectivist, and above the mean are considered individualist. Following that definition, 17 participants have spent time in individualistic cultures and 4 had been in collectivistic cultures. As employed by Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988), the score for individualism was also used to determine whether a country has a high- or low-context culture. An individualism score below median is considered to be indicative of a high-context culture, and above the median indicative of a low-context culture. Following this definition, 17 participants had been in low-context cultures and 4 had been in high-context cultures.

Questionnaire

ESDQ-45, which has been used extensively in research recently, was employed in the survey. ESDQ-45 can measure 11 facets of self: *spiritual me*, *physical me*, *social me*, *material me*, *kinship me*, and *existential me*, and 3 facets of personality which are not directly referred to, such as *hobbies*, *opinions*, and *rumors*. Spiritual me has 3 phases: *intellectual*, *emotional*, and *value orientations*. Spiritual me (intellectual) focuses on confidence or anxiety about intellectual competence and intellectual interests. Spiritual me (emotional) focuses on the experience of emotional hurt and recognition of being emotionally immature. Physical me has 3 phases: *appearance*, *functional and constitutional*, and *sexual*. Physical me (appearance) focuses on appearances and posture as physical attractiveness. Physical me (functional and constitutional) focuses on the constitution and health of one's body, as well as athletic competence. Physical me (sexual) focuses on anxiety regarding and interest in sexual matters. Social me has 2 phases: *personal human relations* and *relationships in public roles*. Social me personal human relations has 2 perspectives, one being *same-sex relations*, and the other, *opposite-sex relations*. Social me (personal human relations, same-sex relations) focuses on preferences and worries regarding friends. Social me (personal human relations, opposite-sex relations) focuses on the experience of romantic relationships and worries about the relationships with opposite-sex friends. Social me (relationships in public roles) focuses on jobs which one is interested in and the position of work in one's life. Material me concerns the ways of spending money or preferences in clothes. Kinship me concerns demands and complaints involving one's parents and anxiety about family members. Existential me concerns loneliness, feelings of being excluded, and anxiety about one's life.

The reliability of the ESDQ-45 is confirmed based on inter-item correlations among construal factors has been proved[4] ($.7<r<.8$, $p<.001$; Enomoto, 1997). This research targeted the following relationships: *father*, *mother*, *intimate same-sex friend*, and *intimate opposite-sex friend*. Following the approach of Jourard and Lasakow (1958) and Barnlund (1975, 1989), the criteria standard employed in this research was the 3-level Likert Scale;

0 …… I have talked nothing about this aspect of myself.
1 …… I have talked in general terms about this aspect of myself.
2 …… I have talked in full and complete detail about myself.
X…… I have deceived others by not talking honestly about this aspect of myself honestly.

Procedure

This research was conducted in the courses which are related to communication studies in the School of Cross-Cultural Studies and the School of Human Relations in the first semesters of 2009 and 2010 by the ESDQ-45. These courses selected are taught by this researcher. ESDQ-45 was introduced to the students at the time of studying self-

disclosure as a phase of verbal communication in interpersonal communication. The researcher spent 2 or 3 class periods for explaining the concept of self-disclosure and having the participants fill out and tabulate results for the ESDQ-45. Participants were not required to submit the questionnaire, rather they decided by themselves whether to submit the questionnaire or not. The researcher gave 5 additional points in that semester as an incentive to the students who submitted the questionnaire.

Results

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was conducted in order to find out which factors in participants' answers to the questionnaire, ESDQ-45, has the greatest impact. The Maximum-Likelihood Method was applied to identify factors. To determine the number of factors, the method of Kaiser-Guttmann criterion was applied. As a result of this analysis, 2 factors were discovered (see Table 1).

Table 1. Total Variance Explained in ESDQ-45

Factor	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings[a]
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total
1	9.55	63.68	63.68	9.22	61.45	61.45	8.42
2	1.29	8.61	72.30	.95	6.35	67.81	8.04
3	.67	4.48	76.77				
4	.53	3.55	80.33				
5	.49	3.29	83.61				
6	.40	2.69	86.30				
7	.35	2.34	88.64				
8	.32	2.11	90.75				
9	.27	1.80	92.55				
10	.26	1.74	94.29				
11	.23	1.54	95.83				
12	.19	1.28	97.11				
13	.18	1.19	98.30				
14	.13	.89	99.19				
15	.12	.82	100.00				

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.

a. When factors are correlated, sums of squared loadings cannot be added to obtain a total variance.

Correlation between 2 factors was $r = .76$, so Promax with Kiser Normalization Rotation Method was employed (see Table 2). Factors with a factor loading of more than .40 were chosen. Table 2 shows, 7 factors were appeared in Factor 1, and 8 factors were showed up in Factor 2. In contrasting Table 2 with Table 3, those facets of self and personality seen in Factor 1 should be called *public self* and those that appeared in Factor 2 should be called *private self*, as Barnlund (1975, 1989) confirmed in an earlier study.

Table 2. Pattern Matrix[a] of Self-Disclosure

	Factor		
	1 (Public self)	2 (Private self)	Commonalities Extraction
Hobbies	1.01	−.21	.74
Material me	.96	−.14	.74
Opinions	.90	−.06	.74
Spiritual me (Intellectual)	.74	.19	.80
Social me (Relationships in Public Roles)	.74	.19	.80
Physical me (Functional & Constitutional)	.64	.24	.70
Rumors	.55	.28	.61
Spiritual me (Emotional)	−.01	.88	.76
Physical me (Sexual)	−.27	.86	.45
Social me (Personal Relationships with the Opposite Sex)	.02	.78	.64
Existential me	.15	.69	.66
Social me (Personal Relationships with the Same Sex)	.16	.66	.62
Kinship me	.16	.59	.52
Spiritual me (Value Orientations)	.44	.49	.77
Physical me (Appearance)	.36	.49	.63

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

In the cases of Spiritual me (Value Orientations) and Physical me (Appearance), factor loading in those facets of self resulted in close numerical values. As for factor loading in Spiritual me (Value Orientations), Factor 1 was .44 and Factor 2 was .49. As for factor loading in Physical me (Appearance), Factor 1 was .36 and Factor 2 was .49. The difference in factor loading between Factor 1 and Factor 2 in both cases was less than .15.

According to Table 3, correlation coefficient of Factor 1 with Spiritual me (Value Orientations) was $r = .82$; with Factor 2, this correlation coefficient was $r = .83$. Both factors indicated strong correlations with Spiritual me (Value Orientations). Physical me (Appearance) also showed strong correlations with Factor 1 and Factor 2: for Factor 1,

Table 3. Structure Matrix of Self-Disclosure

	Factor	
	1 (Public self)	2 (Private self)
Social me (Relationships in Public Roles)	.88	.75
Spiritual me (Intellectual)	.88	.75
Opinions	.86	.62
Material me	.86	.59
Hobbies	.85	.55
Physical me (Functional & Constitutional)	.82	.73
Rumors	.76	.69
Spiritual me (Emotional)	.66	.87
Spiritual me (Value Orientations)	.82	.83
Existential me	.68	.81
Social me (Personal Relationships with the Opposite Sex)	.62	.80
Social me (Personal Relationships with the Same Sex)	.66	.78
Physical me (Appearance)	.73	.76
Kinship me	.61	.71
Physical me (Sexual)	.38	.65

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.

this was $r = .73$, and for Factor 2, $r = .76$. From this numerical evidence, it is clear that both of these facets of self are concentrated around the border of public and private self.

Self-Disclosure Regarding all Targets and all Topics

The following table, Table 4, shows the results of computing the mean for self-disclosure among all the participants in regards to all targets and all topics. As explained, ESDQ-45 contains 45 questions on conversation topics but they can be divided into 15 facets of self- and personality-related items. Table 4 shows the results in terms of those 15 facets; 11 facets are directly concerned with self and the remaining 4 facets are not directly associated with self but refer to personality.

Following Barnlund (1975, 1989), each mean figure higher than the mean for the total can be regarded as indicative of "public self", and each figure lower than the total mean can be regarded as indicative of "private self". This means that the border of public self and private self can be drawn between Rumors and Social me (Personal Relationships with the Same Sex). In order to further clarify this statistically, factor analysis was conducted.

Table 4. Descriptive Data on Self-Disclosure Regarding all Topics and Toward all Targets

	N	*M*	*SD*	*Variance*
Hobbies	199	1.41	.43	.18
Spiritual me (Intellectual)	199	1.26	.44	.19
Opinions	199	1.25	.48	.23
Social me (Relationships in Public Roles)	199	1.25	.46	.21
Material me	198	1.17	.45	.20
Physical me (Functional & Constitutional)	199	1.16	.42	.18
Spiritual me (Value Orientations)	199	1.14	.49	.24
Rumors	198	1.06	.39	.15
Social me (Personal Relationships with the Same Sex)	199	1.04	.41	.17
Physical me (Appearance)	199	.99	.43	.19
Kinship me	198	.99	.42	.17
Existential me	198	.93	.43	.18
Spiritual me (Emotional)	198	.92	.39	.15
Social me (Personal Relationships with the Opposite Sex)	199	.87	.35	.12
Physical me (Sexual)	198	.48	.32	.10
*M*ean	194	1.05	.34	.11
Valid *N* (listwise)	194			

Differences in Self-Disclosure Between Participants With Cross-Cultural Experience and Those Without Cross-Cultural Experience

Table 5 is the comparative statistical descriptive summary of the results for self-disclosure with both cross-cultural experienced participants with non cross-cultural experienced participants. As shown in this table, the numerical difference in self-disclosure can be found in all facets of self and personality. Cross-cultural experienced

Table 5. Summary of Self-Disclosure Comparing CCEPs[a] and non CCEPs

Cross-Cultural Experience		Spiritual me (Intellectual)	Spiritual me (Emotional)	Spiritual me (Value Orientations)	Physical me (Appearance)
Yes	*M*	1.54	1.15	1.43	1.14
	N	21	21	21	21
	SD	.33	.38	.43	.46
No	*M*	1.22	.89	1.11	.97
	N	178	177	178	178
	SD	.44	.38	.49	.43
Total	*M*	1.26	.92	1.14	.99
	N	199	198	199	199
	SD	.44	.39	.49	.43

a. CCEPs stands for "Cross-Cultural Experienced Participants".

Table 5. Continued

Cross-Cultural Experience		Physical me (Functional & Constitutional)	Physical me (Sexual)	Social me (Personal Relationships with the Same Sex)	Social me (Personal Relationships with the Opposite Sex)
Yes	*M*	1.46	.59	1.22	1.01
	N	21	20	21	21
	SD	.40	.40	.46	.36
No	*M*	1.12	.46	1.02	.85
	N	178	178	178	178
	SD	.41	.30	.40	.34
Total	*M*	1.16	.48	1.04	.87
	N	199	198	199	199
	SD	.42	.32	.41	.35

Table 5. Continued

Cross-Cultural Experience		Social me (Relationships in Public Roles)	Material me	Kinship me	Existential me
Yes	*M*	1.49	1.39	1.21	1.21
	N	21	21	21	21
	SD	.43	.40	.34	.44
No	*M*	1.22	1.14	.97	.90
	N	178	177	177	177
	SD	.46	.45	.42	.41
Total	*M*	1.25	1.17	.99	.93
	N	199	198	198	198
	SD	.46	.45	.42	.43

Table 5. Continued

Cross-Cultural Experience		Hobbies	Opinions	Rumors	*M*ean
Yes	*M*	1.57	1.56	1.23	1.28
	N	21	21	21	20
	SD	.38	.35	.37	.32
No	*M*	1.39	1.21	1.04	1.03
	N	178	178	177	174
	SD	.43	.47730	.39	.33
Total	*M*	1.41	1.25	1.06	1.05
	N	199	199	198	194
	SD	.43	.48	.39	.34

participants were willingly to disclose more about themselves than non cross-cultural experienced participants.

When comparing the means of all items of self and personality, it seems possible to say that cross-cultural experienced participants tend to disclose more about themselves than non cross-cultural experienced participants. ANOVA was conducted to determine if the raw differences being seen between cross-cultural experienced participants and non cross-cultural experienced participants are statistically significant. The following Table 6 shows the results of conducting ANOVA.

Table 6. ANOVA Results: Differences in Self-Disclosure Between CCEPs[a] and non CCEPs

		Σ^2	*df*	M^2	*F*	*p*	η^2
Spiritual me (Intellectual)	Between Groups (Combined)	1.84	1	1.84	10.02***	.002	.048
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	36.14	197	.18			
Experience	Total	37.98	198				
Spiritual me (Emotional)	Between Groups (Combined)	1.29	1	1.29	8.81***	.003	.043
Cross-Cultural Experience	Within Groups	28.66	196	.15			
Experience	Total	29.94	197				
Spiritual me (Value Orientations)	Between Groups (Combined)	1.97	1	1.97	8.41***	.004	.041
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	46.12	197	.23			
Experience	Total	48.08	198				
Physical me (Appearance)	Between Groups (Combined)	.55	1	.55	2.98[n.s.]	.086	.015
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	36.40	197	.19			
Experience	Total	36.95	198				
Physical me (Functional & Constitutional)	Between Groups (Combined)	2.18	1	2.18	13.08****	.000	.062
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	32.79	197	.17			
Experience	Total	34.96	198				
Physical me (Sexual)	Between Groups (Combined)	.30	1	.30	3.07[n.s.]	.082	.015
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	19.31	196	.10			
Experience	Total	19.61	197				
Social me (Personal Relationships with the Same Sex)	Between Groups (Combined)	.80	1	.80	4.92*	.028	.024
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	32.16	197	.16			
Experience	Total	32.97	198				

Social me (Personal Relationships with the Opposite Sex)	Between Groups (Combined)	.49	1	.49	4.14*	.043	.021
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	23.10	197	.12			
Experience	Total	23.59	198				
Social me Public Role	Between Groups (Combined)	1.38	1	1.38	6.67*	.011	.033
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	40.84	197	.21			
Experience	Total	42.23	198				
Material me	Between Groups (Combined)	1.10	1	1.10	5.56*	.019	.028
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	38.73	196	.20			
Experience	Total	39.83	197				
Kinship me	Between Groups (Combined)	1.15	1	1.15	6.90**	.009	.034
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	32.71	196	.17			
Experience	Total	33.86	197				
Existential me	Between Groups (Combined)	1.77	1	1.77	10.29***	.002	.050
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	33.73	196	.17			
Experience	Total	35.50	197				
Hobbies	Between Groups (Combined)	.59	1	.59	3.29*n.s.	.071	.016
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	35.22	197	.18			
Experience	Total	35.81	198				
Opinions	Between Groups (Combined)	2.39	1	2.39	10.00***	.001	.053
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	42.78	197	.22			
Experience	Total	45.17	198				
Rumors	Between Groups (Combined)	.64	1	.64	4.32*	.039	.022
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	29.25	196	.15			
Experience	Total	29.90	197				
*M*ean	Between Groups (Combined)	1.11	1	1.11	10.37***	.002	.051
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	20.55	192	.11			
Experience	Total	21.66	193				

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .005$. ****$p < .001$.
a. CCEPs stands for "Cross-Cultural Experienced Participants".

Significant differences were acknowledged in most of the facets of self and personality (12 items); only in 3 items were such differences not found: Physical me (appearance), Physical me (sexual), and Hobbies. As seen in Tables 2 and 4, Physical me (appearance) and Physical me (sexual) are in the realm of "private self". In particular, Physical me (sexual) showed the least degree of self-disclosure. Hobbies was the personality-related item with the greatest degree of self-disclosure in "public self". That is, there was no observable difference in the self-disclosure aspect of self and

personality between cross-cultural experienced participants and non cross-cultural experienced participants. As for Physical me (appearance), the fact that a difference was not found between cross-cultural experienced participants and non cross-cultural experienced participants might be a result of the typical female view of self[5].

Significant differences in each mean with all targets between cross-cultural experienced participants and non cross-cultural experienced participants were identified (see Table 7). This indicates that there are significant differences not only in the aspects of self and personality but also among targets. It can be interpreted that cross-cultural experienced participants displayed obviously different patterns of self-disclosure from non cross-cultural experienced participants.

Table 7. ANOVA Results: Differences in Self-Disclosure Between CCEPs[a] and non-CCEPs With Given Targets

		Σ^2	df	M^2	F	p	η^2
*M*ean (Father)	Between Groups (Combined)	1.12	1	1.12	6.09*	.014	.030
Within Groups	Cross-Cultural	36.54	199	.18			
Experience	Total	37.65	200				
*M*ean (Mother)	Between Groups (Combined)	1.40	1	1.40	7.76**	.006	.037
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	36.39	202	.18			
Experience	Total	37.78	203				
*M*ean (Intimate Same Sex Friends)	Between Groups (Combined)	.70	1	.70	4.99*	.027	.024
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	28.36	203	.14			
Experience	Total	29.06	204				
*M*ean (Intimate Opposite Sex Friends)	Between Groups (Combined)	1.27	1	1.27	6.55*	.011	.032
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	38.09	197	.19			
Experience	Total	39.36	198				
*M*ean (All Targets)	Between Groups (Combined)	1.11	1	1.11	10.37***	.002	.051
Cross-Cultural	Within Groups	20.55	192	.11			
Experience	Total	21.66	193				

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .005$. ****$p < .001$.

a. CCEPs stands for "Cross-Cultural Experienced Participants".

Discussion

Relationship Between Cross-Cultural Experience and Self-Disclosure

Significant differences in self-disclosure between cross-cultural experienced participants and non cross-cultural experienced participants were discovered for both viewpoints of self including personality and the targets of interaction (Table 6 & Table 7). This result indicates that cross-cultural experience has some influence on self-disclosure.

Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988) and Gudykunst and Kim (1997) described self-disclosure as a direct form of communication. Hall (1973) stated that culture is communication, and communication is culture. Therefore, culture and communication are interrelated. On the basis of these definitions, self-disclosure can be said to be a reflection of the culture of the people living in a given country.

Socialization, either in the form of "enculturation" or "acculturation", also takes place through communication (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997; Kim, 2001). That is, being socialized means to learn the appropriate ways of communication in a given society or culture. As an indication of acculturation, it is possible that cross-cultural, or rather intercultural experience influences and changes the way people communicate.

Seen from the perspectives discussed above, the results of this research confirmed the existence of a relationship between cross-cultural experience and self-disclosure. To conduct a closer and more detailed analysis, several aspects of the factors in intercultural adaptation have to be considered.

First of all, one of the aspects of cultural variability, individualism—collectivism (Triandis, 1995; Hofstede, 1997, 2001) must be taken into consideration. Ting-Toomey (1987) indicated that people from an individualistic culture disclose more about themselves than people from a collectivistic culture. As mentioned above, self-disclosure is associated with the direct communication style. The direct communication style is dominant in individualistic cultures, which are generally low-context cultures. On the other hand, collectivistic cultures or high-context cultures tend to employ indirect communication styles. It is possible, then, to imagine that people acculturated in individualistic cultures would display higher degrees of self-disclosure.

Secondly, the length of acculturation should be also one of the critical factors. Kim (2001) explained 2 types of adaptation: the long-term and the short-term. Akiyama (1998) mentioned these tendencies in cultural identification: basically no change during the short-term adaptation, some degrees of change, expansion, and integration during the long-term adaptation. A certain amount of time is necessary to be acculturated (i.e., to acquire cultural traits; communication styles). Akiyama (1998) defined "the long-term" as more than 4–5 years in a culture different from one that the person was born and raised in. Nakane (1972) also said that in the case of Japanese, they need a total of 4–5 years' cross-cultural experience to acquire the sense of becoming intercultural. Akiyama

(1998) also illustrated that, in case of the short-term adaptation, the focus of adaptation is on adjusting/re-socializing to the new environment (i.e., focuses on the external). On the other hand, the long-term adaptation focuses on adjusting/re-socializing the inner self to accommodate new cultural rules. It can be said that the longer people stay in another culture to be acculturated, the more the communicative traits of the culture they stay in will be reflected within them.

Thirdly, the age of being exposed to intercultural environments is another factor not to be overlooked as a factor in deliberate or conscious acculturation. Nakane (1972) said that the critical age for the degree culture-shock influence is 20 years old. She went on to say that the younger one is exposed to intercultural surroundings, the less the degree of culture shock will be, in other words, younger people can fit into another culture relatively easily, while the further one is beyond 20 years old when exposed to a cross-cultural environment, the more difficult it will be for the person to overcome culture shock. On the basis of Nakane (1972), people being exposed to cross-cultural experience when under 20 will be acculturated more smoothly, and acquire the target culture's communication style.

Finally, in this research, intercultural experience has been focused on in terms of its association with self-disclosure. However, in regard to acculturation and intercultural adaptation, several factors mentioned above would be also involved. It is necessary to consider these factors and the combinations of some or all of them in order to conduct a more thoroughgoing investigation into acculturation as the process of acquiring a culture-based disposition toward communication style.

The relationship between cross-cultural experience and self-disclosure has been examined in this paper. In the course of the research, significant differences in self-disclosure between cross-cultural experienced participants and non cross-cultural experienced participants were discovered. There was empirical evidence that the degree of self-disclosure as an aspect of communication style was changed by acculturation through exposure to other cultures.

In this research, whether or not the participants had ever been exposed to intercultural environments was an independent variable. However, many other factors, such as the cultural variable "individualism—collectivism" corresponding largely to "low-context culture—high-context culture", the length of being exposed to another culture, the age at which the participants had their intercultural experience, and the combination of these factors, are involved in transforming the style of self-disclosure. Analysis from this perspective will be considered in subsequent research.

Footnotes

1) I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Sugiyama Jogakuen University for

allowing me to utilize its 2009 Research-Promotion Subsidy Fund to complete this work.

2) "Cross-cultural communication study" means a comparative study of some phenomenon of communication behavior across cultures (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997).

3) Intercultural communication study focuses on the study of communication behavior among people from different cultures (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997).

4) In this research, the inter item correlations among construal factors was $r = .61$ and Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = .96$. Those numerical values indicate sufficient reliability and credibility of the questionnaire.

5) From the view of self-consciousness, Oshimi (1999) and Kasahara (2006) demonstrated through their research that young females indicated significantly higher numerical values on public self-consciousness than private self-consciousness. Compared to males, females also displayed higher degree of public self-consciousness. Public self-consciousness defines that the tendency of being conscious of self being watched from others. This is the tendency of paying attention to self appearances and behavior.

References

Akiyama, T. (1998, January). Ibunkakan mentaru herusu no genzai [Current perspectives on intercultural mental health]. In T. Akiyama (Ed.), *Ibunka to mentaru herusu* [Intercultural mental health]., *Kokoro no kagaku* [Human mind], ***77***, 14–22. Tokyo: Nihonhyoron-sha.

Ando, K. (1990). "Jiko no sugata no hyoshutsu" no dankai [The step of "disclosure of self"]. In Y. Nakamura (Ed.), "*Jiko katei*" *no shinrigaku* [Psychology on "the process of self"] (pp. 148–198). Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppan-kai.

Barnlund, D. C. (1975). *Public and private self in Japan and the United States*. Tokyo: Simul Press.

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

Berg, J. H. & Derlega, V. J. (1987). Themes of the study of self-disclosure. In V. J. Derlega & J. H. Berg (Eds.), *Self-disclosure: Theory, Research, and Therapy* (pp. 1–8). NY: Plenum Press.

Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., & Dasen, P. R. (1993). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chen, G. M. (1995). Differences in self-disclosure patterns among Americans versus Chinese. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, ***26***, 84–91.

Derlega, V. J., Metts, S., Petronio, S., & Margulis, S. T. (1993). *Self-disclosure*. CA: Sage Publications.

Diamond, R. E. & Hellcamp, D. T. (1969). Race, sex, ordinal position of birth, and self-disclosure in high school students. *Psychological Reports*, ***25***, 235–238.

Enomoto, H. (1997). *Jikokaiji no sinrigakuteki kenkyu* [Psychological studies on self-disclosure]. Kyoto: Kitaohji-shobo.

Fukada, H. (1998). *Inta pasonaru komyunikeshon* [Interpersonal communication]. Kyoto: Kitaohji-shobo.

Fukada, H. (1999). *Komyunikeshon shinrigaku* [Psychology from the perspectives of communication]. Kyoto: Kitaohji-shobo.

Gudykunst, W. B. (1986). Toward a theory of intergroup communication. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Intergroup communication* (pp. 152–167). London: Edward Arnold.

Gudykunst, W. B. (1998). *Bridging differences: Effective intergroup communication* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gudykunst, W. B., Gao, G., Schmidt, K. L., Nishida, T., Bond, M. H., Leung, K., et al. (1992). The influence of individualism-collectivism on communication in ingroup and outgroup relationships. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, ***23***, 196–213.

Gudykunst, W. B. & Hammer, M. (1987). The effect of ethnicity, gender, and dyadic composition on uncertainty reduction in initial interactions. *Journal of Black Studies*, ***18***, 191–214.

Gudykunst, W. B. & Kim, Y. Y. (1997). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication* (3rd ed.). NY: McGraw-Hill.

Gudykunst, W. B. & Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Hall, E. T. (1973). *The silent language*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Hall, E. T. (1977). *Beyond culture*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Hall, E. T. (1983). *The dance of life: The other dimension of time*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Hecht, M. & Ribeau, S. (1991). Sociocultural roots of ethnic identity. *Journal of Black Studies*, ***21***, 501–513.

Herskovits, M. J. (1948). Man and his works: *The science of cultural anthropology*. NY: Knopf.

Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Jaffee, L. & Polanski, N. (1962). Verbal inaccessibility in young adolescents showing delinquent trends. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, ***3***, 105–111.

Jourard, S. M. (1958). A study of self-disclosure. *Scientific American*, ***198***, 77–82.

Jourard, S. M. (1961). Self-disclosure patterns in British and American college females. *Journal of Social Psychology*, ***54***, 315–320.

Jourard, S. M. (1963). Self-disclosure in the United States and Puerto Rico, In S. M. Jourard (1971). *Self-disclosure: An Experimental Analysis of the Transparent Self* (pp. 36–44). NY: Wiley-Interscience.

Jourard, S. M. & Lasakow, P. (1958). Some factors in self-disclosure. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, ***56***, 91–98.

Kasahara, M. (2006). Komyunikeshon fuan to jikoishiki tono kankeisei ni tsuite [The Relations Between Communication Apprehension and Self-Consciousness]. *Sugiyama Jogakuen Daigaku kenkyu ronshu—Shakai kagaku hen—* [Journal of Sugiyama Jogakuen University—Social Sciences—]. ***37***, 137–152.

Kelvin, P. (1970). *The bases of social power*. NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kim, Y. Y. (2001). *Becoming intercultural: An integrative theory of communication and cross-cultural adaptation*. CA: Sage Publications.

LeVine, E. & Franco, J. N. (1981). A reassessment of self-disclosure patterns among anglo-Americans and Hispanics. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, ***28***, 522–524.

Littlefield, R. P. (1974). Self-disclosure among some Negro, White, and Mexican-American adolescents. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, ***21***, ***2***, 133–136.

Nakane, C. (1972). *Tekio no joken* [Conditions for adaptation]. Tokyo: Kodan-sha.

Oshimi, T. (1999). 3. Jibun ni chui wo mukeyasui seikaku [3. Personality traits of being conscious of self] (pp. 49–69) *Jibun wo mitsumeru jibun—Jiko fokasu no shakai shinrigaku* [Self gazing at self—Self focused social psychology]. Saiensu-sha.

Plog, S. C. (1965). The disclosure of self in the United States and Germany. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, ***65***, 193–203.

Shimotomari, A. (2001). Jiko hyoshutsu [Self-disclosure]. In I. Saito & K. Shugawara (Eds.), *Taijin shakai shinrigaku juyo kenkyushu* [The collection of important studies on interpersonal social psychology] (pp. 122–164). Tokyo: Seishinshobo.

Stiles, W. B. (1987). "I have to talk to somebody": A fever model of disclosure. In V. J. Derlega & J. H. Berg (Eds.), *Self-disclosure: Theory, Research, and Therapy* (pp. 257–282). NY: Plenum Press.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1987, May). *A comparative analysis of the communicative dimensions of love, self-disclosure maintenance, ambivalence, and conflict in three cultures: France, Japan, and the United States*. Paper presented at the International Communication Association convention, Montreal.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1991). Intimacy expressions in three cultures: France, Japan, and the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, ***15***, 29–46.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communicating across cultures*. NY: The Guilford Press.

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

Uemura, K. (2000). Arinomama no jibun wo shiraseru. Komyunikeshon: jiko kaiji [Tell what you are. Communication: self-disclosure]. In K. Uemura, S. Matsumoto, & M. Fujii, (Eds.), *Komyunikeshon gaku nyumon* [Introduction to communication studies] (pp. 18–31). Kyoto: Nakanishiya-shuppan.

Wheeler, L., Reis, H., & Bond, M. (1989). Collectivism-individualism in everyday social life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, ***57***, 79–86.

Wolken, G., Moriwaki, S., & Williams, K. (1973). Race and social class as factors in the orientation toward psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, ***20***, 312–316.