

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road Ann Arbor MI 48106 1346 USA
313-761-4700 800-521-0600

Order Number 8914790

**The effects of initial self-disclosure on attributions of
trustworthiness and liking**

Sidorowicz, Laura Susan, Ph.D.

City University of New York, 1988

Copyright ©1988 by Sidorowicz, Laura Susan. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

THE EFFECTS OF INITIAL SELF-DISCLOSURE ON
ATTRIBUTIONS OF TRUSTWORTHINESS AND LIKING

by

LAURA S. SIDOROWICZ

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate
Faculty in Psychology in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1988

1988

Laura S. Sidorowicz

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

7/13/83
Date

Irwin Katz
Chair of Examining Committee

July 18, 1988
Date

Herbert D. Saltzman
Executive Officer

Dr. Irwin Katz

Dr. Florence Denmark

Dr. Vita Rabinowitz

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

THE EFFECTS OF INITIAL SELF-DISCLOSURE ON ATTRIBUTIONS OF TRUSTWORTHINESS AND LIKING

by

Laura S. Sidorowicz

Adviser: Professor Irwin Katz

This dissertation examined the effects resulting from an initial act of self-disclosure performed by a stranger. Specifically, the study sought to determine how the source of disclosure affects white women's responses to a person described in terms of trust and liking. The two basic aims of this research were (a) to show that self-disclosure elicits a perception of trustworthiness and (b) to demonstrate that this effect is not mediated by increased interpersonal attraction. Two hundred and eighty subjects were given a written transcript to read while listening to a tape recording of a woman disclosing information about herself (self-disclosure) or another person (non-disclosure). In addition, the information varied in terms of valence, either positive or negative information was revealed. After the information was presented, subjects rated the target person on measures of trustworthiness and liking. The main findings suggest that trustworthiness for the

target person increased significantly as a direct function of self-disclosure and that liking for an individual was primarily determined by the positive or negative quality of the description. Three pilot studies also provided partial support for these findings. The results showed strong evidence which suggests that the determinants of trustworthiness and liking are basically independent of each other. The responses of males and minority subjects indicated, however, that the attribution of trustworthiness and the impact of disclosure is, in part, influenced by gender and race. The main findings have important implications for impression management and person perception. From the discloser's perspective, the study indicates that the images of trustworthiness and liking can be intentionally manufactured by the speaker based on the type of information a person provides about oneself. From the perspective of the listener, one must be conscious of the propensity to attribute trustworthiness and liking as a function of what a person says about him/herself.

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my deep appreciation and sincere gratitude to my mentor, Dr. Irwin Katz. His guidance, patience, helpful suggestions and constructive criticisms throughout my years as a graduate student have been invaluable to me. Irwin showed interest and enthusiasm in my research ideas early in my graduate career. He nurtured my abilities and potential. I am honored and proud to have been his student.

I would like to thank Dr. Florence Denmark for her help and warmth during my undergraduate and graduate school years. Her encouragement and steadfast support have always been appreciated. Florence has been a role model for me, and I have learned a great deal from our relationship.

I would also like to thank Dr. Vita Rabinowitz. Vita's enthusiasm, support and constant encouragement made working with her on my dissertation a pleasure. Her critical comments and keen insight at the initial stage of my dissertation were a great help.

My outside readers, Dr. Kay Deaux and Dr. Michele Paludi, deserve a sincere and warm thank you. Kay and Michele were both responsive and supportive of my

research. Their participation served to make my doctoral defense a truly memorable learning experience.

I am deeply indebted and grateful to all members of my doctoral committee. Thank you all.

I wish to thank my Mom and Dad for their love, support, encouragement, and constant concern. Throughout my years as a graduate student, their main question was, "When is this going to be over?" I am overjoyed that I finally have the answer. I also extend my appreciation to my sisters, Pamela and Lisa. I thank them for their love and friendship.

Most of all, I would like to thank Ray Toledo for his never-ending help, guidance and advice throughout my graduate career. Ray was always there for me and gave a helping hand in time of need. Happiness in life is hard to come by, and Ray has certainly given me more than my share. I thank him for all he has done. His thoughtfulness, kindness and generosity are truly unsurpassed. I am eternally grateful to him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Copyright page.....	ii
Approval page.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	vi
List of Tables.....	xii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement.....	1
Self-Disclosure Defined.....	2
The Significance of Self-Disclosure.....	3
Self-Disclosure and Interpersonal Relations..	4
Self-Disclosure and the Significance of Time.	5
Friendship and Trust as Determinants of Disclosure.....	6
Initial Disclosure.....	9
Person Perception and Self-Disclosure.....	13
Reciprocity and Self-Disclosure.....	14
Theoretical Bases of Reciprocity.....	16
Trust.....	22
Attributional Analysis of Self-Disclosure....	27
Liking and Interpersonal Attraction.....	36
Comparison of Determinants of Perceived Trustworthiness and Liking.....	42
Hypotheses.....	48

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
2. PILOT STUDIES.....	50
Pilot Study 1	50
Pilot Study 2	55
Pilot Study 3	64
3. METHOD.....	75
Overview.....	75
Subjects.....	75
Independent Variables.....	76
Dependent Measures.....	77
Procedure.....	81
4. RESULTS.....	85
Manipulation Check.....	85
Tests of Hypotheses.....	89
White Female Sample.....	89
White Male Sample.....	97
Entire Sample.....	104
Summary of Results.....	114
5. DISCUSSION.....	117
Responses of White Females.....	118
Responses of White Males.....	125
Responses of Entire Sample.....	126
Methodological Issues.....	130

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Appendix A:	
Pilot 1 Low Self-Disclosure Scripts.....	139
Pilot 1 High Self-Disclosure Scripts.....	142
Appendix B:	
Pilot 2 Self-Disclosure Positive Valence Script.....	146
Pilot 2 Self-Disclosure Negative Valence Script.....	148
Pilot 2 Non-Disclosure Positive Valence Script.....	150
Pilot 2 Non-Disclosure Negative Valence Script.....	152
Appendix C:	
Pilot 3 Self-Disclosure Positive Valence Script.....	154
Pilot 3 Self-Disclosure Negative Valence Script.....	156
Pilot 3 Non-Disclosure Positive Valence Script.....	158
Pilot 3 Non-Disclosure Negative Valence Script.....	160
Appendix D:	
Main Study Self-Disclosure Positive Valence Script.....	162
Main Study Self-Disclosure Negative Valence Script.....	164
Main Study Non-Disclosure Positive Valence Script.....	166
Main Study Non-Disclosure Negative Valence Script.....	168
Appendix E:	
Trustworthiness Scale.....	170

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Appendix F: Liking Scale for Pilot 1.....	172
Appendix G: Main Study Liking Scale.....	174
Appendix H: Loneliness Scale.....	176
Flirtation Scale.....	177
Appendix I: Manipulation Checks.....	178
Appendix J: Main Study Cover Sheets.....	180
References.....	182

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1:	Summary of Analysis of Variance for Effects of Self-Disclosure on the Perception of Trustworthiness.....	52
Table 2:	Summary of Analysis of Variance for Effects of Self-Disclosure on the Subsequent Perception of Liking.....	53
Table 3:	Summary of Effects of Self-Disclosure, Valence, and Medium on the Perception of Trustworthiness.....	60
Table 4:	Summary of Effects of Self-Disclosure, Valence, and Medium on the Perception of Liking.....	61
Table 5:	Summary of Effects of Self-Disclosure, Valence, and Medium on the Perception of Trustworthiness.....	67
Table 6:	Means and Standard Deviations of Trustworthiness Scores by Disclosure and Valence Conditions.....	68
Table 7:	Summary of Effects of Self-Disclosure, Valence, and Medium on the Perception of Liking.....	69
Table 8:	Means and Standard Deviations of Liking Scores by Disclosure and Valence Conditions.....	70
Table 9:	Means and Standard Deviations of Trustworthiness Scores for White Female Subjects by Disclosure and Valence Conditions.....	90
Table 10:	Summary of Analysis of Variance of Effects of Disclosure and Valence on Perceived Trustworthiness for White Female Subjects.....	91

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 11: Means and Standard Deviations of Liking Scores for White Female Subjects by Disclosure and Valence Conditions.....	92
Table 12: Summary of Effects of Self-Disclosure and Valence on the Perception of Liking for White Female Subjects.....	94
Table 13: Correlations between Trustworthiness, Liking, Loneliness, Intimacy, and Positiveness Scores by Condition for White Female Subjects.....	96
Table 14: Means and Standard Deviations of Trustworthiness Scores for White Male Subjects by Disclosure and Valence Conditions.....	98
Table 15: Summary of Analysis of Variance of Effects of Disclosure and Valence on Perceived Trustworthiness for White Male Subjects.....	100
Table 16: Means and Standard Deviations of Liking Scores for White Male Subjects by Disclosure and Valence Conditions.....	101
Table 17: Summary of Analysis of Effects of Disclosure and Valence on Liking for White Male Subjects.....	102
Table 18: Correlations between Trustworthiness, Liking, Loneliness, Intimacy, and Positiveness Scores by Condition for White Male Subjects.....	103
Table 19: The Effects of Self-Disclosure and Valence on the Perception of Trustworthiness for the Entire Sample..	106
Table 20: Means and Standard Deviations of Trustworthiness Scores by Race and Disclosure.....	107

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 21: Summary of Analysis of Variance of Effects of Self-Disclosure and Valence on the Perception of Liking for the Entire Sample.....	109
Table 22: Means and Standard Deviations of Liking Scores by Gender and Valence	110
Table 23: Correlations between Trustworthiness, Liking, Loneliness, Intimacy, and Positiveness Scores by Condition for the Entire Sample.....	112

1. INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

The proposed study will seek to better understand some of the initial effects resulting from a single act of self-disclosure performed by a stranger. Specifically, the study will seek to determine how the source of disclosure (self provided information vs. information provided by another person) and the valence of disclosure (positive vs. negative information) affects how an observer responds to the person described in terms of trust and liking.

One of the most reliable findings in the disclosure literature is that self-disclosure tends to be reciprocated (Taylor and Belgrave, 1986; Gaelick, Bodenhausen and Wyer, 1985; Cohn and Strassberg, 1983; Hendrick, 1981; Ehrlich and Graeven, 1971; Jourard and Jaffee, 1970; Chittick and Himmelstein, 1967). A number of theories have been proposed to account for the reciprocity effects of self-disclosure (Lynn, 1978; Altman and Taylor, 1973; Cosby, 1972; Levinger and Snoeck, 1972; Jourard, 1971; Worthy, Gary and Kahn, 1969; Thibaut and Kelley, 1959). The current research is concerned with two alternative explanations associated with the reciprocity effect. It has been

suggested that a listener reciprocates a disclosure because the listener develops either greater trust or greater liking for the speaker after witnessing a speaker's initial disclosure (Rubin, 1975). As a result of either increased trust or liking for the speaker, the observer is more willing to assume the inherent risk involved in expressing his or her own intimacies.

Self-Disclosure Defined

Self-disclosure refers to the act of voluntarily revealing personal information about oneself to another individual in which the content of the message is not, otherwise, readily available to the listener (Jourard, 1971; 1968). Altman and Haythorne (1965) maintain that the "breadth" (i.e. sheer quantity of personal information provided) is less important than "depth" or quality of the information (i.e. the level of intimacy engendered) in defining self-disclosure. In other words, a communication in order to be considered a disclosure must seem to have emotional significance for the speaker. In addition, the act of disclosure must suggest a sense of intimacy or selectivity on the part of the speaker. The fact that the construct has been largely defined in subjective terms has proven to be one of the underlying problems in research on

self-disclosure (Goodstein and Reinecker, 1974). Since the focus of attention will be on the response of the observers rather than the speaker, the primary concern of this proposed research is not whether the stimulus message actually represents self-disclosure but whether the communication is perceived as such by the audience.

The Significance of Self-Disclosure

Self-disclosure is an essential and crucial element in personal adjustment (Cozby, 1973; Jourard, 1971; 1968). Many theorists have emphasized the importance of revealing one's feelings and thoughts to significant others in order to facilitate personality growth and fulfillment (Jourard, 1971; Rogers, 1961; Maslow, 1954). Self-disclosure is one means by which an individual is able to establish contact with his or her real self (Jourard, 1971; Rogers, 1971; Horney, 1950; Cooley, 1922). Jourard (1971) maintains that self-disclosure is a primary means by which an individual can come to know himself or herself.

In addition to promoting personal growth, self-disclosure may serve as an important strategy for coping with stress. Many theorists have argued that the inability to self disclose or reveal oneself to others can lead to neurotic conditions (Mowrer, 1971; Freud as

cited in Hall, 1954). Correspondently, these same theorists believed psychological difficulties could be greatly offset by revealing oneself to other people. As a result, Jourard (1971; 1968), considers self-disclosure a panacea for many neurotic conditions. Although Jourard's position may be extreme, there is no denying that self-disclosure is a prominent feature of the therapeutic process and may alleviate some symptoms.

Self-Disclosure and Interpersonal Relations

The effects of self-disclosure extend beyond the individual and influence interpersonal relations. Both Horney (1950) and Fromm (1955) indicate that the inability to disclose is the primary reason for the development of what they saw as the current trend of alienation in modern social life.

Self-disclosure represents a social process which requires at least two interactants. The scope of the research in this area, however, has been rather limited. Most studies have been devoted to exploring self-disclosure as a dependent variable in which the object has been to identify factors, such as timing, respect and gender, which would serve to promote the occurrence of self-disclosure. This singular focus suggests that many researchers assumed that

self-disclosure is an index of greater intimacy and stronger social bonds. Given this premise, any factor that would increase self-disclosure should also serve to facilitate and fortify interpersonal relations (e.g. Jourard, 1971).

There is research which is consistent with the notion that self-disclosure and social bonds are related (Franzoi, Davis & Young, 1985; Hecht, Sereno & Spitzberg, 1984; Jourard, 1971; Taylor, 1968; Jourard and Lasakow, 1958). The problem is that these studies involved college roommates or family and relatives. Apparently, self-disclosure seems to occur more frequently and strongly in relationships that have withstood the test of time.

Self Disclosure and the Significance of Time

The duration of a relationship seems to be an important factor in determining the degree of self-disclosure. The critical issue is how the time variable is to be interpreted. Time has no independent psychosocial significance; it, therefore, cannot be considered the direct cause of self-disclosure. It is assumed that a moderately high level of self-disclosure involves a slow protractive process which necessitates the elapse of time. The question is whether the

underlying process represents simple acquaintanceship or the development of interpersonal trust. Although friendship and trust are not mutually exclusive, they can exist relatively independent of one another.

Friendship and Trust as Determinants of Disclosure

There is always a danger associated with self-disclosure because it serves to increase the speaker's vulnerability. For the sake of psychological safety, the speaker is motivated to disclose only when s/he feels the information will be kept confidential and that the listener will be an accepting and non-judgmental confidant. Since the potential for imprudent self-disclosure exists, people probably exhibit a great deal of caution and selectivity as to who and what they reveal about themselves. Trust, thus, would seem a more relevant consideration than friendship in determining whether a person will self-disclose. Many studies which claim to demonstrate that self-disclosure and social bonding are related (e.g. Franzoi et al., 1985; Hecht et al., 1984; Jourard, 1971; Taylor, 1968; Jourard and Lasakow, 1958) are subject to a confounding in which the perception of personal safety and friendship covaried and the procedures do not allow for the assessment of the relative contributions of trust or friendship in

promoting self-disclosure. By examining instances in which friendship and the perception of safety are not simultaneously present, something may be learned about the nature and dynamics involved in self-disclosure.

The most obvious examples of self-disclosure not based on friendship are those which result from social protocol and role function. Consider the occupations of psychologists, priests, doctors and lawyers. All are subject to a great amount of disclosure by their clients. Although the possibility exists of friendship with one's lawyer, the client-professional relationship can work in spite of the lack of such an emotional bond. In therapy, friendship may actually undermine the disclosure process. What serves to encourage disclosure in these situations are professional standards, ethics and sometimes laws which ensure the confidentiality of the client.

There is ample anecdotal evidence (Weber, 1986; Simmel, 1950) which indicates that on occasion people direct high levels of self-disclosure to complete and often uninterested strangers (e.g. fellow traveler). Rubin (1975) has labeled the phenomenon "the passing stranger effect." It is unlikely that such brief acquaintanceships between strangers will constitute as

strong a social bond as that shared between long time friends and family members. Yet, highly intimate disclosures often occur between total strangers during an airplane flight. One can only attribute self-disclosure under such circumstances to the liberating effects of anonymity (Zimbardo, 1970). The belief one will never meet the individual again provides the speaker with the necessary assurance that revealing oneself poses no danger that the information will be used against them in the future or become public knowledge in one's social network.

Thus, disclosure is known to occur, once the issue of the speaker's safety has been resolved, despite the lack of a strong social bond. The converse, however, does not seem to be true. It is difficult to imagine a relationship that includes self-disclosure in which the personal security of the speaker is not also implied. Friendship alone, however, even when it involves a lengthy relationship does not automatically guarantee self-disclosure. There are cases in which one might enjoy the company of a particular person and interact with the individual on a regular basis and, yet, the relationship can still lack a certain degree of shared intimacy (e.g. neighbors, co-workers).

The speaker's concern with personal security refers to the issue of trust. It is not an easy matter to predict how the listener will react to new information about the speaker or what the person will do with that knowledge. These are the basic concerns that a speaker must contend with before deciding whether to reveal some aspect of his/her private self. Some disclosures can have a profound negative impact on the listener. Thus, it would seem that trust (i.e. the speaker's security) is a major consideration in determining whether a given individual chooses to disclose to another. Situational factors may serve to promote disclosure by allaying the speaker's fears about revealing him or herself. The fact that self-disclosure occurs in the absence of friendship, however, may suggest that the mere presence of self-disclosure should not be used as an unqualified index of social bonding.

Initial Disclosure

The self-disclosure process is considered an important impetus to further intimacy (Jourard, 1971; 1968). The literature, however, has never addressed the issue of first or "initial" disclosure. The first incident of self-disclosure is important because it serves to thrust the interacting parties into a new

dimension of intimacy. Thus, the first act of disclosure begins the process by which relative strangers start to learn about each other.

The initial act of self-disclosure is assumed to be spontaneous. Which of the two interacting parties will disclose first or at what point during the encounter it will occur seems a matter of random chance. This perception is due largely to the fact that the disclosure literature has relied primarily on a structural rather than functional description of self-disclosure. The first act of self-disclosure to a stranger may serve as a type of litmus test in which the speaker considers whether the other person will like him or her. Social rejection is a highly aversive experience. It is for that reason that most people usually hide behind a "mask" in social situations (Goffman, 1959). Most individuals have a strong need for social approval (Berscheid and Walster, 1969). To minimize the potential for disapproval, individuals tend to like and want to be with those who like them in return (Backman and Secord, 1959).

Individuals are often brought together by superficial reasons or circumstances (e.g. physical attractiveness and propinquity). Whether a strong and

more permanent relationship will develop depends on many factors. One such factor may be the inferred acceptance by the other. In the guise of an apparent overture of friendship, the initial disclosure provides an excellent opportunity for the speaker to assess whether he or she can be his or her true self. One of the worst things any listener can do following an initial disclosure by the speaker would be to respond in an evaluative or condescending manner.

The act of first disclosure, therefore, is not a matter of random chance. The interactant who most strongly desires to establish or maintain contact with the other individual is the one most likely to engage in first disclosure. This prediction is based on general principles of cost analysis (Homans, 1961) which would suggest a positive relationship between potential rewards and assumed risks. For example, in a romantic liaison each partner may resist admitting that they love the other person. If the disclosure is unreciprocated, it would create a relationship based on dependency in which the person who loves least would have greater control (Worchel, 1979). In spite of this risk, the person who wants the relationship most will eventually reveal his or her feelings first.

This paper is primarily concerned with disclosure between strangers, however, the reasons for disclosing to a friend will be considered briefly. Normally, the issue of social acceptance would not account for self-disclosure among friends. There are exceptions though, as when an individual confesses to a serious transgression which might jeopardize the relationship. Based on personal experience, self-disclosure to friends often bears a striking resemblance to a request for advice. For example, "I'm not happy at work; I have not received a promotion or raise in two years." There is often an implied question in such disclosures. This form of self-disclosure seems to be related to Festinger's (1954) theory of social comparison. It is assumed that people may want to evaluate their perceptions, reactions or plans. Sometimes the speaker may benefit a great deal from simply articulating the problem. Other times, advice might be actually sought. In the latter case, the disclosure source would be most receptive to advice if the listener were to reassure the speaker through a reciprocated disclosure that he or she had a similar experience and survived.

The dynamics which determine who will disclose first operate in a similar manner as those associated

with disclosure between people who do not know each other. Quite simply, the person with the greater problem, under more stress, or having the greater need for advice or some form of release will opt to disclose first. An individual may be under so much pressure that they will disclose to the first person who will listen. Actually, this may be a more prudent strategy than it might appear. The speaker may gain from a release of tension, receive valuable advice, and, best of all, there is little danger that the information will be circulated among the speaker's friends and acquaintances.

Person Perception and Self-Disclosure

The dyad represents not only the simplest example of social bonding, but also constitutes the prototype and cornerstone of all other forms of social relationships (Berger and Luckman, 1966). The psycho-social literature has proposed and investigated a number of constructs in order to account for the progression of a dyad from an impersonal encounter between strangers to the formation of a relatively permanent social bond, such as that found between close friends. The self-disclosure literature would seem to suggest that such shared intimacies may prove to be an

invaluable initial orienting factor in determining the course that a particular interaction will assume.

The listener in an encounter may draw potentially erroneous inferences concerning the speaker's character simply because the individual appears willing to reveal personal information about him/herself. In turn, these perceptual effects may influence the listener's interpersonal orientation to the speaker and have highly significant behavioral consequences. Despite its potential importance, the impact of self-disclosure on person perception has not been adequately researched. What has been investigated, however, are the factors which are responsible for increasing self-disclosure. The literature on this issue, therefore, may provide insight as to how self-disclosure influences person perception.

Reciprocity and Self-Disclosure

The single most powerful predictor of self-disclosure is its exhibition by the other interactant in the encounter. Altman and Haythorne (1965) maintain that self-disclosure develops gradually and follows a reciprocal pattern. The reciprocal nature of self-disclosure is one of the most replicable results in the area of self-disclosure research. These findings

hold true in laboratory studies (Derlega, Harris & Chaikin, 1973; Cozby, 1972; Savicki, 1972; Schneider and Eustis, 1972; Worthy, et al., 1969) and in field studies (Rubin, 1975, 1974) where subjects were not aware that they were participants in an experiment. In general, subjects tend to disclose to a greater degree to an individual who has revealed more about him/herself.

"Disclosure does, indeed, seem to beget disclosure. Our ability to understand the causal nature of this relationship has been impaired by the paucity of research evidence that pinpoints determinants of the process." (Chelune et al., 1979, p.140). In attempting to account for the development of self-disclosure in a dyad, it is not enough to cite mutual influence and the presence of a correlation between the self-disclosure of the two persons. One must attempt to identify the underlying mechanisms which are responsible for the correlation. Research, however, has merely focused on the specific behavioral phenomenon of reciprocal disclosure without examining the mediating perceptual processes. These processes, namely, trust and liking will be explored in this dissertation research.

Theoretical Bases of Reciprocity

Since self-disclosure may be an important impetus to further intimacy and interpersonal relationships, a discussion of the theories underlying reciprocity seems relevant. The literature indicates that there are four major theories that attempt to account for the fact that self-disclosure breeds disclosure. They are as follows: ambiguity-reduction theory, equitable-exchange theory, interpersonal trust, and social attraction. The first pair of proposed interpretations have received the most attention. The proposed research will focus on issues related to the last two explanations. Although all the theories have achieved some support in the literature on self-disclosure, the results are far from unequivocal.

The first theory, the ambiguity-reduction explanation, would suggest that the subsequent display of self-disclosure by a recipient of someone's initial disclosure is due to modeling and social imitation (Rubin, 1975; 1973). It is argued that when a person begins an encounter, s/he may be unsure as to how much to reveal about him/herself. New relationships are often characterized by ambiguity. The other interactant through either behavioral examples or situational cues

may reduce such ambiguities by defining the situation and what constitutes an appropriate level of self-disclosure. Assuming that the listener finds the level of self-disclosure acceptable, the person should then respond in kind.

Rubin (1975) compared the impact of modeling on disclosure reciprocity at an airport. Individuals waiting at an airport were approached by confederates who asked them to provide a sample of their handwriting. The individuals who served as subjects were asked to copy a message by the confederate which involved low, intermediate, and high disclosure. Subjects in the condition which involved high disclosure by the confederate made subsequent greater disclosures than subjects who were provided with low disclosure messages. The result can be interpreted as supporting the ambiguity-reduction hypothesis; however, other researchers have failed to find support for the theory (Jones and Archer, 1976; Derlega, Harris & Chaikin, 1973).

Research by Davis and Skinner (1974) argues against the ambiguity-reduction hypothesis. Their study involved three groups. In the first group a confederate disclosed directly to a subject. The second group

involved subjects listening to the confederate's disclosure on tape. In the third group, subjects were not exposed to any form of disclosure. In terms of the ambiguity-reduction hypothesis either the live interaction or the tape situation would have provided the subject with the necessary information about the appropriate level of self-disclosure. However, only the subjects who were disclosed to in a live situation, responded with disclosures of their own. The results seem to suggest that reciprocity of disclosure stems from some felt obligation, which they referred to as demand characteristics (Orne, 1962) rather than ambiguity-reduction.

One serious criticism of the ambiguity-reduction theory is that modeling should serve to elicit reciprocal disclosure of comparable depth even when the initial disclosure is of an extreme form. Research, however, seems to indicate that high levels of self-disclosure are not typically reciprocated (Lynn, 1978). In addition, the ambiguity-reduction theory seems limited to social situations involving strangers. A theory, if it is to prove adequate, must explain self-disclosure not only between strangers but also between friends. It must account for those conditions

under which self-disclosure is not reciprocated. The ambiguity-reduction theory fails to meet these standards.

The equity-exchange theory represents an alternative explanation of the reciprocal self-disclosure effect. It currently enjoys the greatest acceptance. This explanation is based on the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) which assumes that the participants in a social interaction are obligated to exchange comparable behaviors in order to maintain a sense of equity. The theory states that each single act of self-disclosure upsets the delicate balance in the dyadic relationship. The resulting inequity serves to create a dependent relationship, an aversive social situation. Reciprocal self-disclosure, motivated by a desire to reduce tension, functions to re-establish a sense of parity (Adams, 1965). The equity-exchange theory has been supported by several studies in which it has been demonstrated that the effect is independent of interpersonal attraction (Lynn, 1978; Jones and Archer, 1976; Derlega, Wolmer & Furman, 1973; Ehrlich and Graeven, 1971).

One particular problem associated with research on the equity issue is the objective assessment of the

corresponding sets of self-disclosure. In order to be consistent with the theory, an act of self-disclosure must not only be reciprocated, it has to reflect approximately the same level of intimacy or depth as that exhibited by the other participant. It is questionable whether the research findings that have been interpreted as supportive of the exchange theory actually satisfy this condition. For example, Lynn (1978) reported that true reciprocity of disclosure did not occur in his research. Subjects failed to match the level of intimacy of the confederate and instead increased the breadth rather than the depth of their subsequent disclosures. Yet, the findings were interpreted as supportive of the equity-exchange theory.

The viability of the equity-exchange theory is undermined to some extent by several factors. Research, for example, indicates that reciprocal exchange of disclosure typically breaks down when excessive levels of self-disclosure are introduced into the encounter by one of the participants. In addition, Derlega, Wilson and Chaikin (1976) found that subjects matched the initial disclosure of strangers when they reciprocated, but when the initial disclosure was made by a friend, subjects responded with low disclosure regardless of the

intimacy level of the friend's disclosure. The most serious criticism of the equity-exchange theory interpretation is that it is a product of circular reasoning. The norm of reciprocity is inferred from the act of self-disclosure; the obligation is then used to account for the very behavior from which it was deduced. Unless other independent means are used to verify the existence of the norm, the equity-exchange theory should only be considered in the absence of other viable alternative explanations. Until explanations for the reciprocity effect based on trust and liking have proven unfounded, the equity interpretation remains a theory of last resort.

A final observation concerning the equity-exchange theory focuses on the self perception of the discloser. Although the factors responsible for reciprocal disclosure may not be readily accessible through personal reflection, the following should be considered. It is unlikely that individuals if asked to articulate the reason for engaging in reciprocal self-disclosure would make reference to explanations such as "a need to reduce tension," "a felt obligation," or "a desire for equity of exchange," perceptions which are commensurate with equity-exchange theory and the norm of reciprocity.

It is more likely that in attempting to account for their own disclosure, they would appeal to such explanations as interpersonal attraction and trust. Although the equity-exchange theory is the explanation most generally accepted, this fact should not blind one to its flaws or deter the search for a more appropriate and complete interpretation of the phenomenon.

Trust

The two previously discussed theories have serious shortcomings. A third explanation which has been proposed to account for the reciprocal disclosure effect maintains that interpersonal trust serves as a critical mediating factor (Rubin, 1973). It is assumed that in the dyadic encounter the initial act of self-disclosure serves to create an air of trust which in turn serves to promote subsequent disclosure. This premise has not received adequate or sufficient attention. That is, research has failed to examine that having been disclosed to will serve to automatically create the impression that the speaker is trustworthy. Until that is accomplished, the second premise which is that the perception of the speaker as trustworthy is the proximal cause of the listener's reciprocation of disclosure cannot be verified. The primary focus of this

dissertation is to demonstrate that the mere act of disclosure serves to strengthen the perception that the speaker is trustworthy.

The ability to trust and be trusted seems to be an important aspect of everyday social life (Rotter, 1971; Wrightsman, 1964). Yet, no single definition has ever been embraced by researchers. The various definitions can be classified under three broad categories (Worchel, 1979). Trust has been interpreted: a) as an enduring personality trait of the listener (i.e. willingness to trust another), b) as an inferred characteristic of the speaker (i.e. trustworthiness), and c) in terms of an operational definition. The definitions of trust that are essentially operational and tend to rely on the behavior of a person in a situation which involves potential risk seem to be the most appropriate in accounting for the assumed relationship between initial disclosure and the perception of the speaker as trustworthy.

There are various operational definitions of trust. For example, Zand (1972) views trust as "actions which increase one's vulnerability to another whose behavior is not under one's control in a situation in which the

penalty one suffers, if the other abuses the vulnerability, is Wrightsman, 1964). Yet, no single definition has ever been embraced by researchers. The various definitions can be classified under three broad categories (Worchel, 1979). Trust has been interpreted: a) as an enduring personality trait of the listener (i.e. willingness to trust another), b) as an inferred characteristic of the speaker (i.e. trustworthiness), and c) in terms of an operational definition. The definitions of trust that are essentially operational and tend to rely on the behavior of a person in a situation which involves potential risk seem to be the most appropriate in accounting for the assumed relationship between initial disclosure and the perception of the speaker as trustworthy.

There are various operational definitions of trust. For example, Zand (1972) views trust as "actions which increase one's vulnerability to another whose behavior is not under one's control in a situation in which the penalty one suffers, if the other abuses the vulnerability, is greater than the benefits one gains if the other does not abuse the vulnerability" (p.230). Schlenker, Helm and Tedeschi (1973) provide a more rigorous specification of the situational elements

necessary to infer interpersonal trust. They maintain that the following elements must be present:

a) a risky situation, that is, one in which the consequences of a given action are unknown, not predetermined or held fixed; b) the presence of environmental cues which serve to suggest the probability of a potential outcome (e.g. verbal reassurances by the other interactant); and c) the exhibition of some behavior which serves to demonstrate that the person is relying on the information received from the environment.

Situations involving reciprocated disclosure tend to exhibit features identical to those stipulated above. First, choosing to disclose places the individual in a risky situation. Revealing intimacies about oneself can prove imprudent. Engaging in self-disclosure can increase the vulnerability of the speaker to potential physical or psychological discomfort (Jourard, 1968). The discloser has no way of controlling how the listener will respond or what the person will do with the information. Second, the initial disclosure by the other interactant can serve as an assurance, implicit

though it may be, that the person can be trusted and the information will be held in confidence.

The experimental literature on trust suggests that those who trust others tend to be perceived as trustworthy (Stack, 1978). The initial act of disclosure can be interpreted as an indication that the speaker trusts the listener and, therefore, the speaker can or deserves to be trusted. Finally, the listener by reciprocating the disclosure demonstrates that s/he has accepted the implicit assurance of the initial speaker and has acted upon the information in such a way as to increase his or her own vulnerability. The critical element is that the listener interprets the speaker's initial disclosure as an indication that the speaker trusts the recipient. (Theoretically, if one were to strictly adhere to the requirements necessary to define trust as outlined by Schlenker, Helm and Tedeschi (1973), an initial disclosure should not necessarily be interpreted as an indication of trust, because prior to initial disclosure, the listener has not indicated either explicitly or implicitly what he or she will do following the disclosure by the speaker.)

Attributional Analysis of Self-Disclosure

Although an initial disclosure does not imply that the speaker trusts the listener, the behavior is often interpreted as an indication of trustworthiness by the observer. Self-disclosure, within an ongoing dyadic encounter, is highly susceptible to attribution bias. An attributional analysis of self-disclosure should help to show why an initial disclosure will tend to be perceived as a demonstration of trustworthiness.

In an encounter involving recent acquaintances, the first act of self-disclosure marks a substantial milestone in an unfolding relationship (Chelune et al., 1979). Given the significance of the initial disclosure, the recipient will probably attempt to account for the speaker's behavior. The first step is to rule out environmental constraints. The second step is to disqualify alternative personal dispositions which may compete with the trustworthiness interpretation (Shaver, 1975). In order for a trustworthiness inference to be associated with the speaker, the listener must presume that the behavior is primarily the result of an internal disposition. The individual's behavior, therefore, must be seen as freely chosen (Pruitt, 1965). Attribution theory (Kelley, 1967; Jones

and Davis, 1965) would suggest that one could not ascribe the tendency to trust others to an individual when the person's actions appear to be under the coercive influence of another. For example, confessions, like coerced apologies, say very little about the internal disposition of the actor. When behavior is prescribed by role or seems forced by circumstances beyond the control of the individual, the observer has no basis by which to assess the actor's intent which is a necessary prerequisite in any trustworthiness attribution (Pruitt, 1965).

The concept of "correspondence", the extent that an act and the underlying attribution are similarly described by the inference, serves to promote a dispositional rather than situational attribution for initial disclosure (Jones and Davis, 1965). For an act to be considered indicative of trust, it must be perceived as intrinsically motivated (Pruitt, 1965). By its very nature, any recognized instance of self-disclosure must be perceived as stemming from dispositional rather than environmental factors. Self-disclosure is, after all, defined as the voluntary and intentional act of revealing oneself to others (Jourard, 1968).

Once environmental factors have been ruled out, the observers must distinguish between several possible dispositional inferences which might account for the speaker's initial display of disclosure. Realistically, the trust interpretation should be discounted in direct proportion to the number of alternative explanations (Shaver, 1975). In order to ensure the validity of any attribution, including those associated with trust, the perceiver would have to make a number of observations, under various conditions, using different observers (Kelley, 1967). Accuracy notwithstanding, the listener will attempt to ascribe some level of trustworthiness to the speaker based solely on a single observation, which is the initial disclosure. There are four basic characteristics which I associate with initial disclosure that may serve to generate assumptions about the speaker. These characteristics may also bias the inference process. They are primacy, vulnerability, intimacy and appropriateness. These characteristics represent what I feel are criteria which the observer uses to make inferences about the disclosing speaker.

The initial disclosure will have a primacy effect which should remain relatively constant over the remainder of the encounter. The first self-disclosure

in a conversation should represent a significant departure from what has occurred previously in the encounter. Following the initial disclosure, the listener, who may have been debating whether or not to disclose first, is now acutely aware that the speaker has chosen to assume the risk. As the recipient rather than the source of the disclosure, there may be a tendency to exaggerate the degree of trust associated with the speaker in order to account for the individual's willingness to disclose too soon in the relationship.

According to Shaver (1975), the inferences which result from observing an actor will depend in part on whether the behavior reflects personal choice or was predetermined by factors beyond the individual's control. Correspondent inference theory tends to focus on the assessment of the positive and negative noncommon implications of the various behavioral alternatives available to the actor (Jones and Davis, 1965). An inherent attribute of self-disclosure is that it increases the vulnerability of the speaker. Since aversive conditions are usually avoided, the observer will probably assume and attempt to identify the pragmatic goals that must serve to offset the negative

implications of vulnerability. Archer and Berg (1978) found that reciprocity of disclosure did not occur when increases in intimacy were perceived as a threat to the subject's freedom to withhold embarrassing information. As in failed attempts at ingratiation, if the initial disclosure is viewed as a ploy intended to manipulate the listener, the results may be a boomerang effect in which the speaker will be less trusted. Tedeschi, Schlenker and Bonoma (1973) maintain that a speaker will appear most trustworthy when the individual is acting contrary to his/her own best interest. Similarly, assuming the listener cannot attribute the disclosure to a malevolent motive, the appearance of subjecting oneself to increased vulnerability by disclosing should lead to the assumption that the speaker is acting out of some internal predilection to trust the other individual.

Self-disclosure, in effect, involves the sharing of secrets about oneself with another individual. This aspect of self-disclosure serves to create the impression of intimacy. From the observer's perspective, since self-disclosure automatically excludes coercion, the most appealing explanation for the speaker's behavior is that the person must trust the

listener. The greater the degree of perceived intimacy, the greater the probability that the listener will assume that the speaker trusts him or her. Two factors encourage the inference of high intimacy: a) the sensitivity of the information which relates directly to the issue of vulnerability and b) selectivity. The concept of selectivity refers to the number of people that the speaker has or is willing to share the information with. As selectivity decreases so does the appearance of intimacy which, in turn, hinders an individual's ability to perceive the speaker as trustworthy. Paradoxical as it may seem in a disclosure situation, behavior indicative of trust may prevent the perception of trustworthiness. In other words, the fact that a very trusting nature would lead a person to disclose to many people will ultimately undermine the observer's ability to perceive the speaker as trustworthy.

The final aspect of an initial disclosure to be discussed is the appropriateness of the disclosure. The observer will infer the speaker is trusting and, therefore, deserving of trust through a process of elimination in which alternative explanations are abandoned. Two alternative explanations which would

preclude trusting the speaker are that the individual is irrational or indiscreet. An important index of speaker stability or prudence is the depth of initial disclosure. The listener is cognizant of the nature of the relationship that exists between him/her and the speaker. They are essentially strangers. The appearance that the disclosure is excessive or unwarranted serves to suggest that the speaker does not discriminate in terms of what the person reveals or to whom the information is given. The perception of the speaker as trusting presupposes intent. If the person cannot control what he or she says, the attribution that the speaker is trusting will not be inferred. Results from a number of studies seem to be consistent with the premise underlying the notion of appropriateness of initial disclosure (Cozby, 1973; Jourard, 1971).

It would seem that the tendency for observers to perceive the speaker as having a trusting disposition stems primarily from a series of attributional errors associated with initial disclosure. The faulty inference process seems to result from the tendency of listeners to associate four basic characteristics with initial self-disclosure (i.e. primacy, vulnerability, intimacy and appropriateness). The fact that a single

act can generate such a complex but nonetheless erroneous attribution process is a testament to the apparent significance which people attach to self-disclosure.

Although the terms trusting and trustworthiness refer to separate concepts, most people view these characteristics as inseparable (Worchel, 1979; Stack, 1978). The perception of the speaker as trusting of others seems to lead directly to the conclusion that the individual must also be trustworthy. As a result, the listener will be less hesitant about reciprocating disclosure.

Research has not devoted significant attention to the trust interpretation in spite of the fact that it is not subject to any of the previously discussed criticisms. Unlike the norm of reciprocity, the perception of trust can be independently confirmed. Neither the ambiguity-reduction theory nor equity-exchange theory could account for the absence of listener reciprocity when the initial disclosure by the speaker seemed extremely high. The breakdown in the reciprocity effect can be explained by assuming that differential degrees of trustworthiness will be attributed to the speaker by different observers under

varying circumstances. The greater the perception of trustworthiness associated with the speaker, the more likely it is that the listener will reciprocate extreme forms of initial disclosure. There is a catch-22, however, because the extremeness of the initial disclosure may undermine the ability to perceive the speaker as trusting or trustworthy. S/he may seem imprudent or irrational. Whether a recipient of initial disclosure chooses to reciprocate or not can be interpreted as reflecting an interactant's desire for consistency between the perception of trustworthiness and the amount of personal information to be revealed.

The distinction between equity theory and the trust interpretation may seem somewhat ambiguous. In fact, the trust theory is a variant of the equity-exchange explanation. The fundamental difference between the two interpretations rests on the inferred cause of self-disclosure and reciprocity. The equity-exchange theory is motivated to establish parity between the two interactants' disclosures. It seems to suggest that the listener's reciprocated disclosure is elicited. S/he may never have intended to disclose but now is responding to a particular "pull" in the situation. The trust interpretation differs in that it recognizes that

self-disclosure emanates from within the individual. It is not the result of external pressures to maintain parity. The trust interpretation maintains that given an individual wants to disclose, he or she may do so with reasonable security. In other words, the perception of trustworthiness may function as a facilitator for self-disclosure.

Liking and Interpersonal Attraction

The final theory to be considered maintains that disclosure reciprocity is a function of interpersonal attraction (Rubin, 1973; Worthy, Gary and Kahn, 1969). The underlying premise of the theory is that the receiver of a self-disclosure sees the intimacy level of the disclosure as an indication of the sender's trust and liking (McAllister, 1980). Rubin (1973) suggests that the inference of being trusted by another person will be perceived as a social reward which will lead the recipient to like the sender. The greater the intimacy implied by the disclosure, the more socially rewarded the receiver will feel and, as a consequence, the more the individual will like the person disclosing (Jones and Archer, 1976). In terms of the attraction theory, liking for the disclosure source is the primary determinant for the subsequent reciprocation of

disclosure (McAllister, 1980; Rubin, 1973; Worthy et al., 1969).

Before proceeding with a discussion of the research on the attraction theory, the term attraction should be put into proper perspective. Levinger and Snoeck (1972) maintain that "it appears necessary to distinguish a subject's like or dislike of a relative stranger from other forms of attraction that indicate deep affection between people or satisfaction with an ongoing association" (p. 2). Initial disclosures tend to occur relatively early in a relationship when the interactants are nearly strangers. Under these circumstances, the attraction should be taken to be relatively superficial. As a consequence, initial interpersonal attraction or liking is defined as a tentative, slightly diffused, but nonetheless pervasive emotional response derived from the global evaluation of the individual as good or bad (Worchel, 1979).

A number of correlational studies have demonstrated an association between liking in long-term relationships and self-disclosure (Cozby, 1972; Jourard et al., 1968, 1958; Levinger and Senn, 1967; Altman and Haythorne, 1965). Since these studies are correlational they do not provide the necessary evidence for a causal

inference. In addition, the results from these studies, which focus on long-term relationships, contribute little to our understanding of the effect of first disclosure on person perception.

Experimental studies have attempted to clarify the relationship between liking and disclosure. In a study by Worthy et al. (1969) female subjects were allowed to get acquainted in a pre-experimental session. Self-disclosure was measured by a willingness to answer a series of questions that varied from low intimacy (e.g. favorite television programs) to high intimacy (sexual experiences). At the end of the study, the subjects completed an attraction questionnaire. The findings showed that subjects disclosed more information about themselves to those they liked the most. Certner (1973) found similar results using male subjects. Boylan (1968) and Swensen and Nelson (1967) also obtained results consistent with the disclosure-attraction hypothesis.

Not all studies have obtained results consistent with the attraction theory. A study by Derlega, Harris and Chaikin (1973) involved two conditions of high disclosure and one of low disclosure. In the high disclosure conditions, the female confederate described

how she had been caught by her mother while engaged in sex. These two conditions differed in that one referred to a heterosexual encounter and the other referred to a homosexual encounter. As the researchers hypothesized, the person making the homosexual disclosure was liked less than the one making the heterosexual disclosure. However, subjects disclosed more in the two high disclosure conditions than in the low disclosure condition, independent of whether the subject liked or disliked the speaker. The results suggest that liking does not moderate the relationship between a speaker's initial disclosure and the listener's subsequent disclosure. Other studies have also obtained results which cast doubt on the attraction interpretation (Derlega, Wolmer & Furman, 1973; Cozby, 1971; Ehrlich and Graeven, 1971). Even personalism of a disclosure did not influence liking in a study by Jones and Archer (1976). It did not make a difference in the amount of liking whether the initial disclosure by the speaker was perceived as intended specifically and only for the listener.

The inconsistencies in the research on attraction theory may be due to either faulty design and methodological problems or the failure to appreciate the

involvement of other factors moderating the effect of liking. In terms of the former, Taylor and Hinds (1985) and Gould, Brounstein and Taylor (1978) were able to find the predicted results after modifying the personalistic disclosure manipulation. In terms of the latter, many researchers have criticized the self-disclosure literature for ignoring the temporal aspects of the self-disclosure process and how it affects liking (Chelune, 1979; Wortman, 1976; Altman and Taylor, 1973; Jones and Gordon, 1972). Other researchers have focused on the relation between shared similarity between the interactants and disclosure. Support for a similarity effect on disclosure has been found by Brockner and Swap (1976); Taylor and Altman (1975); Altman and Taylor (1973); and Taylor, Altman and Sorrentino (1969).

Proponents of the attraction theory would interpret the similarity manipulation in the above studies as a means of inducing liking for an individual, which would then lead the observer to self-disclose. Although research has shown a relationship between attraction and similarity (Bryne, 1971), this does not mean that the results are not subject to alternative interpretations. One explanation is that perceived similarity leads the

observer to trust the other person. Kanter (1977) believes that in situations of interdependence where there are no objective means of assessing the other person's trustworthiness, people often rely on the perception of similarity. Thus, the studies on similarity and disclosure are consistent with both the trust and attraction interpretations.

The interpersonal attraction interpretation of reciprocated disclosure has advantages. First, it is not subject to a criticism of circular reasoning since interpersonal attraction can be assessed independent of the display of self-disclosure. Second, the breakdown of reciprocal disclosure at the extreme levels can be accounted for as a function of varying degrees of liking. The proponents of the attraction theory, however, are attempting to account for the long-term pattern of reciprocity generally observed in interpersonal relationships. The validity of the attraction theory is not necessarily dependent on whether the initial disclosure will induce greater liking for the speaker. It is quite possible that the attraction effect does not stem from the speaker's first disclosure. Instead, liking for the speaker may arise as a direct result of the listener's own subsequent

disclosure behavior. For example, attraction for the speaker may be induced through a self-attribution process on the part of the listener (Bem, 1972), in which listeners interpret their own reciprocating disclosure as an indication that they must like the speaker.

Comparison of Determinants of Perceived Trustworthiness and Liking

It is proposed that perceived trustworthiness is influenced by first disclosure, whereas interpersonal attraction is relatively independent of first disclosure. The rationale for this statement is as follows.

First, in an initial encounter between two strangers there are probably more factors which have an impact on social attraction and liking than there are factors which influence the perception of trustworthiness. For example, propinquity and physical appearance may be strong initial determinants of one interactant's attraction for the other participant (Berscheid and Walster, 1978). That is, prior to any actual initial disclosure by the speaker, the listener may already be aware of how much s/he likes the speaker. In that light, the potential influence of initial

disclosure on liking is expected to be minimal. However, the factors alluded to above do not seem to have a direct bearing on the perception of a person as trustworthy. The initial act of self-disclosure may have a relatively stronger impact on the perception of trustworthiness because it may represent the first time in the encounter that the issue of trust is salient. If the factors which determine liking for a stranger are not necessarily the same factors which influence perceived trustworthiness, then liking and perceived trustworthiness do not always have to exhibit a positive correlation.

Second, the listener will be cognizant that there is no social bond or relationship between him/herself and the speaker because the two interactants are strangers. There is, therefore, no basis to assume that the speaker's action is motivated by affection or liking for the listener. The listener will attempt to account for the disclosure of the speaker through some other means. Barring the perception of an ulterior motive, the disclosure recipient will be forced to infer that the speaker must trust him or her. Interestingly enough, people may seem very willing to accept a liking interpretation for their own self-disclosure, but may

resist appealing to the same explanation to account for the disclosure of other people. The hesitancy is understandable. People tend to assume that those who like us will act in our own best interest. If we make such an attribution about a stranger too quickly, it may prove unwarranted and dangerous. This should lead the recipient of an initial disclosure to trust the speaker but not necessarily to like him or her.

The perception of the self-discloser as trusting others seems to lead directly to the attribution that the speaker must also be trustworthy. This inference seems to be the result of an attributional bias based on everyday experience. A listener assumes that a person who is open, frank and nonsecretive about him or herself and willing to trust others by self-disclosing is also likely to be trustworthy. A number of researchers on interpersonal trust seem to suggest that there is a positive relationship between trusting others and trustworthiness (Lebra, 1984; Rotter, 1980; Stack, 1978; Schlenker, Helm & Tedeschi, 1973). The converse of this relationship seems more obvious. People find it difficult to trust individuals who are unwilling to trust others (Stack, 1978).

It is also proposed that the positive or negative content of the information initially communicated about a person will influence liking of the person but not perceived trustworthiness. The work of Asch (1946), Kelley (1950), and others serve to demonstrate the import of descriptions in influencing the person perception process. In general, a person who is described in moderately positive terms tends to be liked more than a person who is described in negative terms. This is, in part, due to implicit personality theory which suggests that given a few pieces of information, people tend to form consistent characterizations of others (Schneider, 1973).

The proposition that valence and trustworthiness are not related seems to violate the precepts of balance theory (Heider, 1958). That is, if the valence manipulation results in increasing social attraction for an individual, then there should also be a tendency to perceive the person as trustworthy, since this constitutes another positive attribute. Although this propensity may be quite strong if little other information is available on which to draw an inference, it may be irrelevant when combined with other data. Stack (1978) notes that under certain circumstances an

honest face will not suffice to determine whether a stranger is trustworthy; "His attractiveness does not change, but some indication of his ... reliability and the risk involved for the ... [observer] will become factors relevant to trusting or mistrusting the [individual]" (p. 593). Thus, the relationship between valence and trustworthiness is probably strongest in a paper-and-pencil situation in which an erroneous attribution of trustworthiness presents no risk or danger to the observer. The relationship between valence and trustworthiness would probably be weakest when an error in perception represents an inherent threat to the observer, such as when deciding whether to let a stranger enter your home to use the phone.

The present research may be described as a paper-and-pencil study and, therefore, one might expect a positive relationship between valence and trustworthiness. This relationship, however, is very much dependent on how trustworthiness is assessed. If on the one hand, a subject is simply asked to rate the stimulus person on a general measure of trustworthiness (e.g. indicate how trustworthy is this person) one is apt to find a positive relationship between valence and trustworthiness. On the other hand, if differential

risk to the observer is incorporated into the trustworthiness measure (e.g do you trust this person enough to lend him or her five dollars; do you trust this person enough to lend him or her your brand new car; etc.) the relationship between valence and trustworthiness should not materialize.

If as argued, the relationship between trust and valence is dependent on how trustworthiness is assessed, than a rationale for choosing a risk-dependent trustworthiness measure must be provided. The trustworthiness scale which is used in this research was developed based in part on Zand's (1972) view of trust. He states that trust is an action which serves to increase one's vulnerability to another person whose behavior is not under one's control and in which the truster is likely to suffer a penalty if the assessment is incorrect. Consistent with this perspective, the trustworthiness items used in this research were written to be subject relevant with clearly defined levels of risk. The observer was not simply being asked to indicate whether a stimulus person was trustworthy enough to be lent five dollars or a car, but whether the subject, him or herself, was willing to accept such a risk. Without the notion of self-relevant risk to the

evaluator, I do not believe that the trustworthiness concept has any meaning. Since in this study the subjects were asked to assess the trustworthiness of the stimulus person, no relationship between the social attractiveness manipulation and trustworthiness was anticipated.

Hypotheses

The focus of this paper is on the effect of initial disclosure. Based on the research previously discussed, the following hypotheses are proposed.

Hypothesis 1

A target person will be perceived as more trustworthy if personal information is initially self-disclosed than if the same information about the target is disclosed by someone else.

Hypothesis 2

The positive or negative content of the information initially provided about a target person will have no impact on the perception of the target's trustworthiness.

Hypothesis 3

If the content of the initial information about a target person is positive, the person will be liked more than if the content is negative.

Hypothesis 4

The source of the information initially provided about the target person will have no effect on liking for the person.

2. PILOT STUDIES

Pilot Study 1

A series of pilot studies was undertaken to determine whether there was a relationship between self-disclosure, trustworthiness and liking. The original pilot study (Sidorowicz, 1984) was part of an independent study project which sought to determine whether trustworthiness or liking for a speaker would increase following self-disclosure. The study involved subjects observing a videotape of an actor disclosing to another individual. The stimulus material consisted of a conversation between two women friends. In the high disclosure condition the stimulus person was heard describing a recent and somewhat painful experience she had in which she lost her wallet. The episode had caused her to seriously question whether her boy friend did, in fact, care for her. The low disclosure condition involved a light-hearted description of her experience going to the movies over the weekend with her boy friend (See Appendix A for the transcripts, Pp. 138-145).

The subjects were given an opportunity to rate how much they trusted and liked the speaker before and after the disclosure manipulation (see Appendix E, Pp. 170-171, and Appendix F, Pp. 172-173 for the scales). A

comparison of the pre-scores between conditions showed that there was a significant difference between the two groups on the pre-manipulation trustworthiness scores ($t = -2.38, df = 54, p < .05$). The mean for the high self-disclosure group was 72.9 and the mean for the low self-disclosure group was 61.9. No difference was observed across conditions in terms of pre-liking scores. Separate covariant analyses were performed on the two dependent measures of trustworthiness and liking.

In the first covariant analysis the degree of self-disclosure was the independent variable, the post manipulation trustworthiness score was the dependent measure, and the effects of the trustworthiness pre-scores were controlled. A summary of the results is presented in Table 1. The results showed a highly significant main effect for the amount of self-disclosure $F(1, 55) = 28.8, p < .01$. Higher trust scores were associated with the high self-disclosure condition.

Table 1
Summary of Analysis of Variance for Effects of Self-
Disclosure on the Perception of Trustworthiness

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	<u>df</u>	Mean Square	<u>F</u>
<u>Covariate</u>				
Pretrust Scores	17320.64	1	17320.64	75.17*
<u>Main Effect</u>				
Self-disclosure	6643.10	1	6643.10	28.82*
Explained	23963.74	2	11981.87	51.99*
Residual	12215.01	53	230.47	
Total	36178.75	55	657.80	

* $p < .01$

The second covariant analysis assessed the impact of the level of disclosure on subsequent post-ratings of liking for the speaker, while controlling for the effects of liking pre-scores. The findings are summarized in Table 2. There was a significantly lower degree of liking associated with high disclosure $F(1, 55) = 13.3, p < .01$.

Table 2

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Effects of Self-Disclosure on the Subsequent Perception of Liking

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
<u>Covariate</u>				
Preliking Scores	1438.17	1	1438.17	4.11*
<u>Main Effect</u>				
Self-disclosure	4662.94	1	4662.94	13.32**
Explained	6101.11	22	3050.56	8.7 **
Residual	18560.16	53	350.19	
Total	24661.27	55	448.39	

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

The findings showed that trust for the speaker increased as the level of disclosure increased, but liking for the speaker decreased. Although the pattern

of results provided support for the assumption that initial disclosure leads the listener to trust the speaker, these findings also suggest that trustworthiness and liking are inversely related. To confirm this, correlations between the two dependent measures were performed within each condition. The results showed that trustworthiness and liking scores were negatively related.

The inverse relationship between liking and self-disclosure is highly inconsistent with the attraction theory which maintains that greater liking should result from observing a person disclose. The failure to observe an increase in liking may be attributed to the unique quality of the disclosure which served as a stimulus in the study. Admittedly, it involved a somewhat negative or depressing theme. However, that by itself should not undermine the significance of the results. Most disclosures involve revealing negative information or stigmas about oneself (Chelune, 1979). The findings may, in fact, lend support to the proposed premise that the very act of self-disclosure serves to promote trustworthiness but that the valence content of the disclosure serves to determine whether the speaker will be liked or disliked.

The pilot study involved only one independent variable which was self-disclosure. The negative relationship between liking and trustworthiness was not anticipated. The lack of an independent manipulation for attraction meant that the assumption that trustworthiness and liking were independent within an initial disclosure situation could not be adequately tested.

Pilot Study 2

A second pilot study was conducted to test the post hoc interpretations of the results obtained in the original study. As in the previous study, it was hypothesized that the perception that a speaker was trustworthy would be positively associated with the speaker's display of self-disclosure. Predictions concerning liking and the relationship between liking and trustworthiness, however, were modified. In the second pilot study, it was hypothesized that liking for the speaker would vary directly with the positive or negative content of what was said by the speaker. In addition, the act of self-disclosure was not expected to increase the observer's liking for the speaker; nor was the positive or negative content of the message expected

to have any significant impact on the observer's tendency to trust the speaker.

The second study differed from the original pilot in three ways. First, the operational definition of self-disclosure was changed. Second, the new study did not use videotape material. Finally, the study attempted to compare the impact of two methods of stimulus presentation (transcript vs. audiotape). See Appendix B for transcripts (Pp. 146-153).

In the original pilot study, disclosure was manipulated by varying the intimacy level of the speaker's script. The speaker was considered to be self-disclosing if the intimacy level was high, and the individual was considered not to be disclosing if the intimacy level was low. One major problem with this manipulation of disclosure was that it was somewhat ambiguous. Except for unrealistically extreme examples, which were avoided in the study, clear distinctions between what constitutes self-disclosure and what does not are often difficult. The unexpected results in the previous study may have resulted from such a problem. An additional problem with the original operational definition for disclosure was that disclosure is frequently associated with intimacy; it is the

willingness to reveal oneself that is the critical factor.

In the second pilot study, self-disclosure was more objectively defined by focusing on the source of the information. Self-disclosure was viewed as the willful act of providing information about oneself to another. Non-disclosure was defined as information about a given individual provided by a second party. Since the manipulation centered on the issue of perspective, it meant that identical information could be provided in the disclosure and non-disclosure conditions thereby controlling for the effect of intimacy.

A decision was made not to use videotape in the second pilot study. It was felt that visual cues might serve to obscure the effect of self-disclosure. In particular, there was the possibility that the physical attractiveness of the speaker may have somehow produced the negative relationships between self-disclosure and liking and trustworthiness and liking. Two alternative means of stimulus presentation were considered, audiotape and written transcripts. Since the disclosure literature did not provide any information as to which would be the most appropriate method, or medium, of

stimulus presentation, this was also examined in the study.

As in the previous pilot, the subjects were told that the study was investigating impression formation. The study involved 181 subjects. The stimulus material was introduced as an excerpt from a conversation between two women who were getting acquainted with one another as part of a psychology experiment. One of the women described either herself or an acquaintance (disclosure manipulation). The relationship between the woman and whom she was speaking about was not clearly defined. In the transcript the woman said the following, "I have been asked to talk about Diane. I really do not know what to say. Well, I'll try to discuss her and her interests as best as I can." However, when the speaker described Diane, a great amount of information was revealed which may have given the impression that the person was actually a close friend and not a mere acquaintance. The descriptions were either positive or negative (valence manipulation). In the positive description, hobbies, dating a special boyfriend, and meeting new people were the main focus; whereas, in the negative description, hobbies, flirting and a compulsion to date in order to avoid loneliness were the major

themes. After exposure to the stimulus material, the subjects were directed to complete the trustworthiness and liking scales. Each subject was exposed to a single combination of the three independent variables, hence the study involved a 2 (disclosure) X 2 (valence) X 2 (medium) factorial design.

A 2(disclosure) x 2(valence) x 2(medium) analysis of variance was conducted to evaluate the impact of disclosure, valence and medium on the trustworthiness scores of subjects. A summary of the results are presented in Table 3. A main effect was observed for the disclosure manipulation, $F(1,180) = 11.34, p < .01$. Although a main effect for disclosure was anticipated, the pattern of results was the opposite of what had been predicted. Greater trustworthiness was associated with the non-disclosure condition (i.e. the stimulus person who was described by a second party) than with the actual disclosure condition ($M_s = 107.48$ and 96.94 respectively). No main effect was obtained for either valence or medium, and no interactions were found.

Table 3
Summary of Effects of Self-Disclosure, Valence, and
Medium on the Perception of Trustworthiness

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
<u>Main Effects</u>	5330.64	3	1776.88	4.23*
Self-disclosure	4768.56	1	4768.56	11.34*
Valence	118.22	1	118.22	0.28
Medium	208.72	1	208.72	0.50
<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	975.19	3	325.06	0.77
Discl x Valence	0.58	1	0.59	0.00
Discl x Medium	479.39	1	479.39	1.14
Valence x Medium	523.01	1	523.01	1.24
<u>3-Way Interaction</u>	420.18	1	420.18	0.99
Explained	6726.06	7	960.87	2.28
Residual	72747.75	173	420.51	
Total	79473.81	180	441.52	

* $p < .01$

A second 2 x 2 x 2 analysis of variance was performed on liking scores to examine the effects of disclosure, valence and medium. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Summary of Effects of Self-Disclosure,
Valence, and Medium on the Perception of Liking

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
<u>Main Effects</u>	1615.56	3	538.52	5.25**
Self-disclosure	139.01	1	139.01	1.36
Valence	1437.13	1	1437.13	14.00**
Medium	0.18	1	0.18	0.00
<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	105.87	3	35.29	0.34
Discl x Valence	0.60	1	0.60	0.00
Discl x Medium	7.78	1	7.78	0.08
Valence x Medium	97.86	1	97.86	0.96
<u>3-Way Interaction</u>	214.93	1	214.93	2.10
Explained	1936.36	2	276.62	2.70*
Residual	17727.23	173	102.47	
Total	19663.58	180	109.24	

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

The most important finding was a main effect for valence on the liking scale, $F(1,180) = 14.0$, $p < .01$. As predicted, the positive content condition had a higher mean liking score ($M = 60.08$) than the negative content condition ($M = 54.37$). There were no other significant main effects or interactions. As anticipated, the disclosure manipulation had no significant influence on the liking scores of subjects. The results also demonstrated that the medium of stimulus presentation had no appreciable effect on whether subjects liked the stimulus person.

The data from the second pilot were encouraging. The results provided support for the assumption that liking was primarily a function of the content of the message (positive vs. negative), and that perceived trustworthiness was a function of disclosure. This does not mean that trustworthiness and liking scores were independent. In fact, an overall significant positive relationship was found between trustworthiness and liking scores ($r = +.74$; $p < .01$). Comparable positive correlations were found when the relationship between the two dependent measures were examined within each of the six conditions. This pattern differed from

the previous pilot study in which trustworthiness and liking scores exhibited a negative relationship.

What was discouraging about the results was the fact that greater trustworthiness was associated with the non-disclosure condition. Since the two conditions provided identical information about the stimulus person, it was difficult to understand why a subject would tend to trust an individual more simply because she was described by someone else rather than the person self-disclosing. One potential explanation for the effect was that the subjects misinterpreted the speaker's willingness to talk about someone else as a character reference or more accurately as a testimonial to the person being described. An analogy can be drawn between impression formation studies and the autokinetic effect (Sherif, 1935). Both are similar in that subjects are provided with minimum information from which they are to make a judgmental decision. The speaker in the non-disclosure condition was akin to the influence of the confederate in the Sherif study. That is, if the speaker was perceived as trusting the stimulus person, than the subject was also willing to trust the individual. Tentative support for this hypothesis was obtained by interviewing twelve new

subjects after being exposed to the non-disclosure condition. The subjects were asked why they trusted the person who was described. Many of the participants made reference to one basic theme. Their responses seemed to suggest that the speaker would not have been willing to describe the stimulus person unless the individual trusted her.

Pilot Study 3

A new study was conducted which attempted to re-test the four hypotheses examined in the second pilot study. The procedures and stimulus material were identical to those in the earlier study except for two slight modifications. The first involved dropping the medium of stimulus presentation. The results in the second study indicated that whether the subject heard an audiotape or read a transcript, it had no effect on the pattern of results. A decision was made to use transcripts which avoid possible confounding associated with racial or ethnic identification. The other change made in the new study was that the relationship between the speaker and the person she was describing was more clearly specified. In pilot study 2, the relationship between the two women was rather ambiguous, "I have been asked to talk about Diane. I really do not know what to

say. Well, I'll try to discuss her and her interests as best as I can." In pilot study 3, the relationship between the two women was made salient and clear, "Diane is someone in my class at school." It was thought that such a specification would avoid the presumed testimonial interpretation which was held responsible for the unexpected results in the second study. The setting and the scenario were basically identical to those in Pilot 2.

In the introduction, the subjects were informed that the two individuals were becoming acquainted with one another. A woman either described herself or a recent acquaintance in either positive or negative terms. In the positive description, hobbies, flirting, dating many men, and meeting new people were the main focus; whereas, in the negative description, hobbies, flirting, and a compulsion to date in order to avoid loneliness were the major themes. (See Appendix C, Pp. 154-161 for transcripts.)

Two separate 2 (disclosure) x 2 (valence) analyses of variance were performed to test the four predictions. The first ANOVA, which examined trustworthiness scores, found a significant main effect for disclosure, $F(1, 63) = 8.54, p < .01$ and a main effect for valence, $F(1,$

63) = 11.06, $p < .01$. As predicted, the perception of trustworthiness was greater in the self-disclosure condition (\underline{M} = 102.63) than in the non-disclosure condition (\underline{M} = 88.59). It seems that the modification in the script used in the third pilot, which made it clear that the speaker and the person she was describing were classmates and not close friends, dispelled the testimonial interpretation.

In addition, the results indicated that valence had a significant impact on the perception of the stimulus person as trustworthy. Positive content was associated with greater trustworthiness scores (\underline{M} = 103.08) as compared to negative content (\underline{M} = 90.98). As Table 5 shows, there was a strong suggestion of a disclosure by valence interaction, \underline{F} (1, 63) = 3.13. $p = .08$.

Table 5

Summary of Effects of Self-Disclosure, Valence, and
Medium on the Perception of Trustworthiness

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
<u>Main Effects</u>	5919.75	3	2959.86	9.06**
Self-disclosure	2792.47	1	2747.47	8.54**
Valence	3614.10	1	3614.10	11.06**
<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	1021.80	1	1021.80	3.13*
Explained	6941.55	3	2313.85	7.08**
Residual	19612.83	60	326.88	
Total	79473.81	63	421.50	

* $p < .08$

** $p < .01$

As Table 6 shows, the impact of valence on trustworthiness scores was stronger in the non-disclosure condition than in the disclosure condition, so that when the target person was described negatively by another speaker the trustworthiness scores were disproportionately lower than when the target described herself negatively.

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations of Trustworthiness Scores by Disclosure and Valence Conditions

Disclosure	Valence		
	Negative	Positive	
Non-Disclosure	<u>M</u>	78.0	100.0
	<u>SD</u>	21.2	15.1
	<u>n</u>	15	14
Self-Disclosure	<u>M</u>	100.3	106.1
	<u>SD</u>	12.7	25.3
	<u>n</u>	21	14

A separate 2(disclosure) x 2(valence) ANOVA examined the impact of disclosure and valence using liking scores as the dependent measure. Table 7 summarizes the results. The findings revealed a main effect for valence, but no significant effect was found for disclosure, $F(1,63) = 33.71, p < .01$.

Table 7
Summary of Effects of Self-Disclosure, Valence,
and Medium on the Perception of Liking

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
<u>Main Effects</u>	3603.10	2	1801.55	17.43*
Self-disclosure	248.02	1	248.02	2.40
Valence	3484.64	1	3484.64	33.71*
<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	.81	1	.81	0.00
Explained	3602.91	3	1201.30	11.62*
Residual	6202.95	60	103.38	
Total	9806.86	63	155.66	

* $p < .01$

As Table 8 shows, subjects who read a positive transcript (\bar{M} = 60.4) liked the target person more than subjects who read a negative transcript condition (\bar{M} = 45.4).

Table 8
Means and Standard Deviations of Liking
Scores by Disclosure and Valence Conditions

Disclosure	Valence	
	Negative	Positive
Non-	\bar{M} 43.3	58.6
Disclosure	SD 10.3	6.9
	n 15	14
Self-	\bar{M} 47.6	62.3
Disclosure	SD 9.1	15.1
	n 21	14

In sum, the results of the third pilot replicated the earlier findings as they relate to valence and liking. The findings in the two pilot studies which employed a valence manipulation showed that the positive or negative quality of the description was a major

determinant of liking and that the disclosure manipulation had no effect on liking. In addition, the third pilot study showed that the perception of trustworthiness would increase as a direct function of self-disclosure. The fact that the relationship between disclosure and trustworthiness that had been observed in the second pilot was reversed following a slight modification in the stimulus manipulation lends credence to the testimonial interpretation. Once it was made clear that the speaker was not talking about someone she knew well, the subjects no longer saw the person described as more trustworthy than the self-disclosing stimulus person.

The one result which was not predicted was the positive association between valence and trustworthiness. The previous studies have suggested that valence did not contribute significantly to the attribution of trustworthiness. Assuming the correctness of the original premise that disclosure rather than valence is the proximal cause of the perception of trustworthiness, how can the observed findings be explained? One interpretation suggests that the results are due to chance, but this is highly unlikely, given the .01 probability level of the main effect of valence.

Another possible explanation for the observed relationship between valence and trustworthiness is suggested by the marginally significant interaction between valence and source. The only major difference between the preceding pilot and this one was the modification which served to indicate that the speaker had only casually known the person whom she was describing from her class at school. Perhaps subjects were not expecting the speaker to say anything negative about a fellow classmate. The subjects may have felt that the stimulus person must have made a very negative impression to cause the speaker to say what she did about her. Such an inference may have led subjects in the non-disclosure/negative valence condition to view the stimulus person in a much more negative light. This could account for the severe decrease in trustworthiness scores in the non-disclosure negative condition and may account for the apparent relationship between the valence variable and trustworthiness.

Hypotheses

To recapitulate, the previous discussion on the effects of initial self-disclosure and the results obtained in the three pilot studies have led to several hypotheses which the proposed study will test. Since the previous studies used white female subjects, the following hypotheses are based only on this population.

Hypothesis 1

A target person will be perceived as more trustworthy if personal information is initially self-disclosed than if the same information about the target is disclosed by someone else.

Hypothesis 2

The positive or negative content of the information initially provided about a target person will have no impact on the perception of the target's trustworthiness.

Hypothesis 3

If the content of the initial information about a target person is positive, the person will be liked more than if the content is negative.

Hypothesis 4

The source of the information initially provided about the target person will have no effect on liking for the person.

The two main themes of the stimulus statements will revolve around loneliness and flirting behavior. It is possible that subjects who consider themselves lonely or who are negatively predisposed to flirting behavior may respond to the disclosure and valence manipulation differently from individuals who do not perceive themselves as lonely or positively predisposed to flirting. In order to examine this issue, loneliness and flirtation scales will be included in the experimental procedures.

3. METHOD

Overview

The study was introduced as an investigation of impression formation. In the initial part of the study the participants were exposed to a voice recording and a written transcript of the same recording in which an individual named Diane was described. The material varied with regard to the source of the information (Diane or another person) and the valence of the information (positive or negative). Thus, there were two independent variables. Each subject was exposed to a single combination of source and valence. Immediately following the presentation of the stimulus material, the subjects filled out a questionnaire containing measures of perceived trustworthiness of Diane, and liking for Diane. These were the main dependent variables. Other measures were also included in the questionnaire. The experimental session was terminated after a short debriefing.

Subjects

The study was conducted at the Fashion Institute of Technology. The participants were undergraduate students enrolled in psychology courses who volunteered for the study. The targeted population were white

females. However, other volunteers were not denied an opportunity to participate.

A total of 292 subjects participated in the study, of whom 280 were used, 198 females and 82 males. The responses of three subjects were not analyzed because the experimental session was disrupted by a mechanical problem involving the tape recorder. Nine additional subjects were dropped because on a manipulation check they did not correctly identify whether the stimulus speaker was describing herself or someone else (i.e. the disclosure manipulation). The final sample consisted of 160 white females and 120 other subjects. Subjects were run in small groups, no larger than eight. The average age of the subjects was 24.6 years, with a range of 17 to 48. Racially the sample consisted of 219 whites (78.2 %), 31 blacks (11.1%), 16 Hispanics (5.7%), and 14 Asians (5%).

Independent Variables

In this study self-disclosure was operationally defined as the act of revealing personal information about oneself. In a non-disclosure (control) condition identical information about the target person was provided by someone else. Thus, the self-disclosure variable was manipulated by varying the source of the

information. The target person either described herself or was described by a fellow student. The other independent variable manipulated in the study was the valence of the information about the target person. The main theme of the description, regardless of condition, was the dating behavior of the person. In the positive valence condition, the speaker indicated that the stimulus person dated on a regular basis and enjoyed the activity. In the negative condition, the information divulged suggested that dating had become a compulsive activity and that the individual was experiencing some degree of personal discomfort. Each subject was randomly assigned to a particular combination of source and valence conditions. (See Appendix D, Pp. 162-169 for copies of the stimulus materials.)

Dependent Measures

The dependent measures consisted of trustworthiness and liking scales. The trustworthiness scale consisted of 24 items in a Likert format which assessed the degree of trust the individual subject had for the person being described (see Appendix E, Pp. 170-171). For example, "I would trust this person to lend her \$5.00," and "I would trust this person to the extent that I would cosign a loan for her." The trustworthiness scale was

developed by the experimenter and had been used in an independent research project and several pilot studies. The validity and internal consistency of the trustworthiness scale was examined independently from the experiment manipulations. An independent group of 51 subjects were asked to rate a close friend and a recent acquaintance in terms of the extent to which they trusted these individuals. To avoid an order effect, the order of presentation of the target persons was counterbalanced. It was expected that a close friend would receive a higher trustworthiness score than an acquaintance. A significant difference in trustworthiness scores was observed for friends ($M = 130.57$) versus acquaintances ($M = 99.80$). Internal consistency was high for ratings of both target persons. Coefficient alpha reliability was .97 for the close friend rating and .93 for the acquaintance rating.

The second dependent measure was the liking scale which consisted of 15 items in a Likert format and assessed the degree to which subjects tended to positively evaluate the stimulus person on a number of social traits. The liking scale consisted of items adopted from Rubin's Liking Scale (1970) and Jones and Davis's (1965) Impression Rating Scale. For example,

"Most people would react favorably to her after a brief acquaintance," and "I think she is an extremely likable person" (See Appendix G, Pp. 174-175). The presentation of the trustworthiness and liking scales was counterbalanced.

Since it was believed the particular content of the stimulus message (loneliness and flirtatiousness) might have an influence on the hypothesized relationships between the independent and dependent variables, two additional scales were included as part of the experimental procedure for possible use as covariates in subsequent analyses. Each scale consisted of four Likert type items. The items of the first scale were adopted from the New York University Loneliness Scale (Rubenstein & Shaver, 1979) and were designed to assess the trait of loneliness. For example, "I am a lonely person." The second scale assessed a subject's attitudes towards flirtatious behavior. For example, "Do you enjoy flirting?" (See Appendix H, Pp. 176-179) for the two scales.) The order of presentation of the two scales was counter-balanced, and followed the main dependent variables, the trustworthiness and liking scales.

At the end of the experimental session, the subjects were asked to complete seven individual items which served as manipulation checks (see Appendix I, Pp. 178-179). The first item assessed awareness of whether the speaker was describing herself or someone else. The second item was designed to assess whether in the non-disclosure condition the speaker was perceived as talking about an acquaintance and not a close friend. This distinction appeared to be essential in order to avoid the testimonial interpretation (see p. 63).

The third item required subjects to rate the intimacy level of the information presented in the transcript. The expectation was that the description would be rated as more intimate in the disclosure condition than in the non-disclosure condition. The disclosure literature seems to suggest that intimacy is a component of self-disclosure (Chelune, et al., 1979; Cozby, 1972). In discussing this relationship earlier, I suggested that a speaker will tend to appear more trustworthy when the individual is acting contrary to his or her best interests. By its very nature self-disclosure often appears not to be in the speaker's best interest. Self-disclosure can be described as the willingness to voluntarily place oneself in a situation

in which one is subject to greater social and emotional risk. It is this willingness to place oneself in jeopardy which is assumed to be responsible for the observer's initial attribution of trustworthiness towards the speaker. Trustworthiness should, therefore, increase as personal vulnerability increases due to the information that is revealed. This reasoning leads to the expectation that the more intimate the disclosure seems to be, the greater should be the listener's attribution of trustworthiness. A reversal of this logic seemed to provide an adequate manipulation check for the self-disclosure manipulation. That is, a message statement should appear more intimate simply because it is conveyed as a self-disclosure.

The fourth item checked the valence of the personal description. The last three manipulation checks concerned the portrayal of the stimulus person in terms of realism. These items focused on whether the subjects knew someone like the stimulus person, how similar the stimulus person was to other college students, and how real she appeared in the transcripts.

Procedure

The study was introduced as an investigation of impression formation. At the beginning of the

experimental session each subject was given a small booklet which contained the transcript, dependent measures and manipulation checks. The cover sheet of the booklet included a brief introduction and directions. In addition, the cover sheet requested basic demographic information (See Appendix J, Pp. 180-181). During the experimenter's introduction, subjects were explicitly instructed not to write their names on the booklet.

The respondents were informed that they would be listening to a tape recording of a short talk in which a person was described. The subjects were instructed to follow what the speaker was saying by reading a transcript of her remarks in the booklet. The following information and instructions were given to the subjects by the experimenter for the self-disclosure condition.

This is a study about how first impressions are formed. You are going to listen to an excerpt from a conversation between two women who as part of a psychology experiment were instructed to exchange information about themselves in order to become acquainted with one another. One woman, Diane, is about to describe herself and some of her interests. Diane is a college student and a Business major. The conversation took place in the Psychology Department at school.

Please listen carefully because you will be asked to rate Diane on a series of questionnaires after you hear her describe herself on the audiotape. A written transcript has been provided on the following page so that you may read along as you

listen to the audiotape. Both people have given their permission to use their conversation for this study.

Similar instructions were given for the non-disclosure condition.

This is a study about how first impressions are formed. You are going to listen to an excerpt from a conversation between two women. As part of a psychology experiment, one woman has been asked to speak about an acquaintance of hers, a third party, whose name is Diane. She is describing Diane and some of her interests. Diane is a college student and a Business major. The conversation took place in the Psychology Department at school.

Please listen carefully because you will be asked to rate Diane, the woman who is being spoken about, on a series of questionnaires after you hear her described on the audiotape. A written transcript has been provided on the following page so that you may read along as you listen to the audiotape. Both people have given their permission to use their conversation for this study.

The following information is a brief summary of the positive description of Diane.

Diane is a 21 year old college sophomore who is majoring in Business and hopes to get a MBA degree in the future. Her family is supportive of her endeavors. Diane has several hobbies including music, reading, cooking, traveling, and dating. Diane is very sociable and friendly. She enjoys meeting new men and going out to new places. She has an active social life and believes that is the way it should be for young people.

The following information is a brief summary of the negative description of Diane.

Diane is a 21 year old college sophomore who is majoring in Business and hopes to get a MBA degree in the future. Her family is supportive of her

endeavors. Diane has several hobbies including music, reading, cooking, traveling, and dating. She dates all the time. She just cannot seem to say no when a man asks her out. Diane is extremely flirtatious and admits that the reason she dates is because she does not want to be alone. She is afraid of being alone. Diane goes out with men who she doesn't like much in order not to be alone.

After the stimulus material was presented the experimenter made the following statement:

Now please answer the questions you will find in the remainder of the booklet. Follow the directions carefully. It is important that you respond to each item. Be careful not to skip any items. Remember, this is a study on first impressions; do not spend too much time answering any one item.

At the end of the experimental session the subjects were debriefed. The subjects were informed of the purpose of the study and their questions about the experiment were answered.

4. RESULTS

Manipulation Check

Self-disclosure

All manipulation checks are based on the responses of the white female sample, which constituted the central focus of the study. Two procedures were used to check the disclosure manipulation. In the first procedure, subjects were required to indicate whether the speaker in the tape recording was talking about herself or someone else in order to determine whether the participants in the study were cognizant of the source of the descriptive information (see Item 1, Appendix I, Pp. 178-179). The results show that four white female subjects were not able to correctly state whether the speaker was describing herself (self-disclosure condition) or someone else (non-disclosure condition). These individuals were dropped from any further analyses, leaving 160 white females. (Also, five other subjects were dropped for the same reason, leaving 120 subjects who were not white females.)

The second procedure checked whether subjects in the non-disclosure condition perceived the speaker as close friend, or an acquaintance of the target person. All

subjects correctly identified the target as an acquaintance.

Intimacy Ratings

As part of the experimental procedures, subjects were required to rate the intimacy level of the descriptive statements using a seven-point scale (i.e. "Please circle the number that corresponds with how intimate you think the information was in the transcript."). This item was primarily designed as a manipulation check for valence. It was expected that a negative description would be perceived by a subject as more intimate than a positive description. Subjects' intimacy ratings were also used as a manipulation check for disclosure based on the rationale that the literature suggests that self-disclosure and intimacy are related. If a subject perceived a statement as a self-disclosure, then he or she should tend to perceive it as more intimate than if the statement is not perceived as a self-disclosure.

A 2 (disclosure) x 2 (valence) ANOVA was performed on white female subjects. A main effect for valence was found, $F(1, 279) = 9.8, p < .01$. The mean in the positive valence condition was lower ($M = 3.32$) than the mean in the negative valence condition ($M = 3.96$). A

main effect for disclosure was not found, and no interaction was observed.

Positiveness Rating

As part of the experimental procedures, subjects were required to rate the description as either positive or negative using a seven-point scale (i.e. "Please circle the number that corresponds with how negative or positive you think the information was in the transcript."). It was expected that subjects would rate the description in the positive valence condition as more positive than the description in the negative valence condition.

A 2 (disclosure) x 2 (valence) ANOVA was performed on white female subjects. As expected, a main effect for valence was observed, $F(1, 159) = 41.3, p < .01$. The mean in the positive valence condition was significantly higher ($M = 5.35$) than in the negative valence condition ($M = 3.93$). A main effect for disclosure was not found and no interaction was observed.

Realism Check

Three separate items were used to assess whether the portrayal of the stimulus person was viewed as realistic or natural by the white female subjects. The

responses to these three items served as the dependent measure in three separate 2(disclosure) x 2(valence) analyses of variance. No main effects or interactions were observed. The results suggest that subjects responded to the stimulus person similarly across conditions. The overall mean score across the four conditions for Item 5 ("How similar is Diane to other students at this school?") was 4.39 on a seven-point scale. The overall mean score for item 7 (i.e., "How realistic is Diane?") was 4.01 on a seven-point scale. On Item 6 ("Do you know anyone like Diane?"), the majority of the 160 white female subjects (124 or 77.5%) indicated that they knew someone like Diane. The results suggest that the portrayal of the stimulus person was viewed as reasonable and accepted as real by most of the participants in the study.

Scale Reliability

The internal consistency of four multiple item scales was assessed by means of Cronbach's coefficient alpha. The alpha estimates of reliability for the trustworthiness scale was .90 for the white female sample and .92 for the combined sample of 280 subjects. The alpha estimates of reliability for the liking scale was .84 for the white female sample and .86 for the

for the combined sample. The loneliness scale demonstrated a satisfactory level of internal consistency for the white female sample and the combined sample (.76 and .79, respectively). The alpha estimates of reliability for the flirtation scale was .17 for the white female sample and .21 for the combined sample. As a result of the low internal consistency of the flirtation scale, it was dropped from any further analyses.

Tests of Hypotheses

White Female Sample

Trustworthiness. Hypothesis 1 stated that self-disclosure will increase the degree to which the stimulus person was perceived as trustworthy. Hypothesis 2 stipulated that valence will have no effect on the attribution of trustworthiness. Table 9 presents the cell means and standard deviations for the trustworthiness scores of white female subjects (N = 160).

Table 9
Means and Standard Deviations of Trustworthiness
Scores for White Female Subjects
by Disclosure and Valence Conditions

Disclosure	Valence		
	Negative	Positive	
Non-	<u>M</u>	91.0	90.5
Disclosure	<u>SD</u>	16.6	20.7
Self-	<u>M</u>	96.9	100.3
Disclosure	<u>SD</u>	16.1	18.2

Note. n = 40 in each cell.

Table 10
 Summary of Analysis of Variance of Effects
 of Disclosure and Valence on Perceived
 Trustworthiness for White Female Subjects

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
<u>Main Effects</u>	2543.3	2	1271.65	3.92*
Disclosure	2464.9	1	2464.90	7.60**
Valence	78.4	1	78.40	0.24
<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	152.1	1	152.10	0.47
Explained	2695.4	3	898.46	2.77
Residual	50625.4	156	324.52	
Total	53320.8	159		

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

A 2(disclosure) x 2(valence) analysis of variance was performed on the trustworthiness scores. The results are shown in Table 10. The analysis revealed a main effect for disclosure, $F(2,159) = 7.60$, $p < .01$. As Hypothesis 1 predicted, the mean trustworthiness score for the self-disclosure condition ($M = 98.6$) was significantly higher than the mean trustworthiness score for the non-disclosure condition ($M = 90.75$). Consistent with Hypothesis 2, the valence manipulation

had no significant impact on the trustworthiness scores. In addition, no interaction between disclosure and valence was observed. The results indicate, as predicted, that white female subjects attributed greater trustworthiness to a stimulus person when she described herself than when she was described by another person.

Liking. Hypothesis 3 stated that the valence of the description will influence how much the listener likes the target person. Hypothesis 4 stated that the self-disclosure manipulation will not influence how much the observer likes the target person. The cell means and standard deviations for the trustworthiness scores of white female subjects are presented in Table 11.

Table 11
Means and Standard Deviations of Liking Scores for White
Female Subjects by Disclosure and Valence Conditions

Disclosure		Valence	
		Negative	Positive
Non- Disclosure	<u>M</u>	50.3	56.8
	<u>SD</u>	8.9	8.5
Self- Disclosure	<u>M</u>	51.4	58.6
	<u>SD</u>	7.9	10.0

Note. n = 40 in each cell

A 2 x 2 analysis of variance was conducted on the liking scores (see Table 12). A main effect for valence was found, $F(1,159) = 23.8, p < .01$. The mean liking score of white female subjects for the positive valence condition ($M = 57.7$) was higher than the mean for the negative valence condition ($M = 50.8$). The effect for the disclosure manipulation was not significant. In addition, there was no disclosure by valence interaction effect. As predicted, these results show that white female subjects liked the target person better if she was described positively than if she was described negatively. For white female subjects in this experiment, it seems that what determines perceived trustworthiness of the target person (i.e., self-disclosure) does not determine liking, and that what facilitates liking of the target person does not facilitate the perception of trustworthiness.

Table 12

Summary of Effects of Self-Disclosure and Valence
on the Perception of Liking for White Female Subjects

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
<u>Main Effects</u>	1974.7	2	987.36	12.4*
Disclosure	84.1	1	84.63	1.0
Valence	1890.6	1	1890.63	23.8*
<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	5.6	1	5.63	0.1
Explained	1890.3	3	660.12	8.3*
Residual	12375.4	156	79.32	
Total	14355.7	159		

* $p < .01$

Correlations. Table 13 shows the correlations between the scores of the five scales utilized in the study (i.e. trustworthiness, liking, loneliness, intimacy, and positiveness scores) by condition. The results indicate that there was a moderate positive relationship between trustworthiness and liking and that this relationship was significant in three of the the four experimental conditions.

In addition, Table 13 shows that no other clear pattern of relationships were found among the remaining variables. This suggests that neither loneliness, intimacy, nor subjects' evaluation of the descriptive statements can account for the relationship between self-disclosure and the perception of trustworthiness or the absence of an effect of the valence manipulation on trustworthiness.

Table 13
 Correlations between Trustworthiness, Liking,
 Loneliness, Intimacy and Positiveness
 Scores by Condition for White Female Subjects

Variables	Conditions				
	Non-Disc Negative	Non-Disc Positive	Discl. Negative	Discl. Positive	All Ss
Trust with Liking	.35*	.31*	.29	.43**	.34**
Trust with Loneliness	.36*	-.24	-.27	.22	.06
Trust with Intimacy	.06	.27	.47**	-.08	.15
Trust with Positiveness	.03	.24	.22	.02	.09
Liking with Loneliness	.21	-.16	-.19	-.23	.00
Liking with Intimacy	.20	.45**	.12	.20	.14
Liking with Positiveness	.04	.34*	.21	.33*	.34**

Table 13
(continued)

Variables	Non-Disc Negative	Non-Disc Positive	Discl. Negative	Discl. Positive	All Ss
Loneliness with Intimacy	-.35*	-.40**	-.08	-.20	-.07
Loneliness with Positiveness	-.06	-.16	-.03	.39*	.00
Intimacy with Positiveness	.21	.24	.47**	.09	.12
n	40	40	40	40	160

Note. All tests are two-tailed.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

White Male Sample

Trustworthiness. No specific predictions were made concerning the impact of the disclosure and valence manipulations on white male subjects in the attribution of trustworthiness to the target person. The means and standard deviations for the trustworthiness scores of the white male subjects are shown in Table 14.

Table 14
Means and Standard Deviations of Trustworthiness
Scores for White Male
Subjects by Disclosure and Valence Conditions

		Valence	
		Negative	Positive
Disclosure			
Non-	<u>M</u>	81.0	101.2
Disclosure	<u>SD</u>	28.9	22.2
	<u>n</u>	17	14
Self-	<u>M</u>	101.1	100.3
Disclosure	<u>SD</u>	8.5	12.6
	<u>n</u>	13	15

A 2 x 2 analysis of variance was performed on the trustworthiness scores of the white male subjects. The results are shown in Table 15. The ANOVA shows a nearly significant main effect for disclosure, $F(1,58) = 3.32$, $p = .07$. The mean trustworthiness score for the self-disclosure condition ($M = 100.7$) was higher than the mean trustworthiness score for the non-disclosure condition ($M = 90.1$). In addition, a nearly significant main effect for valence, $F(1,58) = 3.66$, $p = .06$ was

found. The mean trustworthiness score for the positive valence condition ($\underline{M} = 100.8$) was higher than the mean trustworthiness score for the negative valence condition ($\underline{M} = 89.7$). A significant disclosure x valence interaction effect was found, $\underline{F}(1,58) = 3.88$, $p < .07$. The mean trustworthiness scores for the positive and negative self-disclosure conditions and the positive non-disclosure condition ($\underline{M}s = 100.3, 101.1, \text{ and } 101.2$, respectively) were higher than the mean trustworthiness score for the negative non-disclosure condition ($\underline{M} = 81$).

Table 15
 Summary of Analysis of Variance of Effects
 of Disclosure and Valence on Perceived
 Trustworthiness for White Male Subjects

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
<u>Main Effects</u>	3174.8	2	1587.24	3.81**
Disclosure	1382.0	1	1382.03	3.32*
Valence	1526.1	1	1526.06	3.66*
<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	1615.7	1	1615.76	3.88*
Explained	4790.2	3	1596.75	3.83**
Residual	22915.3	55	416.64	
Total	27705.6	58	477.68	

* $p < .07$

** $p < .05$

Liking. Table 16 presents the means and standard deviations for the liking scores of the white male subjects by condition. The response pattern for white males was similar to the pattern exhibited by white females.

Table 16
Means and Standard Deviations of Liking Scores for White
Male Subjects by Disclosure and Valence Conditions

		Valence	
		Negative	Positive
Disclosure			
Non-	<u>M</u>	48.2	61.2
Disclosure	<u>SD</u>	11.0	7.5
	<u>n</u>	17	14
Self-	<u>M</u>	47.5	64.3
Disclosure	<u>SD</u>	8.6	7.6
	<u>n</u>	13	15

A 2 x 2 analysis of variance was performed on the liking scores of the white male subjects (see Table 17). A main effect for valence was found, $F(1,159) = 40.3$, $p < .01$. The mean liking score of white male subjects for the positive valence condition ($M = 62.8$) was higher than the mean for the negative valence condition ($M = 47.9$). No main effect for disclosure and no disclosure by valence interaction effect was found. The results indicate that valence and not disclosure was the primary

determinant of liking for men in the experimental situation.

Table 17

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Effects of Disclosure and Valence on Liking for White Male Subjects

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
<u>Main Effects</u>	3275.8	2	1637.88	20.7*
Disclosure	19.1	1	19.71	0.2
Valence	3190.8	1	3190.79	40.3*
<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	51.3	1	51.33	0.6
Explained	3327.1	3	1109.00	14.0*
Residual	4353.5	55	79.16	
Total	7680.6	159	132.43	

* $p < .01$

Correlations. Table 18 shows the correlations between the scores of the five scales utilized in the study (i.e. trustworthiness, liking, loneliness, intimacy, and positiveness scores) by condition. The results indicate that there was a moderate positive relationship between trustworthiness and liking and that

this relationship was significant in three of the the four experimental conditions.

Table 18
Correlations between Trustworthiness, Liking,
Loneliness, Intimacy and Positiveness
Scores by Condition for White Male Subjects
Conditions

Variables	Non-Disc Negative	Non-Disc Positive	Discl Negative	Discl Positive	All Ss
Trust with Liking	.77**	.62*	.57*	.07	.56**
Trust with Loneliness	.04	.21	.15	.33	.15
Trust with Intimacy	.27	.14	-.24	.15	.06
Trust with Positiveness	.30	.62*	.47	.64*	.39**
Liking with Loneliness	.00	.37	.03	-.42	-.01
Liking with Intimacy	.16	.16	-.17	.14	-.07
Liking with Positiveness	.29	.59*	.65*	.17	.46**

Table 18
(continued)

Variables	Non-Disc Negative	Non-Disc Positive	Discl. Negative	Discl. Positive	All Ss
Loneliness with Intimacy	.48*	-.31	-.18	.06	.02
Loneliness with Positiveness	-.29	-.03	-.18	-.07	-.18
Intimacy with Positiveness	.10	.19	.00	.33	.12
<u>n</u>	17	14	13	15	59

Note. All tests are two-tailed.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Entire Sample

Trustworthiness. The trustworthiness scores for the entire sample were analyzed using a 2(disclosure) by 2(valence) by 2(sex) by 4(race) ANOVA. The results are summarized in Table 19. The findings indicate a main effect for disclosure, $F(1, 279) = 21.3$, $p < .01$. The mean trustworthiness score for the disclosure condition ($M = 99.77$) is significantly higher than the mean trustworthiness score for the non-disclosure condition ($M = 89.81$). Apparently, the propensity to attribute greater trustworthiness to the target person in the self-disclosure condition is not

limited to white females; rather it seems to be a pattern that permeates the entire sample.

The ANOVA found a marginally significant main effect for race, $F(3,279) = 2.4, p = .07$. In terms of race, Hispanics appeared to give the highest mean trustworthiness rating ($M = 100.25$), blacks the next highest rating ($M = 97.13$), whites the third highest rating ($M = 94.81$) and Asians the lowest rating ($M = 84.5$). A main effect for valence was not found. There was also no main effect for gender.

Table 19
The Effects of Self-Disclosure and Valence on the
Perception of Trustworthiness for the Entire Sample

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
<u>Main Effects</u>	9882.5	6	1647.08	5.1**
Disclosure	6867.5	1	6867.49	21.3**
Valence	746.9	1	746.89	2.3
Sex	71.5	1	71.59	0.2
Race	2310.9	3	770.31	2.4*
<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	5850.8	12	487.57	1.5
Discl x Valen	3.3	1	3.35	0.0
Discl X Sex	72.1	1	72.12	0.2
Discl X Race	3789.3	3	1263.09	3.9**
Valen X Sex	980.6	1	980.61	3.0
Valen X Race	390.8	3	130.27	0.4
Race X Sex	1324.6	3	441.53	1.4
<u>3-Way Interaction</u>	3796.9	10	379.69	1.2
Discl X Valen X Sex	652.7	1	652.67	2.0
Discl X Valen X Race	587.6	3	195.88	0.6
Discl X Sex X Race	1785.8	3	595.27	1.8
Valen X Sex X Race	762.6	3	254.21	0.8
<u>4-Way Interaction</u>	2913.8	3	971.2	3.0
Explained	22443.8	31	723.2	2.3
Residual	80108.9	248	323.0	
Total	102552.7	279	367.5	

* $p < .08$

** $p < .01$

Table 20
Means and Standard Deviations of Trustworthiness
Scores by Race and Disclosure

	Disclosure		
	Non-Disclosure	Self-Disclosure	
Blacks	<u>M</u>	84.9	108.6
	<u>SD</u>	12.4	9.8
	<u>n</u>	15	16
Hispanics	<u>M</u>	88.2	107.5
	<u>SD</u>	30.8	11.1
	<u>n</u>	6	10
Whites	<u>M</u>	90.6	99.1
	<u>SD</u>	21.4	15.7
	<u>n</u>	111	108
Asians	<u>M</u>	89.5	80.8
	<u>SD</u>	6.7	22.9
	<u>n</u>	6	8

The analysis also revealed a significant two-way interaction effect between race and disclosure. The relevant means are presented in Table 20. It can be seen that blacks and Hispanics demonstrated the same basic pattern of response as did whites except that

their ratings of trustworthiness were more extreme. Black and Hispanic subjects rated the target person lower than whites in the non-disclosure condition and higher than whites in the self-disclosure condition. The responses of these two minority groups are nevertheless consistent with the prediction made in Hypothesis 1. The attribution of trustworthiness increased as a function of self-disclosure. Asian subjects, however, deviated from the general pattern displayed by the three other groups; their estimate of the target person's trustworthiness seems to decrease as a function of self-disclosure. There were no other significant interactions found.

Liking. The liking scores for the entire sample were analyzed using a 2(disclosure) by 2(valence) by 2(gender) by 4(race) ANOVA design. The results are summarized on Table 21. The results showed a significant main effect for valence, $F(1,279) = 65.1$, $p < .01$. The mean liking score for the positive valence condition ($M = 58.9$) was significantly higher than the mean liking score for the negative valence condition ($M = 50.81$). No other main effects were found. Thus, the entire sample demonstrated the same pattern as was found for the white female sample. The results were

consistent with Hypothesis 3, which stipulated that a positive description would facilitate liking.

Table 21
Summary of Analysis of Variance of Effects
of Self-Disclosure and Valence on the
Perception of Liking for the Entire Sample

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
<u>Main Effects</u>	5107.7	6	851.28	12.2**
Disclosure	174.1	1	174.10	2.5
Valence	4526.5	1	4526.51	65.1**
Sex	5.5	1	5.54	0.1
Race	264.8	3	88.27	1.3
<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	989.2	12	82.43	1.2
Discl x Valen	48.9	1	48.92	0.7
Discl X Sex	2.6	1	2.63	0.0
Discl X Race	80.7	3	26.92	0.4
Valen X Sex	376.6	1	376.61	5.4*
Valen X Race	312.7	3	104.25	1.4
Race X Sex	224.4	3	74.80	1.1
<u>3-Way Interaction</u>	609.7	10	60.97	0.9
Discl X Valen X Sex	35.7	1	35.72	0.5
Discl X Valen X Race	77.2	3	25.73	0.4
Discl X Sex X Race	141.8	3	47.28	0.7
Valen X Sex X Race	363.4	3	121.14	0.7
<u>4-Way Interaction</u>	48.2	3	16.10	0.2
Explained	6754.8	31	217.89	3.1**
Residual	17241.9	248	69.5	
Total	23996.8	279	86.0	

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

The analysis of variance also revealed a two-way interaction between gender and valence. The relevant means are presented on Table 22. Although males tended to demonstrate the same basic pattern of responses as did females, their ratings were more extreme. In the negative valence condition, white males rated the target person slightly lower than did white females. In the positive valence condition, white males tended to give slightly higher ratings than did the white females. No other significant interactions were found.

Table 22
Means and Standard Deviations of Liking
Scores by Gender and Valence

Gender	Valence		
	Negative	Positive	
Females	<u>M</u>	51.3	58.2
	<u>SD</u>	8.0	8.5
	<u>n</u>	97	101
Males	<u>M</u>	49.5	60.9
	<u>SD</u>	9.3	7.6
	<u>n</u>	42	40

Correlations. As Table 23 shows, the four experimental conditions exhibited a significant positive relationship between trustworthiness and liking scores for the entire sample. The relationship between intimacy and positiveness was the only other pattern found in Table 23. Since this pattern did not materialize in either the white female or male samples, it may be due to chance.

Table 23
 Correlations between Trustworthiness, Liking,
 Loneliness, Intimacy and Positiveness
 Scores by Condition for the Entire Sample
 Conditions

Variables	Non-Disc Negative	Non-Disc Positive	Discl Negative	Discl Positive	All Ss
Trust with Liking	.54**	.38**	.24*	.34**	.40**
Trust with Loneliness	.09	.00	-.11	.23	.09
Trust with Intimacy	.09	.29*	.32**	.08	.16**
Trust with Positiveness	.12	.28*	.22	.13	.17**
Liking with Loneliness	.00	.06	-.01	.09	-.04
Liking with Intimacy	.17	.37**	.02	.19	.09
Liking with Positiveness	.12	.30*	.19	.24*	.33**

Table 23
(continued)

Variables	Non-Disc Negative	Non-Disc Positive	Discl. Negative	Discl. Positive	All Ss
Loneliness with Intimacy	-.12	-.09	-.06	.23*	.03
Loneliness with Positiveness	-.26*	.08	-.06	.30*	-.08
Intimacy with Positiveness	.22	.25*	.29*	.21*	.14*
n	70	68	69	73	280

Note. All tests are two-tailed.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Covariate Analyses

Separate covariate analyses were performed on the trustworthiness and liking scores for both the white female sample and the entire sample, using loneliness scores as a covariate. In each of these analyses the relationships observed in the regular ANOVAs remained largely undisturbed. It would seem that the effects of valence and disclosure cannot be attributed to subjects' loneliness self-ratings.

Summary of Results

White Female Sample

As predicted in Hypothesis 1, white females rated the target person as significantly more trustworthy in the self-disclosure condition than the non-disclosure condition.

As predicted in Hypothesis 2, there was no effect of valence and no valence by disclosure interaction effect on trustworthiness ratings.

As predicted in Hypothesis 3, white females rated the target person as significantly more liked in the positive valence condition than in the negative valence condition. As predicted in Hypothesis 4, there was no main effect of disclosure and no interaction effect on liking.

White Male Sample

There were no specific predictions made concerning the responses of white males to the experimental variables. For white male subjects, the results indicated marginally significant main effects for both the disclosure and valence manipulation. The results also show a significant interaction effect. White males tended to attribute greater trustworthiness to the target person during either the self-disclosure or the

positive valence conditions and they tended to attribute least trustworthiness to the target person in the non-disclosure negative valence condition. The findings suggest that white males and white females differ as to what factors serve to influence the attribution of trustworthiness.

White male subjects rated the target person significantly more positively in the positive valence condition than in the negative valence condition. No main effect for the disclosure manipulation and no interaction effect were found. The results indicate that the primary determinant of liking was the valence manipulation for both white male and white female subjects.

Entire Sample

An analysis of trustworthiness ratings for the entire sample revealed a significant main effect for disclosure which was consistent with Hypothesis 1. The results also showed a marginally significant main effect for race. Although they demonstrated essentially the same pattern as whites in response to disclosure, the trustworthiness ratings of blacks and Hispanics were lower than whites' ratings in the non-disclosure condition and much higher than whites' ratings in the

self-disclosure condition. Asians displayed a diametrically opposite response pattern to the disclosure manipulation; the self-disclosure condition was associated with lower mean trustworthiness rating than the non-disclosure condition.

The results for liking ratings of the entire sample showed a significant main effect for valence. The mean liking score for the positive valence condition was significantly higher than the mean liking score for the negative valence condition. In addition, a two-way interaction found a significant relationship between valence and gender.

5. DISCUSSION

In general, the results obtained in the present study suggest that the act of self-disclosure of positive information serves to facilitate the formation of trust and liking in interpersonal relations. Specifically, the findings tend to support the two main hypotheses, which maintain that self-disclosure leads to a perception of trustworthiness and that the valence of the information revealed affects liking. At least initially, different factors are responsible for fostering the perception of trustworthiness and liking in brief social encounters among recent acquaintances.

The two basic aims of the present investigation are (a) to show that self-disclosure elicited a perception of trustworthiness and (b) to demonstrate that this effect is not mediated by increased interpersonal attraction. The significance of the perceived trustworthiness effect is that it contributes directly to the general formation of interpersonal trust, which is a critical and necessary precondition in the development of successful, long-term and satisfying interpersonal relationships. Although many factors may contribute to the establishing of trust between two individuals, the impact of self-disclosure is expected

to be especially important in situations in which people do not know each other and are interacting for the first time.

The manner in which the various segments of the study sample responded to the experimental manipulations are not homogeneous. The reactions of white female subjects provide the strongest support for the experimental hypotheses. Essentially similar, but not identical findings are observed when the responses of the entire 280 participants in the study are considered. Nevertheless, there is some indication that the gender and ethnicity of a subject moderated an individual's response to the disclosure manipulation. Since the experimental hypotheses are the result of pilot research based on white female subjects, the responses of this subsample to the experimental manipulations are of primary interest.

Responses of White Females

As Hypothesis 1 predicted, the degree of trustworthiness attributed to the stimulus person when she is perceived as engaging in self-disclosure is significantly higher than that attributed to the same target person when the information is viewed as emanating from another source. The current findings

replicate similar results that have been observed in all three previous pilot studies. The apparent consistency of this effect contributes strong support for the hypothesis that self-disclosure tends to lead the observer to attribute greater trustworthiness to the speaker. This finding by itself, however, does not preclude alternative interpretations.

The purpose of the present study is not simply to replicate the perceived trustworthiness effect. Rather, the intent was to design a study which would also assess the validity of the two main interpretations which have been proposed to account for the positive relationship between self-disclosure and trustworthiness. The introductory section of this study includes a review of the literature on the reciprocity of self-disclosure. Most of the explanations for the reciprocity effect were rejected because research had either failed to provide support for them or the support was ambiguous and more parsimonious interpretations were available. Only two explanations seem to warrant further consideration. In both of these theories the concept of trust played a central role.

The first theory suggests that self-disclosure is reciprocated because the speaker's initial act of

disclosure is sufficiently reassuring (i.e., trust was inferred) that the listener is willing to risk exposing aspects of his or her private self (Chelune, 1979; Cozby, 1972). The alternative social attraction explanation maintains that people tend to disclose to individuals they like and that the initial act of disclosure simply serves to induce the listener to like the speaker (McAllister, 1980; Jones and Archer, 1976). In effect, trust is not a critical component in this explanation.

The present investigation makes the assumption that the relationship between self-disclosure and trustworthiness is direct, devoid of any intervening influences. That is, the mere observation of self-disclosure will lead the listener to attribute greater trustworthiness to the speaker. Therefore, self-disclosure must be shown not to be related to other possibly relevant dependent variables. In accordance with this reasoning, Hypothesis 2 predicts that self-disclosure will not increase liking. If, however, the liking interpretation is the correct explanation than one should expect the opposite outcome, namely, that self-disclosure will increase liking.

The liking interpretation for the effect of trustworthiness on disclosure implies that the act of self-disclosure serves only to get the observer to perceive the speaker in a more positive light. Related research shows that as the social attractiveness of a person increases, there is a tendency for the observer to infer the presence of other positive traits (Berscheid & Walster, 1978). This generalization or "halo effect" may extend even to ascribing trustworthiness to the speaker, despite the fact that there is no real evidence of trustworthiness. In other words, self-disclosure may lead to liking the speaker more; this greater liking may, in turn, lead to attributing greater trustworthiness to the self-discloser. If true, then self-disclosure has only a tangential bearing on the perception of trustworthiness; any factor which would serve to increase liking would also function to promote the attribution of trustworthiness.

If the perception that an individual can be trusted stems from an increase in liking because the person is observed engaging in self-disclosure, then liking scores should be higher in the self-disclosure condition than in the non-disclosure condition. However, the absence

of a main effect of the disclosure variable on liking scores demonstrates that the effect of disclosure on perceived trustworthiness is probably not the result of any intervening influence of liking. If liking were involved, a significant effect of self-disclosure on liking should have been evident.

It may be argued that despite the results obtained from the manipulation checks the liking scale employed in the present study is an insensitive measure and that if a valid index of social attractiveness had been utilized a main effect of self-disclosure on liking scores would have been evident. In order to eliminate this possibility, a manipulation of liking which did not involve self-disclosure was incorporated into the study. Hypothesis 3 is based on previous pilot research which had shown that the valence of a person's description will affect the degree to which an individual is liked.

The results are as predicted: liking for the stimulus person is significantly higher in the positive information condition than in the negative condition. These results suggest that the liking scale is, in fact, a valid measure and that the absence of a relationship between liking and self-disclosure cannot simply be blamed on an instrument problem. Thus, one has greater

confidence in the conclusion that self-disclosure rather than liking is the principle determinant of trustworthiness in an initial disclosure situation.

In addition to the findings which indicate no evidence of a main effect of valence on perceived trustworthiness, no interaction effect of disclosure and valence on these scores is observed. The results indicate that the degree of trustworthiness attributed to a self-disclosing speaker is basically unaffected by whether the information divulged about herself was positive or negative. A t-test of the difference between the mean trustworthiness scores for self disclosure conditions serves to confirm the fact that regardless whether the personal information disclosed had positive or negative overtones, there is no discernable impact on the degree to which the speaker was trusted.

The failure of valence to have a significant effect on the degree of trustworthiness attributed to a disclosing speaker implies that this attribution is not mediated by liking. Since valence has been demonstrated to be an adequate means of eliciting liking, this manipulation can be considered another test of the liking intervening variable interpretation for the

effect of self-disclosure on trustworthiness. If the perception of trustworthiness which follows self-disclosure is due to the effects of interpersonal attraction, then any factor which would serve to increase liking for the speaker, such as the valence of the message, should also elicit a greater tendency to attribute trustworthiness. The absence of a significant difference in trustworthiness scores between the positive and negative disclosure conditions is then further evidence that liking and trustworthiness have different determinants.

The fact that trustworthiness and liking seem to have independent causes tends to violate intuitive notions of an assumed association. For example, researchers on interpersonal attraction often interpret the attribution of trustworthiness as due to liking (Jourard, 1971, 1968). There are also studies which seem to indicate that the more you like someone, the more that person seems to be trusted (Jones and Archer, 1976). In addition, the present research finds that the two dependent variables, trustworthiness and liking, are positively correlated.

The correlations between perceived trustworthiness and liking may mean that these two variables have

causative factors in common. However, these may be factors other than valence and disclosure, for example, personality traits.

Insofar as the findings reported in this section are reliable and consistent, they may have substantial implications for impression management and person perception. The issue of whether the results can be generalized to individuals other than white females will now be addressed.

Responses of White Males

In the analysis of the white male sample it was found that male subjects demonstrated main effects of disclosure and valence on trustworthiness. The findings suggest that males tend to attribute trustworthiness in situations that involve either self-disclosure or positive valence. This pattern is different from that of the female sample, which demonstrated a main effect only for disclosure. It is believed that the valence main effect on trustworthiness exhibited by the male subjects reflects a gender difference in how men respond to descriptions of unfamiliar females. The study may suggest that the positive or negative description of a female may have greater significance for men than for

women in forming an impression. The reason for this is unclear.

Responses of Entire Sample

The analyses of the entire sample provide the opportunity to determine whether males and non-white participants tend to respond to an initial act of self-disclosure in a manner similar to that of white females.

The over-representation of white females and the minimal number of minorities in the study do not allow for a fair test of the relevant factors. Yet, the data on these groups were accumulated and deserve mention.

The data from the entire sample is similar to the results found in the white female sample. A higher mean trustworthiness score is associated with the self-disclosure condition. The findings contribute further support for the hypothesis that self-disclosure tends to lead the listener to attribute greater trustworthiness to a speaker.

The analysis of trustworthiness scores for the entire sample show evidence of a marginal effect for race and a significant interaction between race and disclosure. Since non-white subjects are under-represented in this study, any interpretation of racial

differences must be considered tentative. Nevertheless, two patterns emerged from the data. First, Asian subjects assigned the stimulus person the lowest mean trustworthiness rating of any of the four racial categories. This may reflect a cultural difference in how Asians perceive and ascribe trustworthiness to others. Second, Asians are not a homogeneous population; this category actually reflects different cultures each with its own set of norms. Despite the small sample of 14 subjects, the results may be an actual reflection of cultural differences. Asians, by American standards, appear to be a less open culture. Even though those who participated in the current study are attending college in the United States, they still may exhibit cultural differences consistent with their heritage. This may account for the low trustworthiness scores associated with the Asian subsample. Since this is only a tentative interpretation, a larger, more representative sample and a fair test of this proposition should be done.

The second race-related finding is that a significant interaction between disclosure and race exists. When compared to the other racial groups, Asian subjects responded in a rather unique manner. Unlike

the blacks, Hispanics or whites, the mean trustworthiness score for the disclosure condition was actually lower than the mean trustworthiness score for the non-disclosure conditions. Lower trustworthiness scores in response to self-disclosure, however, does have its precedence. Research has shown that when a person engages in an inappropriate level of disclosure, it can have a boomerang effect (Cozby, 1973; 1972; Jourard, 1971; 1968). When a speaker is perceived as disclosing too much, the person is viewed less positively. Inappropriate self-disclosure may suggest that the speaker has poor judgement and cannot be taken into one's confidence. It is possible that the same dynamics are operating in the case of Asian subjects. Perhaps Asians have a stricter sense of what they consider appropriate or inappropriate social conduct, especially when it concerns the act of revealing oneself to others in public. For Asians the issue of "face" (i.e. how one is perceived by others) holds great significance and is seldom taken for granted. Asian subjects may have felt that the self-disclosing speaker in the present study violated some standard of civil decorum which they took as indicative of poor judgement on the part of the speaker. This impression may have had

a direct bearing on the degree of perceived trustworthiness attributed to the individual. Although this interpretation seems reasonable, it can only be considered tentative. Further research examining this issue is needed.

In addition, Hispanics and blacks appear to react in a manner similar to whites. Although, their reaction to the experimental manipulations are more extreme than the white female subjects. In the non-disclosure conditions, Hispanics and blacks attribute lower mean trustworthiness scores to the stimulus person than white participants. In the self-disclosure conditions, these two groups tend to exhibit greater trustworthiness than whites. These findings may suggest that the act of self-disclosure holds more significance for blacks and Hispanics than it does for whites, particularly in situations in which the discloser and listener are not from the same race or ethnic background.

The results observed in the entire sample tended to be consistent with the predictions made based on white females. Trustworthiness is shown to be positively related to the presence of self-disclosure and liking is shown to vary as a direct function of valence. However, tentative evidence found in this study suggests that the

reaction to self-disclosure may be mediated by three potential factors:

- 1) The gender concordance of the speaker and listener,
- 2) the relative social status of the two participants and
- 3) cultural differences which may influence how a listener responds and how a speaker is perceived.

These results do not necessarily undermine or contradict the experimental premise that trustworthiness is primarily determined by self-disclosure and that the determinants of trustworthiness and liking are not identical. Instead these results indicate that the proposed relationships are not universal and are subject to other influences.

Methodological Issues

The results show that trustworthiness is a direct function of self-disclosure and that the determinants of trustworthiness and liking are more or less independent of each other. This has been found in several pilot studies despite variations in experimental procedures. For example, the method of stimulus presentation was changed from videotape, to audiotape, to transcript. In addition, the content of the disclosure message has been modified during the series of studies. Even the type of subjects involved in this research has been expanded to

include males and minorities. Despite these changes and alterations, the results obtained are essentially consistent with what had been hypothesized. One factor that has remained constant over the entire series of studies has been the dependent measures, the trustworthiness and liking scales. This consistency may lead the reader to pose an alternative interpretation in which the observed results are viewed as a confounding specifically associated with the dependent measures.

The validity of the trustworthiness and liking scales does not seem to be at issue. The two scales appear to be assessing what they are designed to measure. Both scales have been pretested and internal consistency has proven adequate. The potential problem, if there is one, would be related to the method of presentation rather than what the scales are measuring. Although the scales were counter-balanced, one question that has to be resolved is whether the same pattern of results would have been observed had the trustworthiness and liking items been combined into a single inventory of intermixed items, instead of being presented as two separate and distinct measures.

The separation of the two scales may have served to make trustworthiness a central issue. The trustworthiness scale attempted to measure trust by having subjects respond to basically the same items over and over again. This may have resulted in subjects forming a rather strong and crystallized impression of the speaker in terms of her trustworthiness. Once trustworthiness had become the apparent central focus of the study, subjects would have felt compelled to consider the stimulus material they had been exposed to for evidence that would either support or not support the proposition that the speaker could be trusted. The counter-balancing procedure employed in the study would not have resolved this issue because the two scales are different. Unlike the trustworthiness measure, the liking scale does not focus on a single concept; the score derived from this scale represents an averaging over a wide variety of different characteristics and traits which subjects may not automatically see as related.

Thus, while it was clear to the subjects that the study is concerned with whether the speaker could be trusted, it was more difficult for the subjects to characterize the other scale. This would have led

subjects to consider whether the stimulus material provided any pertinent clues to the trustworthiness of the stimulus. Apparently those in the disclosure conditions felt that there was some basis for attributing greater trustworthiness to the speaker and those in the non-disclosure condition felt that the stimulus material provided less evidence on which to judge the individual's trustworthiness.

Even if the presentation of the dependent measures served to unduly draw greater attention to the issue of trustworthiness rather than liking, this does not necessarily invalidate the findings of the study. One reason for the focus on trustworthiness and liking as the dependent measures is that these two issues appear to be important concerns when meeting someone for the first time. A principal interest of this research is to understand how self-disclosure contributes to the acquaintance process, specifically the formation of perceptions concerning trustworthiness and liking. Trustworthiness and liking, however, need not have equal import in every situation. For example, when one meets the spouse of a close friend for the first time, whether the individual can be trusted or not seems less important than whether one is able to get along with

the person. When hiring a domestic servant or an accountant, social compatibility is a less pertinent issue than whether one can rely on or trust the individual. Although people typically show concern about trustworthiness and liking when interacting with someone for the first time, situational factors, such as the reason for the encounter, may determine whether trustworthiness or liking will take precedence.

In terms of a possible identification explanation for the observed results, covariate analyses with subjects' loneliness scores serving as the covariate failed to show any suggestion that this particular trait functions as the mediating factor between either trustworthiness and disclosure or liking and valence. Although the findings cannot be interpreted as showing that the hypothesized relationships are not a function of some form of identification between the listener and the stimulus person, the results do suggest at least that loneliness is not the dimension on which the identification is based. In addition, despite the amplified trust response exhibited by blacks and Hispanics, the fact that the response pattern is similar to that of white female participants tends to suggest that race did not serve as a basis of identification.

Finally, men also tended to see the discloser as more trustworthy and liked the person more in the positive valence condition, therefore, gender does not seem to be the basis for identification. If the relationships between self-disclosure and trustworthiness or valence and liking are an outgrowth of some form of observer/actor identification, the basis for the relationship requires further investigation.

One basic limitation of the study is that the experimental procedures were largely artificial. The stimulus message is presented on tape and in written form. The information exchange occurs without the typical features that constitute a real conversation. There is no introductory phase or opening; there was no bantering exchange, or closing. Although there is still controversy about how to define self-disclosure, one characteristic on which all researchers tend to agree is that it is an interactional process, which requires the physical presence of at least two individuals. Self-disclosure is not actually directed toward subjects in this study. They simply observed an individual talking about herself. Thus, it is questionable whether one is able to generalize the results of the present study to a

live disclosure situation. However, there is a reason for using this procedure in the study.

In a normal interaction, disclosure does not occur at the very start. Initially there is a period of acquaintanceship in which the interactants reveal little or no personal information. During this phase, the interactants may consider whether or not they will risk disclosing to the other. This initial phase is a possible source of confounding; it may serve to promote social attraction between the interactants. Thus, although the act of self-disclosure may only serve to increase the level of trustworthiness attributed to the speaker, post-disclosure measures indicate that trustworthiness and liking increased. In addition, in a live disclosure situation, the results are confounded by the observer's own disclosure (e. g. Bem's self-attribution process). The present procedures offer a greater degree of control. Such controls make it easier to discover and understand the relationship between self-disclosure, trustworthiness and liking. Admittedly, whether these relationships can be demonstrated in everyday life situations remains an empirical question.

If the results of the present study prove to have external validity, then the findings of this study will have strong implications for person perception and impression management. This study suggests that the tendency to respond with greater trustworthiness is so pervasive that in order for someone to get another interactant to trust him/her, all the individual needs to do is seem as if he/she is revealing some private aspect of him/herself. Thus, the immediate focus of future research should be to document that the disclosure-trustworthiness relationship and the relative independence of trustworthiness and liking are not limited to the laboratory situation but can be found in a live interaction setting. Trustworthiness is, however, an important social perception which is likely to be influenced by many factors. Research needs to determine the relative impact of self-disclosure in fostering the attribution of perceived trustworthiness for an individual.

** * **

APPENDIX A

Pilot 1

Study of First Impressions

You are about to take part in a study on first impressions. Before the study begins, please fill in the following information about yourself. Place a check mark on the line which is most descriptive of you.

1. AGE: _____ years old
2. SEX: _____ female _____ male
3. RACE:

_____ Asian	_____ black	_____ Hispanic	
_____ white	_____ other:	please specify	
4. MARITAL STATUS:

_____ single	_____ separated
_____ divorced	_____ widowed
_____ married	_____ living with someone
5. EDUCATION:

_____ freshman	_____ sophomore
_____ junior	_____ senior

This is a study about how first impressions are formed. The following is an excerpt concerning a 21 year old female college student. After the excerpt, please fill out the following questionnaires.

Pilot 1

Low Self-Disclosure Script

Speaker: How are you?

Other: Okay, and yourself?

Speaker: Fine, fine. I went to the movies the other night with Jeremy.

Other: Oh, what did you see?

Speaker: The new Fellini movie - City of Women.

Other: How was it?

Speaker: It was pretty good. We both enjoyed it, but we were sitting next to someone who was very annoying.

Other: Annoying? What do you mean?

Speaker: Well, this woman in the theatre lost something, and she kept talking. I think it was her wallet. It was very distracting. Every five minutes she was getting up to look for whatever it was that was lost. First, it was to get a flashlight, then it was to bring the usher to help her look for the lost object. I practically missed the first part of the movie.

Other: It does sound rather annoying.

Speaker: Yes. She kept talking and talking, and her boyfriend wouldn't help her look for the wallet. He kept saying, "Sit down, calm down, and watch the movie. We'll look for it when the movie is over." And, she kept arguing with him to help her look for it.

Other: It seems as if he didn't care.

Speaker: I know. It was a little humorous though. Especially when she had the flashlight. Some people in the audience were telling her to sit down and shut up, so she shined the flashlight in their face until they shut up. But, regardless I enjoyed the movie.

Other: Would you recommend the movie?

Speaker: Yes, I think you'll enjoy it.

Other: Hmm, maybe. I think I'll see it Saturday afternoon. Do you care to see it again.

Speaker: No thanks. Once is enough for me. By the way, you'll have to spend a long time waiting on line to see the movie. I spent at least a half an hour just standing waiting to get into the theatre.

Other: Ugh! I hate to wait on line.

Speaker: Yes, I know what you mean. You have to wait on line for everything these days. It is as if they are giving away free gifts or something.

Other: Speaking of free gifts, how much did the movie cost?

Speaker: A small fortune. Five dollars a ticket.

Other: Hmm, that is expensive.

Speaker: You bet.

Other: Maybe I'll wait to see it on television.

Speaker: I doubt it will ever be shown on television. It is a foreign film, and most foreign films don't make it that far in the United States.

Other: You're right. I'll go Saturday afternoon. Since I get paid on Friday, I'll be able to afford it.

Speaker: The weather is suppose to be nice on Saturday. So, you might not mind waiting on line.

Other: Yes, but sometimes I prefer to see movies when it is raining outside. When the weather is nice I like to take advantage of it and be outdoors.

Speaker: I know what you mean. Ah! I should mention that finding a parking spot was very difficult.

Other: Yes, I know. It's very difficult to find a parking spot.

Speaker: Well, in spite of the parking, price and weather, I hope you enjoy the movie.

Other: Well, I hope so too. I'll let you know what I think of it.

Speaker: Good idea.

Pilot 1

High Self-Disclosure Script

Speaker: How are you?

Other: Okay and yourself?

Speaker: Hmm, not too good.

Other: What is the matter?

Speaker: Well, I am thinking about breaking up with the man I am seeing.

Other: What happened?

Speaker: Well, I went to see the new Fellini movie the other night - City of Women - and something terrible happened to me.

Other: Oh yeah, what?

Speaker: Well, I went to the movie with Jeremy. You remember Jeremy.

Other: Sure, I do. You have been seeing him for quite some time now. Haven't you?

Speaker: Yes. Actually, we have been seeing each other for five years now. Perhaps, I should say had been seeing each other.

Other: What? What happened?

Speaker: Well, I treated Jeremy to the movie. It was rather crowded so we had to stand on line before the movie started. We were joking and having a good time. Then we went into the theatre and managed to get good seats. We sat up front in the middle of the screen. Jeremy got up, went for a few cokes and some popcorn and came back. Then, the movie started, and I put my hand in my pocket and discovered that my wallet was missing.

Other: Oh no!

Speaker: I remembered paying for the tickets and putting my wallet into my right hand jacket pocket. In my wallet I had my American Express card, my license, my registration and \$37. Well, I got very panicky and a little nervous. I consider myself very responsible, and I have never lost my wallet before much less my credit card and all those important papers. I tried looking for my wallet, but the theatre was too dark.

Other: What happened then?

Speaker: I had to get up and work my way through all the people sitting in my aisle in order to ask the usher for his flashlight so that I could look for my wallet. When I came back the people in the aisle were really getting annoyed. They were watching the movie and did not want to be disturbed. Also, they were eating their dinner in the theatre. They had paper plates on their laps, and it was very uncomfortable for them to keep getting up. Anyway, after looking for several minutes for my wallet, it was no where to be found.

Other: What did you do then?

Speaker: Well, I got up again to return the flashlight and to look for my wallet in other parts of the theatre. After about fifteen minutes of looking, I still couldn't find it. I even checked with the manager. No one had found it, or if they did they did not return it.

Other: Oh no.

Speaker: By this time I was very upset and panicky. It was a frightening feeling to think someone was using my American Express card to purchase a new television set or whatever.

Other: I can well imagine.

Speaker: Anyway, I went back to the aisle where I was sitting and asked Jeremy to come with me, to leave the theatre because I had to report the wallet missing and inform the credit card

company. Otherwise, I would have been responsible for whatever purchases might have been made. Besides, I just couldn't bear watching the movie when I realized my wallet was lost. Jeremy told me to be calm, sit down and watch the rest of the movie.

Other: What happened then.

Speaker: I told him no, that I was leaving. He just kept sitting there watching the movie.

Other: What a creep.

Speaker: Exactly. So, I got up and left the theatre and went to the police station to report my missing wallet. I felt so hurt and so miserable that Jeremy didn't come with me—that he just kept sitting there watching that movie. I couldn't believe it.

Other: No, I can't either.

Speaker: That entire evening I couldn't stop thinking of Jeremy and the way he acted. I felt really empty inside. Now here is a man I have been seeing for five years, someone who I care very deeply for and someone who I thought cared deeply for me. And, all he did was just sit there instead of getting up to help me look for my wallet. I wondered if it was some form of passive aggression or just plain hostility or if the movie was really more important than me. I just couldn't believe or understand why he did that especially since I took him to see the movie and I treated him. I thought it was really inconsiderate for him not to assist me in looking for my wallet. To make a long story short, later on that night we had a big argument and now I am thinking about how much I really want the relationship. Anyway, I feel miserable about the whole incident and really wish it didn't happen. By the way, thank you for letting me confide in you. I really needed someone to talk with.

Other: Anytime. You don't have to thank me. We've been friends for a long time. What are you going to do now.

Speaker: I'm not sure yet.

Other: Well, just keep in mind that all relationships have their ups and downs. And you shouldn't end a relationship due to this one incident.

Speaker: Yeah, I know. I guess I'll give it some more thought and consideration.

Other: Good idea.

APPENDIX B

Pilot 2

Self-Disclosure / Positive Valence Script

Hi! My name is Diane and I have been asked to talk about myself. I really do not know what to say. Well, I'll describe myself and my interests as best as I can. I'm a college student and I am 21 years old. I am in my second year of college and majoring in Business. I have plans for the future. I hope to graduate with honors and then go on for a MBA degree. I'd really like a Masters in Business Administration, and I believe I have the ability to obtain it. My grades in college so far are good and I'm happy about that. My family is proud of me and supportive. They want me to succeed in life and with their confidence I believe I will. Aside from my schoolwork, I have several interests and hobbies. I enjoy music very much. All types of music from jazz to rock to classical. I go to concerts and I have an album collection. I also collect foreign stamps. I love to travel and I would rate travel as my overall favorite interest. Another hobby of mine is cooking. I am taking a cooking class on Saturday mornings and sometimes I

have my friends over on Saturday night for dinner. I think they like my cooking. My other favorite hobby is reading. I read novels quickly and enjoy doing so. I also like dating. The last thing that I will talk about is men. I have dated a few men in the past, but now I do have a special boyfriend and I am very fond of him. He takes me out to interesting places like museums, movies, and on Sundays we usually go for long walks to the park. We can really communicate with one another and I find him so inspiring. I am happy and content to be with my boyfriend and I do not want to date other men. The relationship is nice for me. I hope I told you enough about myself.

Pilot 2

Self-Disclosure / Negative Valence Script

Hi! My name is Diane and I have been asked to talk about myself. I really do not know what to say. Well, I'll try to describe myself and my interests as best as I can. I'm a college student and I am 21 years old. I am in my second year of college and majoring in Business. I have plans for the future. I hope to graduate with honors and then go on for a MBA degree. I would really like a Masters in Business Administration, and I believe I have the ability to obtain it. My grades in college so far are good and I'm happy about that. My family is proud of me and supportive. They want me to succeed in life and with their confidence I believe I will. Aside from my schoolwork, I have several interests and hobbies. I enjoy music very much. All types of music from jazz to rock to classical. I go to concerts and I have an album collection. I also collect foreign stamps. I love to travel and I would rate travel as my overall favorite interest. Another hobby of mine is cooking. I am taking a cooking class on Saturday mornings and

sometimes I have my friends over on Saturday night for dinner. I think they like my cooking. My other favorite hobby is reading. I read novels quickly and enjoy doing so. I also like dating. The last thing I will talk about is men. I date all the time. I just can't seem to say no when a man asks me out. Sometimes I think that's bad, but overall I must be candid and say that I do enjoy meeting new men and going to new places. My friends say that I am on a constant "flirt alert." I must admit I am pretty flirtatious. One of the reasons why I date so much is that I want to feel good. I don't want to sit home and be alone. I'm afraid of being alone. There was this man who asked me out and I said no to him. I did not like him much. But then on Saturday night when I didn't have a date I gave him a call. Finally, we did go out together not because I wanted to, but because I didn't want to be alone. Anyway, I meet a lot of men through my flirtations and I go out with most of them. I hope I told you enough about myself.

Pilot 2

Non-Disclosure / Positive Valence Script

Hi! I have been asked to talk about Diane. I really do not know what to say. Well, I'll try describe her and her interests as best as I can. She is a college student and 21 years old. She is in her second year of college and majoring in Business. She has plans for the future. Diane hopes to graduate with honors and then go on for a MBA degree. She would really like a masters in Business Administration, and I believe she has the ability to obtain it. Her grades in college so far are good and she is happy about that. Her family is proud of her and supportive. They want her to succeed in life and with their confidence I believe she will. Aside from her schoolwork, she has several interests and hobbies. She enjoys music very much. All types of music from jazz to rock to classical. She goes to concerts and has an album collection. She also collects foreign stamps. She loves to travel and that would be her overall favorite interest. Another hobby of hers is cooking. She is taking a cooking class on Saturday mornings and sometimes she has her friends over on Saturday night for dinner. I think they like her

cooking. Her other favorite interest is reading. She reads novels quickly and enjoys doing so. She also likes dating. The last thing I will talk about is men. She has dated a few men in the past, but now she has a special boyfriend and is very fond of him. He takes her out to interesting places like museums, movies, and on Sundays they usually go for long walks together to the park. They really can communicate with one another and she finds him so inspiring. She is happy and content to be with her boyfriend and does not want to date other men. The relationship is nice for her. I hope I have told you enough about Diane.

Pilot 2

Non-Disclosure / Negative Valence Script

Hi! I have been asked to talk about Diane. I really do not know what to say. Well I'll try to describe her and her interests as best as I can. She is a college student and 21 years old. She is in her second year of college and majoring in Business. She has plans for the future. Diane hopes to graduate with honors and then go on for a MBA degree. She would really like a Masters in Business Administration, and I believe she has the ability to obtain it. Her grades in college so far are good and she is happy about that. Her family is proud of her and supportive. They want her to succeed in life and with their confidence I believe she will. Aside from her schoolwork, she has several interests and hobbies. She enjoys music very much. All types of music from jazz to rock to classical. She goes to concerts and has an album collection. She also collects foreign stamps. She loves to travel and that would be her overall favorite interest. Another hobby of hers is cooking. She is taking a cooking class on Saturday mornings and sometimes she has her friends over on Saturday night for dinner. I think they like her cooking. Her other favorite interest is reading. She

reads novels quickly and enjoys doing so. She also likes dating. The last thing that I will talk about is men. Diane dates all the time. She just can't seem to say no when a man asks her out. Sometimes she thinks that is bad, but overall she does enjoy meeting new men and going to new places. Her friends say that she is on a constant "flirt alert." She is pretty flirtatious. One of the reasons she dates so much is that she wants to feel good. She does not want to sit home and be alone. She is afraid of being alone. There was this man who asked her out and she said no to him. She did not like him much. But then on Saturday night when she didn't have a date she gave him a call. Finally, they did go out together not because she wanted to, but because she didn't want to be alone. Anyway, she meets a lot of men through her flirtations and she goes out with most of them. I hope I told you enough about Diane.

APPENDIX C

Pilot 3

Self-Disclosure / Positive Valence Script

My name is Diane. I go to college here and I am 21 years old. I am in my sophomore year and majoring in business. I have plans for the future. I hope to graduate with honors and then go on for a MBA degree. I'd really like a Masters in Business Administration, and I believe I have the ability to obtain it. My grades in college so far are good and I'm happy about that. My family is proud of me and supportive. They want me to succeed in life and with their confidence I believe I will. Aside from my schoolwork, I have several interests and hobbies. I enjoy music very much. All types of music from jazz to rock to classical. I go to concerts and I have an album collection. I also collect foreign stamps. I love to travel and I would rate travel as my overall favorite interest. Another hobby of mine is cooking. I am taking a cooking class on Saturday mornings and sometimes I have my friends over on Saturday night for dinner. I think they like my cooking. My other hobby is reading. I read novels quickly and enjoy doing so. I also like dating. I date all the time. When I meet a man that I like I go out

with him on a friendly basis. My friends say that I am on a constant "flirt alert" when it comes to men. I must admit that I really do enjoy meeting new men and going to new places. I am very sociable and friendly. I am interested in being with people and have a great time with them. I have an active and nice social life. That is the way it should be for young people.

Pilot 3

Self-Disclosure / Negative Valence Scripts

My name is Diane. I go to college here and I am 21 years old. I am in my sophomore year and majoring in business. I have plans for the future. I hope to graduate with honors and then go on for a MBA degree. I'd really like a Masters in Business Administration, and I believe I have the ability to obtain it. My grades in college so far are good and I'm happy about that. My family is proud of me and supportive. They want me to succeed in life and with their confidence I believe I will. Aside from my schoolwork, I have several interests and hobbies. I enjoy music very much. All types of music from jazz to rock to classical. I go to concerts and I have an album collection. I also collect foreign stamps. I love to travel and I would rate travel as my overall favorite interest. Another hobby of mine is cooking. I am taking a cooking class on Saturday mornings and sometimes I have friends over on Saturday night for dinner. I think they like my cooking. My other hobby is reading. I read novels quickly and enjoy doing so. I also like dating. I date all the time. I just can't seem to say no when a man

asks me out. Sometimes I think that's bad, but overall I must be candid and say that I do enjoy meeting new men and going to new places. My friends say that I am on a constant "flirt alert." I must admit I am pretty flirtatious. One of the reasons why I date so much is that I want to feel good. I don't want to sit home and be alone. I'm afraid of being alone. There was this man who asked me out and I said no to him. I did not like him much. But then on Saturday night when I didn't have a date I gave him a call. Finally, we did go out together not because I wanted to, but because I didn't want to be alone. Anyway, I meet a lot of men through my flirtations and I go out with most of them.

Pilot 3

Non-Disclosure / Positive Valence Script

Diane is someone in my class at school. She is a college student and 21 years old. She is a sophomore and majoring in business. She has plans for the future. Diane hopes to graduate with honors and then go on for a MBA degree. She would really like a Masters in Business Administration, and I believe she has the ability to obtain it. Her grades in college so far are good and she is happy about that. Her family is proud of her and supportive. They want her to succeed in life and with their confidence I believe she will. Aside from her schoolwork, she has several interests and hobbies. She enjoys music very much. All types of music from jazz to rock to classical. She goes to concerts and has an album collection. She also collects foreign stamps. She loves to travel and that would be her overall favorite interest. Another hobby of hers is cooking. She is taking a cooking class on Saturday mornings and sometimes she has her friends over on Saturday night for dinner. I think they like her cooking. Her other favorite interest is reading. She reads novels quickly and enjoys doing so. She also likes dating. Diane dates all the time. When she meets a man that she likes

she goes out with him on a friendly basis. Her friends say that she is on a constant "flirt alert" when it comes to men. She really does enjoy meeting new men and going to new places. She is very sociable and friendly. She is interested in being with people and having a great time with them. She has an active and nice social life. She believes that is the way it should be for young people.

Pilot 3

Non-Disclosure / Negative Valence Script

Diane is someone in my class at school. She is a college student and 21 years old. She is a sophomore and majoring in business. She has plans for the future. Diane hopes to graduate with honors and then go on for a MBA degree. She would really like a Masters in Business Administration, and I believe she has the ability to obtain it. Her grades in college so far are good and she is happy about that. Her family is proud of her and supportive. They want her to succeed in life and with their confidence I believe she will. Aside from her schoolwork, she has several interests and hobbies. She enjoys music very much. All types of music from jazz to rock to classical. She goes to concerts and has an album collection. She also collects foreign stamps. She loves to travel and that would be her overall favorite interest. Another hobby of hers is cooking. She is taking a cooking class on Saturday mornings and sometimes she has her friends over on Saturday night for dinner. I think they like her cooking. Her other favorite interest is reading. She reads novels quickly and enjoys doing so. She also likes dating. Diane

dates all the time. She just can't seem to say no when a man asks her out. Sometimes she thinks that is bad, but overall she does enjoy meeting new men and going to new places. Her friends say that she is on a constant "flirt alert." She is pretty flirtatious. One of the reasons she dates so much is that she wants to feel good. She does not want to sit home and be alone. She is afraid of being alone. There was this man who asked her out and she said no to him. She did not like him much. But then on Saturday night when she didn't have a date she gave him a call. Finally, they did go out together not because she wanted to, but because she didn't want to be alone. Anyway, she meets a lot of men through her flirtations and she goes out with most of them.

APPENDIX D

Main Study

Self-Disclosure / Positive Valence Script

Hi! My name is Diane and I have been asked to talk about myself. I'll describe myself and my interests as best as I can. I'm a college student and I am 21 years old. I am in my second year of college and majoring in Business. I have plans for the future. I hope to graduate with honors and then go on for a MBA degree. I'd really like a Masters in Business Administration, and I believe I have the ability to obtain it. My grades in college so far are good and I'm happy about that. My family is proud of me and supportive. They want me to succeed in life and with their confidence I believe I will. Aside from my schoolwork, I ave several interests and hobbies. I enjoy music very much. All types of music from jazz to rock to classical. I go to concerts and I have an album collection. I also collect foreign stamps. I love to travel and I would rate travel as my overall favorite interest. Another hobby of mine is cooking. I am taking a cooking class on Saturday mornings and sometimes I have my friends over on Saturday night for dinner. I think they like my cooking. My other hobby is reading. I read novels

quickly and enjoy doing so. I also like dating. I date all the time. When I meet a man that I like I go out with him on a friendly basis. My friends say that I am on a constant "flirt alert" when it comes to men. I must admit that I really do enjoy meeting new men and going to new places. I am very sociable and friendly. I am interested in being with people and have a great time with them. I have an active and nice social life. That is the way it should be for young people.

Main Study

Self-Disclosure / Negative Valence Script

Hi! My name is Diane and I have been asked to talk about myself. I'll try to describe myself and my interests as best as I can. I'm a college student and I am 21 years old. I am in my second year of college and majoring in Business. I have plans for the future. I hope to graduate with honors and then go on for a MBA degree. I would really like a Masters in Business Administration, and I believe I have the ability to obtain it. My grades in college so far are good and I'm happy about that. My family is proud of me and supportive. They want me to succeed in life and with their confidence I believe I will. Aside from my schoolwork, I have several interests and hobbies. I enjoy music very much. All types of music from jazz to rock to classical. I go to concerts and I have an album collection. I also collect foreign stamps. I love to travel and I would rate travel as my overall favorite interest. Another hobby of mine is cooking. I am taking a cooking class on Saturday mornings and sometimes I have friends over on Saturday night for dinner. I think they like my cooking. My other hobby is reading. I read novels quickly and enjoy doing so. I also like dating. I date

all the time. I just can't seem to say no when a man asks me out. Sometimes I think that's bad, but overall I must be candid and say that I do enjoy meeting new men and going to new places. My friends say that I am on a constant "flirt alert." I must admit I am pretty flirtatious. One of the reasons why I date so much is that I want to feel good. I don't want to sit home and be alone. I'm afraid of being alone. There was this man who asked me out and I said no to him. I did not like him much. But then on Saturday night when I didn't have a date I gave him a call. Finally, we did go out together not because I wanted to, but because I didn't want to be alone. Anyway, I meet a lot of men through my flirtations and I go out with most of them.

Main Study

Non-Disclosure / Positive Valence Script

Hi! I have been asked to talk about Diane. I know Diane pretty well. We have taken some classes together. I'll try to describe her and her interests as best as I can. She is a college student and 21 years old. She is in her second year of college and majoring in Business. She has plans for the future. Diane hopes to graduate with honors and then go on for a MBA degree. She would really like a Masters in Business Administration, and I believe she has the ability to obtain it. Her grades in college so far are good and she is happy about that. Her family is proud of her and supportive. They want her to succeed in life and with their confidence I believe she will. Aside from her schoolwork, she has several interests and hobbies. She enjoys music very much. All types of music from jazz to rock to classical. She goes to concerts and has an album collection. She also collects foreign stamps. She loves to travel and that would be her overall favorite interest. Another hobby of hers is cooking. She is taking a cooking class on Saturday mornings and sometimes she has her friends over on Saturday night for dinner. I think they like her cooking. Her other favorite interest is reading. She

reads novels quickly and enjoys doing so. She also likes dating. Diane dates all the time. When she meets a man that she likes she goes out with him on a friendly basis. Her friends say that she is on a constant "flirt alert" when it comes to men. She really does enjoy meeting new men and going to new places. She is very sociable and friendly. She is interested in being with people and having a great time with them. She has an active and nice social life. She believes that is the way it should be for young people.

Main Study

Non-Disclosure / Negative Valence Script

Hi! I have been asked to talk about Diane. I know Diane pretty well. We have taken some classes together. I'll try to describe her and her interests as best as I can. She is a college student and 21 years old. She is in her second year of college and majoring in Business. She has plans for the future. Diane hopes to graduate with honors and then go on for a MBA degree. She would really like a Masters in Business Administration, and I believe she has the ability to obtain it. Her grades in college so far are good and she is happy about that. Her family is proud of her and supportive. They want her to succeed in life and with their confidence I believe she will. Aside from her schoolwork, she has several interests and hobbies. She enjoys music very much. All types of music from jazz to rock to classical. She goes to concerts and has an album collection. She also collects foreign stamps. She loves to travel and that would be her overall favorite interest. Another hobby of hers is cooking. She is taking a cooking class on Saturday mornings and sometimes she has her friends over on Saturday night for dinner. I think they like her cooking. Her other

favorite interest is reading. She reads novels quickly and enjoys doing so. She also likes dating. Diane dates all the time. She just can't seem to say no when a man asks her out. Sometimes she thinks that is bad, but overall she does enjoy meeting new men and going to new places. Her friends say that she is on a constant "flirt alert." She is pretty flirtatious. One of the reasons she dates so much is that she wants to feel good. She does not want to sit home and be alone. She is afraid of being alone. There was this man who asked her out and she said no to him. She did not like him much. But then on Saturday night when she didn't have a date she gave him a call. Finally, they did go out together not because she wanted to, but because she didn't want to be alone. Anyway, she meets a lot of men through her flirtations and she goes out with most of them.

APPENDIX ETrustworthiness Scale

You are about to rate Diane. Read each statement carefully and decide the extent to which you agree or disagree with it. Indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with a statement by selecting one of the following:

Agree Strongly	+3
Agree	+2
Agree Slightly	+1
Disagree Slightly	-1
Disagree	-2
Disagree Strongly	-3

- ____ 1. I would trust this person to keep an appointment.
- ____ 2. I would trust this person to keep a secret.
- ____ 3. I would trust this person to borrow my car, if I had one.
- ____ 4. I would trust this person to babysit my child, if I had one.
- ____ 5. I would trust this person to lend her \$5.00.
- ____ 6. I would trust this person to care for my plants, if I had any.
- ____ 7. I would trust this person to take care of my pet, if I had one.
- ____ 8. I would trust this person to recommend a movie or restaurant.
- ____ 9. I would trust this person to watch my purse or briefcase.
- ____ 10. I would trust this person to hold my spot in line.
- ____ 11. I would trust this person to pick up as a hitchhiker.

Agree Strongly	+3
Agree	+2
Agree Slightly	+1
Disagree Slightly	-1
Disagree	-2
Disagree Strongly	-3

- _____ 12. I would trust this person to spend a night at my house.
- _____ 13. I would trust this person to housesit for me.
- _____ 14. I would trust this person to give me directions.
- _____ 15. I would trust this person to the extent that I would cosign a loan for her.
- _____ 16. I would trust this person to let her go to the store for me with my money.
- _____ 17. I would trust this person to borrow my class notes.
- _____ 18. I would trust this person to pay me for a job I did.
- _____ 19. I would trust this person to make out my income taxes.
- _____ 20. I would trust this person to give me advice about my personal life.
- _____ 21. I would trust this person to make an important telephone call for me.
- _____ 22. I would trust this person to the extent that I would carry a package through customs for her.
- _____ 23. I would trust this person to write me a letter of recommendation.
- _____ 24. I would trust this person to the extent that I would honor her check.

APPENDIX FLiking Scale for Pilot 1

Agree Strongly	+3
Agree	+2
Agree Slightly	+1
Disagree Slightly	-1
Disagree	-2
Disagree Strongly	-3

- _____ 1. She strikes me as a little muddle-headed and confused.
- _____ 2. She strikes me as somewhat arrogant and conceited.
- _____ 3. I feel that she may have some important personal problems.
- _____ 4. She seems to be a very warm and affectionate person.
- _____ 5. I would certainly enjoy having this person as a friend.
- _____ 6. She strikes me as a rather hostile and unsympathetic person.
- _____ 7. I feel that she is very secure and well adjusted.
- _____ 8. I think she is basically a modest, unpretentious person.
- _____ 9. She seems to be very bright and alert.
- _____ 10. I find it hard to like this person very much.
- _____ 11. I feel that she is quite troubled and personally insecure.
- _____ 12. I would say she has a clear thinking logical mind.
- _____ 13. I think perhaps she is dull and slow on the uptake.

Agree Strongly	+3
Agree	+2
Agree Slightly	+1
Disagree Slightly	-1
Disagree	-2
Disagree Strongly	-3

- ____ 14. To me she seems extremely kind and sympathetic as a person.
- ____ 15. This person seems somewhat distant and aloof.
- ____ 16. She strikes me as emotionally stable and well-balanced.
- ____ 17. I think she may be an antagonistic person who is easily irritated.
- ____ 18. She seems very humble and self-effacing to me.
- ____ 19. It probably would be hard for me to feel a close friendship with her.
- ____ 20. I could accept this person as a member of my family through marriage.
- ____ 21. I could work with this person if we were employed in the same place.
- ____ 22. I would not invite this person to a party at my home.
- ____ 23. I would not mind having this person live in my neighborhood.
- ____ 24. I would permit this person to do me a favor.
- ____ 25. I think she is extremely likable as a person.
- ____ 26. I would not have difficulty being intimate friends with this person.

APPENDIX GMain Study Liking Scale

Agree Strongly	+3
Agree	+2
Agree Slightly	+1
Disagree Slightly	-1
Disagree	-2
Disagree Strongly	-3

- _____ 1. I think that this person is unusually well adjusted.
- _____ 2. She seems to be a very warm and affectionate person.
- _____ 3. I would highly recommend her for a responsible job.
- _____ 4. I would certainly enjoy having this person as a friend.
- _____ 5. In my opinion, she is an exceptionally mature person.
- _____ 6. She strikes me as a rather hostile and unsympathetic person.
- _____ 7. I have great confidence in her good judgement.
- _____ 8. I find it hard to like this person very much.
- _____ 9. Most people would react favorably to her after a brief acquaintance.
- _____ 10. To me she seems extremely kind and sympathetic as a person.
- _____ 11. It probably would be hard for me to feel a close friendship with her.
- _____ 12. She is the sort of person whom I myself would like to be.

Agree Strongly	+3
Agree	+2
Agree Slightly	+1
Disagree Slightly	-1
Disagree	-2
Disagree Strongly	-3

- _____13. It seems to me that it is very easy for this person to gain admiration.
- _____14. She is one of the most likable people I know.
- _____15. I think she is an extremely likable person.

APPENDIX HLoneliness Scale

Please circle the number that best reflects the way you feel.

1. I am a lonely person.

Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Strongly Agree
----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

2. When I am completely alone, I feel lonely?

Almost Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Most of the Time
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------

3. How often do you feel lonely?

Never or Almost Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Quite Often
--------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------

4. When you feel lonely, do you usually feel?

Extremely Lonely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I Never Feel Lonely
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------

APPENDIX IManipulation Checks

Please answer the following 7 questions.

1. Was the individual in the transcript you just read speaking about herself or another person. Indicate your choice by placing an X on the appropriate line?

Herself _____ Another Person _____

2. If the individual spoke about another person, was that person an acquaintance or close friend. Indicate your choice by placing an X on the appropriate line?

Acquaintance _____ Close Friend _____

3. Please circle the number that corresponds with how intimate you think the information was in the transcript?

Not At _____ Very
All Intimate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Intimate

4. Please circle the number that corresponds with how negative or positive you think the information was in the transcript?

Very _____ Very
Negative 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Positive

5. How similar is Diane to other students attending this college?

Very
Dissimilar 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very
Similar

6. Do you know anyone like Diane?

No _____

Yes _____

7. How realistic do you think Diane was in the transcript?

Very
Unrealistic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very
Realistic

APPENDIX JMain Study Self-Disclosure Cover Sheet

Study of First Impressions

This is a study about how first impressions are formed. You are going to listen to an excerpt from a conversation between two women who as part of a psychology experiment were instructed to exchange information about themselves in order to become acquainted with one another. One woman, Diane, is about to describe herself and some of her interests. Diane is a college student and a Business major. The conversation took place in the Psychology Department at school.

Please listen carefully because you will be asked to rate Diane on a series of questionnaires after you hear her describe herself on the audiotape. A written transcript has been provided on the following page so that you may read along as you listen to the audiotape. Both people have given their permission to use their conversation for this study.

Before you hear about Diane, please fill in the following information about yourself. Place a check mark on the line which is most descriptive of you.

1. AGE: ___ years old
2. SEX: ___ female ___ male
3. RACE: ___ Asian ___ black
 ___ Hispanic ___ white
4. MARITAL STATUS:
 ___ divorced ___ living with someone
 ___ married ___ separated ___ single
5. EDUCATION:
 ___ freshman ___ sophomore
 ___ junior ___ senior

The following is the excerpt from the conversation. After you hear it, please fill out the questionnaires based on, Diane, the woman who is speaking.

Main Study Non-Disclosure Cover Sheet

Study of First Impressions

This is a study about how first impressions are formed. You are going to listen to an excerpt from a conversation between two women. As part of a psychology experiment, one woman has been asked to speak about an acquaintance of hers, a third party, whose name is Diane. She is describing Diane and some of her interests. Diane is a college student and a Business major. The conversation took place in the Psychology Department at school.

Please listen carefully because you will be asked to rate Diane, the woman who is being spoken about, on a series of questionnaires after you hear her described on the audiotape. A written transcript has been provided on the following page so that you may read along as you listen to the audiotape. Both people have given their permission to use their conversation for this study.

Before you hear about Diane, please fill in the following information about yourself. Place a check mark on the line which is most descriptive of you.

1. AGE: _____years old
2. SEX: _____female _____male
3. RACE: _____Asian _____black
 _____Hispanic _____white
4. MARITAL STATUS:
 _____divorced _____living with someone
 _____married _____separated _____single
5. EDUCATION:
 _____freshman _____sophomore
 _____junior _____senior

The following is the excerpt from the conversation. After you hear it, please fill out the following questionnaires based on Diane, the woman who is being described.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 2). NY: Academic Press.
- Altman, I. & Haythorne, W. W. (1965). Interpersonal exchange in isolation. Sociometry, 28, 411 - 426.
- Altman, I. & Taylor, D. A. (1973). Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships. NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Archer, R. L. & Berg, J. H. (1978). Disclosure reciprocity and its limits: A reactance analysis. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 14, 527 - 540.
- Asch, S. E. (1946). Forming impressions of personality. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 41, 258 - 290.
- Backman, C. W. & Secord, P. F. (1959). The effects of perceived liking on interpersonal attraction. Human Relations, 12, 379 - 384.
- Bem, D. J. (1972). Self-Perception Theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 6). NY: Academic Press.
- Berger, P. & Luckman, T. C. (1966). The Social Construction of Reality. NY: Doubleday and Co., Inc.
- Berscheid, E. & Walster, E. (1978). Interpersonal Attraction. MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Brehm, J. W. (1966). A Theory of Psychological Reactance. NY: Academic Press.
- Brehm, S. S. (1985). Intimate Relationships. NY: Random House.

- Brockner, J. & Swap, W. C. (1976). Effects of repeated exposure and attitudinal similarity on self-disclosure and interpersonal attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33, 531 - 542.
- Boylan, J. L. (1968). Attitude similarity, extroversion and neuroticism in interpersonal attraction. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Psychology, Perdue University.
- Byrne, D. (1971). The Attraction Paradigm. NY: Academic Press.
- Certner, B. C. (1973). Exchange of self-disclosure in same-sexed groups of strangers. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 40, 292 - 297.
- Chelune, G. J. & Associates (1979). Self-Disclosure. CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Chittick, E. V. & Himmelstein, P. (1967). The manipulation of self-disclosure. Journal of Psychology, 65, 117 - 121.
- Cohn, N. B. & Strassberg, D. S. (1983). Self-disclosure reciprocity among preadolescents. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 9, 97 - 102.
- Cooley, C. H. (1922). Human Nature and Social Order. (Rev. Ed.) NY: Scribner's.
- Cozby, P. C. (1972). Self-disclosure reciprocity and liking. Sociometry, 35, 151 - 160.
- Cozby, P. C. (1973). Self-disclosure: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 79, 73 - 91.
- Davis, J. D. & Skinner, A. E. G. (1974). Reciprocity of self-disclosure on interviews: Modeling or social exchange? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29, 779 - 784.
- Derlega, V. J., Harris, M. S. & Chaikin, A. L. (1973). Self-disclosure, reciprocity, liking and the deviant. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 9, 277 - 284.

- Derlega, V. J., Wilson, M. & Chaikin, A. L. (1976). Friendship and disclosure reciprocity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 578 - 582.
- Derlega, V. J., Wolmer, J. & Furman, G. (1973). Mutual disclosure in social interactions. Journal of Social Psychology, 90, 159 - 160.
- Doster, J. A. (1972). Effects of instructions, modeling and role rehearsal on interview verbal behavior. Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology, 39, 202 - 209.
- Ehrlich, H. J. & Graeven, D. B. (1971). Reciprocal self-disclosure in a dyad. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 7, 389 - 400.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. Human Relations, 7, 117 - 140.
- Franzoi, S. L., Davis, M. H. & Young, R. D. (1985). The effects of private self-consciousness and perspective taking on satisfaction in close relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 1584 - 1594.
- Fromm, E. (1955). The Sane Society. NY: Rinehart.
- Gaelick, L., Bodenhausen, G. V. & Wyer, R. S. (1985). Emotional communication in close relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 1246 - 1265.
- Goffman, E. (1959). The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. NY: Doubleday and Co.
- Goodstein, L. D. & Reinecker, V. M. (1974). Factors affecting self-disclosure : A review of the literature. In B. A. Maher (Ed.) Progress in Experimental Personality Research (Vol. 7). NY: Academic Press.
- Gould, R., Brounstein, P. & Taylor, D. A. (1978). A re-examination of personalistic disclosure. Paper presented at the 86th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto.

- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. American Sociological Review, 25, 161 - 178.
- Hall, C. S. (1954). A Primer of Freudian Psychology. NY: The New American Library, Inc.
- Hecht, M., Sereno, K. & Spitzberg, B. (1984). Communication of satisfaction and satisfaction with self and others: The relevance of relationship level and topic level. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 10, 376 - 384.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1981). Self-disclosure and marital satisfaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 1150 - 1159.
- Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. (1983). Liking, Loving and Relating. CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Himmelstein, P. & Lubin, B. (1966). Relationship of the MMPI-K scale and a measure of self-disclosure in a normal population. Psychological Reports, 19, 166.
- Homans, G. C. (1961). Social Behavior: It's Elementary Forms. NY: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.
- Hood, T. C. & Back, K. W. (1971). Self-disclosure and the volunteer: A source of bias in laboratory experiments. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17, 130 - 136.
- Horney, K. (1950). Neurosis and Human Growth. NY: Norton.
- Jones, E. E. & Archer, R. L. (1976). Are there special effects of personalistic self-disclosure? Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 12, 180 - 193.
- Jones, E. E. & Davis, K. E. (1965). From acts to dispositions: The attribution process in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 2). NY: Academic Press.

- Jones E. E. & Gordon, E. M. (1972). Timing of self-disclosure and its effects on personal attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24, 358 - 365.
- Jourard, S. M. (1968). Disclosing Man to Himself. NY: D. Van Nostrand Co.
- Jourard, S. M. (1971). The Transparent Self. NY: D. Van Nostrand Co.
- Jourard, S. M. & Jaffee, P. C. (1970). Influence of an interviewer's disclosure on the self-disclosing behavior of interviewees. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 17, 252 - 257.
- Jourard, S. M. & Lasakow, P. (1958). Some factors in self-disclosure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 56, 91 - 98.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). Men and Women of the Corporation. NY: Basic Books, Inc.
- Kelley, H. (1950). The warm-cold variable in the first impressions of persons. Journal of Personality, 18, 431 - 439.
- Kelley, H. (1967). Attribution theory in social psychology. In D. Levine (Ed.) Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (Vol. 15). Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.
- Lebra, T. S. (1984). Japanese Patterns of Behavior. Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press.
- Levinger, G. A. & Senn, D. J. (1967). Disclosure of feelings in marriage. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 13, 237 - 249.
- Levinger, G. A. & Snoeck, J. D. (1972). Attraction in Relationships: A New Look at Interpersonal Attraction. NJ: General Learning Press, Inc.
- Lynn, S. J. (1978). Three theories of self-disclosure exchange. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 14, 466 - 479.

- Maslow, A. H. (1954). Motivation and Personality. NY: Harper.
- McAllister, H. A. (1980). Self-disclosure and liking: Effects for senders and receivers. Journal of Personality, 48, 409 - 417.
- Mowrer, O. H. (1971). Freudianism, behavior therapy and self-disclosure. In E. Southwell & M. Merbourn (Eds.): Personality Readings in Theory and Research. NY: Brooks/Cole.
- Orne, M. (1962). On the social psychology of the psychological experiment: With particular reference to demand characteristics and their implications. American Psychologist, 17, 776 - 783.
- Pedersen, D. & Breglio, U. C. (1968). The correlation of two self-disclosure inventories with actual self-disclosure: A validity study. Journal of Personality, 68, 291 - 298.
- Pruitt, D. G. (1965). Definition of the situation as a determinant of international action. In H. C. Kelman (Ed.) International Behavior. NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Rempel, J. K., Holmes, J. G. & Zanna, M.P. (1985). Trust in close relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 95 - 112.
- Rogers, C. R. (1961). On Becoming a Person. MA: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Rosenfeld, L. B., Civikly, J. M. & Heron, I. R. (1979). Anatomical and physiological sex differences. In G. J. Chelune (Ed.) Self-disclosure. CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rotter, J. B. (1971). Generalized expectancies for interpersonal trust. American Psychologist, 26, 443 - 452.
- Rubenstein, C. M. & Shaver, P. (1982). In Search of Intimacy. NY: Delacorte Press.

- Rubin, Z. (1970). Measurement of romantic love. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16, 265 - 273.
- Rubin, Z. (1973). Liking and Loving. NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Rubin, Z. (1974). Lovers and other strangers: The development of intimacy in encounters and relationships. American Scientist, 62, 182 - 190.
- Rubin, Z. (1975). Disclosing oneself to a stranger: Reciprocity and its limits. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 11, 233 - 260.
- Savicki, V. (1972). Outcomes of non-reciprocal and self-disclosure strategies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 23, 271 - 276.
- Schlenker, B. R., Helm, B. & Tedeschi, J. T. (1973). The effects of personality and situational variables on behavioral trust. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25, 419 - 427.
- Schneider, D. J. (1973). Implicit personality theory: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 1979, 294 - 309.
- Schneider, D. J., Eustis, A. (1972). Effects of ingratiation motivation, target positiveness and revealingness on self-presentation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 22, 149 - 155.
- Sermat, V. & Smythe, M. C. (1973). Context analysis of verbal communication in the development of a relationship: Conditions influencing self-disclosure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 26, 332 - 346.
- Shaver, K. G. (1975). An Introduction to Attribution Processes. MA: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.
- Sidorowicz, L. S. (1984). The Attributions of Liking and Trust in Response to Self-Disclosure. Unpublished Independent Study. Graduate Center, CUNY.
- Simmel, G. (1950). The Sociology of Georg Simmel. IL: Free Press.

- Stack, L. L. (1978). Trust. In H. London & J. E. Exner (Eds.) Dimensions of Personality. NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Swensen, C. H. & Nelson, D. A. (1967). Interpersonal Attraction as a Function of Personality and Attitudes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.
- Taylor, D. A. (1968). The development of interpersonal relationships: Social penetration process. Journal of Social Psychology, 75, 79 - 90.
- Taylor, D. A. & Altman, I. (1975). Self-disclosure as a function of reward-cost outcomes. Sociometry, 38, 18 - 31.
- Taylor, D. A. & Belgrave, L. (1986). The effects of perceived intimacy and valence on self-disclosure reciprocity. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 12, 247 - 255.
- Taylor, D. A., Altman, I. & Sorrentino, R. (1969). Interpersonal exchange as a function of rewards and costs and situational factors: expectancy confirmation - disconfirmation. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 5, 324 - 339.
- Taylor, D. A. & Hinds, M. (1985). Disclosure reciprocity and liking as a function of gender and personalism. Sex Roles, 12, 1137 - 1153.
- Tedeschi, J. T., Schlenker, B. R. & Bonoma, T. V. (1973). Conflict, power and games: The experimental study of interpersonal relations. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Thibaut, J. W. & Kelley, H. H. (1959). The Social Psychology of Groups. NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Vondracek, F. W. (1968). The Manipulation of Self-Disclosure in an Experimental Interview. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Pennsylvania State University.

- Weber, N. F. (1986). Businessman's Flight. New York Times Magazine, March, 16.
- Worchel, S. (1979). Trust and Distrust. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.) The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations. CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Worthy, M., Gary, A. L. & Kahn, G. (1969). Self-disclosure as an exchange process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13, 59 - 63.
- Wortman, C. B. (1976). Self-disclosure: An attributional perspective. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33, 184 - 191.
- Wrightsman, L. S. (1964). Measurement of philosophies of human nature. Psychological Reports, 14, 743 - 751.
- Zand, D. E. (1972). Trust and managerial problem solving. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 229 - 239.
- Zimbardo, P. G. (1970). The human choice: Individuation, reason and order vs. deindividuation, impulse and chaos. In W. J. Arnold and D. Levine (Eds.) Nebraska Symposium on Motivation.