

INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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

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

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

76-21,167

GREEN, Richard Bradley, 1949-
SELF-DISCLOSURE, SELF-ESTEEM, AND PERCEIVED
SIMILARITY.

City University of New York, Ph.D., 1976
Psychology, clinical

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

© 1976

RICHARD BRADLEY GREEN

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SELF-DISCLOSURE, SELF-ESTEEM, AND PERCEIVED SIMILARITY

by

RICHARD B. GREEN

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.

1976

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.

5/16/76
date

David F. Ricks
Chairman of Examining Committee

May 17, 1976
date

Florence S. Benmarch
Executive Officer

Alden Wessman, Ph.D.

Lawrence Gould, Ph.D.

David Ricks, Ph.D.

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

SELF-DISCLOSURE, SELF-ESTEEM, AND PERCEIVED SIMILARITY

by

Richard B. Green

Adviser: David Ricks, Ph.D.

This study investigated factors involved in self-disclosure, an essential process in the establishment and maintenance of intimate relationships. Theoretical considerations and previous research generated two hypotheses (1) that self-esteem (self-ideal congruence) would correlate with actual self-disclosure, and (2) that perceived similarity to the target of the disclosure would also correlate positively with actual self-disclosure. These hypotheses were tested using 16 male and 22 female undergraduates enrolled in group dynamics classes. A positive correlation was obtained between self-disclosure, measured by peer ratings of past disclosure in group, and self-esteem. This effect was stronger for women than for men. However, self-esteem correlated negatively with judges' ratings of actual disclosure to a same-sex member of one's group, using Pedersen and Breglio's (1968) Self-Disclosure Questionnaire. This effect was stronger for men than for women. There was no correlation between perceived similarity and self-disclosure

measured by the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire, except when men and women were considered separately. Among men, high perceived similarity tended to be associated with low disclosure, whereas among women the opposite was true. Factor analysis of subjects' self and ideal concepts, and four individual case studies were presented and discussed. The implications of the study for self-disclosure research and for a theory of intimacy in human relations were explored.

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. David Ricks for his consistent support and guidance throughout the project, and to Drs. Alden Wessman and Bernard Gorman for their help in planning the research and their warm response to the final product. I also want to thank Drs. Lawrence Gould and Charles Smith for the thoughtful consideration they gave this work as members of the committee.

I owe a special debt of gratitude to four friends and colleagues, Drs. Isaiah Rochlin, David Singer, Eugene Newman, and Jonathan Mack, whose patience, encouragement, and critical response to the thesis have made it a particularly satisfying and enjoyable experience. I want to thank Carol Schneider for her persistent commitment to this project as editor, secretary, and friend. I am also grateful to Professor Dan Skillen of William Paterson College for permitting me to use the students in his group dynamics classes as subjects in the experiment, and to Debby Falk for her care in typing the thesis and for her round-the-clock availability.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
General Considerations	
Empirical Background for the Present Study	
Problems in the Measurement of Self-disclosure	
The Present Study	
METHODS	12
Subjects	
Instruments	
Procedure	
RESULTS	23
Interjudge Agreement	
Findings Relating to the Hypotheses	
Additional Findings Relating to the Hypotheses	
Individual Cases	
DISCUSSION	43
Limitations of the Present Study	
Review of Findings Relating to the Hypotheses	
Comparison with Previous Research	
Implications for Research in Self-disclosure	
General Theoretical Considerations	
Suggestions for Future Research	
APPENDICES	58
Appendix A: Samples of Forms Administered to Subjects	
Appendix B: Items Used in Q-sorts	
Appendix C: Table of Correlations between Judges' Ratings	
Appendix D: Factors Underlying Subjects' Self and Ideal Descriptions	
REFERENCES	86

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Correlations between Self-Esteem and Judges' and Peer Ratings of Self-Disclosure	27
2.	Items Clustering at the Extreme Ends of the Principle Factor Dimensions Elicited from Q-sorts .	31
3.	Correlations between Loadings on Primary Factors and Measures of Actual Disclosure	33
4.	Correlations between Three Similarity Measures and Three Related Measures	34
5.	Means, Standard Deviations, and <u>t</u> -Tests Comparing Male and Female Subjects	35
A.	Agreement between Judges' Ratings of Subjects' Responses to the Five Items on the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire	76

INTRODUCTION

General Considerations

"Really highly developed intimacy with another is not the principal business of life, but is, perhaps, the principal source of satisfactions in life." (Sullivan, 1953, p.34). For most people, however, the pursuit of satisfaction does not proceed unhampered to its goal. Existential and humanistic theorists (e.g., Bugental, 1965; Fromm, 1959; Maslow, 1954, 1968) have proposed that, while there is a natural human tendency to move towards greater satisfaction in life, individuals commonly engage in a variety of self-defeating attitudes and behaviors which interfere with their growth and the consequent attainment of satisfaction.

The purpose of this research is to clarify the elements that contribute to establishing and maintaining intimate relationships between people. One of these elements is self-disclosure: the process of revealing oneself to another, usually verbally, and more specifically, of communicating, with varying degrees of candor and depth, the full range of one's experience. Two primary dimensions that affect self-disclosure are the person's perception and evaluation of himself, and his view of the person to whom he is disclosing. In this study, the relationship between self-disclosure and each of these factors is examined, using self-esteem and perceived similarity, respectively, as the measures of these two dimensions.

Intimacy and self-disclosure. Jourard was the pioneer of self-disclosure research (1968, 1971a, 1971b). His interest in self-disclosure derived from his work as a therapist, and he focussed his main research efforts on aspects of self-disclosure in the patient-therapist interaction. In this regard, he is similar to Rogers (1967), who has devoted a large part of his career to the study of factors that enable clients to reveal themselves more fully to their therapists.

However, Jourard's theory was not limited to the patient-therapist relationship; he felt that self-disclosure played a "crucial role . . . in intimate interpersonal relationships" (Jourard & Landsman, 1960, p. 178) throughout people's lives. Moreover, self-disclosure and openness of communication appear frequently as criteria of intimacy in the writings of many authors, although few have made it the focus of their experimental attention. For example, Maslow states that self-actualizing people have an enlarged capacity for "the healthy love relationship," in which "there is much less maintenance of distance, mystery, and glamour, much less reserve and concealment and secrecy" (1954, p. 238). However, since it was not Maslow's intention to clarify the processes that establish such a relationship, his further observations of "the healthy love relationship" are infrequent and not very informative.

In a similar vein, while insightful and evocative, Fromm's (1956) discussion of love offers little explanation of the observable interpersonal processes, such as self-disclosure, that contribute to forming intimate relationships. For the

most part, these authors and others sharing the existential-humanistic bias (e.g., Buber, 1958) have been satisfied with describing the experience of love, or closeness, without exploring the mechanisms whereby loving or close relationships are established and maintained.

Intimacy and self-esteem. Sullivan's definition of intimacy focussed on a different element, self-esteem. He described the intimate relationship as ". . . that type of situation involving two people which permits validation of all components of personal worth" (1953, p. 246). A similar view is expressed when Maslow describes a person in the moment of self-actualization as characterized by a ". . . loving, uncondemning, compassionate and perhaps amused acceptance of the world and of the person, however bad he may look at more normal moments" (1968, p. 92). A close interdependence between intimacy and self-esteem is further suggested by May (1960), Rogers' (1962) description of "unconditional positive regard," Bugental's observation that ". . . feelings of limited or no worth . . . heighten interpersonal estrangement" (1965, p. 312), and Mahler's observation that "self-confidence, self-esteem, and pleasure in independence develop out of trust and confidence in others" (cf. Bowlby, 1973, p. 361).

It has also been noted that situations in which a person's self-esteem is at its lowest can be a source of self-disclosure as well. Parkes (1972) pointed out that it is frequently on the basis of some form of low self-esteem that patients are motivated to initiate or continue psychoanalysis, character-

istically a high-disclosure situation for the patient. In a research project on bereavement, Parkes (1972) invited widows to participate in a series of interviews following the death of their husbands; he found that "the majority seemed grateful for the opportunity to talk freely about the disturbing problems and feelings that preoccupied them" (1972, p. 26). Hinton (1967) made the same observation regarding the willingness of the bereaved to disclose themselves to others. It is possible that this phenomenon is one aspect of a general tendency to disclose during periods of emotional stress, especially to individuals whose role makes them suitable targets for disclosure (e.g., psychoanalysts or individuals with an expressed willingness to listen, such as friends or psychological researchers).

These considerations are not inconsistent with the observations of Sullivan, Mahler, and the other authors cited above. Low self-esteem can function as a stimulus for disclosure when the individual is aware that disclosure, as a promoter of intimacy, may result in an increase of self-esteem. In this case, the result of disclosure is the intimate relationship described by Sullivan permitting "validation of all components of personal worth."

Intimacy and perceived similarity. Fromm describes a third characteristic of individuals who are intimate with others: "If I perceive in another person mainly the surface, I perceive mainly the difference, that which separates us. If I penetrate to the core, I perceive our identity, the fact of

our brotherhood" (1956, p. 47). Rogers has described a similar experience which he sees as "essential to a growth-promoting relationship" (1962, p. 419) in the "empathic understanding" therapists feel for their patients. In operational terms, this quality is captured best by the concept of "perceived similarity." The perception of similarities between oneself and another has been shown to increase interpersonal attraction (Byrne, 1971; Rubin, 1973), and attraction is the first step in the process of developing intimacy.

Kohut (1971) sees people who view themselves as special or in some significant way dissimilar from others as displaying a primitive personality adaptation which he calls "narcissistic isolation" (1971, p. 306). This involves the inhibition of empathy in adulthood and the loss of the capacity for vividly experiencing the feelings of another person. Kohut has made a detailed analysis of the development of empathy beginning in the parent-infant interaction; he suggests that the infant's withdrawal of empathy serves as a defense against the direct experience of the parent's negative emotional state. The result in adulthood is that the person withdraws because he continues to experience intense contact with other people and the world as threatening.

Empirical Background for the Present Study

There is considerable evidence to establish the close relationship between self-disclosure and intimacy in human relationships. Self-disclosure has been found to correlate

negatively with social distance (Fitzgerald, 1963), and positively with closeness (Jourard, 1959), acceptance (Pedersen & Higbee, 1969), liking (Cozby, 1973), and perceived empathy (Shapiro, Krauss & Truax, 1969).

In the one study that has attempted to establish a direct connection between self-esteem and self-disclosure, Fitzgerald found no support for the hypothesis that female undergraduates with low self-esteem would disclose more than those with high self-esteem. The rationale for this hypothesis was that women with low self-esteem would disclose more, out of a need "to gain attention" (1963, p. 506), whereas those with high self-esteem would disclose less. However, it has been suggested above that the primary function of self-disclosure is the promotion of intimacy, a goal very different from "gaining attention." In the pursuit of intimacy, individuals with low self-esteem may actually be at a disadvantage, inasmuch as they are likely to feel more threatened by the prospect of self-disclosure than people with high self-esteem, who are not so chronically afraid of rejection, embarrassment, and criticism. However, the results of Fitzgerald's study do not suggest that any relationship exists between the two factors, either of a positive or negative nature.

Fitzgerald's method of measuring self-esteem makes the interpretation of her results troublesome. She used a self-rating scale of twenty bipolar adjective pairs -- a trait and its opposite -- and asked subjects to "describe yourself as you ordinarily think about yourself" (1963, pp. 406-7). She

measured self-esteem by assigning a "favorable" and "unfavorable" pole to each pair of traits and summed the ratings in the direction of "favorability" for each subject. However, Fitzgerald did not indicate how "favorability" was determined, nor did she report any attempt to validate the measure.

Shlien argues against the use of culturally-defined standards, such as Fitzgerald's "favorability," to measure self-esteem; he describes self-esteem as "a personal feeling, independent of any particular content or culture" (Shlien, 1962, p. 146). He refers to a measure originally developed by Butler and Haigh (1954) called "self-ideal congruence," measured as the correlation between an individuals' self and ideal descriptions. This measure, says the authors, "would indicate operationally not only the way in which the individual perceived himself as possessing (any) given characteristic, but the degree to which he values this state" (Butler & Haigh, 1954, p. 56). In a longitudinal study, Wessman and Ricks (1966) followed the relationship between mood and self-ideal congruence in normal subjects and found decreases in the self-ideal correlation reflecting mood shifts towards depression. This is consistent with "the loss of self-esteem generally noted in most accounts of depression" (p. 43).

Shlien (1962) reported reliabilities between .77 and .91 for self-ideal correlation and demonstrated a strikingly high consistency within individuals when widely divergent methods were used to obtain descriptions of self and ideal. More recently, Cartwright (1975) has reported a stability (reliability)

coefficient for self-ideal correlations of .76; as further evidence of its validity, he has cited correlations of .52 and .45 ($p < .01$) between self-ideal congruence and the Willoughby Emotional Maturity Scale.

The relationship between perceived similarity and self-disclosure was explored in an experiment by Knecht, Lippman, and Swap (1973). These investigators found a positive correlation between the intention to disclose to another and the degree of perceived similarity to that other. This finding is consistent with the hypothesis that there is some relationship between perceived similarity and openness of communication.

Problems in the Measurement of Self-disclosure

Both the Fitzgerald (1963) and Knecht et al (1973) studies suffer from their reliance upon self-report questionnaires for their measure of self-disclosure, a limitation common in the early days of self-disclosure research. When it originally appeared (Jourard & Lasakow, 1958), the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (JSDQ) consisted of sixty items of personal information broken down into several categories. Subjects indicated which of these items they had disclosed to any of a number of individuals who were specified as "targets" of the disclosure. Fitzgerald, who used an adaptation of the JSDQ, collected data on subjects' past disclosure to three target people: "the girl in the class whom you like the best; . . . the girl in the class you like least; and . . . a specific girl in the class who is not a friend of yours nor

the girl whom you like least" (1963, p. 407). Knecht et al. (1973) had subjects indicate which self-disclosure items from Jourard's (1968) questionnaire they would be willing to disclose to an imaginary "partner" for whom the experimenters had prepared a bogus attitude questionnaire which was shown to the subject. Neither study made an attempt to measure actual disclosure in process.

After a careful review of the literature, Cozby had concluded that "it is clear that the JSDQ does not accurately predict actual self-disclosure" (1973, p.74). Knecht et al. conclude a summary of their work with the comment "that it remains for further investigations to determine whether an S will actually self-disclose more" (1973, p. 206) to a partner he or she perceives as similar. Thus, the need remains for research on the relationship between self-disclosure and self-esteem, and between self-disclosure and perceived similarity, when the measure of self-disclosure is based on actual disclosure between two or more individuals.

Techniques have recently been developed to elicit actual disclosure in the laboratory situation. Pedersen and Breglio (1968) used a procedure in which subjects write five brief, self-descriptive essays in topic areas similar to the ones covered by the JSDQ. Based upon Bugental's (1965) description of authenticity, Burhenne and Mirels (1970) have provided criteria for judging the disclosures elicited by the Pedersen and Breglio (1968) procedure. These criteria have been employed with a high degree of interrater reliability.

It has been shown, however, that "individuals' willingness to self-disclose is importantly affected by their perceptions of their relationship with the person to whom they are talking" (Pearce & Wiebe, 1973, p. 610). Neither Pedersen and Breglio (1968) nor Burhenne and Mirels (1970) appear to have taken this into consideration. Pedersen and Breglio administered their Self-Disclosure Questionnaire in groups of four to six students; no mention was made of who would eventually be the audience of the disclosures. Burhenne and Mirels administered the Pedersen and Breglio (1968) questionnaire individually, also making no mention of the target in their directions to the subject. These situations cannot be considered true analogues of real-life disclosure situations, in which individuals reveal themselves to specific others, such as friends, relatives, and work associates. A better experimental situation would involve the observation of self-disclosure as it takes place between two individuals, who have a relationship which exists outside the bounds of the experiment.

The Present Study

This study proposed to measure actual self-disclosure between pairs of individuals, all of whom are sufficiently familiar with one another to make their disclosures meaningful in the context of ongoing relationships. The intention of this study was to explore the relationship between self-disclosure and self-esteem, and self-disclosure and perceived similarity.

Hypothesis 1 refers to the relationship between self-disclosure and self-esteem. Theoretical considerations discussed above would predict that the greater one's self-esteem, the more intimate one's relationship would tend to be and thus the more one would be expected to disclose. On the other hand, Parkes' (1972) observation would suggest lower self-esteem to be associated with higher disclosure. Fitzgerald's (1963) research on self-disclosure and self-esteem employed self-reports of past disclosures and a questionable measure of self-esteem. Thus, her results were inconclusive. In this study an attempt was made to obtain more conclusive results by using an improved actual disclosure measure, and a measure of self-esteem represented by the correlation of self and ideal. It was hypothesized that a relationship between self-esteem and actual self-disclosure would reveal itself through the use of the procedures employed in this study, and its form and direction would be clarified.

Hypothesis 2 refers to the relationship between self-disclosure and perceived similarity. Theoretical considerations in this regard (see pp. 4-5) suggest that the more similar people feel towards each other, the more they are likely to disclose to one another. However, the Knecht et al. (1973) research "simply establishes a greater intention" (Knecht et al., 1973, p. 206) for an individual to disclose to another he perceives as similar. The present study attempted to establish whether an individual "will actually self-disclose" (Knecht et al., 1973, p. 206) to a partner perceived as similar.

METHODS

Subjects

Thirty-eight student volunteers, 16 males and 22 females, participated in the study. All subjects were enrolled in an undergraduate group dynamics course at a small public college located in the suburbs of New York City. The class met for a minimum of 75 minutes each week in three small sub-groups. As described by the leader (a faculty member of the psychology department), the workshops were unstructured environments in which frequent, spontaneous personal disclosure was encouraged.

The subjects were recruited by the experimenter's announcing the nature of the study in their classes and asking for volunteers at the rate of \$5 per participant. The students were told that it was an experiment in interpersonal communication and that frequently students enjoyed participating because of the opportunity to learn something about themselves and another person. They were informed that one half-hour of class time would be required for preliminary testing and that each subject would be required to participate for approximately 1-1/4 hours at another time. Part of this second period would involve an interaction between the subject and a classmate. All three groups agreed unanimously to participate.

Instruments

Perceived similarity scale. Subjects were directed to "indicate how similar you feel to each of your classmates" by

placing an "X" along a 10-point continuum from "we are extremely opposite" to "we are practically identical." A sample of the scale and rating form used is included in appendix A.

Measure of past disclosure in group. A 5-point scale was devised to provide a measure of each subject's self-disclosure to his or her group during the three month period from the beginning of the semester to the time of the experiment. The directions of the scale read as follows:

Rate each of your classmates according to how much they have revealed about themselves since the beginning of this course. Indicate your rating by placing an "X" on the line beneath the appropriate description.

The points on the scale were labelled as follows:

1. This person has revealed little or no information of any kind.
2. This person has revealed only facts and attitudes of a general nature.
3. This person has revealed some personal facts as well as attitudes and information of a general nature.
4. This person has revealed more than the average amount of personal information and attitudes.
5. This person has revealed a great deal of attitudes and information of a personal nature.

These descriptions are modeled after Pedersen and Breglio's (1968) 3-point rating scale, used by their judges to rate subjects' written disclosure. They reported a reliability coefficient of .83 between two judges using this 3-point version of the scale. A sample of the rating form distributed to subjects for rating their peers' past disclosure in group is included in appendix A.

Measure of self-esteem. The measure of self-esteem here assessed is known as "self-ideal congruence" (Shlien, 1962). The higher the correlation between one's real and ideal selves, the higher the self-esteem is assumed to be.

Measurement of self-ideal congruence is based upon Q-sort descriptions of self and ideal, a method first developed by Stephenson (1953) and discussed in depth in Brown and Brenner's (1972) recent anthology. The Q-sort method involves having subjects organize a large number of items into a series of categories, to provide a self-description. In this case, 70 items and 7 categories were used. The frequency distribution of items into categories is predetermined by the experimenter; it approximates a normal curve, flattened slightly to add items to the extreme categories. To obtain descriptions of the real self-concept, subjects are directed to treat the categories as spanning a continuum from "least like me" to "most like me" and to distribute the items into the categories following the distribution specified by the experimenter. The directions for the ideal self-description are the same, except that the categories span a continuum from "least like the person I would like to be and ideally could be" to "most like the person I would like to be and ideally could be."

The items were selected from writing samples obtained from the students in undergraduate psychology classes at the same institution where the group dynamics classes were held. None of these students were in the classes from which subjects for the experiment were drawn. There were 59 men and 73 women

asked to write brief descriptions of what the people at their school were like. Descriptive words and phrases were selected from these writing samples, and the total list shortened to 70 items for each sex by eliminating redundancies. Each item was typed onto a 2" x 3" card, and a number which had been randomly assigned to that item was written on the reverse side. (See appendix B for a complete list of the items used in the male and female Q-sorts.)

The computation of the correlation between real and ideal selves began by assigning a score from 1 to 7 to each item in an individual's real and ideal self Q-sort, depending upon the category in which it had been placed by the subject. "Least like me" and "least like the person I would like to be and ideally could be" were assigned scores of 1, and the categories were numbered consecutively up to 7, for "most like me" and "most like the person I would like to be and ideally could be." For each subject, one Pearson product-moment correlation was computed, between item scores on the real and ideal self Q-sorts. This correlation coefficient is the index of congruence between the real and ideal selves, or self-esteem.

Basic Information Questionnaire. A brief form was designed to elicit descriptive and background material about each subject and about the relationship between the subject and his or her partner. The Basic Information Questionnaire included questions concerning the age, sex, year in college, and major of the subject, as well as questions regarding the length of time the subject had known his or her partner, the closeness

of the relationship, and the frequency of contact between the partners (see appendix A for a sample).

Measure of self-disclosure. Pedersen and Breglio's (1968) Self-Disclosure Questionnaire was the instrument used to elicit actual self-disclosure. The Self-Disclosure Questionnaire consists of

. . . five questions, one on each of five sheets of paper, constructed so as to include five of the six areas covered by the Jourard Self-Disclosure Inventory . . . The five areas and the questions covering them are as follows:

1. Interests. What are your main interests in life? Describe those activities and experiences which you enjoy.
2. Personality. Describe your personality. Consider both your strengths and weaknesses.
3. Studies. Describe yourself as a student. Include in your description an evaluation of your abilities, current motivation, and future educational and/or occupational plans.
4. Body. Describe your present state of health and physical appearance. What do you like/dislike about your physical characteristics?
5. Money. What is your current financial condition? Include a description of both your financial assets and liabilities.

Pedersen and Breglio (1968) had judges rate the disclosure elicited by this questionnaire using the 3-point rating scale referred to in the section on the past disclosure measure developed for this study. Information regarding the reliability of ratings obtained using this scale has already been reported (p. 13).

In this study, the following directions were used to introduce the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire:

Each of these five pages has a question on it about yourself. Read the question and use the space provided below it to write your answer. Write clearly and neatly. You will have five minutes to answer each question. After both of you have finished writing answers to all five questions, you will exchange papers and read what the other one has written. Then you will have an opportunity to talk over anything you have read.

After you have read each other's answers, I will collect them. From then on, the contents of what you wrote will be kept in strictest confidence. In addition, you must agree at this point not to disclose anything that your partner writes to you. Do you agree?

(A sample of the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire is included in appendix A.)

following administration of the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire, each subject's response to each of the five questions was typed on a 5" x 7" index card. These cards were divided into five groups. Each group of 38 cards contained responses to only one of the five Self-Disclosure Questionnaire questions.

Three Ph.D. psychologists and the experimenter independently judged all 190 disclosures in the following way. The judges were asked to sort the cards in each group into five categories, from "least revealing" to "most revealing," according to the following plan: 3 cards were placed in each of the extreme categories, 8 in each of the less extreme categories, and the remaining 16 in the middle category. Each disclosure received a score, according to the category in which it had

been placed, from 1 ("least revealing") to 5 ("most revealing"). Individual subjects' actual disclosure scores were the average of all the scores assigned to their disclosures by this procedure.

The judges were given the following descriptions as guidelines for rating the disclosures. Burhenne and Mirels (1970) developed these descriptions to define the low, middle, and high values of a 5-point scale for rating written self-descriptive essays obtained with the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire. They reported an interjudge reliability coefficient of .85 for these criteria.

Score

- 1 The respondent seems to be defensively guarding against having anything about himself known. His statements are cultural stereotypes, and he seems not to be "in touch" with his own feelings. He offers a rote repetition of majority beliefs in a doctrinaire fashion, with little indication of experienced conflict (concerning his values, beliefs, etc.).
- 3 The individual speaks to the question in a direct manner, yet his answers seem vague and general with respect to himself so that one gets no real feeling about him. His self-descriptions are impersonal, mechanized, and seem very much like diagnostic explanations. There is little evidence of feeling and involvement.
- 5 The individual relates, in a spontaneous way, what he really feels. His statements are personal (usually in the first person) and affective. This response has a non-defensive quality about it so that one gets the impression that this person is allowing the subjective aspects of his "self" to be seen. With the realization that there are few certainties, this individual freely expresses his doubts. Furthermore, he acknowledges responsibility for himself and his actions.
(Burhenne & Mirels, 1970, p. 411).

Procedure

Administration of group measures. The measure of past disclosure in group and the perceived similarity scale were administered at the time of recruitment to all members of the groups. Subjects received these forms stapled together, including written directions. Subjects listed all class members' names, excluding their own, on the rating forms (see appendix A).

Scheduling of subjects. Subjects were randomly assigned to same-sex pairs on the basis of their availability for the second part of the experiment. To insure that partners had had some experience with one another in a group disclosure situation, both members of each pair were drawn from the same section of the course. Subjects were contacted by telephone, once to arrange the appointment and a second time to confirm the time and the place. Once arrangements had been made for the subjects to attend the second part of the experiment, a colleague of the experimenter randomly assigned a number to each subject and placed the number in an envelope with the subject's name on the outside.

Administration of Q-sorts. Two plywood boards, 28" x 36", had been painted with identical bell-curve patterns of 70 2" x 3" rectangles, arranged in columns. Seven different colors were used to represent the seven sections of the distribution, from "least like me" to "most like me," etc.

When both subjects had arrived for the second part of the experiment, they were shown into two identical rooms. On

a table in each room was a sorting board and one of the decks of Q-sort cards. Subjects were first instructed to sort the cards according to the directions given above for describing their real selves. Subjects were given 15 minutes to complete the sort. Once all the cards were placed, the subjects were given a form marked "Data Sheet" on which to record their responses. They were shown the numbers on the backs of the cards and instructed on how to enter their responses on the record form (see appendix A for sample).

They were then given the sealed envelopes which contained their code numbers. It was explained to them that the experimenter did not know their code numbers and did not want to know them, and that subjects should use only their code numbers to identify themselves on all other forms they would be asked to complete. To maintain the confidentiality of the code numbers, the subjects were told to deposit all completed forms in a blank envelope which was not opened until all subjects had completed the experiment. The subjects were told that the experimenter would not be able to match up any knowledge of them as individuals outside of the experiment with information obtained in the course of the research. Subjects were questioned to be sure that they had understood the point of this procedure.

When the subjects had recorded their real selves, their forms were collected and the instructions for the ideal self Q-sort were given. Subjects had 15 minutes in which to complete this sort; the recording procedure was repeated. Before

handing them out, the experimenter made a small notation on the recording form to indicate whether the Q-sort being recorded was a real or an ideal self-description.

Experimental interaction and measurement of basic information and self-disclosure. When both subjects had finished recording their ideal self Q-sorts, they were brought together in a larger room containing two student's desks, facing at right angles to one another. They were seated, given the Basic Information Questionnaire, and instructed to complete this form, including their code numbers, and to place the completed forms in the blank envelope. Next, a copy of the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire was presented to each subject, and the experimenter read the directions aloud to the subjects, who followed silently. If both subjects agreed to maintain confidentiality, the experimenter reminded them that he would not know who had revealed which information to whom, due to the use of the code numbers. He instructed them to keep in mind that when writing about themselves, they should be thinking of their partner as their only audience. They were instructed to wait for the experimenter's signal to begin each question and not to go on until directed to do so. If they had no further questions, they were instructed to begin the first essay on the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire. At five minute intervals, they were told to finish the last sentence they were writing and then go on to the next question.

After the five questions were answered, the subjects were directed to exchange papers and read what each other had

written. When they were finished, the subjects placed their Self-Disclosure Questionnaire in the envelope and were told that the experiment was over. The experimenter asked the subjects to hold any questions regarding the experiment, indicating that he would be glad to explain the experiment to each of the classes as a whole when all the data had been collected. Subjects then received their payment, were thanked for their participation, and were dismissed. When all the data had been gathered, the experimenter visited each of the groups individually and explained the experiment.

RESULTS

Interjudge Agreement

Each of the 38 subjects made five disclosures, for a total sample of 190 disclosures. These were rated separately by each of the four judges, so that each judge rated each subject five times. The mean of these five ratings was computed separately by judge, and Pearson product-moment correlations were computed between each pair of judges.

The mean of all six correlation coefficients thus obtained was .76; the individual coefficients of correlation ranged from .69 to .83. All six correlation coefficients were found to be statistically significant at $p < .001$, using Fisher's r to Z transformation. (A table of the correlations may be found in appendix C.)

Findings Relating to the Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. The first hypothesis predicted that a relationship between rated self-disclosure and self-esteem would be revealed. Two measures of self-disclosure were used, the mean of the judges' ratings and the mean of the ratings made by peers in the same class as the study participants.

A slight negative trend was found ($r = -.14$, $p < .20$) between the composite of the judges' ratings of disclosure and self-esteem. Since some of the judges felt they had responded not only to the content of the disclosures but also to their length, the total number of words that each subject

had written was computed. Word count was found to correlate with judges' ratings of self-disclosure at a high level of statistical significance ($\underline{r} = .72, \underline{p} < .001$). A subsequent computation of the partial correlation between judges' ratings and self-esteem, controlling for length of subjects' responses, provided a corrected measure, $\underline{r} = -.33$, statistically significant at $\underline{p} < .05$. This indicates that the higher the self-esteem, the lower the self-disclosure, when the length of the subjects' responses is eliminated as a factor.

The relationship between self-disclosure and self-esteem was also assessed using peer ratings of disclosure. At the outset of the experimental procedure, all the members of the group dynamics seminars indicated on a 5-point scale the amount they felt each other member of their group to have revealed about him or herself since the beginning of the semester. Thus, depending on the size of the groups, between 11 and 15 independent ratings of each subjects' past disclosure in group was available. The mean of the ratings assigned to each subject by the other members of his or her group was computed, resulting in a second index of self-disclosure based on peer ratings of self-disclosure and self-esteem was computed; a trend emerged ($\underline{r} = .27, \underline{p} < .06$), indicating a tendency for subjects with higher self-esteem to be rated by peers as more disclosing. This correlation was found to be significantly different from the negative one reported above, between judges' ratings of disclosure and self-esteem ($\underline{t} = 3.10, \underline{df} = 36, \underline{p} < .005$)

A number of factors may have influenced these results,

causing significantly different relationships to emerge in the two disclosure conditions studied. To begin with, the backgrounds of the raters differed, as did the directions given to them for use in making their judgements. Often clinical psychologists are trained to examine conscious verbalizations for evidence of defenses against underlying conflicts. Thus, a person who presents himself in an exclusively favorable light might be perceived as denying unacceptable negative feelings, and therefore, rated by the judges as less disclosing. This bias would be compounded by the criteria that were provided the judges to rate the disclosures, specifying that admissions of self-doubt and self-criticism qualified as high self-disclosure. Needless to say, undergraduate students, including those taking a course in group dynamics, are not as psychologically sophisticated as the judges, nor were the directions they were given in judging the disclosures as detailed and specific as were the judges' criteria. Consequently, the students could not be expected to have examined the disclosures from the same professionally analytical perspective as the judges used.

The quality and the quantity of the disclosures were a second source of variation between the two situations. In loosely structured groups like the ones in which these subjects participated, typically the conversation is directed by the members themselves, and disclosures occur as spontaneous responses to questions or statements offered by other members of the group. Consequently, the disclosures rated by the

peers would have had a particular quality of immediacy and relevance, which the experimental disclosures would have lacked. Moreover, based on as much as 15 hours of participant-observation in the group process, peer judgements might represent a more accurate assessment of a subject's normal disclosing behavior than judges' ratings of a written sample collected in 25 minutes under laboratory conditions.

Upon closer examination, the difference between the two correlations already reported was found to reflect underlying sex-related situational tendencies. Table 1 shows the breakdown by sex of the observed relationships between self-disclosure and self-esteem. While the correlation between clinicians' judgements of disclosure and self-esteem is negative consistently for both men and women, it is significant only in the case of the male subjects. In this case, however, the difference between the men's and women's correlations is not significant. On the other hand, while the correlation between peer ratings of self-disclosure and self-esteem are consistently positive for both male and female subjects, the correlation is significant only in the women's case; and here the difference between the sexes does approach statistical significance ($z = 1.47, p < .08$). Thus the different correlations obtained in the two disclosure conditions may reflect a difference in the disclosure patterns of men and women, as a function of their self-esteem and the situation in which they are disclosing.

TABLE 1

Correlations between Self-Esteem and Judges'
and Peer Ratings of Self-Disclosure
for Males and Females

		Self-esteem and Judges' Ratings (word count partialled out)	Self-esteem and Peer Ratings
Males	(<u>N</u> =16)	-.45**	.09
Females	(<u>N</u> =22)	-.19	.43**
Total	(<u>N</u> =38)	-.33**	.27*

* $p < .06$

** $p < .05$

Hypothesis 2. In the second hypothesis, a significant positive correlation was predicted between actual self-disclosure and the degree of perceived similarity of the subject or his or her partner in the experimental disclosure situation. A correlation coefficient of $r = .06$ was found; this was not statistically significant. Since in the case of Hypothesis 1 it had proved fruitful to recompute the hypothesized correlation while partialling out the effects of word count, a similar procedure was followed. The resulting partial correlation was not statistically significant ($r = -.005$).

When the sample was divided by sex, a significant difference was revealed between men and women in terms of the correlation between perceived similarity and self-disclosure, controlling for word count. Men tended to disclose less to partners they perceived as similar ($r = -.33$, $p < .12$), whereas women tended to disclose more ($r = .30$, $p < .10$). The difference between these correlations approaches statistical significance ($z = 1.87$, $p < .08$, two-tailed). Apparently, when the correlation coefficient was computed for the total sample, these two effects cancelled out.

Additional Findings Relating to the Hypotheses

Examination of hypotheses using combined mean ratings.

Thus far the analyses have considered the hypotheses as relating only to individuals. However, different combinations of individuals could have produced pairs that interacted in a way which would not be apparent on inspection of the individual

measures. Consequently, mean scores for the two subjects in each pair were computed along each of the following variables: judges' ratings of disclosure, peer ratings of disclosure, self-esteem, perceived similarity, and word count. Because of the pairing procedure, these figures are based on $\underline{N} = 19$ rather than $\underline{N} = 38$.

In relation to Hypothesis 1, it was found that mean judges' ratings of self-disclosure correlated with mean self-esteem scores at $\underline{r} = .12$ (N.S.); mean judges' ratings correlated with mean word counts at $\underline{r} = .78$ ($\underline{p} < .001$); and mean judges' ratings correlated with mean self-esteem at $\underline{r} = .04$ (N.S.), when mean word count was partialled out. The correlation between mean peer ratings of self-disclosure and mean self-esteem was found to be .29 (N.S.).

A test of Hypothesis 2 revealed a correlation between mean judges' ratings and mean perceived similarity of $\underline{r} = .18$. The partial correlation between these two variables, controlling for mean word count, was $\underline{r} = .39$ ($\underline{p} < .10$), indicating a trend in the direction of the hypothesis.

Relationship between actual disclosure and personality factors elicited from subjects' Q-sorts. An analysis was undertaken to elicit the main conceptual dimensions underlying the subjects' self and ideal Q-sorts. Since the male and female Q-sorts were based on different sets of items and since it could not be assumed that similar factors would underlie subjects' concepts of their selves and their ideals, principal-component Q-type factor analyses were performed on the following

four groups of Q-sorts: male, self; female, self; male, ideal; and female, ideal. Terminal factors were obtained using a Varimax orthogonal rotation procedure.

In the case of each set of Q-sorts, one principle factor emerged which accounted for between 73% and 94% of the variance. Due to the large size of these figures, only these primary factors will be reported. The scores of individual items on each of these factors were computed in the following way. The ranks assigned by each subject to each of the 70 items in each Q-sort were multiplied by the subject's loading on the factor in question. These products, or weighted individual scores, were then summed across all subjects, to obtain a total of weighted scores for each item in the Q-sort. The resulting sums were the "scores" of items on the factors.

Table 2 shows the highest and lowest scoring items on each of the four primary factors. For male, self Q-sorts, a primary factor, "Friendly vs. Boring," was responsible for 73% of the variance in the sample. In the case of male ideal Q-sorts, 92% of the variance was accounted for by the factor "Serious and Friendly vs. Plastic." Female self Q-sorts along the dimension "Warm vs. Cold" accounted for 80% of the variance; and female ideal Q-sorts along the dimension "Confident and Warm vs. Cold" accounted for 94% of the variance. The results of this factor analysis indicate that a primary concern of these students is the degree to which they seek intimacy by being open, trusting, warm, and understanding or seal themselves off from intimacy by being cold, plastic, and phony. For these

students, the subjective experience of self-esteem was linked to their conception of how intimate they are with other people. (A full description of these factors, including the scores of all Q-sort items on each factor, may be found in appendix D.)

TABLE 2

Items Clustering at the Extreme Ends of the Principle
Factor Dimensions Elicited from Q-sorts

Male, Self		"Friendly vs. Boring"	
<u>High End</u>		<u>Low End</u>	
<u>Item</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Score</u>
Understanding	18.7	Dull, uninterest-	
Trusting	18.5	ing, boring	4.4
Good natured	18.1	Cold	5.0
		Plastic	5.0
Male, Ideal		"Serious and Friendly vs. Plastic"	
<u>High End</u>		<u>Low End</u>	
<u>Item</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Score</u>
Understanding	21.5	Plastic	4.3
Happy	18.9	Cold	5.0
Involved	17.6	Wears a mask	6.9
Receptive, easy to talk to, easy to relate to	17.6	Dull, uninterest- ing, boring	7.0
Female, Self		"Warm vs. Cold"	
<u>High End</u>		<u>Low End</u>	
<u>Item</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Score</u>
Generous, giving	21.2	Cold	4.1
Understanding, kind	21.0	Antisocial	5.3
Compassionate	19.9	Phony	7.4
Warm	19.6		
Female, Ideal		"Confident and Warm vs. Cold"	
<u>High End</u>		<u>Low End</u>	
<u>Item</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Score</u>
Confident	31.5	Cold	7.2
Warm	27.8	Antisocial	8.5
Understanding	22.4	Phony	8.9
Honest about feelings	25.9		

Subjects' scores on both self and ideal factor dimensions were correlated with judges' and peer ratings of disclosure. These findings are displayed in table 3. One of the twelve correlations reported achieved statistical significance at the level of $p < .05$. Three showed trends at levels less than .10. Three of these four relationships were with peer ratings; only one was with judges' ratings.

The correlations between ideal factor scores and peer ratings of self-disclosure show a striking contrast between male and female subjects (see table 3). Men with higher loadings on the male ideal factor tended to disclose more to their peers ($r = .52$, $p < .02$), whereas women with higher loadings on the female ideal factor tended to disclose less to their peers ($r = -.33$, $p < .07$). The difference between these correlations is significant at the .01 level ($z = 2.52$, two-tailed.)

Relationship between actual disclosure measures. A significant degree of agreement was found between judges' and peers' ratings of disclosure (Pearson $r = .31$, $p < .05$). When the effect of word count on the judges' ratings was partialled out, the relationship between these two measures was weaker; however, a trend in the direction of agreement was still indicated ($r = .23$, $p < .09$).

Perceived similarity, actual similarity, and related measures. To provide an index of the validity of the perceived similarity measure, two measures of actual similarity were computed. One was the correlation between the partners' self descriptions, and the other was the correlation between the

TABLE 3
 Correlations between Loadings on Primary Factors
 and Measures of Actual Disclosure

Males (<u>N</u> =16)		
	Self ("Friendly vs. Boring")	Ideal ("Serious and Friendly vs. Plastic")
Judges' Ratings	.00	.36 ($p < .09$)
Judges' Ratings, corrected for word count	-.22	.24
Peer Ratings	.42 ($p < .06$)	.52 ($p < .02$)
Females (<u>N</u> =22)		
	Self ("Warm vs. Cold")	Ideal ("Confident and Warm vs. Cold")
Judges' Ratings	.05	-.09
Judges' Ratings, corrected for word count	-.18	-.18
Peer Ratings	.25	-.33 ($p < .07$)

partners' ideal descriptions. The first of these actual similarity measures correlated significantly with perceived similarity scores ($r = .30$, $p < .04$), indicating that subjects' perception of similarity with their partners was significantly related to the amount of actual similarity in their self descriptions. Actual similarity based on ideal descriptions and perceived similarity showed a trend in the direction of a positive relationship ($r = .23$, $p < .08$). No significant differences emerged when separate correlations were computed for men and women. Neither of the two actual similarity measures correlated significantly with judges' ratings of disclosure; partialling out word count had no significant effect.

TABLE 4
Correlations between Three Similarity Measures
and Three Related Measures

	"How close do you feel to your partner?"	"How often do you see your part- ner?"	"How long have you known your partner?"
Perceived Similarity	.52***	.42**	.38**
Actual Similarity (correlated self- descriptions)	.50***	.39**	.24
Actual Similarity (correlated ideal- descriptions)	.51***	.36*	.40**

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

Consistently significant correlations were observed between all three similarity measures (perceived, actual based on self similarity, and actual based on ideal similarity) and three related measures: how close the subject felt to his or her partner, how often the subject saw his or her partner, and how long the subject had known his or her partner. These correlations are presented in table 4.

Additional sex differences. Table 5 shows means, standard deviations, and levels of significance for t-tests of the difference between male and female subjects on judges' and peer ratings of actual disclosure, self-esteem (congruence), perceived similarity, and word count. No significant sex differences were found. However, test for homogeneity of variance revealed a significant difference between the male and female groups on the judges' ratings for actual disclosure, with the male group the more variable of the two ($F = 3.92, p < .01$).

TABLE 5
Means, Standard Deviations, and t-Tests Comparing
Male and Female Subjects

		Males	Females	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
Judges' Ratings	<u>M</u>	2.80	3.14	-1.53 ^a	n.s.
	<u>SD</u>	.83	.42		
Peer Ratings	<u>M</u>	3.24	3.15	0.35	n.s.
	<u>SD</u>	.80	.73		
Self-Esteem	<u>M</u>	.50	.56	-0.68	n.s.
	<u>SD</u>	.27	.24		
Perceived Similarity	<u>M</u>	5.38	6.41	-1.31	n.s.
	<u>SD</u>	2.36	2.42		
Word Count	<u>M</u>	313.44	371.36	-1.56	n.s.
	<u>SD</u>	134.44	94.65		

^aDue to the significant difference between the variances of the male and female groups (see text), this t is based on a separate variance estimate with df=20.5. All other t-tests are based on df=36.

The difference between male and female subjects' self-esteem scores is consistent with Maccoby and Jacklin's (1974) report that, contrary to previously held beliefs, men do not have higher self-esteem than women. In fact, while not statistically significant, the findings of the present study are in the opposite direction.

Individual Cases

So far, the analysis of the data collected in this study has been concerned with groups of subjects and not with individuals. In this section, in an effort to grasp some of the complexity and detail which is overlooked in the group analysis of the data, four individual cases will be examined. Fictional names have been assigned to subjects for the purposes of this discussion.

Tom and Danny received the judges' ratings for the highest and lowest male disclosures, respectively; they were partners in the experiment. The judges' rating scale consisted of 5 points, with the highest possible disclosure scoring 5. Tom received a mean rating of 4.2 (approaching two standard deviations above the mean disclosure for the men in the sample), and Danny received a score of 1.2 (two standard deviations below the mean for men in the sample). Word count showed a similar pattern for these men, with Tom far above the mean, and Danny far below. Peer ratings of disclosure for the two men indicate that Tom is a higher discloser than Danny in the group situation as well, although the difference between the

two was not as pronounced in group as it was in the private experimental encounter. On the whole, these two men provide a contrast between a consistently high discloser and a consistently low or moderate one.

Of the two, Tom has the higher self-esteem, although he is slightly below the average for male subjects. Danny's self-ideal correlation was very low for his group, 1-1/2 standard deviations below the mean. These findings are generally consistent with the positive relationship between self-esteem and self-disclosure found for men in the experimental situation; however, the difference between their self-esteem scores was not as extreme as the difference between the disclosure scores they received from the judges. Thus, the difference in their levels of disclosure cannot be accounted for simply by the difference observed in their levels of self-esteem.

A closer examination of the subjects' self-descriptions and the particular items in which the greatest discrepancy exists between the self-concept and the ideal reveals personality differences which may have bearing upon the difference in disclosure levels. Tom, the high discloser in the pair, is primarily concerned that he is not "understanding" enough; he wants to "feel accomplishment and friendship in clubs and teams, make a good impression," and "enjoy spending time with people" more than he does. He would like to be less "quiet" and "keep to himself" less. In short, Tom has indicated that his primary goal is to have a more active and satisfying social life. Danny, on the other hand, does not

have such clearly formulated interpersonal objectives. He feels he does not "get out what he puts into life;" he wants to be "happier," less "passive" and "alone." While, in fact, Danny may need to have a more active and satisfying social life, perhaps even in the same specific ways that Tom does, he is not aware of his own needs. Rather, he communicates a vague sense of general dissatisfaction with himself and his life. It is worth considering that there may be a relationship between the explicitness of Tom's need for improved social relationships and his higher disclosure, as contrasted with Danny's vague sense of dissatisfaction and his lower disclosure.

The possibility remains that the judges' ratings did not reflect global disclosingness as much as situation-specific reactions of the individuals to their partners. In other words, Tom's high disclosure and Danny's low disclosure in the experimental situation may have been related to feelings they had about one another, based on previous experience in group or outside of class. In light of the fact that their perceived similarity scores were inversely related to their disclosure scores, this appears unlikely. Tom, who disclosed much to Danny, perceived Danny as "extremely opposite;" whereas Danny, who disclosed very little to Tom, saw Tom as only "slightly more different than alike." The pattern was similar for their ratings of closeness to one another. Tom saw Danny as an "acquaintance," whereas Danny thought of Tom as a "casual friend," considered a step closer than an "acquaintance" on the rating scale. Thus, while Tom felt less similar to Danny and more

distant from him, he disclosed a great deal to Danny. On the other hand, Danny felt more similar and closer to Tom but disclosed less.

To summarize, Tom is a high discloser in group; he is as satisfied with himself as the average man in his class. To the extent that he feels the need to change, it is in the direction of enjoying himself more with friends and being more understanding. Finding himself with Danny, an acquaintance whom he considers to be "extremely opposite" from himself, he discloses a great deal.

Danny, on the other hand, is a moderate discloser in group, who is very dissatisfied with his life, relative to the other men in the class. He feels alone and that he is too passive; he wants to get more out of life and to be happier. When he finds himself with Tom, who he considers a casual friend, and only "slightly less similar than alike" himself, he discloses as little as possible.

It is ironic that Danny, who stands to gain from becoming friends with Tom, should be the one not to disclose himself. One possible explanation is that when confronted by an available party, Danny was afraid to open up. The alternative explanation is the one suggested above, that it is not simply fear but also Danny's vagueness that keeps him from opening up. He does not seem to make the connection between being more open, making a friend, and having a better life. In all likelihood, Danny's low disclosure is the result of a combination of not seeing the relevance of the disclosure and his

fear of its consequences.

The second pair of subjects who were chosen for individual case study, Gloria and Donna, were both 22-year-old seniors at the time of the experiment. They were not partners in the experiment, but, according to peer ratings, were tied for lowest female discloser in group, each one disclosing "only facts and attitudes of a general nature" (rated 2.0 out of a possible 5). Both scored higher in the judges' ratings of disclosure: Gloria was slightly above the mean for women (by approximately one-quarter of a standard deviation), and Donna was somewhat higher in her disclosure to partner (exactly one-half a standard deviation above the mean.) However, the difference between them remained fairly small; they appear to have disclosed at a similar level in both situations.

By contrast, there is a very large difference between these women's self-ideal correlations. Gloria ($r = .12$) fell nearly two standard deviations below the women's mean, whereas Donna ($r = .76$) was nearly one full standard deviation above the mean. Thus, on the whole Gloria is much more dissatisfied with herself than is Donna. That this difference between them is not reflected in their disclosure scores, either to peers or to partners, suggests that the relationship between personality and self-disclosure is not simply dependent upon the level of self-esteem. More specific individual characteristics must account for the variations in self-esteem and the similarities in self-disclosure observed in these two women.

Gloria's self-description reveals that she does not feel

"free to express ideas, share experiences, talk about goals and ideas on life," nor to be "open, open up." She does not feel that "conversation flows easily" with her or that she is "interesting, fascinating to others." She is too "shy" and "finds it hard to make friends." Along with her low self-ideal correlation, these specific dissatisfactions indicate that Gloria is considerably distressed over the difficulty she has in getting close to others. Since her peers rated her as a low discloser, her distress may be the result of an actual problem.

Donna is not in distress. In fact, she is more satisfied with herself than the majority of the women in this sample. The discrepancies that do exist between her self and ideal concepts are that she would like to be more of a "bookworm type" and more "involved." She also feels herself to be too "confused about her future" and too "liberal." However, she feels she is "responsive, kind, compassionate, and accepting," as well as "alert, courteous, and decent." She does not consider herself to be "cold, phony, antisocial, uptight, or stiff;" nor does she "keep to herself" or "feel strange, out of place." She thinks of herself as an outgoing and friendly person who feels comfortable enough with people to get along and perhaps even to be somewhat involved socially; on the whole she is quite happy with herself and the way things are. The shortcomings she sees in herself -- her lack of a clear sense of direction and her need to take school and perhaps her life in general more seriously -- are not consciously

related in her mind to the low level of disclosure she maintains in her peer group. Thus, in terms of self-disclosure the difference between Gloria and Donna is the way in which they conceive of their need to disclose, rather than their actual level of disclosure. While these two women are very similar in terms of rated disclosures, their subjective experience of themselves and of their disclosingness is different.

In these two cases, the subjective feeling of dissatisfaction with self is more closely related to the felt need to disclose than it is to actual disclosure itself. One woman feels self-satisfied with no need to disclose; the other is in distress and relates her distress to her difficulties in disclosing. This suggests that an individual's actual disclosing behavior should not be taken as a direct reflection of their motivation to disclose; rather, subjective dimensions, such as the level of felt need to disclose and of felt inhibition in disclosure, appear to differentiate between people as well.

DISCUSSION

Limitations of the Present Study

To observe the process of self-disclosure as it takes place in the context of active, real-life relationships, subjects for this study were drawn from ongoing group dynamics classes. Conducting the study during the third month of the group experience insured that subjects would have sufficient familiarity with one another; their decisions to disclose and their estimates of perceived similarity would be based on a substantial amount of experience in social interaction with one another. Another advantage of choosing this population was that from the experience of the group dynamics classes, the subjects themselves could estimate each others' previous disclosure.

The limitation of this decision is that it provides a sample of subjects which is perhaps atypical compared to a random cross-section of the undergraduate population. Students who elect group dynamics tend to be aware that it is a class where a high degree of participation and disclosure are more the rule than the exception. They are often students who want to explore themselves or to get to know other people. Students who feel extremely uncomfortable in groups probably would not register, unless they were committed to changing these feelings. Such factors might limit the eligible subjects to a relatively outgoing and self-confident subgroup.

The choice of self-ideal congruence as the measure of

self-esteem for this research was motivated by the desire to focus on the subject's experience of his own self-esteem; this measure provided the most accurate appraisal of that variable. Measuring an individual's conscious self-satisfaction avoided Fitzgerald's (1963) problem of making assumptions as to the nature of the subjects' values and goals. A possible limitation of this technique is that, to some extent, subjects' self-esteem ratings may reflect their inclination to respond in the direction of social desirability (Edwards, 1957). In previous research self-ideal congruence has correlated significantly with social desirability scores (Cartwright, 1975; Shlien, 1962; Wessman & Ricks, 1966). Moreover, inspection of the factors underlying the ideal Q-sorts of subjects in the present study reveals a loading of what could be considered socially desirable items, for example "Understanding, confident, warm, happy, involved, honest, trusting, good-natured, generous, fun to be with, intelligent," etc. (see appendix D for full factor descriptions).

A crucial element in the design of this study was the use of an experimental situation in which actual disclosure took place between two individuals, both of whom were physically present and previously known to one another. The physical presence of the target of disclosure was an innovative approach to the problem of obtaining as close to real-life disclosure as possible. The use of a standardized set of questions to elicit actual disclosure was developed by earlier researchers (Pederson & Breglio, 1968) in order to structure the situation

for the subjects, and to provide them with an opportunity to disclose across a range of topic areas.

The problem with this procedure is the possibility of the partners distancing themselves from the situation by conceiving of it as artificial (Burhenne & Mirels, 1960). Rarely, if ever, do people get to know one another by exchanging notes written in response to a standardized set of questions, broadly phrased, covering a wide range of topic areas. The problem of experimentally eliciting disclosure which can be graded and analyzed statistically, yet which approximates naturally occurring disclosure closely enough to permit generalization from the experiment to real life, remains open to further improvement by imaginative researchers in this area.

Review of Findings Relating to the Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. It was found that the relationship between self-esteem and self-disclosure depended upon the situation in which the self-disclosure was being measured. High self-esteem was associated with low self-disclosure when same-sex dyads were asked to write notes to one another on a series of standardized self-disclosure topics. This effect was observed for all subjects but was more pronounced among the men. High self-esteem was associated with high self-disclosure when self-disclosure was measured according to how much the individual had revealed of himself in the course of ten weeks of the group dynamics class. In this case, the relationship was stronger for the women subjects, although the findings for the male subjects were in the same direction.

Hypothesis 2. The relationship between self-disclosure and perceived similarity was found to be opposite for the men and women in this study: in women, high disclosure was associated with high perceived similarity; whereas in men, high disclosure was associated with low perceived similarity.

Comparison with Previous Research

In the only other study which has attempted to establish a direct link between self-disclosure and self-esteem, Fitzgerald (1963) was unable to support her hypothesis that female undergraduates with low-self-esteem would disclose more than those with high self-esteem, out of a need "to gain attention;" in fact, she found no relationship between the two variables. In this study, however, the results indicate that in a group setting women with high self-esteem disclose more than women with low self-esteem and that in same-sex dyads both men and women subjects with high self-esteem tend to disclose less than subjects with low self-esteem. Two possible reasons for Fitzgerald's failure to obtain significant results were her use of a self-report questionnaire of past disclosure and her use of a measure of self-esteem which had no reported source of external validation.

As previously noted, Parkes (1972) observed that low self-esteem can promote self-disclosure, given the proper circumstances, for example, when an individual initiates psychotherapy or when a recent widow is given the opportunity to share her feelings with a psychologist researching the topic of grief.

The face-to-face disclosure situation used in the present study provided subjects with an available, if "captive," audience and an opportunity to open up "in private." It was in this situation that the inverse relationship between self-esteem and self-disclosure was found. Perhaps this phenomenon, observed in this study's "private" disclosure situation, relates to the one described by Parkes and reflects a tendency for individuals to disclose themselves in private when they feel troubled, pained or distressed.

A contrasting situation, which provided contrasting findings in the present study, is the group disclosure situation, where the disclosure is "public" rather than "private." Cravens (1975) elaborated upon the difference between public and private disclosure situations, in particular with respect to subjects' need-for-approval, as measured by Crowne and Marlowe's (1964) social desirability scale. Using a sample of 60 female undergraduates, he found that subjects with high need-for-approval "disclosed themselves more intimately in public than in private conditions whereas low- and moderate-need subjects disclosed more intimately in private than in public" (Cravens, 1975, p. 513). This pattern of relationships bears a striking similarity to the correlations obtained in the present study between self-disclosure and self-esteem. Although social desirability was not assessed directly in the present study, it could have played a role, in light of the factor analytic data and the correlation between self-ideal congruence and social desirability found in previous studies referred to above. This

suggests that the role of social desirability in the relationship between self-disclosure and self-ideal congruence needs further investigation and clarification.

Knecht et al. (1973) found a positive relationship between perceived similarity and the intention to disclose, based on combined data from nine male and nine female subjects. The current study found no relationship between actual disclosure and perceived similarity, using data from the combined men-and-women sample. However, when the data on men and women were considered separately, opposite trends emerged; women tended to disclose more to partners they perceived as similar, and men tended to disclose more to partners they perceived as dissimilar. Knecht et al. (1973) did not report sex differences in their study, perhaps due to the small sample size. However, the data here suggest that the effect of the interaction between sex and perceived similarity upon self-disclosure should be tested in future research involving these variables.

Implications for Research in Self-disclosure

This study clarifies a fundamental issue in self-disclosure research. In real life, disclosure is a complex activity, occurring in a variety of situations between a wide array of individuals and groups. When originally developed by Jourard (1971a, 1971b), the experimental study of self-disclosure relied upon self-report measures for its data. Subjects typically related the amount of personal information that either they had conveyed or would be willing to convey to specified others

("targets"). Targets typically included mother, father, best male friend, and best female friend. Serious questions were raised concerning the predictive validity of such measures, however (cf. Cozby, 1973), with the result that references to measures of actual disclosure began to appear in the literature (e.g., Pedersen & Breglio, 1968). A typical example of such a measure is the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire used in this experiment. However, before the present study, the traditional method had been to administer the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire to groups of subjects, with no particular reference to the supposed target of the disclosure. Usually, subjects were left with the accurate impression that none but the experimenter would read their disclosures. In designing the present study, it was felt that the artificiality of the traditional procedure may have detracted sufficiently from its real-life applicability to make an improved technique necessary. Thus, the procedure of the present study was devised in order to provide a more realistic experimental disclosure situation.

A second measure of self-disclosure was used here: ratings of actual self-disclosure observed over the course of approximately 10 weeks of group experience. This measure of disclosure does not depend upon a "contrived" situation as its source of data; rather, it takes advantage of the participant-observer status of the group members to obtain an assessment of each individual's naturally occurring disclosing behavior. Peer ratings have the advantage over judges' ratings of being based on up to 15 hours of observation of the subjects, as opposed

to the 25 minutes required to fill out the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire. This contrast reflects not only a difference in the quantity of disclosure observed in the two situations but also in the quality of the disclosures observed. Unlike judges, who were limited to the written responses to standardized questions, peers had gathered information during a wide range of group activities: making introductions, sharing personal experiences and problems in "rap sessions," discussing conflicts and quarrels with other group members, talking while engaging in cooperative group projects, etc. As a result, the peer ratings are a good source of information regarding the subjects' "general" or "characteristic" disclosure in a group situation.

In the factor analysis of the Q-sorts, where the dimensions along which subjects described their selves and ideals were specified, the peer ratings, not the judges' ratings, correlated significantly with the self and ideal factors. This suggests that peers took into account important aspects of each others' self-concepts which the judges did not, perhaps because of the comparatively limited information available to them. On the basis of these considerations, it is recommended that future researchers take advantage of the peer rating procedure.

General Theoretical Considerations

This study has demonstrated that the relationship between personality and situational factors that influence self-disclosure is a matter of considerable complexity. For example, it was

found that disclosure patterns depend not only upon the discloser's self-esteem and perception of the "target" but also upon the discloser's sex. It appears that when men experience low self-esteem they will confide in one another in private. The data suggest, however, that to some extent this tendency may be counteracted by high levels of perceived similarity between the two. This may reflect a conflict built into the sex-roles according to which men are socialized, such that they see one another as both potential confidants and competitors, as sources of solace and strength, and threats to each other's self-esteem. Such conflicting attributes would generate a great deal of tension between men and would account for much of the difficulty which is often experienced between men when they try to establish close, trusting friendships.

Women in this study reacted differently. The insecure ones were also wary of disclosing themselves in public; they left that activity to the ones with greater self-confidence. However, all women reacted positively when left alone with a woman to whom they felt similar. From the point of view of socialization, because women have traditionally been cast in the inferior role, even women with high self-esteem must be prepared to transcend the negative stereotypes that might accompany public self-disclosure. For women who feel less sure of themselves, disclosing in public, hence, risking embarrassment, brings added pressure. The fact that women responded positively to one another's similarities in this study may indicate a disinclination to feel openly competitive with other

women, perhaps because this might be considered "aggressive." Of course, on the other hand, this finding could be an indication of a generally higher level of trust among women than among men.

Another factor which complicates the relationship between self-esteem and self-disclosure is the nature of the individual's personal goals and the person's level of motivation to achieve these goals, as reflected by the internal structure of their ideals and the discrepancies between their selves and ideals. Speculating from the content of the individual case studies, it appears that disclosure is greatest when the individual's felt motivation is to improve his relationships with others. Moreover, the clearer and more specific the person is in his formulation of these interpersonal goals, the greater likelihood of his actively promoting relationships with others via increased disclosure.

This was suggested most clearly by the contrast between Tom and Danny. Tom, the highest male discloser, experienced in some very specific ways a clear need for the improvement of his interpersonal life; for example, he wanted to "feel accomplishment and friendship in clubs and teams" and "enjoy spending time with people" more, and he wanted to be less "quiet" and "keep to himself" less. Danny, the lowest male discloser, formulated his deficits more vaguely, showing little awareness of the specific improvements that would change his social life. For example, his goals were to become "happier," to "get out what he puts into life," and to be less "passive" and "alone."

Only the last of these four self-defined objectives even makes reference to the need for improving the interpersonal domain. Donna and Gloria could also be distinguished according to how clearly and specifically each formulated her goals in terms of improving her interpersonal relations. However, in their case an additional factor comes into play which interfered with Gloria's ability to achieve the interpersonal goals which she had set for herself. This factor has been described as "felt inhibition of disclosure," that is, a powerful sense of frustration in opening up to people.

These complicating factors can be placed into a larger framework of sources of variability in disclosure and can be classed into three general categories. The first, which includes the sex-role stereotypes of disclosure described above, also includes other influences on individual disclosure which have their origin in culturally-prescribed attitudes. One set of attitudes mentioned above is men's view of men both as potential "buddies" in whom they can confide "man to man," and as competitors and potential threats to each others' self-esteem. The woman's view of women described above is of a less consciously competitive person, but one who thinks so poorly of herself that she is frightened to risk being open about her thoughts and feelings in public. Other attitudes towards disclosure which are prevalent in this culture are exemplified in the following commonly heard statements: "Self-respecting people don't go around talking about their private affairs in public"; "Silence is golden"; "Children should be seen and

not heard"; "I'm looking for a man who's really the strong and silent type"; "People don't want to sit and listen to your problems; they've enough of their own." Individuals will be limited in their disclosure to the extent that they identify with and adhere to such culturally-supported rationalizations for low disclosure.

The second general category of factors influencing disclosure includes the motivational considerations touched upon earlier in this section. Three interrelated variables were proposed to account for subjects' motivation to disclose. The first was the degree to which the individual's goals were formulated specifically in terms of promoting intimacy in their lives. The clearer and more concrete the person's desire for improved interpersonal relations, the more likely he is to disclose. The second motivational factor influencing disclosure is the extent to which the person feels himself to be discrepant from these goals. The discrepancies between self and ideal, based on those items relating to intimacy, may be considered an index of the individual's felt motivation to become more intimate. The third motivational factor is the felt inhibition of disclosure. This is reflected most often in the individual's self-concept by the presence of items which portray the person as a low discloser. Future research could profitably explore the dynamic relationship among these three variables: salience of intimacy as a personal goal, felt motivation to move towards these goals, and felt inhibition of disclosure.

The third and final set of factors that influence the disclosure process relate to the cognitive processes associated with disclosure. "Opening up" to others is a process with a number of identifiable steps: formulating one's thoughts in consciousness, selecting a listener, making sure that the listener is interested in the moment, and finally expressing one's thoughts in terms that the listener will most easily understand. With the exception of psychoanalytic investigation into repression, which relates to the process of formulating one's thoughts in consciousness, these phenomena have eluded the attention of psychological investigators.

In conclusion, self-disclosure can be inhibited by factors relating to any of the above areas: (1) adherence to cultural prohibitions against disclosure, such as those related to sex-roles; (2) motivational deficits (poorly formulated goals, inadequate attraction to intimacy, overpowering inhibitions); and (3) cognitive deficits (inability to express oneself clearly in words, choose an available audience and time one's disclosures appropriately). Intimacy involves expanding the range of feelings and satisfactions that are shared with increasing intensity between two or more people. When the level of an individual's self-disclosure is too low, he is prevented from the full experience of intimacy. Each increase in self-disclosure enhances the capacity for sharing, understanding, empathizing, and responding to others. When allowed to proceed without hindrance, self-disclosure can unlock the vault of loneliness and secrecy within which people reside;

as long as the doors remain open, the capacity for intimacy is limitless.

Suggestions for Future Research

It has been proposed above that variation in self-disclosure can be traced to three primary sources: cultural influences, internal motivational factors, and the development of the cognitive capacity for effective communication. Future research should be directed toward clarifying the independent effects and interactions among the cultural, motivational, and cognitive dimensions of the disclosure process.

The results suggest two specific areas of research in need of further investigation. First is the effect of the interaction between sex and perceived similarity on patterns of disclosure. While no significant correlation emerged between perceived similarity and self-disclosure, based on the combined sample of men and women, high perceived similarity tended to be associated with low disclosure in men and with high disclosure in women. This effect needs further exploration in a variety of disclosure situations before it can be integrated into the theory of self-disclosure.

The second area of research suggested by this study concerns the role of social desirability in the relationship between self-disclosure and self-ideal congruence. The factor analysis of subjects' ideal descriptions revealed items which may reflect a heavy loading of social desirability. If social desirability did significantly affect subjects' ideal self-

concepts in this study, as has happened in previous research (Cartwright, 1975; Shlien, 1962; Wessman & Ricks, 1966), then the findings of the present study may be consistent with Cravens' (1975) results on the effect of the interaction between need-for-approval and the public/private dimension on disclosure. A precise specification of the relationship between these variables cannot be formulated until further research has been designed and conducted with these particular questions in mind.

A major innovation in self-disclosure research was introduced in this study. The use of an ongoing group with an existence independent of the experiment provided the opportunity to assess self-disclosure in a more meaningful context than had previously been possible, one in which the disclosures could have consequences for the future of the relationships between the subjects. In addition, this situation provided peer ratings of disclosure, a second source of data on the subjects' disclosingness. Future researchers could profitably explore disclosure as it takes place in other meaningful, real-life contexts, where the data would consist of the actual disclosures made by the subjects in the course of their daily lives, for example among college students relaxing in the lounge or among co-workers on the job. Naturalistic and participant-observational methods, such as the peer ratings employed in this study, could be adopted from previous research (cf. Jourard, 1971b) or developed in response to the needs of the individual study.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLES OF FORMS ADMINISTERED TO SUBJECTS

MEASURE OF PERCEIVED SIMILARITY

page 1

On the following page, indicate how similar you feel to each of your classmates by putting an "X" on the line beneath the appropriate number. The numbers refer to the descriptions listed below:

1. We are extremely opposite
2. We are very different
3. We are much more different than alike
4. We are very different but there are some similarities
5. We are slightly more different than alike
6. We are slightly more alike than different
7. We are much more alike than different
8. We are a lot alike, but there are some differences
9. We are very much alike
10. We are practically identical

BASIC INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Your Code Number _____

Your Age _____

Your Sex (circle one) M F

Your Class (circle one) Fr Soph Jr Sr

Your Major _____

Which of the following best describes your relationship with your partner? (check one)

_____ Close friend

_____ Casual friend

_____ Acquaintance

How long have you known your partner? _____

About how often do you see your partner? (check one)

_____ Every day

_____ Three or more times a week

_____ Once or twice a week

_____ Less than once a week

SELF-DISCLOSURE QUESTIONNAIRE

page 1

Each of these five pages has a question on it about yourself. Read the question and use the space provided below it to write your answer. Write clearly and neatly. You will have five minutes to answer each question. After both of you have finished writing answers to all five questions, you will exchange papers and read what the other one has written. Then you will have an opportunity to talk over anything you have read. Remember to put your code name on each page.

After you have read each other's answers, I will collect them. From then on, the contents of what you wrote will be kept in strictest confidence. In addition, you must agree at this point not to disclose anything that your partner writes to you. Do you agree?

SELF-DISCLOSURE QUESTIONNAIRE

page 2

Code Number: _____

1. What are your main interests in life? Describe those activities which you enjoy.

SELF-DISCLOSURE QUESTIONNAIRE

page 3

Code Number: _____

2. Describe your personality. Consider both your strengths and weaknesses.

SELF-DISCLOSURE QUESTIONNAIRE

page 4

Code Number: _____

3. Describe yourself as a student. Include in your description an evaluation of your abilities, current motivation, and future educational and/or occupational plans.

SELF-DISCLOSURE QUESTIONNAIRE

page 5

Code Number: _____

4. Describe your present state of health and physical appearance. What do you like and/or dislike about your physical characteristics?

SELF-DISCLOSURE QUESTIONNAIRE

page 6

Code Number: _____

5. What is your current financial condition? Include a description of both your financial assets and liabilities.

APPENDIX B

ITEMS USED IN Q-SORTS

Items for Q-sort (Males)

1. Always has time for others, gives up personal time to help
2. Feels accomplishment and friendship in clubs and teams
3. Not actively seeking friends
4. Goes his own way
5. Has a life just like anyone else
6. Can't get close to other kids
7. Understanding
8. Brainy
9. Holds things against people
10. Good natured
11. Intent on goals and aspirations
12. Passive
13. Likes to party
14. Comfortable with a group
15. Interested in having a good time
16. Outgoing, friendly
17. Mingles
18. Plastic
19. Makes a good impression
20. Worries about communications
21. Willing to meet and bullshit with people
22. Not eager to accept other people as friends
23. Involved
24. Fair, unbiased
25. Intelligent
26. Enjoys spending time with other people
27. Shares in the feelings of others
28. Can deal with different people
29. Loud
30. Quiet
31. Tries to show how intelligent he is
32. Leads a marginal existence
33. Shows consideration
34. Cold
35. Leads a hectic life
36. Easy going, has a free and easy style
37. Good
38. Gets out what he puts into life
39. Wears a mask
40. Courteous
41. Lacks lasting friendships
42. Apathetic
43. Shy
44. Alone
45. Works alone
46. Happy
47. Busy
48. Helpful, willing to lend a hand
49. Fun to be with
50. Keeps to himself, sticks to himself

Items for Q-sort

(Males)

51. Self-centered
52. Gets along well with others
53. Likes people
54. Dull, uninteresting, boring
55. Fascinated by pinball machines and pool tables
56. Finds it awkward to break the ice
57. Doubts other peoples' intelligence
58. Exciting
59. Dedicated
60. Feels he has something important to say, a contribution to make
61. His smiles are superficial and forced
62. Enjoys getting into heavy philosophical discussions
63. Hard to break the barriers of communication with
64. More concerned with jobs, than friends
65. Trusting
66. Congenial
67. Receptive, easy to talk to, easy to relate to
68. Wild
69. Interested in doing good in school
70. Industrious, works hard

Items for Q-sort (Females)

1. Honest about feelings
2. Turned on to others
3. Easy to get along with
4. Enjoys a good time
5. Uninhibited
6. Cold
7. Relaxed
8. Feels free to express ideas, share experiences, talk about goals and ideas on life
9. Looks neat
10. Shy
11. Likes to party
12. Does not worry about grades or money
13. Wears jeans and long hair
14. Has a need to get into social life
15. Fun to be with
16. Interested in her fellow man
17. Serious, takes work seriously
18. Confused about her future
19. Different in her own way
20. Intellectual, a thinker (academically inclined)
21. Bookworm type
22. Does not have very intense contact with people
23. Keeps to herself, self-contained
24. Feels afraid and alone
25. Feels strange, out of place
26. Looks "cool"
27. Likes to socialize, enjoys others' company, socially inclined
28. Open, opens up
29. Liberal
30. Leads a busy life
31. Interested in others' rights
32. Casual
33. Considerate
34. Conversation flows easily
35. Understanding
36. Mannerly, courteous
37. Warm
38. Decent
39. Willing to help and guide
40. Easy to get to know
41. Interesting, fascinating to others
42. Manipulative
43. Hesitant
44. Antisocial
45. Involved
46. Enthusiastic

Items for Q-sort

(Females)

47. Hard to get to know
48. Kind, compassionate
49. Worldly
50. Reliable
51. Intelligent
52. Responsive
53. Mature
54. Takes things slow and easy
55. Highly motivated
56. Confident
57. Quiet
58. Alert
59. Generous, giving
60. Uptight, stiff
61. Accepting
62. Fun loving
63. Friendly, first to extend a hand in making a friend
64. Has difficulty in communicating feelings, is afraid to show or receive feelings
65. Unambitious, lacks drive and initiative
66. Finds it hard to make friends
67. Trusting
68. Interested in getting an education
69. Phony
70. Hippie-ish

APPENDIX C

TABLE OF CORRELATIONS BETWEEN JUDGES' RATINGS
OF SUBJECTS' RESPONSES TO THE
FIVE ITEMS ON THE SELF-DISCLOSURE QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLE A

Agreement between Judges' Ratings
of Subjects' Responses to the
Five Items on the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire

Judge	Judge		
	B	C	D
A	.83	.76	.76
B	-	.73	.69
C	-	-	.79

Note: All correlations significant at $p < .001$.

APPENDIX D

FACTORS UNDERLYING SUBJECTS' SELF AND
IDEAL DESCRIPTIONS

MALE REAL-FACTORItem Scores

Score	Item
18.7	Understanding
18.5	Trusting
18.4	Likes People
18.1	Good Natured
16.9	Shows consideration
16.2	Easy going, has a free and easy style
15.6	Enjoys spending time with other people
15.5	Always has time for others, gives up personal time to help
15.5	Interested in having a good time
15.5	Helpful, willing to lend a hand
15.5	Fun to be with
15.1	Alone
15.0	Happy
15.0	Interested in having a good time
14.7	Likes to party
14.5	Outgoing, friendly
14.5	Congenial
14.4	Involved
14.4	Shares in the feelings of others
14.4	Courteous
14.2	Intelligent
14.1	Dedicated
14.0	Industrious, works hard
13.9	Good
13.8	Receptive, easy to talk to, easy to relate to
13.6	Exciting
13.5	Mingles
13.3	Makes a good impression
13.3	Gets along well with others
12.8	Interested in doing good in school
12.8	Quiet
12.7	Feels he has something important to say, a contribution to make
12.5	Busy
12.3	Fair, unbiased
12.2	Feels accomplishment and friendship in clubs and teams
12.2	Willing to meet and bullshit with people
12.2	Doubts other peoples' intelligence
12.0	Shy

MALE REAL-FACTOR

Score	Item
11.7	Comfortable with a group
11.7	Gets out what he puts into life
11.4	Goes his own way
11.4	Can deal with different people
11.4	Enjoys getting into heavy philosophical discussions
11.2	Brainy
11.1	Fascinated by pinball machines and pool tables
10.8	Has a life just like anyone else
10.7	Wild
10.5	Intent on goals and aspirations
10.4	Worries about communications
10.4	Loud
10.4	Leads a hectic life
10.3	Tries to show how intelligent he is
10.0	Leads a marginal existence
10.0	Apathetic
9.7	Passive
9.4	Can't get close to other kids
9.2	Receptive, easy to talk to, easy to relate to
9.0	Not eager to accept other people as friends
9.0	Loud
9.0	Finds it awkward to break the ice
8.9	Lacks lasting friendships
8.6	Holds things against people
8.2	Keeps to himself, sticks to himself
8.0	Hard to break the barriers of communication with
7.4	Works alone
7.1	Self-centered
6.5	More concerned with jobs than friends
5.0	Plastic
5.0	Cold
4.4	Dull, uninteresting, boring

MALE IDEAL-FACTORItem Scores

<u>Score</u>	<u>Item</u>
21.5	Understanding
18.9	Happy
17.6	Involved
17.6	Receptive, easy to talk to, easy to relate to
17.1	Trusting
16.6	Good natured
16.5	Enjoys spending time with other people
16.5	Shares in the feelings of others
16.5	Fun to be with
16.4	Outgoing, friendly
16.4	Helpful, willing to lend a hand
16.4	Likes people
15.8	Intelligent
15.6	Intent on goals and aspirations
15.2	Interested in having a good time
15.2	Shows consideration
15.2	Easy going, has a free and easy style
15.2	Alone
15.1	Dedicated
14.6	Always has time for others, gives up personal time to help
14.6	Willing to meet and bullshit with people
14.5	Comfortable with a group
14.5	Can deal with different people
14.5	Good
14.5	Gets out what he puts into life
14.0	Exciting
13.9	Likes to party
13.9	Fair, unbiased
13.8	Industrious, works hard
13.4	Feels he has something important to say, a contribution to make
13.3	Courteous
13.2	Interested in doing good in school
13.2	Brainy
13.2	Mingles
13.2	Gets along well with others
13.2	Wild

MALE IDEAL-FACTOR

Score	Item
12.6	Enjoys getting into heavy philosophical discussions
12.1	Makes a good impression
12.0	Feels accomplishment and friendship in clubs and teams
12.0	Quiet
11.9	Busy
11.8	Not eager to accept other people as friends
11.8	Congenial
11.4	Goes his own way
11.3	Has a life just like anyone else
11.3	Works alone
10.9	Can't get close to other kids
10.8	Leads a hectic life
10.8	Keeps to himself, sticks to himself
10.8	Fascinated by pinball machines and pool tables
10.6	Loud
10.6	Tries to show how intelligent he is
10.6	Finds it awkward to break the ice
10.2	Leads a marginal existence
10.1	Holds things against people
10.1	Finds it awkward to break the ice
10.1	Hard to break the barriers of communication with
10.0	Not actively seeking friends
9.8	Lacks lasting friendships
9.5	Worries about communications
9.5	His smiles are superficial and forced
9.4	More concerned with jobs, than friends
9.3	Apathetic
8.9	Passive
8.8	Self-centered
8.2	Shy
7.0	Dull, uninteresting, boring
6.9	Wears a mask
5.0	Cold
4.4	Plastic

FEMALE REAL-FACTORItem Scores

Score	Item
21.2	Generous, giving
21.0	Understanding
19.9	Kind, compassionate
19.6	Warm
18.9	Considerate
18.5	Accepting
18.1	Interested in her fellow man
18.1	Easy to get to know
17.0	Honest about feelings
17.0	Responsive
16.9	Intelligent
16.9	Trusting
16.8	Easy to get along with
16.8	Interested in getting an education
16.7	Leads a busy life
16.3	Interested in others' rights
16.3	Willing to help and guide
16.2	Enthusiastic
16.2	Reliable
16.1	Coversation flows easily
15.7	Serious, takes work seriously
15.7	Intellectual, a thinker (academically inclined)
15.5	Enjoys a good time
15.5	Mature
15.4	Enthusiastic
15.0	Highly motivated
14.9	Feels free to express ideas, share experiences, talk about goals and ideas on life
14.9	Alert
14.9	Friendly, first to extend a hand in making a friend
14.7	Fun to be with
14.3	Likes to socialize, enjoys others' company, socially inclined
14.3	Mannerly, courteous
14.3	Decent
14.2	Confident
14.1	Liberal
14.1	Fun loving

FEMALE REAL-FACTOR

Score	Item
13.6	Turned on to others
13.5	Interesting, fascinating to others
13.4	Open, opens up
13.4	Casual
12.9	Likes to party
12.8	Different in her own way
12.6	Looks neat
12.2	Uninhibited
12.2	Wears jeans and long ahir
11.6	Worldly
11.5	Confused about her future
11.5	Takes things slow and easy
10.9	Does not worry about grades or money
10.8	Has a need to get into social life
10.3	Quiet
10.1	Shy
10.1	Bookworm type
10.1	Looks "cool"
10.1	Hesitant
9.7	Feels afraid and alone
9.5	Hippie-ish
9.4	Manipulative
9.4	Uptight, stiff
9.3	Does not have very intense contact with people
9.2	Has difficulty in communicating feelings, is afraid to show or receive feelings
8.3	Hard to get to know
8.1	Keeps to herself, self-contained
8.1	Unambitious, lacks drive and initiative
8.1	Finds it hard to make friends
7.9	Feels strange, out of place
7.4	Phony
5.5	Antisocial
4.1	Cold

FEMALE IDEAL-FACTORItem Scores

Score	Item
31.5	Confident
27.8	Warm
27.4	Understanding
25.9	Honest about feelings
25.2	Intelligent
25.2	Responsive
24.7	Generous, giving
24.6	Easy to get along with
24.6	Friendly, first to extend a hand in making a friend
24.5	Considerate
24.4	Kind, compassionate
24.3	Uninhibited
23.9	Turned on to others
23.8	Feels free to express ideas, share experiences, talk about goals and ideas on life
23.8	Interested in her fellow man
23.2	Easy to get to know
23.1	Enthusiastic
23.0	Willing to help and guide
22.9	Fun to be with
22.5	Interesting, fascinating to others
22.5	Highly motivated
22.4	Different in her own way
22.4	Intellectual, a thinker (academically inclined)
22.4	Reliable
22.3	Relaxed
22.3	Interested in others' rights
22.3	Accepting
22.3	Trusting
21.9	Conversation flows easily
21.8	Responsive
21.7	Likes to socialize, enjoys others' company, socially inclined
21.5	Enjoys a good time
21.5	Involved
21.3	Leads a busy life
21.0	Decent
21.0	Alert

FEMALE IDEAL-FACTOR

Score	Item
20.3	Liberal
20.3	Serious, takes work seriously
20.3	Interested in getting an education
20.2	Open, opens up
19.6	Casual
19.5	Mannerly, courteous
19.5	Fun loving
19.0	Takes things slow and easy
18.8	Likes to party
18.8	Worldly
18.0	Does not worry about grades or money
16.1	Has a need to get into social life
16.0	Looks "cool"
15.7	Looks neat
15.4	Wears jeans and long hair
15.4	Hard to get to know
15.3	Quiet
14.6	Bookworm type
14.6	Hippie-ish
14.0	Shy
14.0	Finds it hard to make friends
13.9	Feels strange, out of place
13.9	Hesitant
13.4	Uptight, stiff
13.3	Unambitious, lacks drive and initiative
13.2	Confused about her future
13.2	Keeps to herself, self-contained
13.2	Has difficulty in communicating with others, is afraid to show or receive feelings
12.6	Does not have very intense contact with people
11.1	Feels afraid and alone
11.0	Manipulative
8.9	Phony
8.5	Antisocial
7.2	Cold

References

- Bowlby, J. Separation. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Brown, S. R., & Brenner, D. J. (Eds.) Science, psychology, and communication: essays honoring William Stephenson. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1972.
- Buber, M. I and thou. New York: Scribner's, 1958.
- Bugental, J. F. T. The search for authenticity. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.
- Burhenne, D., & Mirels, H. L. Self-disclosure in self-descriptive essays. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 35, 409-413.
- Butler, J. M., & Haigh, G. V. Changes in the relation between self-concepts and ideal-concepts consequent upon client-centered counseling. In C. R. Rogers & Rosalind F. Dymond (Eds.), Psychotherapy and personality change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Byrne, D. The attraction paradigm. New York: Academic Press, 1971.
- Cartwright, D. S. Patient self-report measures. In I. E. Waskow, & M. B. Parloff (Eds.), Psychotherapy change measures. Rockville, Md.: National Institute of Mental Health, 1975.
- Cozby, P. C. Self-disclosure: a literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 73, 73-91.
- Cravens, R. W. The need for approval and the private versus public disclosure of self. Journal of Personality, 1975, 43 (3), 503-514.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. The approval motive. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Edwards, A. L. The social desirability variable in personality assessment and research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1957.
- Fitzgerald, M. P. Self-disclosure and expressed self-esteem, social distance, and areas of the self revealed. Journal of Psychology, 1963, 56, 405-412.
- Fromm, E. The art of loving. New York: Harper & Row, 1956.

- Fromm, E. Values, psychology, and human existence. In A. H. Maslow (ed.), New knowledge in human values. New York: Harper & Row, 1959.
- Hinton, J. Dying. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1967.
- Jourard, S. M. Self-disclosure and other-cathexis. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 428-431.
- Jourard, S. M. Disclosing man to himself. New York: Van Nostrand, 1968.
- Jourard, S. M. The transparent self. New York: Van Nostrand, 1971. (a)
- Jourard, S. M. Self-disclosure: an experimental analysis of the transparent self. New York: Wiley, 1971. (b)
- Jourard, S. M., & Landsman, M. J. Cognition, cathexis, and the "dyadic effect" in men's self-disclosing behavior. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1960, 6, 178-186.
- Jourard, S. M., & Lasakow, P. Some factors in self-disclosure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 91-98.
- Knecht, L. Lippman, D. & Swap, W. Similarity, attraction, and self-disclosure. Proceedings of the 81st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1973, 8, 205-206.
- Kohut, H. The analysis of the self. New York: International Universities Press, 1971.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1974.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.
- Maslow, A. H. Toward a psychology of being. New York: Van Nostrand, 1968.
- May, R. (Ed.). Existential psychology. New York: Random House, 1960.
- Parkes, C. M. Bereavement: studies of grief in adult life. New York: International Universities Press, 1972.
- Pearce, W. B., & Wiebe, B. Relationship with and self-disclosure to friends. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1973, 37, 610.

- Pedersen, D. M., & Breglio, V. J. Personality correlates of actual self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1968, 22, 495-501.
- Pedersen, D. M., & Higbee, K. L. Personality correlates of self-disclosure. Journal of Social Psychology, 1969, 78, 81-89.
- Rogers, C. The interpersonal relationship: the core of guidance. Harvard Educational Review, 1962, 32, 416-429.
- Rogers, C. Toward a modern approach to values: the valuing process in the mature person. In C. Rogers, & B. Stevens, Person to Person. Lafayette, Calif.: Real People Press, 1967.
- Rubin, Z. Liking and loving. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.
- Shlien, J. Toward what level of abstraction in criteria? In H. Strupp and L. Luborsky (Eds.) Research in psychotherapy, vol. II. Washington, D.C.: APA, 1962.
- Shapiro, J. G., Krauss, H. H., & Truax, C. B. Therapeutic conditions and disclosure beyond the therapeutic encounter. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 290-294.
- Stephenson, W. The study of behavior: Q-technique and its methodology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Sullivan, H. S. The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: W. W. Norton, 1953.
- Wessman, A. E., & Ricks, D. F. Mood and personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.