

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms International

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

77-21,380

JOSLIN, Gale Leon, 1946*
EFFECTS OF TOPIC INTIMACY AND GENDER UPON
SELF-DISCLOSURE.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1977
Psychology, clinical

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

EFFECTS OF TOPIC INTIMACY AND GENDER UPON
SELF-DISCLOSURE

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
GALE LEON JOSLIN
Norman, Oklahoma
1977

EFFECTS OF TOPIC INTIMACY AND GENDER UPON
SELF-DISCLOSURE

APPROVED BY

Gerald Kowin

Charlyce King

William H. Jones

Robert B. Bagler
DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his gratitude to his advisor, Dr. Gerald T. Kowitz, who has been an inspiration both professionally and personally to the writer throughout his doctoral program. The suggestions provided by Dr. Charlyce R. King, Dr. Robert E. Ragland, and Dr. William H. Graves have been of value to the writer in the preparation of this dissertation.

To list the friends and relatives who have provided assistance to the writer in one way or another would be an impossible task. However, special acknowledgment is extended to my wife, Kathleen, whose typing skills, moral support, and assumption of most household duties allowed the writer to finish his dissertation on time.

Additionally, the writer wishes to thank his five children, Bob, Kevin, Gale, Amy and Missy, for their collective encouragement and patience. Children have a way of knowing when to be extra supportive. Finally, the writer would like to pay tribute to his mother and father, Helen and Gale Joslin, whose wisdom and support have extended not only through the dissertation project, but throughout the writer's thirty-one year existence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	5
III. METHODOLOGY	19
IV. RESULTS	26
V. INTERPRETATION AND COMMENTARY ON DATA	31
VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	39
BIBLIOGRAPHY	43
APPENDICES	50

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance	28
2. Means and Standard Deviations of the Four Treatment Groups	29
3. Global Rating (N=32)	30
4. F-Maximum Test for Homogeneity of Variance	32
5. Adjusted Analysis: Scores Raised to Eliminate Zero; Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance	33
6. Adjusted Analysis: Scores Raised; Means and Standard Deviations	34
7. Adjusted Analysis: Word Count; Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance	35
8. Adjusted Analysis: Word Count; Means and Standard Deviations	35
9. Adjusted Analysis: Blank Segments; Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance	36
10. Adjusted Analysis: Blank Segments; Means and Standard Deviations	37
11. Time Analysis	37

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure		Page
1.	A Graphic Illustration of the Experimental Design	27
2.	A Graphic Illustration of the Pilot Study Design	66

EFFECTS OF TOPIC INTIMACY AND GENDER
UPON SELF-DISCLOSURE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Self-disclosure, or the willingness of a person to relate information about himself to others, has been a topic of concern for a number of years. Jourard coined the term and much of the research on self-disclosure has been generated from his contributions (Jourard and Lasakow, 1958). Rickers-Ovsiankina (1956) referred to social accessibility when speaking of disclosure. Buber (1965) and Polansky (1965) wrote about a process by which a person learns to understand the self. While these and other authors have written about a person relating to other people, Jourard's term "self-disclosure" has had the most influence upon the literature (Cozby, 1973).

By 1957, Jourard had been working as a psychotherapist for about eight years. During that time he had been inviting clients to disclose their problems in the counseling sessions so that they might lessen the burden which engulfed their lives. He proposed that an essential part of any successful counseling relationship is the ability of the client to reveal authentic

or genuine thoughts and feelings to the counselor in order to prevent having to live an unreal existence (Webb, 1975).

A decade before Jourard's work, Fenichel (1945) a psychoanalytic writer stated free association from the client of all the thoughts which come to his or her mind is vital to the analyst's diagnosis and interpretation of the central conflict of the person's life. Fromm (1955) related that the current alienation of people from other humans is primarily due to the inability to disclose relevant information to significant others.

Mowrer (1961) concluded that guilt results from a failure of people to disclose misdeeds to the injured party. When a transgression is committed, the real danger to the transgressor is the inability to confess his or her act to the offended person. In reality, this is not always possible; therefore disclosure is a "meaningful other", such as a counselor is necessary before an emotionally satisfying life can be lived.

From the client-centered counseling viewpoint, Rogers (1961) noted that the self-actualized person is able to reveal his or her self to others. More recently, Latimer (1973), a Gestalt therapist, had stressed the importance of living in the present which includes becoming aware of oneself and the relationship of this awareness to the person's environment. Gestalt therapy maintains that the sum of the parts of a person are greater than the whole individual. When one part is not performing correctly, the whole organism can not function in the manner in which it is designed to do. In terms of

self-disclosure, if the client is not able to reveal thoughts and feelings, then he or she can not live up to capacity. Behavioral counselors recognize the value of self-disclosure as an agent in defining different levels of anxiety from which the client is to be desensitized. In order for the counselor to know where to begin the systematic desensitization process he or she must define the source of fear and subsequent anxiety (Krasner, 1965).

From this restricted survey, it would seem that self-disclosure is a significant aspect of counseling or psychotherapy. Hence, it would seem important to find means by which it could be measured. Cozby (1973) concluded that what is needed in self-disclosure research is more behaviorally oriented studies involving actual self-disclosure on the part of the subject.

If self-disclosure is redefined according to measureable criteria then the counselor is in a better position to know how to be of help and if intervention has been successful.

Definition of Terms

- (1) Self-disclosure: Information about oneself which is revealed to others and is measureable according to Haymes (1971) self-disclosure scale.
- (2) Topic intimacy: The measureable amount of privacy one places upon certain self-disclosure topics.
- (3) Topic levels: In this study, topic levels will be either a high intimacy level or a low intimacy level. Dating experiences is considered a high intimacy topic and school

experiences is considered a low intimacy topic (Jourard, 1971).

(4) Subject groups: In this study, there will be two groups of subjects. One group will be males and the other group will be females. The male-female comparison is often neglected in favor of other variable manipulations; therefore it should be explored.

Purpose of the Study

Following Cozby's (1973) conclusion that what is needed in self-disclosure research is more behaviorally oriented studies, this study proposes to explore the effects of independent variables upon actual disclosing behaviors of subjects. Because there has been very few behavioral studies in the area of self-disclosure, this study is an essentially exploratory investigation. It is an attempt to integrate two variables into self-disclosure research. The purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of topic intimacy and gender upon self-disclosure in a monologue situation.

Limitations of the Study

Because the variables defined for study are limited to two comparisons: (1) topic intimacy and (2) gender of the client, the present research excludes other possible comparisons. For example: race, cultural background, religion, marital status, and birth order could have an effect upon self-disclosure.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Volumes have been written about self-disclosure. Most of the publications about the topic are concerned with the use of questionnaires which really do not measure actual self-disclosure, but rather measure what subjects think they would do, would have done under certain given circumstances, or what they think is expected of them.

Jourard and Lasakow (1958) developed a questionnaire in order to measure various aspects of the disclosing process. The Self-disclosure Questionnaire contains sixty items sorted into six categories of ten items each. Taylor and Altman (1966) constructed a self-report inventory to measure the intimacy value of self-disclosure. Their rationale was that subjects would disclose differently according to the value they placed on certain topics. Realizing that age level would possibly affect the disclosure of subjects, West and Zingle (1969) developed the Self-Disclosure Inventory for Adolescents. Jourard and Resnick (1970) revised a forty item inventory which required subjects to answer items in terms of prior and present self-disclosure.

A general review of the literature is provided by Cozby (1973) and Goodstein and Reinecker (1974). In their reviews the authors point out that there are obvious individual differences in self-disclosure yet we know little about the meaning of these differences. Additionally, the intimacy value of what a person discloses has been neglected. Does a person talk as easily about his or her sexual experiences as he or she does about the weather? Another issue contained in the reviews is the question of how does one know when self-disclosure has occurred. Both studies note a lack of research involving actual verbal self-disclosure in favor of the questionnaire technique.

Although the questionnaire has received considerable attention, Cozby (1973) stated that it does not predict actual self-disclosure and its reliability and validity have not been consistent across studies. Some results have been encouraging while others raise questions concerning the real value of questionnaires in self-disclosure research. Jourard and Lasakow (1958) reported a split-half reliability coefficient of .94 for their sixty item questionnaire. However, Panyard (1971) obtained a split-half reliability coefficient of only .70 using a similiar subject grouping. Furthermore, both Vondracek (1969) and Ehrlich and Graeven (1971) found non-significant correlations between scores on self-disclosure questionnaires and actual self-disclosure in interview situations.

Since this paper deals with actual self-disclosure, the literature reviewed here will be restricted to the behaviorally oriented research and to those reports which use the variables defined: self-disclosure, topic intimacy, and gender.

Self-disclosure can be studied behaviorally by conceptualizing it on an ambiguous-unambiguous response continuum. An ambiguous response is one over which the subject has little control or for which there is no correct answer. For example, if a person were asked to give a personal opinion on bussing of school students the response would be considerably different from respondent to respondent because there is no correct answer to such an inquiry.

An unambiguous response, on the other hand, is a response in which the answer is relatively standardized and can therefore be predicted with a high degree of accuracy. An example of this type of response would be one in which the subject would be asked to name plural nouns from a given list of singular equivalents. In this situation there is minimal allowance for creativity; some of the answers are defined.

Self-disclosure, as many points on the verbal response continuum, is considered to be ambiguous in that one can not be certain at what point the subject will disclose meaningful information.

Behavioral Research on Self-disclosure

Bandura (1962) stated that a response, whether ambiguous or unambiguous can be modified as long as it is within the repertoire of the subject. He considers one trial verbal

conditioning sufficient for modifying behavior when the subject has experienced the behavior in some form in previous social learning experiences. Krasner (1965), on the other hand, has argued that ambiguous responses, including self-disclosure, can not be modified as easily as unambiguous responses. He believes that ambiguous responses are under much less subject control than are unambiguous responses. According to Krasner (1965), even if instructions are clear as to the task requirements, subjects can not necessarily produce the desired operants. Additionally, extinction strengths may well differ between one trial learning as proposed by Bandura (1962) and reinforced learning, with the latter being harder to extinguish. Existing evidence appears to support Bandura (1962): Hamsher and Farina (1967) attempted to assess the degree to which conscious motivation affects subject "openness," as measured by A Manual of Openness, on Thematic Apperception Test cards. Thirty-one undergraduates were directed to tell personally revealing stories to six TAT cards while twenty-nine undergraduates were instructed to write "guarded" stories. Judges rating the stories for "openness," according to a five point scale manual developed for this study, found that subjects could control "openness." The ratings were significant at the .01 level using a *t*-test for statistical comparison. The Hamsher and Farina (1967) study lends support to Bandura's (1962) belief that subjects can respond in the manner which is requested of them as long as they have previously acquired the appropriate response.

Merbaum and Lukens (1968) compared the efficiency of instructions, elicitations, and reinforcements in the manipulation of affective verbal behavior. Their results indicated that subjects who received instructions achieved significantly higher rates at the .01 level using an analysis of variance design for both positive and negative emotional words than did the subjects who received reinforcements. The subjects who received elicitations also produced more affect words than the reinforcement group. These two studies have achieved effective results in the modification of ambiguous responses and support Bandura's (1962) position over that of Krasner (1965).

Within the last five years, very few articles have addressed the direct measurement of actual self-disclosure. They are steps in a positive direction of measuring what a subject discloses during an experimental situation as opposed to what a subject says he or she might disclose or would have disclosed to a "significant other" in past circumstances. For many years, since Jourard's initial work, researchers have taken on faith that intentional disclosure correlates well with actual disclosure. The behaviorally oriented research is an attempt to accurately define what a subject will disclose.

Leaman (1976) investigated the differential effects of various modeling conditions on client self-disclosure. The conditions were as follows: intimate videotape treatment, superficial videotape treatment, dyad videotape treatment which involved a model sharing with a subject intimately, and

a control group which did not receive a videotape treatment.

After exposure to a treatment condition, subjects were asked to pair with other subjects and disclose personal information. Results indicated that there were no significant differences in subject self-disclosure among the four treatment conditions. However, additional analysis revealed that those subjects with a strong religious commitment were significantly different on the premodeling and postmodeling measures than subjects with no commitment to religion. Deeply religious subjects increased disclosure on posttest measures while those with no commitment to religion decreased.

In a study concerning the training of clients in behavioral skills useful in counseling, Stone and Stebbins (1975) found videotape modeling was more effective than audiotape modeling in producing self-disclosure in college students. Using three modeling procedures to teach college students to self-disclose, the authors found the video model group produced more self references during a twenty minute interview. The audio model group produced more self references than did the no model group.

Scheiderer (1975) studied the effects of instruction and modeling in producing self-disclosure in the initial clinical interview. Thirty-two clients were exposed to one of four pre-interview conditions: modeling, detailed instructions, detailed instructions plus modeling, and a control group. The results indicated that detailed instructions produced a significant effect in increasing personal self-disclosure.

Modeling also produced a significant effect in the same direction. The combination of modeling and instructions was effective in increasing self-disclosure; however, not more so than each variable by itself. Additionally, clients who were instructed rated their session as more effective and their counselors as more concerned than did noninstructed clients.

In a study involving the modification of affective and descriptive statements, Green and Marlett (1972) found instructions to be a significant determinant of both types of statements. It was determined that instructions to produce specific ideas and personal feelings were significantly different from the control group beyond the .001 level using an analysis of variance design.

Stone and Gotlib (1975) examined the effectiveness of modeling and instructional procedures in training college students to self-disclose. Forty-eight university students were randomly assigned to one of three treatment groups: those who were given specific instructions to discuss personal feelings within certain topic areas, those who were given general instructions to discuss personal feelings within the same area, and those who were given no instructions. Half of the subjects also listened to a tape recorded model of a person disclosing on prescribed topics and half did not. After pretraining, each subject tape recorded a brief monologue which was subsequently scored for self-disclosure using Haymes (1971) Technique for Measuring Self-Disclosure from Tape-Recorded Interviews. The results indicated that both modeling and instructions by

themselves were significant determinents in increasing self-disclosure. Further analysis showed that the instructional effect was the result of the difference between specific and no instructions.

The preceding articles are examples of behaviorally oriented research which provides a more accurate assessment of self-disclosure than do questionnaires. The studies demonstrate effective modification procedures, but most of them do not refer to considerations of the intimacy of topics and to gender differences; both of which should be investigated. Such investigations should provide a better understanding of the independent contribution of each variable.

Topic Intimacy

Goodstein and Reinecker (1974) made a distinction between disclosure of public and private information; the latter being more intimate and disclosed only under special circumstances while the former can be considered part of the acquaintanceship process which can be shared on a broader scope with a greater quantity of people. Private information is not as readily accessible to everyone and gives a more indepth picture of the individual.

Lazarus (1969) developed a counseling strategy which he called the "inner circle" by which the counselor can gain the confidence of the client and help the latter overcome guilt which is associated with the perceived intimacy of his or her problem. In using the "inner circle," the counselor diagrams five circles where each additional circle surrounds the one

before it. The circles are labeled: A, B, C, D and E. Circle A, which is at the core of all the other circles, represents an area where thoughts and feeling are shared only with family or close friends. Circles C, D, and E each represent an ever widening sharing of thoughts and feelings until at circle E information can safely be shared with anyone. Two real benefits can be gained by using the "inner circle" technique: (1) the client can be shown that sharing information can and should be done discriminately and (2) the client is afforded the opportunity to examine just what is the information which he or she is keeping to his or her self and to consider the alternative of not disclosing that information.

Jourard and Lasakow (1958) found subjects less willing to disclose information about "body" and "personality" than on the topics of "interest" and "work." Altman and Haythorn (1965) concluded that individuals disclose less about more intimate topics. In another study Pope and Siegman (1965) found specific questions about intimate topics aroused anxiety and decreased the amount of word production in interview situations.

Using sixty-nine undergraduate students, Wilson and Rappaport (1974) found a significant difference in the discussion of high and low intimacy topics. Essentially, the results indicated no differences for the students when they were discussing low intimacy topics, but depending on how the high intimacy topics were treated, there was a difference in

the latter. When the subjects were told by a research assistant that the interviewer was easy to talk to and when the interviewer self-disclosed personal information there was a significant difference in the amount of interviewee self-disclosure on high intimacy topics. The high intimacy topics were: (1) sexual arousal, (2) shameful past experiences, and (3) maladjustments of the subject's family members.

Exploring self-disclosure as a function of sex-roles, subject-experimenter rapport, gender of the experimenter, and intimacy with college students, Switkin (1974) found that sex-roles, rapport, and experimenter gender did not significantly effect self-disclosure. However, when given a choice, subjects preferred a low intimacy topic to high intimacy topic.

Gaebelein (1976) studied the relationship between self-disclosure and the degree of acquaintance. Under the guise of collecting handwriting samples, from thirty-two male and thirty-six female undergraduates, she found that the more the experimenter disclosed to the subjects, prior to their task, the more disclosure he received from them. Friends tended to disclose most to friends and less to strangers. The degree of intimacy was measured by the number of words written by the subject.

Allen (1974) found sexual experience to be the best indicator of behavioral self-disclosure. Using sixty pairs of undergraduate male students, he had one of each pair be the interviewer and one be the interviewee; the former asking the latter about his sexual experiences. Four measures were taken:

respondent's preinterview self-disclosure questionnaire scores, examiner's ratings of respondents' behavioral self-disclosure, respondent's post interview self-ratings of self-disclosure, and the interviewer's ratings of respondents' self-disclosure. Of the four measures, the only ones that correlated significantly were the respondents' self-disclosure preinterview scores and their self ratings of their performance.

Allen (1974) acquired two additional measures: respondents' sexual experiences as measured by a Sexual Experience Inventory (Brady and Levitt, 1965) and feelings of sexual guilt as measured by Mosher's (1966) forced choice guilt scale. A multiple regression analysis was employed to determine the independent contribution of each of three factors in behavioral self-disclosure: who would disclose sexual attitudes, sexual guilt, and sexual experience. The only significant variable was sexual experience.

In all of the research conducted thus far on topical differences there does not appear to be any studies which deal primarily with the difference between topics. Topical focus tends to be a secondary issue to other variables such as interviewer-interviewee manipulation.

Gender

The influence of gender on self-disclosure appears to be a complex matter. Diamond and Hellkamp (1969), Jourard and Richman (1963), and Plog (1965) found that females tend to disclose more than males. West (1970) discovered males are

more selective about the content of disclosure while females are more selective about the target of self-disclosure. These studies have employed questionnaire methodology and do not measure actual self-disclosure.

In sampling the experimental literature one finds very few gender comparisons with self-disclosure. Zeldow (1975) investigated the effects of sex differences on clinical judgments. Fifty male and fifty female college students evaluated self-disclosing statements attributed to seriously disturbed psychiatric patients. Judgements of emotional maladjustment were not influenced by the gender of the raters.

Brooks (1974) examined the effects of self-disclosure on forty male and forty female college students in interviews with either a male or female therapist of high or low status. The results indicated that males disclosed more to females while females disclosed more to low status interviewers.

Derlega (1976) concluded that there are sex-linked norms regarding self-disclosure and violation of these norms influence a person's attribution of mental illness. He had both male and female subjects rate stimulus persons on a series of nine point scales, including psychological adjustment and level of intimacy of disclosure. Male stimulus persons were rated by the subjects as being better adjusted when they failed to disclose personal information. The reverse situation was true when a female stimulus person was being evaluated. She was seen as better adjusted when she disclosed than when she did not disclose.

Conclusions

Most of the research on self-disclosure has involved questionnaires which do not measure actual disclosing behavior. Usually, behavioral studies which have been done have excluded intimacy and gender comparisons in favor of manipulation of other variables, primarily because of the value-laden speculations of different researchers (Cozby, 1973). Hence, it seems important to conduct behavioral research which involves intimacy and gender comparisons.

Based on the results of a pilot experiment (see Appendix E), which explored the effects of intimacy and gender upon self-disclosure, hypotheses for the study were formulated. The purpose of this study has been stated as an investigation of the effects of topic intimacy and gender upon self-disclosure in a monologue situation. This study is important to counselors and psychotherapists because it can be critical to know what a client will disclose under different conditions. If a counselor knows that gender makes a difference in the willingness to relate significant facts about a client's experiences, then he or she can modify the treatment procedure more accurately to meet the needs of the person being served. The same thing would be true about the willingness to discuss different topics in therapy.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses to be tested are:

Hypothesis 1.--Subjects are more willing to

disclose on a low intimacy topic than they are on a high intimacy topic.

Hypothesis 2.--Female subjects are more willing to disclose than are male subjects on both high and low intimacy topics.

Hypothesis 3.--Gender and intimacy interact such that males disclose more on the low intimacy topic than they do on the high intimacy topic.

Stated in null form the hypotheses are as follows:

H₀1: There is no significant difference between the mean self-disclosure scores of the high intimacy topic and the mean self-disclosure scores of the low intimacy topic as measured by Haymes Scale at $p > .05$, by a 2 x 2 factorial analysis of variance.

H₀2: There is no significant difference between the mean self-disclosure score of males and females as measured by Haymes Scale at $p > .05$, by a 2 x 2 factorial analysis of variance.

H₀3: There is no significant interaction between topic intimacy and gender as measured by Haymes Scale at $p > .05$, by a 2 x 2 factorial analysis of variance.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In the review of the literature it was stated that Bandura (1962) and Krasner (1965) have proposed opposing views on the capacity of subjects to produce ambiguous responses. Bandura (1962) stated that a subject can produce any verbal response as long as it is within his or her repertoire. However Krasner (1965) has stated that ambiguous responses are more difficult to obtain from a subject and probably require extensive verbal conditioning to achieve the desired response. The purpose of this study, as has been previously stated, is to investigate the effects of topic intimacy and gender upon self-disclosure. This study will attempt to ascertain whether the variables defined have an influence on self-disclosure; thereby lending support to the position of either Bandura (1962) or Krasner (1965).

To measure the effects which topic intimacy and gender have on self-disclosure, an experimental situation was proposed which was designed to test the influence of the independent variables upon the dependent variable.

Sample

Sample size was determined from the results of a pilot study and of Theta Q computed according to Kirk's (1968) formula. The level of significance was set at .05. The level of power considered was .91 against a difference of one standard deviation from the pilot study results. Power was arbitrarily set at a high level in order to reduce the probability of making a type II error. With power being at a high level, one can be relatively certain that the statistical test is sensitive to the variables of this experiment, and one can be reasonably sure in a decision not to reject the null hypotheses should the F ratios prove to be nonsignificant. Furthermore, with power set at .91, one can be comfortable in believing that he or she has adequate sample size to accomplish the task but not too large of a sample which would make detected differences impractical. The subjects were sixteen males and sixteen females from the undergraduate division of the College of Education research pool at the University of Oklahoma. Each subject was randomly selected and randomly assigned to one of four treatment groups.

Data Collection

The plan for data collection was as follows. Each subject was asked to speak for five minutes on the topic presented to him or her. The monologue approach was utilized as a neutral data collector in order to eliminate any interference from extraneous variables, including interviewer interaction.

This study deals only with the effects of intimacy and gender upon self-disclosure.

During the actual experiment, each subject was alone in a room equipped with a tape recorder, a microphone, and a light signal which indicated when to begin and when to terminate talking. Once seated in the experimental room, a female research assistant played prerecorded instructions regarding the experiment to each subject. When the subject indicated he or she understood what was expected, the assistant produced a card with the experimental topic printed on it and left the room.

Once outside the experimental room, the assistant activated both the tape recorder and the signal light. At the same time the assistant began a stop watch to ensure each subject got five minutes. At the conclusion of the allotted time, the assistant switched off both the light and the tape recorder. This also gave notice to the subject that he or she should cease talking. Reentering the experimental room, the assistant expressed appreciation to the subject and explained that a mimeographed letter would be in the mail after the completion of the study which would explain the experiment and results in detail.

This same procedure was used with each subject in each experimental group. In order to distinguish between group members and groups, the assistant ran the tape thirty seconds between taped segments. The experiment was designed to avoid deception. No individual person can be identified with any taped monologue since names were not associated with any tape.

Each subject participated voluntarily and a debriefing session will be made available to both individuals and groups following the conclusion of the study. Because the study, using a larger number of subjects from the same population, was conducted after the pilot study, questions about the pilot experiment might possibly have invalidated the results of the major study; therefore all debriefing is to be done after the completion of the study.

There were four groups in all. The groups are as follows:

- Group 1: Males-High Intimacy Topic
- Group 2: Males-Low Intimacy Topic
- Group 3: Females-High Intimacy Topic
- Group 4: Females-Low Intimacy Topic

The topics used for this research were selected from a list prepared by Jourard (1971). Using a median value, the topics on the list were divided either into high or low intimacy groups. They are:

- I. High Intimacy Topic: Dating Experiences
- II. Low Intimacy Topic: School Experiences

The highest intimacy value topic on the list "Sexual Experiences" was not selected because it was felt that it might be too provocative and sensitive for this essentially exploratory experiment. Therefore, "Dating Experiences" was chosen so as to preserve the essence of the high intimacy topic while at the same time keeping it within propriety. "School Experiences" was the lowest intimacy value topic on the Jourard (1971) list.

Two raters rated the taped monologues from typescript copies. They were trained to use Haymes Technique for Measuring Self-Disclosure from Tape-Recorded Interviews (Haymes, 1971). Initially, they studied Haymes' training manual (see Appendix D for the entire manual). Permission to use the manual was obtained in Jourard's (1971) book on self-disclosure. Following this study period there was a discussion period during which it was made clear what is and what is not a criterion response. At this time, the raters were given an opportunity to ask questions about any aspect of the rating procedure and to rate eight randomly selected typescript segments, two from each of the four treatment conditions from the pilot study. A discussion of the differences in ratings followed. Each segment was ten seconds in length. Haymes manual states that the segments should be thirty seconds in duration, but because another study which employed the technique used ten second segments and achieved significant results (Stone and Gotlib, 1975), the present experiment employed the ten second segment guideline. The ten second guideline appeared to be more sensitive to genuine disclosures which could go unnoticed using the thirty second procedure. Additionally the pilot study achieved significance using the ten second guideline.

To assess interrater reliability each rater was given eighty randomly selected, ten second segments (twenty segments from each condition) which were chosen from the thirty-two taped monologues. A Pearson product moment correlation was computed between the two sets of ratings. The resultant

correlation was .85. Once it had been determined that a satisfactory correlation had been achieved, each rater independently rated half of all the randomly selected typescript segments which produced the correct number of scores which was subsequently subjected to an analysis of variance.

Haymes' scale was selected as a measurement of choice for two reasons: (1) it is designed to yield a numerical rating for tape recorded self-disclosure; (2) it has achieved favorable interrater reliability coefficients in other studies (Jourard, 1971).

Ex Post Facto Analysis

In order to provide a more complete understanding of the results of the data, three different ex post facto analyses were incorporated into the study.

The first analysis re-evaluated Haymes (1971) scale in terms of the point value given for disclosure. The scale records self-disclosure as follows: (1) two points for first person references; (2) one point for second person references; (3) zero points for non-disclosing third person references.

The reanalysis eliminated the zero score and raised all scores in the scale. The modified scale is as follows: (1) four points for first person references; (2) three points for second person references; (3) two points for nondisclosing third person references; (4) one point for blank segments.

The second ex post facto analysis examined the data according to another rating procedure suggested by Iker and

Harway (1965) as a means of comparison against the rating procedure designed by Haymes (1971). Iker and Harway (1965) used a word count procedure for analyzing psychotherapeutic interviews. Following their methodology, the data was subjected to the word count analysis.

One final analysis was performed on the data. The analysis for word count takes into consideration those subjects who tend to talk more than other subjects. Therefore, an analysis of blank segments in subject monologues was conducted in an attempt to understand what happens to the analysis when subjects do not talk or talk with the frequency of other subjects. An examination of this and discussion of the results of these ex post facto analyses is presented in the Chapter V.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Three hypotheses were stated about the effects of intimacy and gender upon self-disclosure. The hypotheses were designed so that statistical tests would provide information about the relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable. An initial pilot study was conducted in order to provide justification for collecting data and for exploring hypotheses concerning self-disclosure (see Pilot Study, Appendix E). Because the results of the statistical analysis of the pilot study were significant, it was decided to proceed with the data collection for the major study.

Data Description

The study was similar to the pilot study; however, the former used a larger number of subjects. Sample size was determined by the results of the pilot study and by calculation of Theta Q (Kirk, 1968). There were 32 subjects in the experiment. The level of power was arbitrarily set at .91 in order to reduce the probability of making a type II error.

A graphic illustration of the design is presented below. There were two levels of topic intimacy and two levels of gender. Male and female undergraduates from the College of Education at the University of Oklahoma were used as subjects. Each subject was randomly assigned into one of the four treatment groups: (1) Male-High Intimacy Topic, (2) Male-Low Intimacy Topic, (3) Female-High Intimacy Topic, and (4) Female-Low Intimacy Topic.

INTIMACY

		High Topic	Low Topic
G E N D E R	Female Male	8	8
		8	8

Each subject recorded a five minute taped monologue on either a high intimacy topic (Dating Experiences) or a low intimacy topic (School Experiences). Each monologue was transformed into typescript and marked off into thirty segments, each ten seconds in length, for rating its self-disclosure value according to Haymes' Technique for Measuring Self-Disclosure from Tape-Recorded Interviews (1971). Two raters, one Ph.D. psychologist and one M.S.W. Social Worker, were given eighty randomly selected segments from subject monologues. Using a Pearson product moment correlation, interrater reliability

was assessed at .85. These trained raters rated one-half of all the typescripts; each rating an equal number of subjects from every cell. The results of this rating were subjected to a 2 x 2 analysis of variance which is described in Table 1.

Examination of this table reflects the fact that under the existing conditions there is no significant difference in male and female disclosures of intimate or nonintimate topics at the .05 level of probability. The error term is too large for either of the two main effects or the interaction effect to achieve significance.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Total	4490.82	31	--	--	--
Intimacy	47.53	1	47.53	.30	n.s.
Gender	2.35	1	2.53	.01	n.s.
I x G	61.34	1	61.34	.39	n.s.
Error	4379.60	28	156.40	--	--

Inspection of the means and standard deviations (see Table 2) amplifies the findings in Table 1. The means of the four treatment groups differ by only 3.63 points. This is

not a large difference considering that there are 60 total possible points. Additionally there is considerable variation within groups as reflected in the large standard deviations. Individual members from each of the four treatment groups scored well above and below the respective group means.

TABLE 2

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE FOUR TREATMENT GROUPS

Treatment Group	Mean	S.D.
Male High	34.75	9.14
Female High	33.00	14.04
Female Low	36.63	13.60
Male Low	36.00	12.91

To gather additional information about the results of the analysis of variance, a global rating (see Table 3) was conducted by a 3rd rater who was naive to the purpose and design of the experiment and unknowledgeable of the work of the other two raters. Ratings were assigned to each complete monologue according to a seven point scale.

The global rating compares favorably with the results of the analysis of variance. Twenty-two of the total thirty-two scores clustered in the average to above average range. Most of the subjects were approximately the same in self-disclosure.

TABLE 3
GLOBAL RATING (N=32)

Disclosure Rating	# of Subjects	Males	Females
1. No disclosure	1	0	1
2. Minimal disclosure	3	2	1
3. Below average disclosure	4	2	2
4. Average disclosure	12	8	4
5. Above average disclosure	10	3	7
6. Almost complete disclosure	2	1	1
7. Complete disclosure	0	0	0

Summary of Results

The analysis of variance did not detect a significant difference among the means of the four treatment groups. Means and standard deviations for the four groups reflected the lack of any significant differences in the treatments and additional global rating demonstrated that twenty-two of the thirty-two ratings clustered around the average disclosure range. Therefore, rejection of the null hypotheses is not possible in the experiment. An explanation of this conclusion will be presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

INTERPRETATION AND COMMENTARY ON DATA

Minium (1970) states that four assumptions for the analysis of variance are necessary for the analysis to be legitimate. They are as follows:

1. The subgroup populations are normally distributed.
2. Samples are drawn at random.
3. Selection of elements comprising any subgroup is independent of the selection of elements of any other subgroup.
4. The variances of the several subgroup populations are the same for all subgroups.

Selection of subjects for this study has complied with the first three assumptions.

In order to determine the equality of variances of the four treatment groups, Hartley's F-Maximum test for Homogeneity of Variances was conducted (see Table 4).

Since the value computed in Hartley's F-Maximum test is smaller than the value required at the .05 level of significance, it was concluded that the variances of the treatment groups were sufficiently homogeneous.

TABLE 4

F-MAXIMUM TEST FOR HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCE

Treatment Group	Variance
Male High	83.64
Female High	197.14
Female Low	185.14
Male Low	166.85

$$F_{\max} = 197.14/83.64 = 2.357$$

$$df = 7$$

$$K = 4$$

$$F_{(.05,4,7)} = 8.44$$

Because the analysis of variance failed to reject the null hypotheses, reanalyses of the data have been conducted in order to help explain the existing results.

Haymes (1971) scale records self-disclosure as follows: (1) two points for first person references; (2) one point for second person references; (3) zero points for non-disclosing third person references. Because several of the subjects had segment scores of zero stemming from a reticence to talk and others had zero scores stemming from nonscorable 3rd person references, a modified scale was developed. The modified scale is as follows: (1) four points for first

person references; (2) three points for second person references; (3) two points for non-disclosing third person references; and (4) one point for blank segments. The results of the adjusted analysis is presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5

ADJUSTED ANALYSIS: SCORES RAISED TO ELIMINATE ZERO;
SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	D
Total	9727.00	31	--	--	--
Intimacy	148.00	1	148.00	.43	n.s.
Gender	2.06	1	2.06	.006	n.s.
I x G	11.94	1	11.94	.03	n.s.
Error	9565.00	28	341.60	--	--

The results of the adjusted analysis proved to be non-significant. Inspection of the group means reveals that the difference between the largest and smallest means was 5.49 (see Table 6).

The difference in group means is relatively small when it is compared to the 120 total possible points for each group mean.

Among the different methods of determining intimacy from subject verbalizations which have been suggested, Iker and

TABLE 6

ADJUSTED ANALYSIS: RAISED SCORES;
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE FOUR TREATMENT GROUPS

Treatment Group	Mean	S.D.
Male High	91.38	14.18
Female High	89.63	25.01
Female Low	95.12	13.85
Male Low	94.50	18.65

Harway (1965) used a word count procedure for analyzing psychotherapeutic interviews. Following their methodology the data was subjected to a word count analysis which is presented in Table 7. Total words for each subject in each treatment group were counted.

The results of this analysis, also, proved to be non-significant. Means and standard deviations for the word count analysis are presented in Table 8. One final analysis was performed on the data. In reviewing the individual type-scripts, it was discovered that several of the monologues had blank segments. The analysis for word count had taken into consideration those subjects who tended to talk more than other subjects; therefore, it was decided to analyze monologues in terms of reticence to talk. It was thought this was

TABLE 7

ADJUSTED ANALYSIS: WORD COUNT;
SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Total	6901.00	31	--	--	--
Intimacy	17.00	1	17.00	.07	n.s.
Gender	102.00	1	102.00	.43	n.s.
I x G	101.00	1	101.00	.42	n.s.
Error	6681.00	28	239.00	--	--

TABLE 8

ADJUSTED ANALYSIS: WORD COUNT;
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE FOUR TREATMENT GROUPS

Treatment Group	Mean	S.D.
Male High	546.88	112.42
Female High	618.25	274.29
Female Low	568.37	127.69
Male Low	569.13	206.99

especially important in view of the fact that a high intimacy topic female had 29 blank segments. Additionally, other subjects had several blank segments. The data was subjected to a 2 x 2 analysis of variance. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 9.

TABLE 9
ADJUSTED ANALYSIS: BLANK SEGMENTS;
SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Total	1165.60	31	--	--	--
Intimacy	1.50	1	1.50	.03	n.s.
Gender	28.50	1	28.50	.70	n.s.
I x G	4.50	1	4.50	.11	n.s.
Error	1131.00	28	40.39	--	--

Although this appeared to be a fruitful undertaking, it, too, proved to be nonsignificant. Table 10 presents the means and standard deviations for the four treatment groups.

For further understanding of this particular analysis, Table 11 presents a time analysis.

TABLE 10

ADJUSTED ANALYSIS: BLANK SEGMENTS;
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE FOUR TREATMENT GROUPS

Treatment Group	Mean	S.D.
Male High	3.00	5.32
Female High	3.75	10.21
Female Low	1.13	.49
Male Low	5.60	5.60

TABLE 11

TIME ANALYSIS

Group	Minutes Available	Minutes Used	Minutes Not Used
Male High	40	35.5	4.5
Female High	40	35.0	5.0
Female Low	40	38.5	1.5
Male Low	40	37.0	3.0

TABLE 10

ADJUSTED ANALYSIS: BLANK SEGMENTS;
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE FOUR TREATMENT GROUPS

Treatment Group	Mean	S.D.
Male High	3.00	5.32
Female High	3.75	10.21
Female Low	1.13	.49
Male Low	2.25	5.60

TABLE 11

TIME ANALYSIS

Group	Minutes Available	Minutes Used	Minutes Not Used
Male High	40	35.5	4.5
Female High	40	35.0	5.0
Female Low	40	38.5	1.5
Male Low	40	37.0	3.0

Although there were blank segments in each of the four treatment groups, which using Haymes (1971) scale would mean fewer total group points, each group used at least 87.5 percent of the total time available.

Summary Statement

In an attempt to explain why the analysis of variance failed to reject the null hypotheses, several reanalyses were conducted. Haymes (1971) rating scale was re-evaluated to eliminate the zero score which was felt might effect the calculations of the analysis of variance. Additionally, total quantity of verbalization was examined following a procedure designed by Iker and Harway (1965). Reticence to self-disclose was inspected by examining the number of segments where there were no words at all. A time analysis was used to support the examination of reticence. Each of these analyses proved to be nonsignificant and lend support to the conclusion drawn from the original analysis of variance that there is no significant difference between the way males and females disclose on the topics of school experience and dating experiences.

Conclusions from the experiment and recommendations for future research are presented in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study suggested that there are no significant differences in the way males and females disclose on the topics of school experiences and dating experiences. Thus, it would seem that Bandura's (1962) position is supported by the results of this study. Bandura (1962) had stated that subjects can give a verbal operant as long as it is within their verbal repertoire. Krasner (1965) had argued that subjects might have difficulty expressing ambiguous responses. An explanation as to why the study did not achieve significant results and recommendations for future research are presented in the following sections.

Conclusions

There are several possible reasons why the study did not achieve significant results. They are offered here for consideration. First, there was not enough variability in the scores of the treatment groups. It would appear that doubling the sample size for each cell from that of the pilot study reduces the variability between groups. As opposed to the pilot study which had sizeable differences between group

scores, the major study did not. Both male and female subjects were willing to talk about school experiences as well as dating experiences. In the pilot study, male subjects were not as willing to disclose on the intimate topic as were the other three groups.

A second possibility is that "School Experiences" might not be the low intimacy topic Jourard (1971) states that it is. As opposed to the pilot study, the data for the major study was collected the week before final examinations. A subject who had experienced pressure throughout his or her academic career to achieve might not view school experiences as a non-threatening low intimacy topic.

A third possibility is that dating experience does not have the same meaning that it has had in years past. It is possible due to new ideas about morality, increased affluence, and other variables that dating is as common place as buying groceries. It could be that college students do not date, in the traditional sense of the word, but rather have more involved relationships. After having read the typed monologues, it is reasonable to assume that sexual experiences as a topic, as opposed to dating experiences, might have changed the content of the monologues. Several of the high intimacy disclosures, both male and female, contained sexually related material.

A fourth possibility has to do with the rating of self-disclosure statements. Although Haymes (1971) scale has achieved good results in other studies, including the pilot

study, it is only a three point scale. Perhaps with a larger selection of scores, ratings could be more refined.

A fifth possibility is that there is, in fact, no significant difference in the way males and females disclose on the intimate and nonintimate topics. The results of the major study might be accurate. Moreover, the pilot study, which achieved significance, might have been a chance situation. There is always that possibility that what appears to be an accurate assessment of a situation is, in fact, a happenstance which would appear only in a few instances. In the case of the pilot study, where significance was achieved at the .025 level, it is reasonable to assume that the results were one of these chance situations.

Recommendations

There are three recommendations that would appear relevant. First, research should investigate topical differences. As stated in the conclusions, "Sexual Experiences" might have been treated differently by the subjects than was "Dating Experiences." Additionally, "School Experiences" might not be a low intimacy topic for all subjects. "Hobbies," for example, might prove to be even less threatening a topic than was "School Experiences" (Jourard, 1971). Corollary to this, other researchers might examine gender differences with a number of different high and low disclosure topics.

The second recommendation concerns rating procedures. Studies should be done which compare different rating procedures

used on the same data. Haymes (1971) scale might produce different results if it were increased from a three point scale to a seven point scale. The expansion might make the scale more sensitive to self-disclosing statements of subjects. For example, a seven point rating scale could include: intimate disclosure high, intimate disclosure medium, intimate disclosure low, average disclosure, non-intimate disclosure high, non-intimate disclosure medium, and non-intimate disclosure low.

The third recommendation is that more behavioral research should be done on the demographic data as dependent variables. Race, religion, age, socio-economic background, to name a few, should be studied as possible factors in self-disclosing behavior. These demographic variables have been studied using the questionnaire technique. Questionnaires have been challenged for their inconsistent reliability and validity data. Just as researchers are provided with more information when intimacy and gender are examined under an actual disclosing situation, the same should be true of other demographic variables. Once it is known how these variables affect self-disclosure, then the different combinations of variables should be studied in an actual disclosing situation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, J.C. When does exchanging personal information constitute "Self-disclosure"? Psychological Reports, 1974, 35, 195-198.
- Altman, I. and Haythorn, W. W. Interpersonal exchange in isolation. Sociometry, 1965, 28, 411-426.
- Bandura, A. Social learning through imitation. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1962.
- Brady, J. P. and Levitt, E. E. The scaleability of sexual experiences. Psychological Record, 1965, 15, 275-279.
- Brooks, L. Interactive effects of sex and status on self-disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 469-474.
- Buber, M. The knowledge of man. New York: Harper, 1965.
- Cozby, P. C. Self-disclosure: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 79, 73-91.
- Davis, J. D. and Sloan, M. L. The basis of interviewee matching of interviewer self-disclosure. British Journal of Social Clinical Psychology, 1974, 13, 359-367.

- Derlega, V. J. and Chaikin, A. L. Norms affecting self-disclosure in men and women. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 44, 376-380.
- Diamond, R. E. and Hellkamp, D. T. Race, sex ordinal position of birth, and self-disclosure in high school students. Psychological Reports, 1969, 25, 235-238.
- Ehrlich, J. J. and Graeven, D. B. Reciprocal self-disclosure in a dyad. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1971, 7, 389-400.
- Fenichel, O. The psychoanalytic theory of neurosis. New York: Norton, 1945.
- Fromm, E. The sane society. New York: Rinehart, 1955.
- Gaebelein, J.W. Self-disclosure among friends, acquaintances, and strangers. Psychological Reports, 1976, 38, 967-970.
- Goodstein, L. D. and Reinecker, V. M. Factors affecting self-disclosure: A literature review. Progress in Experimental Personality Research, 1974, 7, 49-77.
- Green, A. and Marlatt, G. Effects of instruction and modeling upon affective and descriptive verbalization. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1972, 80, 189-196.
- Hamsher, J. H. and Farina, A. Openness as a dimension of projective test responses. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 525-528.
- Haymes, M. Self-disclosure and the acquaintance process. In S.M. Jourard. Self-disclosure: An experimental analysis of the transparent self. New York: Wiley, 1971.

- Iker, H. P. and Harway, N. I. A computer approach toward the analysis of content. Behavioral Science, 1965, 10, 173-182.
- Jourard, S. M. Self-disclosure: An experimental analysis of the transparent self. New York: Wiley, 1971.
- Jourard, S. M. and Resnick, J. L. Some effects of self-disclosure among college women. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1970, 10, 84-93.
- Jourard, S. M. The transparent self. New York: Van Nostrand, 1964.
- Jourard, S. M. and Richman, P. Disclosure output and input in college students. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1963, 9, 141-148.
- Jourard, S. M. and Lasakow, P. Some factors in self-disclosure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 91-98.
- Kirk, R. E. Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral sciences. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1968.
- Krasner, L. Verbal conditioning and psychotherapy. In L. Krasner and L. Ulmann (Eds.). Research in behavioral modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Latimer, J. The gestalt therapy book. New York: Bantam Books, 1973.
- Lazarus, A. The "inner circle" strategy: Identifying crucial problems. In J. D. Krumboltz and C. E. Thoresen, Behavioral Counseling: Cases and Techniques. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.

- Leaman, D. R. The effects of modeling on self-disclosure.
(Doctoral dissertation, Ball State University) Ann Arbor,
Mich.: University Microfilms, 1976, No. 76-4575.
- Merbaum, M. and Lukens, H. Effects of instructions, elicitations, and reinforcements in the manipulation of affective verbal behavior. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 376-380.
- Minium, E. Statistical reasoning in psychology and education.
New York: Wiley, 1970.
- Mosher, D. L. The development and multitrait-multimethod matrix analysis of three measures of three aspects of guilt. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1966, 30, 25-29.
- Mowrer, O. H. The crisis in psychiatry and religion. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand-Reinholt, 1961.
- Panyard, C. M. Method to improve the reliability of the Jourard self-disclosing questionnaire. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 606.
- Plog, S. C. The disclosure of self in the United States and Germany. Journal of Social Psychology, 1965, 65, 193-203.
- Polansky, N. A. The concept of verbal accessibility. Smith College Studies in Social Work, 1965, 36, 1-46.
- Pope, B. and Siegman, A. W. Interviewer specificity and topical focus in relation to interviewee productivity. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1965, 4, 188-192.

- Post, B. J. The effectiveness of modeling, vicarious reinforcement, behavioral rehearsal and self-instruction in facilitating self-disclosure by pre-adolescent children (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1975, No. 75-12914.
- Rickers-Ovsiankina, M. S. Social accessibility in three age groups. Psychological Reports, 1956, 2, 283-294.
- Rogers, C. R. On becoming a person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
- Scheiderer, E. G. Effects of instructions and modeling in producing self-disclosure in the initial clinical interview. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1975, No. 75-11824.
- Stone, G. L. and Stebbins, L. W. Effects of differential pretraining on client self-disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 17-20.
- Stone, G. L. and Gotlib, L. Effect of instructions and modeling on self-disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 288-293.
- Switkin, L. R. Self-disclosure as a function of sex roles, experimenter-subject distance, sex of experimenter, and intimacy of topics. (Doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1974, No. 74-24148.

- Taylor, D. A. and Altman, I. Intimacy-scaled stimuli for use in studies of interpersonal relations. Psychological Reports, 1966, 19, 729-730.
- Vondracek, F. W. Behavioral measurement of self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1969, 25, 914.
- Webb, W. B. Contributions to the history of psychology: XXII. Sidney Marshall Jourard: 1926-1974. Psychological Reports, 1975, 36, 533-534.
- West, L. and Zingle, H. W. A self-disclosure inventory for adolescents. Psychological Reports, 1969, 24, 439-445.
- West, L. Sex differences in the exercise of circumspection in self-disclosure among adolescents. Psychological Reports, 1970, 26, 226.
- Wilson, M. N. and Rapport, J. Personal self-disclosure: expectancy and situational effects. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 901-908.
- Zeldow, P. B. Clinical judgement: a search for sex differences. Psychological Reports, 1975, 37, 1135-1142.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH VOLUNTEER PROGRAM

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH VOLUNTEER PROGRAM

1. Name _____ I.D. No. _____
(Last) (First) (Middle)
2. Local address: _____
(No. & Street) (City) (State) (Zip Code)
Telephone Number _____ Best time to reach me by phone
_____.
3. Major _____
4. Sex: F () M ()
5. Age: _____
6. Birth Order & Family Size: I am the _____ child of _____
children in my family.
7. Tuition Status: In State () Out-of-State ().
8. Marital Status: Single () Married () Divorced ()
Widowed ().
9. Number of Children: 0 () 1 () 2 () 3 ()
4 or more ().
10. Home Background: Urban () Suburban () Small town ()
Rural ().
11. Religious Preference: Protestant () Catholic ()
Other (Specify) _____ None ().
12. Race: Caucasion () Black () American Indian ()
Oriental () Other: (Specify) _____
13. Classification: Freshman () Sophomore () Junior ()
Senior () Masters () Prof. Cert. () Doctoral ()
14. Number of hours enrolled in this semester _____

15. For Course # _____ Section _____ Instructor _____

I understand the above information is for research purposes only. No identification of participating individuals will be made in any resulting reports: Volunteers will be accorded the full protection of APA professional standards of ethics. When contacted to participate I have the right to refuse without penalty. However, if I agree to participate and fail to do so I may be penalized. I further understand that completing this form does not guarantee that I will be selected to participate.

Signature

Date

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO VOLUNTEERS

LETTER TO VOLUNTEERS

To the Volunteers in the Self-disclosure Project:

Thank you very much for your cooperation in this dissertation project. This letter is intended to answer questions you might have about your participation in the experiment.

The experiment was designed to see if there was a significant difference between the way males and females disclosed information about two different topics: school experiences and dating experiences.

The results indicated that there were no significant differences. In other words, both males and females disclosed about the same amount as each other, and disclosed about the same amount of information on both of the topics of school experiences and dating experiences.

This experience, in which you have participated, can give you insight into graduate level projects. Should you decide to continue your education beyond the undergraduate degree, it is possible that you will be doing such a project yourself.

If you desire additional information about the project, please call Barbara Parker at 521-0325. Individual and group conferences can be arranged upon request. Once again, thank you for your participation in this experiment.

Sincerely,

Gale L. Joslin
Ph.D. Candidate

APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS TO SUBJECTS

INSTRUCTIONS TO SUBJECTS

The following instructions, patterned after those used by Green and Marlett (1972), were tape-recorded and played for each subject prior to his or her monologue:

"Your task is to talk for the next five minutes into the microphone which is attached to the tape recorder. Momentarily, you will be handed a card with a printed topic which is to be the basis of your monologue. Everything you say will be confidential and your name can not be identified with what you are about to say."

"Everyone talks about university students and what they are like but few people have actually tried to find out anything from the students themselves. We are interested in getting an idea of how students feel about certain areas which confront all of us. We thought the best way to find out how students feel about certain areas would be to ask them to talk about their feelings. Your instructions are to talk into the tape recorder for the next five minutes concerning how you feel about the topic which will be presented to you. When we say we want you to talk about how you feel concerning this area, this means we want you to concentrate on verbalizing your personal emotions, personal reactions, and personal responses concerning this area. In emphasizing your feelings and thoughts concerning this area, you might want to talk about your problems and satisfactions, your ups and downs, your elations and disappointments, your confidences in

relation to this area. Whatever your feelings concerning it your job is to talk about it in a subjective, spontaneous and personal manner."

"Often, there is a tendency in this type of situation to stray away from talking about how you subjectively feel into giving descriptions and impersonal opinions concerning the subject. We want to prevent you from doing this. We are not interested in how others feel, but in your own feelings and thoughts. The degree to which you want to explore specific or general feelings is left to you. The only thing we wish to emphasize is that you give vent to the subjective expression of your thoughts and feelings."

APPENDIX D

HAYMES TECHNIQUE FOR MEASURING
SELF-DISCLOSURE FROM TAPE-RECORDED
INTERVIEWS

HAYMES* TECHNIQUE FOR MEASURING
SELF-DISCLOSURE FROM TAPE-RECORDED
INTERVIEWS

Code and Scoring Manual for Self-Disclosure

Self-disclosure will include four major categories of response:

- (1) Expressions of emotion and emotional processes.
- (2) Expressions of need.
- (3) Expressions of fantasies, strivings, dreams, hopes.
- (4) Expressions of self-awareness.

Self-disclosure will specifically exclude opinions about objects other than self unless the person obviously intends the opinion to be saying something about himself. Since this experiment deals with the acquaintance process, it is only rarely that one comes across such inferential statements without their being followed up by a clarifying remark which is scorable under one of the categories below.

Although much self-disclosure of the types described below is stated in the first person singular, it is possible to make self-disclosing statements in the third person. Examples of both types are included below.

*From Haymes, M. Self-disclosure and the acquaintance process. In S.M. Jourard. Self-disclosure: An experimental analysis of the transparent self. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Scoring Procedure

A score of two points will be given to disclosures of the defined types when they are first person references.

A score of one point will be given to the disclosures of the same types when they are reflexive third person references. These statements in the third person in which the word "you" is an obvious substitution for saying "I."

Non-reflexive third person references, such as "people always. . .," in which the person is not really revealing any information about himself will not be scored.

For this experiment, ratings will be given for each 30 seconds of interaction. In any 30-second segment, only the score for the maximally disclosing statement will be used. In other words, if a person makes 1, 2, or 10 2-point disclosures in any 30-second segment his score is 2 points for that segment. This avoids inaccurately scoring for speech pattern repetitions. Similarly, if a person makes a 1-point statement, and a 2-point statement in the same 30-second segment, his score is 2 points for that segment.

Examples

(1) Expressions of emotions and emotional processes:

Irritation--"It really bugs me..." "You get peeved at..." "It makes me sick when..." "It drives me crazy..." Also references to be agitated, irritated, testy, etc.

Anger, rage, hostility, hate, bitterness, resentment--
"It gets me very angry when..." "You (I) just naturally hate

people like her."

Excitement, involvement, concern, etc.--"I get all caught up in..." "It gets to me..." "It gets me goin'" "I'm really close to my father." "I'm excited by..." Also the opposite of involvement. "I can't seem to get into the material." "Boredom is one of my big problems."

Sad, blue, apathetic, cheerless, depressed, grief, mournful, pensive, gloomy, etc.--"It depresses me when..." "I get blue frequently."

Happy, contented, delighted, feeling great, secure, feeling well (strong, confident, etc.), assured, pleased, jovial, elated, euphoric, merry--"I feel great when she..." "You really feel good when..." (Also the opposite of feeling well and strong, i.e., discussion of health problems, physical complaints, expression of general lack of the feeling of well being), expressions which have been leached of their emotional content are not scored.

(2) Expressions of needs, demands made upon others in contact with self: "I demand a great deal of attention." "I don't feel too motivated to do much of anything." "All I want is..." These will frequently be expressed in statement of self-awareness (see below).

(3) Expressions of self-awareness, internal forces, processes, capabilities, and/or the lack of them. "You (I) tell yourself that..." "I rationalize that by..." "That's one of my handicaps." "I don't panic easily." "I get mad at myself..." "I have the worst time writing." "It's not a natural

thing for me..." "It's easy for me to..." "It's really bad for me when I..." "I'm torn between..." "I'm not mature." "I'm not too hot at..." "I can't possibly integrate all that stuff." "You (I) adjust to things..." "I can think logically but math is impossible." "I identify with people who..." "I get very sentimental when..." "I'm a night-time person."

(4) Expressions of fantasies, hopes, strivings, long-range plans, etc. "I've wanted to be a doctor since I was five years old." "I frequently dream that I'm..." "I dream of the day when..."

Surprise, shock, astonishment, amazement. "She really shocked me terrifically with her openness." "I love being surprised."

Sorry, repentent, ashamed, guilty, etc. "I feel very guilty about..." "I always feel sorry when..."

Pride, self-esteem, feelings of fulfillment, self-confidence. "I felt good about what I did for her." "I've been feeling great lately."

Confused, perplexed, puzzles, cloudy, incoherent, disoriented, uncertain, etc. To be scored the statement must indicate some emotional disorientation or confusion. (i.e., "My math homework confuses me" is not scored.) "Situations like that puzzle the hell out of me." "I just don't know how I feel about it."

Anxious, tense, afraid, on-edge, overwrought, upset, distressed, worried, etc. "I get really tense in situations like this." "It worries me when..." "She scares me." "You

(I) get frightened when..."

Love, tenderness, affection, warmth, caring-for another,
passion, arousal (sexual), etc. "I loved her before she..."

"I was so hung up on her that I couldn't even..." (Colloquial).

APPENDIX E

PILOT STUDY

PILOT STUDY

Pilot Study Discussion and Results

An initial pilot study was conducted in order to provide justification for collecting data for exploring hypotheses concerning self-disclosure. A 2 x 2 analysis of variance was employed.

	High topic	Low topic
Female	4	4
Male	4	4

There were two factors of topic intimacy and two factors of gender. Male and female undergraduate students from the College of Education were used as subjects. Each subject was randomly assigned into one of the four treatment groups: (1) Male-High Intimacy Topic, (2) Male-Low Intimacy Topic, (3) Female-High Intimacy Topic, (4) Female-Low Intimacy Topic. Each subject recorded a five minute taped monologue on either a high intimacy topic (Dating Experiences) or a low intimacy topic (School Experiences). Each monologue was transformed into typescript and marked off into 30 segments, each 10 seconds in length, for rating its self-disclosure value according to Haymes Technique for Measuring Self-Disclosure from Tape-Recorded Interviews (1971). Two raters, who have

had extensive experience as psychotherapists and who were naive to the experiment, were trained to rate the typescripts. First, each was given a copy of Haymes Technique. After studying the technique, both raters and the writer discussed it and established what would be considered criterion responses for self-disclosure. Next, each rater was given 40 randomly selected, 10 second segments (10 segments from each treatment condition) which were chosen from the 16 typescript monologues. Each rated the segments which yielded an interrater reliability coefficient of .93.

Following this, each rated 8 randomly selected typescripts. The results of this second rating was subjected to a two way analysis of variance.

Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Total	1116	15			
Intimacy	272	1	272	8.63	.025
Gender	12	1	12	.38	NS
Intimacy x Gender	454	1	454	14.41	.005
Error	378	12	31.5	--	--

An examination of the summary table reveals significance was achieved at the .025 level for intimacy (topic difference) and for the interaction of intimacy and gender at the .005 level. With these statistical differences justification for

the dissertation study was established and a basis for making directional hypotheses was obtained. Thus it should be possible to reject the null hypotheses that intimacy and the interaction of intimacy and gender have no effect on self-disclosure.

A subsequent analysis of Simple Main Effects was applied in order to explore the effect of each of the factors in relation to the significant interaction obtained.

Analysis of the Simple Main Effects of Intimacy

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
I at G_m^{**}	435.12	1	435.12	13.81	.005
I at G_f^{**}	6.2	1	6.2	.20	NS
Error	--	12	31.5	--	--

**I at G_m (Intimacy at Male Gender)

*I at G_f (Intimacy at Female Gender)

Analysis of the Simple Main Effects of Gender

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
G at I_h^{**}	136.2	1	136.2	4.32	.10
G at I_l^*	45.2	1	45.2	1.43	NS
Error	--	12	31.5	--	--

**G at I_h (Gender at High Intimacy)

*G at I_l (Gender at Low Intimacy)

Inspection of the analysis makes it possible to discover that the real effect of the interaction concerned males. Topical differences had a significant effect on male self-disclosure. Moreover, examination of the means and standard deviations of the four treatment groups emphasizes that males disclosed more on the low intimacy topic of school experiences and had difficulty compared with the other three groups, disclosing on the high intimacy topic of dating experiences. However, females appeared to be equally willing to disclose on either topic as evidenced by a nonsignificant F ratio in the analysis and by their treatment mean scores.

Means and Standard Deviations of
the Four Treatment Groups

Treatment Group	Mean	S.D.
Male High	30.25	4.79
Female High	38.50	5.80
Female Low	40.25	11.44
Male Low	45.00	5.77

Combining all four treatment groups yields a grand mean of 38.5 with a standard deviation of 8.63 and a standard error of 2.26. With a maximum of 60 points, it is apparent, as a group, the males who had the high disclosure topic scored well below the mean while the other three groups scored at the mean

or above it. All of the four group means were well below the maximum total which indicates there was limited self-disclosure from both males and females.

An examination of the individual segments of the four treatment groups reveals a nonsignificant trend. The highest quantitative self-disclosure occurs in the first 1/3 of the segments. The second highest numerical self-disclosure occurs in the last 1/3 of the segments. The middle 1/3 of the segments is slightly below the other two sections in self-disclosure.

The same trend occurs if the monologues are divided into six sections of five segments each. The first two sections are numerically greater than the last two sections and the fifth and sixth sections are larger than the third and fourth.

Stated in another way, the subjects disclosed more at the beginning of their monologues than at any other time during the experiment. Disclosure decreased during the middle of the experiment and increased again during the final portion of the monologue.

A global rating, utilizing a 7 point scale, was completed on each subject in the four treatment groups. The scale included the following: (1) no disclosure; (2) minimal disclosure; (3) below average disclosure; (4) average disclosure; (5) above average disclosure; (6) almost complete disclosure; (7) complete disclosure. This scale was completed by a person who has had considerable experience as a psychotherapist. She was completely naive to the purpose and design of the study. The purpose of doing a global rating was to help determine the

overall disclosure value of each subject's disclosure compared to every other subject's disclosure. The results of the rating, cited below, are generally consistent with the rating completed by the two raters using Haymes Scale. Males were rated as having disclosed less than females. Taking the mean score of each group, both male groups were rated as being below average in self-disclosure while both female groups were rated average to above average in disclosure.

Neither males nor females were given a rating of 1 or 7. According to this rating, every subject disclosed something while no subject disclosed completely.

Global Rating (N=16)

Disclosure Rating	# of Subjects	Males	Females
1. No disclosure	0	0	0
2. Minimal disclosure	2	1	1
3. Below average disclosure	5	5	0
4. Average disclosure	2	0	2
5. Above average disclosure	4	2	2
6. Almost complete disclosure	3	0	3
7. Complete disclosure	0	0	0