

2000

Self-Disclosure Within Intimate Romantic Relationships: Determining Relevant Relational Factors

Gretchen L. Clark

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.

Recommended Citation

Clark, Gretchen L., "Self-Disclosure Within Intimate Romantic Relationships: Determining Relevant Relational Factors" (2000).

Masters Theses. 1555.

<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/1555>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

**THESIS/FIELD EXPERIENCE PAPER
REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE**

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

SUBJECT: Permission to Reproduce Theses

The University Library is receiving a number of request 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 these 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.

12/11/00

Date

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

Author's Signature

Date

Self-Disclosure Within Intimate Romantic Relationships:
Determining Relevant Relational Factors

BY

Gretchen L. Clark

1972-

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Arts

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS


2000

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING

THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

12/13/00

DATE

 12/16/00

DATE

Abstract

The Romantic Intimacy Survey assessed the value of self-disclosure in intimate romantic relationships. Males and females place a stronger disclosure importance in specific intimate relationships, such as mom/female guardian, friends from college, friends from high school, previous romantic partners, dad/male guardian, cross-gender friends, and siblings. In addition, females place more disclosure importance than males on specific intimate relationships. These specific relationships included siblings, current roommates, instructors, and peers within social organizations. Males and females categorize relationships into different factors when assessed by a factor analysis. Males and females also thought different relationships had disclosure importance. Males thought adult friends should not be disclosed, whereas youth friends should be disclosed to a romantic partner. Females thought youth friends should not be disclosed, whereas adult friends should be disclosed to a romantic partner. The subjects included 108 female and 51 male undergraduate students.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Norman Greer and Dr. Douglas Bock for their beneficial dedication, prompt replies, and intelligent perceptive suggestions. Without these men on my committee and in my life, I would not have been able to complete this thesis. These men well represent our discipline. It is an honor to have their guidance and assistance.

Table of Contents

| | |
|-----------------------------|----|
| List of Tables..... | 5 |
| Introduction..... | 6 |
| Review of Literature..... | 6 |
| Hypotheses..... | 14 |
| Methodology | |
| Participants..... | 15 |
| Procedure..... | 15 |
| Results..... | 16 |
| Discussion/Conclusions..... | 19 |
| Reference..... | 22 |
| Appendixes..... | 27 |

List of Tables

| | |
|-------------------------------|----|
| Romantic Intimacy Survey..... | 27 |
| Frequency Table Report..... | 28 |
| Two sample T-test..... | 31 |
| Factor Analysis Report..... | 35 |

Introduction

Self-disclosure within romantic relationships has been studied in many researches. The review of literature connects intimate relationships, intimacy, self-disclosure, and gender. There have been overlooked researchable areas. These researches have not evaluated the types of intimate relationships that males and females determine important for disclosure, nor how these relationships are categorized.

Literature Review

Impact of Intimate Interpersonal Relationships

Romantic relationships are considered voluntary interpersonal interactions because people choose to enter them due to the way the other person makes them feel (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1992). Romantic partners need to be skilled in providing qualities such as care, warmth, encouragement, and mutual support (Burleson, Kunkel, Samter, & Werking, 1996). A study by Fletcher, Thomas, Giles, and Simpson (1999) evaluated the qualities that people determined to be ideal for both romantic partners and relationship satisfaction. The study found that a factor they labeled as “intimacy-loyalty” was the ideal quality for romantic relationships. “Intimacy-loyalty” is defined as a relationship that included qualities such as respect, care, honesty, trustworthiness, and support. However, each ideal can have “a different meaning relative to concepts of love, realistic expectations, or judgments of specific relationships or partners” (p. 86).

Past relationships can negatively affect current relationships through the development of unresolved issues. These issues can lead to terminations of future relationships. These issues can include a range of negative behaviors. One, “may not

only fail to develop good interpersonal skills, but they may learn bad interpersonal skills” (Stets, 1993, p. 247). The intimate relationships developed during one’s adolescence are a struggle between control, conformity, closeness, affection, disclosure, and commitment. The ability to balance these qualities reflects a maturity of the relationship. Individuals that have had exposure to balancing relational closeness and individuality through previous intimate relationships will be better able to adapt between the two polarities. A successful intimate relationship involves a balance between power and control, which allows integration without losing one’s identity. When this type of intimate relationship exists, partners can confidently express their own views. A mutual respect develops through this balanced interaction (Shulman, Laursen, Kalman, & Karpovsky, 1997).

An unbalanced relationship will affect one's self-esteem. People that have received positive disclosures from previous intimate interpersonal relationships continue to use disclosures as a source of self-esteem. Whereas people with negative disclosures from previous interpersonal relationships, they will look to task-oriented items as a source of self-esteem (Brennan & Bosson, 1998).

Self-disclosure of romantic feelings about a partner can be especially important if the partner’s self-esteem or self-worth is low. When dealing with a distressing situation, people with a low self-esteem feel that the distressing situation is proof or an indication of their worth. Consequently, people with low self-esteem need external validation to counterbalance the external cues (Longmore & Demaris, 1997).

A study by Brennan & Bosson (1998) found that there are attachment styles, which correlate to self-esteem and self-disclosure. These attachment styles demand

different types of communication to validate self-esteem. In addition, the different attachment styles communicate by different approaches. The attachment styles are developed through the early caregiving environment. If a person has a distant caregiver, then they grow to believe that other intimate interpersonal relationships will also be distant. Due to this belief, they tend to avoid other people when distressed. This avoidance substantially reinforces this previously learned notion. People that had sensitive caregivers will have different perceptions than people with distant caregivers (Fraley & Waller, 1998). With each new or following relationship, there is a chance for change (Brennan & Bosson, 1998).

Creation of Intimacy Through Self-disclosure

Several researchers have proven the positive effects of self-disclosure on an interpersonal relationship. Self-disclosure can be a predictor of a relationship's length (Sprecher, 1987). It is central to the relationship's development (Collins & Miller, 1994). Also, the relationship has a more progressive ability and the quality increases (Brehm, 1992). Self-disclosure can change the direction, definition, or intensity of a relationship due to its dynamic nature. A relationship's self-disclosure can change the level of intimacy, which in return changes the relationally defined self-disclosure (Bogard & Spilka, 1996). Self-disclosure can be definitive of a long-term, committed relationship (Vangelisti & Banski, 1993).

An interpersonal relationship develops a set of common assumptions about the way things are, the communication patterns, and the degree of importance for each other. There is an agreement that develops between the two individuals that defines a meaning

that is only significant to the dyad. This common meaning influences their behavior as it relates to their perception of the world. This is known as symbolic interaction. "It represents the construction of reality or world view unique to the couple. This 'relational world view' defines the meanings which will be given to behaviors when they are enacted within the context of the relationship" (Stephen, 1984, p. 397).

Relational common meanings help create a shared interpersonal relational reality. According to a study by Heller & Wood (1998), a married relationship is more mutually intimate when a spouse really knows and understands the partner's reality. To accomplish this a partner must be "emotionally, cognitively, and physically self-disclosing" and the spouse must be receptive and have the "ability to comprehend" (p. 278). In fact, intimacy is viewed by Weingarten (1992) as a quality of a particular interaction which is "occurring when people share meaning or co-create meaning and they are able to coordinate their actions to reflect their mutual meaning-making" (p. 47). Several researchers have similar views about intimacy. It is viewed as a subjective relational experience in which there is a genuine want to reciprocate information because of the mutual understanding, empathy, and trusting self-disclosure (Rubin, 1983; Wynne & Wynne, 1986; Weingarten, 1992). In continuous relationships, greater depths of intimacy can be achieved through the building of mutual self-disclosure (Kirkpatrick, 1975).

Since intimacy is mutual by nature, the more intimate one person feels, the more intimate the other person will feel. Also feeling intimate may increase self-disclosure, which would lead to a greater understanding of one another. Heller and Wood (1998)

found that a more accurate understanding of another's perspective would increase self-disclosure of vulnerabilities. A communicative sender is more comfortable disclosing to a partner that has an accurate perception of the discloser (Swann, Stein-Seroussi, & Giesler, 1992). The discloser is more comfortable communicating personal vulnerabilities with this receiver, because there is less possibility for misunderstanding or failed expectations (Collins & Miller, 1994).

Placing confidence in one's romantic partner can promote effective interactions within the relationship. The placement of confidence is accomplished through trust. Interpersonal trust promotes a healthy intimate relationship. "Like self-disclosure, consent for a partner to engage in an activity that others find threatening may be viewed as proof of trust in one's mate" (Zak, Gold, Ryckman, & Lenney, 1998, p. 218). Trust can be relationship specific, which is achieved through expectations of positive outcomes by the partner. After trust is built, faith develops through the partners' belief in the relationship's future. The partner must demonstrate care and response to the other's present and future needs (Zak et al, 1998). The partner's ability to meet these present and future needs is based on the romantic partner's perceptions of their behaviors. If their behaviors are perceived to be dependable and predictable, then they are considered trustworthy (Holmes & Rempel, 1989).

Self-disclosure's Role in Romantic Relationships

Self-disclosure varies in relationships due to several aspects: Timing of the disclosure, the different levels of relational intimacy, and point in relational development (Hosman, 1987). Self-disclosure is communicatively revealing any information about

oneself to another person, which can vary in intent, depth, honesty, amount, and positiveness (Wheless, 1976). A developing relationship and self-disclosure do not have a set pattern guiding toward greater intimacy. Self-disclosure can fluctuate throughout the relationship (Prisbell & Dallinger, 1991). For example, too much self-disclosure early in a relationship's development can be detrimental to the relationship (Altman & Taylor, 1973). In initial stages of relational development, highly intimate self-disclosures can be evaluated as inappropriate to social norms (Collins & Miller, 1994).

Taylor notes that self-disclosure simultaneously contains rewarding and risky aspects (1979). The risky aspect evolves from the effects of disclosing vulnerabilities and weaknesses. Disclosing items of this type could lead to shame or concern about potential rejection. Through self-disclosure, a person may discover disheartening information about oneself. This information is discovered as the gap between the actual self and the ideal self diminishes (Duval & Wicklund, 1972). In a study by Howell & Conway (1990), they found that negative and intense self-disclosures were considered more intimate than positive self-disclosures. However, self-disclosure about fears and personality weaknesses help to develop and maintain intimacy (Collins & Miller, 1994).

Self-disclosure is not the only factor that promotes intimacy. It is also important to be responsive to a partner's disclosure to promote more intimate disclosures. A person must also be responsive to the partner's disclosure, which increases the partner's faith in the other's intentions (Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991).

Self-disclosure, like intimacy, is thought to be mutual. Therefore, as one person increases the intimacy of the conversational self-disclosure, then the other person will

elevate his or her own self-disclosure (Cozby, 1972; Derlega, Harris, & Chaikin, 1973).

The easiest way to get someone to disclose is to talk about oneself. The disclosures between partners therefore create a “feedback loop” of mutual self-disclosing and liking (Collins & Miller, 1994, p. 470). When a romantic partner feels secure within a relationship, self-disclosure becomes greater in both depth and breadth. Furthermore, there is a more compromising, problem-solving style and more supportive interpersonal interaction which results from the feelings of security (Morrison, Goodlin-Jones, & Urquiza, 1997).

Jourard (1959) stated that a self-discloser with a healthy personality would benefit due to the rewarding and therapeutic nature of self-disclosing. He reasoned that the positive affects from self-disclosing would result in a positive self-evaluation. Jourard (1959) thought that the discloser would attribute the positive affects with the receiver, which would increase the liking of the recipient. A lack of self-disclosure causes feelings of loneliness and dissatisfaction with one’s social group (Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991).

A person’s thoughts about their romantic partner can affect the relationship’s satisfaction. A dissatisfied person attributes the partner’s positive behaviors to an external cause and the negative behaviors to an internal cause. However, a satisfied person attributes the partner’s positive behavior to an internal cause and negative behaviors to an external cause. The perceptions of a satisfied individual enhance the relationship, whereas the perceptions of a dissatisfied individual distress the relationship (Vangelisti, Corbin, Lucchetti, & Sprague, 1999).

Satisfaction is a subjective feeling that arises from evaluation that the relationship's costs are less than the rewards. Also, the relationship's costs and rewards must be a better option than expectations of alternative relationships. Satisfaction increases as the costs decrease and the rewards increase as compared to the expectations (Sprecher & Metts, 1995). The exchange of self-disclosure is considered a reward to the receiver. (Worthy, Gary, & Kahn, 1969; Collins & Miller, 1994). Self-disclosure is considered a reward because this form of communication seems to define the value that the sender places on the relationship (Collins & Miller, 1994). People will give more rewards to those they like (Worthy et al., 1969). When evaluating relationships, a partner should seek a romantic relationship with the most rewarding outcomes (Collins & Miller, 1994).

Not only is the self-discloser giving a relational reward, a discloser receives a type of reward from the receiver. When self-disclosers are selective on the receivers of their intimate information, the receivers consider the disclosers to be more favorable (Kleinke, 1979). The receivers feel more trusted and liked (Wortman, Adesman, & Herman, 1976). The receivers believe that the disclosure was specifically personalized for them (Collins & Miller, 1994). The receivers feel more trusted and liked for justifiable reasons, because senders are more willing to disclose to those they like and trust (Jourard, 1964). Furthermore, when a discloser likes the receiver, the sender will disclose more to the receiver (Collins & Miller, 1994).

Self-disclosure Gender Differences

Men and women have been reported to vary in factors of self-disclosing. Men self-disclose equal amounts of information as women, however the genders disclose differently according to the context. Studies show that females have been taught to promote expressive relationships, which would produce harmonious relationships. In contrast, males have been taught to be unconcerned with social-expressive concerns (Eagly, 1987; Shaffer & Pegalis, 1992). Eagly (1987) states that women are concerned with the effects of self-disclosures on others due to their commitment "to preserving group harmony and enhancing positive feelings among group members" (p. 98). Therefore, females tend to disclose more in social or expressive contexts and males tend to disclose more in collaborative or instrumental contexts (Pegalis, Shaffer, Bazzini, & Keegan, 1994). Men's goal is to promote a good working relationship with receivers. Whereas, women's goal is to promote harmony, therefore restricting their disclosures in task contexts (Shaffer & Pegalis, 1996).

The review of previous research lead to four derived hypotheses.

H₁: Certain intimate relationships have more self-disclosure significance than other intimate relationships between romantic partners.

H₂: Females will rate some relationships as more important to disclose than males will rate those relationships.

H₃: Females will categorize intimate relationships differently than males.

H₄: Males and females will think different factors should be disclosed to a romantic partner.

Methodology

Participants

The participants were 159 undergraduates enrolled in Eastern Illinois University's introductory speech course. The participants included 51 males and 108 females. The participants completed the Romantic Intimacy Survey (RIS) voluntarily.

Procedure

Each student was handed the RIS (See Appendix A) on a single sheet of paper. The survey was only on the front side of each paper. The directions were contained on the survey.

The survey was developed after reviewing the literature. The survey was a 22-item survey. The participant identified his or her gender. The survey instructed the participants to relate the questionnaire to their current or most recent romantic relationship. The participant specified the length of this relationship. Next, the participant evaluated the importance of disclosure of 16 intimate relationships. The relationships were evaluated on a 5-point Likert-type scale.

The following relationships were evaluated: Mom/Female guardian, dad/male guardian, siblings, friends from grade school, friends from junior high school, friends from high school, friends from college, cross-gender friends, previous roommates, current roommates, previous romantic partners, instructors, co-workers, bosses, coaches/organizational leaders, and peers within the social organization. The participant evaluated which were the three most significant relationships for discussion. The

participants placed the determined relational number in each of the three scaled blanks.

Finally, the participant rated the relational satisfaction on a ten-point scale.

Results

H₁: A frequency table report evaluated which relationships were rated as the most important to disclose to a romantic partner (See Appendix B-D). Four relationships were most frequently rated as the most significant relationships to talk about with a romantic partner (See Appendix B). These relationships included mom/female guardian, friends from college, friends from high school, and previous romantic partners with percentages of 33.96, 21.38, 12.58, and 10.69, respectively. Five relationships were most frequently rated as the second most significant relationships to talk about with a romantic partner with a romantic partner (See Appendix C). These relationships included dad/male guardian, mom/female guardian, cross-gender friends, friends from college, and friends from high school with percentages of 26.42, 16.98, 15.09, 14.47, and 11.95, respectively. Five relationships were most frequently rated as the third most significant relationships to talk about with a romantic partner with a romantic partner (See Appendix D). These relationships included siblings, friends from college, friends from high school, dad/male guardian, and cross-gender friends with percentages of 16.98, 16.35, 12.58, 11.95, and 9.43, respectively.

H₂: A two-sample test evaluated the rating of self-disclosure importance between the two genders (See Appendix E-H). The results supported the hypothesis by evaluating the mean from each gender. Females rated relationships with siblings higher (3.81) in disclosure importance than males (3.35) (See Appendix E). This proved to be

statistically significant at 0.0166. Females rated relationships with current roommates higher (3.94) in disclosure importance than males (3.27) (See Appendix F). This proved to be statistically significant at 0.0003. Females rated relationships with instructors higher (2.49) in disclosure importance than males (2.12) (See Appendix G). This proved to be statistically significant at 0.0366. Females rated relationships with peers within social organizations higher (3.16) in disclosure importance than males (2.73) (See Appendix H). This proved to be statistically significant at 0.0203. Therefore, females did rate some relationships of higher disclosing importance than males.

H₃: A factor analysis determined the relational factors. An Eigenvalue of 1.0 or higher was used to determine statistical significance for a factor. Females and males categorized the relationships differently. Females had four factors (See Appendix I-L). One factor was defined as organizational (See Appendix I). This factor included coaches/organizational leaders, co-workers, bosses, peers within social organizations, and instructors. This factor's Eigenvalue was 3.39. Another factor was defined as youth friends (See Appendix J). This factor included friends from grade school and friends from junior high school. This factor's Eigenvalue was 2.04. The next factor was defined as family (See Appendix K). This factor included dad/male guardian, mom/female guardian, and siblings. This factor's Eigenvalue was 2.31. The last factor was defined as adult friends (See Appendix L). This factor included previous romantic partners, previous roommates, current roommates, and cross-gender friends. This factor's Eigenvalue was 1.64.

Males also had four factors (See Appendix M-P). One factor was defined as organizational (See Appendix M). This factor included bosses, coaches/organizational leaders, peers within social organizations, instructors, and co-workers. This factor's Eigenvalue was 3.49. Another factor was defined as adult friends (See Appendix N). This factor included cross-gender friends, current roommates, previous romantic partners, friends from college, and previous roommates. This factor's Eigenvalue was 2.56. The next factor was defined as family (See Appendix O). This factor included mom/female guardian and dad/male guardian. This factor's Eigenvalue was 2.43. The last factor was defined as youth friends (See Appendix P). This factor included friends from junior high school, friends from grade school, and friends from high school. This factor's Eigenvalue was 2.35.

H₄: The positive or negative score of the factor analysis values determine which factors each gender believes should be discussed with a romantic partner. The females' organizational and youth friends factor had negative scores (See Appendix I & J). Therefore, females think the relationships that comprise these two factors do not have importance in conversations with a romantic partner. The females' family and adult friends factor had positive scores (See Appendix K & L). Therefore, females think the relationships that comprise these two factors have importance in conversations with a romantic partner. The males' organizational and adult friends factor had negative scores (See Appendix M & N). Therefore, males think the relationships that comprise these two factors do not have importance in conversations with a romantic partner. The males' family and youth friends factor had positive scores (See Appendix O & P). Therefore,

males think the relationships that comprise these two factors have importance in conversations with a romantic partner.

Discussion/Conclusions

The findings in this study were congruent with previous research and helped to further self-disclosure research. This study found that both genders think that certain intimate relationships have more disclosure significance within romantic relationships. Of the 16 relationships listed on the survey, only seven relationships were frequently listed as significant for disclosure. These relationships included mom/female guardian, college friends, high school friends, previous romantic partners, dad/male guardian, cross-gender friends, and siblings. However, this study was limited by only surveying traditional college students. As the participants mature, these relationships may change in disclosure significance or other relationships may become more significant. Further researches about intimate relational significance for self-disclosure should use a population of participants with a greater age span.

The results are congruent with the findings that females are more social context disclosers (Eagly, 1987; Shaffer & Pegalis, 1992). Females rated social contextual relationships as more important for disclosure within romantic relationships. The female participants rated importance higher in the following relationships: Siblings, current roommates, and peers within social organizations.

Women have been socialized to produce harmonious relationships, which could explain the higher ratings from the women. However, the women also rated relationships with instructors of higher disclosure importance. This was incongruent with previous

research. Men have socialized to value disclosures in a work environment or an instrumental context (Eagly, 1987; Shaffer & Pegalis, 1992; Shaffer & Pegalis, 1996). Future studies should evaluate which relationships or contexts men consider instrumental.

This study also supported the third hypothesis that females and males will categorize intimate relationships differently. Both females and males had four factors, however three of the factors comprised of different relationships. Females thought family should include three relationships, dad/male guardian, mom/female guardian, and siblings. However, males did not include siblings in this factor. Another definitive difference was in the youth friends factor. The male's friend factor included friends from grade school, friends from junior high school, and friends from high school. The female's friend factor does not include friends from high school. The last definitive difference was in the adult friends factor. The male's factor included previous romantic partners, previous roommates, current roommates, cross-gender friends, and friends from college. The female's factor did not include friends from college. The last factor was organizational. Both females and males defined the organizational factor with the same relationships.

Females and males both agreed that the relationships that comprise the organizational factor (which contain the same relationships) do not have importance in conversations with a romantic partner. Females and males also agreed that the relationships that comprise of the family factor (females include siblings, though) do have importance in conversations with a romantic partner. Females think that the youth friends factor does not have importance in conversations with a romantic partner.

Whereas males thought that the adult friends factor does not have importance in conversations with a romantic partner. Females think that the adult friends factor has importance in conversations with a romantic partner. Whereas males think that the youth friends factor has importance in conversations with a romantic partner.

References

- Altman, I., & Taylor, D. (1973). Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Bogard, R., & Spilka, B. (1996). Self-disclosure and marital satisfaction in mid-life and late-life remarriages. Aging and Human Development, 42, 161-172.
- Brehm, S. S. (1992). Intimate Relationships. (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brennan, K. A., & Bosson, J. K. (1998). Attachment-style differences in attitudes toward and reactions to feedback from romantic partners: An exploration of the relational bases of self-esteem. Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 24, 699-715.
- Burleson, B. R., Kunkel, A. W., Samter, W., & Werking, K. J. (1996). Men's and women's evaluations of communication skills in personal relationships: When sex differences make a difference—and when they don't. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 13, 201-224.
- Collins, N. L., & Miller, L. C. (1994). Self-disclosure and liking: A meta-analytic review. Psychological Bulletin, 116, 457-475.
- Cozby, P. C. (1972). Self-disclosure, reciprocity, and liking. Sociometry, 35, 151-160.
- Derlega, V. J., Harris, M. S., & Chaikin, A. L. (1973). Self-disclosure, reciprocity, liking, and the deviant. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 9, 277-284.
- Duval, T. S., & Wicklund, R. (1972). A theory of objective self-awareness. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

- Eagly, A. H. (1987). Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fletcher, G. J. O., Thomas, G., Giles, L., & Simpson, J. A. (1999). Ideals in intimate relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *76*, 72-89.
- Fraley, R. C., & Waller, N. G. (1998). Adult attachment patterns: A test of the typological model. Simpson, J. A., & Rholes, W. S. (Eds.). Attachment theory and close relationships. New York: Guilford.
- Heller, P. E., & Wood, B. (1998). The process of intimacy: Similarity, understanding and gender. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, *24*, 273-288.
- Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1992). Romantic love. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Holmes, J. G., & Rempel, J. K. (1989). Trust in close relationships. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), Review of personality and social psychology: Close relationships (Vol. 10). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hosman, L. A. (1987). The evaluational consequences of topic reciprocity and self-disclosure reciprocity. Communication Monographs, *54*, 420-435.
- Howell, A., & Conway, M. (1990). Perceived intimacy of expressed emotion. Journal of Social Psychology, *130*, 467-477.
- Jourard, S. M. (1959). Self-disclosure and other-cathexis. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, *59*, 428-431.
- Jourard, S. M. (1964). The transparent self. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- Kirkpatrick, W. (1975). Identity and intimacy. New York: Dell.

Kleinke, C. L. (1979). Effects of personal evaluations. In G. J. Chelune (Ed.), Self-disclosure: Origins, patterns, and implications of openness in interpersonal relationships (pp. 59-79). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Longmore, M. A., & Demaris, A. (1997). Perceived inequity and depression in intimate relationships: The moderating effect of self-esteem. Social Psychology Quarterly, 60, 172-184.

Mikulincer, M., & Nachshon, O. (1991). Attachment styles and patterns of self-disclosure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61, 321-331.

Morrison, T. L., Goodlin-Jones, B. L., & Urquiza, A. J. (1997). Attachment and the representation of intimate relationships in adulthood. The Journal of Psychology, 131, 57-72.

Pegalis, L. J., Shaffer, D. R., Bazzini, D. G., & Greenier, K. (1994). On the ability to elicit self-disclosure: Are there gender-based and contextual limitations on the opener effect? Society for Personality and Social Psychology, 20, 412-420.

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

Rubin, L. (1983). Intimate strangers: Men and women together. New York: Harper & Row.

Shaffer, D. R., & Pegalis, L. J. (1992). Gender and self-disclosure revisited: Personal and contextual variations in self-disclosure to same-sex acquaintances. Journal of Social Psychology, 132, 307-316.

Shaffer, D. R., & Pegalis, L. J. (1996). When boy meets girl (revisited): Gender, gender-role orientation, and prospect of future interaction as determinants of self-disclosure among same- and opposite-sex acquaintances. Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, *22*, 495-507.

Shulman, S., Laursen, B., Kalman, Z., & Karpovsky, S. (1997). Adolescent intimacy revisited. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, *26*, 597-618.

Sprecher, S. (1987). The effects of self-disclosure given and received on affection for an intimate partner and stability of the relationship. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, *4*, 115-128.

Sprecher, S., & Metts, S. (1995). Domains of expressive interaction in intimate relationships: Associations with satisfaction and commitment. Family Relations, *44*, 203-211.

Stephen, T. D. (1984). A symbolic exchange framework for the development of intimate relationships. Human Relations, *37*, 393-408.

Stets, J. E. (1993). The link between past and present intimate relationships. Journal of Family Issues, *14*, 236-261.

Swann, W. B., Stein-Seroussi, A., Jr., & Giesler, R. B. (1992). Why people self-verify. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *62*, 392-401.

Taylor, D. A. (1979). Motivational bases. In G. L. Chelune (Ed.), Self-disclosure: Origins, patterns, and implications of openness in interpersonal relationships (pp. 110-151). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Vangelisti, A. L., & Banski, M. A. (1993). Couples' debriefing conversations: The impact of gender, occupation, and demographic characteristics. Family Relations, *42*, 149-157.

Vangelisti, A. L., Corbin, S. D., Lucchetti, A. E., & Sprague, R. J. (1999). Couples' concurrent cognitions: The influence of relational satisfaction on the thoughts couples have as they converse. Human Communication Research, *25*, 370-398.

Weingarten, K. (1992). A consideration of intimate and non-intimate interactions in therapy. Family Process, *31*, 45-59.

Wheless, L. R. (1976). Self-disclosure and interpersonal solidarity: Measurement, validation, and relationships. Human Communication Research, *3*, 47-61.

Worthy, M., Gary, A. L., & Kahn, G. M. (1969). Self-disclosure as an exchange process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *13*, 59-63.

Wortman, C. B., Adesman, P., & Herman, E. (1976). Self-disclosure: An attributional perspective. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *33*, 184-191.

Wynne, L., & Wynne, A. R. (1986). The quest for intimacy. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, *12*, 383-394.

Zak, A. M., Gold, J. A., Ryckman, R. M., & Lenney, E. (1998). Assessment of trust in intimate relationships and the self-perception process. The Journal of Social Psychology, *138*, 217-229.

Appendix A

Male _____ Female _____

THINK OF YOUR CURRENT ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP OR MOST RECENT ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP:

What is the length of this romantic relationship? _____ years _____ months

RATE THE IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNICATING ABOUT THE FOLLOWING RELATIONSHIPS IN YOUR LIFE TO THIS ROMANTIC PARTNER:

5= VERY IMPORTANT 4= IMPORTANT 3= AVERAGE IMPORTANCE 2= NOT VERY IMPORTANT 1= NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL

THE IMPORTANCE OF TELLING MY ROMANTIC PARTNER ABOUT MY RELATIONSHIP WITH MY:

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Mom/Female Guardian | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. Dad/Male Guardian | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. Siblings | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. Friends from grade school | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. Friends from junior high school | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. Friends from high school | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7. Friends from college | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 8. Cross-gender friends | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 9. Previous roommates | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 10. Current roommates | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 11. Previous romantic partners | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 12. Instructors | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 13. Co-workers | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 14. Bosses | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 15. Coaches/Organizational leaders | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 16. Peers within social organizations | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

RATE THE THREE MOST SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS TO TALK ABOUT:

Rate them by the number adjacent to the relationship (for example if college friends were the most important you would put a 7 in the first blank)

1ST _____ 2ND _____ 3RD _____

RATE YOUR SATISFACTION WITH YOUR CURRENT ROMANTIC PARTNER.

10 Being the highest and 1 being the least.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Appendix B

Frequency Table Report

| Variable | Count | Percent |
|----------------------------|-------|---------|
| Mom/Female guardian | 54 | 33.96 |
| Friends from college | 43 | 21.38 |
| Friends from high school | 20 | 12.58 |
| Previous romantic partners | 17 | 10.69 |

The relationships rated the most significant to talk about within a romantic relationship.

Appendix C

Frequency Table Report

| Variable | Count | Percent |
|--------------------------|-------|---------|
| Dad/Male Guardian | 42 | 26.42 |
| Mom/Female Guardian | 27 | 16.98 |
| Cross-gender friends | 24 | 15.09 |
| Friends from college | 23 | 14.47 |
| Friends from high school | 19 | 11.95 |

The relationships rated the second most significant to talk about within a romantic relationship.

Appendix D

Frequency Table Report

| Variable | Count | Percent |
|--------------------------|-------|---------|
| Siblings | 27 | 16.98 |
| Friends from college | 26 | 16.35 |
| Friends from high school | 20 | 12.58 |
| Dad/Male Guardian | 19 | 11.95 |
| Cross-gender friends | 15 | 9.43 |

The relationships rated the third most significant to talk about within a romantic relationship.

Appendix E

Two-Sample T-Test

| Gender | Count | Mean | SD | Prob. |
|---------|-------|------|------|--------|
| Males | 51 | 3.35 | 1.16 | 0.0167 |
| Females | 108 | 3.81 | 1.10 | |

The importance of telling my romantic partner about my relationship with my siblings.

Appendix F

Two-Sample T-Test

| Gender | Count | Mean | SD | Prob. |
|---------|-------|------|------|--------|
| Males | 51 | 3.27 | 1.11 | 0.0003 |
| Females | 108 | 3.94 | 1.03 | |

The importance of telling my romantic partner about my relationship with my current roommates.

Appendix G

Two-Sample T-Test

| Gender | Count | Mean | SD | Prob. |
|---------|-------|------|------|--------|
| Males | 51 | 2.11 | 1.01 | 0.0366 |
| Females | 108 | 2.49 | 1.05 | |

The importance of telling my romantic partner about my relationship with my instructors.

Appendix H

Two-Sample T-Test

| Gender | Count | Mean | SD | Prob. |
|---------|-------|------|------|--------|
| Males | 51 | 2.73 | 1.15 | 0.0203 |
| Females | 108 | 3.16 | 1.05 | |

The importance of telling my romantic partner about my relationship with my peers within social organizations.

Appendix I

Factor Analysis Report

| Females - Organizational | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------|
| Variables | Factor 1 | Eigenvalue |
| Coaches/Organizational leaders | -0.82 | |
| Co-workers | -0.78 | 3.39 |
| Bosses | -0.75 | |
| Peers within social organizations | -0.71 | |
| Instructors | -0.61 | |

Appendix J

Factor Analysis Report

Females – Youth Friends

| Variables | Factor 2 | Eigenvalue |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------|
| Friends from junior high school | -0.89 | 2.04 |
| Friends from grade school | -0.84 | |

Appendix K

Factor Analysis Report

| Females - Family | | |
|---------------------|----------|------------|
| Variables | Factor 3 | Eigenvalue |
| Dad/Male Guardian | 0.90 | |
| Mom/Female Guardian | 0.84 | 2.31 |
| Siblings | 0.63 | |

Appendix L

Factor Analysis Report

| Females – Adult Friends | | |
|---------------------------|----------|------------|
| Variables | Factor 4 | Eigenvalue |
| Previous romantic partner | 0.58 | |
| Previous roommates | 0.57 | 1.64 |
| Current roommates | 0.53 | |
| Cross-gender friends | 0.50 | |

Appendix M

Factor Analysis Report

| Males - Organizational | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------|
| Variables | Factor 1 | Eigenvalue |
| Bosses | -0.81 | |
| Coaches/Organizational leaders | -0.78 | 3.49 |
| Peers within social organizations | -0.73 | |
| Co-workers | -0.72 | |
| Instructors | -0.66 | |

Appendix N

Factor Analysis Report

| Males – Adult Friends | | |
|----------------------------|----------|------------|
| Variables | Factor 2 | Eigenvalue |
| Cross-gender friends | -0.79 | |
| Current roommates | -0.71 | 2.56 |
| Previous romantic partners | -0.63 | |
| Friends from college | -0.51 | |
| Previous roommates | -0.50 | |

Appendix O

Factor Analysis Report

| Males - Family | | |
|---------------------|----------|------------|
| Variables | Factor 3 | Eigenvalue |
| Mom/Female Guardian | 0.95 | 2.43 |
| Dad/Male Guardian | 0.81 | |

Appendix P

Factor Analysis Report

Males – Youth Friends

| Variables | Factor 4 | Eigenvalue |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------|
| Friends from junior high school | 0.93 | |
| Friends from grade school | 0.91 | |
| Friends from high school | 0.55 | 2.35 |