

“But Enough About Me...”:  
An Investigation of Young Adults’ Self-Disclosure in Summer Camp Environments

Presented to the Faculty  
Liberty University  
School of Communication Studies

In Partial Fulfillment  
Of the Requirements for the  
Master of Arts  
In Communication Studies

by  
Courtney Elizabeth Hunt

May 2011

Thesis Committee

---

Faith E. Mullen, Ph.D., Chair Date

---

Lynnda S. Beavers, Ph.D. Date

---

William L. Mullen, Ph.D. Date

This Project is Dedicated to My Parents---

Bill Hunt

Alice Hunt

---the Greatest Teachers and Friends I Have Ever Had.

**Copyright © 2011**  
**Courtney Elizabeth Hunt**  
**All Rights Reserved**

### Abstract

Irwin Altman and Dalmas Taylor's social penetration theory has been applied to numerous studies on self-disclosure for various target groups and contexts. While the self-disclosure of adolescents and young adults has been studied by many researchers, the self-disclosure of young adults at summer camp has not previously been studied, nor has it been compared with young adults' self-disclosure to new acquaintances in familiar settings. In this study, the researcher examined young adults' tendencies in self-disclosure while in camp settings to identify if self-disclosure at camp differed from their typical self-disclosure tendencies and if their self-disclosure at summer camp increased compared to their typical self-disclosure. The researcher also examined the self-disclosure of female young adults compared to male young adults while at camp and in familiar settings to determine if differences occur between genders. Participants in the study completed a survey inquiring about their predictions of their self-disclosure to a new acquaintance in a familiar setting and about their reported self-disclosure to a new acquaintance while at summer camp. The results of the study are inconclusive.

**Key Words:** Social Penetration Theory, Irwin Altman, Dalmas Taylor, Self-Disclosure, Young Adults, Summer Camp, Gender

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the members of my thesis committee. Dr. Faith Mullen has been an encouragement, challenge, and inspiration throughout my college experience, and I will be forever grateful for how hard I had to work in her classes. Her example and standards have made me a better scholar and individual. Dr. Lynnda Beavers was the first communication professor I encountered, and it has been a privilege and pleasure to continue learning from her through the rest of my educational experience. She has been a friend and encouragement in some of the darkest hours of my academic journey, and I have enjoyed the challenge of her meticulousness that has made me a better student and writer. Dr. William Mullen has been a kind and consistent leader and professor. I am grateful for his faith in me as an instructor and for his high standards as a professor. Each of my committee members has been a shining example of excellence, steadfast faith, kind leadership, and true humility. It has been an honor to learn under each of them.

To the other communication studies faculty and staff, thank you for your faithful time and service. You have made this an unforgettable experience. To my fellow graduate students, thank you for your camaraderie, support, and encouragement. This has been a long process that would have been too great for me alone. It has been an honor and pleasure to walk alongside all of you.

Most importantly, I would like to thank my friends and family for supporting me and for challenging me to be more diligent, optimistic, and realistic. I would not be anything that I am today without my parents. Thank you for your wisdom, patience, encouragement, and faith. I hope to be a better reflection of my mother's determination, focus, generosity, and grace and of my father's patience, strength, kindness, and confidence one day.

“But Enough About Me...”:

An Investigation of Young Adults’ Self-Disclosure in Summer Camp Environments

Table of Contents

	Page
Chapter 1 – Introduction	1
Chapter 2 – Literature Review	4
Social Penetration Theory	4
Emotional Outcomes of Self-Disclosure	19
Online Self-Disclosure	23
Self-Disclosure of Adolescents and Young Adults	29
Young Adults and Camp Behavior	40
Chapter 3 – Methodology	44
Chapter 4 – Results	53
Analysis of Each Survey Item	54
Analysis By Depth Category	78
Low Intimacy Level	79
Moderate Intimacy Level	80
High Intimacy Level	82
Analysis By Gender	84
Emotional Responses	90
Discussion	92
Chapter 5 –Future Research	100

Limitations	100
Recommendations	103
Conclusion	105
Works Cited	107
Appendix A: Study Survey	115
Appendix B: Survey Results	119
Appendix C: Item by Item Test Analysis	122
Appendix D: Gender Comparison Test Analysis	125



*Dio è buono e tutto è bene.*

## Chapter 1 – Introduction

Everyone has memories of growing up and the circumstances and events experienced during those years. An activity commonly experienced during adolescence is summer camp. According to American Camp Association, more than 11 million children and adults attend a summer camp of some sort each year (2010). Camp experiences provide novel activities and settings for the youth involved and often stimulate the growth of social skills and character for the youth who attend camp. While simple observation of adolescents at camp reveals differences in their communication activities between familiar settings and camp settings, there has been little research conducted investigating adolescent self-disclosure at camp.

Some researchers have investigated changes in adolescents' communication influenced by setting. Researchers Patti Valkenburg and Jochen Peter examined the relationship between online communication and the closeness of existing friendships in their article "Preadolescents' and Adolescents' Online Communication and Their Closeness to Friends" ("Closeness to Friends" 267). The researchers found that 15-year-old adolescents disclosed the most information in online communication compared to other ages (Valkenburg and Peter, "Closeness to Friends" 267). Other researchers have looked specifically at the camp situation for adolescents. Author Jessi Hempel, in the article "Hello Muddah, Hello Fadduh...", explores the immersion of adolescents in technology today and the steps taken by camps to address this issue. Hempel explains that nearly 90% of summer camps ban the use of cell phones for youth while they are attending the camp. The article briefly addresses adolescent adjustment to the technology ban while at camp and the speedy return they have to technological immersion once returning home, even when they enjoyed the freedom from technology and intended to minimize their utilization of technological devices upon returning home.

While these examples demonstrate the research that has been conducted in the two spheres of changes in adolescents' self-disclosure and of the camp experience for adolescents, no research has bridged the gap between the two spheres and investigated changes in adolescent self-disclosure while at camp. Previous research has also neglected to address any increase in adolescents' self-disclosure while at camp and has not investigated the subsequent emotions felt by the adolescents regarding their increased self-disclosure. Given the popularity of the summer camp experience and the absence of information regarding adolescents' altered self-disclosure while in this setting, an investigation of changes in adolescents' self-disclosure while at camp is necessary to satisfy this void in communication research.

In this study, the researcher investigated the experiences of young adults in new environments, specifically camp experiences, and the self-disclosure in which they engage in light of the social penetration theory. This study also involved the investigation of possible reasons and motivations for self-disclosure and the subsequent reactions that young adults have to their own self-disclosure. This study is significant because it is a unique application of social penetration theory to a type of interaction not yet studied and to a context that may provide generalizable concepts applicable to studying adolescents' self-disclosure in other novel environments. The research questions proposed by this study are:

RQ1: Do young adults' tendencies in self-disclosure while in camp settings differ from their typical self-disclosure tendencies?

RQ2: Do young adults' tendencies in self-disclosure while in camp settings fall into the category of increased self-disclosure?

RQ3: Do the self-disclosure tendencies of female young adults and those of male young adults differ in either familiar settings or summer camp settings?

The purpose of this quantitative study is to apply social penetration theory, relating the summer camp experience and environment to self-disclosure and controlling for individual self-disclosure tendencies for adolescents and young adults enrolled at a large, mid-Atlantic university. The independent variable of summer camp experience and environment is defined as any organization's summer camp requiring campers to reside away from home for at least five days and involving adolescents and young adults who did not previously know each other. The dependent variable of self-disclosure is defined as the sharing of personal information with a stranger or new acquaintance. The control and intervening variable of self-disclosure tendencies is defined as each individual participant's predicted natural self-disclosure to strangers or new acquaintances in more familiar settings, such as school. The self-disclosure of each participant in the summer camp environment was examined for depth and breadth of information offered that exceeds or is less than what the individual would typically reveal to a stranger or new acquaintance.

## Chapter 2 – Literature Review

This study involves the examination of the self-disclosure of young adults in camp settings and touches on the subsequent emotional reactions to their self-disclosure in light of social penetration theory. This study also includes a brief investigation of possible reasons and motivations for self-disclosure and the subsequent reactions that young adults have to their own self-disclosure, testing the existence of a direct relationship between the reason for self-disclosure and the emotions felt afterward, such as relief or regret. A gender comparison is also made, investigating potential differences between male and female self-disclosure in familiar settings and at summer camp. The review of literature for this study breaks down into five different categories. Social penetration theory, emotional outcomes of self-disclosure, online self-disclosure, self-disclosure of adolescents and young adults, and young adults and camp behavior are the five significant components of the literature reviewed for this study.

### **Social Penetration Theory**

The first component of and the basis for this study is Altman and Taylor's social penetration theory, developed in 1973. *Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships* is a book by Irwin Altman and Dalmis Taylor in which they analyze the events that occur with the development of relationships from the level of strangers to the level of casual acquaintances, close friends, and beyond (3). The authors define "social penetration" as the overt interpersonal behaviors that take place in social interactions and the internal subjective processes that precede, accompany, and follow the overt exchange (5). The authors present two key concepts in their book: 1) that the social penetration process is orderly and proceeds through stages over time and 2) that people assess interpersonal rewards and costs, satisfaction and dissatisfaction, gained from interaction with others and that the advancement of the relationships

depends heavily on the amount and nature of the rewards and costs (6). Altman and Taylor's theory takes into consideration the characteristics of individual people, recognizing that different people will go through the process of social penetration differently, based upon their personal characteristics and upon the situation in which the process occurs (7). Another aspect of this theory describes the de-penetration process that occurs with the deterioration of interpersonal relationships, anticipating that these types of relationships will move from more to less intimate interaction and from more often to less often interaction (7). The authors state that the social penetration process implies a gradual overlapping and exploration of mutual selves by the individuals involved in a relationship and that this exploration involves discovering breadth and depth of topics and life areas that reveal a person's personality, which they compare to the layers of an onion (15). Breadth deals with different areas and aspects of a person's life to which someone may become privy, which would relate to how much of the "onion's" first layer is known, and depth deals with the extent to which someone is privy to a certain area or aspect of a person's life or the level of intimacy, which would relate to the number of layers into the "onion" that are known (15-17).

Social penetration theory is a simple, practical, and easily applicable theory that has been used to study the development of many different types of relationships. The authors of the theory themselves, along with Ladd Wheeler, used the theory to examine self-disclosure in a variety of contexts. In the article "Self-Disclosure in Isolated Groups," Dalmas Taylor, Ladd Wheeler, and Irwin Altman analyzed self-disclosure behavior in various conditions and circumstances (39). The authors describe social penetration theory as proposing normally orderly, systematic, and gradual reciprocal disclosures between strangers with cautious approaches to openness (39). The researchers contend that relationships that do not have a long history will not handle stress as

well as relationships with long histories with a wide range of past experiences, and the researchers hypothesize that relationships with short histories will be more susceptible to disruptions (39). In approaching this study, the researchers identified three areas of self-disclosure to investigate: the development of social penetration process in a controlled, laboratory environment, the development changes in intimate versus nonintimate areas, and the differences in stress produced by conditions of isolation (40). The three aspects of social isolation that were manipulated in their study were privacy, outside stimulation, and expected length of confinement (40). The researchers' findings supported the hypotheses of social penetration theory, and the prominent findings of the study associated self-disclosure with environmental parameters and group processes (39). When they were analyzing predispositions for high revealing and the effects of this predisposition on actual disclosure during confinement, the researchers also found a relationship between mission completion and the amount of disclosure shared with a partner (39). In the discussion of social penetration theory, the authors describe this theory as positing that intimacy must be learned gradually and that "immediate intimacy" is extremely uncommon (46).

To further test and expand their theory, Dalmas Taylor and Irwin Altman conducted another study in which they developed a 671-item list of statements designed to measure interpersonal exchange and self-disclosure (II). They describe their research in the article, "Intimacy-Scale Stimuli for Use in Studies of Interpersonal Relationships." For this study, judges from two independent populations, college students and sailors, evaluated the statements, which were developed and included in the measurement tool, for intimacy and topical category (II). Taylor and Altman developed this list to aid in the research testing of their social penetration theory, as they discovered that they were hindered in the testing of their theory by the lack of an

applicable method of measurement and analysis (II). The authors mention other questionnaire instruments that were previously developed and that have been used to measure self-disclosure, but they argue that none of these provided coverage of enough material and aspects of life to fulfill the requirements of longitudinal studies (2). Taylor and Altman also report that no other attempt has been made to categorize measurement items into topical categories, as their questionnaire did (2).

The instrument that Taylor and Altman developed is divided into thirteen topical categories: religion; own marriage and family; love, dating, sex; parental family; physical condition and appearance; money and property; government and politics, current events and social issues; emotions and feelings; interests, hobbies, habits; relationships with other people; personal attitudes, values and ethics, and self evaluation; school and work; and biographical characteristics (5-8). The authors themselves state that the items developed are appropriate to be used in a self-disclosure questionnaire and offer a more complete and beneficial measurement than other existing questionnaires (28). The items included in the measurement tool developed by Taylor and Altman and scaled for levels of intimacy will be the basis of the survey developed for the present study.

The intimacy-scaled items developed by Taylor and Altman have been tested for reliability by other studies. Cecilia Solano, in her article "Sex Differences and the Taylor-Altman Self-Disclosure Stimuli," tested Taylor and Altman's intimacy-scaled stimuli for any changes in the levels of perceived intimacy and for any shift in the relative intimacy of topics within categories nearly twenty years after the development of the stimuli (288). Solano also altered the stimuli, making them applicable to both genders to test the stimuli's reliability in measuring the self-disclosure of both men and women (287). The author's study revealed slight and



insignificant changes in the perceptions of the stimuli's intimacy and categorization by both men and women and validated the continued use of the Taylor-Altman intimacy-scaled stimuli to measure self-disclosure (288).

In another article, entitled "Self-Disclosure as a Function of Reward-Cost Outcomes," Taylor and Altman investigated fifty-six sailors who participated in an extended interaction with a study collaborator and who were subjected to one of four reward/cost interaction histories (18). The researchers measured the average time talked and the breadth and depth of interaction, and concluded that more disclosure occurred in nonintimate areas rather than in intimate areas of topics, disclosure varied based on interpersonal reward/cost factors, and the most significant impact of reward/cost factors' influence was in intimate topics (18).

Many researchers have utilized social penetration theory to examine the influence of various characteristics of relationships on the development of and self-disclosure within those relationships. One example of this is Mitchell Hammer and William Gudykunst's article, "The Influence of Ethnicity and Sex on Social Penetration in Close Friendships," in which the researchers examine the influence of "black" or "white" ethnicity and the influence of "male" or "female" gender on social penetration in close friendships. The researchers distributed questionnaires to 784 students, with a nearly equal number of black participants and white participants and with a perfectly equal number of male participants and female participants (422). The questionnaires prompted participants to respond to items while referencing their communication with their best friend (422). Hammer and Gudykunst found that participants of black ethnicity engage in greater social penetration with their best friend than participants of white ethnicity (427). The researchers also found that female participants engaged in greater social penetration with their best friend than male participants (430). Of particular interest to this

study, the authors describe Altman and Taylor's social penetration theory as a framework to explain the process of relationship development, with disclosure being a significant factor in relational intimacy and causing the development of relationships from superficial exchanges to more personal interactions (418). Hammer and Gudykunst explain that social penetration theory dictates that the development of more personal relationships occurs through increased frequency and increased intimacy of disclosures between relationship participants and that relationships progress through four developmental stages, which are increasingly deep and broad in disclosure: orientation, exploratory affective exchange, full affective exchange, and stable exchange (418).

In her paper, "Social Penetration: A Description, Research, and Evaluation," Nicole Allensworth explores the philosophical perspective behind social penetration theory (n.p.). Allensworth provides a definition of communication based on social penetration theory, stating that communication is the "process of exchanging symbols and gaining understanding and sharing from that exchange" (n.p.). She also describes the four commonly assumed stages of social penetration, including orientation, which involves superficial information; exploratory affective exchange, in which communication expounds on superficial topics and approaches the inner layers of personal information; affective exchange, in which topics related to central layers of a person's personality are disclosed; and stable exchange, which she says is reached in few relationships (n.p.).

Social penetration theory has been applied to relationships in many different ways, including comparing its posits to the propositions of other theories. "Uncertainty and Social Penetration Theory Expectations About Relationship Communication: A Comparative Test" is an article by Joe Ayres in which he compares the information seeking strategies of social

penetration theory and uncertainty theory. He does so with the contradictory expectations that, according to social penetration theory, the number of questions asked in a conversation between an individual and a friend and a conversation between an individual and a stranger should be roughly the same but that types of questions would differ, and that, according to uncertainty theory, strangers would present more questions than friends would in conversations both initially and over time but that types of questions would not differ (194). To conduct this study, the researcher audiotaped and analyzed conversations between six pairs of strangers and six pairs of friends (194). No difference in amounts of questions were found, but by analyzing the types of questions and responses used in conversation, the results showed support for social penetration theory and not for uncertainty theory (200).

Many studies incorporating social penetration theory use the theory as a framework for developing expectations for the behaviors of individuals in relationship for both positive and negative relational aspects. Different types of relationships to which social penetration theory has been applied are marriage relationships, romantic relationships, friendships, and intercultural relationships. Some aspects of marriage relationships that have been studied are marital dissolution, marital complaints, and marital functioning. Jan Yoder and Robert Nichols compare the attitudes and perspective of married and divorced individuals in light of social penetration theory's projection that marital dissolution is directly related to the attitudes of the marriage partners in their article "A Life Perspective Comparison of Married and Divorced Persons." The researchers identified four attitude factors when analyzing the results of the National Opinion Research Center's 1976 General Social Survey. The four attitudes identified were life satisfaction, trust, optimism, and political conservatism (413). The study involved people from four different categories: divorced and remarried, married and never divorced, currently divorced

or separated, and never married (415). The researchers found that divorced people were less satisfied with life, more liberal, and less optimistic than people who had never been divorced (413). Of particular interest were the authors' descriptions of social penetration theory, which they describe as a type of exchange theory that particularly pertains to dyadic interpersonal relationships and as proposing that the development of interpersonal relationships involves situational and personality factors as well as the usual cost and reward factors of an exchange theory (413).

Researchers have also used social penetration theory as the basis for research in studying the influence of time on intimacy in relationships. "Nonverbal Communication Accuracy in Married Couples: Relationship with Marital Complaints" is an article by Ronald Sabatelli, Ross Buck, and Albert Dreyer in which the researchers examine nonverbal communication abilities as potential mediators of marital complaints (1088). The authors hypothesized that the longer couples had lived together, the better they would be at understanding each other's nonverbal expressions than those who had not cohabitated as long, that individuals whose spouses are effective nonverbal communicators will experience fewer marital complaints, and that individuals with fewer marital complaints will be effective nonverbal communicators (1088). The researchers based their study on social penetration theory, which they describe as suggesting that by exchanging information about the self both verbally and nonverbally, individuals receive rewards and are able to predict what future rewards may be in future exchanges (1088). Forty-eight recently married couples participated in a three-hour session for this study, in which one spouse was taken to a separate room and given a marital complaint measurement and one spouse was given an encoding task, and when completed, the members of the couple switched tasks (1089-90). The researchers found that the length of the relationship did not coincide with the

ability to read nonverbal communication accurately, although the spouses were found to be able to read nonverbal communication more accurately than a panel of judges (1088). The ability to read nonverbal communication accurately did not coincide with fewer marital complaints (1088).

Many studies related to social penetration theory have dealt with the development of friendships. Robert Hays, in the article, “A Longitudinal Study of Friendship Development,” followed the relationship development of 84 college freshmen, who completed questionnaires regarding two of their recently initiated, same-sex friendships every three weeks (909). The researcher hypothesized that, in accordance with social penetration theory, the friendships’ initial interactions would progress from “superficial to increasingly intimate exchange” (910). The researcher also hypothesized that the range of behaviors in which the dyads participated, or breadth, and the intimacy, or depth, of their interactions were anticipated to correlate positively with the participants’ ratings of friendship intensity (910). Another hypothesis was that the intimacy level of friendship interactions as the relationships progressed was anticipated to explain an increasing percentage of the variance in ratings of friendship intimacy beyond what would be accounted for by quantity of interactions (910). Finally, Hays also expected situational and individual factors to influence the outcome of friendship development (910). The author found that individual, dyadic, and environmental factors were all significantly related to the outcome of the friendship development (923). Friendship intensity ratings were found to increase steadily over time in close friendships and partners’ emotional aggravation increased with friendship intensity, while the frequency of dyadic behavior fluctuated (923). Finally, Hays concludes that the dynamics of a relationship vary with the developmental stage of the relationships (923).

In another study involving the development of relationships over time, “Communication Characteristics of Relationships with Differential Growth Rates” by Leslie Baxter and William Wilmot, the authors monitored 116 relationships over a two-week time period, having one party in each relationship maintain a structured diary (264). The relationships were categorized as no growth, low growth, or high growth based on the respondents’ perceptions of their relationship change (264). The researchers found that no, low, and high growth groups displayed progressively more perceived effectiveness, personalness, and satisfaction in their encounters and also displayed progressively higher perceived importance for their encounters (264). Baxter and Wilmot also found sex differences, relevant to sex role socialization, how personal encounters were, breadth of topics covered, the importance of the encounters, and engaging in talk for talk’s sake, with female having more instances of all areas in their conversations than males (270). The researchers attribute this to female socialization to value interpersonal relationships highly (270).

Another application of social penetration has been to discover the necessary elements for stable relationships. In the article “A Model of Marital Functioning Based on an Attraction Paradigm and Social-Penetration Dimensions,” James Honeycutt reports a test of his “structural question model of marital functioning” that was based on social penetration variables and an attraction paradigm (651). The researcher proposes that the attraction paradigm factors of being satisfied with marital issues and of perceived similarity in attitudes will have an impact on marital happiness and on the perception of how understanding a marriage partner is, which also affects happiness in marriage. Another hypothesis presented in this study is that the social penetration variables of openness, attentiveness, flexibility, and expressiveness will reflect effective communication and lead to marital happiness and partner understanding as well (651).

Some statements of particular interest in this study regarding social penetration theory are that this theory “assumes that the degree of shared intimacy is manifested by communication between partners” and that this theory involves the progression of self-disclosure from basic, surface information to a deeper, more intimate and personal level of information determined by an individual’s perception of interpersonal costs and rewards (652). The researcher used quantitative methods to conduct this study through the use of surveys, asking participants to rank a series of statements as descriptive or not descriptive of themselves. The findings of the study reveal that partner understanding leads to marital-issue satisfaction and communication effectiveness more strongly than to happiness, and the findings support social penetration theory in that perceived partner understanding is important for stable relationships (657).

Social penetration theory is often used when examining self-disclosure, as the penetration process is heavily reliant on the contributors’ self-disclosure. This theory has been used, though less frequently, to study the depenetration process of deteriorating romantic relationships. “Self-Disclosure, Intimacy, and the Depenetration Process” is an article by Betsy Tolstedt and Joseph Stokes in which the researchers examine six variables of self-disclosure in romantic relationships in light of social penetration theory (84). The authors hypothesized that the depth and breadth of self-disclosure would decrease as intimacy in relationships decrease and, as intimacy decreased, the valence of self-disclosures would be more negative (84). The authors explain that intimacy and self-disclosure are two vital components to the development of relationships according social penetration theory but that this theory does not explain the dissolution of relationships beyond proposing that it is the reversal of the processes that leads to social penetration (84). The self-disclosure variables that the researchers examined were intimacy, self-disclosure breadth, descriptive depth, evaluative depth, positive valence, and negative valence (88). For this study,

sixty couples participated in various elements of the experiments; seventeen of those couples completed only a questionnaire, and forty-three couples completed a questionnaire, graphed their relationship together on a chart, listed the current strengths and weaknesses of their relationship, and were audiotaped during the completion of all of the tasks aside from the questionnaire (86). The researchers found that the hypothesis of social penetration theory for self-disclosure breadth and valence was supported because self-disclosure breadth decreased with decreased intimacy (88). A surprising finding revealed by the authors is that depth of self-disclosure actually increases with decreased intimacy. The authors explain this finding as being related to the crisis in which each couple was when participating in the study, stating that the individuals may have been particularly willing to describe their negative emotions given their troubled conditions (89).

Social penetration theory has also been applied to friendships in studying approaches to intimacy, incorporating the use of self-disclosure to increase intimacy and incorporating the concept of depth of social penetration in the study of how individuals may vary in their perspectives. Elizabeth Mark and Thelma Alper examine affiliative interests of adolescents with the hypothesis that male and female adolescents' affiliative interests will differ significantly, especially in the intensity of their motivation toward intimacy in their article "Sex Differences in Intimacy Motivation." The authors take their definition of intimacy from social penetration theory, which asserts that as the intimacy of a relationship increases, the members in the relationship will express and share deeper levels of their personalities, with the deepest level assumed to be comprised of worries and negative self-perceptions (164-165). Based upon these posits of social penetration theory, the researchers identify the three distinguishing characteristics of intimacy in relationships as: a friendship dyad, self-disclosure between the members of the friendship dyad, and disclosure of deeply personal information (165). For the study, the



researchers developed scenario cues and had participants create projected stories when given scenario cues, designated the “lunch cue,” which involved one worried person, and the “chemistry cue,” which involved characters whose roles the participants might have perceived as reversed based on gender (165). The authors hypothesized that, given the lunch cue, more female participants would create stories involving self-disclosure more often than the male participants and that male participants who create stories involving self-disclosure in the lunch cue would be less likely to create a story from the chemistry cue involving masculine stereotypes or dominance (166). The study involved a total of 197 high school students as participants. The researchers found support for their hypothesis that female participants’ stories would involve more self-disclosure than males’ and for the hypothesis that males whose stories involved more self-disclosure would also be less likely to demonstrate stereotypical male roles in stories (168).

Regarding the use of self-disclosure to increase intimacy in friendships, Rebecca Rubin, Alan Rubin, and Matthew Martin investigate the relationship between affinity-seeking and self-disclosure and the role that self-awareness plays in mediating the relationship between affinity-seeking and self-disclosure in their article “The Role of Self-Disclosure and Self-Awareness in Affinity-Seeking Competence” (115). Based on social penetration theory, the researchers anticipate that people who are capable of developing affinity in a relationship will self-disclose to increase the intimacy of the relationship and that, because of this, people who self-disclose will be more competent in affinity-seeking (115). Four hundred undergraduate students participated in completing surveys, which measured affinity-seeking competence, self-disclosure, and self-awareness (119). The results of the researchers’ study support a sequential relationship between self-disclosing and affinity-seeking competence and a curvilinear relationship between self-disclosure and affinity-seeking performance, but self-awareness was

not found to play a significant role in these relationships (124). Of particular significance are the descriptions of social penetration theory that the authors include, explaining that according to social penetration theory, individuals who develop affinity in relationships are the same who tend to self-disclose to increase the intimacy of the relationship and that key elements of social penetration theory are the amount and depth of disclosure involved in interactions (117).

Many communication theories have been applied to intercultural situations, and social penetration theory is no exception. “An Exploratory Comparison of Close Intracultural and Intercultural Friendships” is an article by William Gudykunst in which the author proposes that a major focus of intercultural studies should be in applying interpersonal, clarified as intracultural, communication theories to intercultural contexts (270). Gudykunst conducted two exploratory studies to compare perceived similarity and social penetration in close intracultural and intercultural friendships (270). Seventy-five undergraduate students from three different colleges and a variety of countries participated in the studies (276). The author issued a questionnaire to the participants, using items developed by Taylor and Altman, the creators of social penetration theory, in order to measure the breadth and depth of interpersonal penetration (276). The article provides descriptions of the various categories designed to measure penetration, including religion, relationships with others, parental family, love and dating, physical condition and attractiveness, school-work, money and property, and interests (277). The questionnaire had two forms: one to measure intracultural penetration and one to measure intercultural penetration (277). The author concludes that the similarity people perceive themselves to share with others has influence on intracultural attraction as well as intercultural attraction, and similarity in cultural background is not essential to friendship preference.

Another article involving intercultural relationships is “Influences of Culture on Self-Disclosure as Relationally Situated in Intercultural and Interracial Friendships from a Social Penetration Perspective” by Yea-Wen Chen and Masato Nakazawa. In this article, the authors examine the influences of individualism and collectivism and of relational intimacy on the dimensions and the choices of topics of self-disclosure in intercultural and interracial friendships in light of social penetration theory (77). The authors examined self-disclosure pertaining to six different topics: attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, work or studies, money, personally, and body (82). For the study, self-disclosure was examined as categorized in five dimensions: intended disclosure, amount of disclosure, positive or negative disclosure, control of depth of disclosure, and honesty and accuracy in disclosure (83). The researchers surveyed 252 participants and found that relational intimacy positively correlated with all six topics examined and with four out of the five dimensions of self-disclosure examined (77). The results also indicated that individualism significantly predicts the five dimensions of self-disclosure as a set and that individuals mirror their intercultural or interracial friends in all six topics and in the positive or negative dimension of self-disclosure (77). From these results, the researchers conclude that relational intimacy has a greater influence on close intercultural and interracial friendships than does cultural variability (77).

All theories have some limitations, and many researchers have critiqued theories or proposed expansions of them. Social penetration has been criticized as not being sufficient to explain relationship development, which has led at least one researcher to propose the use of social penetration theory in conjunction with another theory. Wayne Hensley theoretically analyzes the relationship between the looking-glass-self and social penetration in his article “A Theory of the Valenced Other: The Intersection of the Looking-Glass-Self and Social

Penetration.” Hensley hypothesizes that there exists in the junction of looking-glass-self and social penetration a relationship, which he calls the “valenced other” and which he describes as existing between image accuracy, related to looking-glass-self, and level of depth and breadth in the relationships with the reference person, related to social penetration (293). The author proposes various relationships to be studied in the future between four different types of interpersonal connections, the intimate, the friend, the acquaintance, and the stranger, in regards to how accurate the connection is in information about an individual and in regards to the amount and scope of information known by the connection about an individual (306). Of particular interest is the description of social penetration theory as positing that relationships develop over time in a methodical predictable manner and that all relationships involve different degrees of social penetration and levels of intimacy, progressing from the position of stranger to casual acquaintance to friend and finally to intimate (299). Hensley also proposes that neither social penetration, which he states focuses on information divulged, nor looking-glass-self, which he states focuses on information received, can stand alone in explaining relationship development (293).

### **Emotional Outcomes of Self-Disclosure**

The second component of this literature review concerns the emotional outcomes of self-disclosure. Self-disclosure is vital to the social penetration process, as self-disclosure is necessary for the exchange of information and for progress in the depth and breadth of intimacy. When an individual self-discloses, he or she is simply sharing information, which will vary in the degree of how personal or private that information is, with another person. This communication concept has been studied extensively, typically focusing on the emotional effects or motivations of the self-disclosure. In the article “Sharing the Good, Sharing the Bad: Benefits of Emotional

Self-Disclosure Among Middle-Aged and Older Adults,” Carol Magai, Nathan Consendine, Katherine Fioro, and Arlene King describe their manipulation of positive and negative self-disclosure of healthy middle-aged and older adults to discover the impact of this manipulation on the participants’ emotional, psychological, and physical well-being. Of particular interest in this study regarding self-disclosure is the explanation that organized self-disclosure can have a positive and beneficial influence on health and well being, partially due to the “development of insight and the cognitive integration of experience” in which self-disclosure results (287). The authors report the purpose of the study to be testing the “generalizability of the effects of self-disclosure in a large ethnically diverse sample of middle-aged and older men and women,” testing the “possibility that positive self-disclosure may be beneficial in this population,” and testing the influence that gender and ethnicity have on this process (287). The researchers utilized mixed methods of conducting research through the issuance of a demographics questionnaire, measurement of physical and psychological health and stress, and emotional stability, and open-ended relation of emotional events by the participants (293-294). The findings of the researchers indicate that “short-term, experience-specific self-disclosure may have a clinically meaningful impact on the physical and mental well-being of older adults” (309).

While self-disclosure has been found to be beneficial in some cases, some individuals are less likely to self-disclose, despite the fact that they could benefit from the disclosure.

“Emotional Self-Disclosure and Emotional Avoidance: Relations with Symptoms of Depression and Anxiety” is an article by Jeffrey Kahn and Angela Garrison in which the researchers hypothesize that, because it has been observed that people with intensified symptoms of anxiety and mood disorders also participate in decreased emotional disclosure, this relationship between disorder symptoms and self-disclosure would be influenced by the “avoidance of emotional

experience and expression” (573). A significant statement about emotional self-disclosure defines it as “a verbal form of emotional expression whereby an emotional experience is articulated into words and then communicated to another person via written or spoken channels” (573). The researchers conducted a quantitative study using a questionnaire to measure the moods and anxieties of the participants through the participants’ rating of occurrence and intensity of emotions from the past week and an additional index to measure the emotional self-disclosure of the participants by their rating how strongly they agreed or disagreed with a series of statements (575). The researchers found that while individuals experiencing increased symptoms of depression and anxiety have more distress that they could disclose to others, these individuals are less likely to disclose these symptoms and emotions (581).

Emotional reactions to the mode of communication involved also influence willingness to self-disclose. The article, “When is Trust Not Enough?: The Role of Perceived Privacy of Communication Tools in Comfort with Self-Disclosure” by Nancy Frye and Michele Dornisch, reports their research investigating how privacy concerns about communication tools might predict how comfortable people feel when communicating through these communication tools (1120). Specifically, the authors examine whether “topic intimacy and perceived privacy predict levels of comfort with disclosure” and whether these potential relationships are moderated by general levels of trust in the technology used and the frequency with which the technology is used (1120). The researchers found that privacy concerns were most important to those who used the technology less frequently, and topic intimacy mattered the most to people with low trust levels (1120).

While some individuals have been found to be less likely to self-disclose, even when they could benefit from the disclosure, other individuals have been found to reap negative

consequences by self-disclosing in certain situations. Jessica Cameron, John Holmes, and Jacquie Vorauer examine the potential predictive qualities of self-esteem in determining harmful responses to individuals' self-disclosure of personal failures in their article "When Self-Disclosure Goes Awry: Negative Consequences of Revealing Personal Failures for Lower Self-Esteem Individuals" (217). The researchers conducted a quantitative study through the use of surveys and lab experiments, setting up scenarios in which one half of 59 dating couples would participate in a psychological test, which they were told held significant implications for future job performance (218). The psychological tests were arranged so that all participants actually performed very poorly, and half of the participants were to disclose the experience to their dating partners and half were to disclose a nonthreatening side experience in the lab (218). The participants to whom information was disclosed wrote written responses to their partners, and then both members of each dating couple responded to questionnaires about their emotions throughout the experience (219). The researchers found that participants with low self-esteem were more likely to feel devalued and unsupported after disclosing personal failures than participants with high self-esteem (221). The authors conclude that, for individuals with low self-esteem, self-disclosure of failures produces costly negative emotions but the disclosure of neutral experiences does not (221). This study provides interesting data regarding types of self-disclosure and influences and consequences of those disclosures.

A final article dealing with emotional outcomes of self-disclosure involves potential discrepancies between the emotional reactions that the discloser experiences compared to the emotional reactions to disclosure that the one to whom the information is disclosed experiences. The article, "Value Revelations: Disclosure is in the Eye of the Beholder," by Emily Pronin, John Fleming, and Mary Steffel, reports the researchers' investigation of individuals' value

disclosures and their own and the recipients' perceptions of those disclosures (795). The authors hypothesized that people view their disclosures regarding what they value as more revealing of themselves than do the recipients of the self-disclosure (795). The researchers conducted six separate studies to examine various aspects and contexts of self-disclosure and perceived revelation of personal information by the discloser and the recipient. The researchers discovered that people and their perceptions of meaningful and personal self-disclosures can be obstacles in developing intimate relationships (806). Pronin, Fleming, and Steffel also propose that the establishment of intimacy through the revelation of personal values may prove to be problematic, as, in the worst of possible scenarios, individuals are likely to believe that they have presented essential parts of themselves through these revelations, while recipients of these disclosures are likely to perceive little meaning in the information conveyed (806).

### **Online Self-Disclosure**

The third component is the examination of self-disclosure specifically in online communication settings. As technology changes and progresses, the means of communicating via various technological programs and devices continues to alter and expand communication channels. The impact of technology on self-disclosure and relationship development has become an increasingly popular topic of study with the advances of technology. Some studies have revealed concerns for privacy that users of technology have when using technology to communicate. "A Model for Exploring Individual's Self-Disclosure Online" is an article by Sheng-Fei Hsu and Dong-Her Shih in which they investigate how psychological and technological factors concurrently impact individuals' privacy concerns and restrain disclosure (594). The researchers had six main hypotheses and expectations in this study: 1. individual's perceived privacy has a positive indirect effect on trust, 2. individual's perceived privacy has a



positive indirect effect on self-disclosure online, moderated by trust, 3. privacy concern has a positive effect on users' past privacy behavior, 4. individual's privacy concern has a positive indirect effect on self-disclosure online, moderated by past privacy behavior, 5. computer self-efficacy has a positive effect on individual's privacy concern, and 6. computer self-efficacy has a positive effect on individual's self-disclosure online (595-96). The authors conducted quantitative research through the use of surveys and scales. The findings of the researchers demonstrate support for each of the hypotheses except the final hypothesis. Computer self-efficacy was actually seen to have a negative effect on the privacy concerns of participants (598). Of particular interest in this study is the researchers' explanation that trust increases self-disclosure and that privacy concern impacts self-disclosure.

In stark contrast to the privacy concerns that some studies have discovered, other studies have revealed that communication mediated by some type of technology is more open than face-to-face communication. Some researchers have termed this unusual openness "hyperpersonal communication" and have examined this phenomenon and what influences the development trust of those communicating online. Samantha Henderson and Michael Gilding investigate the development of trust in online communication, which by nature has been observed to be "hyperpersonal communication" in their article "'I've Never Clicked This Much with Anyone in My Life': Trust and Hyperpersonal Communication in Online Friendships" (487). The researchers conducted a qualitative study involving interviews with 17 Internet users to investigate the foundations of trust built and developed in online friendships (487). Interviews with the participants were conducted both online and face-to-face, and the researchers observed a tendency for online participants to elaborate on their self-disclosure online, including disclosing exactly what they or the online friend(s) had disclosed (494). An interesting fact that the

researchers identify is that researchers have often identified computer-mediated communication by its impersonal aspects and the reduction of nonverbal cues in communication, which would seem to contradict the commonality of hyperpersonal communication being shared in online friendships (489). Based on the responses of the participants, the researchers conclude that there are four main categories of trust that influence the level of trust developed in online relationships: reputation, performance, pre-commitment, and situational factors.

Social networking aspects of online communication have greatly influenced online relationships and self-disclosure. Described in their article “All About Me: Disclosure in Online Social Networking Profiles: The Case of Facebook,” Amanda Nosko, Eileen Wood, and Seija Molema examine self-disclosure in online social networking profiles. The researchers first developed a tool to assess the content of the profiles; grouping categories to identify and investigate information relevant to identity threat, personal and group threat and developed a grouping strategy to include all information given on the Facebook profile but to organize it in a meaningful and functional way (406). Nosko, Wood, and Molema collected and examined 400 randomly selected Canadian Facebook profiles (407). The researchers found that Facebook users disclosed approximately 25% of all possible information (406). The disclosure of personal information such as gender and age was found to be positively related to disclosing other sensitive and highly personal information (406). The researchers found age and relationship status to be indicative factors in disclosure (406). As the age of users increased, the amount of personal information disclosed in their profiles decreased, and users seeking relationships disclosed the greatest amount of extremely sensitive and potentially stigmatizing information (406).

In a similar study, described in their article, “Tell Me More: Online Versus Face-to-Face Communication and Self-Disclosure,” Olivia Bruss and Jennifer Hill examined how the type of communication occurring, either online or face-to-face, affects self-disclosure (3). For the study, fifty-eight college students participated in either face-to-face communication or communication mediated by an instant-messaging system and then completed a self-report scale (3). Bruss and Hill found that students who communicated via the online instant-messaging system disclosed significantly higher amounts of personal information and perceived higher amounts of their partner’s self-disclosure than those students who communicated face-to-face (3).

Some researchers have taken their studies in a different direction and investigated the impact that online communication has on live friendships, or friendships that existed prior to communication online between the friends. In the article “Preadolescents’ and Adolescents’ Online Communication and Their Closeness to Friends,” Patti Valkenburg and Jochen Peter examine the relationship between online communication and the closeness of existing friendships and attempt to improve two contradictory hypotheses, which they list as the rich-get-richer and the social compensation hypotheses (267). Of particular significance in this article are the findings regarding communication online and self-disclosure. The researchers found that participants categorized as “socially anxious” perceived the Internet to be a more beneficial means of intimate self-disclosure than participants categorized as “nonsocially anxious” (267). This perception of socially anxious participants led to increased online communication over time, which the researchers found supportive of the social compensation hypothesis, although the initial finding that socially anxious participants communicated less frequently online than nonsocially anxious participants supported the rich-get-richer hypothesis (267). The researchers used quantitative research methods through the use of surveys distributed to 794 adolescents

(271). The participants' responses revealed that those who communicated more frequently with their friends online felt closer to their friends, but this was only true when the participants were communicating online with people with whom they already had established friendships (275). The researchers also found that 15-year-old adolescents disclosed the most information in online communication and that female participants were closer to their friends and were more socially anxious than the male participants (267).

Researchers also have studied factors that may influence the depth and breadth of self-disclosure that takes place online. "Will You Be My Friend?" Computer-Mediated Relational Development on Facebook.com" is a conference paper by Elizabeth Craig, Magdalena Igiel, Kevin Wright, Cory Cunningham, and Nicole Ploeger in which the researchers investigate the influence that perceived similarity and social attraction have on development of relationships and self-disclosure among college students who utilize the social networking website, Facebook.com (1). Of particular interest regarding self-disclosure is the researchers' proposition that college students' perceptions of attraction that are based on previous perceptions or on the types of friends with which they socialize are likely to prompt self-disclosure rather than self-disclosure creating attraction (7). Another significant statement made by the researchers is that self-disclosure is a vital element of the process of social penetration and that studies of social penetration often focus on the depth and breadth of information exchanged (8). The researchers utilized quantitative research methods through the distribution of surveys using scales to 283 college students who are Facebook users (15). The researchers found that attitude similarity and social attraction are related and can predict high levels of depth and breadth in the self-disclosure of participants to friends via Facebook (19). The authors also discovered that high levels of depth

and breadth in self-disclosure influenced the predictability and interdependency of interactions between Facebook friends (20).

A common topic of study involving mediated communication has been the presentation of self on online dating websites and the implications that self-disclosure may have in this setting. In the article, “Self-Presentation in Online Personals: The Role of Anticipated Future Interaction, Self-Disclosure, and Perceived Success in Internet Dating,” Jennifer Gibbs, Nicole Ellison, and Rebecca Heino examine self-disclosure in the context of online dating relationships. The authors anticipate that higher levels of self-disclosure will result in increased perceptions of success in online dating relationships (159). The researchers conducted a mixed methods study through the use of surveys and interviews. A statement of particular interest in this article regarding social penetration theory states that this theory maintains that disclosure intimacy is a key factor in the development of satisfying interpersonal relationships and that it predicts that self-disclosure will lead to relational intimacy and satisfaction (158). The findings of this study support the assumptions of social penetration theory, the social information processing and hyperpersonal perspectives, and a positive effect of anticipated face-to-face interaction in the future on self-disclosure during online communication (152). The researchers also discovered four predictive dimensions in online dating success: honesty, amount, intent, and valence. Honesty was the only dimension identified as having a negative effect on online dating success (152).

Online dating profiles have also been a popular study of mediated communication due to the ease of deception and to the nature of the motivations and consequences of self-disclosure of information on these types of websites. Ji Pan and Paul Lieber examine user profiles on a prominent Chinese dating website from the perspective of social penetration theory in their

article “Emotional Disclosure and Construction of the Poetic ‘Other’ in a Chinese Online Dating Site”. The researchers examined 200 dating profiles, which were coded for various categories, including demographic information and content types; the content types were categorized as factual information, expectation/opinions/values, and emotions/wishes/feelings with a fourth category of dummy information, which addressed inclusions of poems (37). The researchers conclude that the order of information sharing proposed by social penetration theory may be reversed in online settings, with self-disclosure occurring more quickly and deeply than other settings, and that a calculating of costs and rewards may constantly be regulating self-disclosure online (39). The study provided support for the social penetration theory posit that a constant cost-reward analysis regulates decisions to self-disclose personal information and/or build relationships with strangers (32). Regarding social penetration, the authors explain that social penetration theory was developed to represent ideas of how people mutually explore and form special bonds in relationships (32).

### **Self-Disclosure of Adolescents and Young Adults**

The fourth component is the more focused examination of the self-disclosure of adolescents and young adults, as this age group is target population of the research. The self-disclosure of adolescents and young adults has been studied in a variety of contexts. Some research has been conducted to identify impact of gender and age on the depth of self-disclosure of adolescents to their friends. “Adolescents' Disclosure to Best and Good Friends: The Effects of Gender and Topic Intimacy” is an article by Kim Dolgin and Stephanie Kim in which they examine the disclosure of adolescents, grades seven through twelve, to four other people: the best friend of same sex, the best friend of opposite sex, a good friend of same sex, and a good friend of opposite sex (146). Two hundred seventy-three participants were involved in this study

took part in a series of five questionnaires, four of which had participants indicate the degree to which they discussed various topics with their four categorized friends and the last of which had participants rank the intimacy of the topics in the other four surveys (148). The researchers found that adolescents discuss low and moderate intimacy topics more deeply than highly intimate topics and more to their best friends than to friends with whom they were not as close; they also found the tendency for girls to disclose more about high or moderate intimacy topics to other girls and low intimacy topics to boys and for boy to disclose more about high or moderate intimacy topics to girls and low intimacy topics to other boys (154). Female-female best friend pairs were found to be more self-revealing than any other pairing, and the difference between disclosure to a best friend and disclosure to a lesser good friend was larger in female participants than in male participants (154). Finally, female participants were found to disclose more about highly intimate topics than the male participants, and the male participants were found to be less selective than the female participants in choosing to whom they would disclose (155).

Another article examining self-disclosure and the development adolescent friendships is the article “Intimacy in Adolescent Friendship: The Roles of Attachment, Coherence, and Self-Disclosure” by Nirit Bauminger, Ricky Finzi-Dottan, Sagit Chason, and Dov Har-Even. In this article, the authors investigate the potential predictive value of attachment, coherence, and self-disclosure for intimacy in adolescent friendships (409). The researchers also examine the extent to which the relationship between attachment and intimacy is mediated by coherence and disclosure and investigated the effects of gender and grade-level on intimacy development (409). Their study involved 196 participants in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades, and attachment, coherence, and disclosure were found to predict intimacy strongly (409). The researchers also found that self-disclosure and coherence interacted to influence intimacy, with a tendency of

self-disclosure contributing to intimacy to a greater extent at low levels of coherence (409). Finally, the researchers found that avoidant and anxious attachment indirectly affected intimacy and were mediated by coherence and disclosure (409).

The self-disclosure of adolescents has also been studied in the online context. “The Development of Online and Offline Self-Disclosure in Preadolescence and Adolescence and Their Longitudinal Effects on the Quality of Friendships,” a conference paper by Patti Valkenburg and Jochen Peter, contains the authors’ examination of three areas: how individuals’ online self-disclosure develops in adolescence, how online self-disclosure interacts with others’ online self-disclosure, and to what extent online and offline self-disclosure contributes to quality of friendships in adolescence (1). To conduct their research, the authors issued surveys to six hundred ninety preadolescents and adolescents on three separate occasions, with half a year between each survey (1). The surveys used three different scales measuring online self-disclosure, offline self-disclosure, and quality of friendships (13). The researchers found nonlinear relationships between both online and offline self-disclosure and the participants’ ages, with what the authors describe as a U-shaped relationship between age and self-disclosure for male participants and an elongated S-shaped relationship between age and self-disclosure for female participants (1). The researchers also found that both online and offline self-disclosure had a significant and positive effect on the quality of adolescents friendships, but only for adolescents of thirteen years of age or older (1). Finally, the authors’ findings revealed that male participants preferred online self-disclosure over offline self-disclosure more often than female participants, and online self-disclosure enhanced the quality of friendships of male participants more than it enhanced the quality of relationships for female participants (1).



Many developmental changes take place during adolescence, which has motivated some researchers to examine the influence that age has on adolescents' self-disclosure. In the article "Age Differences in Self-Disclosure" by Virendra Sinha, Sinha's Self-Disclosure Inventory was distributed to two hundred and fifty-two female adolescents of three different levels of age development to investigate self-disclosure in light of age differences (257). For this study, adolescence was divided into the three age levels of early, mid-, and late adolescence (257). The Sinha's Self-Disclosure Inventory, a self-rating scale, was seen to be reliable in previous studies, and for this study the inventory was expanded to measure the magnitude of self-disclosure (257). Significant differences were found in self-disclosure scores between the three age levels, with early adolescence having the highest levels of self-disclosure, mid-adolescence the lowest amount of self-disclosure, and late adolescence increasing in self-disclosure from mid-adolescence (257). The researcher proposes that the dip in mid-adolescence may be explained by self-consciousness that increases in mid-adolescence but decreases in late adolescence with increased maturity (257).

Reaching back farther when investigating age and self-disclosure, Mark Bennett, Peter Mitchell, and Pauline Murray, in their article "Children's Judgments About Their Own Self-Knowledge: The Role of Disclosure to Other," investigate the thought processes of children behind their own self-disclosing and understanding. The authors describe their study as opposing the previous proposition that young children fail to comprehend their own self-knowledge, often citing their mothers as knowing and understanding them better than they understand themselves (731). In their study, the researchers presented 5, 7, 9, and 11-year-old children with hypothetical scenarios in which the child was portrayed as either disclosing or not disclosing a specified state to their mother rather than asked general questions (731). The children were then asked who

would know the state best: their mothers or themselves (731). The researchers found that when the state of feeling was not disclosed in the story, the children were more likely to attribute better understanding to themselves, but when state of feeling was disclosed to their mother in the story, they were more likely to attribute better understanding to their mothers (731).

Other researchers have searched for predictable patterns, based on gender, in the self-disclosure of adolescents and young adults. Kimberley Radmacher and Margarita Azmitia in which the researchers investigated adolescents' and emerging adults' perceptions of intimacy in friendships and searched for tendencies in those perceptions related to age and gender in their article "Are There Gendered Pathways to Intimacy in Early Adolescents' and Emerging Adults' Friendships?" (415). For the research, two studies were conducted, with 137 adolescent and emerging adult participants in the first study and with 174 emerging adult participants in the second study (415). In both studies the participants related narratives about a time when they felt particularly close to a friend, and these narratives were coded for affective feelings and intimate behaviors (415). In the second study, participants also completed surveys to measure the intimacy in their closest friendships (415). The researchers found, in the first study, that early adolescents' narratives contained more shared activities and less self-disclosure than those of emerging adults, and no differences in intimacy were revealed related to gender (415). In the second study, the researchers found that emerging adult male and female participants indicated equal levels of self-disclosure but that female participants' narratives contained more self-disclosure and fewer reports of shared activities than the male participants' narratives (415). The researchers found self-disclosure to be predictive of emotional closeness for both male and female participants in the second study and also found mention of shared activities to be predictive of emotional closeness in friendships for male participants (415).

Confidentiality has also been studied to determine the impact it may have on the self-disclosure of adolescents. In the article “The Influence of Confidentiality Conditions on Self-Disclosure of Early Adolescents” by Bella Kobocow, John McGuire, and Burton Blau, the researchers aim to measure the effects that varying levels of confidentiality assurance have on the frequency of self-disclosure of junior high school students (435). The researchers hypothesized that adolescents would disclose personal and potentially condemning information most frequently when given the assurance of confidentiality and the least frequently when explicitly not given the guarantee of confidentiality (439). For this study, forty-five male participants and forty-five female participants completed a self-disclosure questionnaire in randomly assigned groupings, which separated the participants into one of three treatment conditions: confidentiality expressly guaranteed, confidentiality not mentioned, and confidentiality expressly not guaranteed (435). The researchers found that their study’s results did not support their hypothesis that perceived lack of confidentiality would limit self-disclosure (435). The findings revealed that male participants disclosed more frequently in all confidentiality conditions than the female participants did (435). When discussing their findings, the researchers make an interesting suggestion that by mentioning confidentiality, the female participants might have felt more strongly self-protective (441).

Researchers have also examined the influence that gender and amount of self-disclosure among friends has on the romantic relationships of adolescents. “Correlates of False Self in Adolescent Romantic Relationships” is an article by Lorrie Sippola, Carie Buchanan, and Sabrina Kehoa in which the researchers investigate the relationship between interpersonal competencies in friend relationships among peers and “feelings of false self” in romantic relationships (515). In this study, the researchers examined the contributions of interpersonal

skills in both same-sex and other-sex relationships, anticipating that an observable connection would exist between interpersonal skills in relationships with peers and feelings of false self in romantic relationships, and investigated the influence of gender on the relationship between interpersonal skills with peers and feelings of false self in romantic relationships (516). The researchers used quantitative research methods through the use of scales to measure participants' false selves and interpersonal skills. Of particular significance regarding self-disclosure was the inclusion of a self-disclosure scale in measuring interpersonal skills; the researchers found a positive correlation between high competency of self-disclosure in same-sex friendships and low levels of false self in romantic relationships in the male participants of the study (518). The researchers conclude that relationships with same-sex peers have an impact on the sense of self of adolescents in their romantic relationships but that this impact differs for the two genders (520).

Aside from studying the ways that self-disclosure can influence other aspects of adolescents' and young adults' lives, researchers have also examined factors that contribute to or discourage adolescents' and young' adults self-disclosure. Traumatic events can have a significant impact on the likelihood of self-disclosure of individuals of all ages. In the article "Willingness to Self-Disclose Among Late Adolescent Female Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse" by Nancy Nereo, Barry Farber, and Veronica Hinton, the researchers compare the willingness of late adolescent women who were sexually abused and the willingness of late adolescent women who were not sexually abused to disclose general and sexual information to strangers and intimate partners (303). The two hypotheses of the study were that sexually abused adolescents will differ from adolescents who were not sexually abused in their willingness to disclose general and sexual information to either extreme of highly or minimally disclosing and

in their willingness to disclose to specific individuals, who in this study were strangers and intimate partners (305). For this study, sixty-one late adolescent female participants completed a sexual experiences questionnaire, a social desirability scale, which was used to identify possible bias of participants in responses to appear more socially desirable, and an adapted disclosure inventory (305). Based on the reports of the participants, the researchers conclude that sexually abused adolescents are less likely to be willing to highly disclose general and sexual information to intimate partners than nonabused adolescents (303).

While past events alter the communication behaviors of young adults, personality and psychological condition can have a significant impact on conversational habits and self-disclosure. Some researchers have studied the motivations of adolescents who consistently draw conversations back to being about themselves and the impact these behaviors can have on their friends seeking the conventional exchange of self-disclosure. Rebecca Schwartz-Mette and Amanda Rose examine the interpersonal relationships of adolescents, identifying a new element that they call conversational self-focus, which involves the direction of conversation toward oneself and away from others, in their article “Conversational Self-Focus in Adolescent Friendships: Observational Assessment of an Interpersonal Process and Relations with Internalizing Symptoms and Friendship Quality” (1263). The participants were sixty adolescents in tenth grade, thirty same-gender friendships pairs with an even number of male and female pairs (1269). The participants identified problems they were willing to disclose and were taped interacting with their partner in the study (1270). From their observations, the researchers conclude that adolescents with symptoms of internalizing are particularly likely to engage in self-focus and that because of this, their friends are more likely to perceive the relationship as lower in quality (1263). The researchers also discovered that self-focused adolescents talked

about themselves in ways that distracted the conversation and attention away from the problems of their friends and that they changed the subject abruptly in conversation (1263). Schwartz-Mette and Rose mention that a possible explanation for the self-focus of internalizing youth is that they have difficulty disengaging from their problems because of the overwhelming and constant nature of their contemplation (1267). The authors describe the impact of self-focus on relationships, saying that, while friends can provide unique support in adolescence, adolescents with self-focused friends are less likely to receive the benefits of normative self-disclosure, or help with their problems, when the focus is constantly being drawn away from them, and they will feel unsupported (1267).

While some adolescents with psychological neediness may draw conversations to themselves so that the exchange of self-disclosure focuses on themselves without opportunity given for reciprocation, other adolescents are very guarded with their self-disclosure. At this age it is common for guarded self-disclosure to occur primarily with parents, and several researchers have studied this tendency in adolescents' self-disclosure. In the article "How Much Do I Tell Thee? Strategies for Managing Information to Parents Among American Adolescents from Chinese, Mexican, and European Backgrounds" by Marina Tasopoulos-Chan, Judith Smetana, and Jenny Yau, the researchers examine adolescents' strategies for managing information about their activities to their parents, and these strategies include partial disclosure, avoidance, lying, and full disclosure (364). The participants in this study were 497 American adolescents from Mexican, Chinese, and or European backgrounds and from varying generational statuses (364). The researchers examined adolescents' management of information regarding personal activities, prudential activities, and overlapping, or multifaceted, activities (364). The participants ranked their own uses of information management strategies (367). Following this, the participants

completed surveys, ranking items to assess their closeness and trust in regards to their parents, their feelings of family obligation, their involvement in problem behaviors, and their inclination toward depressed moods (367). The researchers found that Chinese-American adolescents partially disclose to their mothers about personal and multifaceted activities more than Mexican-American adolescents and more about personal activities to their fathers than European-American adolescents disclosed (364). Both European- and Mexican-American adolescents fully disclosed more to their mothers than Chinese American adolescents (364). Some significant conclusions drawn by the researchers are that adolescents who disclose fully to their parents and who lie less about their personal and multifaceted activities indicate stronger support of family obligations, stronger trust in their parents, and less problem behavior (364). Lying about personal activities occurred more in adolescents with more depressed moods (364).

Adolescents may be selective in their self-disclosures to their parents, but parental behaviors impact the self-disclosures of their children as well. “Parenting and Antisocial Behavior: A Model of the Relationship Between Adolescent Self-Disclosure, Parental Closeness, Parental Control, and Adolescent Antisocial Behavior,” an article by Alessio Vieno, Maury Nation, Massimiliano Pastore, and Massimo Santinello, contains the authors’ exploration of the relationships between parenting, adolescent self-disclosure, and antisocial behavior (1509). The researchers’ primary goal was to test and extend a model of parenting and adolescent behavior problems studied by other researchers (1510). To do this, the authors examined direct and indirect relationships between parental control, the closeness of parent-child relationship, the willingness of adolescents to self-disclose, and their collective relationship with parental knowledge and antisocial behavior (1510). The participants of the study included 840 adolescents and their parents, and for this study, both parents and adolescents completed

questionnaires that measured parenting and antisocial behavior (1512). The researchers conclude that maternal control is positively related to adolescents' self-disclosure and to their mother's knowledge of their behavior but that this model does not work with fathers (1516). They found that generally boys were less likely to self-disclose to their parents than girls, and because of this, parents were less informed about the activities of their male children (1517). Finally, the authors conclude that adolescents play an important and active role in the amount of information their parents receive about them as well as in the extent to which their parents monitor their behavior and that parents' development of an open and positive relationship with their children directly impacts the openness and behaviors of their children (1517).

Researchers have also revealed connections between the self-disclosure of adolescents to their family members and the likelihood of adolescents to be depressed, anxious, or suicidal. Netta Horesh and Alan Apter examine personality in self-disclosure and the relationship that this has to depression, anxiety, and suicidal behaviors in adolescent psychiatric inpatients in their article "Self-Disclosure, Depression, Anxiety, and Suicidal Behavior in Adolescent Psychiatric Inpatients" (66). Eighty-seven inpatients between the ages of thirteen and twenty-one participated in this study, which used several scales to measure suicide potential, lethality, intent, tendency, and ideation (67). Other factors measured in the study, using various developed and tested scales, were depression, anxiety, and self-disclosure (68). They discovered that a significant relationship exists between suicidality and low levels of self-disclosure, most significantly between the adolescent and his or her family members, and that this seemed to be mediated by anxiety and depression (63). The researchers also found that nonsuicidal youth were as likely to disclose to family members as they were to peers or other adults, but suicidal youth are specifically less likely to disclose to their immediate family (70).



## **Young Adults and Camp Behavior**

The final category of this review of literature is the behaviors of young adults in camp settings. Little research has been focused on studying communication in camp settings. What little has been conducted has largely focused on the communication in camps specifically designed for youth with medical needs, such as diabetes or obesity. “Who Are the Teen Campers?: Teens Today” is an article by Karla Henderson and Deborah Bialeschki in which they discuss who chooses to come to camp and for what reasons. The study involved surveying 1016 teens between the ages of twelve and nineteen (1). According to their survey results, more girls than boys indicated planning to attend camp, and Caucasian youth with both parents employed full-time were more likely to attend camp (1). Some of the reasons reported for attending camp included: to meet and spend time with people from other places, to have a good time, to engage in different activities than possible at home, to spend time away from home and enjoy more independence, and to spend more time out of doors (1). The article includes discussion on some specific characteristics of the current generation that shape their attitudes and potentially their camp experience.

Some research has investigated positive effects that camp attendance can have on adolescents. In the article “The Role of Autonomy Support in Summer Camp Programs: Preparing Youth for Productive Behaviors” by Ron Ramsing and Jim Sibthorp, the authors examine the mechanisms and predictors within a summer camp that lead to increased perceptions of autonomy support for youth with diabetes (67). The authors define autonomy support as “the environmental factors that allow for choice, rationale provision, and perspective taking... most often afforded by a person in a leadership... position (63). To do so, the researchers explore the relationship between the participants’ perceptions of autonomy support at camp and camp

characteristics like group size, nature of competition, instructional approach, and programs areas. The researchers also investigate the implications of gender differences in camp programming. This study involved sixty-six participants between the ages of ten and thirteen attending a six-day camp in the intermountain west, and these campers completed self-report questionnaires that measured the participants' perceived autonomy support (67, 69). Based on the responses to the questionnaires, the researchers conclude that group size does not impact participants' perceptions of autonomy support, that noncompetitive activities are higher in autonomy support than are competitive activities, and that instructional styles that are focused on the camper and less educationally focused are perceived as more autonomy supportive (71-72). The researchers also found that female participants preferred cooperative learning more than the male participants (72). This study focused on the use of camp situations and leadership as a means to assist youth with diabetes to develop the behaviors necessary to their health better than simple instruction does.

Another article addressing the influence of summer camp on campers' development is "Research Notes: Youth Development at Summer Camp," which is a compilation of three research synopses, of studies conducted by Barry A. Garst, Jeremy Johnson, Rachelle H. Toupence, Deborah M. Bialeschki, Karla Henderson, Amy Krehbiel, and Dawn Ewing, assembled by Gwynn Powell. These articles contain the researchers' exploration of the influence of camp counseling on leadership skill development by adolescent campers, leadership self-perceptions of adolescent campers while at camp, and the perceptions of camp staff of campers' developmental outcomes at camp. Powell describes camp as providing unique developmental advances for adolescents, including enhancements of campers' self-esteem, self-concept, knowledge, skills, abilities, attitudes, self-reported behaviors and behavioral intentions, and their

physical, social, and spiritual growth. The studies described in this article include an exploration of how participation in camp can develop an adolescent's leadership skills. The researcher discovered that adolescents in leadership roles at camp learn more about themselves, become more responsible, develop increased confidence and effective communication skills, and learn how to manage and solve problems in stressful situations. The study investigating adolescent campers' self-perceptions of their leadership skills reveal that after the camp experience, adolescent campers perceive their leadership skills to be stronger in communication, positional leadership, making decisions, working with groups, and understanding themselves. The final study included in the article pinpoint the goals of the camp experience as perceived by camp staff. These goals include: providing new and unique experiences, opportunities to overcome fears, and opportunities to achieve accomplishments; establishing educational components and outcome-focused programming; providing positive reinforcement, consistent behavior, and goal-setting with campers through the camp staff; and enabling campers to be determined to succeed, to be accountable for their actions, and to obtain and provide peer support. Several recommendations for camp directors are provided and discussed in each of the three studies in light of the developmental progress made by adolescents at camp.

The camp experiences of adolescents have also been studied in regards to the health, developmental, and character benefits that participation can provide for teenagers. In the article "Rites of Passage: Camp Pays Off in Youth Development, Happiness, Health, and Safety," Stephen Wallace identifies several benefits and developmental effects that the camp experiences offer adolescents. Some developmental goals in which camps have been seen to assist are adolescents' self-esteem, independence, leadership, friendships skills, social comfort, and peer relationships (n.p.). Growth in identity, independence, and peer relationships, combining in an

overall sense of self, has been seen to promote feelings of intelligence, success, responsibility, and confidence in adolescents as well as their increased likelihood to perceive their relationships with their parents as positive and to avoid drug and alcohol use (n.p.). Adolescents who take the positive risks that camps promote are 20 percent more likely to avoid destructive behaviors than those who did not take positive risks (n.p.). Wallace identifies three main ways that summer camps provide positive rites of passage for adolescents: through recognizing adolescent life-transitions, by encouraging campers' participation in activities with inherent opportunities to measure progress toward the accomplishment of some goal or achievement, and in offering unique opportunities for increased responsibility (n.p.).

In summary, social penetration theory deals with the development of relationships and the exchange of personal information through the use of self-disclosure. Self-disclosure has been seen to have a wide variety of motivations and influences. Social penetration theory has been widely accepted as a valid theory with which to study the development of relationships and the exchange of self-disclosure. While both social penetration theory and self-disclosure have been studied extensively, including the study of adolescents' and young adults' self-disclosure and hyperpersonal self-disclosure, no studies have been conducted investigating adolescents' and young adults' sudden disclosure of large amounts of personal information outside of the online context or of the sudden disclosure of large amounts of personal information to strangers or new acquaintances in the exciting, new environment of the summer camp setting. Very little research has also been conducted concerning communication in summer camp environments. Thus, there is a need to study both communication in the camp context and the self-disclosure of adolescents and young adults in face-to-face settings.

### Chapter 3 – Methodology

Several of the studies discussed in this review of literature utilized various questionnaires and surveys with which to measure self-disclosure and breadth and depth of social penetration, which could be beneficial in a study such as this. However, Dalmas Taylor and Irwin Altman's Intimacy-Scaled Stimuli appears to be the most appropriate for the study in question, and a survey was created from Taylor and Altman's list of items to measure the self-disclosure for young adults in camp environments, the motivations behind it, and the emotions that result from it. This survey was made available to approximately 2520 freshman COMS 101 students due to their availability and proximity to the target age and camp experience.

The purpose of this quantitative study is to investigate the experiences of young adults in camp environments and self-disclosure in their interpersonal interactions in light of social penetration theory. This is a significant study because, as evidenced in the literature review of this study, social penetration theory is a valid approach to studying the development of interpersonal interactions and self-disclosure but has never been applied to self-disclosure in the novel environment of the summer camp setting. This is an area of communication that has not been studied in depth and a context of interaction that has not been previously studied. The method of this study is shaped to investigate the self-disclosure of young adults in camp environments in light of social penetration theory. The findings of this study could potentially be generalized to reveal tendencies of adolescents' self-disclosure to new acquaintances in novel settings. The research questions proposed by this study are:

RQ1: Do young adults' tendencies in self-disclosure while in camp settings differ from their typical self-disclosure tendencies?

RQ2: Do young adults' tendencies in self-disclosure while in camp settings fall into the category of increased self-disclosure?

RQ3: Do the self-disclosure tendencies of female young adults and those of male young adults differ in either familiar settings or summer camp settings?

A survey was selected to conduct this research because of the cost- and time-efficiency of this type of research design. The use of a survey also encouraged a larger number of participants through the ease of distribution and through the minimal effort required by the participants to complete the surveys. For this study, a large sample is particularly beneficial because of the influence personality has on individual self-disclosure. By having a large number of participants, the variety of personalities involved in the study will be increased, making the findings more accurately generalizable to a larger population. The survey for this study was cross-sectional, meaning the participants completing the survey within a specific window of time and with no later repetition of the survey. The type of survey used for this study was self-administered questionnaires, made available to the participants as Web-based surveys through the company SurveyMonkey. This company was selected because the name is likely to be familiar to the participants and because of the user-friendly format the company provides. Both of these characteristics were likely to encourage participation, as they would make the respondents more comfortable throughout the survey-completion process.

The population being investigated in this study is young adults who have attended any organization's summer camp that required campers to reside away from home for at least five days and that involved adolescents and young adults who did not previously know each other. The online survey for this study was made available to approximately 2520 traditional college freshmen enrolled in a basic communication course at a large private university in central

Virginia and who have attended a summer camp involving residing away from home for at least five days with unfamiliar peers. “Traditional college freshman,” for the purpose of this study, included freshman between the ages of eighteen and twenty. This sample was selected because traditional college freshmen are in their late teens, thus being within the target population without being minors. Potential participants were made aware of the survey through in-class announcements and emails from their class instructors. The emails included a link leading directly to the survey for easy access. Any responses provided by students younger than eighteen or older than twenty were discarded through filters in the response analysis of the online survey.

College freshmen between the ages of eighteen and twenty were selected as the participants for this study because they are likely to have attended a summer camp directly before entering college, while college sophomores, juniors, and seniors are less likely to have recently attended a summer camp. Thus, the recall of camp experiences would be more difficult and less accurate for sophomores, juniors, and seniors than it would be for freshmen. All freshmen students enrolled in a basic communication course partially instructed by a graduate assistant in the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters were given the opportunity to participate in the sample and provided with access to the online survey. The basic communication course at the university is a graduation requirement for all students, regardless of major. This provided a well-rounded cross section of students. These courses were selected from which to draw participants because of convenience and accessibility of the researcher. The sample was stratified and taken from a basic communication course at a large private university in central Virginia and involved both male and female traditional freshmen college students between the ages of eighteen and twenty. Students were given five points extra credit in the communication course for participating in the study. The data collection process involved complete anonymity for the

students participating. Survey responses were collected on SurveyMonkey's website and analyzed all together.

As previously mentioned, the basis for this study is Altman and Taylor's social penetration theory, which explains the development of relationships as a mutual, gradual overlapping and exploration of identities by the individuals involved in a relationship and involving the discovery of both breadth and depth of an individual's personality (Altman and Taylor 15). Altman and Taylor describe social penetration as a process that goes through stages over time. While the creators of this theory acknowledge that people progress through the stages uniquely and differently, there is an understanding that people take time to reveal a wide range of information and deeply personal information about themselves to others. If increased self-disclosure is revealed during young adults' interpersonal interactions in camp settings, this study might identify a scenario in which the norms of gradual self-disclosure, established by social penetration theory, do not consistently occur. Social penetration theory has been applied to increased self-disclosure in various online communication contexts, but face-to-face communication contexts have been neglected in research regarding altered self-disclosure. The researcher hopes to apply this theory in a new way and to a new context.

To test their theory and measure self-disclosure, Dalmas Taylor and Irwin Altman conducted a study in which they developed a 671-item list of statements, entitled "Intimacy-Scaled Stimuli for Use in Studies of Interpersonal Relationships," designed to measure interpersonal exchange and self-disclosure (ii). Taylor and Altman developed this list to aid in the conducting of research to test their theory of social penetration, as they discovered that they were hindered in the testing of their theory by the lack of an applicable method of measurement and analysis (ii). The authors themselves state that the items developed are appropriate for the



use of developing a self-disclosure questionnaire and for offering a more complete and beneficial measurement than other existing questionnaires (Taylor and Altman 28).

Cecilia Solano, in her article “Sex Differences and the Taylor-Altman Self-Disclosure Stimuli,” tested Taylor and Altman’s intimacy-scaled stimuli for any changes in the levels of perceived intimacy and for any shift in the relative intimacy of topics within categories nearly twenty years after the development of the stimuli (288). Solano also altered the stimuli to be applicable to both genders to test the stimuli’s reliability in measuring the self-disclosure of both men and women, as the original list of items had been directed toward men only (287). The study revealed slight and insignificant changes in the perceptions of the stimuli’s intimacy and categorization by both men and women and validated the continued use of the Taylor-Altman intimacy-scaled stimuli to measure self-disclosure (288). Given the validation of the items generated by Taylor and Altman and the appropriateness and applicability of their list, the items included in the measurement tool developed by Taylor and Altman and scaled for levels of intimacy was the basis of the survey developed for the present study.

In the present study, two statements were constructed from each of the thirteen categories of items developed by Taylor and Altman. Taylor and Altman’s thirteen topical categories, listed in “Self-Disclosure in Isolated Groups,” include: religion; own marriage and family; love, dating, sex; parental family; physical condition and appearance; money and property; government and politics, current events and social issues; emotions and feelings; interests, hobbies, habits; relationships with other people; personal attitudes, values and ethics, and self evaluation; school and work; and biographical characteristics (5-8). The items of the survey were limited to two statements per category, rather than including all of the 671 items of Taylor and Altman’s scale, to aid in the ease and willingness of participants taking the survey. For each category, one

statement of a high intimacy level and one statement of a low-to-moderate intimacy level were selected. The statements included in Taylor and Altman's list are specific, are often implicitly directed toward participants of a certain age or gender, and are at times dated, particularly in which statements about political leanings and decisions are involved. The items selected for the survey were categorized by the depth of intimacy self-disclosure about that topic would involve. The three possible categories were low intimacy, moderate intimacy, and high intimacy. Seven of the items on the survey fell under the low intimacy category, ten items on the survey fell under the moderate intimacy category, and nine items fell under the high intimacy category.

The 26 items selected for this study were adapted to be representative of their categories, age and lifestyle appropriate, and applicable to both genders. Participants responded to each statement on a Likert-type continuous scale, indicating their level of willingness to disclose the information described in the 26 items, first in a typical setting of getting to know a new acquaintance, such as meeting new people at school. Participants then indicated their level of willingness to disclose the information described in the 26 items a second time, being instructed to have in mind a specific acquaintance met during a summer camp experience and their self-disclosure with that person while responding to those statements. Thus, the survey included 26 items that were repeated, for a total of 52 items related to self-disclosure. The participants' answers to the first set of 26 statements provided the control variable of typical self-disclosure practices to be compared with the second set of answers revealing the self-disclosure of participants in camp settings.

Eight additional demographic items were included, instructing participants to indicate gender, age, organizational affiliations of the camp attended, length of camp stay, whether the camp experience involved staying away from home over night, whether the camp experience

involved meeting new people, whether the conversations described occurred with a peer and fellow camper, and finally the participant's year of study in college. The last four questions of the survey addressed the participants' reasons for disclosing what they did at camp, the participants' comfort or discomfort over their self-disclosure at camp, participants' initial emotional responses to their self-disclosure at camp, and the participants' current emotional responses looking back on their self-disclosure at camp, for a final total of 64 survey items to which participants responded. Response options for the first set of 26 items were: "I would not share this with a new acquaintance," "I probably would not share this with a new acquaintance," "I might or might not share this with a new acquaintance," "I probably would share this with a new acquaintance," and "I would share this with a new acquaintance." The response options for the second set of 26 items were, "I did not share this at all with my new camp acquaintance," "I did not say much about this to my new camp acquaintance," "I shared this with my new camp acquaintance if he or she brought it up first," "I did share this a little with my new camp acquaintance," and "I did share this fully with my new camp acquaintance." See Appendix A for the full survey.

A test study was conducted prior to the main survey to test the clarity and reliability of the 55 items developed for this study. The test study included four items from each of Taylor and Altman's categories, for a total of 110 questions. The test study included three participants, one male and two female, who were enrolled in the same basic communication course during the spring semester of 2010. The three participants took the 110-item survey online through the SurveyMonkey website, as with the present study. A comment section was included in the test study's survey, and the reactions of the test study participants were noted. No problems were found with the test study survey, and so the only alterations made to the survey for the present

study was the elimination of two items from each category for the ease of the participants in responding. The results of the test study were analyzed to ensure that the survey produced relevant responses, but no alterations were deemed necessary. The timeline for the present study spanned two college semesters, the fall semester of 2010 and the spring semester of 2011. College freshman enrolled in a basic communication course partially instructed by a graduate assistant in the fall semester of 2010 were given the opportunity to take the survey during that semester, and the survey was accessible online to them during that entire semester. For students enrolled in a basic communication course partially instructed by a graduated assistant during the spring semester of 2011, the survey was available online during the first three weeks of that semester. For the courses in question, “partially instructed by a graduate assistant” refers to courses in which students met in a large lecture setting taught by a faculty member once a week; the same students met two other days a week in smaller classes instructed by graduate assistants.

As previously stated, this study involved the investigation of the self-disclosure of young adults in novel camp environments. This study also included a brief investigation of possible reasons and motivations for self-disclosure and subsequent reactions that young adults have to their own self-disclosure, testing the existence of a direct relationship between the reason for self-disclosure and the emotions felt afterward, such as relief or regret.

The analysis of the data collected from the surveys includes careful description of the participants’ responses for each of the 64 items of the survey. The percentages of responses for natural tendencies in self-disclosure were compared to the percentages of responses regarding actual occurrences of self-disclosure in camp settings. The self-disclosure tendencies reported for low, moderate, and high intimacy items were compared with each other. The averages of male and female responses were also compared to identify any differences in self-disclosure

tendencies that potentially exist between the genders. The numbers produced by the results of the study were analyzed using SPSS to determine the statistical significance of the results, which is described in the following results discussion. The study will aim for a precision level of less than  $\pm 5\%$ . The final step of the data analysis involved interpretation of the results, indicating the answers to the research questions that were revealed by the results. This step of the data analysis also includes a discussion of the results in light of social penetration theory. The procedures described in this methodology were utilized to discover the natural self-disclosure tendencies of adolescents and to compare those natural tendencies with the self-disclosure of adolescents that occurs in the novel summer camp environment. The discussion section of the present study explores the conclusions and implications that may be made from the data presented here.

## Chapter 4 – Results

The variables examined in this study were young adults' tendencies in self-disclosure to new acquaintances in familiar settings compared to the same young adults' reported self-disclosure to a new acquaintance in a summer camp setting. The research questions proposed by this study are:

RQ1: Do young adults' tendencies in self-disclosure while in camp settings differ from their typical self-disclosure tendencies?

RQ2: Do young adults' tendencies in self-disclosure while in camp settings fall into the category of increased self-disclosure?

RQ3: Do the self-disclosure tendencies of female young adults and those of male young adults differ in either familiar settings or summer camp settings?

Participants in this study were restricted to those respondents who met specific criteria. Given the guidelines for participation, four of the demographic questions on the survey, questions 56-59, must have been responded to affirmatively for a respondent's survey to be included in the study. (See Appendix A for full survey) These four demographic questions were, "Did the camp you attended last five days or more?," "Did the camp you attended involve staying away from home overnight?," "Did the camp you attended host people you had never met before?," and finally, "Did the conversations you had in mind while answering questions about your self-disclosure at camp happened between you and a peer (a fellow camper)?" Of the approximately 2520 students to whom the survey was made available, 454 responded to the survey, for roughly an 18% response rate. Of the 454 total respondents, 357 fulfilled the criteria to be included in the study. Out of the 357 responses included in the study, 256 were 18 years of age, making up 71.7% of the respondents, 91 were 19 years of age, making up 25.5%, and 10

were 20 years of age, making up 2.8%. The number of participants who were male was 126, or 35.3%, and 231 participants were female, or 64.7% of the respondents. The final demographic question included in the survey asked participants to indicate whether the camp they attended was religiously affiliated. Of the 357 participants, 304 indicated that the camp they attended was religiously affiliated, making up 85.2% of the respondents. The remaining 53 respondents indicated that the camp they attended was not religiously affiliated, making up 14.8% of the respondents. See Appendix B for full survey results.

### **Analysis of Each Survey Item**

The first set of 26 questions on the survey instructed participants to indicate their likelihood of sharing a particular piece of information with a new acquaintance in a familiar setting. The second set of 26 questions on the survey instructed participants to indicate to what level they shared or did not share a particular piece of information with their new acquaintance at summer camp. The first item on the survey was “the reasons why I am or am not religious.” In answer to the first question, 9 (2.5%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 26 (7.3%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 85 (23.8%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 94 (26.3%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 143 (40.1%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. In response to this item regarding actual self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance, 22 (6.2%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 39 (10.9%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 84 (23.5%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 122 (34.2%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp

acquaintance, and 90 (25.2%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. The largest percentage of participants, 40.1%, indicated that they would share reasons why they were or were not religious with a new acquaintance. When reflecting upon their actual self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance, the largest percentage of participants, 34.2%, indicated that they shared a lot about this topic. These results indicate a slight but significant decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. The statistical analysis revealed that this is a significant difference between the participants' predicted self-disclosure to a new acquaintance in a familiar setting and their reported self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance,  $t(356, 1) = 5.837(p <.001)$ .

The second item on the survey was “common interests that I would like my spouse and I to have.” Responding to the first question, 28 (7.8%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 73 (20.4%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 92 (25.8%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 88 (24.6%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 76 (21.3%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. In response to this item on the second set of questions, 83 (23.2%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 82 (23.0%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 90 (25.2%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 64 (17.9%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 38 (10.6%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. When indicating their likelihood to share with a new acquaintance what common interests they hoped to share with their spouse, the largest percentage of participants, 25.8%, indicated that they might or might not share this



information. In response to the second question about this topic, the largest percentage of participants, 25.2%, indicated that they shared some information about this topic to their new camp acquaintance. The majority results indicate little change. However, 7.8% predicted that they would not share any information about this topic, when in actuality, to a new camp acquaintance, 23.2% reported that they did not share this information. Also, 21.3% predicted that they would share information about common interests they want to have with their spouse, when in actuality, only 10.6% reported that they shared everything about this information with their new camp acquaintance. Thus, these results indicate that there was a significant decline from predicted self-disclosure to reported self-disclosure about this topic. The statistical analysis revealed that this was a significant difference between the predicted self-disclosure and the participants' reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 8.496(p < .001)$ .

The third item on the survey was "situations that bore me." In response to the first question about this item, 14 (3.9%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 51 (14.3%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 100 (28.0%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 109 (30.5%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 83 (23.2%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. Responding to this item on the second set of questions, 34 (9.5%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 65 (18.2%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 110 (30.8%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 85 (23.8%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 63 (17.6%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. The largest percentage of

participants, 30.5%, indicated that they probably would share information about situations that bore them with a new acquaintance. When indicating their actual self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance, the largest percentage of participants, 30.8%, indicated that they shared some information about this topic. These results indicate a slight but significant decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. The statistical analysis revealed that this was a significant difference between the participants' predicted self-disclosure and their reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 5.133(p < .001)$ .

The fourth item on the survey was "things that I would not want people to find out about me if I ever ran for a political office." Indicating their response to the first question about this item, 156 (43.7%) respondents selected that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 105 (29.4%) selected that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 54 (15.1%) selected that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 30 (8.4%) selected that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 12 (3.4%) selected that they would share this with a new acquaintance. In response to the question regarding what they did disclose about this item to their new camp acquaintance, 176 (49.3%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 86 (24.1%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 57 (16.0%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 17 (4.8%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 21 (5.9%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. When predicting their self-disclosure about things they would not want people to find out about them if they ever ran for a political office, the largest percentage of participants, 43.7%, indicated that they would not share information about this with a new

acquaintance. When answering the second question about this topic, the largest percentage of participants, 49.3%, indicated that they did not share any information about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. These results indicate that respondents' self-disclosure to a camp acquaintance remained consistent with their prediction. The statistical analysis revealed that there was no significant difference between predicted self-disclosure and reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 0.667(p = .505)$ .

The fifth item on the survey was "what I would do if it seemed that my marriage was not a success." In response to the first question about this topic, 100 (28.0%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 116 (32.5%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 86 (24.1%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 37 (10.4%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 18 (5.0%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. Responding to the second question about this topic, 171 (47.9%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 77 (21.6%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 64 (17.9%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 29 (8.1%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 16 (4.5%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. The largest percentage of participants, 32.5%, indicated that they would probably not share information about what they would do if their marriage was not a success with a new acquaintance. When answering the second question about this topic, the largest percentage of participants, 47.9%, indicated that they did not share anything about this topic with a new camp acquaintance. These results indicate a significant decrease in reported self-disclosure

compared to predicted self-disclosure. The statistical analysis revealed that this was a significant difference between the participants' predicted self-disclosure and their reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 4.810(p <.001)$ .

The sixth item on the survey was "the extent to which I worry about money." When replying to this question, 83 (23.1%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 105 (29.4%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 107 (30.0%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 46 (12.9%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 16 (4.5%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. In response to the question regarding self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance about this topic, 136 (38.1%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 99 (27.7%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 72 (20.2%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 35 (9.8%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 15 (4.2%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. The largest percentage of participants, 30.0%, indicated that they might or might not share information about the extent to which they worry about money with a new acquaintance. When answering the second question about this topic, the largest percentage of participants, 38.1%, indicated that they did not share any information about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. These results indicate that respondents' self-disclosure to a camp acquaintance decreased significantly compared to their predictions. The statistical analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between predicted self-disclosure and reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 4.924(p <.001)$ .

The seventh item on the survey was “things that would cause me to break up a friendship.” In response to the first question regarding this topic, 61 (17.1%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 98 (27.5%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 115 (32.2%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 60 (16.8%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 23 (6.4%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. Responding to the question about actual self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance on this topic, 97 (27.2%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 96 (26.9%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 86 (24.1%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 52 (14.6%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 26 (7.3%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. When indicating their predictions of their own self-disclosure to a new acquaintance regarding things that would cause them to break up a friendship, the largest percentage of participants, 32.2%, indicated that they might or might not share information about this topic. In response to the second question about this topic, the largest percentage of participants, 27.2%, indicated that they did not share any information about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. These results indicate a slight but significant decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. The statistical analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between predicted self-disclosure and reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 2.922(p = .004)$ .

The eighth item on this survey was “my worst experience in school.” In response to the first question about this topic, 30 (8.4%) respondents indicated that they would not share this

with a new acquaintance, 55 (15.4%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 95 (26.6%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 108 (30.3%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 69 (19.3%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance.

When replying to the question about self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance on this topic, 72 (20.2%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 68 (19.0%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 95 (26.6%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 72 (20.2%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 50 (14.0%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. In answer to the question about how likely they were to disclose information about their worst experience in school to a new acquaintance, the largest percentage of participants, 30.3%, indicated that they probably would share information about this topic. When reflecting upon their actual self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance, the largest percentage of participants, 26.6%, indicated that they shared some information about this topic. This 26.6% actually matched the prediction percentage, with 26.6% of respondents predicting that they might or might not share information about this topic with a new acquaintance. However, this percentage became the majority in the reported camp disclosure indications when there was a dramatic shift in prediction of not sharing any information about the topic compared to respondents who indicated they did not actually share information about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. Of the participants, 8.4% predicted that they would not share anything about this topic with a new acquaintance, while 20.2% reported that they actually did not share anything about this topic at camp. These results indicate a significant decrease in reported self-

disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. The statistical analysis revealed that this was a significant difference between the predicted self-disclosure and the reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 6.582(p <.001)$ .

The ninth item on this survey was “the number of brothers and sisters I have.” Responding to the first question regarding this topic, 3 (0.8%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 5 (1.4%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 23 (6.4%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 81 (22.7%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 245 (68.6%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. In response to the question regarding actual self-disclosure at summer camp about this topic, 5 (1.4%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 10 (2.8%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 38 (10.6%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 60 (16.8%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 244 (68.3%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. When indicating their predictions of their own self-disclosure to a new acquaintance regarding how many brothers and sisters they have, the largest percentage of participants, 68.6%, indicated that they would share information about this topic. In response to the second question about this topic, the largest percentage of participants, 68.3%, indicated that they shared everything about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. Thus, the majority of participants’ reported self-disclosure remained consistent with their predictions. However, statistical analysis revealed significant differences in the percentages for the other response options. Overall, these percentages revealed a slight but significant decrease from participants’

prediction of self-disclosure to a new acquaintance in a familiar setting to their reported self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance about the number of brothers and sisters they have. The statistical analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between predicted self-disclosure and reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 2.016(p = .045)$ .

The tenth item on the survey was “my views on sexual morality – how I feel that I and others ought to behave in sexual matters.” In response to the first question about this topic, 33 (9.2%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 57 (16.0%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 95 (26.6%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 92 (25.8%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 80 (22.4%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. When replying to the question regarding actual self-disclosure at camp about this topic, 69 (19.3%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 56 (15.7%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 72 (20.2%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 79 (22.1%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 81 (22.7%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. The largest percentage of participants, 26.6%, indicated that they might or might not share information about their views on sexual morality with a new acquaintance. When answering the camp-related question about this topic, the largest percentage of participants, 22.7%, indicated that they shared everything about this topic with a new camp acquaintance. However, this largest percentage is nearly equal to the percentage, 22.4%, of participants who predicted that they would share information about that topic with a new acquaintance, even though more participants, 26.6%, predicted that they might



or might not share information about this with a new acquaintance in a familiar setting. The biggest change in self-disclosure was evident between the predictions of not disclosing anything to a new acquaintance in a familiar setting and the instances of actually not disclosing anything about this topic to a new camp acquaintance. Of the participants, 9.2% predicted that they would not share information about this topic with a new acquaintance, while 19.3% indicated that they did not actually share anything about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. These results indicate a significant decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. The statistical analysis revealed that this was a significant difference between the predicted self-disclosure and the reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 2.988(p = .003)$ .

The eleventh item on this survey was “my name.” Responding to the first question about this topic, 2 (0.6%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 2 (0.6%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 11 (3.1%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 24 (6.7%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 318 (89.1%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. In response to the question regarding self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance about this topic, 4 (1.1%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 6 (1.7%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 12 (3.4%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 18 (5.0%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 317 (88.8%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. When indicating their predictions of their own self-disclosure to a new acquaintance regarding sharing their names, the largest percentage of participants, 89.1%,

indicated that they would share information about this topic. In response to the second question about this topic, the largest percentage of participants, 88.8%, indicated that they shared everything about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. Thus, the majority of participants' reported self-disclosure remained consistent with their predictions. The statistical analysis revealed that there was no significant difference between predicted self-disclosure and reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 1.274(p = .203)$ .

The twelfth item on the survey was "how I might (or did) feel if my mother and father were separated or divorced." When replying to the first question about this topic, 48 (13.4%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 81 (22.7%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 105 (29.4%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 75 (21.0%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 48 (13.4%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. In response to the question regarding camp self-disclosure about this topic, 123 (34.5%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 69 (19.3%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 68 (19.0%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 60 (16.8%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 37 (10.4%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. The largest percentage of participants, 29.4%, indicated that they might or might not share information about how they might or did feel if their mother and father were separated or divorced with a new acquaintance. When answering the question regarding self-disclosure with a new camp acquaintance about this topic, the largest percentage of participants, 34.5%, indicated that they did not share any information about this

topic with their new camp acquaintance. These results indicate that respondents' self-disclosure to a camp acquaintance decreased significantly compared to their predictions. The statistical analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between predicted self-disclosure and reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 6.525(p < .001)$ .

The thirteenth item on the survey was "disappointments or bad experiences I have had in romantic relationships." In response to the first question regarding this topic, 78 (21.8%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 81 (22.7%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 115 (32.2%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 60 (16.8%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 23 (6.4%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. Responding to the question about self-disclosure at summer camp on this topic, 109 (30.5%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 74 (20.7%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 75 (21.0%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 59 (16.5%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 40 (11.2%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. When indicating their predictions regarding their self-disclosure about disappointments or bad experiences they have had in romantic relationships, the largest percentage of participants, 32.2%, indicated that they might or might not share information about that topic with a new acquaintance. To the question regarding self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance, the largest percentage of participants, 30.5%, responded that they did not share any information about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. While the percentage of participants who predicted they would share this topic

with a new acquaintance was 6.4% and increased to 11.2% of participants who indicated they shared everything about this topic with their new camp acquaintance, the overall tendency was a slightly decreased amount of self-disclosure at camp when compared to predicted self-disclosure about this topic. These results indicate that respondents' self-disclosure to a camp acquaintance decreased slightly compared to their predictions. However, the responses to the two questions about this topic showed only slight differences. The statistical analysis revealed that there was no significant difference between predicted self-disclosure and reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 0.847(p = .398)$ .

The fourteenth item on this survey was "my favorite hobbies." In response to the first question about this topic, 2 (0.6%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 7 (2.0%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 14 (3.9%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 109 (30.5%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 225 (63.0%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. Responding to the question about camp self-disclosure on this topic, 6 (1.7%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 7 (2.0%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 54 (15.1%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 91 (25.5%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 199 (55.7%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. When indicating their predictions of their own self-disclosure to a new acquaintance regarding sharing their favorite hobbies, the largest percentage of participants, 63.0%, indicated that they would share information about this topic. In response to the second question about this topic, the

largest percentage of participants, 55.7%, indicated that they shared everything about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. The overall percentages for this topic reveal that respondents' reported self-disclosure to a camp acquaintance decreased slightly but significantly compared to their predictions. The statistical analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between predicted self-disclosure and reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 4.614(p < .001)$ .

The fifteenth item on this survey was "how I would feel about getting tattooed." When replying to the first question about this topic, 11 (3.1%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 25 (7.0%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 81 (22.7%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 116 (32.5%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 124 (34.7%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. In response to the question about their actual self-disclosure to a new acquaintance at summer camp on this topic, 80 (22.4%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 56 (15.7%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 73 (20.4%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 64 (17.9%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 84 (23.5%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. When indicating their predictions of their own self-disclosure to a new acquaintance regarding how they would feel about getting tattooed, the largest percentage of participants, 34.7%, indicated that they would share information about this topic. In response to the question about camp self-disclosure on this topic, the largest percentage of participants, 23.5%, indicated that they shared everything about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. The percentages all indicated a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to the participants'

predictions of their self-disclosure. The statistical analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between predicted self-disclosure and reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 10.632(p < .001)$ .

The sixteenth item on the survey was “what I believe about God.” When replying to the first question about this topic, 3 (0.8%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 7 (2.0%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 41 (11.5%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 113 (31.7%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 193 (54.1%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. In response to the question regarding summer camp self-disclosure about this topic, 13 (3.6%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 20 (5.6%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 42 (11.8%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 98 (27.5%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 184 (51.5%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. The largest percentage of participants, 54.1%, indicated that they would share information about what they believe about God with a new acquaintance. When indicating their actual self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance, the largest percentage of participants, 51.5%, indicated that they shared everything about this topic. These results indicate a slight but significant decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. The statistical analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between the predicted self-disclosure and the reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 3.651(p < .001)$ .

The seventeenth item on this survey was “things I’d really like to have if I could afford them.” When responding to the first question about this topic, 9 (2.5%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 29 (8.1%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 95 (26.6%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 109 (30.5%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 115 (32.2%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. In response to the question about self-disclosure with a new camp acquaintance regarding this topic, 43 (12.0%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 70 (19.6%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 108 (30.3%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 78 (21.8%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 58 (16.2%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. When indicating their predictions of their own self-disclosure to a new acquaintance regarding sharing things they would really like to have if they could afford them, the largest percentage of participants, 32.2%, indicated that they would share information about this topic. In response to the second question about this topic, the largest percentage of participants, 30.3%, indicated that they shared some information about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. The overall percentages for this topic reveal that respondents’ reported self-disclosure to a camp acquaintance decreased significantly compared to their predictions. The statistical analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between predicted self-disclosure and reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 11.131(p <.001)$ .

The eighteenth item on the survey was “times when I have wished that I could change something about my physical appearance.” When responding to the first question regarding this

topic, 63 (17.6%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 111 (31.1%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 108 (30.3%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 53 (14.8%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 22 (6.2%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. In response to the question about self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance on this topic, 94 (26.3%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 87 (24.4%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 91 (25.5%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 63 (17.6%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 22 (6.2%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. The largest percentage of participants, 31.1%, indicated that they would probably not share information about times when they had wished that they could change something about their personal appearance with a new acquaintance. When indicating their actual self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance, the largest percentage of participants, 26.3%, indicated that they did not share anything about this topic. These results indicate a slight increase in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. The statistical analysis revealed that there was no significant difference between the predicted self-disclosure and the reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 1.210(p = .227)$ .

The nineteenth item on the survey was “how interested I am in politics.” When responding to the first question regarding this topic, 31 (8.7%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 68 (19.0%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 121 (33.9%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 76 (21.3%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new



acquaintance, and 61 (17.1%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. In response to the question regarding self-disclosure to a new summer camp acquaintance about this topic, 136 (38.1%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 89 (24.9%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 56 (15.7%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 37 (10.4%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 39 (10.9%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. The largest percentage of participants, 33.9%, indicated that they might or might not share information about how interested they are in politics with a new acquaintance. When indicating their actual self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance, the largest percentage of participants, 38.1%, indicated that they did not share anything about this topic. The overall results indicate significant decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. The statistical analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between the predicted self-disclosure and the reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 12.455(p < .001)$ .

The twentieth item on the survey was “my weight.” In response to the first question regarding to this topic, 91 (25.5%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 83 (23.2%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 70 (19.6%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 62 (17.4%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 51 (14.3%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. When replying to the question about summer camp self-disclosure on this topic, 137 (38.4%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 77 (21.6%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 62 (17.4%)

indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 38 (10.6%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 43 (12.0%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance.

When indicating their predictions of their own self-disclosure to a new acquaintance regarding their weight, the largest percentage of participants, 25.5%, indicated that they would not share information about this topic. In response to the question regarding self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance about this topic, the largest percentage of participants, 38.4%, indicated that they did not share anything about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. Overall, the results indicated a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to the participants' predictions of their self-disclosure. The statistical analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between predicted self-disclosure and reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 5.348(p < .001)$ .

The twenty-first item on this survey was "what I think would be an ideal job." In response to the first question regarding this topic, 8 (2.2%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 15 (4.2%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 77 (21.6%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 120 (33.6%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 137 (38.4%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. When responding to the question regarding summer camp self-disclosure about this topic, 43 (12.0%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 48 (13.4%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 96 (26.9%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 88 (24.6%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 23 (23.0%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new

camp acquaintance. The largest percentage of participants, 38.4%, indicated that they would share information about what they think an ideal job would be with a new acquaintance. When indicating their actual self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance, the largest percentage of participants, 26.9%, indicated that they shared some information about this topic. The overall results indicate significant decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. The statistical analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between the predicted self-disclosure and the reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 9.605(p < .001)$ .

The twenty-second item on the survey was “one of the worst things that ever happened to me.” When responding to the first question about this topic, 62 (17.4%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 84 (23.5%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 102 (28.6%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 65 (18.2%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 44 (12.3%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. In response to the question about self-disclosure at summer camp on this topic, 84 (23.5%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 86 (24.1%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 89 (24.9%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 53 (14.8%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 45 (12.6%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. When indicating their predictions of their own self-disclosure to a new acquaintance regarding one of the worst things that ever happened to them, the largest percentage of participants, 28.6%, indicated that they might or might not share information about this topic. In response to the second question about this topic, the largest percentage of

participants, 24.9%, indicated that they shared some information about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. Overall, the results indicated a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to the participants' predictions of their self-disclosure. The statistical analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between predicted self-disclosure and reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 2.198(p = .029)$ .

The twenty-third item on the survey was "whether I am a 'listener' or a 'talker' in social conversations." When responding to the first question regarding this topic, 18 (5.0%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 49 (13.7%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 102 (28.6%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 109 (30.5%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 79 (22.1%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. In response to the question about self-disclosure to a new summer camp acquaintance on this topic, 61 (17.1%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 73 (20.4%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 94 (26.3%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 68 (19.0%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 61 (17.1%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. The largest percentage of participants, 30.5%, indicated that they probably would share information with a new acquaintance about whether they are "listeners" or "talkers" in social conversations. When answering the question regarding camp self-disclosure about this topic, the largest percentage of participants, 26.3%, indicated that they shared some information about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. These results indicate that respondents' self-disclosure to a camp

acquaintance decreased significantly compared to their predictions. The statistical analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between predicted self-disclosure and reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 7.681(p <.001)$ .

The twenty-fourth item on the survey was “whether or not I wear glasses.” When responding to the first question regarding this topic, 9 (2.5%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 24 (6.7%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 50 (14.0%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 70 (19.6%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 204 (57.1%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. In response to the question regarding actual self-disclosure at summer camp, 59 (16.5%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 29 (8.1%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 49 (13.7%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 50 (14.0%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 170 (47.6%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. When indicating their predictions of their own self-disclosure to a new acquaintance regarding whether they wear glasses, the largest percentage of participants, 57.1%, indicated that they would share information about this topic. In response to the question about self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance on this topic, the largest percentage of participants, 47.6%, indicated that they shared everything about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. The results indicated a significant decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to the participants’ predictions of their self-disclosure. The statistical analysis revealed that there was a

significant difference between predicted self-disclosure and reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 6.889(p < .001)$ .

The twenty-fifth item on the survey was “the things in my past or present life about which I am most ashamed.” When responding to the first question regarding this topic, 170 (47.6%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 87 (24.4%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 47 (13.2%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 38 (10.6%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 15 (4.2%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. Responding to the question about self-disclosure to a new summer camp acquaintance on this topic, 158 (44.3%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 86 (24.1%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 50 (14.0%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 43 (12.0%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 20 (5.6%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. The largest percentage of participants, 47.6%, indicated that they would not share information with a new acquaintance about the things in their past or present lives about which they are most ashamed. When answering the question regarding actual camp self-disclosure about this topic, the largest percentage of participants, 44.3%, indicated that they did not share any information about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. These results indicate that respondents’ self-disclosure to a camp acquaintance increased very slightly compared to their predictions. The statistical analysis revealed that there was no significant difference between predicted self-disclosure and reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = -1.759(p = .079)$ .

Finally, the twenty-sixth item on the survey was “adventures and/or strange things that have happened to me.” In response to the first question about this topic, 7 (2.0%) respondents indicated that they would not share this with a new acquaintance, 20 (5.6%) indicated that they would probably not share this with a new acquaintance, 86 (24.1%) indicated that they might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 125 (35.0%) indicated that they probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 119 (33.3%) indicated that they would share this with a new acquaintance. When responding to the question regarding self-disclosure to a new acquaintance at summer camp about this topic, 11 (3.1%) respondents indicated that they did not share anything about this with their new camp acquaintance, 33 (9.2%) indicated that they did not say much about this to their new camp acquaintance, 102 (28.6%) indicated that they shared some information about this with their new camp acquaintance, 111 (31.1%) indicated that they shared a lot about this with their new camp acquaintance, and 100 (28.0%) indicated that they shared everything about this with their new camp acquaintance. When indicating their predictions of their own self-disclosure to a new acquaintance regarding adventures and/or strange things that have happened to them, the largest percentage of participants, 35.0%, indicated that they probably would share information about this topic. In response to the question about actual self-disclosure at camp on this topic, the largest percentage of participants, 31.1%, indicated that they shared a lot about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. Overall, the results indicated a significant decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to the participants’ predictions of their self-disclosure. The statistical analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between predicted self-disclosure and reported self-disclosure,  $t(356, 1) = 3.863 (p < .001)$ . See Appendix C for item-by-item analysis results.

### **Analysis By Depth Category**

The items on the survey are categorized by the depth of intimacy self-disclosure about that topic would involve. The three possible categories are low intimacy, moderate intimacy, and high intimacy. Seven of the items on the survey fall under the low intimacy category, ten items on the survey fall under the moderate intimacy category, and nine items fall under the high intimacy category.

#### *Low Intimacy Level*

Items 2, 9, 11, 14, 17, 19, and 24 and both lists of 26 measured self-disclosure on low intimacy items. These items asked questions about self-disclosure regarding the participants' common interests they would like to have with their spouse, the number of brothers and sisters they have, their names, their favorite hobbies, things they would really like to have if they could afford them, how interested they are in politics, and whether they wear glasses.

In response to the questions about the second item, "common interests that I would like my spouse and I to have," the participants' responses indicated a significant decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. Responding questions about the ninth item on this survey, "the number of brothers and sisters I have," the responses of the participants revealed a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. When responding to the questions about the eleventh item on this survey, "my name," participants' responses revealed no significant change between predicted and reported self-disclosure. In response to the fourteenth item on this survey, "my favorite hobbies," the responses of the participants indicated a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure.

Responding to the questions about the seventeenth item on this survey, "things I'd really like to have if I could afford them," the participants' responses revealed a significant decrease in



reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. When responding to the questions about the nineteenth item on the survey, “how interested I am in politics,” the responses of the participants indicated a significant decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. In response to the questions about the twenty-fourth item on the survey, “whether or not I wear glasses,” participants’ responses revealed a significant decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. The overall tendency in participants’ responses regarding low intimacy items is a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure.

#### *Moderate Intimacy Level*

Items 3, 6, 7, 10, 15, 16, 18, 21, 23, and 26 on both lists of 26 were measuring self-disclosure on moderate intimacy level items. These items prompted the participants to respond about their self-disclosure regarding situations that bore them, the extent to which they worry about money, things that would cause them to break up a friendship, their views on sexual morality – how they feel that they and others ought to behave in sexual matters, how they would feel about getting tattooed, what they believe about God, times when they have wished that they could change something about their physical appearance, what they think an ideal job would be, whether they are a “listener” or a “talker” in social conversations, and adventures and/or strange things that have happened to them.

In response to the questions regarding the third item on the survey, “situations that bore me,” participants’ responses indicated a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. When responding to the questions about the sixth item on the survey, “the extent to which I worry about money,” participants’ responses revealed a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. Responding to the questions about

the seventh item on the survey, “things that would cause me to break up a friendship,” the responses of the participants indicated a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. In response to the questions about the tenth item on the survey, “my views on sexual morality – how I feel that I and others ought to behave in sexual matters,” participants’ responses indicated a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. When responding to the questions about the fifteenth item on this survey, “how I would feel about getting tattooed,” the responses of the participants indicated a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. Responding to the questions regarding the sixteenth item on the survey, “what I believe about God,” participants’ responses revealed a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure.

When responding to the questions about the eighteenth item on the survey, “times when I have wished that I could change something about my physical appearance,” the responses of the participants revealed a slight but insignificant increase in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. In response to the questions about the twenty-first item on this survey, “what I think would be an ideal job” the responses of the participants revealed a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. Responding to the questions about the twenty-third item on the survey, “whether I am a ‘listener’ or a ‘talker’ in social conversations,” the participants’ responses indicated a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. When responding to the questions about the twenty-sixth item on the survey, “Adventures and/or strange things that have happened to me,” the participants’ responses revealed a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. The overall tendencies of the participants’ responses to items of a moderate

intimacy level revealed a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure.

### *High Intimacy Level*

Items 1, 4, 5, 8, 12, 13, 20, 22, and 25 were measuring self-disclosure on high intimacy level items. These items required participants' responses indicating their self-disclosure regarding reasons why they are or are not religious, things that they would not want people to find out about them if they ever ran for a political office, what they would do if it seemed their marriages were not successes, their worst experiences in school, how they might or did feel if their mothers and fathers were separated or divorced, disappointments or bad experiences they have had in love affairs, their weight, one of the worst things that ever happened to them, and things in their past or present about which they are most ashamed.

In response to the questions regarding the first item on the survey, "the reasons why I am or am not religious," the participants' responses indicated a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. When responding to the questions about the fourth item on the survey, "things that I would not want people to find out about me if I ever ran for a political office," the responses of the participants revealed no significant change from predicted self-disclosure to reported self-disclosure. Responding to the questions about the fifth item on the survey, "what I would do if it seemed that my marriage was not a success," the responses of the participants indicated a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. When responding to the questions regarding the eighth item on this survey was "my worst experience in school," the participants' responses indicated a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure.

In response to the questions about the twelfth item on the survey, “how I might (or did) feel if my mother and father were separated or divorced,” the responses of the participants indicated a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. Responding to the questions about the thirteenth item on the survey, “disappointments or bad experiences I have had in romantic relationships,” the participants’ responses revealed a slight but insignificant decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. In response to the questions about the twentieth item on the survey, “my weight,” the responses of the participants revealed a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. When responding to the questions about the twenty-second item on the survey, “one of the worst things that ever happened to me,” the responses of the participants revealed a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. In response to the questions regarding the twenty-fifth item on the survey, “the things in my past or present life about which I am most ashamed,” the participants’ responses indicated a very slight but insignificant increase in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. While the high intimacy level category included the largest amount of variety in response differences, the overall tendencies for this category was also a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. Thus, the responses of the participants indicate a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure in all three levels of intimacy examined.

It is of interest that 21 out of the 26 items on the survey received responses from the participants indicating decreased reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. The five items that did not receive decreased self-disclosure received either no change or such slight change that it was insignificant. These five items were, from the low intimacy category, item 11, “my name;” from the moderate intimacy level, item 18, “times when I have wished that

I could change something about my physical appearance;” and from the high intimacy level, item 4, “things that I would not want people to find out about me if I ever ran for a political office;” item 13, “disappointments or bad experiences I have had in love affairs;” and item 25, “the things in my past or present life about which I am most ashamed.”

### **Analysis By Gender**

The results of the study were also separated by gender and tested for significant differences. Overall, significant differences were found between the male participants’ responses to the first set of 26 questions, regarding their predicted natural self-disclosure with a new acquaintance in a familiar setting and the female participants’ responses to the same set of 26 questions. Discussed here are the specific questions for which there was found to be a significant difference between the male and female participants’ responses. The first item from the first set of 26 questions that differed significantly between the male participants’ responses and the female participants’ responses was item 5, “what I would do if it seemed my marriage was not a success.” The largest percentage of the female participants, 28.4%, indicated that they would not tell a new acquaintance in a familiar setting this information. The largest percentage of the male participants was tied, with 26.2% indicating that they would not tell a new acquaintance this information and 26.2% indicating that they would probably not tell a new acquaintance this information. The difference between male and female responses for this question was statistically significant,  $t(355, 1) = 2.338 (p = .020)$ .

The second question from the 26 questions regarding predicted self-disclosure to a new acquaintance in a familiar setting that received significantly different responses from male participants and female participants was item 6, “the extent to which I worry about money.” The largest percentage of the female participants was split evenly, with 29%, indicating that they

would probably not tell a new acquaintance in a familiar setting this information and 29% indicating that they might or might not share this information with a new acquaintance. The largest percentage of the male participants, 31.7% indicated that they might or might not tell a new acquaintance this information. The difference between male and female responses for this question was statistically significant,  $t(355, 1) = 2.516 (p = .012)$ .

The third question from this set of questions that revealed significant difference was item 13, “disappointments or bad experiences I have had in love affairs.” The largest percentage of the female participants, 32.5%, indicated that they probably would tell a new acquaintance in a familiar setting this information. The largest percentage of the male participants, 38.9%, indicated that they would tell a new acquaintance this information. The difference between male and female responses for this question was statistically significant,  $t(355, 1) = 2.798 (p = .006)$ .

The fourth question revealing gender differences in self-disclosure was item 17, “things I’d really like to have if I could afford them.” The largest percentage of the female participants, 31.6%, indicated that they might or might not tell a new acquaintance in a familiar setting this information. The largest percentage of the male participants, 33.3%, indicated that they might or might not tell a new acquaintance this information. For this question, a much larger percentage of female participants, 26.0%, than male participants, 14.3%, indicated that they would not tell this information to a new acquaintance. The difference between male and female responses for this question was statistically significant,  $t(355, 1) = 2.025 (p = .044)$ .

The fifth question that revealed gender differences was item 18, “times when I have wished that I could change something about my physical appearance.” The largest percentage of the female participants, 31.2%, indicated that they probably would not tell a new acquaintance in a familiar setting this information. The largest percentage of the male participants was divided

evenly, with 31.7% indicating that they probably would not share this information and with 31.7% indicating that they might or might not tell a new acquaintance this information. For this question, a much larger percentage of female participants, 21.2%, than male participants, 10.3%, indicated that they would not tell this information to a new acquaintance. The difference between male and female responses for this question was statistically significant,  $t(355, 1) = 2.989(p = .003)$ .

The next significantly different question was item 19, “how interested I am in politics.” The largest percentage of the female participants, 31.1%, indicated that they might or might not tell a new acquaintance in a familiar setting this information. The largest percentage of the male participants, 40.0%, indicated that they might or might not tell a new acquaintance this information. For this question as well, a much larger percentage of female participants, 10.4%, than male participants, 5.6%, indicated that they would not tell this information to a new acquaintance. The difference between male and female responses for this question was statistically significant,  $t(355, 1) = 2.376(p = .018)$ .

The seventh question that indicated gender differences in self-disclosure was item 20, “my weight.” The largest percentage of the female participants, 26.8%, indicated that they probably would not tell a new acquaintance in a familiar setting this information. The largest percentage of the male participants, 29.4%, indicated that they might or might not tell a new acquaintance this information. For this question as well, a much larger percentage of female participants, 36.8%, than male participants, 4.8%, indicated that they would not tell this information to a new acquaintance. The difference between male and female responses for this question was statistically significant,  $t(355, 1) = 8.880(p < .001)$ .

The eighth question from the first set of 26 questions that revealed gender differences in disclosure was item 22, “one of the worst things that ever happened to me.” The largest percentage of the female participants, 27.7%, indicated that they might or might not tell a new acquaintance in a familiar setting this information. The largest percentage of the male participants, 30.2%, indicated that they might or might not tell a new acquaintance this information. A much larger percentage of female participants, 21.2%, than male participants, 10.3%, indicated on this question that they would not tell this information to a new acquaintance. The difference between male and female responses for this question was statistically significant,  $t(355, 1)=3.254(p =.001)$ .

The final question from the first set of 26 survey questions, regarding predicted self-disclosure, that indicated gender differences was item 25, “the things in my past or present life about which I am most ashamed.” The largest percentage of the female participants, 54.5%, indicated that they would not tell a new acquaintance in a familiar setting this information. The largest percentage of the male participants, 34.9%, indicated that they would not tell a new acquaintance this information. The difference between male and female responses for this question was statistically significant,  $t(355, 1)=3.512(p =.001)$ .

Overall, there was no significant difference between the male and female participants’ responses to the second set of 26 questions, regarding their reported self-disclosure with a new acquaintance in a summer camp setting. While seven of the questions did differ significantly between the male and female participants’ responses, the overall differences were not significant. Discussed here are the questions from the second set that revealed some significant differences. The first question that revealed gender differences in self-disclosure with a camp acquaintance was item 4, “things that I would not want people to find out about me if I ever ran for a political



office.” The largest percentage of the female participants, 54.9%, indicated that they did not tell their new camp acquaintance anything about this topic. The largest percentage of the male participants, 38.9%, indicated that they did not tell their new camp acquaintance anything about this topic. The difference between male and female responses for this question was statistically significant,  $t(355, 1)=2.768(p =.006)$ .

The second question regarding camp disclosure that revealed gender differences was item 5, “what I would do if it seemed that my marriage was not a success.” The largest percentage of the female participants, 51.5%, indicated that they did not tell their new camp acquaintance anything about this topic. The largest percentage of the male participants, 41.2%, indicated that they did not tell their new camp acquaintance anything about this topic. The difference between male and female responses for this question was statistically significant,  $t(355, 1)=2.051(p =.041)$ .

The third question that indicated gender differences in self-disclosure at summer camp was item 6, “the extent to which I worry about money.” The largest percentage of the female participants, 43.7%, indicated that they did not tell their new camp acquaintance anything about this topic. The largest percentage of the male participants, 29.4%, indicated that they did not tell their new camp acquaintance much about this topic. The difference between male and female responses for this question was statistically significant,  $t(355, 1)=3.291(p =.001)$ .

The fourth question regarding camp self-disclosure that indicated gender differences was item 9, “the number of brothers and sisters I have.” The largest percentage of the female participants, 75.3%, indicated that they told their new camp acquaintance everything about this topic. The largest percentage of the male participants, 55.6%, indicated that they told their new

camp acquaintance everything about this topic. The difference between male and female responses for this question was statistically significant,  $t(355, 1) = -3.441 (p = .001)$ .

The fifth question from the second set of 26, regarding summer camp self-disclosure, that revealed gender differences was item 19, “how interested I am in politics.” The largest percentage of the female participants, 44.2%, indicated that they did not tell their new camp acquaintance anything about this topic. The largest percentage of the male participants, 27.8%, indicated that they did not tell their new camp acquaintance much about this topic. The difference between male and female responses for this question was statistically significant,  $t(355, 1) = 3.269 (p = .001)$ .

The sixth question that indicated gender differences in self-disclosure at summer camp was item 20, “my weight.” The largest percentage of the female participants, 47.2%, indicated that they did not tell their new camp acquaintance anything about this topic. The largest percentage of the male participants was evenly divided, with 22.2% indicating that they did not tell their new camp acquaintance anything about this topic and 22.2% indicating that they shared some information about this topic with their new camp acquaintance. The difference between male and female responses for this question was statistically significant,  $t(355, 1) = 5.483 (p < .001)$ .

The final question regarding camp self-disclosure that revealed gender differences was item 24, “whether or not I wear glasses.” The largest percentage of the female participants, 52.4%, indicated that they told their new camp acquaintance everything about this topic. The largest percentage of the male participants, 38.9%, indicated that they told their new camp acquaintance everything about this topic. The difference between male and female responses for

this question was statistically significant,  $t(355, 1) = -2.361 (p = .019)$ . See Appendix D for gender analysis results.

### **Emotional Responses**

The final four questions on the survey address participants' emotional responses to their reported self-disclosure with a new camp acquaintance. The first of these four questions asked participants, "Why did you choose to say what you did to your new acquaintance at camp?" Respondents could select multiple responses out of the options provided, which included "It came up in conversation," "To get to know the person," "Because something they shared made me think of it," "They volunteered that information about themselves first," "Just to have something to talk about," and "Something was weighing on you that you wanted to share or talk about." The second of this set of questions was a "yes" or "no" question, asking the participants if they feel comfortable with how much about themselves they shared with their new acquaintance at camp. The third of these four questions was "Right after talking with your new acquaintance at camp did you: (check all that apply) Regret how much you told them? Regret a specific thing about yourself that you told them? Feel relief to tell someone about something that had been on your mind? Simply enjoy conversing with them?" The fourth and final question is like the third but asked, "Looking back on your camp conversations, do you now: (check all that apply) Regret how much you told them? Regret a specific thing about yourself that you told them? Feel relief to tell someone about something that had been on your mind? Simply enjoy conversing with them?"

In response to the first question, the majority of respondents, 331, making up 92.7%, indicated that they chose to say what they did to their new camp acquaintance because it came up in conversation. Of the 357 respondents, 201, or 56.3%, selected that they chose to disclose what

they did just to have something about which to talk. The number of respondents who selected that their conversation partner volunteered that information about themselves first as their reason for sharing what they did was 167 of the 357 respondents, or 46.8%. Finally, 92 of the respondents, or 25.8%, stated that they said what they did to their camp acquaintance because something was weighing on them that they wanted to talk about or to share. In response to the question asking whether they feel comfortable about how much they shared about themselves with their new camp acquaintance, 345 of the 357 respondents, or 96.6%, stated that they were comfortable. Only 12 of the 357, or 3.4%, indicated that they were not comfortable with how much they shared about themselves with their camp acquaintance.

When responding to the question asking about their emotional reaction to their self-disclosure immediately after conversation, 15, or 4.2%, indicated regretting how much they told their camp acquaintance, 39, or 10.9%, indicated regretting a specific thing about themselves that they told their new camp acquaintance, 101, or 28.3% indicated feeling relief to tell someone about something that had been on their mind, and the majority, 331 of the 357 respondents, or 92.7%, indicated simply enjoying conversing with their new camp acquaintance. In response to the asking about the participants' current emotional reactions to their self-disclosure as they look back on their camp conversations, 17, or 4.8%, indicated regretting how much they told their new camp acquaintance, 30, or 8.4%, indicated regretting a specific thing about themselves that they told their new camp acquaintance, 85, or 23.8%, indicated feeling relief to tell someone about something that had been on their minds, and the majority, 327, or 91.6%, indicated simply enjoying conversing with their new camp acquaintance.

It is of interest that only 12 respondents indicated now feeling uncomfortable about how much they shared about themselves with their new camp acquaintance when at least 39

participants indicated regretting something about their conversation. When comparing the immediate emotional responses to self-disclosure with current emotional reactions to past self-disclosure with their new camp acquaintance, over time there is a slight decrease in the selection of the options “Regret a specific thing about yourself that you told them?” “Feel relief to tell someone about something that had been on your mind?” and “Simply enjoy conversing with them?” There is also a slight increase in the participants’ selection of the option “Regret how much you told them?” after time had elapsed. However, no statistically significant changes in response were found between the immediate emotional responses and the emotional responses over time,  $t(356, 1) = -.420(p = .675)$ .

## **Discussion**

The research questions investigated by this study were:

RQ1: Do young adults’ tendencies in self-disclosure while in camp settings differ from their typical self-disclosure tendencies?

RQ2: Do young adults’ tendencies in self-disclosure while in camp settings fall into the category of increased self-disclosure?

RQ3: Do the self-disclosure tendencies of female young adults and those of male young adults differ in either familiar settings or summer camp settings?

In response to the first research question, the results of the study indicate that young adults’ tendencies in self-disclosure while in camp settings do significantly differ from their typical self-disclosure tendencies. Nearly every item about which the respondents indicated their actual and predicted self-disclosure revealed variations between actual and predicted self-disclosure. Only 5 out of the 26 items revealed either no change or no significant change between predicted and reported self-disclosure. The least amount of variation between predicted

and reported self-disclosure occurred in items from a high intimacy level. In light of social penetration theory, the highest occurrence of no change or no significant change being related to items from a high intimacy level is not surprising. As predicted by social penetration theory, individuals will typically cover topics of other lower levels of intimacy in their self-disclosure before being willing to disclose about more highly intimate items. In light of social penetration theory, participants would be expected to be most willing to reveal information about low intimacy topics, less willing to disclose information about moderate intimacy items, and least willing to share information about high intimacy items. The third of these assumptions is supported by the results of this study, but little difference was found between low and moderate intimacy items.

Regarding the second research question, the responses of the participants indicate that young adults' tendencies in self-disclosure while in camp settings do not fall into the category of increased self-disclosure. Rather, the results indicate that young adults' self-disclosure in camp settings actually decreases. As previously mentioned, only 5 out of the 26 topics addressed in the survey received no change or no significant change in self-disclosure from predicted to reported. The one item from the low intimacy level that received no change in self-disclosure was item 11, "my name." As this item is the most basic of the low intimacy items, it is not surprising that participants remained consistent in their disclosing or withholding of their names with a new acquaintance. There is also very little room for various interpretations and associations of this topic. Participants were likely to perceive this item the same way, and their comfort levels regarding sharing or withholding this information could possibly be concretely established for individuals. The item from the moderate intimacy level, item 18, "times when I have wished that I could change something about my physical appearance," received a very slight increase in

reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure, but this increase was too small to be significant.

The final three items that receive no change or no significant change in self-disclosure were all from the high intimacy level items. This is unsurprising, because, in light of social penetration theory, topics within the highest intimacy level would be likely to be more strongly guarded by individuals than lower intimacy level items, and individuals' willingness to reveal information about these level of topics is likely to remain more consistent than less intimate items. The first high intimacy level item, item 4, "things that I would not want people to find out about me if I ever ran for a political office," received no change in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. This lack of change is most likely due to the fact that this topic would involve the worst experiences, embarrassments, vices, and other such negative information about an individual. Such topics are likely to be strongly guarded, and willingness to share this kind of information is likely to be more resistant to change due to a new environment. The second high intimacy level item, item 13, "disappointments or bad experiences I have had in love affairs," received a very slight but insignificant decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure. Romance is of high concern to and a common topic of conversation among young adults. The slight decrease could be due to negative emotions associated with the disappointments or bad experiences, but individuals are likely to know what emotions thinking or speaking of their experiences will evoke. These emotions are likely to have been well understood by the participants and may have caused their willingness or unwillingness to share this information to have been more concretely established than other topics. The final item that received no or insignificant change in self-disclosure was item 25, "the things in my past or present life about which I am most ashamed." This item received a slight but insignificant

increase in reported self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance compared to predicted self-disclosure. This slight increase could be related to the life-changing atmosphere that camp has been described to be (Ramsing and Sibthorp; Powell et al.; Wallace), which could instigate campers sharing of information about areas of their lives that the camp experience has encouraged them to change. Still, self-disclosure about this topic remained consistent overall, so this area could also have more concretely established willingness by individuals to share or withhold this information.

It is interesting to note that the responses of male participants to the questions regarding predicted self-disclosure with a new acquaintance in a familiar setting significantly differed from the female participants' responses. The tendency was for female participants to feel more strongly about not revealing information about certain topics than the male participants do. While the female participants' predictions of their self-disclosure were far more guarded than the male participants' predictions, the reported self-disclosure practices of both groups did not vary greatly. There were some smaller differences between male and female participants' responses regarding actual self-disclosure at summer camp, the overall differences were insignificant in this area.

The majority of participants claimed to have disclosed what they did to their new camp acquaintance because it came up in conversation and to have something about which to talk. A little over a quarter of the participants chose to reveal the information they did to their new camp acquaintance because something specific was weighing on them. The majority of participants also indicated simply enjoying conversing with their new camp acquaintance both immediately after the interaction and at the time of completing the survey. Roughly a quarter of the participants indicated feeling relief after the conversation, having shared something that was



weighing on their minds. The vast majority of the participants indicated being comfortable with the amount of information they shared with their new camp acquaintances. The results indicate that there is no significant change in young adults' emotional responses to their own self-disclosure to a new acquaintance in a novel setting over time.

Much of the research conducted utilizing social penetration theory supports the gradual increasing of the intimacy of self-disclosure over time in relationships that the theory predicts. The theorists themselves, in their book *Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships*, state that the social penetration process is orderly and proceeds through stages over time (Altman and Taylor 6). Altman and Taylor's theory also takes into consideration the characteristics of individual people, recognizing that different people will go through the process of social penetration differently, based upon their personal characteristics and upon the situation in which the process occurs (7). Dalmis Taylor, Ladd Wheeler, and Irwin Altman, in their article, "Self-Disclosure in Isolated Groups," describe social penetration theory as proposing normally orderly, systematic, and gradual reciprocal disclosures between strangers with cautious approaches to openness (Taylor, Wheeler, and Altman 39). In their article, "Self-Disclosure as a Function of Reward-Cost Outcomes," Taylor and Altman describe that more disclosure occurred in nonintimate areas rather than in intimate areas of topics (Self-Disclosure as a Function 18).

These propositions align with the results of this study. Given the expectations and findings of other researchers, it would be expected that individuals would be cautious in what information and how much information they reveal to a new acquaintance, perhaps especially in an unfamiliar place. It would also be expected that individuals would share more information about nonintimate subjects than they would about intimate topics with a new acquaintance. However, as Altman and Taylor provide in their theory, personal characteristics and situation

will influence social penetration. As could be expected, in this study, participants indicated a much greater willingness to disclose about low intimacy items than high intimacy items. The one exception to this was regarding reasons why the participants are or are not religious. Participants indicated a high willingness to share about this topic, despite its being a high intimacy item. This coincides with Altman and Taylor's allowance that personal characteristics and situation influence the social penetration process. As previously mentioned, 85.2% of the participants indicated having attended a religiously affiliated summer camp. Thus, the majority of individuals involved in the study possesses personal characteristics and/or was in a situation that influenced them to be willing to talk freely about this high intimacy item.

Along with Taylor, Wheeler, and Altman's description that gradual reciprocal disclosures between strangers occur with cautious approaches to openness, it could be expected that interactions with new acquaintances would be guarded for most individuals. The decrease found from participants' predictions of their own self-disclosure with a new acquaintance in a familiar setting to their reported self-disclosure with a new acquaintance at summer camp could indicate that young adults disclose to new acquaintances in an unfamiliar setting with even more caution than in familiar settings.

Looking specifically at age and self-disclosure, Virendra Sinha, in her article "Age Differences in Self-Disclosure," explains that early adolescents have the highest levels of self-disclosure, mid-adolescents have the lowest amount of self-disclosure, and late adolescents increase in self-disclosure from mid-adolescence (257). Sinha proposes that the dip in mid-adolescence may be explained by self-consciousness that increases in mid-adolescence but decreases in late adolescence with increased maturity (257). The participants for this study were all young adults. Their predictions of their self-disclosure to a new acquaintance in a familiar

setting would have been a reflection of their current, late-adolescent perspectives. If their camp experiences occurred in mid-adolescence, the decrease found in this study from their predictions of self-disclosure to their reported self-disclosure could be related to the mid-adolescent self-consciousness that Sinha describes.

Research has shown that trust also influences self-disclosure. In their article, “A Model for Exploring Individual’s Self-Disclosure Online,” Sheng-Fei Hsu and Dong-Her Shih explain that trust increases self-disclosure and that privacy concern also impacts self-disclosure. Given a lack of substantial history with a new acquaintance, the absence of developed and tested trust with a new camp acquaintance and an uncertainty regarding privacy could have influenced the participants’ self-disclosure to their new camp acquaintance and caused it to be lower than they predicted their self-disclosure to a new acquaintance in a familiar setting would be. In contrast, the results show some support for the research of Carol Magai, Nathan Consendine, Katherine Fioro, and Arlene King. In their article, “Sharing the Good, Sharing the Bad: Benefits of Emotional Self-Disclosure Among Middle-Aged and Older Adults,” the researchers state that “short-term, experience-specific self-disclosure may have a clinically meaningful impact on the physical and mental well-being of older adults” (Magai et al. 309). In the present study, 25.8% of the participants indicated that they chose to share the information they did with the new camp acquaintance because something was weighing on them that they wanted to share or talk about, and 28.3% indicated feeling relief after their self-disclosure to tell someone something that had been on their mind. Thus, self-disclosure could be emotionally, if not also physically and mentally, beneficial to adolescents and young adults as well as to older adults.

Several researchers have looked at gender differences in self-disclosure. Mitchell Hammer and William Gudykunst, in their article, “The Influence of Ethnicity and Sex on Social

Penetration in Close Friendships,” explain that female participants engaged in greater social penetration with their best friend than male participants (430). As reported in a similar study, “Adolescents' Disclosure to Best and Good Friends: The Effects of Gender and Topic Intimacy” by Kim Dolgin and Stephanie Kim, female participants disclosed more about highly intimate topics than the male participants and that the male participants were less selective than the female participants in choosing to whom they would disclose (Dolgin and Kim 155). In correspondence with Dolgin and Kim’s second finding, in the present study, female participants indicated significantly less willingness to share information about certain topics with a new acquaintance than the male participants did. This comparatively lesser willingness of female participants to share information with a new acquaintance included high intimacy level items, which does not coincide with Dolgin and Kim’s finding that female participants disclosed more about highly intimate topics than male participants. However, their study was an investigation of self-disclosure in “best” and “good” friend relationships. The present study involved new acquaintances rather than individuals in established relationships, which could account for this discrepancy.

The overall decrease in the participants’ reported self-disclosure to a new camp acquaintance from their predictions of their self-disclosure to a new acquaintance in a familiar setting could suggest that young adults in general will be more willing to disclose information in a familiar setting than in a new environment. As trust has been seen to be connected to self-disclosure, it is possible that young adults are more likely to trust new acquaintances when they meet and interact with the new person in a familiar setting rather than meeting and conversing with the new acquaintances in a new setting. Future research should be conducted to investigate these tendencies.

## Chapter 5 –Future Research

### **Limitations**

As with all research, there are limitations to this study that leave remaining questions and restrict generalizability. This study involved 357 freshman undergraduate students from a basic communication course at a large, private university in central Virginia who had attended a summer camp overnight for five days or more and involving meeting unfamiliar people. Thus, this study reflects the self-disclosure of a limited sample. Camp affiliation could also have influenced the results of the study. Out of the 357 participants, 304, or 85.2%, indicated that the camp they attended was religiously affiliated. Of the 26 topics included in the survey, two addressed religious topics, one from the moderate intimacy level and one from the high intimacy level. In addition to these two items directly connected to religion, many other items could be considered moral topics. The attendance of the participants at religiously affiliated camps could influence their willingness to disclose information about these topics.

Another influence on the study was the nature of the survey. Self-report reflects only what the participants remember or choose to divulge but might not accurately and fully reflect the actual interaction. Likewise, because the details about an individual's life associated with each statement will vary from person to person, the survey's categorization of each statement as at a low-, moderate-, or high-intimacy level could only be vaguely and generally labeled. What might be considered as a low intimacy level item to one individual may differ from the measurement tool's categorization and could be considered a high intimacy level item by another individual, based on experience or association. These variations in individuals' perceptions of items could influence the responses given regarding self-disclosure. Also, some participants may simply not have experienced the topic addressed by the survey items, such as questions 13 and

39 regarding disappointments or bad experiences in love affairs. Participants who have not had these experiences would automatically have nothing to disclose about them.

Aside from experience variations among the individual participants, some of the questions could have been interpreted differently by participants. For example, on items such as “common interests that I would like my spouse and I to have” or “what I would do if it seemed that my marriage were not a success,” some participants could have responded about information they disclosed speculatively about the future, while other participants may have automatically indicated that they would share nothing or did not share anything about these topics because they are not currently married. Also, while the gender of the participants was examined, the gender of the imagined other person, in the case of predicted self-disclosure, and the gender of the camp acquaintance was not investigated in this study.

Regarding the instrument used, for purposes of comparison in this study, prediction of not sharing any information about a topic was equated with actual not sharing of any information, prediction of probably not sharing any information about a topic was equated with actual sharing of little information, prediction of maybe or maybe not sharing information on a topic was equated with actual sharing of some information, prediction of probably sharing information on a topic was equated with actual sharing of a lot of information, and prediction of definite sharing of information about a topic was equated with actual sharing of everything about that topic. This basis for comparison could have led to some skewed results, as respondents could have interpreted the designations differently. The instrument also called for participants to indicate their likelihood and actual occurrence of revealing information about various topics. While participants could indicate their likelihood of self-disclosure for innumerable topics, lack of actual self-disclosure in a real interaction does not necessarily indicate unwillingness to

disclose information about a particular topic. The topic might have simply not come up in conversation. Thus, a decrease in reported self-disclosure compared to predicted self-disclosure could reveal a lack of introduction of a topic rather than an unwillingness to disclose about that topic.

In addition, while the purpose of this study was to investigate the self-disclosure of adolescents and young adults at summer camp, the age at which camp must have been attended was not stipulated in the participant restrictions, nor was a specification given regarding how recently the camp experience must have occurred. This contextual information could have influenced the recall of the participants and deemed certain questions irrelevant to ask regarding participants' camp disclosure. Any participants who may have been recalling camp experiences from their childhood would have been influenced in both their ability to recall camp conversations, in the life experience that was the basis for their self-disclosure, and in the topics of conversation that would have been likely to come up in interactions at camp. Such recollections would not fit into this study of adolescents' and young adults' self-disclosure tendencies at camp.

Finally, while the research questions posed by this study proposed comparing actual self-disclosure of participants to a new acquaintance in a familiar setting with the actual self-disclosure of participants to a new acquaintance in a summer camp setting, the data collection of this study involved the information that participants predicted they would disclose to a new acquaintance in a familiar setting compared to their reported self-disclosure from actual interactions with a new acquaintance in a summer camp setting. These two categories of self-disclosure are incomparable, and no conclusions can decisively be drawn from such a comparison.

## **Recommendations**

To improve future similar studies, a broader and more accurate sample should be obtained by including campers from all over the country and globe as participants in the study. Also, because this survey was dependent upon self-report, the new camp acquaintance and a new acquaintance in a familiar setting should be involved in the study, so the survey would be taken by both halves of the interacting pairs. This could provide a more balanced understanding of the conversations and self-disclosure that took place. Conducting a thorough ethnographic study of one summer camp at a time could also provide clearer results and insight into the self-disclosure between campers by investigating their actual self-disclosure to a new acquaintance in a camp setting. A follow up ethnographic study of those same campers in a familiar setting rather than at camp would provide more detailed and accurate information about their self-disclosure with which to compare their camp self-disclosure. Such a comparison would more clearly and more accurately reveal any differences that might occur between young adults' self-disclosure with a new acquaintance in a familiar setting and their self-disclosure to a new acquaintance at summer camp.

In future research, an additional segment of the study could be included to identify how participants would categorize the various items on the survey regarding intimacy level. This would provide a more accurate measure of the self-disclosure of individuals for various intimacy level topics. Also, a more directly defined scale could eliminate some potential confusion and provide more accurate results. While an attempt was made by the researcher to update Altman and Taylor's Intimacy-Scaled Stimuli items, it could be beneficial in future studies to utilize or create a more current measurement tool to ensure question appropriateness for contemporary participants. Future studies could also include a question in the measurement tool regarding the



gender of the new acquaintance, to explore how the gender of the other person influences the self-disclosure of young adults.

It is recommended that researchers conduct a separate study to identify the topics of conversation that are most commonly present in young adults' conversations with new acquaintances in both familiar and novel environments. Items could be drawn from topics that occur in both the familiar and novel environments to conduct another study that could more accurately reveal changes or consistencies in self-disclosure to a new acquaintance between familiar and novel settings for young adults. Numerous camper-new camp acquaintance interactions should also be analyzed in simulated and practical settings to provide a clearer explanation of the self-disclosure involved, and numerous individual-new acquaintance interactions in a familiar setting should be more closely investigated as well.

No conclusions can be drawn decidedly regarding why participants' self-disclosure decreased in reported self-disclosure in camp settings compared to their predicted natural self-disclosure. It is recommended that another study be conducted with more detailed questions to properly analyze a camper's reasons for disclosing what he or she does, including a final open-ended question prompting participants to reflect on any changes they may perceive in their self-disclosure tendencies and to indicate possible causes. Also, while this study touched on the emotions experienced by the campers following their self-disclosure and their reasons for choosing to disclose the information they did, another study could be conducted from a psychological perspective to fully investigate these elements of self-disclosure.

Finally, future research should compare actual self-disclosure from summer camp settings with actual self-disclosure to a new acquaintance in a familiar setting. For more accurate recall of participants, only responses from participants with camp experiences from the past one-

two years should be included in the data collection. Such a restriction would also ensure that the survey questions are relevant to all participants' self-disclosure topics. A separate study could be conducted investigating the experiences and self-disclosure of children and young adolescents at camp. For such a study, the participants' interactions could be directly observed as well, rather than involving self-report.

### **Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the self-disclosure of young adults and their tendencies in typical self-disclosure with a new acquaintance in a familiar setting compared with self-disclosure with a new acquaintance in a summer camp setting. The basis for this study was Altman and Taylor's social penetration theory, which posits that the social penetration process is orderly and proceeds through stages over time and that people assess interpersonal rewards and costs, satisfaction and dissatisfaction, gained from interactions with others and that the advancement of the relationships depends heavily on the amount and nature of the rewards and costs. The research questions proposed by this study were:

RQ1: Do young adults' tendencies in self-disclosure while in camp settings differ from their typical self-disclosure tendencies?

RQ2: Do young adults' tendencies in self-disclosure while in camp settings fall into the category of increased self-disclosure?

RQ3: Do the self-disclosure tendencies of female young adults and those of male young adults differ in either familiar settings or summer camp settings?

The overall findings of this study indicate that young adults' self-disclosure with a new acquaintance in a camp setting decreases from their predictions of their self-disclosure with a new acquaintance in a familiar setting. However, this study involved a comparison of

participants' predictions of their own self-disclosure with a new acquaintance in a familiar setting with their reported actual self-disclosure with a new acquaintance in a summer camp setting. As these two reports are incomparable, no conclusions can be drawn from this study.

While social penetration theory has been a commonly applied theory in the field of communication, a large amount of research in recent years has been devoted to self-disclosure in online settings. Though the face-to-face self-disclosure of adolescents and young adults has been studied from a variety of perspectives and in a wide range of contexts, no study prior to now has examined the self-disclosure of adolescents and young adults in a camp setting. This study was undertaken to bridge the gap in research that has existed until now between the sphere of research on adolescent and young adult self-disclosure and the sphere of research on camp and camp experiences.

## Works Cited

- Allensworth, Nicole J. "Social Penetration: A Description, Research, and Evaluation." (1996): ERIC. EBSCO. Web. 3 Sept. 2010.
- Altman, Irwin, and Dalmas A. Taylor. *Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973. 1-212. Print.
- Ayres, Joe. "Uncertainty and Social Penetration Theory Expectations About Relationship Communication: A Comparative Test." *Western Journal of Speech Communication*: WJSC 43.3 (1979): 192-200. Communication & Mass Media Complete. EBSCO. Web. 17 Feb. 2010.
- Bauminger, Nirit, Ricky Finzi-Dottan, Sagit Chason, and Dov Har-Even. "Intimacy in Adolescent Friendship: The Roles of Attachment, Coherence, and Self-Disclosure." *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships* 25.3 (2008): 409-428. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 3 Sept. 2010.
- Baxter, Leslie, and William Wilmot. "Communication Characteristics of Relationships with Differential Growth Rates." *Communication Monographs* 50.3 (1983): 264-272. E-Journals. EBSCO. Web. 3 Sept. 2010.
- Bennett, Mark, Peter Mitchell, and Pauline Murray. "Children's Judgments About Their Own Self-Knowledge: The Role of Disclosure to Other." *British Journal of Developmental Psychology* 27.3 (2009): 731-742. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 3 Sept. 2010.
- Bruss, Olivia E., and Jennifer M. Hill. "Tell Me More: Online Versus Face-to-Face Communication and Self-Disclosure." *Psi Chi Journal of Undergraduate Research* 15.1 (2010): 3-7. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 3 Sept. 2010.

- Cameron, Jessica J., John G. Holmes, and Jacquie D. Vorauer. "When Self-Disclosure Goes Awry: Negative Consequences of Revealing Personal Failures for Lower Self-Esteem Individuals." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 45.1 (2009): 217-222. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 31 Jan. 2010.
- Chen, Yea-Wen, and Masato Nakazawa. "Influences of Culture on Self-Disclosure as Relationally Situated in Intercultural and Interracial Friendships from a Social Penetration Perspective." *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research* 38.2 (2009): 77-98. Communication & Mass Media Complete. EBSCO. Web. 3 Sept. 2010.
- Craig, Elizabeth, Magdalena Igiel, Kevin Wright, Cory Cunningham, and Nicole Ploeger. "Will You Be My Friend?: Computer-Mediated Relational Development on Facebook.com." Conference Papers -- International Communication Association (2007): 1. Communication & Mass Media Complete. EBSCO. Web. 31 Jan. 2010.
- Dolgin, Kim G., and Stephanie Kim. "Adolescents' Disclosure to Best and Good Friends: The Effects of Gender and Topic Intimacy." *Social Development* 3.2 (1994): 146-157. SocINDEX with Full Text. EBSCO. Web. 17 Feb. 2010.
- Frye, Nancy E., and Michele M. Dornisch. "When is Trust Not Enough? The Role of Perceived Privacy of Communication Tools in Comfort with Self-Disclosure." *Computers in Human Behavior* 26.5 (2010): 1120-1127. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 3 Sept. 2010.
- Gibbs, Jennifer L., Nicole B. Ellison, and Rebecca D. Heino. "Self-Presentation in Online Personals The Role of Anticipated Future Interaction, Self-Disclosure, and Perceived Success in Internet Dating." *Communication Research* 33.2 (2006): 152-177. Humanities International Complete. EBSCO. Web. 24 Jan. 2010.

- Gudykunst, William B. "An Exploratory Comparison of Close Intracultural and Intercultural Friendships." *Communication Quarterly* 33.4 (1985): 270-283. Communication & Mass Media Complete. EBSCO. Web. 23 Feb. 2010.
- Hammer, Mitchell R., and William B. Gudykunst. "The Influence of Ethnicity and Sex on Social Penetration in Close Friendships." *Journal of Black Studies* 17.4 (1987): 418-37. ERIC. EBSCO. Web. 3 Sept. 2010.
- Hays, Robert B. "A Longitudinal Study of Friendship Development." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 48.4 (1985): 909-924. PsycARTICLES. EBSCO. Web. 3 Sept. 2010.
- Hempel, Jessi. "Hello Muddah, Hello Fadduh.." *Business Week* 3937 (2005): 83-84. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 22 Apr. 2010.
- Henderson, Karla A., and M. Deborah Bialeschki. "Who Are the Teen Campers? Teens Today." *Camping Magazine* 80.5 (2007): 1-3. SPORTDiscus with Full Text. EBSCO. Web. 3 Sept. 2010.
- Henderson, Samantha, and Michael Gilding. "I've Never Clicked This Much with Anyone in My Life: Trust and Hyperpersonal Communication in Online Friendships." *New Media & Society* 6.4 (2004): 487-506. PsycINFO. EBSCO. Web. 24 Jan. 2010.
- Hensley, Wayne E. "A Theory of the Valenced Other: The Intersection of the Looking-Glass-Self and Social Penetration." *Social Behavior and Personality* 24.3 (1996): 293-308. PsycINFO. EBSCO. Web. 17 Feb. 2010.
- Honeycutt, James M., and Deborah D. Godwin. "A Model of Marital Functioning Based on an Attraction Paradigm and Social-Penetration Dimensions." *Journal of Marriage & Family* 48.3 (1986): 651-663. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 24 Jan. 2010.

- Horesh, Netta, and Alan Apter. "Self-Disclosure, Depression, Anxiety, and Suicidal Behavior in Adolescent Psychiatric Inpatients." *Crisis: The Journal of Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention* 27.2 (2006): 66-71. PsycARTICLES. EBSCO. Web. 17 Feb. 2010.
- Kahn, Jeffrey H., and Angela M. Garrison. "Emotional Self-Disclosure and Emotional Avoidance: Relations with Symptoms of Depression and Anxiety." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 56.4 (2009): 573-584. PsycARTICLES. EBSCO. Web. 24 Jan. 2010.
- Kobocow, Bella, John M McGuire, and Burton I Blau. "The Influence of Confidentiality Conditions on Self-Disclosure of Early Adolescents." *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 14.4 (1983): 435-443. Women's Studies International. EBSCO. Web. 23 Feb. 2010.
- Magai, Carol, Nathan Consendine, Katherine Fioro, and Arlene King. "Sharing the Good, Sharing the Bad: The Benefits of Emotional Self-Disclosure Among Middle-Aged and Older Adults." *Journal of Aging & Health* 21.2 (2009): 286-313. Health Source: Nursing/Academic Edition. EBSCO. Web. 24 Jan. 2010.
- Mark, Elizabeth Wyner, and Thelma G. Alper. "Sex Differences in Intimacy Motivation." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 5.2 (1980): 164. SocINDEX with Full Text. EBSCO. Web. 23 Feb. 2010.
- "Media Center: Camp Trends - American Camp Association." ACACamps.org. American Camp Association, 2010. Web. 22 Apr 2010.  
<[http://www.acacamps.org/media\\_center/camp\\_trends/fact.php](http://www.acacamps.org/media_center/camp_trends/fact.php)>.
- Nereo, Nancy E., Barry A. Farber, and Veronica J. Hinton. "Willingness to Self-Disclose Among Late Adolescent Female Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse." *Journal of Youth &*

- Adolescence* 31.4 (2002): 303. Education Research Complete. EBSCO. Web. 23 Feb. 2010.
- Nosko, Amanda, Eileen Wood, and Seija Molema. "All About Me: Disclosure in Online Social Networking Profiles: The Case of FACEBOOK." *Computers in Human Behavior* 26.3 (2010): 406-418. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 3 Sept. 2010.
- Pan, Ji, and Paul S. Lieber. "Emotional Disclosure and Construction of the Poetic 'Other' in a Chinese Online Dating Site." *China Media Research* 4.2 (2008): 32-42. Communication & Mass Media Complete. EBSCO. Web. 17 Feb. 2010.
- Powell, Gwynn M., Barry A. Garst, Jeremy Johnson, Rachelle H. Toupençe, Deborah M. Bialeschki, Karla Henderson, Amy Krehbiel, and Dawn Ewing. "Research Notes: Youth Development at Summer Camp." *Camping Magazine* 76.3 (2003): 1. Education Research Complete. EBSCO. Web. 3 Sept. 2010.
- Pronin, Emily, John J. Fleming, and Mary Steffel. "Value Revelations: Disclosure Is in the Eye of the Beholder." *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology* 95.4 (2008): 795-809. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 26 Mar. 2011.
- Radmacher, Kimberley, and Margarita Azmitia. "Are There Gendered Pathways to Intimacy in Early Adolescents' and Emerging Adults' Friendships?." *Journal of Adolescent Research* 21.4 (2006): 415-448. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 23 Feb. 2010.
- Ramsing, Ron, and Jim Sibthorp. "The Role of Autonomy Support in Summer Camp Programs: Preparing Youth for Productive Behaviors." *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration* 26.2 (2008): 61-77. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 11 Mar. 2010.



- Rubin, Rebecca B., Alan M. Rubin, and Matthew M. Martin. "The Role of Self-Disclosure and Self-Awareness in Affinity-Seeking Competence." *Communication Research Reports* 10.2 (1993): 115-127. PsycINFO. EBSCO. Web. 17 Feb. 2010.
- Sabatelli, Ronald M., Ross Buck, and Albert Dreyer. "Nonverbal Communication Accuracy in Married Couples: Relationship with Marital Complaints." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 43.5 (1982): 1088-1097. PsycARTICLES. EBSCO. Web. 23 Feb. 2010.
- Schwartz-Mette, Rebecca A., and Amada J. Rose. "Conversational Self-Focus in Adolescent Friendships: Observational Assessment of an Interpersonal Process and Relations with Internalizing Symptoms and Friendship Quality." *Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology* 28.10 (2009): 1263-1297. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 17 Feb. 2010.
- Sheng-Fei, Hsu, and Shih Dong-Her. "A Model for Exploring Individual's Self-Disclosure Online." *International Review on Computers & Software* 4.5 (2009): 594-599. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 31 Jan. 2010.
- Sinha, Virendra. "Age Differences in Self-Disclosure." *Developmental Psychology* 7.3 (1972): 257-258. PsycARTICLES. EBSCO. Web. 17 Feb. 2010.
- Sippola, Lorrie K., Carie M. Buchanan, and Sabrina Kehoe. "Correlates of False Self in Adolescent Romantic Relationships." *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology* 36.4 (2007): 515-521. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 31 Jan. 2010.
- Solano, Cecilia H. "Sex Differences and the Taylor-Altman Self-Disclosure Stimuli." *Journal of Social Psychology* 115.2 (1981): 287. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 13 Apr. 2010.

Tasopoulos-Chan, Marina, Judith G. Smetana, and Jenny P. Yau. "How Much Do I Tell Thee?

Strategies for Managing Information to Parents Among American Adolescents from Chinese, Mexican, and European Backgrounds." *Journal of Family Psychology* 23.3 (2009): 364-374. PsycARTICLES. EBSCO. Web. 23 Feb. 2010.

Taylor, Dalmas A., and Irwin Altman. "Intimacy-Scaled Stimuli for Use in Studies of

Interpersonal Relationships." *Psychological Reports* (1966) 19: 112. PsycEXTRA. EBSCO. Web. 12 Apr. 2010.

---. "Self-Disclosure as a Function of Reward-Cost Outcomes." *Sociometry* 38.1 (1975): 18-31.

SocINDEX with Full Text. EBSCO. Web. 3 Sept. 2010.

Taylor, Dalmas A., Ladd Wheeler, and Irwin Altman. "Self-Disclosure in Isolated Groups."

*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 26.1 (1973): 39-47. PsycARTICLES. EBSCO. Web. 23 Feb. 2010.

Tolstedt, Betsy E., and Joseph P. Stokes. "Self-Disclosure, Intimacy, and the Depenetration

Process." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 46.1 (1984): 84-90. PsycARTICLES. EBSCO. Web. 23 Feb. 2010.

Valkenburg, Patti M., and Jochen Peter. "Preadolescents' and Adolescents' Online

Communication and Their Closeness to Friends." *Developmental Psychology* 43.2 (2007): 267-277. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 31 Jan. 2010.

---. "The Development of Online and Offline Self-Disclosure in Preadolescence and Adolescence

and Their Longitudinal Effects on the Quality of Friendships." Conference Papers -- International Communication Association (2009): 1-36. Communication & Mass Media Complete. EBSCO. Web. 23 Feb. 2010.

- Vieno, Alessio, Maury Nation, Massimiliano Pastore, and Massimo Santinello. "Parenting and Antisocial Behavior: A Model of the Relationship Between Adolescent Self-Disclosure, Parental Closeness, Parental Control, and Adolescent Antisocial Behavior." *Developmental Psychology* 45.6 (2009): 1509-1519. PsycARTICLES. EBSCO. Web. 17 Feb. 2010.
- Wallace, Stephen. "Rites of Passage: Camp Pays Off in Youth Development, Happiness, Health, and Safety." *Camping Magazine* 79.3 (2006): 1. Education Research Complete. EBSCO. Web. 3 Sept. 2010.
- Yoder, Jan D., and Robert C. Nichols. "A Life Perspective Comparison of Married and Divorced Persons." *Journal of Marriage & Family* 42.2 (1980): 413-419. Academic Search Complete. EBSCO. Web. 17 Feb. 2010.

Appendix A

Self-Disclosure at Summer Camp Survey

While categorizing the following 26 items, please indicate how likely you would be to share that information about that topic with a new acquaintance in a familiar setting, for example, with someone you met at school or at church.

Please select the appropriate number, with 1 = I would not share this with a new acquaintance, 2 = I probably would not share this with a new acquaintance, 3 = I might or might not share this with a new acquaintance, 4 = I probably would share this with a new acquaintance, and 5 = I would share this with a new acquaintance.

1. The reasons why I am or am not religious. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Common interests that I would like my spouse and I to have. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Situations that bore me. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Things that I would not want people to find out about me if I ever ran for a political office.  
1 2 3 4 5
5. What I would do if it seemed that my marriage was not a success. 1 2 3 4 5
6. The extent to which I worry about money. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Things that would cause me to break up a friendship. 1 2 3 4 5
8. My worst experience in school. 1 2 3 4 5
9. The number of brothers and sisters I have. 1 2 3 4 5
10. My views on sexual morality--how I feel that I and others ought to behave in sexual matters.  
1 2 3 4 5
11. My name. 1 2 3 4 5
12. How I might (or did) feel if my mother and father were separated or divorced. 1 2 3 4 5
13. Disappointments or bad experiences I have had in love affairs. 1 2 3 4 5
14. My favorite hobbies. 1 2 3 4 5
15. How I would feel about getting tattooed. 1 2 3 4 5
16. What I believe about God. 1 2 3 4 5
17. Things I'd really like to have if I could afford them. 1 2 3 4 5
18. Times when I have wished that I could change something about my physical appearance.  
1 2 3 4 5
19. How interested I am in politics. 1 2 3 4 5
20. My weight. 1 2 3 4 5
21. What I think would be an ideal job. 1 2 3 4 5
22. One of the worst things that ever happened to me. 1 2 3 4 5
23. Whether I am a "listener" or a "talker" in social conversations. 1 2 3 4 5
24. Whether or not I wear glasses. 1 2 3 4 5
25. The things in my past or present life about which I am most ashamed. 1 2 3 4 5
26. Adventures and/or strange things that have happened to me. 1 2 3 4 5

While categorizing the following 26 items, please think of a specific person you met and talked with at summer camp and indicate how much information about that topic you shared with that person.

Please select the appropriate number, with 1 = I did not share anything about this with my new camp acquaintance, 2 = I did not say much about this to my new camp acquaintance, 3 = I shared some information about this with my new camp acquaintance, 4 = I shared a lot about this with my new camp acquaintance, and 5 = I shared everything about this with my new camp acquaintance.

27. The reasons why I am or am not religious. 1 2 3 4 5
28. Common interests that I would like my spouse and I to have. 1 2 3 4 5
29. Situations that bore me. 1 2 3 4 5
30. Things that I would not want people to find out about me if I ever ran for a political office. 1 2 3 4 5
31. What I would do if it seemed that my marriage was not a success. 1 2 3 4 5
32. The extent to which I worry about money. 1 2 3 4 5
33. Things that would cause me to break up a friendship. 1 2 3 4 5
34. My worst experience in school. 1 2 3 4 5
35. The number of brothers and sisters I have. 1 2 3 4 5
36. My views on sexual morality--how I feel that I and others ought to behave in sexual matters. 1 2 3 4 5
37. My name. 1 2 3 4 5
38. How I might (or did) feel if my mother and father were separated or divorced. 1 2 3 4 5
39. Disappointments or bad experiences I have had in love affairs. 1 2 3 4 5
40. My favorite hobbies. 1 2 3 4 5
41. How I would feel about getting tattooed. 1 2 3 4 5
42. What I believe about God. 1 2 3 4 5
43. Things I'd really like to have if I could afford them. 1 2 3 4 5
44. Times when I have wished that I could change something about my physical appearance. 1 2 3 4 5
45. How interested I am in politics. 1 2 3 4 5
46. My weight. 1 2 3 4 5
47. What I think would be an ideal job. 1 2 3 4 5
48. One of the worst things that ever happened to me. 1 2 3 4 5
49. Whether I am a "listener" or a "talker" in social conversations. 1 2 3 4 5
50. Whether or not I wear glasses. 1 2 3 4 5
51. The things in my past or present life about which I am most ashamed. 1 2 3 4 5
52. Adventures and/or strange things that have happened to me. 1 2 3 4 5

Likert scale:

- 1 – I would not share this with a new acquaintance.
- 2 – I probably would not share this with a new acquaintance.
- 3 – I might or might not share this with a new acquaintance.
- 4 – I probably would share this with a new acquaintance.
- 5 – I would share this with a new acquaintance.

- 1 – I did not share anything about this with my new camp acquaintance.
  - 2 - I did not say much about this to my new camp acquaintance.
  - 3 - I shared some information about this with my new camp acquaintance.
  - 4 - I shared a lot about this with my new camp acquaintance.
  - 5 - I shared everything about this with my new camp acquaintance.
53. Gender:
- Male
  - Female
54. Age:
- 18
  - 19
  - 20
  - Other
55. Was your camp affiliated with a religious organization?
- Yes
  - No
56. Did the camp you attended last five days or more?
- Yes
  - No
57. Did the camp you attended involve staying away from home overnight?
- Yes
  - No
58. Did the camp you attended host people you had never met before?
- Yes
  - No
59. Did the conversations you had in mind while answering questions about your self-disclosure at camp happen between you and a peer (a fellow camper)?
- Yes
  - No
60. Year in college:
- Freshman
  - Sophomore
  - Junior
  - Senior
61. Why did you choose to say what you did to your new acquaintance at camp? (check all that apply)
- It came up in conversation.
  - To get to know the person.
  - Because something they shared made me think of it.
  - They volunteered that information about themselves first.
  - Just to have something to talk about.
  - Something was weighing on you that you wanted to share or talk about.
62. Do you feel comfortable about how much you shared about yourself with your new acquaintance at camp?
- Yes

No

63. Right after talking with your new acquaintance at camp did you: (check all that apply)

Regret how much you told them?

Regret a specific thing about yourself that you told them?

Feel relief to tell someone about something that had been on your mind?

Simply enjoy conversing with them?

64. Looking back on your camp conversations, do you now: (check all that apply)

Regret how much you told them?

Regret a specific thing about yourself that you told them?

Feel relief to tell someone about something that had been on your mind?

Simply enjoy conversing with them?

\*Note: Survey appeared differently in the online version.

Appendix B: Survey Results

		I would not share/did not share anything about this	I probably would not share/did not share much about this	I might or might not share/shared some information about this	I probably would share/shared a lot about this	I would share this/shared everything about this
1. The reasons why I am or am not religious.	Prediction	2.5%	7.3%	23.8%	<b>26.3%</b>	40.1%
	Camp	6.2%	10.9%	23.5%	<b>34.2%</b>	25.2%
2. Common interests that I would like my spouse and I to have.	Prediction	7.8%	20.4%	<b>25.8%</b>	24.6%	21.3%
	Camp	23.2%	23.0%	<b>25.2%</b>	17.9%	10.6%
3. Situations that bore me.	Prediction	3.9%	14.3%	28.0%	<b>30.5%</b>	23.2%
	Camp	9.5%	18.2%	<b>30.8%</b>	23.8%	17.6%
4. Things that I would not want people to find out about me if I ever ran for a political office.	Prediction	<b>43.7%</b>	29.4%	15.1%	8.4%	3.4%
	Camp	<b>49.3%</b>	24.1%	16.0%	4.8%	5.9%
5. What I would do if it seemed that my marriage was not a success.	Prediction	28.0%	<b>32.5%</b>	24.1%	10.4%	5.0%
	Camp	<b>47.9%</b>	21.6%	17.9%	8.1%	4.5%
6. The extent to which I worry about money.	Prediction	23.2%	29.4%	<b>30.0%</b>	12.9%	4.5%
	Camp	<b>38.1%</b>	27.7%	20.2%	9.8%	4.2%
7. Things that would cause me to break up a friendship.	Prediction	17.1%	27.5%	<b>32.2%</b>	16.8%	6.4%
	Camp	<b>27.2%</b>	26.9%	24.1%	14.6%	7.3%
8. My worst experience in school.	Prediction	8.4%	15.4%	26.6%	<b>30.3%</b>	19.3%
	Camp	20.2%	19.0%	<b>26.6%</b>	20.2%	14.0%
9. The number of bothers and sisters I have.	Prediction	0.8%	1.4%	6.4%	22.7%	<b>68.6%</b>
	Camp	1.4%	2.8%	10.6%	16.8%	<b>68.3%</b>
10. My views on sexual morality—how I feel that I and others ought to behave in sexual matters.	Prediction	9.2%	16.0%	<b>26.6%</b>	25.8%	22.4%
	Camp	19.3%	15.7%	20.2%	22.1%	<b>22.7%</b>
11. My name.	Prediction	0.6%	0.6%	3.1%	6.7%	<b>89.1%</b>
	Camp	1.1%	1.7%	3.4%	5.0%	<b>88.8%</b>



12. How I might (or did) feel if my mother and father were separated or divorced.	Prediction	13.4%	22.7%	<b>29.4%</b>	21.0%	13.4%
	Camp	<b>34.5%</b>	19.3%	19.0%	16.8%	10.4%
13. Disappointments or bad experiences I have had in romantic relationships.	Prediction	21.8%	22.7%	<b>32.2%</b>	16.8%	6.4%
	Camp	<b>30.5%</b>	20.7%	21.0%	16.5%	11.2%
14. My favorite hobbies.	Prediction	0.6%	2.0%	3.9%	30.5%	<b>63.0%</b>
	Camp	1.7%	2.0%	15.1%	25.5%	<b>55.7%</b>
15. How I would feel about getting tattooed.	Prediction	3.1%	7.0%	22.7%	32.5%	<b>34.7%</b>
	Camp	22.4%	15.7%	20.4%	17.9%	<b>23.5%</b>
16. What I believe about God.	Prediction	0.8%	2.0%	11.5%	31.7%	<b>54.1%</b>
	Camp	3.6%	5.6%	11.8%	27.5%	<b>51.5%</b>
17. Things I'd really like to have if I could afford them.	Prediction	2.5%	8.1%	26.6%	30.5%	<b>32.2%</b>
	Camp	12.0%	19.6%	<b>30.3%</b>	21.8%	16.2%
18. Times when I have wished that I could change something about my physical appearance.	Prediction	17.6%	<b>31.1%</b>	30.3%	14.8%	6.2%
	Camp	<b>26.3%</b>	24.4%	25.5%	17.6%	6.2%
19. How interested I am in politics.	Prediction	8.7%	19.0%	<b>33.9%</b>	21.3%	17.1%
	Camp	<b>38.1%</b>	24.9%	15.7%	10.4%	10.9%
20. My weight.	Prediction	<b>25.5%</b>	23.2%	19.6%	17.4%	14.3%
	Camp	<b>38.4%</b>	21.6%	17.4%	10.6%	12.0%
21. What I think would be an ideal job.	Prediction	2.2%	4.2%	21.6%	33.6%	<b>38.4%</b>
	Camp	12.0%	13.4%	<b>26.9%</b>	24.6%	23.0%
22. One of the worst things that ever happened to me.	Prediction	17.4%	23.5%	<b>28.6%</b>	18.2%	12.3%
	Camp	23.5%	24.1%	<b>24.9%</b>	14.8%	12.6%
23. Whether I am a "listener" or a "talker" in social conversations.	Prediction	5.0%	13.7%	28.6%	<b>30.5%</b>	22.1%
	Camp	17.1%	20.4%	<b>26.3%</b>	19.0%	17.1%
24. Whether or not I wear glasses.	Prediction	2.5%	6.7%	14.0%	19.6%	<b>57.1%</b>
	Camp	16.5%	8.1%	13.7%	14.0%	<b>47.6%</b>

25. The things in my past or present life about which I am most ashamed.	Prediction	<b>47.6%</b>	24.4%	13.2%	10.6%	4.2%
	Camp	<b>44.3%</b>	24.1%	14.0%	12.0%	5.6%
26. Adventures and/or strange things that have happened to me.	Prediction	2.0%	5.6%	24.1%	<b>35.0%</b>	33.3%
	Camp	3.1%	9.2%	28.6%	<b>31.1%</b>	28.0%
Gender	Male					35.3% (126)
	Female					<b>64.7% (231)</b>
Age	18					<b>71.7% (256)</b>
	19					25.5% (91)
	20					2.8% (10)
Was your camp affiliated with a religious organization?	Yes					<b>85.2% (304)</b>
	No					14.8% (53)
Did the camp you attended last five days or more?	Yes					<b>100.0% (357)</b>
	No					0.0% (0)
Did the camp you attended involve staying away from home overnight?	Yes					<b>100.0 (357)</b>
	No					0.0% (0)
Did the camp you attended host people you had never met before?	Yes					<b>100.0% (357)</b>
	No					0.0% (0)
Year in college	Freshman					<b>100.0% (357)</b>
	Sophomore					0.0% (0)
	Junior					0.0% (0)
	Senior					0.0% (0)
Did the conversations you had in mind while answering questions about your self-disclosure at camp happen between you and a peer (a fellow camper)?	Yes					<b>100.0% (357)</b>
	No					0.0% (0)
Why did you choose to say what you did to your new acquaintance at camp? (check all that apply)	It came up in conversation.					<b>92.7% (331)</b>
	They volunteered that information about themselves first.					46.8% (167)
	Just to have something to talk about.					56.3% (201)
	Something was weighing on you that you wanted to share or talk about.					25.8% (92)
Do you feel comfortable about how much you shared about yourself with your new acquaintance at camp?	Yes					<b>96.6% (345)</b>
	No					3.4% (12)
Right after talking with your new acquaintance at camp did you: (check all that apply)	Regret how much you told them?					4.2% (15)
	Regret a specific thing about yourself that you told them?					10.9% (39)
	Feel relief to tell someone about something that had been on your mind?					28.3% (101)
	Simply enjoy conversing with them?					<b>92.7% (331)</b>
Looking back on your camp conversations, do you now: (check all that apply)	Regret how much you told them?					4.8% (17)
	Regret a specific thing about yourself that you told them?					8.4% (30)
	Feel relief to tell someone about something that had been on your mind?					23.8% (85)
	Simply enjoy conversing with them?					<b>91.6% (327)</b>

Appendix C

Question by Question Paired Samples Test Analysis

		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
Pair 1	1.1 The reasons why I am or am not religious. - 2.1 The reasons why I am or am not religious.	.328	1.061	.056	.217	.438	5.837	356	.000
Pair 2	1.2 Common interests that I would like my spouse and I to have. - 2.2 Common interests that I would like my spouse and I to have.	.613	1.364	.072	.471	.755	8.496	356	.000
Pair 3	1.3 Situations that bore me. - 2.3 Situations that bore me.	.331	1.217	.064	.204	.457	5.133	356	.000
Pair 4	1.4 Things that I would not want people to find out about me if I ever ran for a political office. - 2.4 Things that I would not want people to find out about me if I ever ran for a political office.	.045	1.269	.067	-.087	.177	.667	356	.505
Pair 5	1.5 What I would do if it seemed that my marriage was not a success. - 2.5 What I would do if it seemed that my marriage was not a success.	.322	1.265	.067	.190	.454	4.810	356	.000
Pair 6	1.6 The extent to which I worry about money. - 2.6 The extent to which I worry about money.	.317	1.215	.064	.190	.443	4.924	356	.000
Pair 7	1.7 Things that would cause me to break up a friendship. - 2.7 Things that would cause me to break up a friendship.	.202	1.304	.069	.066	.337	2.922	356	.004
Pair 8	1.8 My worst experience in school. - 2.8 My worst experience in school.	.479	1.375	.073	.336	.622	6.582	356	.000

Pair 9	1.9 The number of brothers and sisters I have. - 2.9 The number of brothers and sisters I have.	.090	.840	.044	.002	.177	2.016	356	.045
Pair 10	1.10 My views on sexual morality--how I feel that I and others ought to behave in sexual matters. - 2.10 My views on sexual morality--how I feel that I and others ought to behave in sexual matters.	.230	1.453	.077	.078	.381	2.988	356	.003
Pair 11	1.11 My name. - 2.11 My name.	.045	.665	.035	-.024	.114	1.274	356	.203
Pair 12	1.12 How I might (or did) feel if my mother and father were separated or divorced. - 2.12 How I might (or did) feel if my mother and father were separated or divorced.	.490	1.419	.075	.342	.638	6.525	356	.000
Pair 13	1.13 Disappointments or bad experiences I have had in romantic relationships. - 2.13 Disappointments or bad experiences I have had in romantic relationships.	.062	1.375	.073	-.081	.205	.847	356	.398
Pair 14	1.14 My favorite hobbies. - 2.14 My favorite hobbies.	.218	.895	.047	.125	.312	4.614	356	.000
Pair 15	1.15 How I would feel about getting tattooed. - 2.15 How I would feel about getting tattooed.	.843	1.498	.079	.687	.999	10.632	356	.000
Pair 16	1.16 What I believe about God. - 2.16 What I believe about God.	.185	.957	.051	.085	.284	3.651	356	.000
Pair 17	1.17 Things I'd really like to have if I could afford them. - 2.17 Things I'd really like to have if I could afford them.	.711	1.208	.064	.586	.837	11.131	356	.000
Pair 18	1.18 Times when I have wished that I could change something about my physical appearance. - 2.18 Times when I have wished that I could change something about my physical appearance.	.078	1.225	.065	-.049	.206	1.210	356	.227

Pair 19	1.19 How interested I am in politics. - 2.19 How interested I am in politics.	.880	1.334	.071	.741	1.018	12.455	356	.000
Pair 20	1.20 My weight. - 2.20 My weight.	.353	1.247	.066	.223	.483	5.348	356	.000
Pair 21	1.21 What I think would be an ideal job. - 2.21 What I think would be an ideal job.	.686	1.350	.071	.546	.827	9.605	356	.000
Pair 22	1.22 One of the worst things that ever happened to me. - 2.22 One of the worst things that ever happened to me.	.157	1.348	.071	.017	.297	2.198	356	.029
Pair 23	1.23 Whether I am a "listener" or a "talker" in social conversations. - 2.23 Whether I am a "listener" or a "talker" in social conversations.	.524	1.289	.068	.390	.658	7.681	356	.000
Pair 24	1.24 Whether or not I wear glasses. - 2.24 Whether or not I wear glasses.	.541	1.483	.078	.386	.695	6.889	356	.000
Pair 25	1.25 The things in my past or present life about which I am most ashamed. - 2.25 The things in my past or present life about which I am most ashamed.	-.112	1.203	.064	-.237	.013	-1.759	356	.079
Pair 26	1.26 Adventures and/or strange things that have happened to me. - 2.26 Adventures and/or strange things that have happened to me.	.204	1.000	.053	.100	.309	3.863	356	.000

Appendix D

Gender Comparison Independent Samples Test

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
1.1 The reasons why I am or am not religious.	Equal variances assumed	.247	.619	.969	355	.333	.115	.119	-.119	.350
	Equal variances not assumed			.979	264.964	.328	.115	.118	-.117	.348
1.2 Common interests that I would like my spouse and I to have.	Equal variances assumed	.932	.335	1.422	355	.156	.194	.137	-.074	.463
	Equal variances not assumed			1.406	249.113	.161	.194	.138	-.078	.466
1.3 Situations that bore me.	Equal variances assumed	.013	.910	-.814	355	.416	-.100	.123	-.343	.142
	Equal variances not assumed			-.813	256.245	.417	-.100	.123	-.343	.143
1.4 Things that I would not want people to find out about me if I ever ran for a political office.	Equal variances assumed	.804	.371	1.613	355	.108	.198	.123	-.043	.439
	Equal variances not assumed			1.564	235.037	.119	.198	.126	-.051	.447
1,5 What I would do if it seemed that my marriage was not a success.	Equal variances assumed	6.958	.009	2.430	355	.016	.304	.125	.058	.550
	Equal variances not assumed			2.338	229.639	.020	.304	.130	.048	.560
1.6 The extent to which I worry about money.	Equal variances assumed	.062	.804	2.513	355	.012	.308	.123	.067	.549
	Equal variances not assumed			2.516	257.905	.012	.308	.122	.067	.549
1.7 Things that would cause me to break up a	Equal variances assumed	.038	.847	1.886	355	.060	.236	.125	-.010	.482

friendship.	Equal variances not assumed			1.859	246.743	.064	.236	.127	-.014	.486
1.8 My worst experience in school.	Equal variances assumed	1.056	.305	1.740	355	.083	.230	.132	-.030	.490
	Equal variances not assumed			1.788	278.041	.075	.230	.129	-.023	.484
1.9 The number of brothers and sisters I have.	Equal variances assumed	1.248	.265	-0.835	355	.404	-.069	.083	-.232	.094
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.831	253.895	.406	-.069	.083	-.233	.095
1.10 My views on sexual morality--how I feel that I and others ought to behave in sexual matters.	Equal variances assumed	.397	.529	1.643	355	.101	.227	.138	-.045	.498
	Equal variances not assumed			1.640	255.466	.102	.227	.138	-.046	.499
1.11 My name.	Equal variances assumed	13.581	.000	1.852	355	.065	.113	.061	-.007	.232
	Equal variances not assumed			2.141	353.103	.033	.113	.053	.009	.216
1.12 How I might (or did) feel if my mother and father were separated or divorced.	Equal variances assumed	.051	.822	.910	355	.364	.124	.136	-.144	.392
	Equal variances not assumed			.899	248.447	.369	.124	.138	-.148	.396
1.13 Disappointments or bad experiences I have had in romantic relationships.	Equal variances assumed	1.938	.165	2.766	355	.006	.359	.130	.104	.614
	Equal variances not assumed			2.798	265.708	.006	.359	.128	.106	.611
1.14 My favorite hobbies.	Equal variances assumed	3.119	.078	.863	355	.389	.069	.079	-.088	.225
	Equal variances not assumed			.908	296.189	.365	.069	.075	-.080	.217
1.15 How I would feel about getting tattooed.	Equal variances assumed	.016	.899	.221	355	.825	.026	.117	-.205	.257
	Equal variances not assumed			.222	259.181	.825	.026	.117	-.205	.257

1.16 What I believe about God.	Equal variances assumed	.026	.872	.063	355	.950	.006	.092	-.174	.186
	Equal variances not assumed			.062	249.509	.950	.006	.092	-.176	.188
1.17 Things I'd really like to have if I could afford them.	Equal variances assumed	1.106	.294	1.999	355	.046	.232	.116	.004	.461
	Equal variances not assumed			2.025	266.786	.044	.232	.115	.006	.458
1.18 Times when I have wished that I could change something about my physical appearance.	Equal variances assumed	.027	.870	3.033	355	.003	.373	.123	.131	.615
	Equal variances not assumed			2.989	246.372	.003	.373	.125	.127	.619
1.19 How interested I am in politics.	Equal variances assumed	.026	.871	2.353	355	.019	.307	.130	.050	.563
	Equal variances not assumed			2.376	264.080	.018	.307	.129	.052	.561
1.20 My weight.	Equal variances assumed	1.046	.307	8.659	355	.000	1.210	.140	.935	1.485
	Equal variances not assumed			8.880	276.281	.000	1.210	.136	.942	1.478
1.21 What I think would be an ideal job.	Equal variances assumed	.141	.707	.436	355	.663	.048	.109	-.167	.263
	Equal variances not assumed			.439	262.688	.661	.048	.108	-.166	.261
1.22 One of the worst things that ever happened to me.	Equal variances assumed	.404	.526	3.245	355	.001	.447	.138	.176	.717
	Equal variances not assumed			3.254	259.071	.001	.447	.137	.176	.717
1.23 Whether I am a "listener" or a "talker" in social conversations.	Equal variances assumed	.147	.701	.271	355	.787	.034	.125	-.212	.280
	Equal variances not assumed			.273	263.694	.785	.034	.124	-.210	.278
1.24 Whether or not I wear glasses.	Equal variances assumed	6.890	.009	-2.052	355	.041	-.244	.119	-.478	-.010



	Equal variances not assumed			-1.946	220.375	.053	-.244	.125	-.491	.003
1.25 The things in my past or present life about which I am most ashamed.	Equal variances assumed	6.195	.013	3.665	355	.000	.475	.130	.220	.729
	Equal variances not assumed			3.512	227.102	.001	.475	.135	.208	.741
1.26 Adventures and/or strange things that have happened to me.	Equal variances assumed	4.713	.031	.998	355	.319	.109	.109	-.106	.324
	Equal variances not assumed			1.039	287.836	.300	.109	.105	-.098	.315
2.1 The reasons why I am or am not religious.	Equal variances assumed	.144	.705	-.220	355	.826	-.028	.128	-.280	.224
	Equal variances not assumed			-.219	255.737	.827	-.028	.128	-.281	.224
2.2 Common interests that I would like my spouse and I to have.	Equal variances assumed	1.875	.172	1.122	355	.263	.161	.143	-.121	.443
	Equal variances not assumed			1.141	270.048	.255	.161	.141	-.117	.438
2.3 Situations that bore me.	Equal variances assumed	.255	.614	-.414	355	.679	-.056	.134	-.319	.208
	Equal variances not assumed			-.417	261.256	.677	-.056	.133	-.318	.207
2.4 Things that I would not want people to find out about me if I ever ran for a political office.	Equal variances assumed	2.282	.132	2.841	355	.005	.365	.128	.112	.618
	Equal variances not assumed			2.768	238.151	.006	.365	.132	.105	.625
2.5 What I would do if it seemed that my marriage was not a success.	Equal variances assumed	2.716	.100	2.110	355	.036	.274	.130	.019	.530
	Equal variances not assumed			2.051	236.749	.041	.274	.134	.011	.538
2.6 The extent to which I worry about money.	Equal variances assumed	5.471	.020	3.403	355	.001	.429	.126	.181	.677
	Equal variances not assumed			3.291	233.404	.001	.429	.130	.172	.686

2.7 Things that would cause me to break up a friendship.	Equal variances assumed	1.258	.263	.327	355	.744	.045	.137	-.225	.314
	Equal variances not assumed			.320	241.559	.749	.045	.140	-.231	.320
2.8 My worst experience in school.	Equal variances assumed	.337	.562	-.408	355	.683	-.060	.147	-.348	.229
	Equal variances not assumed			-.407	254.933	.684	-.060	.147	-.350	.230
2.9 The number of brothers and sisters I have.	Equal variances assumed	16.489	.000	-3.697	355	.000	-.360	.097	-.552	-.168
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.441	209.388	.001	-.360	.105	-.566	-.154
2.10 My views on sexual morality--how I feel that I and others ought to behave in sexual matters.	Equal variances assumed	5.012	.026	1.194	355	.233	.189	.158	-.122	.500
	Equal variances not assumed			1.231	280.829	.219	.189	.154	-.113	.491
2.11 My name.	Equal variances assumed	5.147	.024	-1.320	355	.188	-.100	.076	-.250	.049
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.288	239.397	.199	-.100	.078	-.254	.053
2.12 How I might (or did) feel if my mother and father were separated or divorced.	Equal variances assumed	.006	.940	.151	355	.880	.023	.153	-.278	.324
	Equal variances not assumed			.151	259.113	.880	.023	.153	-.277	.323
2.13 Disappointments or bad experiences I have had in romantic relationships.	Equal variances assumed	.002	.969	-.081	355	.935	-.012	.151	-.310	.285
	Equal variances not assumed			-.081	255.989	.936	-.012	.152	-.311	.286
2.14 My favorite hobbies.	Equal variances assumed	.409	.523	-1.803	355	.072	-.183	.101	-.382	.017
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.767	242.105	.079	-.183	.103	-.386	.021
2.15 How I would feel about getting tattooed.	Equal variances assumed	.075	.784	.551	355	.582	.090	.164	-.232	.412
	Equal variances not assumed			.548	252.761	.584	.090	.165	-.234	.414

	not assumed									
2.16 What I believe about God.	Equal variances assumed	.170	.680	-.745	355	.457	-.089	.119	-.323	.146
	Equal variances not assumed			-.746	258.869	.456	-.089	.119	-.323	.145
2.17 Things I'd really like to have if I could afford them.	Equal variances assumed	1.642	.201	1.035	355	.302	.142	.137	-.128	.412
	Equal variances not assumed			1.066	279.780	.287	.142	.133	-.120	.405
2.18 Times when I have wished that I could change something about my physical appearance.	Equal variances assumed	.887	.347	-.967	355	.334	-.131	.136	-.398	.136
	Equal variances not assumed			-.978	265.088	.329	-.131	.134	-.396	.133
2.19 How interested I am in politics.	Equal variances assumed	4.630	.032	3.378	355	.001	.501	.148	.209	.792
	Equal variances not assumed			3.269	233.767	.001	.501	.153	.199	.802
2.20 My weight.	Equal variances assumed	3.943	.048	5.646	355	.000	.835	.148	.544	1.127
	Equal variances not assumed			5.483	235.988	.000	.835	.152	.535	1.136
2.21 What I think would be an ideal job.	Equal variances assumed	.063	.802	.030	355	.976	.004	.144	-.278	.287
	Equal variances not assumed			.030	260.429	.976	.004	.143	-.277	.286
2.22 One of the worst things that ever happened to me.	Equal variances assumed	2.593	.108	1.528	355	.127	.223	.146	-.064	.510
	Equal variances not assumed			1.560	272.969	.120	.223	.143	-.058	.504
2.23 Whether I am a "listener" or a "talker" in social conversations.	Equal variances assumed	1.301	.255	-1.271	355	.205	-.187	.147	-.476	.102
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.260	250.772	.209	-.187	.148	-.479	.105

2.24 Whether or not I wear glasses.	Equal variances assumed	1.868	.173	-2.393	355	.017	-.402	.168	-.732	-.072
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.361	247.151	.019	-.402	.170	-.737	-.067
2.25 The things in my past or present life about which I am most ashamed.	Equal variances assumed	5.437	.020	1.562	355	.119	.216	.138	-.056	.487
	Equal variances not assumed			1.515	235.187	.131	.216	.142	-.065	.496
2.26 Adventures and/or strange things that have happened to me.	Equal variances assumed	6.580	.011	.794	355	.428	.094	.118	-.138	.326
	Equal variances not assumed			.827	288.463	.409	.094	.113	-.129	.317

Gender Comparison Averages and Significance Independent Samples Test

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Familiar	Equal variances assumed	.524	.470	2.997	355	.003	.20491	.06837	.07044	.33937
	Equal variances not assumed			2.959	247.728	.003	.20491	.06924	.06853	.34129

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Camp	Equal variances assumed	.004	.953	.905	355	.366	.07631	.08433	-.08954	.24216
	Equal variances not assumed			.894	248.340	.372	.07631	.08533	-.09175	.24438