

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

THE EFFECTS OF SEX AND RELATIONSHIP ON  
SELF-DISCLOSURE

by

Nina Anderson

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

APRIL, 1976

"THE EFFECTS OF SEX AND RELATIONSHIP ON  
SELF-DISCLOSURE"

by

NINA ANDERSON

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of  
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1976

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-  
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this dissertation, to  
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this  
dissertation and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY  
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this dissertation.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the  
dissertation nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-  
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her appreciation to Dr. H. L. Appleton, Dr. J. G. Adair and Dr. J. L. Gray for their helpful comments and constructive criticisms.

Appreciation is also expressed to Terry Prociuk, who offered his assistance on several aspects of the project.

A special debt of gratitude is extended to Dr. Daniel Perlman, for his encouragement, patience, and guidance, from the conception of this study to its completion.

## ABSTRACT

In the extensive self-disclosure literature females have gained the reputation of being higher self-disclosers than males (Jourard, 1971; Block & Goodstein, 1971). Recently, however, reviewers have called for an examination of possible interactions between sex and target-situation variables, to help sort out seeming discrepancies in the literature. The purpose of this research was to examine the hypothesized interaction between sex and interpersonal relationship, by comparing the actual self-disclosures made by male and female subjects to best friends and strangers. It was hypothesized that subjects would disclose more to best friends than to strangers, that females would disclose more than males to best friends, and that males would disclose more than females to strangers.

A 2 x 2 x 3 mixed factor design incorporated two levels of subject sex (male and female), two levels of relationship (best friends and strangers), and three repeated levels of topic (interests, personality and body). The four dependent measures were subjects' ratings of their disclosure, partners' ratings of subjects' disclosure, independent raters' ratings of subjects' disclosures, and length of time talked. Eighty introductory psychology students from the University of Manitoba served as subjects to help satisfy a course requirement.

Neither hypothesis was confirmed. There was a significant effect for greater female self-disclosure, but

only with the measure of retrospective self-reports. This is discussed in terms of the self-disclosure literature, which, upon closer look reveals the same pattern: only retrospective self-report paradigms, as opposed to paradigms of predicted self-disclosure, actual self-disclosure, or evaluation of hypothetical situations, show the sex effect. Various methodological issues are also examined.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
	ABSTRACT .....	iv
I	LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES .....	1
	Studies Investigating Retrospective Self-Reports of Self-Disclosure .....	3
	Studies Investigating Predicted Self-Disclosure .....	4
	Studies Investigating the Actual Behavior of Self-Disclosure .....	5
	A Study Employing Hypothetical Self-Disclosures .....	6
	The Main Effects of Sex and Relationship .....	8
	A Summary of the Hypotheses .....	9
II	METHOD .....	10
	Experimental Design .....	10
	Subjects .....	10
	Procedure .....	12
	Dependent Measures .....	15
III	RESULTS .....	19
	Manipulation Check .....	19
	Interrater Reliability .....	20
	Intermeasure Reliability .....	20
	Rater Rating .....	22
	Self-Ratings .....	22
	Partner Ratings .....	25
	Footage .....	25

CHAPTER	PAGE
	Summary of the Self-Disclosure Results ..... 30
IV	DISCUSSION ..... 31
	Methodological Issues ..... 31
	The Model ..... 34
	The Sex Effect for Self-Reported Self-Disclosure ..... 35
	Topic Effects ..... 38
	An Examination of the Measures ..... 39
	Summary ..... 40
	REFERENCE NOTES ..... 42
	REFERENCES ..... 43
APPENDICES	Appendix A - Sociometric Questionnaire ..... 49
	Appendix B - Instruction Booklet ..... 51
	Appendix C - Post-Experimental Questionnaire ..... 58
	Appendix D - Letter to Subjects ..... 64
	Appendix E - Table A - Analysis of Variance Using Partner Ratings Averaged Across Dyadic Partners as the Dependent Variable ..... 66

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Doster's Disclosure Rating Scale: Abbreviated Form.....	16
2	Correlations Among Four Measures of Self-Disclosure.....	21
3	Analysis of Variance Using Raters' Ratings Averaged Across Dyadic Partners as the Dependent Variable.....	23
4	Mean Raters' Ratings by Topic by Sex of Subjects and by Relationship of Subjects.....	24
5	Analysis of Variance Using Self- Ratings Summed Across Dyadic Scores as the Dependent Variable.....	26
6	Mean Self-Ratings Using Dyad Scores by Sex of Subjects, Relationship of Subjects, and Topic.....	27
7	Mean Self-Ratings Using Dyad Scores by Relationship and Topic.....	28
8	Analysis of Variance Using Tape Footage per Dyad as the Dependent Variable.....	29

## CHAPTER I

### LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

"Self-disclosure may be defined as that which occurs when A knowingly communicates to B information about A which is not generally known and is not otherwise available to B" (Worthy, Gary, & Kahn, 1969).

Block and Goodstein (1971) refer to women as "notoriously higher self-disclosers than men". Indeed, females have repeatedly reported higher self-disclosure on Jourard's Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (JSDQ) (Jourard & Lasakow, 1958), which instructs subjects to indicate the extent to which they have disclosed various information about themselves to their mother, father, same-sex friend, and opposite-sex friend (Bath & Daly, 1972; Himelstein & Lubin, 1965; Hood & Back, 1971; Jourard, 1958; Jourard & Lasakow, 1958; Jourard & Rubin, 1968; Littlefield, 1974; Pederson & Higbee, 1969a). Higher female self-disclosure has, in fact, become almost a truism in the literature (Jourard, 1971; Block & Goodstein, 1971), variously attributed to "feminine subjects' 'expressive' role expectations, role performance, differential feminine need for 'unburdening'" (Block & Goodstein, 1971), insightfulness, and empathy (Jourard, 1971). Jourard (1971) even considers females' high self-disclosure to be indicative of their superior mental health. Two recent review articles (Cozby, 1973; Goodstein & Reinecker, 1974) have suggested, however, that the widespread acceptance of higher female self-disclosure may be premature,

and have called for examination of possible interactions between sex and target-situation variables.

The proposed research will attempt to examine the generalizability of the phenomenon of high female self-disclosure. A continuum of situations along which self-disclosure might occur is proposed. Self-disclosure situations in which the potential discloser interacts in a personal, loving relationship, as with a best friend, would be placed at one end of this continuum, and self-disclosure situations in which the potential discloser interacts in an impersonal, nonloving relationship, as with a government bureaucrat, would be placed on the other. This continuum could encompass such self-disclosure situations as disclosure to a mental health professional or disclosure to a stranger on a train. To the extent that these situations are seen by the discloser as personal or impersonal, loving or nonloving, they tend to either end of the proposed continuum.

The review to follow will examine the four paradigms employed in the study of self-disclosure: a) studies investigating retrospective self-reports or self-disclosure, b) studies investigating predicted self-disclosure, c) studies investigating the actual behavior of self-disclosure, and d) a study investigating hypothetical self-disclosure situations. This review will suggest that although females should disclose more than males in relationships on the personal-loving end of the continuum, males should disclose more than females in relationships on the impersonal-nonloving end of the continuum. In a

study of actual self-disclosure, it is predicted that females should disclose more than males to a same-sex best friend and that males should disclose more than females to a same-sex stranger. The proposed research will compare, in a laboratory setting, the disclosures made to same-sex best friends with disclosures made to strangers.

### Studies Investigating Retrospective Self-Reports of Self-Disclosure

The bulk of the literature that has gained females the reputation of high disclosers has used measures based on retrospective self-reports, such as the JSDQ, discussed above. However, JSDQ targets are people usually found in personal-loving relationships: mother, father, same-sex best friend, and opposite-sex best friend. One might conclude, then, that females have gained their reputation for high self-disclosure by reporting high self-disclosure in relationships on the personal-loving end of the continuum.

With reference to the targets of their communication, females repeatedly report highest self-disclosure to significant other females: mother and/or same-sex best friend (Dimond & Munz, 1967; Doster & Strickland, 1969; Jourard, 1961a; Jourard & Richman, 1963, Pederson & Higbee, 1969b; West & Zingle, 1969). The male pattern of retrospective self-reported self-disclosure targets is less clear. Pederson and Higbee (1969b) report that same-sex best friend is the male's highest disclosure target. In Jourard and Richman's (1963) study, however, both male and female best friend targets received significantly more disclosure than

parents, and in Doster and Strickland's (1969) study male best friend and parents were disclosed to significantly more than a female best friend. Contrary to even these conflicting results, Jourard (1961b) and Dimond and Munz (1967) have found no target effects for males.

All this appears to be consistent with a finding of West's (1970): female adolescents report themselves to be more discriminating of the target of their self-disclosures than are males. Woodyard and Hines (1973) have similarly found adult females to report greater disclosure to the four traditional targets and less disclosure to casual friends than do males. Males were found to report disclosure to a wider range of targets, whereas females reported concentrating their disclosures on fewer people.

It appears, then, from the retrospective self-report studies that the female reports higher self-disclosure than the male, that this is largely in the target area of personal-loving relationships, and that same-sex best friend is reported to be one of the female's primary targets. One might predict, therefore, in a study of actual self-disclosure, that females would disclose more to a same-sex best friend than would males, and that males would disclose more to a stranger than would females.

Studies Investigating Predicted Self-Disclosure

When subjects are asked to indicate what they would be willing to disclose, as opposed to what they have disclosed, females are no longer the higher scorers. A modification of the JSDQ has been used in three such studies (Plog, 1965;

Rickers-Ovsiankina & Kusmin, 1958; Weigal, Weigal, & Chadwick, 1969): casual friends were added to the four traditional target persons, and subjects were asked to predict their self-disclosures rather than to recall them. No sex differences were found in any of these studies. This discrepancy between reported and predicted self-disclosure can probably not be completely clarified until studies in actual self-disclosure have examined various discloser-disclosee relationships.

Edelman and Snead (1972) have found females' predicted self-disclosure to stranger-professionals (psychiatrist, psychologist, social worker and personnel manager) to be lower than males' predicted self-disclosure. If this situation represents an impersonal-nonloving relationship, it would support one of the predictions of this study: males should self-disclose more to a same-sex stranger than should females.

#### Studies Investigating the Actual Behavior of Self-Disclosure

A third class of self-disclosure measures involves the actual behavior of self-disclosing, which is of primary interest in this study. Subjects are interviewed or requested to self-disclose in a questionnaire situation, and a count is made of number of words spoken or depth of self-disclosure. These studies have produced mixed results.

Three such studies have demonstrated a main effect of greater male than female self-disclosure in the laboratory (Jourard & Friedman, 1970, Experiment 1; Marlatt, 1970; Mickelson & Stevic, 1971). These findings may indicate that although females report themselves to be higher self-disclosers

than males, they are not, in actuality. On the other hand, it may speak to the sex x situation interaction of self-disclosure. The laboratory setting of disclosing to a strange experimenter may be inhibiting to females, who may perceive the situation as being on the impersonal-nonloving end of the continuum.

There are even more cases, however, where no sex difference in actual self-disclosure appeared (Davis & Skinner, 1970; Davis & Sloan, 1974; Jourard & Friedman, 1970, Experiment 2; Marlatt, 1971; McAllister & Kiesler, 1975; Vondracek & Vondracek, 1971). These latter studies appear to share only one unique feature: prior to subject self-disclosure the experimenter or (less often) a confederate-model self-disclosed, using a prearranged script. It is possible that this paradigm shifts the interviewer-interviewee relationship toward the personal-loving end of the continuum to some neutral point where, the continuum model would predict, neither sex should have the advantage in self-disclosure conditions.

If this supposition is correct, if females do tend to disclose less than males in a laboratory situation perceived as impersonal-nonloving, then although females may be higher self-disclosers than males to their best friends, males should be higher self-disclosers than females to strangers.

#### A Study Employing Hypothetical Self-Disclosures

One known attempt has been made to establish a continuum of self-disclosure relationships. Chaikin and Derlega

(1974) asked their male and female subjects to comment on the appropriateness of self-disclosure between a female speaker and various hypothetical female target persons: friends, acquaintances, and strangers. A significant main effect of a friend-acquaintance-stranger continuum of appropriateness was found: overall, subjects saw friends as the most appropriate, and strangers as the most inappropriate target. There was a significant sex x relationship interaction, also: females saw disclosure to a friend as more appropriate, and disclosure to a stranger as more inappropriate, than did males. These findings would, of course, support the predictions of this paper, if subjects actually do adhere to an appropriateness continuum in their self-disclosing behaviors. Unfortunately, since all hypothetical target persons in the study were female, this tends to limit the results. Males subjects may have been commenting on how they feel females, rather than they, themselves should behave. A study employing male and female subjects actually self-disclosing to a same-sex best friend and a same-sex stranger would serve to expand Chaikin and Derlega's findings.

A review of the self-disclosure literature has not uncovered a single study in which the actual self-disclosures of same-sex best friends were examined. The proposed research will be unique in comparing the self-disclosures made by males and females to their same-sex best friends or to strangers, under conditions of complete anonymity to the experimenter.

### The Main Effects of Sex and Relationship

Although the interaction effects of sex x relationship are of primary interest in this study, the proposed main effects warrant some attention. Relationship between the discloser and disclosee represents one of the main effects in this study. Although female should exceed male self-disclosure on the personal-loving end of the continuum, and male should exceed female self-disclosure on the impersonal-nonloving end of the continuum, there is reason to believe that both sexes should disclose more to their same-sex best friend than they should to a stranger. Jourard has shown retrospective self-reports of self-disclosure to be positively correlated with liking for friends in females (Jourard, 1959), and knowing of friends in males (Jourard & Landsman, 1960). If one can assume that females like their best friends better than they like strangers, and that males know their best friends better than they know strangers, one could predict that friends would receive more actual self-disclosure overall than would strangers.

Chaikin and Derlega's (1974) main effect, as discussed above, is also of interest here. Their subjects delineated a friend-acquaintance-stranger continuum of appropriateness of self-disclosure to various hypothetical target persons. If subjects adhere to this appropriateness continuum, best friends would receive more actual self-disclosure overall than would strangers.

No prediction is being ventured on the second main

effect of this study: subject sex. Only one method of data collection--that of retrospective self-report--has yielded unambiguous sex main effects: females report having disclosed more than do males. As discussed above, there appears to be a definite tendency for higher male self-disclosure in laboratory settings, but the reciprocal nature of the self-disclosure paradigm should offset that male advantage, by shifting the situation toward the personal-loving end of the continuum. Further, female experimenters, as employed in the proposed study, are known to facilitate female self-disclosure (Marlatt, 1970).

#### A Summary of the Hypotheses

1. The relationship main effect will be higher self-disclosure scores in the personal-loving relationship (same-sex best friends) than in the impersonal-nonloving relationship (same-sex strangers).
2. Sex will interact with relationship in the following way: females will have higher self-disclosure scores than males when disclosing to a same-sex best friend, and males will have higher self-disclosure scores than females when disclosing to a same-sex stranger.

## CHAPTER II

### METHOD

#### Experimental Design

In essence, the subjects in this experiment came to the laboratory in pairs and discussed three different personal topics for about five minutes per topic. The study involved a 2 x 2 x 3 mixed factor design, the two between subject factors being sex of the subjects (male and female) and relationship of the subjects (best friends and strangers), and the within subjects factor being topics of self-disclosure (interests, personality and body). The four dependent measures were rater's rating of the self-disclosure tapes (Rater Rating), subjects' evaluation of their own self-disclosures (Self-Rating), subjects' evaluations of their partners' self-disclosures (Partner Rating), and length of time talked (Footage).

#### Subjects

Subjects were eighty introductory psychology students, half of whom were male, and half of whom were female. All subjects were chosen from a total pool of 1,000 students, on whom sociometric data were available. These 1,000 students were given, as part of an earlier experiment that term, a form asking if any of their ten same-sex best friends were enrolled in introductory psychology at The University of Manitoba, and 817 replied that they were. The name, address, age, section number and phone number of four such friends

were requested, as well as information about length of acquaintance and each friends' ranking among subjects' ten best same-sex friends (See Appendix A for form used).

Eighty-two males and 77 females, whose names were obtained from a pool of 817 who had a best friend in introductory psychology, were contacted by telephone and asked to participate in a psychology study for experimental credit. Although sociometric data collected yielded information on friends below the first best friend category, there were enough first best friends listed that only people with first best friends in introductory psychology were contacted. One member of a best friend pair was called by the female experimenter, and the other member by a male research assistant. If subjects agreed to participate, their class schedules were obtained in order to pair them up with their best friend or a stranger. Only one female and four male subjects refused; the males had already filled their experimental obligations, and the female did not wish to participate in an experiment about which she knew nothing. Seventy of the contacted subjects were unable to take part in the study because we could not match their schedules with an appropriate partner. Forty subjects (ten male and ten female pairs) were paired with their best friends; 44 (eleven male and eleven female pairs) were paired with subjects from another section of the course whom they had not indicated as being one of their best friends, and whose schedules coincided with theirs. In this way, all subjects were chosen from the same

pool: i.e., subjects who have best friends in introductory psychology. The two extra pairs of strangers had to be deleted from the study because of prior acquaintance. The study was run over a period of five weeks.

### Procedure

Subjects reported to either the experimental room or a subjects' waiting room on the same floor, to avoid the possibility of best friends realizing they were in the same experiment and working out hypotheses together. If the subject sent to the subject waiting room arrived first, he or she was asked to wait for the other subject, and then come to the experimental room. If the subject sent to the experimental room arrived first, he or she was taken to the subject waiting room to await the other subject; they returned to the experimental room together. All stranger pairs were asked if they knew each other, and assured that experimental credit would still be given if they could not participate because of prior acquaintance. To qualify as stranger, subjects must never have spoken to each other, even to say hello. The experimenter then signed experimental credit forms.

The experimental room was 10½ feet by 12 feet, and outfitted with two deep, comfortable arm chairs, a rug, a low table, subdued lighting, wall posters, a book case, and two high tables, one of which held a recording tape recorder, and one of which held a playing tape recorder, a coffee pot, spoons, cups, cream and sugar.

As soon as the subjects entered the experimental room the experimenter said,

The instructions for this study are going to be played to you by tape recorder. I'd like you to each take one of these instruction booklets (See Appendix B), and follow along in the booklet with the tape I'm going to play. (The experimenter switched on recording tape recorder and playing tape recorder). I'll be waiting for you in Room 505. Help yourselves to coffee as soon as you've finished listening to the tape. (The experimenter then left the room and closed the door).

Subjects in all conditions of the experiment heard the same tape, to avoid experimenter bias in presenting the experimental instructions. The recorded message requested subjects to make themselves comfortable and to discuss, as deeply as they felt comfortable in doing, the topics described on pages 3, 4, and 5 of their booklets: interests, personality, and body. They were asked to allot about five minutes to each topic, and to engage in a conversation rather than a series of two monologues. They were told that they were taking part in a study about how people engage in conversations about themselves, and assured of their anonymity. The last message on the tape instructed subjects how to turn off the playing tape recorder before they began the experimental task and requested them to notify the experimenter when they were finished. The recording tape recorder continued through the instructions and experimental task, so subjects did not have to be bothered turning on a second recorder and so none of their conversation was missed. Subjects were fully aware of both the playing and recording tape recorders, which were mentioned in the instructions.

The subjects then discussed the three topics.

When they were finished they reported back to the experimenter. When subjects met the experimenter in the subject waiting room she brought them back to the experimental room to complete a post-experimental questionnaire (See Appendix C). When this questionnaire was completed the experimenter gave subjects some background to the research, discussed the hypotheses, and responded to any questions. Subjects were assured of written feedback (See Appendix D) on the results of the study, and requested not to talk to other students about the experiment until the entire study had been run.

The topics for this study were chosen from the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire, SDQ (Pederson & Breglio, 1968a; 1968b; Pederson & Higbee, 1969b), which also requested subjects to disclose about their studies and financial situation. In order to be able to fit the entire conversation on a half-hour cassette tape, the topics of studies and financial situation were omitted from this study. Other than the use of the three topics, the present measure bears little resemblance to the SDQ. SDQ subjects were asked to respond by essay to five topics rather than in conversation to three topics. Their disclosures were rated by raters on a 3-point scale, whereas subjects in this study were rated on a 7-point scale by themselves, by their partners, and by raters. Tape footage was also used as a dependent measure in this study, rather than number of words written.

Topics in this study were presented to all sub-

jects in the same order: interests, personality, then body. It is recognized that this will result in a confound between topic and order effects, but it was felt that subjects would find it so difficult to launch into a discussion about their personalities and bodies at the beginning of the experiment that the alternative of balancing for order effects was rejected.

### Dependent Measures

All data, in their taped form, were given to hypothesis-blind raters, who rated each topic on Doster's (Note 1) Disclosure Rating Scale (See Table 1), a 7 point scale for rating depth of disclosure, where 0 represents very impersonal, and 6 represents very personal disclosure. The raters' ratings of each subject's self-disclosure were transformed by adding a constant of 1 to each value, to make this scale consistent with the Self-Rating and Partner Rating measures which ranged from 1 to 7, and to eliminate zero values in the SPSS program. Nowhere are these values directly compared with Self-Rating and Partner Rating scores, however.

The raters were trained to a criterion of .90 interrater reliability. This scale had been used in several studies which reported reliabilities from  $r = .75$  (McAllister, Note 2), to  $r = .98$  (Doster, Note 1), all significant at the .05 level. The dyad disclosure rating for each topic was averaged across raters and subjects.

A second measure of self-disclosure was the subjects' self-rating of disclosure. The Self-Rating ques-

TABLE IDoster's Disclosure Rating Scale: Abbreviated Form

When you are making your ratings you may find it helpful to use the abbreviated form below. Certain phrases have been underscored to help you pinpoint your rating. Familiarize yourself with the detailed level descriptions and definitions of scale components in the previous section before attempting to use this form.

0. This person attempts to define, clarify or discuss this topic by focusing on external other people, objects and events rather than on himself. Self-references are lacking or few in number. Although he provides information, he does not claim his ideas as his own through personal pronouns. Or his response is an inability or refusal to disclose to the topic.
1. He claims his ideas as his own (e.g., I believe that...) but the central focus is on the external events rather than internal experiences. He may reveal self through group membership or "weness" (e.g., In our family...). He discloses how he thinks about or perceives external events, but not his interaction with external events or their impact on him.
2. The ideas expressed are his own. His disclosures concern his internal experiences rather than himself as an observer of external events. He is primarily at a cognitive level owning his attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions of himself in events. Elaboration beyond cognitions is shallow and not profound in content. Reference to emotionality or actions are vague and general. He does not tie down, explore or make finer discriminations of these references through adjectives (denoting which one, what kind of, how many) or adverbs (denoting how, when, where, to what extent).
3. Clearly he places himself within the context of his experiences, but information is oriented more to elaborating or clarifying his perceptions about events he's been involved in. Disclosures about his emotionality or actions enhance the picture you have of his participation in the event, but do not provide an explored, integrated understanding of his internal or nonpublic experiences.
4. His disclosures allow for a clear, integrated understanding of his personal frame of reference. Events are a departure point toward a finer exploration of his beliefs, perceptions, ideas about himself and his emotionality. While you clearly understand the impact of external events on his thoughts and feelings, the reverse remains unclear or vague. Namely, the impact of his cognitions and emotions on his actions, reactions and interactions with the external is absent.
5. A clear, integrated understanding of his personal frame of reference is provided by his disclosures of his beliefs, his perceptions, ideas about himself and his emotionality. You understand both the impact of external events on his thoughts and feelings and the impact of his internal experiences on his actions, reactions, or interactions with the external.
6. A clear, integrated understanding of the impact of external events on his beliefs, perceptions, ideas about himself and his emotionality as well as the impact of these personal, internal experiences on his actions is provided. He goes beyond providing an intimate picture of his personal frame of reference by making judgments and evaluations of his framework or self-system. Using some chosen standard he is taking a stand on his liking of the self-system, or its adjustiveness, adequacy, feasibility, functionality, or the regard others have for this system.

tion (Question 9, Appendix C) on the Post-Experimental Questionnaire read: "Which of these alternatives most clearly describes how you feel you disclosed to your partner on each of the three topics?" The three topics were represented by continua presented below the question, ranging from 1 (disclosed nothing about myself) to 7 (disclosed extremely personal information about myself). The dyad's disclosure rating for each topic was averaged across both subjects.

A third measure of self-disclosure was the subjects' rating of his or her partner's disclosure. The Partner Rating question (Question 15, Appendix C) on the Post-Experimental Questionnaire read: "Which of these alternatives most clearly describes how you feel your partner disclosed to you on each of these three topics?" The three topics were represented by continua presented below the question, ranging from 1 (disclosed nothing) to 7 (disclosed extremely personal information). Again, the dyad's disclosure rating for each topic was averaged across both subjects.

Records of tape footage was kept by the male rater who had the appropriate gauge on his tape recorder. A single rating of footage was considered to be adequate because past research has found the interrater reliability on this measure to be greater than .99 (Nelson & Karlsruher, Note 3). A separate footage rating was given for the total dyad response to each of the three topics. The rater began

the footage count as soon as subjects began discussing the topic, and stopped when they stopped.

A Post-Experimental Questionnaire manipulation check requested subjects to describe their relationship with their partner on a continuum from 1 (best friend) to 7 (perfect stranger). The question is outlined in Question 16, Appendix C.

## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS

This chapter will present the results of the manipulation check, the interrater reliability, the intermeasure reliability, and the major results of the study. To assess the effects of the independent variables on self-disclosure, a 2 x 2 x 3 analysis of variance (Hays, 1973) was performed four separate times, once for each of the four dependent measures: Rater Rating (independent raters' rating of disclosure intimacy), Self-Rating (subjects' ratings of their own disclosure), Partner Rating (subjects' ratings of partners' disclosure), and Footage (time spent disclosing).

A fixed effects model was used for each of the four ANOVAs. This model introduces a lower error rate than the random effects model, and may result in inflated  $F$  values.

#### Manipulation Check

Subjects in the best friend condition rated their partners an average of 1.3, and subjects in the stranger condition rated their partners an average of 6.9 on the best friend (1)-stranger (7) continuum presented in Question 16. A  $t$  test showed this difference to be highly significant,  $t(78) = 16.6$ ,  $p < .0005$ . As strangers found it difficult to rate each other on the descriptive adjectives listed in Question 16, this data did not enter into the analysis.

### Interrater Reliability

Doster's (Note 1) Disclosure Rating Scale, presented in Table 1, was employed for the training of raters. Taped data was rated by the same scale. Interrater reliability was computed with Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Hays, 1973), using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, SPSS (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbierner & Bent, 1975) computer program. The coefficient for practice material rated at the end of the training sessions was  $\underline{r} (78) = .90, p < .001$ .

Each judge's ratings were summed across the three topics discussed by each subject in the present experiment. The sums of the two judges' ratings of the eighty individual subjects were correlated. The resulting correlation coefficient was  $\underline{r} (78) = .75, p < .001$ . A breakdown by topics yielded interrater reliability coefficients of  $\underline{r} (78) = .62, p < .001$  for interests,  $\underline{r} (78) = .75, p < .001$  for personality, and  $\underline{r} (78) = .58, p < .001$  for body.

### Intermeasure Reliability

Pearson product-moment correlations were computed between each of the four self-disclosure measures: a) Rater Rating, b) Self-Rating, c) Partner Rating, and d) Footage (See Table 2). These correlations were based on data summed across topics and treating each dyad, rather than each individual subject, as the unit of analysis. There were significant correlations between Footage and Rater Rating,  $\underline{r} (38) = .47, p < .001$ , and between Self-Rating and Partner Rating,

TABLE 2

Correlations Among Four Measures of  
Self-Disclosure

	Rater Rating	Self Rating	Partner Rating
Self Rating	.16		
Partner Rating	.23	.70*	
Footage	.47*	.26	.17

Note: There were 38 degrees of freedom for all correlations

\*  $p < .001$

$r(38) = .70, p < .001$ . Neither Footage nor Rater Rating correlated significantly with Self-Rating or Partner Rating.

#### Rater Rating

The Rater Rating data was averaged across both subjects and both raters, rather than treating each subject and each rater as separate units of analysis. A  $2 \times 2 \times 3$  ANOVA was performed with the MANSTAT computer program (Note 4) using two levels of sex, two levels of relationship, and three levels of topic as independent variables (See Table 3). The means are presented in Table 4.

It was hypothesized that friends would self-disclose more than strangers and that females would self-disclose more to a best friend and less to a stranger than would males. Contrary to hypotheses, there was no significant main effect for relationship, and no sex x relationship interaction on Rater Rating. There was a main effect for topic,  $F(3,72) = 6.88, p < .01$ , however, with subjects being rated as disclosing most on personality, then body, then interests. The means were 4.00, 3.81, and 3.43, respectively. A Tukey HSD (Kirk, 1968) was performed on the means, and revealed that personality differed significantly from interests,  $q(3,72) = 4.52, p < .01$ , and body differed significantly from interests,  $q(3,72) = 3.41, p < .05$ . There were no other significant pairwise comparisons.

#### Self-Ratings

The Self-Rating data was summed rather than

TABLE 3

Analysis of Variance Using Raters' Ratings  
Averaged Across Dyadic Partners as  
the Dependent Variable

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Sex (S)	1	6.3020	3.90
Relationship (R)	1	2.2686	1.40
S x R	1	2.9018	1.80
Error (1)	36	1.6176	
Topic (T)	2	3.4291	6.88*
S x T	2	.5084	1.02
R x T	2	.3563	.72
S x R x T	2	.4258	.85
Error (2)	72	.4986	

\*  $p < .01$

TABLE 4

Mean Raters' Ratings by Topic by  
Sex of Subjects and by Relationship of  
Subjects

Group	Topics		
	Interests	Personality	Body
<b>Males</b>			
Friends	3.10	3.40	3.17
Strangers	3.53	4.13	3.78
<b>Females</b>			
Friends	3.45	4.15	4.38
Strangers	3.63	4.33	3.92

averaged across both subjects to form a dyad score. A 2 x 2 x 3 ANOVA, performed as for Rater Ratings, is presented in Table 5. Again, neither hypothesis was confirmed. There was a significant main effect for sex, however,  $F(1,36) = 5.63, p < .025$ , with females reporting higher self-disclosures than males. The means were 9.97 and 8.65 respectively. There was also a relationship x topic interaction,  $F(1,72) = 5.94, p < .01$ . The means are presented in Table 6. A Tukey HSD Test (Kirk, 1968) was performed on the means presented in Table 7. Although there was no significant difference between friends' and strangers' self-ratings of their disclosure on the topic of interests, friends perceived themselves as disclosing more about personality,  $q = 3.85, p < .01$  and body,  $q = 2.94, p < .05$ , than did strangers. Neither the main effect for topic nor any of the remaining interactions were statistically significant.

#### Partner Ratings

The Partner Rating data was handled in an identical manner to the Self-Rating data. There were no significant main or interaction effects (See Appendix E).

#### Footage

A 2 x 2 x 3 ANOVA was performed on the Footage (length of time each subject pair talked). These data are presented in Table 8. Neither hypothesis was confirmed. There was a main effect for topic,  $F(1,72) = 5.97, p < .01$ , however, with subjects talking longer about body,

TABLE 5

Analysis of Variance Using Self-Ratings  
Summed Across Dyadic Scores as the  
Dependent Variable

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Sex (S)	1	52.0083	5.628*
Relationship (R)	1	31.0083	3.355
S x R	1	25.2082	2.728
Error (1)	36	9.2417	
Topic (T)	2	0.4083	.327
S x T	2	2.5083	2.011
R x T	2	7.4083	5.940**
S x R x T	2	1.1083	.889
Error (2)	72	1.2472	

\*  $p < .025$

\*\*  $p < .01$

TABLE 6

Mean Self-Ratings Using Dyad Scores  
by Sex of Subjects, Relationship  
of Subjects, and Topic

Group	Topics		
	Interests	Personality	Body
Males			
Friends	8.70	8.60	8.80
Strangers	9.20	8.30	8.30
Females			
Friends	10.00	11.10	11.70
Strangers	9.40	8.80	8.80

Note: Scores were summed, rather than averaged, across partners in a dyad. They could therefore range from 2 (low self-disclosure) to 14 (high self-disclosure).

TABLE 7

Mean Self-Ratings Using Dyad Scores  
by Relationship and Topic

Relationship	Topics		
	Interests	Personality	Body
Friends	9.35	9.85	10.25
Strangers	9.30	8.55	8.55

Note: Scores were summed, rather than averaged, across partners in a dyad. They could therefore range from 2 (low self-disclosure) to 14 (high self-disclosure).

TABLE 8

Analysis of Variance Using Tape  
Footage per Dyad as the  
Dependent Variable

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Sex (S)	1	13419.67	2.506
Relationship (R)	1	7.01	.001
S x R	1	9666.07	1.805
Error (1)	36		
Topic (T)	2	12006.40	5.967*
S x T	2	840.06	.417
R x T	2	1042.63	.518
S x R x T	2	332.43	.165
Error (2)	72	2012.15	

\*  $p < .01$

then personality, then interests. The means were 105.58, 91.98, and 71.18 respectively. A Tukey HSD (Kirk, 1968) was performed on these means: length of time spent on the topic of body was found to be significantly longer than length of time spent on the topic of interests,  $q(3,72) = 4.85$ ,  $p < .01$ . Neither of the other two possible pair-wise comparisons was statistically significant.

#### Summary of the Self-Disclosure Results

It was hypothesized that friends in this study would self-disclose more than would strangers, and that females would self-disclose more to friends and less to strangers than would males. Contrary to the first and second hypotheses, no measure showed a significant main effect for relationship, or a sex x relationship interaction. Thus, neither of the hypotheses was confirmed.

There was a significant main effect for sex on one of the measures: Self-Rating. Females felt that they disclosed more than males,  $F(1,36) = 5.63$ ,  $p < .025$ , although this was not confirmed by any of the other dependent measures. There were main effects for topic on two of the measures, Footage and Rater Rating. Tukey's HSD revealed conflicting differences on these two measures. There was also a relationship x topic interaction on one of the measures, Self-Rating. Friends reported higher self-disclosure on the topics of body and personality than did strangers.

## CHAPTER IV

### DISCUSSION

The model presented in Chapter I predicted that subjects in an actual self-disclosure situation would disclose more to a friend than to a stranger (Hypothesis 1), and that a significant sex x relationship interaction would occur, with females disclosing more than males to a friend, and less than males to a stranger (Hypothesis 2). Four dependent measures were employed to test these hypotheses: Rater Rating, Self-Rating, Partner Rating, and Footage. Neither hypothesis was confirmed. This is obviously due either to methodological deficiencies, to the invalidity of the model, or to some combination of both. The present chapter will speak to these issues, as well as to the effects that the topics of discussion have on self-disclosure.

#### Methodological Issues

It is very difficult to understand why no relationship main effect was obtained--why friends did not disclose more than strangers. That such was not the case grates so harshly on the nerves of common sense, that it is difficult to believe there were not serious methodological problems in this study.

One of the problems that may have been encountered is lack of experimental realism. It is entirely possible that subjects were so aware of being in an exper-

iment, in spite of precautions taken to make the setting comfortable, that they did not take the conversations seriously. If there was systematic difference in the extent to which the conversations represented normal conversation--if strangers' conversations, for example, were more atypical than were the conversations of other pairs--a systematic bias would have been introduced. There is no basis for expecting a systematic bias, but such a situation is certainly not beyond the realm of possibility. It may have been that friends considered the experimental procedures a violation of their privacy and formed a pact of silence, or friends may not have discussed personal information simply because it was already so well known to the partner. It is possible that one would have to tape the conversations of unknowing subjects in order to raise the external validity of a study such as this to a point where the model could be supported.

Another obvious methodological problem is the low interrater reliability of the raters' ratings. It is possible that this measure was too imprecise to capture any effects that might have been present. Even though the raters were trained to an interrater reliability of .90, and immediately began rating the actual data, their correspondence dropped considerably. Raters were trained together, and thus spent equal amounts of time listening to training tapes. The male rater took 25 hours longer than the female rater (130 hours, as opposed to 105 hours) to rate the data tapes, however; this factor alone may have accounted for the

large discrepancies. Rater sex differences may even have contributed to the low correspondence. Another biasing factor was that each rater rated half the tapes and then exchanged them with the other rater, so that any learning or fatigue effects could not be consistent between raters. This would, of course, lower interrater reliability. Interrater reliability was greatest on the topic of personality,  $r(78) = .75$ ,  $p < .001$ . However, a  $2 \times 2$  (sex  $\times$  relationship) ANOVA on the topic of personality revealed no support for the author's hypotheses. The present author considers the interrater reliability for this topic minimally satisfactory. Thus, in the present author's opinion, low interrater reliabilities may contribute to, but do not fully explain, the failure of the data to support the model.

The number of subjects who took part in this study may well have led to another methodological problem--there may have been too few subjects to show the effects that were present. Only in Self-Rating and Partner Rating were the relationship main effects even in the correct direction for hypothesis confirmation, however, and examination of the critical value (Gabriel, Note 5) indicated that it would have required 48 like subject pairs in the former case, and 132 in the latter, to confirm Hypothesis 1 at the .05 level. For the Rater Rating and Footage data, main effects, although nonsignificant, were in the opposite direction. As for the sex  $\times$  relationship interaction, it was not in the hypothesized direction for any of the dependent measures, and, in

fact, differed slightly in every case. It appears, then, that though greater power could have been obtained with more subjects, Hypothesis 1 would have been confirmed on only two measures, and Hypothesis 2, not at all. Further examination of the model is in order.

### The Model

Another strong possibility, apart from methodological considerations, is that the self-disclosure model proposed in Chapter I is invalid. The crucial experiment in the formation of the model upon which this study's hypotheses were based was Chaikin and Derlega's (1974) hypothetical self-disclosure by a female target person to three hypothetical disclosees: a friend, an acquaintance, and a stranger. There was a main effect for relationship: subjects considered it most appropriate to disclose to a friend, then an acquaintance, and lastly, to a stranger. There was also a significant sex x relationship interaction: female subjects saw the target person's disclosure to a friend as more appropriate, and her disclosure to a stranger as more inappropriate than did male subjects. On this basis, it was predicted that female subjects would disclose more to a best friend and less to a stranger than would males. Neither of these hypotheses were confirmed. It is possible, of course, that people do not themselves adhere to the self-disclosure patterns they consider appropriate for others. Failure to obtain a main effect for relationship on any of the four measures would point to that possibility. On the other

hand, subjects may have been commenting only on what they considered appropriate for females, rather than what they considered appropriate either for males or for themselves. A study is presently underway which expands the paradigm to allow male and female subjects to rate male and female target persons, in order to examine the same-sex and cross-sex patterns of social appropriateness. Subjects will also be asked to suggest what they would have done in the same situation, which will reveal at least the relationship between socially desirable and self-predicted self-disclosure. It is yet another step to the actual behavior of self-disclosure, of course.

#### The Sex Effect for Self-Reported Self-Disclosure

It is interesting to note that of the four methods of studying self-disclosure reviewed in Chapter I, only one yielded an unambiguous main effect due to subject sex: in retrospective self-report measures women consistently reported having disclosed more than did men. This was not the case in other studies however, when males and females were asked what they would be willing to disclose (Plog, 1965; Rickers-Ovsiankina & Kusmin, 1958; Weigal, Weigal & Chadwick, 1969), were placed in actual self-disclosure situations (Davis & Skinner, 1970; Davis & Sloan, 1974; Jourard & Friedman, 1970; Marlatt, 1970; 1971; McAllister & Kiesler, 1975; Mickelson & Stevic, 1971; Vondracek & Vondracek, 1971), or were asked to comment on the appropriateness of self-disclosure in hypothetical situations (Chaikin & Derlega, 1974).

Similarly, in the present study, females reported having self-disclosed more than males, but neither length of time talked, rater's ratings, nor partner's ratings of self-disclosure confirmed this, although all measures showed differences in the same direction. This may indicate, as suggested in Chapter I, that although females report themselves to be higher self-disclosers than males, they are not, in actuality. There may be a social desirability bias operating here which causes females to overreport and/or males to underreport their self-disclosures according to a sex role stereotype of the talkative female and the aloof male. There is really no basis for asserting that such a stereotype exists, of course, but the replication of Chaikin & Derlega's (1974) research, discussed above, with a condition of male disclosure will speak to this issue.

This interpretation still leaves a discrepancy within the self-report literature. Although females' retrospective self-reports of self-disclosure are higher than those of males (Dimond & Munz, 1967; Doster & Strickland, 1969; Jourard, 1961a; Jourard & Richman, 1963; Pederson & Higbee, 1969b; West & Zingle, 1969) there are either no sex differences or higher male self-disclosure when subjects are asked to predict future self-disclosure (Plog, 1965; Rickers-Ovsiankina & Kusmin, 1958; Weigal, Weigal & Chadwick, 1969). If there is a social desirability factor operating in retrospective self-reports, why is this same bias not inflating female predictions and deflating male predictions? Perhaps

it only means that women disclose more than they mean to disclose or that males disclose less than they think they will disclose. The Chaikin and Derlega (1974) replication will speak to the relationship between social desirability and predicted self-disclosure.

If this interpretation is correct--if there is a stereotype of higher female self-disclosure which biases the self-ratings--one would think that there would be a tendency for partners and independent raters to rate females higher. For both sets of data, although insignificant, this was indeed the case. Examination of the critical value suggested that had 52 pairs of like subjects been run the sex effect for Rater Rating and Partner Rating would have been significant at the .05 level (Gabriel, Note 5). Perhaps females do actually disclose slightly more than males, which contributes to a stereotype of higher female self-disclosure, which, in turn, makes it socially desirable for females to report higher self-disclosure. Unfortunately this interpretation does not explain why Chaikin and Derlega found sex differences in the employment of the stereotype.

The sex effect in this study may also have been due to the sex of the experimenter rather than to the social desirability or stereotype of self-disclosure. Female experimenters are known to facilitate female self-disclosure (Marlatt, 1970), and Self-Rating may be the most effective measure we have to catch this phenomenon.

### Topic Effects

There were several effects due to topics that bear discussion at this point. There were main effects for topic on both Footage and Rating Rating, and a relationship  $\times$  topic effect on Self-Rating. Subjects talked longer about body than the other two topics, and they were judged by the independent raters to have disclosed more on personality and body than on interests.

In this experimental design, for reasons discussed in Chapter II, the topics effect was confounded with order of presentation. So, on one hand, personality and body may be topics that lead themselves more readily to high self-disclosure. On the other hand, we may be observing a warm-up effect. The topic of interests was presented first to all subjects, essentially as a warm-up topic, so it is difficult to separate the effects of topic from the effects of order. Why Self-Ratings and Partner Ratings did not concur with this finding is interesting, however. Perhaps raters were biased by the length of time subjects talked and by their perceptions of certain topics as more intimate than others.

There was a relationship  $\times$  topic interaction on Self-Ratings,  $F(1,72) = 5.94$ ,  $p < .01$ , with friends reporting higher self-disclosure than strangers on the topics of personality and body, but not interests. This may indicate that researchers must choose very intimate topics to obtain relationship differences in self-disclosure studies, or it may mean that friends warm up quicker than do strangers.

This still leaves us with the problem of why no relationship x topic interaction was obtained for any of the other three measures. Perhaps the liberal method of running four rather complex ANOVAs inflated the chances of finding a relationship x topic effect where none existed. It also underscores the lack of correspondence we seem to be encountering again and again between various measures of self-disclosure.

#### An Examination of the Measures

Perhaps the most important contribution this study can hope to make is to initiate a questioning of our measurements and the assumption that they are equivalent. It is clear that the self-disclosure literature contains many discrepancies which the present author has attributed to a model of self-disclosure in which females were more comfortable than males disclosing in personal relationships and males were more comfortable than females disclosing in impersonal relationships. Perhaps, however, the incongruous literature points less to a sex x relationship interaction than to a sex x measure interaction. Perhaps the various measures in self-disclosure are measuring very different things. In this study, for instance, Footage and Rater Ratings correlated significantly and Self-Ratings and Partner Ratings correlated significantly, but the two clusters did not correlate with each other.

What is self-disclosure beyond what "A knowingly communicates to B" (Worthy, Gary & Kahn, 1969)? Is it how

much A predicts he or she would tell B? Is it how long A talked? Is it how much B feels A disclosed? Is it how much an independent team of raters feels A disclosed? Is it how much A retrospectively reports disclosing by checking off items of information that have been given to B? Or is it how much A feels he or she has disclosed to B compared to some internal standard of what has been disclosed in the past to others, and how much has been withheld from B? Perhaps these are all very different phenomenon, or perhaps they could be made more equivalent with better methodology. Until some of these measurement questions have been answered, however, it will be very difficult to test any model adequately.

#### Summary

The present research was undertaken to examine a possible interaction between sex and relationship of the participants in a self-disclosure situation. A review of the literature revealed that four paradigms had been employed in the past in the study of self-disclosure and that they were not consistent in their sex difference findings. It was noted that females gave higher retrospective self-reports of self-disclosure (Bath & Daly, 1972; Himelstein & Lubin, 1965; Hood & Back, 1971; Jourard, 1958; Jourard and Lasakow, 1958, Jourard & Rubin, 1968; Littlefield, 1974; Pederson & Higbee, 1969a), but that this effect was not evident in the literature of predicted self-disclosure (Plog, 1965; Rickers-Ovsiankina & Kusmin, 1958; Weigal,

Weigal & Chadwick, 1969) or in studies investigating the actual behavior of self-disclosure (Jourard & Friedman, 1970, Experiment 1; Marlatt, 1970; Mickelson & Stevic, 1971). Furthermore, when subjects were asked to comment on the appropriateness of self-disclosure in a hypothetical situation (Chaikin & Derlega, 1974), it was discovered that although females considered self-disclosure to a friend as more appropriate than did males, males considered self-disclosure to a stranger as more appropriate than did females.

The results of the Chaikin and Derlega (1974) study, combined with the conditions under which studies in the three other paradigms had been run, seemed to point to a model of self-disclosure in which friends would disclose more than strangers and females would disclose more to friends and less to strangers than would males. Subjects were paired with either a best friend or a stranger and asked to discuss three personal topics in a laboratory setting. The hypotheses were not confirmed with any of the four measures used to test them: independent raters' rating, tape footage, subjects' self ratings of their disclosure, and subjects' ratings of their partners' disclosure.

The author discusses some of the methodological and measurement problems in the self-disclosure literature, and questions the implicit assumption of equivalence in the various phenomenon we have come to call self-disclosure.

## REFERENCE NOTES

1. Doster, J. A., The self-disclosure rating scale (Rev. ed.). Unpublished training manual, University of Missouri, Columbia, 1971.
2. McAllister, A., Interviewee self-disclosure as a function of level and identity of self-disclosing models. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Emory University, 1971). Doster, J. A., The self-disclosure rating scale (Rev. ed.). Unpublished training manual, University of Missouri, Columbia, 1971.
3. Nelson, G., & Karlsruher, A. E., The effects of pre-interview instruction and modeling and interviewer self-disclosure on interviewers' self-disclosure. Paper presented at the meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Quebec City, June, 1975.
4. MANSTAT Repeated Measures ANOVA, Computer Centre, University of Manitoba, June, 1975.
5. Gabriel, R., Personal communication, April 5, 1976.

## REFERENCES

- Bath, K. E., & Daly, D. L., Self-disclosure: relationships to self-described personality and sex differences, Psychological Reports, 1972, 31, 623-628.
- Block, E. L., & Goodstein, L. D., Comment on "Influence of an interviewer's disclosure on the self-disclosing behavior of interviewees", Journal of Counseling, 1971, 18, 595-597.
- Chaikin, A. L., & Derlega, V. J., Variables affecting the appropriateness of self-disclosure, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 588-593.
- Cozby, P. C., Self-disclosure: A literature review, Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 79, 73-91.
- Davis, J. D., & Skinner, A. E., Reciprocity of self-disclosure in interviews: Modeling or social change, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 779-784.
- Davis, J. D., & Sloan, M. L., The basis of interview matching of interviewer self-disclosure, British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 13, 359-367.
- Dimond, R. E., & Munz, D. C., Ordinal position of birth and self-disclosure in high school students, Psychological Reports, 1967, 21, 829-833.
- Doster, J. A., Effects of instructions, modeling, and role rehearsal on interview verbal behavior, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1972, 39, 202-209

- Doster, J. A., & Strickland, B. R., Perceived child-rearing practices and self-disclosure patterns, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 382.
- Edelman, R. L., & Snead, R., Self-disclosure in a simulated psychiatric interview, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1972, 38, 354-358.
- Goodstein, L. D., & Reinecker, V. M., Factors affecting self-disclosure: A review of the literature, Progress in Experimental Personality Research, 1974, 7, 49-77.
- Hays, W. L., Statistics for the social sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Himelstein, P., & Lubin, B., Attempted validation of the self-disclosure inventory by the peer-nomination technique, Journal of Psychology, 1965, 61, 13-16.
- Hood, T. C., & Back, K. W., Self-disclosure and the volunteer: A source of bias in laboratory experiments, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 17, 130-136.
- Jourard, S. M., A study of self-disclosure, Scientific American, 1958, 198, 77-82.
- Jourard, S. M., Self-disclosure and other cathexis, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 428-431.
- Jourard, S. M., Self-disclosure patterns in British and American college females, Journal of Social Psychology, 1961a, 54, 315-320.

- Jourard, S. M., Age trends in self-disclosure, Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development, 1961b, 7, 191-197.
- Jourard, S. M., The transparent self. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1971.
- Jourard, S. M., & Friedman, R., Experimenter-subject "distance" and self-disclosure, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15, 278-282.
- Jourard, S. M., & Landsman, M. J., Cognition, cathexis, and the "dyadic effect" in men's self-disclosing behavior, Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1960, 6, 178-186.
- Jourard, S. M., & Lasakow, P., Some factors in self-disclosure, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 91-98
- Jourard, S. M., & Richman, P., Disclosure input and output in college students, Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development, 1963, 9, 141-143.
- Jourard, S. M., & Rubin, J., Self-disclosure and touching: A study of two modes of interpersonal encounter and their interrelations, Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1968, 8, 39-48.
- Kirk, R. E., Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral sciences. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1968.

- Littlefield, R. P., Self-disclosure among some Negro, White, and Mexican-American adolescents, Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 133-136.
- Marlatt, G. A., A comparison of vicarious and direct reinforcement control of verbal behavior in an interview situation, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16, 680-694.
- Marlatt, G. A., Exposure to a model and task ambiguity as determinants of verbal behavior in an interview, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 36, 268-276.
- McAllister, A., & Kiesler, D. J., Interviewee disclosure as a function of personal trust, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 428.
- Mickelson, D. J., & Stevic, R. R., Differential effects of facilitative and nonfacilitative behavioral consequences, Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 314-319.
- Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H., Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.
- Pederson, D. M., & Breglio, V. J., Personality correlates of actual self-disclosure, Psychological Reports, 1968a, 22, 495-501.

- Pederson, D. M., & Breglio, V. J., The correlations of two self-disclosure inventories with actual self-disclosure: A validity study, Journal of Psychology, 1968b, 68, 291-298.
- Pederson, D. M., & Higbee, K. L., Personality correlates of self-disclosure, Journal of Social Psychology, 1969a, 78, 81-89.
- Pederson, D. J., & Higbee, K. L., Self-disclosure and relationship to the target person. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development, 1969b, 15, 213-220.
- Plog, S. C., The disclosure of self in United States and Germany, Journal of Social Psychology, 1965, 65, 193-203.
- Rickers-Ovsiankina, M. A., & Kusmin, A. A., Individual differences in social accessibility, Psychological Reports, 1958, 4, 391-406.
- Vondracek, S. I., & Vondracek, F. W., The manipulation and measurement of self-disclosure in preadolescents, Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development, 1971, 17, 51-58.
- Weigel, R. C., Weigel, V. M., & Chadwick, P. C., Reported and projected self-disclosure, Psychological Reports, 1969, 24, 283-287.
- West, L. W., Sex differences in the exercise of circumspection in self-disclosure among adolescents, Psychological Reports, 1970, 26, 226.

- West, L., & Zingle, H. W., A self-disclosure inventory for adolescents, Psychological Reports, 1969, 24, 439-445.
- Woodyard, H. D., & Hines, D. A., Accurate compared to inaccurate self-disclosure, Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1973, 13, 61-67.
- Worthy, M., Gary, A. L., & Kahn, G. M., Self-disclosure as an exchange process, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 59-63.

APPENDIX A

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA FRIENDSHIP SURVEY

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ AGE: \_\_\_\_\_ SECTION: \_\_\_\_\_  
 ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_ PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

This form is being distributed to collect data for subsequent research. Filling it out will not, however, obligate you in any way to take part in any such research.

Do any of the students currently taking introductory psychology at The University of Manitoba qualify as one of your ten same-sex best friends? They do not have to be in the same section, but they must currently be introductory psychology students at this university. If you have one, two, three, or four same-sex friends that qualify, please complete below. If you have more than four same-sex friends who qualify, name the four whom you like best.

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ AGE: \_\_\_\_\_ SECTION IF KNOWN: \_\_\_\_\_  
 ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_ PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

How long have you known this person? \_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months

Where would you rank this friend among your ten best same-sex friends?

1st best friend	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th best friend
-----------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------------------------

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ AGE: \_\_\_\_\_ SECTION IF KNOWN: \_\_\_\_\_  
 ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_ PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

How long have you known this person? \_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months

Where would you rank this friend among your ten best same-sex friends?

1st best friend	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th best friend
-----------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------------------------

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ AGE: \_\_\_\_\_ SECTION IF KNOWN: \_\_\_\_\_  
 ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_ PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

How long have you known this person? \_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months

Where would you rank this friend among your ten best same-sex friends?

1st best friend	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th best friend
-----------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------------------------

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ AGE: \_\_\_\_\_ SECTION IF KNOWN: \_\_\_\_\_  
 ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_ PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

How long have you known this person? \_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months

Where would you rank this friend among your ten best same-sex friends?

1st best friend	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th best friend
-----------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------------------------

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTION BOOKLET

-1-

Please have a seat, and make yourselves comfortable. You are taking part in a study about how people engage in conversations about themselves.

You may be wondering why I've taped these instructions rather than talking to you in person. I've chosen to tape them to avoid the bias of treating different subjects differently. It's impossible for an experimenter to treat all subjects identically, and differential treatment can sometimes cause subjects to react differently. After you have taken part in the study, however, we'll discuss it to your satisfaction, and I'll be only too glad to answer any questions you may have. Please bear with me until then.

Now, to explain your tasks. I want you to discuss with each other each of the three topics listed on pages 3, 4, and 5 of your instruction booklets. Each of these three pages outlines one of the three topics. Begin with the topic on page 3: Interests. Then go on to the next topic: Personality, and the next: Body. Please remember to stay on topic. Discuss each topic as deeply as you feel comfortable doing, allotting about five minutes to each topic. In spite of the rather structured format, this should be a conversation, not a series of two monologues. Feel free to interrupt each other with questions or comments. Speak in a normal voice, from your chair. The recording tape recorder is sensitive enough that you needn't speak right into the microphone.

It's important that you be comfortable in this situation. I realize that it's difficult for you to completely forget that you're taking part in a study, but imagine that the two of you

-2-

are together in this quiet room having a conversation. Try to forget the tape recorder. The two people who will be listening to your tape do not know you. I definitely will not be one of those two people. No record of your names will be kept, and your tape will be erased as soon as the study is completed.

Now, to review. I want you to discuss the three aspects of your life listed on pages 3, 4, and 5 of your booklet. Go through the topics one by one. Every effort should be made to try to duplicate a real life situation in which you are meeting with THIS PARTICULAR PERSON and discussing these topics, in conversation.

As you know, neither of you has an obligation to continue with this study if you consider it in any way offensive, either now, or at any time during the study. You'll remember, though, that your tape will be completely anonymous, and will be erased as soon as the research is completed. Furthermore, there is no deception in this study. Everything is exactly as I have described.

When you have gone through all three topics, please come to Room 505, on the fifth floor near the main doors. I'll be waiting for you there. The recording tape recorder has already been activated, and will continue to play during your conversation. Now, please shut off this recorder by pushing the middle gadget at the front of the recorder forward until it clicks. That's the middle gadget at the front. Please push it toward yourself until it clicks. Now help yourselves to some coffee and begin.

-3-

INTERESTS

What are your main interests in life?

Describe those activities and experiences which you enjoy.

-4-

PERSONALITY

Describe your personality.

Consider both your strengths and weaknesses.

-5-

BODY

Describe your present state of health and physical appearance.

What do you like and/or dislike about your physical appearance?

APPENDIX C

- 1 -

Please fill out this form, to give me some feedback as to your feeling about the experimental situation. I would appreciate any extra comments the questions bring to mind, or any explanations you might care to add. Just jot down your thoughts in the margins.

1. As you were talking to your partner, were you actively considering what the people who listen to your tape will be looking for in that tape?

All of the time  
 Most of the time  
 Some of the time  
 A little of the time  
 Not at all

2. What do you think they will be looking for?

3. Do you think you and your partner were particularly chosen as partners for some reason?

Yes       No

4. If YES, why?

5. Did you think about that during your conversation?

All of the time  
 Most of the time  
 Some of the time  
 A little of the time  
 Not at all

6. Do you think that other subjects may have been chosen for different reasons?

Yes       No

7. If YES, for what reasons?

- 2 -

8. Did you think about that during your conversation?

- All of the time  
 Most of the time  
 Some of the time  
 A little of the time  
 Not at all

9. Which of these alternatives most clearly describes how you feel you disclosed to your partner on each of the three topics? I would like you to circle, for each topic, the most appropriate number from 1 to 7, to indicate how you feel you disclosed to your partner. Let 1 represent no self-disclosure, 7 represent the disclosure of extremely personal information about yourself, and 4 represent the midpoint between the two extremes.

INTERESTS

Disclosed nothing about myself      1 2 3 4 5 6 7      Disclosed extremely personal information about myself

PERSONALITY

Disclosed nothing about myself      1 2 3 4 5 6 7      Disclosed extremely personal information about myself

BODY

Disclosed nothing about myself      1 2 3 4 5 6 7      Disclosed extremely personal information about myself

10. Which of these alternatives most clearly describes how much inaccurate information you gave your partner about yourself on each of the three topics? I would like you to circle, for each topic, the most appropriate number from 1 to 7, to indicate how much inaccurate information you gave your partner. Let 1 represent no accurate information about yourself, 7 represent completely inaccurate information about yourself, and 4 represent the midpoint between these two extremes.

INTERESTS

Gave no inaccurate information about myself      1 2 3 4 5 6 7      Gave completely inaccurate information about myself

PERSONALITY

Gave no inaccurate information about myself      1 2 3 4 5 6 7      Gave completely inaccurate information about myself

BODY

Gave no inaccurate information about myself      1 2 3 4 5 6 7      Gave completely inaccurate information about myself

- 3 -

11. Were you able to forget that you were taking part in an experiment? (Please check one):

All of the time  
 Most of the time  
 Some of the time  
 A little of the time  
 Not at all

12. Were you able to forget about the tape recorder?

All of the time  
 Most of the time  
 Some of the time  
 A little of the time  
 Not at all

13. When you were talking to your partner, did you really feel that you were talking to that person, or to (for instance) some unknown person via the tape recorder?

All of the time  
 Most of the time  
 Some of the time  
 A little of the time  
 Not at all

14. Do you think the setting had any bearing on your self-disclosure? How do you think you would have disclosed to this particular person if you had met in some private place and each of these topics had come up? Please circle, for each topic, the most appropriate number from 1 to 7, to indicate how much you would have disclosed, in another, private place, to this particular person. Let 1 represent no self-disclosure, 7 represent the disclosure of extremely personal information about yourself, and 4 represent the midpoint between these two extremes.

INTERESTS

Disclosed nothing about myself	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Disclosed extremely personal information about myself
--------------------------------	---------------	--	---------------	---

PERSONALITY

Disclosed nothing about myself	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Disclosed extremely personal information about myself
--------------------------------	---------------	--	---------------	---

BODY

Disclosed nothing about myself	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Disclosed extremely personal information about myself
--------------------------------	---------------	--	---------------	---

15. Which of these alternatives most clearly describes how you feel your partner disclosed to you on each of the three topics? I would like you to circle, for each topic, the most appropriate number from 1 to 7, to indicate how you feel your partner disclosed to you on each of the three topics. Let 1 represent no self-disclosure, 7 represent the disclosure of extremely personal information, and 4 represent the midpoint between these two extremes.

INTERESTS

Disclosed nothing      1 2 3 4 5 6 7      Disclosed extremely personal information

PERSONALITY

Disclosed nothing      1 2 3 4 5 6 7      Disclosed extremely personal information

BODY

Disclosed nothing      1 2 3 4 5 6 7      Disclosed extremely personal information

16. I would like you to think about the relationship you had with your partner before you took part in this study. How would you describe that relationship on the following dimensions? I would like you to circle the most appropriate numbers, from 1 to 7, with 4 representing neutrality, and 1 and 7 representing the extremes of each description.

best friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	perfect strangers
supportive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	nonsupportive
inflexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	flexible
dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	honest
rewarding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	unrewarding
close	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	distant
caring	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	uncaring
nonintimate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	intimate
humorous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	nonhumorous
cold	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	warm
nonloving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	loving
personal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	impersonal
understanding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	nonunderstanding
free	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	constricted
helping	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	nonhelping
cooperative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	noncooperative
competitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	noncompetitive
trusting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	nontrusting
nonenduring	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	enduring

- 5 -

17. Do you think your partner had any bearing on the amount you self-disclosed? How do you think you would have disclosed to the average student drawn at random from the subject pool? Please circle, for each topic, the most appropriate number from 1 to 7, to indicate how you feel you would have disclosed to the average student drawn at random from the subject pool. Let 1 represent no self-disclosure, 7 represent the disclosure of very personal information about yourself, and 4 represent the midpoint between these two extremes.

INTERESTS

Disclosed nothing about myself	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Disclosed extremely personal information about myself
-----------------------------------	---------------	--

PERSONALITY

Disclosed nothing about myself	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Disclosed extremely personal information about myself
-----------------------------------	---------------	--

BODY

Disclosed nothing about myself	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Disclosed extremely personal information about myself
-----------------------------------	---------------	--

18. Do you want a copy of the study results? If so, I'll keep a record of your name and address, although it won't be connected in any way with your tape.

       Yes                             No

APPENDIX D

April 15, 1976.

Dear

As you will no doubt remember, you participated in a self-disclosure study for me last fall. I'm writing to tell you the results, as promised.

I measured your self-disclosure in four ways:

1. Your evaluation on the questionnaire of how much you had self-disclosed
2. Your partner's evaluation on the questionnaire of how much you had self-disclosed
3. Independent raters evaluations of how much you self-disclosed
4. Amount of tape footage--how long you talked

There were no differences between the disclosures of strangers and of best friends on any of these measures. Furthermore, the interaction I predicted--that females would disclose more to friends and less to strangers--was not confirmed. Females saw themselves as disclosing significantly more to both strangers and friends (Measure 1), and the other three measures showed a tendency for females to disclose more than males.

Again, many thanks.

Yours very truly,

Nina Anderson

APPENDIX E

TABLE A

Analysis of Variance Using Partner  
Ratings Averaged Across Dyadic  
Partners as the Dependent Variable

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Sex (s)	1	38.533	3.011
Relationship (R)	1	14.700	1.149
S x R	1	22.533	1.761
Error (1)	36		
Topic (T)	2	.9333	0.741
S x T	2	3.7333	2.965
R x T	2	1.9000	1.509
S x R x T	2	0.4333	0.344
Error (2)	72		