

THE ACCEPTABILITY TO COLLEGE STUDENTS OF
HIGHLY INTIMATE DISCLOSURES FROM STRANGERS

by

Jessie Furrer
B.A., San Diego State University, 1975

Submitted to the Department of
Speech Communications and Human
Relations and the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University
of Kansas in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts.

Redacted Signature

~~Instructor in Charge~~

Redacted Signature

For the department

DEDICATION

This Master's thesis is dedicated to my parents, Ivan and Dot, for their love and pride. Without them I would not be.

It is also dedicated to Professor Kim Giffin, for endless encouragement and concern.

Margie, for her friendship and typing skills.

Finally, but not last, Dr. Meredith Moore for her patience, care and friendship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION AND PREVIOUS RESEARCH	1
I. Purpose of this Study	1
II. Definitions	2
III. A Review of Relevant Studies	3
A. Definitions	3
B. Likability	4
C. Reciprocity and Target Persons	5
D. Disclosure to a Stranger	6
E. Self-disclosure and Attraction	7
F. Conclusion	8
IV. Hypothesis	8
V. Pilot Study	8
A. Rationale	8
B. Subjects	12
C. Materials	12
D. Procedure	12
E. Results	13
F. Discussion	13
II. PROCEDURES FOR THE MAJOR STUDY	17
I. Subjects	17
II. Research Design	17
III. Materials	17
IV. Procedure	18
V. Data Analysis	19
III. RESULTS	21
I. Validation of Stimulus Scripts	21
A. Test #1	22
B. Test #2	24
II. Major Study Results	25
IV. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	31
APPENDIX A, Instructions for Pilot Study and Major Study	36
APPENDIX B, Scripts for Pilot Study	38
APPENDIX C, Scripts for Major Study	42
APPENDIX D, Validation Stimulus Scripts #1 and Rating Scale	47

Chapter	Page
APPENDIX E, Validation Stimulus Scripts #2 and Rating Scale	53
APPENDIX F, Questionnaire for Pilot Study and Major Study	59
REFERENCES	62

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. T-test Results for Pilot Study	15
2. Analysis of Variance for Rating Scale #1	26
3. Analysis of Variance for Rating Scale #2	26
4. Analysis of Variance for Rating Scale #3	27
5. Analysis of Variance for Rating Scale #4	27
6. Analysis of Variance for Rating Scale #5	28
7. Analysis of Variance for Rating Scale #6	28
8. Analysis of Variance for Rating Scale #7	29
9. Analysis of Variance for Rating Scale #8	29
10. Analysis of Variance for Rating Scale #9	30

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND PREVIOUS RESEARCH

I. Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this investigation is to examine attitudes of college students towards intimate self-disclosure from an acquaintance. More specifically, this study will look at the hypothesis: Highly intimate information is viewed as appropriate by college students when offered by a person they do not know well.

The thrust of this study parallels a previous study, "Liking for the norm-breaker in self-disclosure," executed by Allan L. Chaiken and Valerian J. Derlega (1974). Previous research studies have suggested that self-disclosure is a mandatory tool for maintaining good mental health and encouraging intrapersonal as well as interpersonal communication. Self-disclosing behavior has generally been considered a positively valued activity (Culbert, 1968). Jourard (1964) has argued that an optimal amount of disclosure under specific conditions "is synonymous with mental health" (p.15). It appears that people must make themselves known to other individuals in order to live an emotionally healthy existence. One possible way of this is through self-disclosure.

II. Definitions

For the purpose of the present study the major terms will be defined as follows:

1. Self-disclosure. In this study my direction of investigation encompasses the concepts of the appropriateness of high and low intimate disclosure between a designated person and a stranger. Cozby (1973) defined self-disclosure as "any information about himself which Person A communicated to a Person B" (p.73). Obviously, this information can be of either a public or private nature. Goodstein and Reinecker, in a 1974 review of self-disclosure literature, suggested that research in this area should focus on the private, intimate information about the self. Culbert (1968) offers the following definition of self-disclosure:

Self-disclosure refers to an individual's explicitly communicating to one or more others some personal information that he believes these others would be unlikely to acquire unless he himself discloses it. Moreover, this information must be "personally private"; that is, it must be of such a nature that it is not something the individual would disclose to everyone who might inquire about it (p.2).

Derlega and Chaiken (1975) discuss self-disclosure as, "The process by which one person lets himself be known by another person" (p.1).

For the purpose of the present study self-disclosure is defined as, disclosure of intimate information about a designated person to a stranger.

2. Intimate information. Personally private information.
3. Appropriate. Disclosure which suits the time, the occasion, and the relationship between the listener and the discloser.
4. Inappropriate. Disclosure that conflicts strongly with the time, the occasion, the place, and the context for disclosing various matters, and the relationship between the listener and the receiver.
5. College Students. Students enrolled in Communication Arts courses 101 (Theory of Communication) and 150 (Public Speaking) at Washburn University in Topeka, Kansas.

III. A Review of Relevant Studies

"Things are seldom what they seem.
Skim milk masquerades as cream.
Externals don't portray insides,
Jekylls may be masking Hydes."

(Jourard 1971)

The literature to be reviewed relates to the verbal disclosure of information about oneself. We often present a face, an aspect, a side of ourselves that does not reveal our true attitudes, emotions, convictions, etc.. In this section, I will attempt to categorize some of the relevant self-disclosure literature into specific areas.

A. Definitions. Through my investigations I have drawn the conclusion that self-disclosure is defined for the purpose of each individual discloser. Self-disclosure does not refer to specific content, but is rather a behavioristic application of an idea, thought, process. "Self-disclosure may be defined as any information about himself which Person A communicates verbally to a Person B," according to Cozby (1973, p.73). A similar definition comes from Worthy, Gary,

and Kahn (1969), when they talk about self-disclosure as disclosure of something when A knowingly communicates to B information about A which is not generally known and is not otherwise available to B. Terms like "verbal accessibility," Polansky (1965) and "social accessibility," Rickev-Ovsiankina (1956) were forebearers for the synonym of today's self-disclosure. They are ambiguous and rely on individual interpretation for meaning. Jones-Strong (1976) say, "Self-disclosure is usually defined as intentional verbal disclosure of self-referent material to one or more others" (p.59). Self-disclosure has also carried the definition as an index of adjustment according to Jourard (1964). Am I attractive, do I have social desirability, can I afford to take the risk? All interesting aspects of an individual's adjustment, more specifically, aspects of an individual's self-disclosure. Self-disclosure appears in almost every aspect of human social interaction/behavior according to Derlega and Chaiken (1975). In general, intimate disclosure indicates that the discloser trusts his listener according to Derlega and Chaiken (1975).

B. Likability. Controversy arises over two hypotheses: (1) liking-leads to disclosure-to liking and (2) disclosure-leads to liking according to Altman and Taylor (1973). Into this issue comes the aspect of cost/reward. Altman and Taylor (1973) would argue hypothetically that "the process of disclosure and revealing is not rewarding per se for all people, in all situations, or with all recipients" (p.52). Sometimes it must be decided if some degree of disclosure is necessary before one can like another. It may be

necessary to stimulate the other person to reveal or make oneself attractive to the other. Jourard and Lasakaw (1958) and Jourard Landsman (1960) hypothesize, "that liking another person is a result of having disclosed or revealed to that person, almost independent of that person's reaction to the disclosure" (p.50). For a person to be willing to disclose personal information there has to be an element of closeness. "In more general terms, self-disclosure and liking for the other person may be correlated," according to Jourard (1971, p.13).

C. Reciprocity and Target Persons. Chaiken and Derlega (1974) say, "One common finding in the self-disclosure literature is the 'dyadic effect': a subject tends to reciprocate the same level of intimacy to the discloser that has been revealed to him" (p.117-118). Rubin (1973) indicates that modeling behavior may be one of the reciprocity mechanisms of self-disclosure.

There have been numerous ways of viewing and investigating the reciprocity factor of self-disclosure, but the results usually come up similar. If Person A discloses information, Person B will reciprocate and Person A will reveal more and Person B will engage in more disclosure, etc. according to Jourard and Jaffee (1970), Resnick (1970), Worthy et al (1969). Altman and Taylor (1973) quote Jourard and Landsman as saying that, "liking was not as important a factor in revealing, as knowing another person, and they suggested that a process of mutual reciprocity guides the disclosure process, that is, revealing begets revealing as a basic interpersonal process" (p.51).

According to Ehrlich (1971) "It appears that in the development of interpersonal relations mutual self-disclosures tend to be reciprocal and to become more intimate as relationships proceed over time" (p.390).

When we borrow, our culture stresses the paying back of our debts, just as when we give, whether it be materialistic or of oneself; to reciprocate/give back, is almost mandatory. According to Derlega, Harris and Chaiken (1973) "The recipient of intimate information who fails to disclose in return is in an inequitable relationship: the discloser has given him a 'gift' that he has not repaid. The discomfort felt by the recipient arising from this state of affairs can be alleviated by disclosure reciprocity" (p. 283).

Out of the concept of reciprocity comes the premise of target persons: those persons one feels most willing and comfortable disclosing to. In studies, subjects reported that when they revealed a great deal of personal information to their parents and closest friends and likewise, those target persons disclosed a lot back to them (Jourard 1971). The general level of friendship increased as a function of intimate disclosure and as the relationship grew so did the level of self-disclosure according to Walker and Wright (1976). Since such information typically is disclosed only to friends, it is indicated that the relationship carries trust and likability according to Worthy, Gary and Kahn (1969). Jourard (1971) "argued that full, reciprocal disclosure of self is the essence of relationships of love or deep friendship" (p.79).

D. Disclosure to a Stranger. It has been hypothesized that strangers will reveal their most intimate thoughts and problems to one another, things they would not reveal to their closest friend,

relative or associate, because there is relative certainty that they will remain secrets according to Thibaut and Kelly (1959).

In contrast to this theory, Chaiken and Derlega (1974) report that, "disclosure of intimate information to a stranger was responded to negatively, leading subjects to rate the discloser's behavior as inappropriate and maladjusted" (p.591). To take this idea one step further, Chaiken and Derlega (1974) found that disclosure of intimate information to anyone but a close friend was less appropriate and less socially desirable than no disclosure. Chelune (1976) adds, "there was a tendency to see speakers who made a high percentage of self-descriptive statements to a stranger as less emotionally stable and strong than those speakers who revealed less information about themselves" (p.1002). Chelune (1976) quotes Cozby as saying, "High disclosure to a stranger violates the norms of social penetration which suggests that relationships proceed from nonintimate to intimate areas of exchange via verbal disclosure, activities engaged in, and non-verbal communication" (p.1002).

E. Self-disclosure and Attraction. Wortman, Ademan, Herman and Greenberg (1976) say, "several investigators have argued that disclosures are reciprocated because they result in increased interpersonal attraction and trust and that this process causes the relationship to become closer and more intimate" (p.184). Byrne (1971) has done considerable research and provided a vast amount of support for the positive relationship between similarities in attitudes and a subject's interpersonal attraction for others. Jourard (1971) shows "highly significant F-ratios ($p < .001$) were found for comparison between levels of

attractiveness and levels of disclosingness" (p.91).

F. Conclusion. It appears to me that most people want to explore and learn to know each other. Ordinarily, they do not want to lose their individuality, but wish to grow through the experience of self-expression and self-disclosure. Are college students generally ready to accept intimate information from someone they do not know well? In this study, specifically, I will look at the degree to which high intimate disclosure from a stranger is viewed by college students as being appropriate.

IV. Hypothesis

High intimate disclosure from a stranger is viewed as appropriate by college students.

V. Pilot Study

A. Rationale. In the areas of psychology, sociology, social-psychology, counseling, speech communication, and human relations the intriguing concept of self-disclosure has been investigated from many different directions. Cozby (1973) has provided a review of the relevant literature. In his review he describes (1) self-disclosure inventory for adolescents developed by West and Zingle (1969), (2) a system for scoring self-disclosure by preadolescents in interview situations developed by Vondracek and Vondracek (1971), (3) Polansky (1965) developed a concept of "verbal accessibility" and (4) Taylor and Altman (1966) developed the idea of intimacy value and topical category.

In this study, I am specifically concerned with the level of intimate self-disclosure between strangers and how appropriate such disclosure is viewed by college students. Chaiken and Derlega (1975) maintained that self-disclosure may be either appropriate or inappropriate depending on the time, the occasion, and the relationship between the listener and the discloser. They state that, "In general, disclosure is inappropriate when it conflicts strongly with the prevailing norms concerning the time, place, and context for disclosing various matters" (p.12).

The prevailing model of the process of developing interpersonal relationships proceed gradually from a superficial to a more intimate level. For example, the social exchange model of Thibaut and Kelley (1959) describes initial encounters and Kelley (1959) describes initial encounters as typically including polite, stereotyped, socially acceptable behaviors. They state that as the relationship progresses, individuals gradually gain more information about each other. Altman and Taylor (1973) expand the social exchange model in their social penetration theory, in which they assert that interpersonal exchange gradually progresses from superficial, nonintimate areas to more intimate, deeper layers of the selves of the social actors.

Considering this norm, indiscriminate self-disclosure may be seen as deviant behavior in our society. Chaiken and Derlega (1975) refer to the "too-quick self-discloser" as the "plunger," and warn that his behavior may be seen as maladaptive or at least untrustworthy. They caution that the "plunger" may be seen as a person who does not value the privacy of others.

A possible exception to this viewpoint is the well known stranger-on-the-train phenomenon, in which intimate information is disclosed to a person with whom further encounters are unlikely. However, we have no way of knowing how the "stranger" views the discloser in this case, and whether such behavior is seen as deviant.

A possible "new mode" of interacting with others, which is not gradual and systematic, but rather gets quickly to the "core" of the other person, is mentioned by Altman and Taylor (1973), as an indication that norms may be changing. In discussing their social penetration model with students, Altman and Taylor discovered a widespread commitment to "genuiness," "openness," and "honesty." This commitment seems to result in greater value being placed on ready accessibility of the self to others rather than on behaving in accord with traditional social norms. The popularity of such books as Contract: The First Four Minutes (Zunin and Zunin, 1972) and Pairing: how to Achieve Genuine Intimacy (Bach and Deutsch, 1970) lends support to this idea.

However, in a recent experiment which Chaiken and Derlega (1974) conducted with college student subjects, they found strong evidence that these subjects considered intimate information to a stranger inappropriate. Specifically, they had subjects read one of four disclosure scripts, two of which contained highly intimate information and two of which contained low intimate information. The subjects were told to imagine that two girls had just met one another for the first time, and that the first girl had just told the other girl what was written in the script. After reading the script of

the first girl's disclosure, the subjects were asked to rate her on nine nine-point scales.

Analysis of these ratings showed that the subjects saw the high intimacy disclosure (both scripts) as less appropriate ($F=49.4$, $p < .001$) and more unusual ($F=30.5$, $p < .001$) than the low intimacy disclosure scripts. Subjects also liked the low discloser more than the high discloser ($F=8.7$, $p < .005$) and were more willing to be friends with the low revealer ($F=10.1$, $p < .003$). No significant differences were found between the responses to the two highly intimate scripts.

Chaiken and Derlega (1974) concluded that since the behavior of the high revealer was seen as less appropriate and more unusual than that of the low revealer, "it would appear that a norm prohibiting intimate disclosure to a stranger does exist" (p.126).

They emphasized that these results occurred regardless of any possible differences in the content of the intimate disclosures, and that there were no significant differences in ratings given by male or female subjects.

In an informal pilot study that Lynn Osterkamp and I conducted, we used this study by Chaiken and Derlega (1974) as model for replication. We were specifically interested in discovering whether we could find similar evidence. Our hypothesis, based on the results of Chaiken and Derlega (1974) was that, "Revealing highly intimate information to a stranger is seen as inappropriate." The results of this informal replication were different enough to create some interest and inspire thoughts that possibly some self-disclosure trends are changing. The following is a description of the parts of the pilot study.

B. Subjects. Thirty-nine students enrolled in beginning speech classes at Washburn University in Topeka, Kansas, served as subjects.

C. Materials. Chaiken and Derlega's four disclosure scripts were used, with changes only where necessary to conform with a Kansas location. These scripts were used because pretest ratings reported by Chaiken and Derlega showed the two high intimacy disclosure scripts to be rated significantly higher in intimacy than the two low intimacy scripts ($F=51.5, p<.001$). Two scripts were used for each level of intimacy which pretests had shown were approximately equivalently intimate at each level. This was done in order to minimize the danger of confounding topic content with topic intimacy. (See Appendix B for scripts)

D. Procedure. The four scripts were distributed randomly to the subjects. Each subject read only one script. All subjects were told to imagine that two girls had just met each other in the school cafeteria for the first time, and the first girl (Sue) had just told the other girl what was written in the script. The subjects were asked to read the script and then rate Sue on a nine-point rating scale.

These instructions, as well as the rating scales used, were the same as those used by Chaiken and Derlega. The questionnaire items included ratings of liking for Sue, trust in her, judgment of Sue's psychological adjustment, Sue's warmth, desire to have Sue as a friend, the appropriateness of Sue's behavior, the degree to which her behavior was unusual, Sue's typical level of intimacy in talking to others, and the subject's confidence in the estimate. (See Appendix F for questionnaire)

E. Results. Mean ratings given by the subjects reading the high intimacy scripts were compared with mean ratings given by subjects reading the low intimacy scripts for all nine of the rating scales. These data are summarized in Table 1, T-test Results For Pilot Study. Analysis of the data showed that the subjects reading the high intimacy scripts rated the way "Sue usually talks to people" as significantly more intimate than did those subjects reading the low intimacy scripts ($t=2.17$, $p<.05$). There were no significant differences between the two groups on the other rating scales.

These results are contrary to those of Chaiken and Derlega, who found that subjects rated disclosure in the high intimacy condition as significantly more inappropriate ($p<.001$), and more unusual ($p<.005$), and were more willing to be friends with the low revealer ($p<.003$). Our results actually showed an opposite trend for the liking dimension, although the difference was not significant. We found that subjects liked the high revealer more than they liked the low revealer ($t=1.74$, $p<.10$). We found, essentially, no difference between the groups in their willingness to have as a friend.

F. Discussion. The fact that we did find a significant difference between subjects reading the high intimacy scripts and the subjects reading the low intimacy scripts on their rating of "how intimately Sue usually talks to people," indicates that our subjects were aware of the intimacy level of the scripts they were reading. That is, since subjects reading the high intimacy scripts felt that Sue usually talks to people significantly more intimately than did subjects reading the low intimacy scripts, we can assume that our failure to obtain findings similar to those of Chaiken and Derlega

was not due to our subjects disagreeing on the intimacy level of disclosure.

Of course, we could not conclude on the basis of our results that Chaiken and Derlega's conclusions were in error. A number of possibilities, including some unique characteristics of their sample, or of our sample, could account for the differences in results. Also, there were some differences in administration, as their subjects participated in a true laboratory setting, while ours participated as part of a class exercise.

Specifically, by conducting our experiment as a classroom exercise, we may have introduced a new variable. This could be caused by the fact that the instructor of the beginning speech course for the classes in which our experiment was conducted doubled her role as experimenter and as instructor. We believe this could have affected our results, because this instructor was known to be more intimate and self-disclosing in relating to her students than are most other faculty members at Washburn University. So, she may have established a classroom atmosphere in which high intimacy was highly valued, and her students may have unconsciously reacted to this factor in evaluating disclosure in the pilot study.

Nevertheless, our findings did seem to point the way to a need for further investigation of this question. Particularly, the fact that our subjects expressed more liking for the high discloser ($M=5.45$) than for the low discloser ($M=4.44$), even though the difference is not significant, is an interesting result. Also, the fact that our subjects found the high discloser to be just as trustworthy, well-adjusted, and almost as appropriate as the low discloser, raises some questions.

TABLE 1

T-test Results For Pilot Study

Rating Scale	Intimacy Level	Mean	Standard Deviation	Test for differences between Means
Liking for Sue	High (N=20)	5.45	2.51	t=1.74
	Low (N=18)	4.44	1.75	
Trust of Sue	High (N=20)	4.30	1.72	t=.11
	Low (N=19)	4.36	1.71	
Like to have Sue as friend	High (N=20)	5.25	2.10	t=.10
	Low (N=19)	5.32	2.26	
Sue's psychological adjustment	High (N=20)	4.40	2.68	t=.32
	Low (N=19)	4.68	2.81	
Warm or cold person	High (N=20)	6.35	2.16	t=.10
	Low (N=19)	6.42	2.16	
Appropriateness of Sue's comments	High (N=20)	3.95	2.87	t=.96
	Low (N=19)	4.84	2.97	
Intimacy Sue usually talks to people	High (N=19)	7.0	2.69	t=2.17*
	Low (N=19)	4.79	3.13	
Confidence in intimacy rating	High (N=19)	7.37	2.19	t=1.46
	Low (N=19)	6.32	2.36	
How unusual Sue's behavior	High (N=20)	6.0	3.08	t=.22
	Low (N=19)	5.79	2.82	

*sig. at .05 level (df=36)

On the bases of our pilot study we asked whether the norm that Chaiken and Derlega proposed in (1974) prohibiting intimate disclosure to a stranger, is changing as Altman and Taylor (1973) suggested. Although a good deal has been written on the topic of self-disclosure, Goodstein and Reinecker concluded their 1974 review of the literature by saying, "As yet there has been little done to study the effects of too much or premature self-disclosure" (p.72). They suggested further research in this area.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURES FOR THE MAJOR STUDY

I. Subjects

The one hundred fifty five subjects for this study were all enrolled in either one of the two basic communication arts courses (Theory of Communication and Public Speaking) at Washburn University in Topeka, Kansas. I felt that this pool sufficiently represented many different backgrounds, because these two classes are a general education requirement for graduation, indicating a large representation of the university population.

II. Research Design

The condition being investigated was the reactions of college students to the appropriateness of two levels of (Sue's) disclosure (high and low) to a stranger. There were four scripts (two high intimacy and two low intimacy) distributed randomly to approximately twenty to thirty subjects at one time.

III Materials

Chaiken and Derlega's four disclosure scripts were used in the pilot study, but a revision of their scripts were used in the major

study, striving to keep the language and events as constant as possible.

The scripts used in the major study were pretested using forty-six subjects in pretest No. 1 and forty-seven subjects in pretest No. 2 to assess the intimacy level of each script. I used an analysis of variance and an orthogonal contrast to analyze the data and determine the intimacy level of each script.

IV. Procedure

Each of the subjects received and responded to one of the four scripts that were randomly distributed. Each subject read only one script. All subjects were told to imagine that two girls had just met each other for the first time, and the first girl (Sue) had just told the other girl what was written in the script. The subjects were asked to read the script and then rate Sue on a number of nine-point rating scales. (See Appendix A for instructions)

These instructions were the same as those used by Chaiken and Derlega, and the same as those used in the pilot study. However, the scripts used by Chaiken and Derlega were revised to make the language and events constant in general. (See Appendix C for major study scripts) I wanted to make the language and events as similar as possible so that the subjects would not be responding to the differences of the written language or specific happenings of each script. In the present study, an attempt was made to make the script as constant as possible without interfering with the intimacy level (personally private information) of each script. In this way it was believed

that the ratings on the questionnaire items would reflect more accurately the reactions of the subjects to the level of intimacy.

The rating scales that were used were the same as those used by Chaiken and Derlega. The questionnaire items included ratings of liking for Sue, trust in her, judgment of Sue's psychological adjustment, Sue's warmth, desire to have Sue as a friend, the appropriateness of Sue's behavior, the degree to which her behavior was unusual, Sue's typical level of intimacy in talking to others, and the subjects' confidence in this estimate. (See Appendix F for questionnaire)

The new scripts were pretested to determine the intimacy levels (personally private information) of each of the four scripts. Approximately fifty subjects rated each of the four scripts on a nine-point scale of intimacy. (See Appendix D for rating scale) These scales were subjected to determine that their levels of intimacy were perceived as different.

V. Data Analysis

The pretested scripts were subjected to a 2x1 analysis of variance looking for differences between the combinations of scripts one and four and two and three. Then an a priori orthogonal test was performed to see if the scripts were statistically independent.

Results from the reading of the scripts and responding to the questionnaire were subjected to a 2x1 analysis of variance showing two levels of intimacy (high and low) disclosed by Sue to a stranger, and the degree to which high intimacy disclosure is viewed by college

students as appropriate on nine nine-point scales. Then a Scheffe test for multiple comparisons was administered to compare the results between each group.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The question investigated for this study was: Is high intimate disclosure from a stranger viewed as appropriate by college students? Responses were obtained by having each subject respond to one of four scripts (two high intimate and two low intimate) and then indicate their reactions to these scripts by using nine nine-point scales. The scales rated liking for Sue (the purported originator of the messages in the scripts), trust in her, judgment of Sue's psychological adjustment, Sue's warmth, desire to have Sue as a friend, the appropriateness of Sue's behavior, the degree to which her behavior was unusual, Sue's typical level of intimacy in talking to others, and the subjects' confidence in their ratings. (See Appendix F for questionnaire) The results of this study will be reported in two categories: results of the two tests for the validation of the stimulus scripts and then results on the research question.

Two tests were performed to verify a significant difference between the high and low intimacy levels of the scripts. Then the revised scripts were used as a stimulus for the major study.

I. Validation of Stimulus Scripts

The four scripts, moderately revised from the pilot study to

keep the language and events constant, were evaluated on a nine-point rating scale from low intimacy to high intimacy. (See Appendix D for rating scale) A two-dimensional analysis of variance for only one entry per cell was used for data analysis. The program for the analysis of variance was, The Funstat Program in Fortran IV, M₂ written by Roscoe (1973). In addition to the results from the analysis of variance, Dr. Gary Forbach, a professor at Washburn University, helped perform an orthogonal contrast test as explained by Kirk (1978) to further tighten the results.

A. Test #1. The forty-six subjects' (N=46) responses on a nine-point rating scale of high and low intimacy comprised a 2x1 analysis of variance indicating a significant difference between the high and low intimacy scripts ($p < .05$). However, an a priori orthogonal contrast demonstrated that the scripts were not appropriate for this study. In step one, scripts one and four were significantly different from scripts two and three, but scripts one and four were significantly different from each other ($p < .001$).

Step 1.

$$t = \frac{4.98 - 6.65}{\frac{\sqrt{2(4.6961)}}{46}}$$

$$t = 3.696$$

$$df = 135$$

$$(p < .001)$$

This means that the difference between the high and low intimacy scripts could be attributed to script four alone. A second step demonstrated that scripts two and three were not different ($p > .50$).

Step 2.

$$t = \frac{4.43 - 4.64}{\frac{\sqrt{2(4.6961)}}{46}}$$

$$t = 0.465$$

$$df = 135$$

$$(p > .25)$$

Thus far, the conclusion was that scripts two and three measured a similar variable, low intimacy. However, only script four measured high intimacy. A third orthogonal manipulation demonstrated that scripts one and four were not significantly different from scripts two and three ($p < .001$) when scripts one and four are treated separately.

Step 3.

$$t = \frac{\frac{1}{2}(4.98) + \frac{1}{2}(4.43) + \frac{1}{2}(4.64) - \frac{1}{2}(6.65)}{\sqrt{4.6961 \left[\frac{(-\frac{1}{2})^2}{46} + \frac{(\frac{1}{2})^2}{46} + \frac{(\frac{1}{2})^2}{46} + \frac{(-\frac{1}{2})^2}{46} \right]}}$$

$$t = \frac{1.28}{0.31951}$$

$$df = 135$$

$$t = -4.01$$

$$(p < .001)$$

Without the orthogonal contrast the scripts tested first could have been used, but they would have had to be used in combinations rather than as separate instruments. Scripts one and four together would have measured high intimacy and scripts two and three together would have measured low intimacy, but that would have confounded the data because scripts one and four contained different content. The subjects could have been reacting to content rather than intimacy. So, the researcher elected to rewrite script one in order to improve the validity of the stimulus scripts. (See Appendix D for validation stimulus scripts test #1)

B. Test 2. Results of test two also included an orthogonal contrast. Step one demonstrated that scripts one and four were not different ($p > .25$).

Step 1.

$$t = \frac{6.63 - 6.43}{\frac{\sqrt{2(6.1919)}}{47}} = \frac{.2}{.51}$$

$$t = 0.3896 \quad df = 138$$

($p > .25$)

Step two demonstrates that scripts two and three did not differ ($p > .25$).

Step 2.

$$t = \frac{3.80 - 4.32}{\frac{\sqrt{2(6.1919)}}{47}} = \frac{0.52}{0.51}$$

$$t = -1.013 \quad df = 138$$

($p > .25$)

The final step demonstrated that scripts one and four treated separately differed from scripts two and three treated separately ($p < .001$).

Step 3.

$$t = \frac{(-\frac{1}{2})6.63 + \frac{1}{2}(3.80) + \frac{1}{2}(4.32) + (-\frac{1}{2})(6.43)}{\sqrt{6.1919 \left[\frac{(-\frac{1}{2})^2}{47} + \frac{(\frac{1}{2})^2}{47} + \frac{(\frac{1}{2})^2}{47} + \frac{(\frac{1}{2})^2}{47} \right]}} = \frac{3.96}{0.363}$$

$$t = 10.910 \quad df = 138$$

($p < .001$)

More succinctly, we now knew that the high intimacy scripts measured intimacy, not content and the low intimacy scripts measured intimacy, not content. The orthogonal contrast strengthens the stimulus instrument (the scripts) and demonstrates that the level of significance can

be attributed to the difference in intimacy of the scripts.

II. Major Study Results

The one hundred fifty-two subjects (N=152) responded to nine nine-point rating scales. (See Appendix F for questionnaire) The investigator of this study chose to accept ($p < .05$) level of significance. The subjects' evaluations of Sue's behavior comprised a 2x1 analysis of variance observing significance for each scale. The hypothesis to be tested was: high intimate disclosure from a stranger is viewed as appropriate by college students, that is, there would be no significant difference between students' responses to the low intimacy scripts compared with their responses to the high intimacy scripts. Their responses were measured on nine scales and none of the nine scales showed significant difference ($p < .05$).

Further examination, using the Scheffe test for multiple comparisons as explained by Kirk (1978), reached significance on only one rating scale. The Scheffe test is a conservative comparison of group means of individual items. It locates which means were significantly different from each other. The Scheffe test would isolate significance among the four means whereas the analysis of variance would only show differences between two means. On the Scheffe test, scales one through eight (See Appendix F for questionnaire) did not show significance differences ($p < .05$).

SUMMARY TABLE 2

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATING SCALE #1:
DO YOU THINK YOU WOULD LIKE SUE?

Source of variance	Sum of squares	d.f.	Mean squares	F
Between groups	21.7551	3.	7.2517	1.8511
Within groups	579.7976	148.	3.9176	
Total	601.5527	151.		

SUMMARY TABLE 3

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATING SCALE #2:
HOW MUCH DO YOU TRUST SUE?

Source of variance	Sum of squares	d.f.	Mean Squares	F
Between groups	17.4651	3	5.8217	1.3441
Within groups	641.0547	148	4.3315	
Total	658.5198	151		

SUMMARY TABLE 4

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATING SCALE #3:
WOULD YOU LIKE TO HAVE SUE AS A FRIEND?

Source of variance	Sum of squares	d.f.	Mean squares	F
Between groups	27.8855	3	9.2952	2.2190
Within groups	619.9502	148	4.1889	
Total	647.8357	151		

SUMMARY TABLE 5

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATING SCALE #4:
HOW WOULD YOU RATE SUE'S PSYCHOLOGICAL ADJUSTMENT?

Source of variance	Sum of squares	d.f.	Mean squares	F
Between groups	33.2476	3	11.0825	1.8904
Within groups	867.6406	148	5.8624	
Total	900.8882	151		

SUMMARY TABLE 6

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATING SCALE #5:
DO YOU THINK SUE IS A WARM OR COLD PERSON?

Source of variance	Sum of squares	d.f.	Mean squares	F
Between groups	20.3867	3	6.7956	1.8961
Within groups	530.4297	148	3.5840	
Total	550.8164	151		

SUMMARY TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATING SCALE #6:
HOW APPROPRIATE DO YOU THINK SUE'S COMMENTS WERE?

Source of variance	Sum of squares	d.f.	Mean squares	F
Between groups	15.5686	3	5.1895	1.0422
Within groups	736.9314	148	4.9793	
Total	752.5000	151		

SUMMARY TABLE 8

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATING SCALE #7:
HOW UNUSUAL DO YOU THINK SUE'S BEHAVIOR WAS IN THIS SITUATION?

Source of variance	Sum of squares	d.f.	Mean squares	F
Between groups	30.5410	3	10.1803	1.4413
Within groups	1045.3999	148	7.0635	
Total	1075.9409	151		

SUMMARY TABLE 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATING SCALE #8:
HOW INTIMATELY DO YOU THINK SUE USUALLY TALKS TO PEOPLE?

Source of variance	Sum of squares	d.f.	Mean squares	F
Between groups	56.8789	3	18.9596	3.7667
Within groups	744.9570	148	5.0335	
Total	801.8359	151		

However, the Scheffe test revealed a significance difference ($p < .05$) in students' responses on one rating scale; thus indicating that the subjects had significantly different reactions to scripts earlier identified as different in degree of intimacy. This scale was #9: How confident are you of your rating of how intimately Sue usually talks to people?

SUMMARY TABLE 10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATING SCALE #9:
HOW CONFIDENT ARE YOU OF YOUR RATING OF HOW INTIMATELY SUE
USUALLY TALKS TO PEOPLE?

Source of variance	Sum of squares	d.f.	Mean squares	F
Between groups	55.9023	3	18.6341	*3.3397
Within groups	825.7773	148	5.5796	
Total	881.6797	151		

*Significance ($p < .05$)

These findings will be discussed further in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine if high intimate disclosure from a stranger is viewed as appropriate by college students. Refer to Chapters II and III for a detailed explanation of the methodology and results for this study.

The results of the study of self-disclosure are in contrast to the results of the dominant study that this investigation paralleled by Chaiken and Derlega (1974). Chaiken and Derlega (1974) found "that revealing highly intimate information to a stranger, even when the stranger will not be seen again, is counter-normative" (p.125). Washburn University Communication Arts 101 and 150 students, the subjects for this study, found high intimate disclosure to a stranger as acceptable as low intimate disclosure as indicated by their responses to a questionnaire (See Appendix F). The conclusion can be drawn that: Washburn University Communication Arts 101 and 150 students appear to accept disclosure at both high and low intimate levels. This conclusion was established by the statistical evidence of the present study; there was no significance difference ($p < .05$) between the responses of the subjects to the questionnaires regarding the four scripts (See Appendix C for scripts). In Chaiken and Derlega's (1974)

study they found that their, "subjects rated disclosure in . . . high intimacy conditions as more inappropriate ($F = 49.4, p < .001$) and more unusual ($F = 30.5, p < .001$) than in . . . low intimacy conditions" (p.126).

This study has opened a new door for further study in changing trends of self-disclosure. Until this time, the literature has generally suggested that high intimate disclosure to a stranger is seen as inappropriate, unacceptable and threatening. Possibly, this study will inspire other investigators to look at the other side of the coin. Of course, this study cannot provide concrete, hard core evidence that high intimate disclosure is acceptable to all. It only suggests that possibly people, times and trends of behavior are changing. There are a number of questions and possibilities, including some unique characteristics of the sample, the time in the semester that the test was administered, the nature of the population sampled, perhaps a new openness evolving between 1974 and 1978, perhaps more acceptance of once taboo subjects and possibly a new ethic proposed by Altman and Taylor (1973) (see paragraph below) that could account for this study's results.

As compared to other universities within the surrounding vicinity, Washburn University has been labeled conservative. This observation helps strengthen the present study's results. It would be thought that a conservative sampling would tend to react more favorably toward messages having a low intimacy level, but the subjects used in this study accepted both high and low levels of intimacy in regard to the questionnaire administered by the investigator (See Appendix F for questionnaire).

Another aspect of the sample that needs to be acknowledged, is the diversity of the subjects' educational backgrounds. All the subjects used in this study were enrolled in communication arts courses, 101 and 150, which are general educational requirements for graduation; thus pooling subjects from all academic majors, not just those with speech communication orientation. This factor could possibly influence their reactions and acceptance of different levels of (high and low intimacy) disclosure. In essence, the subjects used in this study had a minimal amount of exposure to communication theory regarding self-disclosure.

Similar to the above discussion about sampling influences and biases, the time period during the semester in which the test was administered needs to be discussed. Had the intimacy scripts been read and the questionnaire responded to at the end of the academic semester, the conclusion could be inferred and/or drawn that the introduction to communication theory could have possibly influenced the subjects' responses to the disclosure scripts and questionnaire. The investigator took this possibility into consideration and administered the test the first week of the Spring, 1978 semester. Therefore, the results of this study cannot be attributed to a semester of learning communication skills. The results are strictly based on the subjects' responses to the four intimacy scripts and questionnaire. They appear to accept both high and low levels of intimate disclosure.

Chaiken and Derlega's (1974) study, "Liking for the norm-breaker in self disclosure," which the present study parallels, would seem to

need updating according to the results of this study. Chaiken and Derlega (1974) report, "The high revealer was evaluated less highly and was seen as more inappropriate and unusual than the low revealer." (p.126) The present study's results indicate that the subjects were more accepting of high intimate disclosure. This would suggest that times may be changing. There may be a new openness and desire to know and be known by others. This area of research needs to be continually investigated, because time and people are not static. They are in a constant state of flux. Behaviors, attitudes, needs and the environment change daily, so to assume that standards of 1974 will remain the same in 1978 is not realistic.

As the world changes so people may become more liberalized. Perhaps this is a reason why the subjects of this study found high intimate disclosure as acceptable as low intimate disclosure in regards to the questionnaire. Taboo events, such as sexual affairs, illegitimate babies, psychiatric analysis and unfaithful spouses, the content of the four intimacy scripts, appear to be more and more acceptable topics for interpersonal communication (See Appendix C for Scripts). It would appear that people are more willing to talk about themselves honestly and have others listen; thus, self-disclosure occurs.

A new ethic proposed by Altman and Taylor (1973) could possibly account for this study's results. Altman and Taylor (1973) say, "The idea is to facilitate the breaking out of normal, stereotyped modes of relating to others as quickly as possible in order to facilitate cutting through barriers that people establish to prevent

premature interpersonal exchange" (p.183). I would conclude from the results of this study, that people honestly want to communicate on a personal/intimate level and they are moving toward their desired goal.

In summary, the results of this study indicate that the subjects were willing to accept high intimate disclosure as well as low intimate disclosure as indicated by the questionnaire (See Appendix F). This finding is in conflict with previous research and literature indicating a possible new pattern in self-disclosure behavior. Research needs to be continued to examine changing trends in society's acceptance of self-disclosure.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PILOT STUDY AND MAJOR STUDY



INSTRUCTIONS FOR PILOT STUDY AND MAJOR STUDY

Each subject will read only one script. All subjects will be told to imagine that two girls have just met each other in the school cafeteria for the first time and the first girl (Sue) has just told the other girl what is written in the script. The subjects will be asked to read the script and then rate Sue on a number of nine-point rating scales.

APPENDIX B

SCRIPTS FOR PILOT STUDY

HIGH INTIMACY SCRIPT

My name is Sue Smith and I'll be a junior next year here at Washburn University. I've got an apartment not too far from school, on Mulvane. I've had it for about a year; before that I was living at home, but I had to move out. Well, I didn't really have to, but I think it was the only thing to do. You see, I was going with this guy named Bill, and we really got along beautifully. He was my first major relationship. I'd never gone to bed with anyone before Bill, but with him it just seemed so natural and good, so I wasn't ashamed of anything. So, that wasn't my problem. My mother found out about our relationship and there was a big blow-up. So, I decided to move out. Bill and I are much happier since I moved.

HIGH INTIMACY SCRIPT

My name is Sue Smith. Right now I'm rather upset. My mother just had a nervous breakdown. She's in Bayberry Psychiatric Hospital, and I really believe it's my fault. Mom and Dad have never gotten along. They had me early in their marriage, maybe too early. I think they've stuck together this long just for me. They resent me, and I guess I haven't been the perfect kid, disobeying them, going out with people they don't like, and not doing what they want. I don't see Dad very much, cause he works a lot. But any time I'm around Mom, we fight. I used to think it was her fault, but now I realize she had a lot on her mind and I wasn't helping any. A couple of weeks ago, they started talking about divorce. That really scared me and I was pleading with them to stick together. But, I guess they figured I was grown up enough to handle it--so anyway, I guess Mom just couldn't take it anymore, and she just sort of collapsed. I don't know what's going to happen now, all I know is that I feel responsible for what went wrong.

LOW INTIMACY SCRIPTS

Well, my name is Sue Smith, and I go to school at Kansas University. I'm just taking some courses here at Washburn University just to have something to do. Washburn University is all right, but I really enjoy getting away from home and living in the dorms. You get to meet so many people. y'know? I have two older brothers and a kid sister who's still in high school. One of my brothers goes to the University of Virginia--he's married and has a little girl who'll be two in August. Right now I'm taking English Composition and Algebra. The teachers are O.K., and I guess so are the courses. But, I'm really looking forward to the Fall when I can go back to my friends at school.

* * * * *

My name is Sue Smith and I'll be a junior next year here at Washburn University. I was born in Tampa, Florida, in 1952, so I'm 20 years old. We moved to Norfolk when I was 7, then to Lawrence 3 years later. I've lived there ever since. . . . It's kind of rough commuting every day to school, but it's really economical, and I can save my money for things I want. I'm an English major, and I really enjoy the program --maybe after I graduate, I'll go on and get my Master's degree--I don't know. I think I might enjoy going to graduate school at a place like the University of Kansas.

APPENDIX C

SCRIPTS FOR THE MAJOR STUDY

HIGH INTIMACY SCRIPT--SCRIPT #1

My name is Sue Smith and I'll be a junior next year here at Washburn University. I've got an apartment not too far from school, on Mulvane. I've had it for about a year; before that I was living at home and my mother and I argued all the time, so I moved out. I didn't have to, but I think it was the only thing to do. You see, I was having an affair with this guy named Bill, we really got along well and our sex life was beautiful, but he was married. He was my first major relationship. I'd never gone to bed with anyone before Bill, but with him it just seemed so natural and good. I got pregnant, but I wasn't ashamed of anything. So, that wasn't my problem. My mother found out about the affair and my pregnancy, and there was a big blow-up, so I decided to move out. Bill and I are much happier since I moved, but we're not sure what to do about the baby.

LOW INTIMACY SCRIPT--SCRIPT #2

My name is Sue Smith and I'll be a junior next year here at Washburn University. I've got an apartment not too far from school, on Mulvane. I've had it for about a year; before that I was living at home, but I moved out. I didn't have to, but I think it was the thing to do. You see, I was going with this guy named Bill, and we really got along beautifully. He was my first major relationship. I'd never gone with anyone before Bill, but going with him just seemed so natural and good. My mother found out about our relationship and there was a big blow-up. So, I decided to move out. Bill and I are much happier since I moved.

LOW INTIMACY SCRIPT--SCRIPT #3

My name is Sue Smith. Right now I'm rather upset. My mother is ill. She's in the hospital and I wonder if it's my fault. I guess I haven't been the perfect kid, disobeying them, going out with people they don't like, and not doing what they want. I don't see Dad very much, cause he works a lot. But anytime I'm around Mom, we fight. I used to think it was her fault, but now I realize she had a lot on her mind, and I wasn't helping any. I guess Mom just couldn't take it any more. I don't know what's going to happen now.

HIGH INTIMACY SCRIPT--SCRIPT #4

My name is Sue Smith. Right now I'm rather upset. My mother just had a nervous breakdown. She's in Bayberry Psychiatric Hospital and I really believe it's my fault. Mom and Dad have never gotten along. They had me early in their marriage, maybe too early. I think they've stuck together this long just for me. They resent me, and I guess I haven't been the perfect kid, disobeying them, going out with people they don't like, and not doing what they want. I don't see Dad very much, cause he works a lot. But anytime I'm around Mom, we fight. I used to think it was her fault, but now I realize she had a lot on her mind, and I wasn't helping any. A couple of weeks ago, they started talking about divorce. That really scared me and I was pleading with them to stick together. But I guess they figured I was grown up enough to handle it--so anyway, I guess Mom just couldn't take it anymore, and she just sort of collapsed. I don't know what's going to happen now, all I know is that I feel responsible for what went wrong.

APPENDIX D

VALIDATION STIMULUS SCRIPTS #1 AND RATING SCALE



SCRIPT #1

My name is Sue Smith and I'll be a junior next year here at Washburn University. I've got an apartment not too far from school, on Mulvane. I've had it for about a year; before that I was living at home, but I had to move out. Well, I didn't really have to, but I think it was the only thing to do. You see, I was going with this guy named Bill, and we really got along beautifully. He was my first major relationship. I'd never gone to bed with anyone before Bill, but with him it just seemed so natural and good, so I wasn't ashamed of anything. So that wasn't my problem. My mother found out about our relationship and there was a big blow-up. So, I decided to move out. Bill and I are much happier since I moved.

SCRIPT #2

My name is Sue Smith and I'll be a junior next year at Washburn University. I've got an apartment not too far from school, on Mulvane. I've had it for about a year; before that I was living at home, but I moved out. I didn't have to, but I think it was the thing to do. You see, I was going with this guy named Bill, and we really got along beautifully. He was my first major relationship. I'd never gone with anyone before Bill, but going with him just seemed so natural and good. My mother found out about our relationship, and there was a big blow-up. So, I decided to move out. Bill and I are much happier since I moved.

SCRIPT #3

My name is Sue Smith. Right now I'm rather upset. My mother is ill. She's in the hospital and I wonder if it's my fault. I guess I haven't been the perfect kid, disobeying them, going out with people they don't like, and not doing what they want. I don't see Dad very much, cause he works alot. But anytime I'm around Mom we fight. I used to think it was her fault, but now I realize she had a lot on her mind, and I wasn't helping any. I guess Mom just couldn't take it anymore, I don't know what's going to happen now.

SCRIPT #4

My name is Sue Smith. Right now I'm rather upset. My mother just had a nervous breakdown. She's in Bayberry Psychiatric Hospital and I really believe it's my fault. Mom and Dad have never gotten along. They had me early in their marriage, maybe too early. I think they've stuck together this long just for me. They resent me, and I guess I haven't been the perfect kid, disobeying them, going out with people they don't like, and not doing what they want. I don't see Dad very much, cause he works a lot. But anytime I'm around Mom we fight. I used to think it was her fault, but now I realize she had a lot on her mind, and I wasn't helping any. A couple of weeks ago, they started talking about divorce. That really scared me and I was pleading them to stick together. But I guess they figured I was grown up enough to handle it--so anyway, I guess Mom just couldn't take it anymore, and she just sort of collapsed. I don't know what's going to happen now, all I know is that I feel responsible for what went wrong.

Intimacy Scales for Pretesting of Scripts

Script #1:

How intimate is this script?

Low intimate _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ highly intimate

Script #2:

How intimate is this script?

Low intimate _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ highly intimate

Script #3:

How intimate is this script?

Low intimate _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ highly intimate

Script #4:

How intimate is this script?

Low intimate _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ highly intimate

APPENDIX E

VALIDATION STIMULUS SCRIPTS #2 AND RATING SCALE



SCRIPT #1

My name is Sue Smith and I'll be a junior next year here at Washburn University. I've got an apartment not too far from school, on Mulvane. I've had it for about a year; before that I was living at home and my mother and I argued all the time, so I moved out. I didn't have to, but I think it was the only thing to do. You see, I was having an affair with this guy named Bill, we really got along well and our sex life was beautiful, but he was married. He was my first major relationship. I'd never gone to bed with anyone before Bill, but iwth him it just seemed so natural and good. I got pregnant, but I wasn't ashamed of anything. So, that wasn't my problem. My mother found out about the affair and my pregnancy, and there was a big blow-up, so I decided to move out. Bill and I are much happier since I moved, but we're not sure what to do about the baby.

SCRIPT #2

My name is Sue Smith and I'll be a junior next year at Washburn University. I've got an apartment not too far from school, on Mulvane. I've had it for about a year; before that I was living at home, but I moved out. I didn't have to, but I think it was the thing to do. You see, I was going with this guy named Bill, and we really got along beautifully. He was my first major relationship. I'd never gone with anyone before Bill, but going with him just seemed so natural and good. My mother found out about our relationship, and there was a big blow-up. So, I decided to move out. Bill and I are much happier since I moved.

SCRIPT #3

My name is Sue Smith. Right now I'm rather upset. My mother is ill. She's in the hospital and I wonder if it's my fault. I guess I haven't been the perfect kid, disobeying them, going out with people they don't like, and not doing what they want. I don't see Dad very much, cause he works a lot. But anytime I'm around Mom we fight. I used to think it was her fault, but now I realize she had a lot on her mind and I wasn't helping any. I guess Mom just couldn't take it anymore, I don't know what's going to happen now.

SCRIPT #4

My name is Sue Smith. Right now I'm rather upset. My mother just had a nervous breakdown. She's in Bayberry Psychiatric Hospital and I really believe it's my fault. Mom and Dad have never gotten along. They had me early in their marriage, maybe too early. I think they've stuck together this long just for me. They resent me, and I guess I haven't been the perfect kid; disobeying them, going out with people they don't like, and not doing what they want. I don't see Dad very much, cause he works a lot. But anytime I'm around Mom we fight. I used to think it was her fault, but now I realize she had a lot on her mind, and I wasn't helping any. A couple of weeks ago, they started talking about divorce. That really scared me and I was pleading them to stick together. But I guess they figured I was grown up enough to handle it--so anyway, I guess Mom just couldn't take it anymore, and she just sort of collapsed. I don't know what's going to happen now, all I know is that I feel responsible for what went wrong.

Intimacy Scales for Pretesting of Scripts

Script #1:

How intimate is this script?

Low intimate _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ highly intimate

Script #2:

How intimate is this script?

Low intimate _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ highly intimate

Script #3:

How intimate is this script?

Low intimate _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ highly intimate

Script #4:

How intimate is this script?

Low intimate _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ highly intimate

APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PILOT STUDY AND MAJOR STUDY

QUESTIONNAIRE

Each subject will read only one script. All subjects will be told to imagine that two girls had just met each other in the school cafeteria for the first time, and the first girl (Sue) had just told the other girl what was written in the script. The subjects will be asked to read the script and then rate Sue on a number of nine-point scales.

1. Do you think you would like Sue?

not at all	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	very much
---------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------------

2. How much would you trust Sue?

not at all	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	very much
---------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------------

3. Would you like to have Sue as a friend?

not at all	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	very much
---------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------------

4. How would you rate Sue's psychological adjustment?

very poor	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	very good
--------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------------

5. Do you think Sue is a warm or a cold person?

very cold	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	very warm
--------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------------

6. How appropriate do you think Sue's comments were?

_____ not _____ very
 appropriate appropriate

7. How unusual do you think Sue's behavior was in this situation?

_____ very _____ not
 unusual unusual

8. How intimately do you think Sue usually talks to people?

_____ not intimately _____ very
 at all intimately

9. How confident are you of your rating of how intimately Sue usually talks to people?

_____ not confident _____ confident
 at all

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Altman, Irwin and Taylor, Dalmis A., Social Penetration The Development of Interpersonal Relationships, New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Ashworth, Clark; Furman, Gail; Chaiken, Alan and Derlega, Valerian, Physiological responses to self-disclosure. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1976 (Spr), Vol 16(2), 71-80.
- Bach, G. R. and Deutsch, R. M., Paring: How To Achieve Genuine Intimacy, New York: Peter Wyden, 1970.
- Banikiotes, Paul G. and Daher, Douglas M., Similarity in level of disclosure and interpersonal attraction. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1974 Vol 1 (1), 73-75.
- Braithwaite, Ronald, A paired study of self-disclosure of black and white inmates. Journal of Non-white Concerns in Personnel and Guidance, 1973 (Jan), Vol 1 (2), 86-94.
- Carich, Pete A., Teacher self-disclosure: a study of student perceptions of teacher behavior. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974 (Feb), Vol 34(8-A, Pt1), 4730.
- Cash, Thomas F., Self-disclosure in the acquaintance process: effects of sex, physical attractiveness, and approval for motivation. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975 (Jan), Vol 35(7-B), 3572.
- _____.; Stack, James J. and Luna, Gloria C., Convergent and discriminant behavioral aspects of interpersonal trust. Psychological Reports, 1975 (Dec), Vol 37(3,Pt1), 983-986.
- Chaiken, Alan L. and Derlega, Valerian J., Liking for the norm-breaker in self-disclosure. Journal of Personality, 1974, Vol 42(1), 117-129.
- _____.; Derlega, Valerian J. and Miller, Sarah J., Effects of room environment on self-disclosure in a counseling analogue. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976 (Sept), Vol 23(5), 479-481.
- Chelune, Gordon J., A multidimensional look at sex and target differences in disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1976 (Aug), Vol 39(1), 259-263.

- _____. , Reactions to male and female disclosure at two levels. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976 (Nov), Vol 34(5), 1000-1003.
- _____. , Self-disclosure situations survey: a new approach to measuring self-disclosure. Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1976 (Nov), Vol 6, 11-112.
- _____. , Self-disclosure: an elaboration of its basic dimensions. Psychological Reports, 1975 (Feb), Vol 36(1), 79-85.
- Cravens, Richard W., The need for approval and the private versus public disclosure of self. Journal of Personality, 1975 (Sept), Vol 43(3), 503-514.
- Critelli, Joseph W.; Rappaport, Julian and Golding, Stephen L., Role played self-disclosure as a function of liking and knowing. Journal of Research in Personality, 1976 (Mar), Vol 10(1), 89-97.
- Culbert, Samuel A., The Interpersonal Process of Self-disclosure: It Takes Two to See One. New York: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Sciences, Renaissance Editions, Inc., 1968.
- Daher, Douglas M. and Banikiotes, Paul G., Disclosure content-disclosure level and interpersonal attraction. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1974 Vol 1(1), 76-78.
- _____. , and Banikiotes, Paul G., Measurement of self-disclosure: note on format and content of items. Psychological Reports, 1976 (June), Vol 38(3, pt 2), 1255-1256.
- _____. , and Banikiotes Paul G., Interpersonal attraction and rewarding aspects of disclosure content and level. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976 (Apr), Vol 33(4), 492-496.
- Dawson, Carolyn, Affect of self-disclosure as a function of touch in an interview between strangers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973 (Dec), Vol 34(6-B), 2925.
- Davis, John D., Self-disclosure in an acquaintance exercise: responsibility for level of intimacy. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976 (June), Vol 33(6), 787-792.
- _____. , and Sloan, Margaret L., The basis of interviewee matching of interviewer self-disclosure. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1974 (Dec), Vol 13(4), 359-367.

Derlega, V. J.; Harris, M. S.; and Chaiken, A. L., Self-disclosure reciprocity, liking, and the deviant. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1973, Vol 9, 277-284.

_____.; Walmer, J.; and Furman, G., Mutual disclosure in social interactions. Journal of Social Psychology, 1973, Vol 90, 159-160.

_____.; Lovell, Ron and Chaiken, Alan L., Effects of therapist disclosure and its perceived appropriateness on client self-disclosure. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976 (Oct), Vol 44(5), 866.

_____.; and Chaiken, Alan L., Sharing Intimacy: What We Reveal To Others and Why, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1975.

Dietch, James and House, James, Affiliative conflict and individual differences in self-disclosure. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 1975, Vol 6(2), 69-75.

Ehrlich, H. L. and Graeven, D. B., Reciprocal self-disclosure in a dyad. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1971, Vol 7, 389-400.

Fantasia, Saverio C.; Lombardo, John P. and Wolf, Thomas M., Modification of self-disclosing behaviors through modeling and vicarious reinforcement. Journal of General Psychology, 1976 (Oct), Vol 95(2), 209-218.

Ferguson, George A., Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.

Gilbert, Shirley J., Self-disclosure, intimacy and communication in families. Family Coordinator, 1976 (Jul), Vol 25(3), 221-231.

Gitter, A. George; Antonellis, Richard and Cohen, Steven, Candor of communication about self. CRC Report, 1975 (Feb), No. 69, 34.

Goodstein, L. D. and Reinecker, V. M., Factors affecting self-disclosure: a review of the literature. Progress in experimental personality research, Vol 7, New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Horner, Beverly M., The effect of counselor similarity self-disclosure on clients with differing role expectations. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975 (Jan), Vol 35(7-A), 4158.

Jourard, Sidney M. and Friedman, Robert, Experimenter-subject "distance" and self-disclosure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, Vol 25, 278-282.

_____. , The Transparent Self, New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1971.

- _____. , Disclosing Man To Himself, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1968.
- _____. , Self-disclosure An Experimental Analysis of the Transparent Self, Wiley-Interscience: A division of John Wiley and Sons Inc., New York, 1971.
- Kent, John H., Relation of personality, expectancy and situational variables to self-disclosing behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975 (Feb), Vol 43(1), 120-121.
- Kerlinger, Fred N., Foundations of Behavioral Research, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Kimble, Charles E., The effects of acquaintanceship, disclosure level and attributional variables on attraction and self-disclosure. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973 (Aug), Vol 34(2-A), 862.
- Kinder, Bill N., Evidence for a nonlinear relationship between self-disclosure and self-actualization. Psychological Reports, 1976 Vol 38(2), 631-634.
- Kirk, Roger E., Introductory Statistics, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1978.
- Kohen, Janet, Liking and self-disclosure in opposite sex dyads. Psychological Reports, 1975 (Jun), Vol 36(3), 695-698.
- Mulligan, William L., The effects of induced self-disclosure and interviewer feedback on compliance and liking. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973 (Aug), Vol 34(2-B), 878.
- Nelson-Jones, Richard and Strong, S. R., Rules, risk and self-disclosure. British Journal of Guidance and Counseling, 1976 (Jul), Vol 4(2), 202-211.
- _____. , and Strong, Stanley R., Positive and negative self-disclosure, timing and personal attraction. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1976 (Sept), Vol 15(3), 323-325.
- Orr, C. Jack, Sponsorship, self-presentation and legitimacy. Speech Monographs, 1976 (Mar), Vol 43(1), 80-90.
- Otto, Herbert and Mann, John, ed., Ways of Growth, New York: Viking Press, 1968.
- Pearlman, Virginia H., Development and validation of two companion instruments for measuring the quality of openness. The O. M. semantic differential and O. M. graphic. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973 (July), Vol 34(1-A), 139.

- Petzelt, John A., Self-disclosure and interpersonal attraction: the intimacy value and attitudinal similarity of the content of disclosure. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974 (Feb), Vol 34(8-B), 4026.
- Rabin, Marilyn S., The effectiveness of helper self-disclosure as a function of role expectations and levels of self-disclosure. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975 (Oct), Vol 36(4-B), 1929-1930.
- Ronsvalle, John L., The influence of perceptual presence on interpersonal disclosure. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973 (Aug), Vol 34(2-B), 883.
- Roscoe, John T., The Funstat Package in Fortran IV, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Rubin, Zick, Disclosing oneself to a stranger: reciprocity and its limits. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1975 (May), Vol 11(3), 233-260.
- Rubin, Zick, Naturalistic studies of self-disclosure. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1976 (Sum), Vol 2(3), 260-263.
- Schofield, Janet W., Effect of norms, public disclosure, and need for approval on volunteering behavior consistent with attitudes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975 (Jun), Vol 31(6), 1126-1133.
- Schutte, Jerald G., The effects of power and trust on self-disclosure in social interaction. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974 (Nov), Vol 35(5-B), 2484-2485.
- Sherman, Richard C. and Goodson, John L., The intimacy of discussion topics: a comparison of three scaling methods. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 1975 (Dec), Vol 6(6), 581-584.
- Showalter, John R., Counselor nonverbal behaviors as operant reinforcers for client self-reference and expression of feelings. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974 (Dec), Vol 35(6-A), 3435.
- Sinha, V., Self-disclosure: its clinical importance. Indian Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1974 (Sept), Vol 1(2), 81-83.
- Switkin, Linda R., Self-disclosure as a function of sex roles, experimenter-subject distance, sex of experimenter and intimacy of topics, Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974 (Nov), Vol 35(5-B), 2451.

- Solberg, Oskar, An analysis of Norwegian and American high school students' real and ideal self-disclosure in school as related to selected demographic and school variables. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974 (July), Vol 35(1-A), 200.
- Stachwick, Thaddeus I., Effects of pretherapy modeling model status and therapist status on client self-disclosure: an analogue study. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974 (Dec), Vol 35(6-B), 3038.
- Strassberg, Donald S. and Anchor, Kenneth N., Rating intimacy of self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1975 (Oct), Vol 37(2), 562.
- Thelen, Mark H., and Brooks, Samuel J., Social desirability and self-disclosure: both independent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976 (Oct), Vol 44(5), 868.
- Thibaut, J. W. and Kelley, H. H., The Social Psychology of Groups, New York: Wiley, 1959.
- Walker, Lilly S. and Wright, Paul H., Self-disclosure in friendship. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1976 (June), Vol 42(3,Pt1), 735-742.
- Wilson, Melvin N. and Rappaport, Julian, Personal self-disclosure: expectancy and situational effects. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974 (Dec), Vol 42(6), 901-908.
- Winer, B. J., Statistical Principles in Experimental Design, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.
- Worthy, Morgan; Gary, Albert L.; and Kahn, Gay M., Self-disclosure as an exchange process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, Vol 13, 59-63.
- Wortman, Camille B.; Adesman, Peter; Herman, Elliot and Greenberg, Richard, Self-disclosure: an attributional perspective. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976 (Feb), Vol 33(2), 184-191.
- Zoberi, Seemie Z., Rapport by operant conditioning. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973 (Nov), Vol 34(5-B), 2324-2325.
- Zunin, L. and Zunin, N., Contact: The First Four Minutes, New York: Ballantine Books, 1972.