1-1-1995

Can we talk?: Gender and age differences in self-disclosure among close friends

Nancy Curtin Alwardt

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in Speech Communication at Eastern Illinois University. Find out more about the program.

CAN WE TALK? GENDER AND AGE DIFFERENCES
IN SELF-DISCLOSURE AMONG CLOSE FRIENDS

ALWARDT

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates (who have written formal theses)

SUBJECT: Permission to Reproduce Theses

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

PLEASE SIGN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

_Nancy Curtin Alwardt_____   _8/4/95_____
              Author   Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis to be reproduced because:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____   _____
            Author   Date

Can We Talk?

Gender and Age Differences in Self-Disclosure Among Close Friends
(TITLE)

BY

Nancy Curtin Alwardt

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Arts

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1995
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

August 1, 1995
DATE

Gail E. Mason
ADVISER

8/2/95
DATE

DEPARTMENT HEAD

Running Head: SELF-DISCLOSURE

Can We Talk?

Gender and Age Differences in Self-Disclosure Among Close Friends

Nancy Curtin Alwardt

Eastern Illinois University

Abstract

Gender and age were examined in order to discover how these variables affect self-disclosure among close friends. A questionnaire comprised of forty-six topics from Jourard's Self-Disclosure Questionnaire were chosen and given to high school freshmen, upperclassmen college students and adults in the workforce. Subjects indicated on a described scale how much they have discussed each topic with their closest friend. Results showed that level of discussion for topics changes as age changes. Specifically, results revealed a curvilinear effect in which depth of discussion increased as age increased but depth of disclosure peaked for college students; adults disclosed more than high school freshmen. In other words, college students disclosed the most about topics in all six categories and high school freshmen the least. Based on topics chosen for ANOVA, which tended to be more intimate, females consistently disclosed more than males. ANOVA results rejected the hypothesis that high school students will disclose the least and college students will disclose the most. Suggestions for future research are described.

Thank you . . . . .

A special thanks to my parents, Larry and Pat Curtin for instilling and nurturing the value

of an education. Also a heartfelt thanks and dedication go to Jill Bohn, my best friend,

who was the inspiration and reason for this project. Through our friendship, I have been

blessed to truly know and experience self-disclosure as I dreamed it should exist between

best friends. Finally, love and gratitude to my husband, Nevin for his constant support,

encouragement and understanding while I pursued my goal of a master's degree. Nevin's

continual love and kindness remind me everyday that I am the most fortunate and blessed

woman in the world.

Thank you to my committee for their guidance in this project:

Dr. Gail Mason, Thesis Director

Dr. Melanie Mills and Dr. Doug Bock, Committee Members

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction and Literature Review

"Each person's life is lived as a series of conversations."

Deborah Tannen, <u>You Just Don't Understand</u> (1990)

During one's life, a multitude of conversations are encountered, and much can be learned by the examination of these conversations. The content of conversations contains information about the person, receiver, and especially the relationship. Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson (1967) proposed the concept of "the content and relationship levels of communication" (p. 51). They argue that one axiom of communication is that "any communication implies a commitment and thereby defines the relationship" (p. 51).

In order to attempt to analyze and understand relationships, self-disclosure has been researched for many years; various components of self-disclosure, such as topic, gender of discloser and gender of disclosee, have been explored. More specifically, contributing factors such as the degree of social anxiety of discloser, the degree of self-esteem as well as attachment styles of the discloser have also been studied. Despite the examination of an abundance of different variables, a significant area of interest continues to be the target of the disclosure. A person who is a stranger, acquaintance or friend will usually receive varying degrees of disclosure depending upon the status of that particular relationship, which is supported by Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson's (1967) axiom of communication. Other target persons such as therapists, spouses and parents, to name a few, have also been the subjects of research.

Conclusions from 205 studies report that females disclose more than men (Dindia & Allen, 1992). The degree of intimacy in topics also mediates self-disclosure with females disclosing more about intimate topics (Morgan, 1976 as cited in Dolgin et al.,

1993). Other research indicates that no gender differences exist (Cozby, 1973 as cited in Dindia & Allen, 1992). A topic which men usually surpass women on disclosure is the topic concerning sports (Aries & Johnson, 1983). Furthermore, much of the research has shown that females are often the recipient of disclosure, both when men and women are the disclosers (e.g. Cash, 1975 cited in Dolgin, Meyer and Schwartz, 1991).

For this particular analysis of the literature about self-disclosure, I will focus on self-disclosure as affected by three categories of target persons: stranger, acquaintance and friend. Self-disclosure is often seen as a process in the context of developing relationships; often it is assumed that disclosure will increase on all topics as the relationship develops. Furthermore, age of the discloser may affect the level of disclosure on certain topics. Because of this potential effect, it is necessary to discover <u>what</u> topics are more often discussed between close friends at different ages, instead of assuming that disclosure increases on all topics. After reviewing relevant literature, I will discuss the study which I conducted about disclosure between close friends.

<u>Literature Review</u>

An important aspect of self-disclosure is actually the opposite of self-disclosure, that is self-disclosure avoidance. Before discussing what factors contribute to self-disclosure, it is important to discover any gender differences in the avoidance of self-disclosure. Only then can people begin to understand or appreciate more fully the differences in self-disclosure by seeing the differences in avoidance of it. Rosenfeld (1979) researched self-disclosure via a self-disclosure scale instrument and a self-disclosure avoidance questionnaire. The self-disclosure instrument measured self-disclosure along five variables: intent to disclose, amount of disclosures, positive-negative nature of

disclosure, control of depth of disclosure and honesty-accuracy of disclosure. The self-disclosure avoidance questionnaire listed 18 reasons for avoidance of self-disclosure; each participant indicated the degree (on a five-point Likert scale) in which each reason was personally used. Rosenfeld found that males reported that a major reason for avoidance is that they may project an unwanted image which may cause them to lose control over the other person. Females, however, avoided self-disclosure so as to avoid potential personal hurt and problems with the relationship.

While Rosenfeld (1979) investigated the reasons to avoid self-disclosure, Petronio, Martin and Littlefield (1984) researched what conditions must exist for each gender to self-disclose. Four prerequisite conditions for self-disclosure were examined: receiver, sender, setting and relationship characteristics. They also investigated how topic or content affects self-disclosure between genders. The questionnaire, completed by 252 students, was composed of four parts in which each represented a different topic; the four categories of self-disclosure content were classified according to global, parental, achievement or sexual topics. Subjects were asked to judge personally the importance of prerequisite conditions essential for disclosure. The subjects expressed their judgment with a four-point scale using the terms "very important" (4) to "not important" (1). A variety of situations along the four conditions, receiver, sender, setting and relationship characteristics, were included.

Petronio et al. (1984) found that women, more than men, valued the existence of sender and receiver characteristics in order to feel comfortable self-disclosing, especially with regard to global and sexual topics. More specifically, women found it more important than men that the target of potential disclosure be sincere, liked, warm and

open, among other qualities. Women placed much importance on the receiver and desired characteristics needed to elicit self-disclosure. Furthermore, Petronio found that "receiver characteristics were found to be significantly more important for women than for men on three topics: global, parental, and sexual" (p. 270). Although this is only one particular study, it is interesting and relevant to remember the importance of receiver characteristics as self-disclosure is examined in the context of various target persons.

Strangers as Recipients

After considering the reasons for self-disclosure and avoidance of it, it is important to analyze how self-disclosure develops and exists along three major relationship levels: stranger, acquaintance and friend. Prisbell and Dallinger (1991) examined self-disclosure from a developmental perspective among strangers along five dimensions: amount, intent, positiveness, honesty and depth. To conduct this study, Prisbell and Dallinger enlisted 44 dyads as subjects for a three-phase study. Data were collected from these subjects, undergraduate students, throughout the semester: during the second class period, at the end of the third week of the semester, and at the end of the sixth week of the semester. During this second class period (phase 1), the class instructor formed dyads composed of two strangers who were to work on class exercises. After participating in each phase, subjects then completed a self-disclosure questionnaire. Phase 2 occurred during the second and third weeks of school and had the dyads work on exercises which required interaction between them. Phase 3 had the dyads work on a project outside of class between the fourth and sixth weeks.

Prisbell and Dallinger (1991) concluded that amount and intent of disclosure tended to increase but intent reached a peak and then decreased. This amount increased

from phase 1 to phase 2 and also from phase 2 to phase 3. Regarding intent of disclosure, the average intent to disclosure increased from phase 1 to phase 2 but decreased from phase 2 to phase 3. In addition, depth of disclosure tended to decrease over time; the average decreased from phase 1 to phase 2 as well as from phase 2 to phase 3. Self-disclosure was then not "linear to the stage of the relationship," Prisbell and Dallinger argue. Thus, self-disclosure varies or changes over time.

The norm of reciprocity is a popular construct in self-disclosure tested in various research settings, especially when strangers are involved. Basically, this norm of reciprocity states that "disclosure by one member of a dyad establishes the context for appropriateness of the level of disclosure by the other member and creates an obligation to reciprocate that is enforced by social disapproval for failure to respond in kind" (Brewer & Mittleman, 1980, p. 90). Subjects for this research procedure were 180 undergraduate females; each was paired for this experiment. Each member of the dyad was placed into separate rooms in which one was instructed to choose one of five topics based on a normative demand for level of intimacy of the disclosure (low, medium, or high intimacy topics) and to write a self-descriptive essay on that topic. After writing the essay, a "bogus" essay was given to the second subject. The replacement essays were similar in intimacy to the written one; this replacement was done in order to maintain anonymity and secrecy. The second subject was then faced with two variables: the content of the essay and the choice of topics offered by the experimenter. The second subject decided what she wanted to disclose. A standardized essay was again replaced with the original essay and given to the other subject.

Brewer and Mittleman (1980) concluded that the reciprocity effect did not exist. Instead, the intimacy level was regulated by normative cues or normative demand for intimacy, such as low, medium, or high intimacy. For example, Brewer and Mittleman note, "The reciprocity effect was eliminated in that both first and second disclosers matched their intimacy level to the normative cue rather than to the level of the other's disclosure" (p. 89).

However, reciprocity seemed to vary in another context which depended on the type of information being disclosed. VanLear (1987) researched how self-disclosure changes over time in three levels: public, semiprivate and private-personal. He also studied whether self-disclosure is reciprocated at these levels as well as if reciprocity varied over time. In order to research these aspects of self-disclosure, VanLear employed a longitudinal study of same-sex dyads (three female and four male) composed of undergraduate students who were strangers. The researcher gave them no instructions or tasks for the interactions. VanLear decoded statements which fit into the following four categories: nonsubstantive utterances, public accessible utterances, semiprivate disclosure or private-personal disclosure.

VanLear (1987) concluded that there was a normative sequence of intimate disclosures; however public and semiprivate disclosures were less subject to normative constraints. In other words, he reasons that since public and semiprivate information is not as risky, this disclosure is more apt to occur at any time during the interaction. Overall, though, semi-private disclosure was reciprocated more frequently than the reciprocity of public or private information (VanLear, 1987). Also, as the relationships progressed, more private-personal information was shared until it reached a peak in which

it dropped off (usually towards the end of the relationship); this is similar to Prisbell and Dallinger's (1991) conclusions.

Combinations of Various Recipients

While this norm of reciprocity is especially evident when applying or researching in the context of strangers, it should also be analyzed in the context of other target persons. Stokes, Fuehrer and Childs (1980) examined how self-disclosure varies depending on gender differences to various target persons. In two similar experiments, Stokes et al. asked female and male undergraduate students via a questionnaire how willing they would be to talk about 14 topics to three target persons: stranger, acquaintance and an intimate friend. The topics reflected a variety of intimacy levels. In the first experimental procedure, subjects responded according to friends of the same gender; however, in the second experiment, subjects indicated if the gender of the target person was the same or opposite of the subject.

Stokes et al. (1980) concluded that target and discloser's gender did affect how one self-discloses to each of three same-gender targets. In the first experiment, women were more willing than men to disclose to intimate friends; however, males showed more willingness than females to disclose to strangers and acquaintances. The degree of intimacy affected the disclosure to various target persons; in other words, who the target person was, was a major factor in how males and females disclosed to them. In the second experiment, gender of the target person influenced disclosure. Both men and women disclosed more to opposite-sex strangers and acquaintances rather than to same-sex strangers and acquaintances. However, regarding intimate target persons, men and women disclosed more to same-sex rather than to opposite-sex recipients.

Varying target persons were also researched by Hatch and Leighton (1986). Based on previous research findings and theories about gender differences in self-disclosure, Hatch and Leighton examined whether these conclusions were accurate and could be replicated based on the content dimension. They investigated how and if men and women differed in self-disclosure of personal strengths and weaknesses; Hatch and Leighton tested the validity of Derlega and Chaikin's (1976) claim that women are encouraged to disclose their weaknesses while men are encouraged to disclose their strengths. They also considered the impact on self-disclosure of other factors such as the level of intimacy between discloser and disclosee as well as the target person's gender.

Hatch and Leighton (1986) developed and employed a Strength/Weakness Disclosure Scale. On the scale were 20 brief sketches portraying situations; 10 of these described the subject in a position of strength and the other 10 described the subject in a position of weakness. After reading each sketch, the subject indicated on a Likert scale the likelihood of disclosing the details of the situation to four target persons: best male friend, best female friend, an acquaintance and a person whom you would never encounter again. Hatch and Leighton found that women disclosed more, and they also were more open than men about their strengths; this finding contradicted Derlega and Chaikin's (1976) claim. Hatch and Leighton also concluded that the same-sex friend received the highest amount of disclosure.

Besides the intimacy level between discloser and target person affecting the amount of disclosure, sex roles were hypothesized to be a factor in self-disclosure (Shaffer, Pegalis & Cornell, 1992; Grigsby & Weatherley, 1983; Stokes, Childs & Fuehrer, 1981). Stokes et al. (1981) postulated that androgynous subjects would indicate

more of willingness to self-disclose since they possessed combined feminine and masculine traits, such as a tendency to make expressive and oppositional statements. Also, Stokes et al. predicted that sex roles would indicate the willingness to disclose to various target persons. Similar to the Stokes et al. (1980) methodology, Stokes et al. (1981) used the same questionnaire in which subjects were asked to indicate their willingness to disclose on 14 various topics. The target person was designated as either being the same or opposite sex of the respondent. The additional procedure from that of the 1980 study was that of the Bem Sex Role Inventory; each subject completed this inventory.

Stokes et al. (1981) found that androgynous subjects reported more self-disclosure than all other subjects. Furthermore, Stokes et al. noted that a balance of scores on masculine and feminine dimensions were necessary in order to predict disclosure to intimate targets. However, the interaction of gender of the subject and target person on disclosure was not found to be mediated by sex typing. Furthermore, Stokes et al. reported that masculine scores predicted a level of disclosure to strangers and acquaintances, but feminine scores were not solely found to predict disclosure to intimates.

Interacting with sex-role identity is another factor, that of context. Shaffer, Pegalis and Cornell (1992) hypothesized that self-disclosure would be affected based on sex-role identity and contexts of either social/expressive or instrumental. The social/expressive contexts exist when the main objective is to talk and become acquainted with one another, a social goal in a sense. The instrumental context is when interaction occurs in order to complete a task. They postulated that subjects scoring high in femininity would self-disclose more than those who score low in femininity. Furthermore, it was predicted that

subjects scoring high in masculinity would disclose more in instrumental contexts, rather, when they expect to work with the acquaintances. Shaffer et al.'s (1992) subjects, who were undergraduates, were already classified as high or low in masculinity and femininity as a result of completing the Personal Attributes Questionnaire. The context was manipulated in three ways: no prospect of further interaction, prospect of further social interaction, or prospect of future collaboration. For the initial meeting, each dyad was to choose four cards denoting different topics. The order they picked the cards was the order they were to discuss each topic. The four topics were rated private or personal from past research. The other member of the dyad, an unknown same-sex participant, was really a confederate.

Shaffer et al. (1992) determined that context did affect the willingness of participants to self-disclose; however, sex itself did not predict these differences. Rather, sex-role identities affected self-disclosure differences across the social/expressive and collaborative contexts. For instance, when anticipating talking more with their partners, highly feminine participants disclosed more intimate information. Shaffer et al. did not conclude that masculine individuals will self-disclose more in collaborative contexts. In essence, the degree of femininity is a factor in more meaningful self-disclosure to same-sex acquaintances in a social/expressive context.

Contrary findings were exposed by Grigsby and Weatherley (1983) who sought to examine the relationship between gender and sex-roles and how these factors influence the intimacy of self-disclosure to strangers. They expected that women would reveal more intimate information about themselves. Also, they expected that individuals who scored higher in femininity (androgynous and feminine people) would share more intimate

information than those who were lower in femininity (masculine and undifferentiated

people). In order to test these hypotheses, undergraduate subjects completed a Personal

Attributes Questionnaire in order to obtain a sex-role classification. They were then told

that they would share information about themselves to people whom they would later

meet. Each subject completed a self-disclosure questionnaire in which subjects responded

to all of the following questions: tell about your goals, tell about your worries, and tell

about what brings you pleasure. These questionnaires were scored for the intimacy value.

As each subject responded, they expected the other partner to eventually read it.

However, subjects did not read self-descriptions supposedly written by their partner; in

actuality, there were four standardized self-descriptions written by the researchers which

were used.

Grigsby and Weatherley (1983) concluded that women self-disclosed more

intimately than men, but androgynous subjects self-disclosed less intimately than did

feminine subjects. Also, no relationship existed between femininity scores and intimacy of

self-disclosure, but masculinity scores for men and women were negatively related to

intimacy of self-disclosure. Even though feminine subjects disclosed more intimately than

masculine subjects, they did not disclose more intimately than subjects of undifferentiated

sex-role type. Although Grigsby and Weatherley and Stokes et al. (1981) seem to have

contradicting information, Grigsby and Weatherley argue that these differences could be

downplayed because of the different approaches. Respondents in the Stokes et al. study

answered questions based on various hypothetical target persons while Grigsby and

Weatherley respondents based their answers using same-sex strangers as the target.

Strangers, or rather the perception of a stranger, can have different connotative meanings.

Many factors, especially level of comfort with a stranger, contribute to whether and how someone self-discloses.

Another specific target person often researched in self-disclosure is acquaintances. Just as reciprocity was researched by Brewer and Mittleman (1980) as applied to the stranger context, Won-Doornink (1979) investigates what association exists between the three stages of a relationship and reciprocity of self-disclosure. Won-Doornink anticipated that there would be an overall inverse association between the stage of the relationship and the occurrence of reciprocity of nonintimate disclosure; it was also predicted that the stage of the relationship and the occurrence of reciprocity of intimate disclosure would be curvilinearly related. Won-Doornink recruited undergraduate females who in turn each chose three people, one for each of the stages of the relationship: acquaintance, friend and best friend. Three separate sessions were held with each subject in which the subject talked about any topic with the person whom they had chosen. Conversations were recorded and statements were categorized according to intimacy level.

As predicted and in agreement with Altman and Taylor's social penetration theory, non-intimate disclosures decreased as the relationship progressed (Won-Doornink, 1979). Another prediction consistent with Altman and Taylor's theory was a curvilinear association between relationship stage and amount of intimate disclosures. Basically, the relationship reaches a peak and then amount of intimate disclosures decreases. As mentioned above concerning VanLear's (1987) research, Won-Doornink and VanLear reached the same conclusion, which was the curvilinear association. It is important to note though that Won-Doornink conducted the study in the context of three relational stages: acquaintance, friend and best-friend. However, VanLear's subjects were strangers

participating in a longitudinal study in which they, of course, became familiar with each other over time.

Acquaintances as Recipients

Self-disclosure is affected to a degree in a same-sex acquaintance context depending on how subjects view future encounters. Shaffer and Ogden (1986) attempted to see how anticipated future interaction influenced self-disclosure during the acquaintance process. Two studies were conducted in order to verify one of two opposing hypotheses. One hypothesis was based on the modeling explanation; if this explanation is correct, then it was expected that men, more than women, would use partners' self-disclosures as a model for their own since men are usually unpracticed at expressiveness. The rival hypothesis states that a situational variable, such as prospect of future interaction, will impact self-disclosure. If this explanation is true, Shaffer and Ogden expect men to be more self-disclosing when there is a prospect of future interaction, whereas, this prospect of future interaction is not predicted to affect women. The reasoning for this hypothesis is that because men tend to be more instrumental (more concerned with task rather than the relationship), men will see a need to self-disclose to ensure an effective working relationship.

For one study Shaffer and Ogden (1986) arranged to have a confederate begin talking with each subject about four personal topics. The subjects were either told that they would or would not be meeting with their partners after this initial acquaintanceship phase of the study. Also, the subjects were told that they could decline to discuss any of the four personal topics. After the interaction, the subject was asked to respond to a questionnaire about his/her impressions of the interaction.

Shaffer and Ogden (1986) found that, whereas females tend to disclose more in various situations, males disclosed information "that was as intimate as that disclosed by female subjects" (Shaffer & Ogden, 1986, p. 97). More importantly, the prospect for future interaction affected men's self-disclosure more than women; men were more intimate and involved when they were told that they would be interacting with their partners again. When there was no prospect for future interaction, women disclosed less intimately. Rather, women and men acted the exact opposite in the situation where there's prospect for further interaction; men disclosed more and women disclosed less. Also, it was found that men followed the confederate's disclosures more than women. However, other observations discredited the modeling hypothesis.

Shaffer and Ogden (1986) conducted a second study in order to gain more explanations to the findings in the first study. In other words, they knew what the findings were, but they did not have enough information to support existing theories or bridge new ones. This second study asked students to imagine themselves as participating in an experiment with an acquaintance in which they would discuss four personal topics. The variable manipulated was again the prospect for future interaction. Subjects simply reflected on what the experiment would be like and then were asked to complete a questionnaire. This survey asked about aspects of how comfortable, intimate and emotional they would be discussing these topics with an acquaintance as well as their concern and self-confidence about the interaction.

In this second study, Shaffer and Ogden (1986) confirmed the findings from the first study, which is men are more disclosing and intimate than women when there is a prospect for future interactions. Men, more than women, also were found to be more

concerned about appropriate behavior and placed great importance on establishing a harmonious relationship. Based on the findings, Shaffer and Ogden offered two different hypotheses. One is the "avoidance of intimacy" hypothesis which proposes that women will refrain from intimate disclosures so as not to appear overly intrusive and possibly impair an effective working relationship. The other hypothesis, "the evaluation apprehension," states that women again are concerned about establishing a good working relationship and thus, refrain from intimate disclosures. Furthermore, they may fear that the collaborator will evaluate them causing them to "close up" so as not to make them vulnerable.

Friends as Recipients

As can be seen from previous research, women and men have different goals and definitions as to what constitutes an environment conducive to self-disclosing intimately. These goals and definitions vary depending on the target person, among other factors. Shifting from strangers/acquaintances to a friend as the target affects self-disclosure dramatically. One characteristic often associated with close friendships is the level/degree of intimacy. As is obvious, there are many meanings of intimacy in friendships. Self-disclosure is usually included in the definition of intimacy in same-sex and cross-sex friendships, if it isn't already **the** definition (Monsour, 1992; Jones, 1991; Ashton, 1980). Most recently, Monsour (1992) attempted to discover the definition and expression of intimacy as reported by individuals in cross- and same-sex friendship. Monsour reiterates agreement exists that intimacy is an essential component of meaningful relationships, but agreement and thus, consistency, does not exist when actually defining intimacy in friendships. In order to generate some consistency in definitions, Monsour simply invited

subjects to respond to open ended questions; the two questions asked about the definition of intimacy and expression of intimacy as applied to a personal situation with one good friend. "Good friend" was clearly defined for the subjects.

Monsour (1992) reported that self-disclosure was overwhelmingly listed most often by males and females as a definition of intimacy in both cross- and same-sex friendships. However, females in same-sex friendships listed self-disclosure as a definition of intimacy significantly more than males or females in the other friendship groups. Even though this research revealed that males list self-disclosure as a definition of intimacy more than previous research showed, males still do not stress this as a definition of intimacy as much as females in same-sex friendships.

Just as Monsour (1992) investigated the definition and expression of intimacy and found multidimensional definitions, Jones (1991) analyzed "sex differences in characteristics associated with the core provisions of friendship, namely, intimacy, mutual assistance and companionship" (Jones, 1991, p. 167). Jones conducted two studies; of most interest to the area of self-disclosure is the second one. More specifically, this second study assesses the behavioral characteristics of existing friendships and examines the contributions of these characteristics to friendship satisfaction in order to determine any sex differences. Self-disclosure is one of the characteristics which represents intimacy, one of the core provisions of friendships. Subjects consisted of 138 undergraduate students (78 males, 60 females) who responded to questionnaires. The questionnaires assessed the negativity and enjoyment of the friendship, level of self-disclosure and reciprocity as well as overall satisfaction of the friendship. To answer each of these

questions, each subject was asked to list the initials of each friend and the category of each

friend (i.e. a relative, a non-romantic friend, a romantic boyfriend/girlfriend, or other).

Jones (1991) deduced that self-disclosure was one of two significant contributors

to friendship satisfaction (the other being friendship enjoyment). Despite females

reporting more self-disclosure in their friendships than males, males and females agree that

self-disclosure is a significant contributor to friendship satisfaction. Jones summarizes,

"The overall evidence from this research is that there are greater similarities than

differences in the qualities that enhance friendship satisfaction for males and females" (p.

181).

In another study, Ashton (1980) wanted to gain a clearer perspective of the

perceptions of best-friend relationships. Ashton felt that a more objective and clearer

perspective could be achieved if the subjects responded to open and closed-ended

questions. Each form instructed the subjects to either respond in reference to a same-sex

or other-sex friend. Other questions posed besides the list of characteristics mentioned

above included the following: demographic characteristics of the friends, rating of 21

characteristics based on importance to the friendship, an open-ended question asking for

factors important in the friendship, and a self-disclosure evaluation based on the 40-item

Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire.

Ashton (1980) reported no differences existed between males and females

regarding the degree to which intimacy contributes to best-friend relationships. Likewise,

there was little difference between males and females for self-disclosure and the

importance of the ability to communicate. Actually the only differences that emerged

concerned "shared interests" and "stability of relationship"; these were perceived to be

more important for friendships with a male. Females, more than males, believed that the characteristic, "boost each other's egos" was more important.

Basically, the definitions of friendship are relatively void of gender-differences; the only discrepancy involves, perhaps, the degree of difference in the definition of intimacy. As we know, though, a popular definition of friendship is intimacy, which in turn, is self-disclosure. Although men and women agree that intimacy is an attribute to friendship satisfaction (Monsour, 1992; Jones, 1991; Ashton, 1980), the actual friendship patterns vary (Aukett, Ritchie & Mill, 1988). In other words, how one expresses intimacy varies. A good starting point to judge intimacy levels is to analyze conversations/topics and the level of self-disclosure conveyed to friends.

Among adolescents, amount of emotional disclosure to various target people varies. Papini, Farmer, Clark, Micka and Barnett (1990) examined the patterns of adolescents' self-disclosure to family and friends. More specifically, they wanted to analyze the age and gender differences of adolescents as they self-disclose to parents and friends. They expected that older adolescents would disclose more to friends than parents while younger adolescents would prefer disclosing to parents. Family and individual characteristics were explored to find characteristics typical of a conducive disclosing atmosphere. For the study, 174 junior high students completed a packet of questionnaires designed to measure the amount of emotional self-disclosure and perceptions of family and individual characteristics.

Overall, according to Papini et al.(1990) females, as expected, conveyed more emotional self-disclosure to parents and peers than did males. Younger adolescents disclosed more to parents about their emotional state; older adolescents preferred to

disclose to friends. Concerning family and individual characteristics, adolescents who were more apt to disclose to parents perceived there to be an openness of family communication, family cohesion, and satisfaction with family relationships. Characteristics associated with self-disclosure to friends were marked by adolescent self-esteem and development of an identity.

In adolescents, the level of self-disclosure varied as seen from Papini et al.'s (1990) research, but in college students, it was not only the level but the characteristics of the self-disclosure which were distinct. Tardy, Hosman & Bradac (1981) sought to answer if discloser gender, target and topic affect or interact to affect disclosure along these variables: valence (positive-negative dimension of disclosure), honesty, intent, amount and depth. Subjects, 104 undergraduate students, were given 31 items concerning two distinct topics, schoolwork (task) and social relations. The subjects were asked to imagine three targets (mother, father and best same-sex friend) as they completed each question. In essence, subjects answered 186 times since there were 31 items, two topics and three targets, resulting in a 31 x 2 x 3 design.

For undergraduate college students, Tardy et al. (1981) discovered that their disclosure to same-sex best-friends tended to be more honest, intimate, negative and frequent than disclosure to parents. Moreover, the topic affected the honesty/accuracy of the disclosure. Interestingly, female subjects did not change the honesty of their disclosures as the topics changed, but males did. At these two age levels then, subjects preferred to disclose to their friends, but honesty related to the topic varied depending on gender.

Another factor influencing the level of self-disclosure between best-friends is sex-role identity. Williams (1985) defined masculinity and femininity in terms of instrumental and expressive qualities, respectively. Williams hypothesized that masculinity would be negatively related and femininity would be positively related to emotional intimacy in same-sex friendship for both sexes. Respondents consisted of undergraduate students who completed questionnaires assessing the magnitude of femininity-masculinity as well as measuring the emotional intimacy in same-sex friendships. Questions regarding demographics were also asked. Respondents were asked to answer in terms of their best or closest friend.

Keeping in mind the above definition that masculinity and femininity equates to instrumental and expressive qualities, respectively, Williams (1985) determined that males expressed lower levels of emotional intimacy in same-sex friendships while femininity showed a positive relationship with intimate friendship. There was no relationship between masculinity and degree of intimacy in friendship. In other words, Williams discovered that exhibiting masculine qualities did not predict non-intimate relationships. Furthermore, Williams found support for the hypothesis that femininity is positively related to emotional intimacy. For both sexes, androgynous and feminine individuals scored higher than any other group of individuals on emotional intimacy. No support emerged for the negative relationship between masculinity and emotional intimacy.

In addition to Williams (1985), Lavine and Lombardo (1984) confirmed that sex-role and not gender was a factor in self-disclosure. Overall Lavine and Lombardo investigated the influence of sex-role categories on intimate and nonintimate disclosures to parents and best friends of each gender. More specifically, they expected that

undifferentiated females and males would disclose less than androgynous and traditional females and males, respectively. Also, they thought that androgynous males would report disclosing more than the other male groups (undifferentiated and traditional). Based on previous research, they also made hypotheses about the father's role affecting disclosure. Finally, Lavine and Lombardo predicted that androgynous males and females, undifferentiated males and females and traditional males will disclose to their peers (male and female) first while traditional females will disclose to females (mother and friend) first. To test these hypotheses, 32 androgynous, traditional, and undifferentiated males and females (total of 192) were asked to complete a self-disclosure questionnaire consisting of 30 intimate and 30 non-intimate items. On a five-point scale, they were to indicate the degree to which they had discussed each item with each of the four targets.

Lavine and Lombardo (1984) discovered that androgynous individuals disclosed more than traditional and undifferentiated individuals. In addition, androgynous males disclosed much more to most targets than traditional and undifferentiated males. Contrary to previous research, someone classified as an androgynous female disclosed more information to her best male friend than to the female's mother, thus, showing a peer's first pattern of disclosure rather than a female's first pattern. Undifferentiated males and females reported less disclosure than androgynous and traditional males and females.

In a related aspect to sex-role identity, Snell (1989) hypothesized that social anxiety and willingness to disclose were related based on a self-presentational theory. More explicitly, women and men who have higher levels of social anxiety will be more concerned with how they present themselves and if their behavior is gender-role

consistent. For instance, he predicted high-social anxiety women would be more willing to discuss expressive-feminine aspects of themselves with their female friends. Likewise, high-social anxiety men would be more willing to discuss instrumental-masculine aspects of themselves with their male friends. On the other hand, high-social anxiety would be less willing to discuss instrumental-masculine aspects of themselves with male friends; high social-anxiety men would less willing to discuss expressive-feminine aspects of themselves with their female friends. Snell's subjects consisted of 215 undergraduates, 62 males and 153 females, who completed self-report questionnaires. For measuring social anxiety, subjects responded to a five-point Likert scale to measure their comfort level in social situations. To measure self-disclosure, subjects were asked to evaluate and respond how willing they are to discuss specific topics to two disclosure recipients: a male friend and a female friend.

Snell (1989) found these high-social-anxiety subjects were less willing to discuss information inconsistent with their gender-role. They were more willing to discuss with same-gender rather than other-gender friends information that was consistent with their gender-role. Not only did the need to present gender-role consistent behavior influence self-disclosure, but the particular type of topic (instrumental-masculine vs. expressive-feminine) affected disclosure also. More specifically, high-social anxiety females "reported being more willing to disclose instrumental rather than expressive trait information with their female friends" (Snell, 1989, p. 122). Likewise, high-social anxiety males "were more willing to discuss expressive rather than instrumental *trait* information with their female friends" (p. 122). These expected gender-role consistent behaviors evolve from the established stereotypical characteristics of each gender. As is evident

studies and will be from the following studies, often this expectation for gender-role behavior influences the topics discussed between friends.

The content of the topic and the amount of self-disclosure of that topic varies between friends. What topics friends discuss and don't discuss can often symbolize/indicate other characteristics of the friendship and its participants. And it is not only the issue of what topics are discussed, but also the depth in which they are discussed. The characteristics of various topics are related to the willingness and likelihood to discuss. For example, high-social-anxiety females said they were more willing to disclose instrumental rather than expressive trait information with their female friends (Snell, 1989). Likewise, high-social-anxiety males reported more willingness to disclose expressive rather than instrumental trait information with their female friends.

Somewhat different findings regarding instrumental, expressive, masculine and feminine topics were discovered by Snell, Belk, Flowers & Warren (1988). They studied women's and men's willingness to self-disclose about gender-related aspects of themselves to friends and therapists. According to Snell et al., gender differences were expected in the willingness to disclose information about the masculine and feminine aspects of themselves. Snell et al.'s (1988) subjects were 99 upperclassmen who responded to items via a Likert scale using the Masculine and Feminine Self-Disclosure Scale. For each of the items, subjects "indicated their willingness to discuss that statement with four different target persons: female and male friends and therapists" (p. 771).

Snell et al. (1988) noted a target recipient's gender played a large role in what topics are discussed. For example, women were more willing to discuss with both female and male friends their expressive behaviors and global femininity (how feminine she is).

On the other hand, men were more willing to disclose global masculine (how masculine he is) aspects of themselves to a male friend. Clearly, this research reinforces that self-disclosure is not only influenced by gender roles of the discloser but also by gender of the recipient.

More specifically regarding the content of topics, Aukett, Ritchie & Mill (1988) replicated an American study (Caldwell & Peplau, 1982) in the context of New Zealand students to discover if the findings were consistent. This study was investigating the gender differences in friendship patterns. Aukett et al. enlisted the help of 66 male and 152 female undergraduates who completed the Friendship Questionnaire which assesses the emotional sharing, joint activities and students' preferred type of interaction with friends. Demographic questions were also asked.

Aukett et al. (1988) concluded that females reported more often discussing their personal problems with same-sex friends and preferred talking with friends over another activity. Furthermore, women said they discussed personal problems with their same-sex friends; thus, women were said to be more intimate and emotional in same-sex friendships. These findings were similar to Caldwell & Peplau's (1982) conclusions.

Dolgin, Meyer & Schwartz (1991) not only attempted to replicate other findings on the effects on disclosure of discloser's and target's gender as well as topic but also researched how self-esteem and self-disclosure were related. Although they performed two studies, of most interest to this paper is the first one, which researches self-disclosure between best friends. To investigate the potential effects of these variables, Dolgin et al.'s subjects, 172 undergraduate students, responded to a questionnaire composed of items from Jourard's Self-Disclosure Questionnaire and the Culture-Free Self-Esteem Inventory

for Adults. Each student was to indicate on a scale 0-3 the discussion that occurred in each topic area. For each of these statements, each respondent was to imagine two specific persons, their closest friend for each gender, and they were not to be romantically involved with them.

Dolgin, Meyer & Schwartz (1991) found that men and women said that they disclosed more to their same-sex best friend than to their cross-sex best friend. Regarding topics, men disclose equally to men and women on all topics except money; however, women report disclosing more about themselves to other women on every topic. Self-esteem was a factor with women's self-disclosure, but it did not affect men's disclosure. For instance, women with generally high self-esteem seem to disclose more than women with moderate or low self-esteem. Males, regardless of self-esteem level, disclose about equally as women with moderate or low self-esteem.

One aspect not often considered as affecting self-disclosure is marital status. Tschann (1988) analyzed marital status coupled with gender as variables in self-disclosure. The researcher sought to discover whether gender and marital status had an effect on adults' self-disclosure to same-sex close friends. He hypothesized that regardless of marital status, women would disclose more than men to their same-sex closest friends. He also predicted that single people, regardless of gender, would report higher disclosure than married people to their same-sex closest friends. A final hypothesis was that married people, regardless of gender, would disclose more to their spouses than to their same-sex closest friends. To investigate, Tschann enlisted the help of adults between 25-50 years old. The sample consisted of 120 people (67 women, 53 men). Sixty-five percent were married and 22% had never been married while 13% were separated or divorced.

Interviews were conducted to obtain information about the respondent's close friendships and other close relationships as well as amount of self-disclosure to closest friend or spouse. Nine conversational topics were rated by the subjects for intimacy, recency and depth of their disclosure of these topics to their closest friend and to their spouse.

Tschann's (1988) results showed that concerning more intimate topics, marital status seemed to affect self-disclosure in males while it did not affect females. According to Tschann, "Married men in this sample of middle-class urban adults disclosed less to their friends than unmarried men, married women and unmarried women about more intimate topics and problems" (p. 77). Married men shared high levels of intimate disclosure to their spouses while only low levels of disclosure to their closest friends; Married women, however, disclosed a high amount of intimacy to spouses and moderate-to-high to their closest friend. On a more specific note, women more than men disclosed their negative feelings of depression, anxiety, anger and fear to their female friends and to their lovers. However, no gender differences were found in the expression of the more neutral or positive emotions.

Besides a self-report of what topics are discussed, performing actual field experiments gives one an accurate gauge of conversational content. In these types of observations, it is usually safe to assume that people heavily involved in a conversation are not strangers. Often times, although not usually recorded, the participants in the conversation are friends. Bischoping (1993) replicated Moore's (1922) research and compared the 1990 findings to the 1922 findings in order to assess any change in gender differences over 68 years. Over a period of eight days, Bischoping had 35 students record conversations in four settings: a large classroom building, a central outdoor square, the

student union and eating places near campus. The categories of conversation topics used

for classification were based on Moore's 1922 categories.

Bischoping (1993) rejected Moore's prediction that gender differences would

continue to exist concerning the distribution of topics; Moore argued that women would

continue to prefer to discuss men and appearances over all other topics. In the context of

a college campus, Bischoping discovered (1993) the topic of work and money was the

most popular for men and women while leisure activity was the second most popular.

Appearance was the least discussed among both genders. In contrast to Moore's finding,

"men and women were found to rank topics very similarly in the 1990 study" (p. 5).

Proceeding from ranking of topics discussed to actual differences in topics discussed,

Bischoping confirmed Moore's prediction that gender differences would continue to exist

in conversation topics. According to the 1990 findings, women discuss the opposite sex

and appearances more than men do, and men discuss work and leisure more than women

do, but Bischoping notes that these gender differences are weaker.

However, different findings appeared when Haas and Sherman (1982) explored

which topics are discussed by adult males and females in various roles, such as same-sex

friends, co-workers, siblings, parents and children. These contrary findings were the result

of a study in which subjects indicated the level of discussion about 22 topics with the

above mentioned people in those specific roles. Haas and Sherman (1982) found the topic

of the opposite-sex to be the most popular for both genders. Even when different topics

are discussed with various target persons such as same-sex friends, co-workers, siblings,

parents and children, this same topic emerged in every instance.

Different findings concerning conversation topics yet still emerged in research by

Kipers (1987). Compared to Haas and Sherman (1982) who examined same-sex

relationships, Kipers scrutinized conversations among all-male, all-female and mixed

gender groups in a middle school faculty room before classes, during lunch periods and

during breaks over a period of several months. Topics were then categorized. Kipers not

only wanted to find out the relationship between topic and gender and hence, what topics

are discussed, but wanted to find out how the conversants rated their topics, trivial or

important.

Kipers (1987) found that among all-male, all-female and mixed gender groups in a

work setting, the topics about home and family appeared the most among all-female

groups. In addition, these same topics appeared the second highest among mixed-gender

groups. Distinctly different was the all-male group who discussed work-related topics the

most followed by topics revolving around recreation. Basically, the topics most often

discussed by all-female groups were focused around home and family which included

topics alluding to personal and family finance as well as social issues. For example, the

second most discussed topic for all-female groups was social issues; however, this topic

was the least discussed by all-male groups. For mixed gender groups, it was the third

highest category. Mixed gender groups discussed work related topics the most.

Concerning ranking of topics as trivial or important, overall men and women agreed on

this aspect of the research.

When studies specifically targeted and researched conversations between same-sex

friends, some differences arose depending on the age of the participants. Johnson and

Aries (1983) and Aries and Johnson (1983) analyzed conversations among same-sex

friends who were college students and adults, respectively. They wanted to find out what topics are frequently and infrequently discussed as well as the depth of these discussions in close friendship dyads. Participants consisted of 176 college students, the majority were 18-19 years old. For the second survey, Aries & Johnson (1983) distributed the same survey to the parents of these college students. The resulting sample was 62 men and 74 women. The survey method was a self-report indicating the frequency and depth of the given 17 topics.

According to Johnson and Aries (1983), among late-adolescent same-sex close friends, females discussed more frequently and in greater depth topics about themselves and their close relationships; males, on the other hand, talked more frequently and in greater depth about activity-oriented topics. All participants' conversations centered around topics involving self, relationships and day-to-day activities. The topics concerning religious/moral issues and political/social issues were among the topics never discussed by the largest percentage of adolescents. Overall, there was great breadth of content since over 80% of the dyads discussed at least sometimes all 17 of the topics.

Some similar findings surfaced among adults in same-sex, close friendships. Confirming sex-stereotypical characteristics, females discussed intimate topics and daily activities more frequently than men. Females also reported that they discussed personal and family matters in greater depth than males. Contrary to adolescents though, females discussed significantly more than males topics of politics, religion and sex (Aries & Johnson, 1983). The only topic males outscored females on concerning frequency and depth was sports (Aries and Johnson, 1983). Also remarkably different than adolescents, adults tended to avoid topics about intimate relationships, personal finances, sex and

sexual concerns. As appeared in other studies, there is indeed support that stereotypical

characteristics still emerge and are not being ignored. These characteristics are not only

impacting topics of conversations, but also who is the recipient in the conversation.

On a narrower scope of topics, Lombardo & Berzonsky (1979) investigated sex

differences in self-disclosure of three topics of increasing intimacy: politics, religion and

sex. In order to compensate for limitations due to questionnaire instructions or an

imbalance of intimate or nonintimate items, researchers interviewed subjects about the

three topics. They found comparable findings to Aries & Johnson (1983); females

disclosed significantly more than males. More specifically, on the topic of politics, males

and females did not differ in the depth of this topic. Females, though, surpassed males on

disclosure regarding religion and sex, the two intimate topics.

Rationale

As is noted in the literature, a prominent theme in studies of self-disclosure is the

examination of self-disclosure as it affects varying levels of relationships. Both men and

women agree that self-disclosure is a definition of intimacy, but how that intimacy is

communicated varies along three relational levels: stranger, acquaintance and friend.

Among strangers, inconclusive evidence is found for the norm of reciprocity, but

conclusive evidence supports that self-disclosure doesn't necessarily increase as the

relationship develops. Varying results exist for the influence of sex roles on disclosure.

More concrete evidence, however, endures to argue that males tend to disclose more to

strangers and acquaintances while females disclose more to intimate friends. This

acquaintance level is shown to be curvilinear related to the stage of the relationship and

amount of intimate disclosures. Among acquaintances, context affects disclosure by men

and women differently. With friends, the age of discloser affects the level of disclosure about certain topics. Adolescent females tend to disclose more emotional aspects of themselves, which includes aspects about themselves and close relationships while males' topics are more activity-oriented. Among adults, females discuss more than males on intimate topics, daily activities, personal and family matters, politics, sex and religion. The focus of males' conversations was sports. Gender differences existed when sex-role was a moderating factor for self-disclosure. Social anxiety was another moderating variable affecting men and women's disclosure in order to preserve gender-role consistent behavior. As for the composition of a dyad conducive to self-disclosure, the same-sex friend received the most amount of disclosure as indicated by both genders. Inconclusive evidence exists on what the most popular topics are among men and women; one topic, though, that seems to be common is the topic of work.

Although much of the self-disclosure research has incorporated many different variables, such as self-esteem, sex-roles, social anxiety, age of the discloser, recipient's role (i.e. friend, parent, stranger, etc.), a systematic study of self-disclosure across several ages is rare. Conversation topics are researched, but not much research discusses how these topics change over the course of one's life. The stage of one's life, whether it is high school, college or beyond, may influence the level of self-disclosure differently. For example, topics discussed as 20-year-olds often may not be discussed as 40-year-olds. High school or typical college-age students probably would not be as concerned as older adults about health problems, discipline of children or future retirement plans.

As the literature suggests, age of the discloser has been studied (Papini et al., 1990; Aries & Johnson, 1983; Johnson & Aries, 1983) however, little research has been

done among various ages for comparison purposes. In other words, research such as Aries & Johnson (1983) and Johnson and Aries (1983) have examined only two distinct groups, late-adolescents (18-19 years old) and parents of these college students. Although this aids in revealing any topic trends, it would be more enlightening to survey a broader age range; this may make any trends in topics discussed more apparent. More specifically, what topics are popular or of concern to people at one stage in their life may increase or decrease in importance as the individual ages.

For this reason, the purpose of this study was to research developmental changes in topics discussed over varying years according to three age groups: freshmen in high school, upperclassmen college students and adults. Of specific concern are topics discussed and the depth to which they are discussed between close friends. The study targeted gender and age in order to analyze the differences. Two research questions and two hypotheses were identified:

RQ 1:   Do males and females differ on the depth of topics discussed?

RQ 2:   Does the level of discussion for topics change as age changes?

H 1:   High school students will disclose the least and college students will disclose the most.

H 2:   Males will consistently disclose less than females.

Chapter 2: Methodology

The sample size consisted of 294 subjects: 97 (57 females, 40 males) adults in the workforce, 103 (50 females, 53 males) freshmen in high school and 94 (60 females, 34 males) upperclassmen college students. In total there were 167 females and 127 males.

One questionnaire from the high school freshmen group was discarded due to errors in the completion of it.

The adults were recruited from a medium-sized newspaper business in central Illinois; employees numbered approximately 300, which included part-time and full-time employees. The questionnaire was also administered to a manufacturing company in which respondents consisted of union and company workers. The questionnaire was administered during the regular workday so as to ensure that the respondents were regular full-time, adult employees and not high school or college-age students who often work at night or on the weekends. The high school freshmen participants were obtained from five sections of a required freshmen-level English class. The college student volunteers were taken from various classes so as to secure a variety of majors; all classes were designated for upperclassmen.

High school and college student participants were given a questionnaire (see Appendix A) comprised of 46 topics from the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (Jourard & Lasakow, 1958). Three demographic questions also accompanied the questionnaire. These demographic questions asked the sex of the respondent, sex of the closest friend and the category of respondent's age. Adults were also given the same Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (see Appendix B); their questionnaire had the same above-mentioned three demographic questions, but asked one additional demographic question. Since one could assume the level of education of high school freshmen and college students, level of education was only asked on the questionnaire distributed to adults.

The Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (JSDQ) consists of ten items in each of

the six categories: attitudes and opinions; tastes and interests; work; money; personality;

body. Because students were being surveyed, the work statements were changed to

correspond with academics; of course, the statements regarding work remained for the

adults. Two items from each category were discarded, with the exception of the

categories of body and attitudes/opinions. In those categories, three items were discarded

because one item was combined with another item in each of the two instances. The

deletion of items from the original JSDQ was completed to resemble Dolgin, Meyer and

Schwartz's (1991) procedure. The resulting JSDQ consisted of 46 items. Although the

instructions for the questionnaire were modified, the present study still partially replicated

the instructions of Dolgin, et al. (1991). Subjects were asked to indicate how much they

would discuss the particular topic with one closest friend with whom they are not

romantically involved. Subjects indicated this level of discussion according to the

following scale: A=would never consider discussing that topic with your friend; B=have

not discussed the topic, but feel you might in the future; C=have discussed the issue in a

vague, general way; D=have discussed the issue in detail.

Two measures of central tendency, mean and median, were obtained for each

question in each group of respondents (high school, college and workforce) as well as the

percentages for each response. Mean scores for all six topic categories were calculated

for each age group. Analyses of data were performed using analysis of variance

(ANOVA); all significance levels were set at $p < .05$. For the ANOVA results, topics

were chosen based on varying degrees of intimacy, although the distribution of chosen

topics leans toward more intimate topics. The topics were also chosen to test past

research conclusions based on gender of respondent. The number of topics in each category chosen for analysis of variance are as follows: attitudes/opinions (4), tastes/interests (1), work/academics (1), money (3), personality (7) and body (3). The data analysis allowed for comparison among the three subject groups according to the variables of topic, age and gender.

Chapter 3: Results

High School Freshmen--Overall

Using the scale of 1 to 4 described on the questionnaire (see Appendix A), the mean scores of topics for freshmen ranged from 1.9 to 3.7 with two topics at 1.9, 28 topics falling between 2.0 to 2.9 and 16 topics between 3.0 to 3.7. A majority of the topics in the categories of attitudes/opinions, tastes/interests and academics were the object of in-depth discussion more often than any other topic category. For example, the number of topics in the range of 3.0 to 3.7 were as follows according to topic category: attitudes/opinions, 4; tastes/interests, 6 and academics, 5. Only one topic earned a mean score of 3.7 which concerned "likes/dislikes in music." A large number of topics in the three categories of "money, personality and body" were discussed less, with the mean scores in the range of 2.0 to 2.9. For instance, topics about "body" were in the range of 2.0 to 2.9 while all but one topic in the "money" and "personality" categories were also in this range. Topics that tended to be avoided (mean=1.9) were about "personal opinions and feelings about other religious groups than my own" and "total financial worth." Mean scores for topic categories revealed freshmen discussed topics about tastes/interests the most and topics about money the least (see Appendix F).

After considering the range and mean scores for the topics, further analysis allows

for a more descriptive picture of the individual topics. This closer analysis enables one to

view responses in terms of the distribution of percentages for each of the topics in order to

see which specific topics are discussed the least and most by freshmen. The combination

of ranges and individual percentages provide a more accurate and complete representation

of freshmen conversations.

For the attitudes/opinions category, the largest percentage of high school freshmen

had discussed each of the topics either in a vague way or in detail (on a scale of 1-4 with 4

being discussed in detail), with one exception. The topic of "personal opinions and

feelings about other religious groups" was one that 43% of the freshmen would never

consider discussing with his/her closest friend. The majority of the freshmen (64%)

indicated that they had discussed in detail their "personal standards of attractiveness in the

opposite sex." This was the largest single percentage for any topic in this category.

Similar to the category of attitudes/opinions, the category results of tastes/interests

yielded the largest percentage of respondents saying that they had discussed each topic

either generally or in detail. One may not be surprised that the topic of "likes/dislikes in

music" produced the single, largest response for any one topic; 71% had discussed this

topic in detail.

Consistent with the above findings in the categories of attitudes/opinions and

tastes/interests were responses regarding academics. It seems that students are concerned

and/or interested in academic topics because the largest percentage either discussed each

topic in general terms or in detail. The largest single percentage (61%) for any one topic

in this category was about "what I find to be the most boring and unenjoyable aspects of school."

Freshmen were pretty decisive about the topic of money; the largest single percentage for each of the "money" items either discussed them in a general way or would never consider discussing the topic with his/her friend. For four of the eight topics, the level of discussion was pretty balanced. For example, the topic "whether or not I have a savings account and the amount of it," 32% said they would never discuss this with a friend, and 34% had discussed it in a general way. The largest single percentage (45%) would never consider discussing with their friend their total financial worth.

For the personality category, level of discussion varied. Topics about "aspects of your own personality", "facts about present relationships", "feelings of attractiveness to the opposite sex", "things in the present or past that you feel guilty about", and "kinds of things that make you feel proud" were all discussed either in a general way or in detail. The level of discussion about "what it takes to get me real worried" was pretty evenly distributed; 28% would never consider discussing, 30% had discussed it in a vague way and 29% had discussed it in detail. The largest single percentage of freshmen reported that they would never discuss "what makes me real depressed" (31%) or "what it takes to hurt my feelings deeply" (34%).

Concerning the topics of body, the largest percentage of freshmen seem to discuss in detail, matters about their current appearance and ideals for appearance. "Past problems/worries about appearance" were either largely discussed in a general way (29%) or would never be discussed (30%). Thirty percent, the largest single percentage, would

never consider discussing "future worries about health."   Past illnesses and efforts to keep

healthy were discussed either in general or in detail by the largest amount of freshmen.

College Students--Overall

In this age group, mean scores for topics ranged from 2.3 to 3.8, using the same

scale of 1 to 4. Seven topics fell into the range of 2.3 to 2.9 and the remaining 39 topics

fell between 3.0 to 3.8. All seven topics in the range of 2.3 to 2.9 dealt with money

issues. There was only one other money topic and that mean score was in the range of 3.0

to 3.8; that topic was "my most pressing need for money right now." Five topics achieved

a mean score of 3.8 (see Appendix D). The distribution of topics in these two ranges

clearly demonstrates that college students discuss all other topics more than the majority

of money topics. This suggests that money topics are not "available" or important to

college students, with the exception of "my most pressing need for money." The money

topics seem to not be applicable to today's college students. Mean scores for topic

categories showed that topics about attitudes/opinions and tastes/interests were popular

for discussion while college students tend to rarely discuss money issues (see Appendix F).

As can be seen from the range of mean scores, college students overall have

discussed many of the topics. Just as performed for freshmen responses, an analysis was

completed using the distribution of responses reported in terms of percentages. This

allowed for an in-depth look at individual topic categories.

More specifically, in five of the six categories, attitudes/opinions, tastes/interests,

academics, personality and body, the largest single percentage of subjects had discussed

all items, except for three, in detail. The three exceptions were items that had still been

discussed, but only in a general way (see Appendix D). These three topics were "my

views on the present government", "any problems and worries that I had with my

appearance in the past", and "whether or not I have any long-range worries or concerns

about my health." Eighty-three percent of the freshmen, the largest percentage for any

one topic, had discussed in detail the topic, "my ambitions and goals for the future."

The category of money was the only one which had varying answers, just as it did

for the other groups. The topic, "total financial worth," was one respondents (35%) said

they would never consider discussing with their friend. Owing money, however, was a

topic they had discussed in detail; "whether or not I owe money" (38%) and "to whom I

owe money or have borrowed from in the past" (34%) were discussed in detail by the

largest single number of respondents.

Workforce--Overall

The range of scores for adults was 2.1 to 3.6. A more even distribution of topics

occurred in these ranges. Twenty topics fell into the range of 2.1 to 2.9 while 26 topics

were in the range of 3.0 to 3.6. It appears that adults tend to not discuss money matters

much as all money topics were in the range of 2.1 to 2.9. The majority of personality

topics (6) and body topics (6) were the object of little discussion also. Adults discussed

the remaining topics more, with scores ranging from 3.0 to 3.6. These findings may

suggest that money issues and a majority of topics in the personality and body category

are not appropriate and/or important for discussion at the adult level. Mean scores for

topic categories revealed topics about work were discussed the most and money issues

were not the subject of discussion much (see Appendix F).

Similar to the analyses of distribution of percentages for freshmen and college

students, the responses of the workforce were examined. For the workforce, the largest

single percentage of respondents discussed in detail all topics, except one, in the

categories of attitudes/opinions, tastes/interests and work. The only exception concerned

the "personal opinions and feelings about other religious groups." Despite this exception,

this statement yielded almost parallel numbers; 38% had discussed the topic in a vague,

general way and 37% had discussed it in detail.

Varying answers resulted in the remaining categories of money, personality and

body. On the topic of money, for all statements in this category, none of the statements

elicited the highest self-disclosure level in which they discussed the topic in detail; the

respondents indicated all other varying levels (see Appendix E).

For the personality category, the level of disclosure was split in half for the eight

topics. For the first four topics, "aspects of personality that I dislike, worry about"

(40%); "facts about present relationships" (34%); "whether or not I feel I'm attractive to

the opposite sex" (34%), and "things in past or present that I feel ashamed or guilty

about" (31%), the highest percentage of respondents indicated that they had discussed

each of these issues in a vague, general way. For the remaining four personality topics,

"what it takes to get me feeling real depressed" (36%); "what it takes to get real worried,

anxious, afraid" (34%); "what it takes to hurt my feelings deeply" (36%); "the kinds of

things that make me especially proud of myself"(43%), the highest percentage of

respondents indicated that they had discussed each issue in detail. Concerning the

category of body, the level of disclosure varied. For all items, the highest percentage of

respondents either discussed the topic in a general way or in detail. Overall, the highest

percentage responding to one particular issue was 45% in which these respondents had

discussed in detail "whether or not I make special efforts to keep fit."

Anova Results

In order to find the combination of dyads, or the gender of the respondent and gender of target, a cross tabulation was performed. Forty-six percent of the women named women as their closest friend; 11% women named men as their closest friend. Ten percent of the men named women as their closest friend while 33% of the men named men as their closest friend.

A (3) Subject Group x (2) Respondent's Sex analysis of variance was calculated for varying topic items; the dependent variable was each topic item. Significance was set at $p < .05$ for each of the topic items. For these topic items, it was hypothesized that high school students would be the least disclosing about all topics chosen for the ANOVA and college students would disclose the most. Furthermore, it was hypothesized that males would consistently disclose less than females.

On two items about the body, "my feelings about the appearance of my face" and "ideals for overall appearance," significant results showed that high school females discussed this topic the most and high school males the least. For the topic of "face appearance", the mean was 3.54 for females and 2.04 for males (d.f.=2, F=7.31, p=.00). For the topic of "ideals for overall appearance," the mean for females was 3.48 and for males 2.02 (d.f.=2, F=3.25, p=.04). This clearly suggests that appearance is more of a concern and important to high school females than to high school males. This concern obviously translates into more detailed discussion about these topics.

For eight items, two in the category of attitudes/opinions and six in the personality category, high school males consistently disclosed the least and college females the most. Although high school males don't discuss either of the two topics much, thoughts about

"religion/personal views of religion" and "personal opinions about other religions," the

males tend to discuss their personal religious views (mean=2.13, d.f.=2, F=4.93, p=.01)

more than their feelings about other religions (mean=1.53, d.f.=2, F=4.47, p=.01). These

findings were consistent with one other topic in the category of attitudes/opinions, but an

additional group was also the most disclosing. For the topic of "personal standards of

attractiveness in the opposite sex," high school males were the least disclosing

(mean=3.25, d.f.=2, F=2.96, p=.05), and the most disclosing were two female groups,

high school and college females (mean=3.8, d.f.=2, F=2.96, p=.05).

In the personality category, as stated above, high school males disclosed the least.

For three particular topics, the mean for high school males was particularly low. The

mean score for each of the topics is as follows: "what it takes to get me feeling real

depressed and blue" (mean=1.81, d.f.=2, F=4.69, p=.01); "what it takes to get me real

worried, anxious, afraid" (mean=1.98, d.f.=2, F=3.70, p=.03); "what it takes to hurt my

feelings deeply" (mean=1.69, d.f.=2, F=5.49, p=.00). The college females' mean

consistently ranged from 3.32 to 3.45. A different finding resulted for the topic, "facts

about present relationships." College females were the again the most disclosing

(mean=3.7, d.f.=2, F=3.34, p=.04), but workforce males were the least disclosing for this

topic (mean=2.55, d.f.=2, F=3.34, p=.04).

Although interaction effects were not significant for three items, there was

significance (p < .05) for the gender of the respondent and subject group. Main effects

were found for one item in each of the following categories: attitudes/opinions, academics

and body. For each of these topics "personal views on sexual morality", "ambitions/goals

for the future", and "any long-range worries about health," college students were the most

disclosing and high school students were the least. The mean scores of college students'

for these three topics is as follows: "personal views on sexual morality" (mean=3.62,

d.f.=2, F=13.97, p=.00); "ambitions/goals for the future" (mean=3.78, d.f.=2, F=19.42,

p=.00); "any long-range worries about health" (mean=3.00, d.f.=2, F=15.01, p=.00).

High school students' mean scores for these three topics ranged from 2.32 to 3.28. With

regard to gender on these three topics, females discussed these topics the most. For the

topic, "personal views on sexual morality," females showed a mean score of 3.45 (d.f.=1,

F=9.19, p=.00) while the mean for males was 3.15 (d.f.=1, F=9.19, p=.00). For the topic,

"ambitions/goals for the future," the mean was the highest for females and males among

these three topics (Females: mean=3.64, d.f.=1, F=21.01, p=.00; Males: mean=3.28,

d.f.= 1, F=21.01, p=.00). A distinctly different finding was a main effect for subject group

level; for the topic, "my most pressing need for money right now", the workforce

discussed this topic the least (mean=2.52, d.f.=2, F=8.03, p=.00) and college students

discussed it the most (mean=3.06, d.f.=2, F=8.03, p=.00).

Three topics were found to have no significant results. One topic, which was in

the category of tastes/interests, "favorite ways of spending spare time." The other two

topics concerned money; they were "present sources of income" and "total financial

worth."

To consider the topic and the target's gender as a recipient for disclosure, a (3)

Subject Group x (2) Sex of Closest Friend analysis of variance was calculated for two

topics, "personal views on religion" and "personal views on sexual morality". For the

religion topic, the interaction effect was significant; high school males were least often the

recipient of disclosure on this topic (mean=2.06, d.f.=2, F=6.38, p=.00) whereas college

males were most often the recipient (mean=3.62, d.f.=2, F=6.38, p=.00). For the topic of personal views on sexual morality, the interaction effect was not significant, thus, resulting in only main effects. Most often the recipients of views on sexual morality were college students (mean=3.6, d.f.=2, F=14.18, p=.00) and high school students the least (mean=2.99, d.f.=2, F=14.18, p=.00). Females more often received this information (mean=3.47, d.f.=1, F=12.60, p=.00) but not by much as compared with males' (mean score=3.12, d.f.=1, F=12.60, p=.00).

Another ANOVA was completed in order to assess the gender differences for the intimate topic, "personal views on sexual morality." An interaction effect existed for gender of the respondent and target's gender. Higher disclosure occurred for this topic when males were disclosing to females (mean=3.53, F=5.44, p < .05); the least amount occurred with males disclosing to males (mean=2.96).

Chapter 4: Discussion

Through this study, I sought to answer two questions. The first question concerns whether males and females differ on the depth of topics discussed. In response to this question, females and males do differ on the depth of disclosure. Mean scores of topic categories consistently showed that college students disclosed more than the other groups on all six categories while high school freshmen disclosed the least (see Appendix G). Of the topics chosen for ANOVA, which tended to be more intimate topics, females consistently disclosed more than males. The second question addresses whether the level of discussion for topics changes as age changes. Results showed that amount of time discussing the topic increases as age increases (see Appendix F & G). Also, two hypotheses were formulated. They were that high school students will disclose the least

and college students will disclose the most, and secondly, males will consistently disclose less than females. The first hypothesis, high school students disclosing the least and college students the most, was rejected. The second hypothesis was supported. In general, overall results confirm that gender differences exist for topics which tend to be more intimate; consistently females disclose more than males on the chosen topics for ANOVA. Also, age does affect the amount of discussion for various topics. It seems that college students, specifically the females, discuss in depth various topics while high school males do not discuss these topics much at all.

When examining each of the topic categories for each of the subject groups with no breakdown for gender, amount of time discussing the topic increases as the age increases. This finding is seen in five of the six topic categories, all except the money category. More specifically, college students and workforce people consistently reported discussing the topics in detail more often than high school students. For example, in the category of attitudes/opinions, college students and workforce people had discussed all topics in detail except one; for college students, this was the topic about "views on the present government" and for the workforce, it was about the "personal opinions and feelings about other religious groups." Even then, for both of these topics, the highest percentage of subjects reported that they had discussed it in general terms whereas high school freshmen said they would never consider discussing "personal opinions and feelings about other religions." High school freshmen reported that they had discussed the other topics in general or in detail. Although there was generally a high amount of disclosure in this category among all subject groups, college and workforce people still disclosed more than high school freshmen.

Likewise, the categories of tastes/interests and academics/work reflected the same trend: as age increases so does amount of discussion on topics. For each of these categories, college and workforce subjects indicated that they had discussed all the topics in detail whereas high school freshmen had discussed the topics either in general or in detail. Perhaps this is because high school freshmen are still formulating their tastes and interests. Furthermore, school and work become more demanding so discussion may take place more often to solve problems or offer/receive support.

For the categories of personality and body, again college and workforce subjects provided more disclosure for these topics. For personality, the largest percentage of college students discussed them in detail while the workforce discussed them in general and in detail. Even though the high school freshmen discussed all topics, except two, in general or in detail, these two exceptions provide evidence that the older subjects are more disclosing. This is similar to results in the body category; workforce adults and college students had discussed all the topics in general or in detail, but for high school freshmen, the largest percentage of freshmen would never consider discussing two topics, "any problems and worries that I had with my appearance in the past", and "whether or not I have any long-range worries or concerns about my health." Admittedly, the percentages were close between the responses of "would never discuss" (30%) and "discuss in general" (29%) for the topic about problems/worries about past appearance.

This study sought to prove two hypotheses. However, ANOVA results could only confirm one hypothesis. When considering topics which were significant ($p < .05$) at the interaction effect of topic with gender and age of the respondent, males did consistently disclose less than females, thus confirming the second hypothesis. However, high school

students did not consistently disclose the least. For example, on one topic in particular, "my most pressing need for money right now," the workforce discussed this the least.

Looking at more specific topic items, two of the three topics about body showed significance at the interaction level based on gender of the respondent; these two topics concerned appearance. High school females discussed this the most while their counterparts, high school males, discussed it the least. This finding is interesting when compared with Bischoping (1993)'s conclusion that appearance was the least popular topic of men and women. The mean score for high school females, 3.54, is one of the higher of all ANOVA results. The third topic was only significant at the main effect level. Concerning any long-range worries about health, college students disclosed the most and high school students the least while females showed more disclosure than males. This is somewhat surprising since it is often believed that as age increases, health concerns will increase, too. The AIDS scare among other diseases could be influencing this topic more than in the past, as evident of the high amount of discussion by college students about health concerns.

For the category of attitudes/opinions, three of the four topics were significant at the interaction level for gender of the respondent. For all three of these categories, the highest disclosers were college females and the lowest were by high school males. For one of these topics (see Appendix A, #9), high school females and college females tied for highest amount of disclosure. Two of these three categories dealt with religion, which is interesting in light of Johnson & Aries' (1983) findings that religious/moral issues was one of the least frequently discussed topics among college students who were same-sex friends, but females tended to discuss it more than males. The remaining topic in this

category was insignificant at the interaction effect, but was significant for respondent's gender and subject group. For personal views on sexual morality, college students were the most disclosing and high school freshmen the least; females were the most disclosing for this same topic. This is consistent with the findings that women disclose more often and more in depth about more intimate topics (Dindia & Allen, 1992; Morgan, 1976 as cited in Johnson & Aries, 1983). Also, this topic becomes more of an issue as maturation increases.

For all items in the personality category, college females disclosed the most; for all but one topic high school females disclosed the least. For this exception, facts about present relationships, workforce males disclosed the least. Aries & Johnson (1983) found that among adult same-sex friends, sex/sexual concerns was least frequently discussed and least discussed in depth. Furthermore, they found that females discuss intimate relationships more often and in more depth than men. The topic of facts about present relationships (see Appendix A, #36) could be categorized into either of these categories because of varying interpretation. If it were placed in either category, then this would support Aries & Johnson's findings.

The only significant finding in the money category was for the topic, "my most pressing need for money right now." The workforce discussed this the least and college students the most. Again, this is similar to Aries & Johnson (1983)'s finding that adults tend to avoid the topic of personal finances with their closest friend and college students usually discuss this at some time. This may not be surprising since money is often an issue at the college-level; conversations are often prominent about the lack of money, etc. For adults, though, conversations about money are more vague or nonexistent.

Two topics, personal views on religion and sexual morality, were chosen to investigate gender of the target as recipients for disclosure. Although the topic of personal views on religion was previously rated by college students as being low in intimacy (Jourard & Resnick, 1970), out of the other topics, it was believed to be one of the more intimate topics and perhaps not as often discussed as many other topics. The topic of sexual morality is usually regarded as high in intimacy. It was believed that this combination of topics would provide a clearer indication of how target's sex affected disclosure. For the religion topic, the most likely recipient of disclosure were college males and least likely were high school males. This is contradictory to much of the research which concludes that females are more often the target of disclosure (e.g. Cash, 1975 cited in Dolgin, Meyer and Schwartz, 1991). For the topic of personal views on sexual morality, main effects showed college students were most often the recipients and high school students the least; females more than males received this same information. These findings for target's sex are consistent with the results of sex of the respondent for these same two topics in which high school freshmen and males are associated with low disclosure while college and females are associated with high disclosure.

These findings may indicate that these topics may be too mature for high school freshmen to discuss; in other words, freshmen may not see them as "available" topics in that they may not be deemed important enough to discuss. Because of this minimal likelihood for discussion in high school, there is less chance for high school students to be the target of this disclosure. Likewise, college students are more apt to talk about these two topics so the chance for a college student to be a recipient of this disclosure is greater since most college students' friends are fellow students themselves.

In order to see the gender composite of the dyad which was most and least disclosing, one intimate topic, views on sexual morality, was examined for an interaction effect with gender of the respondent and target. Males disclosing to females was the most and the least was males disclosing to males. These findings are consistent with the research in which females, more than males, were found to be the recipient of disclosure, but it is inconsistent with Stokes, Fuehrer and Childs' (1980) conclusion that females are more willing than males to disclose to intimates. Furthermore, it is inconsistent with Stokes et al. who report that when disclosing to intimates, men and women would disclose more to same-sex rather than to opposite-sex targets. However, further analysis is necessary to legitimately fortify or reject Stokes et al.'s conclusions.

When considering disclosure among the three various subject groups, evidence supports that disclosure of topics increases as the subject's age increases, which addresses the first research question of this study. Despite this, a more exhaustive analysis of the topics is necessary in order to prove legitimately that the level of discussion for topics changes as age changes. Although some significant findings did exist, inconclusive evidence was enough to hinder the likelihood of formulating a statement about the relationship between age and topics. Furthermore, gender differences for self-disclosure did appear for various topics which address the second research question.

Chapter 5: Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

One limitation included the wording of a few of the topics on the questionnaire. Items (see Appendix A, #9, #37) from Jourard's Self-Disclosure Questionnaire assume that all respondents' sexual orientation is heterosexual. For future research, these two items need to be re-worded so as to apply to everyone, regardless of their sexual

orientation. Also, the fact that "work" topics were changed to "academics" to apply to

students made it difficult to compare with any legitimacy. Thus, the only comparison for

this topic category could be between college and high school students; only a single,

simple analysis could be calculated for the workforce.

     Based on this information especially pertaining to disclosure between close friends,

I think it will be imperative for future research that longitudinal studies are employed.

Self-reports and field observations are valid and provide important information. However,

a friendship doesn't exist at one point in time. In other words, the status and all the

qualities of a particular friendship constantly change. Gathering self-report data will only

inform us on the behavioral characteristics of the friendship at that specific time. To more

accurately reflect friendship and all of its unique aspects requires us to take a step further.

This step will actually be a slow step, albeit an important one, as we gauge friendship

longitudinally.

     By analyzing friendships longitudinally, the developmental nature of the disclosure

of various topics can be more accurately tracked and reflected. Instead of asking at one

point in time to what extent a person has discussed a topic in the past with his/her best

friend, a longitudinal study affords the opportunity to ask questions pertaining to the

present. So, a questionnaire surveying what topics he/she is discussing right now (at this

time in the relationship) will be easier for the subject to remember and to report. It is then

the researcher's job to compare trends in topics discussed; thus, the burden to analyze and

compare is not on the subject, but on the researcher.

References

Aries, E.J. & Johnson, F.L. (1983). Close friendship in adulthood: Conversational content between same-sex friends. Sex Roles, 9 (12), 1183-1196.

Ashton, N.L. (1980). Exploratory investigation of perceptions of influences on best-friend relationships. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 50, 379-386.

Aukett, R., Ritchie, J. & Mill, K. (1988). Gender differences in friendship patterns. Sex Roles, 19 (1/2), 57-66.

Bischoping, K. (1993). Gender differences in conversation topics, 1922-1990. Sex Roles, 28 (1/2), 1-18.

Brewer, M.B. & Mittleman, J. (1980). Effects of normative control of self-disclosure on reciprocity. Journal of Personality, 48 (1), 89-101.

Dindia, K. & Allen, M. (1992). Sex differences in self-disclosure: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 112, (1), 106-124.

Dolgin, K.G., Meyer, L. & Schwartz, J. (1991). Effects of gender, target's gender, topic, and self-esteem on disclosure to best and midling friends. Sex Roles, 25 (5/6), 311-329.

Grigsby, J.P., & Weatherley, D. (1983). Gender and sex-role difference in intimacy of self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 53, 891-897.

Haas, A. & Sherman, M.A. (1982). Conversational topic as a function of role and gender. Psychological Reports, 51, 453-454.

Hatch, D. & Leighton, L. (1986). Comparison of men and women on self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 58, 175-178.

Johnson, F.L. & Aries, E.J. (1983). Conversational patterns among same-sex pairs of late-adolescent close friends. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 142, 225-238.

Jones, D.C. (1991). Friendship satisfaction and gender: An examination of sex differences in contributors to friendship satisfaction. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 8, 167-185.

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

Jourard, S.M. & Resnick, J.L. (1970). Some effects of self-disclosure among college women. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 10, 84-93.

Kipers, P.S. (1987). Gender and topic. Language & Society, 16, 543-557.

Lavine, L.O. & Lombardo, J.P. (1984). Self-disclosure: Intimate and nonintimate disclosures to parents and best friends as a function of Bem Sex-Role Category. Sex Roles, 11, (7/8), 735-744.

Lombardo, J.P. & Berzonsky, M.D. (1979). Sex differences in self-disclosure during an interview. The Journal of Social Psychology, 107, 281-282.

Monsour, M. (1992). Meanings of intimacy in cross- and same-sex friendships. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 9, 277-295.

Papini, D.R., Farmer, F.F., Clark, S.M., Micka, J.C. & Barnett, J.K. (1990). Early adolescent age and gender differences in patterns of emotional self-disclosure to parents and friends. Adolescence, 25 (100), 959-975.

Petronio, S., Martin, J. & Littlefield, R. (1984). Prerequisite conditions for self-disclosing: A gender issue. Communication Monographs, 51 (3), 268-273.

Prisbell, M. & Dallinger, J.M. (1991). The developmental nature of self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 68, 211-214.

Rosenfeld, L.B. (1979). Self-disclosure avoidance: Why I am afraid to tell you who I am. Communication Monographs, 46, 63-75.

Shaffer, D.R., Pegalis, L.J. & Cornell, D.P. (1992). Gender and self-disclosure revisited: Personal and contextual variations in self-disclosure to same-sex acquaintances. The Journal of Social Psychology, 132 (3), 307-315.

Shaffer, D.R. & Ogden, J.K. (1986). On sex differences in self-disclosure during the acquaintance process: The role of anticipated future interaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51 (1), 92-101.

Snell, W.E., Jr. (1989). Willingness to self-disclose to female and male friends as a function of social anxiety and gender. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15 (1), 113-125.

Snell, W.E., Jr., Belk, S.S., Flowers, A. & Warren, J. (1988). Women's and men's willingness to self-disclose to therapists and friends: The moderating influence of instrumental, expressive, masculine, and feminine topics. Sex Roles, 18 (11/12), 769-776.

Stokes, J., Childs, L. & Fuehrer, A. (1981). Gender and sex roles as predictors of self-disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28 (6), 510-514.

Stokes, J., Childs, L. & Fuehrer, A. (1980). Gender differences in self-disclosure to various target persons. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27 (2), 192-198.

Tardy, C.H., Hosman, L.A. & Bradac, J.J. (1981). Disclosing self to friends and family: A reexamination of initial questions. Communication Quarterly, 263-268.

Tschann, J.M. (1988). Self-disclosure in adult friendship: Gender and marital status differences. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 5, 65-81.

VanLear, C.A., Jr. (1987). The formation of social relationships: A longitudinal study of social penetration. Human Communication Research, 13 (3), 299-322.

Watzlawick, P., Beavin. J.A. & Jackson, D.D. (1967). Pragmatics of human communication. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Williams, D.G. (1985). Gender, masculinity-femininity, and emotional intimacy in same-sex friendship. Sex Roles, 12 (5/6), 587-600.

Won-Doornink, M.J. (1979). On getting to know you: The association between the stage of a relationship and reciprocity of self-disclosure. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 15, 229-241.

Student Questionnaire

Directions: Please complete each of the following items. To answer each question, please indicate how much you would discuss that particular topic with your **closest friend with whom you are not romantically involved.**

1. Please state your gender.
   A=female   B=male

2. Please state the gender of your closest friend.
   A=female   B=male

3. Please indicate the category of your age.
   A=13-16   B=17-20   C=21-24   D=25-28   E=29 and over

For the following questions, please use this scale.

        A=would never consider discussing that topic with your friend
        B=have not discussed the topic, but feel you might in the future
        C=have discussed the issue in a vague, general way
        D=have discussed the issue in detail

4. What I think and feel about religion; my personal religious views.

5. My personal opinions and feelings about other religious groups than my own, e.g., Protestants, Catholics, Jews, atheists.

6. My views on the present government--the president, government policies, etc.

7. My personal views on drinking.

8. My personal views on sexual morality--how I feel that I and others ought to behave in sexual matters.

9. My personal standards of attractiveness in the opposite sex.

10. My feelings about how parents ought to deal with children.

11. My favorite foods, the ways I like food prepared, and my food dislikes.

12. My likes and dislikes in music.

13. My favorite reading matter.

14. The kinds of movies that I like to see best; the TV shows that are my favorites.

15. My tastes in clothing.

Student Questionnaire

A=would never consider discussing that topic with your friend
B=have not discussed the topic, but feel you might in the future
C=have discussed the issue in a vague, general way
D=have discussed the issue in detail

16. The style of house, and the kinds of furnishings that I like best.

17. The kind of party, or social gathering that I like best, and the kind that would bore me, or that I wouldn't enjoy.

18. My favorite ways of spending spare time, e.g., movies, reading, sports events, parties, dancing, etc.

19. What I find to be the worst pressures and strains at school.

20. What I enjoy most, and get the most satisfaction from at school.

21. What I find to be the most boring and unenjoyable aspects of school.

22. What I feel are my shortcomings and handicaps that prevent me from studying as I'd like to or that prevent me from earning better grades than I do.

23. What I feel are my special strong points and qualifications in school.

24. My ambitions and goals for the future.

25. My feelings about my grades.

26. How I really feel about my teachers.

27. How much money I make or receive as an allowance.

28. Whether or not I owe money; if so, *how much*.

29. Whom I owe money to at present; or whom I have borrowed from in the past.

30. Whether or not I have savings, and the amount.

31. All of my present sources of income--wages, allowance, interest from savings account, etc.

32. My total financial worth, including college funds, savings, bonds, etc.

33. My most pressing need for money right now, e.g., some major purchase that I desired or needed.

Student Questionnaire

A=would never consider discussing that topic with your friend
B=have not discussed the topic, but feel you might in the future
C=have discussed the issue in a vague, general way
D=have discussed the issue in detail

34. How I budget my money--the proportion that goes to necessities, luxuries, etc.

35. The aspects of my personality that I dislike, worry about, that I regard as a handicap to me.

36. The facts about my present relationships--including knowledge of sexual activity; relationship development, any problems that I might have.

37. Whether or not I feel that I am attractive to the opposite sex; my problems, if any, about getting favorable attention from the opposite sex.

38. Things in the past or present that I feel ashamed and guilty about.

39. What it takes to get me feeling real depressed and blue.

40. What it takes to get me real worried, anxious, and afraid.

41. What it takes to hurt my feelings deeply.

42. The kinds of things that make me especially proud of myself, elated, full of self-esteem or self-respect.

43. My feelings about the appearance of my face--things I don't like, and things that I might like about my face and head--nose, eyes, hair, teeth, etc.

44. How I wish I looked: my ideals for overall appearance.

45. My feelings about different parts of my body--legs, hips, waist, weight, chest, or bust, etc.

46. Any problems and worries that I had with my appearance in the past.

47. Whether or not I have any long-range worries or concerns about my health, e.g., cancer, AIDS, other sexually-transmitted diseases, ulcers, heart trouble.

48. My past record of illness and treatment.

49. Whether or not I now make special efforts to keep fit, healthy, and attractive, e.g., diet, exercise.

Workforce Questionnaire

Directions: Please complete each of the following items. To answer each question, please indicate how much you would discuss that particular topic with your **closest friend with whom you are not romantically involved.**

1. Please state your gender.
       A=female   B=male

2. Please state the gender of your closest friend.
       A=female   B=male

3. Please state your highest level of education received.
       A=high school   B=some college   C=2 years   D=4 years   E=more than 4 years

4. Please state your age based on the following categories.
       A=under 25   B=26-35   C=36-45   D=46-55   E=over 55

For the following questions, please use this scale.

         A=would never consider discussing that topic with your friend
         B=have not discussed the topic, but feel you might in the future
         C=have discussed the issue in a vague, general way
         D=have discussed the issue in detail

5. What I think and feel about religion; my personal religious views.

6. My personal opinions and feelings about other religious groups than my own, e.g., Protestants, Catholics, Jews, atheists.

7. My views on the present government--the president, government policies, etc.

8. My personal views on drinking.

9. My personal views on sexual morality--how I feel that I and others ought to behave in sexual matters.

10. My personal standards of attractiveness in the opposite sex.

11. My feelings about how parents ought to deal with children.

12. My favorite foods, the ways I like food prepared, and my food dislikes.

13. My likes and dislikes in music.

14. My favorite reading matter.

Workforce Questionnaire

A=would never consider discussing that topic with your friend
B=have not discussed the topic, but feel you might in the future
C=have discussed the issue in a vague, general way
D=have discussed the issue in detail

15. The kinds of movies that I like to see best; the TV shows that are my favorites.

16. My tastes in clothing.

17. The style of house, and the kinds of furnishings that I like best.

18. The kind of party, or social gathering that I like best, and the kind that would bore me, or that I wouldn't enjoy.

19. My favorite ways of spending spare time, e.g., movies, reading, sports events, parties, etc.

20. What I find to be the worst pressures and strains in my work.

21. What I enjoy most, and get the most satisfaction from in my present work.

22. What I find to be the most boring and unenjoyable aspects of my work.

23. What I feel are my shortcomings and handicaps that prevent me from working as I'd like to, or that prevent me from getting further ahead in my work.

24. What I feel are my special strong points and qualifications for my work.

25. My ambitions and goals in my work.

26. My feelings about the salary or rewards that I receive for my work.

27. How I really feel about the people that I work for, or work with.

28. How much money I make at my work.

29. Whether or not I owe money; if so, *how much*.

30. Whom I owe money to at present; or whom I have borrowed from in the past.

31. Whether or not I have savings, and the amount.

32. All of my present sources of income--wages, fees, allowance, dividends, etc.

Workforce Questionnaire

A=would never consider discussing that topic with your friend
B=have not discussed the topic, but feel you might in the future
C=have discussed the issue in a vague, general way
D=have discussed the issue in detail

33. My total financial worth, including property, savings, bonds, insurance, etc.

34. My most pressing need for money right now, e.g., outstanding bills, some major purchase that I desired or needed.

35. How I budget my money--the proportion that goes to necessities, luxuries, etc.

36. The aspects of my personality that I dislike, worry about, that I regard as a handicap to me.

37. The facts about my present relationships--including knowledge of sexual activity; relationship development, any problems that I might have.

38. Whether or not I feel that I am attractive to the opposite sex; my problems, if any, about getting favorable attention from the opposite sex.

39. Things in the past or present that I feel ashamed and guilty about.

40. What it takes to get me feeling real depressed and blue.

41. What it takes to get me real worried, anxious, and afraid.

42. What it takes to hurt my feelings deeply.

43. The kinds of things that make me especially proud of myself, elated, full of self-esteem or self-respect.

44. My feelings about the appearance of my face--things I don't like, and things that I might like about my face and head--nose, eyes, hair, teeth, etc.

45. How I wish I looked: my ideals for overall appearance.

46. My feelings about different parts of my body--legs, hips, waist, weight, chest, or bust, etc.

47. Any problems and worries that I had with my appearance in the past.

48. Whether or not I have any long-range worries or concerns about my health, e.g., cancer, AIDS, ulcers, heart trouble.

Workforce Questionnaire

A=would never consider discussing that topic with your friend
B=have not discussed the topic, but feel you might in the future
C=have discussed the issue in a vague, general way
D=have discussed the issue in detail

49. My past record of illness and treatment.

50. Whether or not I now make special efforts to keep fit, healthy, and attractive, e.g., diet, exercise.

Appendix C

High School Freshmen Results

For each item, response frequencies and the median are printed on the first line and percentages and the mean are printed on the second. (The total used for calculating the median and mean excludes omits.)

Item	1	2	3	4	5	Omit	Median / Mean
1	50.0	53.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
	48.5	51.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
2	55.0	48.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
	53.4	46.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
3	100.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
	97.1	1.9	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.1
4	22.0	23.0	44.0	14.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
	21.4	22.3	42.7	13.6	0.0	0.0	2.5
5	44.0	35.0	18.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
	42.7	34.0	17.5	5.8	0.0	0.0	1.9
6	36.0	19.0	40.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
	35.0	18.4	38.8	7.8	0.0	0.0	2.2
7	2.0	9.0	30.0	62.0	0.0	0.0	3.7
	1.9	8.7	29.1	60.2	0.0	0.0	3.5
8	15.0	9.0	39.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
	14.6	8.7	37.9	38.8	0.0	0.0	3.0
9	5.0	3.0	29.0	66.0	0.0	0.0	3.7
	4.9	2.9	28.2	64.1	0.0	0.0	3.5
10	15.0	12.0	34.0	41.0	0.0	1.0	3.2
	14.6	11.7	33.0	39.8	0.0	1.0	3.0
11	13.0	6.0	45.0	39.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
	12.6	5.8	43.7	37.9	0.0	0.0	3.1
12	0.0	0.0	29.0	73.0	1.0	0.0	3.8
	0.0	0.0	28.2	70.9	1.0	0.0	3.7
13	32.0	19.0	44.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	2.5
	31.1	18.4	42.7	7.8	0.0	0.0	2.3
14	4.0	5.0	35.0	59.0	0.0	0.0	3.6
	3.9	4.9	34.0	57.3	0.0	0.0	3.4
15	5.0	2.0	39.0	57.0	0.0	0.0	3.6
	4.9	1.9	37.9	55.3	0.0	0.0	3.4
16	23.0	19.0	41.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	2.7
	22.3	18.4	39.8	19.4	0.0	0.0	2.6
17	4.0	7.0	34.0	57.0	1.0	0.0	3.6
	3.9	6.8	33.0	55.3	1.0	0.0	3.4
18	2.0	1.0	34.0	65.0	1.0	0.0	3.7
	1.9	1.0	33.0	63.1	1.0	0.0	3.6
19	13.0	12.0	41.0	37.0	0.0	0.0	3.1
	12.6	11.7	39.8	35.9	0.0	0.0	3.0

Appendix C continued

20	20.0	14.0	42.0	27.0	0.0	0.0	2.9
	19.4	13.6	40.8	26.2	0.0	0.0	2.7
21	5.0	7.0	27.0	63.0	1.0	0.0	3.7
	4.9	6.8	26.2	61.2	1.0	0.0	3.5
22	27.0	22.0	36.0	18.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
	26.2	21.4	35.0	17.5	0.0	0.0	2.4
23	26.0	21.0	39.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
	25.2	20.4	37.9	16.5	0.0	0.0	2.5
24	4.0	10.0	43.0	46.0	0.0	0.0	3.4
	3.9	9.7	41.7	44.7	0.0	0.0	3.3
25	7.0	9.0	58.0	29.0	0.0	0.0	3.1
	6.8	8.7	56.3	28.2	0.0	0.0	3.1
26	5.0	11.0	34.0	53.0	0.0	0.0	3.5
	4.9	10.7	33.0	51.5	0.0	0.0	3.3
27	27.0	14.0	36.0	26.0	0.0	0.0	2.8
	26.2	13.6	35.0	25.2	0.0	0.0	2.6
28	33.0	17.0	35.0	18.0	0.0	0.0	2.5
	32.0	16.5	34.0	17.5	0.0	0.0	2.4
29	30.0	20.0	36.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	2.5
	29.1	19.4	35.0	16.5	0.0	0.0	2.4
30	33.0	19.0	35.0	15.0	0.0	1.0	2.4
	32.0	18.4	34.0	14.6	0.0	1.0	2.3
31	35.0	18.0	33.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	2.4
	34.0	17.5	32.0	16.5	0.0	0.0	2.3
32	46.0	23.0	28.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
	44.7	22.3	27.2	5.8	0.0	0.0	1.9
33	14.0	14.0	44.0	31.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
	13.6	13.6	42.7	30.1	0.0	0.0	2.9
34	31.0	25.0	32.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
	30.1	24.3	31.1	14.6	0.0	0.0	2.3
35	24.0	14.0	41.0	23.0	0.0	1.0	2.8
	23.3	13.6	39.8	22.3	0.0	1.0	2.6
36	14.0	9.0	26.0	53.0	0.0	1.0	3.5
	13.6	8.7	25.2	51.5	0.0	1.0	3.2
37	20.0	13.0	31.0	38.0	0.0	1.0	3.1
	19.4	12.6	30.1	36.9	0.0	1.0	2.9
38	21.0	20.0	33.0	27.0	1.0	1.0	2.8
	20.4	19.4	32.0	26.2	1.0	1.0	2.7
39	32.0	15.0	27.0	28.0	0.0	1.0	2.6
	31.1	14.6	26.2	27.2	0.0	1.0	2.5
40	29.0	12.0	31.0	30.0	0.0	1.0	2.8
	28.2	11.7	30.1	29.1	0.0	1.0	2.6
41	35.0	13.0	28.0	26.0	0.0	1.0	2.6
	34.0	12.6	27.2	25.2	0.0	1.0	2.4

Appendix C continued

42	23.0	19.0	37.0	23.0	0.0	1.0	2.7
	22.3	18.4	35.9	22.3	0.0	1.0	2.6
43	25.0	9.0	32.0	36.0	0.0	1.0	3.0
	24.3	8.7	31.1	35.0	0.0	1.0	2.8
44	27.0	10.0	28.0	37.0	0.0	1.0	3.0
	26.2	9.7	27.2	35.9	0.0	1.0	2.7
45	33.0	7.0	24.0	37.0	0.0	2.0	2.9
	32.0	6.8	23.3	35.9	0.0	1.9	2.6
46	31.0	19.0	30.0	21.0	0.0	2.0	2.5
	30.1	18.4	29.1	20.4	0.0	1.9	2.4
47	31.0	28.0	21.0	21.0	0.0	2.0	2.2
	30.1	27.2	20.4	20.4	0.0	1.9	2.3
48	34.0	16.0	44.0	7.0	0.0	2.0	2.5
	33.0	15.5	42.7	6.8	0.0	1.9	2.2
49	19.0	11.0	34.0	35.0	0.0	4.0	3.1
	18.4	10.7	33.0	34.0	0.0	3.9	2.9

Sample Size: 103

Appendix D

College Student Results

For each item, response frequencies and the median are printed on the first line
and percentages and the mean are printed on the second. (The total used for
calculating the median and mean excludes omits.)

Item	1	2	3	4	5	Omit	Median / Mean
1	60.0	34.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
	63.8	36.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
2	57.0	37.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
	60.6	39.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
3	0.0	3.0	84.0	5.0	2.0	0.0	3.0
	0.0	3.2	89.4	5.3	2.1	0.0	3.1
4	2.0	3.0	32.0	57.0	0.0	0.0	3.7
	2.1	3.2	34.0	60.6	0.0	0.0	3.5
5	8.0	14.0	24.0	48.0	0.0	0.0	3.5
	8.5	14.9	25.5	51.1	0.0	0.0	3.2
6	2.0	8.0	45.0	39.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
	2.1	8.5	47.9	41.5	0.0	0.0	3.3
7	0.0	1.0	18.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	3.9
	0.0	1.1	19.1	79.8	0.0	0.0	3.8
8	2.0	2.0	22.0	68.0	0.0	0.0	3.8
	2.1	2.1	23.4	72.3	0.0	0.0	3.7
9	1.0	2.0	15.0	76.0	0.0	0.0	3.9
	1.1	2.1	16.0	80.9	0.0	0.0	3.8
10	0.0	8.0	32.0	54.0	0.0	0.0	3.6
	0.0	8.5	34.0	57.4	0.0	0.0	3.5
11	0.0	1.0	24.0	68.0	0.0	1.0	3.8
	0.0	1.1	25.5	72.3	0.0	1.1	3.7
12	0.0	1.0	16.0	76.0	0.0	1.0	3.9
	0.0	1.1	17.0	80.9	0.0	1.1	3.8
13	6.0	13.0	31.0	44.0	0.0	0.0	3.4
	6.4	13.8	33.0	46.8	0.0	0.0	3.2
14	0.0	2.0	23.0	68.0	1.0	0.0	3.8
	0.0	2.1	24.5	72.3	1.1	0.0	3.7
15	1.0	8.0	23.0	61.0	1.0	0.0	3.7
	1.1	8.5	24.5	64.9	1.1	0.0	3.6
16	3.0	24.0	25.0	42.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
	3.2	25.5	26.6	44.7	0.0	0.0	3.1
17	0.0	8.0	30.0	56.0	0.0	0.0	3.7
	0.0	8.5	31.9	59.6	0.0	0.0	3.5
18	0.0	1.0	21.0	70.0	1.0	1.0	3.9
	0.0	1.1	22.3	74.5	1.1	1.1	3.8
19	1.0	4.0	23.0	66.0	0.0	0.0	3.8
	1.1	4.3	24.5	70.2	0.0	0.0	3.6

Appendix D continued

20	1.0	9.0	31.0	53.0	0.0	0.0	3.6
	1.1	9.6	33.0	56.4	0.0	0.0	3.4
21	3.0	7.0	25.0	59.0	0.0	0.0	3.7
	3.2	7.4	26.6	62.8	0.0	0.0	3.5
22	2.0	8.0	41.0	43.0	0.0	0.0	3.4
	2.1	8.5	43.6	45.7	0.0	0.0	3.3
23	3.0	14.0	36.0	41.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
	3.2	14.9	38.3	43.6	0.0	0.0	3.2
24	0.0	1.0	15.0	78.0	0.0	0.0	3.9
	0.0	1.1	16.0	83.0	0.0	0.0	3.8
25	1.0	3.0	34.0	56.0	0.0	0.0	3.7
	1.1	3.2	36.2	59.6	0.0	0.0	3.5
26	2.0	7.0	31.0	54.0	0.0	0.0	3.6
	2.1	7.4	33.0	57.4	0.0	0.0	3.5
27	14.0	12.0	36.0	32.0	0.0	0.0	3.1
	14.9	12.8	38.3	34.0	0.0	0.0	2.9
28	14.0	15.0	29.0	36.0	0.0	0.0	3.1
	14.9	16.0	30.9	38.3	0.0	0.0	2.9
29	18.0	17.0	26.0	32.0	0.0	1.0	2.9
	19.1	18.1	27.7	34.0	0.0	1.1	2.8
30	22.0	15.0	33.0	24.0	0.0	0.0	2.8
	23.4	16.0	35.1	25.5	0.0	0.0	2.6
31	20.0	16.0	37.0	21.0	0.0	0.0	2.8
	21.3	17.0	39.4	22.3	0.0	0.0	2.6
32	33.0	20.0	22.0	19.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
	35.1	21.3	23.4	20.2	0.0	0.0	2.3
33	6.0	16.0	35.0	37.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
	6.4	17.0	37.2	39.4	0.0	0.0	3.1
34	11.0	17.0	39.0	27.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
	11.7	18.1	41.5	28.7	0.0	0.0	2.9
35	3.0	12.0	38.0	41.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
	3.2	12.8	40.4	43.6	0.0	0.0	3.2
36	3.0	4.0	20.0	65.0	1.0	1.0	3.8
	3.2	4.3	21.3	69.1	1.1	1.1	3.6
37	8.0	12.0	29.0	45.0	0.0	0.0	3.4
	8.5	12.8	30.9	47.9	0.0	0.0	3.2
38	6.0	9.0	32.0	46.0	1.0	0.0	3.5
	6.4	9.6	34.0	48.9	1.1	0.0	3.3
39	5.0	16.0	28.0	44.0	1.0	0.0	3.4
	5.3	17.0	29.8	46.8	1.1	0.0	3.2
40	6.0	15.0	32.0	39.0	1.0	1.0	3.3
	6.4	16.0	34.0	41.5	1.1	1.1	3.2
41	10.0	15.0	29.0	39.0	1.0	0.0	3.3
	10.6	16.0	30.9	41.5	1.1	0.0	3.1

Appendix D continued

42	4.0	12.0	37.0	40.0	1.0	0.0	3.3
	4.3	12.8	39.4	42.6	1.1	0.0	3.2
43	9.0	11.0	31.0	42.0	1.0	0.0	3.4
	9.6	11.7	33.0	44.7	1.1	0.0	3.2
44	8.0	16.0	29.0	41.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
	8.5	17.0	30.9	43.6	0.0	0.0	3.1
45	6.0	11.0	34.0	43.0	0.0	0.0	3.4
	6.4	11.7	36.2	45.7	0.0	0.0	3.2
46	6.0	17.0	38.0	33.0	0.0	0.0	3.1
	6.4	18.1	40.4	35.1	0.0	0.0	3.0
47	6.0	15.0	39.0	34.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
	6.4	16.0	41.5	36.2	0.0	0.0	3.1
48	10.0	18.0	29.0	36.0	0.0	1.0	3.1
	10.6	19.1	30.9	38.3	0.0	1.1	3.0
49	0.0	8.0	31.0	52.0	0.0	3.0	3.6
	0.0	8.5	33.0	55.3	0.0	3.2	3.5

Sample Size: 94

Appendix E

Workforce Results

For each item, response frequencies and the median are printed on the first line
and percentages and the mean are printed on the second. (The total used for
calculating the median and mean excludes omits.)

Item	1	2	3	4	5	Omit	Median / Mean
1	57.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
	58.8	41.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
2	54.0	43.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
	55.7	44.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
3	18.0	23.0	11.0	33.0	12.0	0.0	3.2
	18.6	23.7	11.3	34.0	12.4	0.0	3.0
4	5.0	31.0	23.0	25.0	13.0	0.0	3.0
	5.2	32.0	23.7	25.8	13.4	0.0	3.1
5	6.0	9.0	29.0	53.0	0.0	0.0	3.6
	6.2	9.3	29.9	54.6	0.0	0.0	3.3
6	8.0	15.0	37.0	36.0	1.0	0.0	3.2
	8.2	15.5	38.1	37.1	1.0	0.0	3.1
7	2.0	11.0	36.0	47.0	1.0	0.0	3.5
	2.1	11.3	37.1	48.5	1.0	0.0	3.4
8	2.0	9.0	34.0	52.0	0.0	0.0	3.6
	2.1	9.3	35.1	53.6	0.0	0.0	3.4
9	5.0	13.0	30.0	48.0	1.0	0.0	3.5
	5.2	13.4	30.9	49.5	1.0	0.0	3.3
10	2.0	10.0	33.0	50.0	2.0	0.0	3.6
	2.1	10.3	34.0	51.5	2.1	0.0	3.4
11	1.0	6.0	29.0	60.0	1.0	0.0	3.7
	1.0	6.2	29.9	61.9	1.0	0.0	3.6
12	2.0	12.0	28.0	55.0	0.0	0.0	3.6
	2.1	12.4	28.9	56.7	0.0	0.0	3.4
13	5.0	7.0	32.0	53.0	0.0	0.0	3.6
	5.2	7.2	33.0	54.6	0.0	0.0	3.4
14	4.0	19.0	36.0	37.0	0.0	1.0	3.2
	4.1	19.6	37.1	38.1	0.0	1.0	3.1
15	2.0	9.0	26.0	54.0	1.0	5.0	3.7
	2.1	9.3	26.8	55.7	1.0	5.2	3.5
16	6.0	16.0	34.0	41.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
	6.2	16.5	35.1	42.3	0.0	0.0	3.1
17	3.0	15.0	34.0	44.0	0.0	1.0	3.4
	3.1	15.5	35.1	45.4	0.0	1.0	3.2
18	1.0	14.0	33.0	49.0	0.0	0.0	3.5
	1.0	14.4	34.0	50.5	0.0	0.0	3.3
19	0.0	5.0	29.0	63.0	0.0	0.0	3.7
	0.0	5.2	29.9	64.9	0.0	0.0	3.6

Appendix E continued

20	1.0	10.0	21.0	64.0	1.0	0.0	3.8
	1.0	10.3	21.6	66.0	1.0	0.0	3.6
21	0.0	10.0	34.0	52.0	1.0	0.0	3.6
	0.0	10.3	35.1	53.6	1.0	0.0	3.5
22	2.0	8.0	32.0	54.0	0.0	1.0	3.6
	2.1	8.2	33.0	55.7	0.0	1.0	3.4
23	2.0	20.0	31.0	44.0	0.0	0.0	3.4
	2.1	20.6	32.0	45.4	0.0	0.0	3.2
24	0.0	17.0	33.0	46.0	1.0	0.0	3.5
	0.0	17.5	34.0	47.4	1.0	0.0	3.3
25	0.0	14.0	33.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	3.5
	0.0	14.4	34.0	51.5	0.0	0.0	3.4
26	1.0	18.0	36.0	42.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
	1.0	18.6	37.1	43.3	0.0	0.0	3.2
27	1.0	8.0	29.0	59.0	0.0	0.0	3.7
	1.0	8.2	29.9	60.8	0.0	0.0	3.5
28	19.0	18.0	33.0	27.0	0.0	0.0	2.8
	19.6	18.6	34.0	27.8	0.0	0.0	2.7
29	28.0	16.0	33.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
	28.9	16.5	34.0	20.6	0.0	0.0	2.5
30	36.0	18.0	26.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
	37.1	18.6	26.8	17.5	0.0	0.0	2.2
31	26.0	19.0	32.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	2.6
	26.8	19.6	33.0	20.6	0.0	0.0	2.5
32	26.0	28.0	25.0	18.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
	26.8	28.9	25.8	18.6	0.0	0.0	2.4
33	39.0	24.0	21.0	13.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
	40.2	24.7	21.6	13.4	0.0	0.0	2.1
34	21.0	28.0	24.0	24.0	0.0	0.0	2.5
	21.6	28.9	24.7	24.7	0.0	0.0	2.5
35	21.0	29.0	28.0	19.0	0.0	0.0	2.4
	21.6	29.9	28.9	19.6	0.0	0.0	2.5
36	10.0	18.0	39.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
	10.3	18.6	40.2	30.9	0.0	0.0	2.9
37	18.0	16.0	33.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	2.9
	18.6	16.5	34.0	30.9	0.0	0.0	2.8
38	20.0	21.0	33.0	23.0	0.0	0.0	2.7
	20.6	21.6	34.0	23.7	0.0	0.0	2.6
39	20.0	23.0	30.0	23.0	0.0	1.0	2.7
	20.6	23.7	30.9	23.7	0.0	1.0	2.6
40	8.0	22.0	32.0	35.0	0.0	0.0	3.1
	8.2	22.7	33.0	36.1	0.0	0.0	3.0
41	12.0	21.0	31.0	33.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
	12.4	21.6	32.0	34.0	0.0	0.0	2.9

Appendix E continued

42	12.0	22.0	28.0	35.0	0.0	0.0	3.0
	12.4	22.7	28.9	36.1	0.0	0.0	2.9
43	8.0	15.0	32.0	42.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
	8.2	15.5	33.0	43.3	0.0	0.0	3.1
44	14.0	21.0	31.0	31.0	0.0	0.0	2.9
	14.4	21.6	32.0	32.0	0.0	0.0	2.8
45	14.0	19.0	35.0	29.0	0.0	0.0	2.9
	14.4	19.6	36.1	29.9	0.0	0.0	2.8
46	13.0	17.0	32.0	33.0	0.0	2.0	3.0
	13.4	17.5	33.0	34.0	0.0	2.1	2.9
47	13.0	25.0	30.0	27.0	0.0	2.0	2.8
	13.4	25.8	30.9	27.8	0.0	2.1	2.7
48	12.0	25.0	26.0	32.0	0.0	2.0	2.9
	12.4	25.8	26.8	33.0	0.0	2.1	2.8
49	11.0	19.0	32.0	34.0	0.0	1.0	3.1
	11.3	19.6	33.0	35.1	0.0	1.0	2.9
50	4.0	10.0	37.0	44.0	0.0	2.0	3.4
	4.1	10.3	38.1	45.4	0.0	2.1	3.3

Sample Size: 97

Appendix F

Mean Scores for Topic Categories

	H.S. Freshmen	College Students	Workforce
Attitudes/Opinions	2.8	3.54	3.36
Tastes/Interests	3.19	3.55	3.33
Academics (Work)	2.98	3.48	3.39
Money	2.39	2.76	2.43
Personality	2.69	3.25	2.85
Body	2.56	3.16	2.89

Appendix G

Mean Scores--Topic Categories

Legend:
- H.S. Freshmen
- College Students
- Workforce

Y-axis: Mean Scores (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4)

X-axis (Topic Categories): Attitudes/Opinions, Tastes/Interests, Academics (Work), Money, Personality, Body