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ABSTRACT

Two measures of self-disclosure and a rating of anticipated liking were employed in a study of self-disclosure involving 72 college student subjects. Half of the subjects were given a self-disclosure statement from the fictitious male or female psychologist who they believed would interview them. Two-thirds of the subjects (in both statement and no statement conditions) heard a segment of tape depicting an interview between a male student client and a disclosing or a non-disclosing interviewer. The remaining one-third did not hear a tape.

Subjects were asked to list any problems they wished to discuss with their interviewer on a piece of paper (the Concern Index). They then circled items from Taylor and Altman's (1966) pool of items scaled from one to eleven for intimacy level (the Disclosure Depth Index). Subjects circled only those items that they would be willing to discuss with their interviewer. Finally, subjects were requested to assess how much they anticipated liking their interviewer (on a one to nine scale).

Results derived from the Concern Index indicated more concern listing by subjects anticipating a female interviewer. The significant statement x tape interaction for this variable presented confusing results possibly arising from the limited range of scores. The interaction did indicate, however, that interviewer disclosure reciprocity did not increase subject disclosure over control conditions. Discussion considers a possible predisposition on the part of subjects for the reception of reciprocal disclosure from professional sources.
Results from the Disclosure Depth Index revealed that subjects lowered disclosure after hearing a non-disclosing potential interviewer, especially if they had not read the self-disclosure statement. Subjects in these no statement conditions indicated greater willingness to disclose under control than under non-disclosing interviewer conditions. These results, like those from the Concern Index, also suggested that subjects had an expectation of interviewer disclosure which non-reciprocal tape conditions violated.

The Disclosure Depth Index produced additional interactions revealing differential responding due to subject and interviewer sex. A significant statement x subject sex interaction demonstrated decreased disclosure depth by female subjects under no statement conditions. A significant two way tape x interviewer sex x subject sex interaction indicated that both male and female subjects anticipating a same-sex interviewer decreased disclosure depth across interviewer conditions of reciprocal disclosure, non-reciprocal disclosure and control conditions. When anticipating an opposite sex interviewer, this pattern changed. Female subjects anticipating a male psychologist increased disclosure depth under control conditions to a level equivalent to disclosure depth under disclosing interviewer conditions, while producing an approximately 13 point drop under the non-disclosing interviewer condition. Male subjects were willing to disclose at a high level regardless of the behavior of the female interviewer they anticipated. These results are discussed as a possible reflection of cultural constraints on male disclosing behavior.

Analysis of rated anticipated liking revealed that subjects expected to like their interviewer more if they had read the disclosure
statement. As liking did not fluctuate with disclosure scores, discussion concluded that liking had not been a necessary component of disclosure.

The present investigation did not provide strong evidence for the facilitative effects of reciprocity found in the literature. This study suggested, however, that non-disclosing interviewer behavior decreased disclosure levels from those of both control and reciprocal disclosure conditions. These results were qualified by the interaction of subject and interviewer sex.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Self-disclosure (SD), the communication of non-public self-knowledge to another, is an essential component of therapeutic process. The late Sidney Jourard (1964) considered SD a necessity for psychological health and personal growth. Lack of transparency in interpersonal relationships, often accompanied by inadequate self-knowledge, has received extensive consideration as a possible source of psychological maladjustment (Jourard, 1968; Wolman, 1967; Selye, 1950; Horney, 1950; Fromm, 1947; Rogers, 1955; Truax & Carkhuff, 1965; Sullivan, 1953; Arieti, 1974; Maslow, 1954; Mowrer, 1964). Jourard and Lasakow (1958) vitalized experimental investigation of SD with publication of the first disclosure questionnaire consisting of ten items in each of six content areas. SD research frequently employs Jourard's Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (JSDQ), a version of it as a similar instrument. Validity of JSDQ which assesses past disclosure to mother, father, best male friend and best female friend has frequently been questioned (Lubin & Harrison, 1964; Himelstein & Kimbrough, 1963; Himelstein & Pederson, 1968; Ehrlich & Graeven, 1971). Other investigators have measured disclosure through ratings of taped or written materials (Burhene & Mirels, 1970; Derlega, et al., 1973 a,b; Chaiken & Derlega, 1974 a,b; Taylor, et al., 1969), through note passing exercises (Worthy, Gary & Kahn, 1969; Gertner, 1973) and by determining subjects' willingness to discuss specified topics (Edelman & Snead,
1972; Bundza & Simonson, 1973; Ellison & Firestone, 1974). Jourard's (1969) last questionnaire, employing items from Taylor and Altman's (1966) list of intimacy scaled statements, requests that subjects indicate past disclosure and willingness to disclose to a stranger.

Jourard (1964, 1968, 1971) has stressed the nature of traditional psychotherapy, in which the therapist remains aloof and detached, as a means of maintaining control over clients. Jourard (1970) declared: "If authentic self-disclosure was a factor in mental health, and if disclosure begets disclosure, then it made sense for a therapist to be an exemplar of the way he was inviting his client to follow . . ." (p. 352). Turax (1971) stated a similar position: "How can we expect others to disclose of themselves to us, when we in turn are unwilling to disclose ourselves?" (p. 352). Effective therapists, according to these authors and many others, are those who are spontaneous and genuine in therapeutic relationships--risking themselves in a mutual sharing experience. (For a complete review of SD research see Appendix A).

The present investigation sought to determine the effects of an expressed commitment to self-revelation made by a psychologist-interviewer in the first encounter upon subjects' willingness to disclose. This commitment was either observed or violated in taped "demonstration" interview segments with a hypothetical client. Subjects' willingness to disclose and anticipated liking for the interviewer was then assessed. SD research suggested that subjects would be most responsive to a disclosing psychologist especially if they expected disclosing behavior from him/her.

Disclosure assessment was made through a Disclosure Depth Index
composed of items from Taylor and Altman's (1966) list of intimacy-scaled statements. Subjects circled items that they would be willing to discuss. A Concern Index also measured disclosure. The number of concerns or problems listed on a blank sheet of paper served as this dependent variable. Anticipated liking was determined by asking subjects to indicate how much they expected to like their interviewer on a scale of one to nine.

Statement of Problem and Hypotheses

The purpose of this investigation was to manipulate one aspect of subjects' expectancies regarding interviewer behavior and determine effects of this manipulation upon self-disclosure, a component of therapeutic process. Conceptions of "appropriate" role and situational behaviors have frequently been enlisted as explanatory principles in SD research (Heilbrun, 1973; Simonson & Bahr, 1974; Doster & Brook, 1974; Bundza and Simonson, 1973; Mann & Murphy, 1975; Weigel, et al., 1972) through subjects' perception of "openness" as a mode of counselor behavior has not been treated as an independent variable.

Aspects of the study considered in hypotheses formulation included: status of interviewer, situational demands, modeling and reciprocity. Typically, therapy/counseling situations involve high status interviewers whose effectiveness, SD research indicates, may be limited by disclosure, apparently due to status itself and/or conceptions regarding how high-status persons should behave (Ellison & Firestone, 1974; Simonson & Bahr, 1974; Brooks, 1974). In order to examine what effect an expectancy of interviewer openness might have, interviewers
for half the subjects were described in a printed statement as disclosing. The other half received no statement. In light of this consideration, hypothesis one predicted greater disclosure depth when an interviewer was presented as disclosing and then modeled disclosure.

Interviewer reciprocity, as noted, may affect dependent measures because subjects are not accepting of this behavior from professional sources. Given an atmosphere in which SD from the interviewer was established as desirable and forthcoming, subjects who heard a non-reciprocal interviewer were expected to experience inequity in the relationship and lower their SD level (Adams, 1965). According to social exchange (Worthy, Gary & Kahn, 1969) or social penetration theory (Taylor, Altman & Sorrentino, 1969), SD functions as a reward and produces liking and disclosure. Speaking of therapeutic encounters, Jourard (1969) said "I suspect that he (client) will become as open, trusting, and vulnerable as I am willing to be with him" (p. 64).

Others note that therapy and, indeed, all social behaviors are contractual in nature—involving mutual reward exchange (Rimm & Masters, 1974; Tooley & Pratt, 1967). Interviewers control and reward interviewees behavior through their own behavior (Bandura, 1971; Matarazzo, 1965; Truax, 1966; Wexler & Butler, 1976). Based on equity theory, hypothesis two predicted relatively high SD in reciprocal conditions in which subjects had not read a disclosure statement but speculated that, without the statement, SD would be somewhat lower than in statement, reciprocal tape conditions. Hypotheses three and four dealt with conditions of inequity. Hypothesis three predicted that a non-disclosing interviewer style would result in less willingness to disclose. Hypothesis four
anticipated that an interviewer presented as disclosing and then modeled as non-disclosing would elicit less disclosure than all other experimental conditions (except controls) because such an interviewer had violated his/her commitment to SD as a principle.

Demand characteristic of disclosure research may be such that volunteering implies pre-existent high levels of SD willingness (Hood & Back, 1971) or the embience of laboratory research may be such that subjects behave in an uncharacteristic fashion (Orne, 1962; Rosenthal, 1966). In addition to possible demand characteristics, the present study also employed modeled disclosure. Modeling has been demonstrated to be an effective elicitor of disclosure (Davis & Skinner, 1974; Doster & Brook, 1974; Ellison & Firestone, 1974; Doster & Slaymaker, 1972; Marlatt, 1971). In this study, subjects heard a disclosing and a non-disclosing interviewer with or without expecting that he/she would behave in a disclosing manner. Client-modeled disclosure remained constant in all conditions, accordingly, subjects' willingness to SD was examined in control conditions in which neither modeling nor any statement from the interviewer was presented. Control conditions for interviewer statement alone, without tapes, were also employed. Hypothesis five predicted minimal disclosure in control conditions.

An additional methodological consideration was the relationship between stated willingness to SD and actual extent of disclosure. Research indicated that willingness to disclose closely corresponds to actual disclosure when potential targets are the same (Wilson & Rappaport, 1974; Jourard & Jeffe, 1970; Jourard & Resnick, 1970; Doster, 1975; Simonson & Bahr, 1974; Cash & Solloway, 1975). Measurement of
willingness to disclose has received extensive use (Edelman & Snead, 1972; Bundza & Simonson, 1973; Ellison & Firestone, 1974). Jourard's last SD questionnaire was formulated subsequent to the realization that reported disclosure to target persons mentioned in his JSDQ did not predict disclosure in experimental situations with strangers. A 40 item willingness-to-disclose questionnaire employing Taylor and Altman's (1966) intimacy-scaled stimuli was therefore developed (Jourard, 1969).

The present study presented an opportunity to examine modeled reciprocal and non-reciprocal interviewer behavior as a function of subject expectancy. Specific hypotheses regarding subjects' SD were as follows:

1. There will be greater disclosure depth when an interviewer is presented as disclosing and then models SD on tape than in any other condition.

2. Less disclosure depth will be demonstrated in conditions in which no statement regarding interviewer style is given, but disclosure is modeled on tape.

3. There will be still less SD depth in conditions presenting no statement of interviewer style and a modeled lack of disclosure reciprocity.

4. Least SD depth will be demonstrated in conditions committing interviewers to a disclosing style but paired with a non-disclosing taped model.

5. Control conditions presenting only a statement of intention to disclose or no statement or taped model are expected to produce minimal disclosure depth.
6. Females are expected to be more disclosing than males.

Hypotheses regarding anticipated liking for interviewer were as follows:

1. Maximal liking for interviewer is expected under statement, reciprocal tape conditions, followed by no statement, non-reciprocal tape conditions.

2. Statement, non-reciprocal and no statement, reciprocal tape conditions are hypothesized to result in the least amount of liking as they presumably violate experimentally established expectancies or expectations regarding appropriate interviewer behavior.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 72 undergraduate volunteers, 36 males and 36 females. Subjects were paid $2.00 for their participation.

Assessment Measures

Self-disclosure was measured in two ways--through a Disclosure Depth Index and through a Concern Index.

1. Taylor and Altman's (1966) item pool consisting of statements scaled for intimacy level by college students and sailors was employed as a "Disclosure Depth Index." Subjects were asked to circle any of 72 items in six categories of "Own marriage and family," "Love--dating--sex," "Parental family," "Physical condition and appearance," "Emotions and feelings" and "Relationships with other people" that they were willing to discuss. Taylor and Altman obtained split-half and alternate form reliabilities of .82 and .86 respectively (Appendix B).

2. A "Concern Index" consisting of a blank sheet of paper with instructions printed at the top, "Please list below any areas of concern, personal problems, difficulties or worries that you would like to discuss with Dr. Marks," was employed. A count of the number of problems listed provided a measure of written disclosure.

3. A nine point rating scale was employed to ascertain degree of anticipated liking for an interviewer (Appendix D).
**Covariant**

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS) was administered to all subjects (1960). This instrument assesses need approval through responses to 33 true-false statements described as free of pathological content. Endorsement of culturally approved but unlikely items, such as "I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake," results in a high score (Appendix C).

Norms are available for both male and female college students. Split-half and test-retest reliability coefficients were both .88. This instrument was employed as a covariant.

**Procedure**

In a preliminary experiment, a group of 20 subjects judged the level of SD demonstrated on two taped interviews. They determined that the level of interviewer SD shown on these two tapes was non-overlapping. None of these subjects was exposed to experimental conditions.

Volunteers were asked to participate in a study of initial interviews in therapy in which they role-played individuals attending an initial therapy session. Subjects were paid $2.00 for their participation. Confidentiality of information was assured and subjects were informed of their freedom to leave at any time without penalty.

All subjects were given MCSDS. They were told that the scale was an "attitude questionnaire" being given by the Psychology Department to all volunteers. Two major experimental groups were then formed with an equal number of males and females in each group and subsequent sub-group.
Half of the subjects were given a SD statement signed by a fictitious psychologist "Dr. Joan Marks" or "Dr. James Marks" (Appendix E). They then heard a segment of tape depicting an interview between a male student client and a male or female therapist demonstrating SD at level one or level four as defined by Gazda (1973) (Appendix F). Subjects were told that both statement and tape were designed to acquaint them with their interviewer and his/her style. Control subjects heard no tape.

The other half of the subjects were not given a statement but did hear the same tapes. Control subjects neither read a statement nor heard a tape.

All subjects were then given the Concern Index. After listing concerns (if any), subjects were asked to circle any items from the Disclosure Depth Index (Taylor and Altman's intimacy scaled items) that they would be willing to discuss with their interviewer. Items were described as "typical concerns discussed in initial visits to a psychologist." Subjects were told that their indications might be employed as a "guide" by their interviewer and that they should not, therefore, circle any item unless they were willing to discuss it.

Finally, subjects were requested to indicate, "for experimental purposes only," the extent of their anticipated liking for the interviewer.

Subjects were debriefed. Data from any subject who indicated having doubted that an interview would occur were omitted from analysis.

Data Analysis

Correlations were computed between all dependent variables.
Analysis of covariance was employed to permit an examination of dependent variable means adjusted for differences in scores on the social desirability variable. Separate analyses of covariance were conducted for each of the dependent variables. These were as follows: a total Disclosure Depth Index score obtained by summing the ranking of the most intimate item circled in each of the six areas from the Taylor and Altman list, the number of personal problems listed on the Concern Index, and the anticipated liking rating. A .05 level of significance was accepted on all analyses.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The 24 experimental conditions will be referred to as follows: S, NS (statement, no statement); R, NR, NT (reciprocal, non-reciprocal and no tape); MI, FI (male and female psychologist interviewer); MSs, FSs (male and female subjects). Hypotheses restated according to letter code ordered SD as follows: S,R; NS,R; NS,NR; S,NR; S,NT; and NS,NT. Hypothesized order for rated anticipated liking was as follows: S,R; NS,NR; and S,NR or NS,R.

Data from analyses of covariance represent means adjusted for MCSDS scores.

Correlations

There were no significant correlations between dependent variables. The covariant, MCSDS, was correlated with rated anticipated liking for interviewer ($r=.48$, $p<.0001$).

Disclosure Depth Index

Analysis of covariance of these SD scores revealed four significant F's (Table 1). Means given in Table 2 reflect total scores based upon summation of the highest score obtained in each of the six theory-related conditions. SD scores were highest under condition S,R followed by NS,R; S,NR; NS,NT; S,NT; and NS,NR.

A significant main effect for tape ($F=5.762$, $p<.006$) (Figure 1) demonstrated greater willingness to disclose under reciprocal followed by
### TABLE 1

**SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF DISCLOSURE DEPTH INDEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>386.788</td>
<td>2.254</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>988.914</td>
<td>5.762</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300.073</td>
<td>1.748</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SsS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>310.780</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x Tape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>581.715</td>
<td>3.390</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x IS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.600</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x SsS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1081.532</td>
<td>6.302</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape x IS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>210.256</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape x SsS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41.240</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS x SsS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>106.305</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x Tape x IS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>302.483</td>
<td>1.763</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x IS x SsS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.555</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape x IS x SsS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>557.510</td>
<td>3.249</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x Tape x SsS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>395.667</td>
<td>2.306</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x Tape x IS x SsS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46.573</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>171.610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2

**SCORES ON DISCLOSURE DEPTH INDEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>55.34</td>
<td>51.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>48.61</td>
<td>33.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>40.89</td>
<td>45.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>FSS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>FSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>59.47</td>
<td>51.30</td>
<td>58.20</td>
<td>44.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>49.45</td>
<td>61.12</td>
<td>52.28</td>
<td>52.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>31.57</td>
<td>50.15</td>
<td>42.63</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>FSS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>FSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>55.28</td>
<td>57.43</td>
<td>49.15</td>
<td>23.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>39.64</td>
<td>51.04</td>
<td>37.54</td>
<td>42.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>42.90</td>
<td>29.98</td>
<td>59.34</td>
<td>42.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
no tape and non-reciprocal tape conditions, both of the latter were much lower (10 points) than reciprocal tape conditions.

The interaction statement x tape (F=3.390, p= < .04) indicated that the tape effect noted above was probably a function of the interaction: and had only the statement condition been studied, the curve would have changed somewhat; then the no tape condition would have been lowest of the three. Disclosure was lowered significantly under non-reciprocal tape conditions only when subjects did not read that their interviewer intended to be self-revealing (Figure 2).

There was a significant statement x subject sex interaction (F=6.302, p= < .02). Figure 3 graphically illustrated that female subjects lowered SD under most no statement conditions. There was a non-significant (F=2.306, p= < .11) statement x tape x subject sex interaction which suggests that the significant statement x tape interaction was most influenced by lowered SD of female subjects under non-reciprocal, no statement conditions.

The significant two-way interaction of tape x interviewer sex x subject sex (F=3.249, p= < .05; Figure 4) reflects lowered SD scores under non-reciprocal conditions for both male and female subjects expecting to be interviewed by a male psychologist; whereas, under the female interviewer condition only females lowered their SD scores. Scores were lowered by subjects under both non-reciprocal and no tape conditions.

Concern Index

Table 3 contains the results of analysis of covariance of Concern Index scores. The mean disclosure scores for the six theory-related
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Figure 1. Graph of Main Effect for Tape

Figure 2. Graph of Interaction of Statement x Tape

Figure 3. Graph of Interaction Statement x Subjects' Sex
Figure 4. Graph of Interaction Tape x Interviewer's Sex x Subjects' Sex
### TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF CONCERN INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.696</td>
<td>3.905</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss Sex+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x Tape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.482</td>
<td>3.360</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x IS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x SsS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape x IS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.481</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape x SsS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS x SsS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.994</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x Tape x IS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.999</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x IS x SsS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape x IS x SsS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x Tape x SsS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.792</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x Tape x IS x SsS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.841</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ IS= Interviewer's Sex

SsS= Subjects' Sex
conditions (Table 4) indicate most problem admission under NS,NT followed by S,NR; NS,R; S,NT; S,R and NS,NR. Means for the total 24 experimental conditions are also given (Table 4).

A significant main effect for interviewer sex was obtained ($F=3.905$, $p<.05$). More concerns were listed by subjects who thought their interviewer would be female (Figure 5).

The statement x tape interaction was significant ($F=3.360$, $p<.04$). Figure 6 illustrates lowered problem admission under non-reciprocal tape conditions only if subjects did not read the SD statement. Subjects who read the SD statement increased problem admission somewhat under non-reciprocal tape conditions.

**Anticipated Liking**

Analysis of covariance for rated anticipated liking is presented in Table 5. Means for the six theory-related and 24 total conditions are listed in Table 6.

Subjects who read the SD statement anticipated significantly more liking for their interviewer than did no statement condition subjects ($F=11.374$, $p<.0015$; Figure 7).
TABLE 4

SCORES ON CONCERN INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSS</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCERN INDEX

Interviewer's Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Concern Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5

Statement x Tape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tape</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6
TABLE 5

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF ANTICIPATED LIKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.239</td>
<td>11.374</td>
<td>.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.380</td>
<td>2.144</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.488</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SsS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x Tape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x IS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.858</td>
<td>1.399</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x SsS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape x IS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape x SsS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.122</td>
<td>1.528</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS x SsS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.993</td>
<td>1.465</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x Tape x IS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.576</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x IS x SsS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.838</td>
<td>1.878</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape x IS x SsS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x Tape x SsS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.520</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State. x Tape x IS x SsS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 6

Scores on Anticipated Liking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>FSS</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>FSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7. Graph of Main Effect for Statement on Anticipated Liking Variable.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The present study was designed to investigate the effects of various manipulations of interviewer disclosure upon subjects' willingness to disclose (Disclosure Depth Index), written problem listing (Concern Index), and anticipated liking of interviewer. All subjects were placed in one of three tape conditions which differed with respect to the extent to which a demonstration interview involved self-disclosure by the interviewer. Half of these subjects were given a written statement in which their proposed interviewer described himself/herself as disclosing.

The subjects expected to like their interviewer more after they had read the disclosure statement than if they had not read the statement (Figure 7). This was not the pattern of significance found for dependent measures of disclosure, thus liking and disclosure did not necessarily occur conjointly as would be predicted by Worthy, Cary and Kahn (1969), Taylor, Altman and Sorrentino (1969) and Jourard (1959). These results may, however, have some relevance in clarifying the statement x tape interaction found in both measures of SD.

Other investigators have concluded that liking decreases when reciprocity of highly intimate material is demonstrated (Ehrlich & Graeven, 1971; Cozby, 1972; Derlega, et al., 1973a.). The self-information given by psychologist interviewers on reciprocal tapes was not highly intimate in content (Appendix F). Authors have occasionally
hypothesized that professional SD sources are not well received due to loss of status or violation of subjects' expectations regarding professional behavior (Ellison & Firestone, 1974; Simson & Bahr, 1974; Brooks, 1974). In the present study no comparisons with non-professional target persons were made; however, non-reciprocal tapes did not result in greater anticipated liking for interviewer than did reciprocal tapes. Also subjects did not tend toward more or less liking of the reciprocal interviewer contingent upon their expectation (given by the SD statement) that he/she would be disclosing. Rather, the addition of a disclosure statement influenced liking without regard to tape conditions.

The statement x tape interaction of both SD measures indicates differential effects attributable to the written SD statement. Disclosure scores on both the Concern Index and the Disclosure Depth Index decreased under no statement, non-reciprocal conditions (Figures 2 & 6). On both measures, the drop in SD scores under this experimental condition is very sharp. No main effect for tape was shown on the Concern Index because there is a peak in SD scores under the statement, non-reciprocal condition thus cancelling the effects of the no statement, non-reciprocal condition drop in scores (Figure 6). This peak is difficult to explain but as it is less than one point higher than other statement conditions it may be due merely to the small scores recorded for this variable. The mean and standard deviation for Concern Index scores were 2.125 and 1.47, respectively.

Apparently having read that their interviewer was an open, sharing individual, subjects did not respond to a lack of modeled reciprocity as did subjects in no statement conditions. As there was no greater liking
under the statement, non-reciprocal condition, the significantly greater disclosure scores suggest the prepotency of the statement itself in establishing reciprocity. A lengthier exposure to modeled non-reciprocity or an actual experience with this style may have eliminated this prepotency. However, as there was greater liking in all statement versus no statement conditions, subjects may have felt that they liked the interviewer and consequently behaved in a manner consistent with those feelings despite a lack of reciprocity. This explanation accords with cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957).

Subjects' response to this non-reciprocal condition supports most particularly Adams (1965) equity theory, however. Equity theory simply states that a balance between output and input is sought in various types of exchange. In the present study, it appears that subjects lowered SD when they received no information about their presumed partner in the dyad. The disclosure statement, even when contradicted by a non-reciprocal taped demonstration, was a form of information about the interviewer. A group of approximately 15 introductory psychology students presented with this experimental design were able to correctly predict that no statement, non-reciprocal conditions would result in the least amounts of SD. They expressed their own reluctance to talk with someone about whom they could know nothing.

If equity principles were in operation in the present investigation, then the status of a disclosing professional appears to have been a non-issue. There was an assumption that by describing the interviewer as a "doctor" and a "psychologist," an expectation of non-disclosing, reserved behavior would be elicited from subjects. Introduction of the
SD statement was intended to develop an expectation which subjects may have already had, i.e., that of psychologists as disclosing. If equity theory is valid in the present instance, then high SD levels under control conditions can be explained as subjects responding to the equitable, balanced exchange which they were anticipating. Under no statement, non-reciprocal conditions, expectations may have been seriously undermined. If equity theory principles were not functioning, then the data can be seen as providing evidence for disclosure suppression due to non-reciprocity while providing less evidence regarding any facilitative effects of reciprocity on SD. The data demonstrated less SD under non-reciprocity but no particular major increases in SD under reciprocal as compared to control conditions (Figure 2 & 6).

No significant differences in self-disclosure scores were found between reciprocal and control conditions within either the statement or the no statement conditions on the Concern Index. Thus on this variable, the frequently cited facilitative effects of SD reciprocity on subject disclosure (Jourard & Resnick, 1970; Pasternack & Landingham, 1972; Davis & Sloan, 1974; Derlega, et al., 1973; Cozby, 1972; Becker & Munz, 1975; Jourard, 1959; Jourard and Landsman, 1960; Jourard & Richman, 1963; Panyard, 1973; Worthy, Gary & Kahn, 1969; Certner, 1973; Gary & Hammond, 1970) were not demonstrated. On the Disclosure Depth Index, reciprocal tapes, especially under statement conditions, produced more disclosure than did control conditions (Figure 2). Considering this SD variable, it seems probable that reciprocity was an important factor in increasing disclosure scores. Chaiken and Derlega (1974 a,b.) have demonstrated that intimate disclosure between strangers is perceived as inappropriate,
though other results indicate that reciprocal disclosure occurs even in those situations that subjects might judge as inappropriate (Derlega, et al., 1973 a.b.). Thus the evidence appears to suggest a principle of "fairness" or equity as the probable determinant of low disclosure scores under no statement, non-reciprocal conditions.

Additional significant interactions suggest that subject sex may have been influential in the perception of inequity. There were no statement x tape x subject sex interactions to demonstrate that female subjects were especially sensitive to no statement, non-reciprocal conditions; however, other interactions suggest that female subjects may have been more acutely aware of particular information gaps. Disclosure scores, as measured by the Disclosure Depth Index, decreased under all no statement conditions for female subjects only (Figure 3). Chaiken and Derlega (1974 b.) discovered that female subjects saw SD to strangers as more inappropriate than did males. Wright (1975) found that facilitative counselor behaviors were more intensely perceived by female counselees. Jourard and Friedman (1970) concluded that females were more sensitive to the lack of interest implied by no eye contact because the correlation between trust and SD was zero for female subjects when the experimenter avoided looking at them.

A significant tape x interviewer sex x subject sex interaction again reveals the pattern of decreased SD scores under non-reciprocal conditions; however, male subjects anticipating a female interviewer ignored non-reciprocity (Figure 4 b.). Male subjects were willing to SD to a female interviewer regardless of reciprocity. On the Concern Index a mild trend toward an interviewer sex x subject sex interaction
indicated greater willingness of male subjects to disclose to a female psychologist ($F = 1.794, p = .19$). These results compliment the tape x interviewer sex x subject sex interaction on the Disclosure Depth Index. Brooks (1974) found that both male and female subjects disclosed more to female counselors, whereas male subjects discriminated against male counselors of low status. Status of female counselors appeared unimportant in disclosing behavior. On the Concern Index, results indicate that all subjects in the present study listed more concerns when anticipating a female interviewer (Figure 5). Figure 4 b, indicates that male subjects were willing to disclose at a high level to a female interviewer regardless of their knowledge about her. Female subjects were unwilling to disclose to a non-reciprocal or an unknown female doctor; whereas their disclosure scores rose (from the decrease under non-reciprocity) given no information about the male doctor. Heilbrun (1973) hypothesized that female counselees, low in assessed "counseling readiness," were frustrated by non-directive male therapists. These low readiness females reported significantly more past SD to males than did high readiness females. Both male and female subjects in the present study reacted to the non-reciprocity of the male doctor but female subjects increased disclosure scores again under the no tape condition (Figure 4 a.). Females had very low disclosure scores under no tape conditions when anticipating a female psychologist. Thus females were willing to disclose to an unknown male but not to an unknown female; otherwise, they responded to non-reciprocity with lowered disclosure scores. Males, however, did not seem to discriminate on the basis of the female psychologist's behavior. Possibly females are predisposed to
disclose to a male authority, unless confronted with his lack of openness. Jourard's work (1964) indicated that males may experience cultural constraints against disclosing to other males. In order to disclose intimate information to anyone they must disclose to females, consequently they may be less concerned with the reciprocity of the dyad, especially in the therapeutic context. The results of the present study produced no main effect for sex of subjects. Females were not more disclosing in general than were males. Other research may have reached this conclusion due to failure to manipulate interviewer sex as a variable.

Conclusion

Future research might employ extended actual interviews; possibly focusing on the most intimate topics subjects are willing to discuss to render violation of commitment more salient. The present study failed to clarify the effects of commitment violation on disclosure—possibly because exposure to potential therapists was too brief or because subjects pre-experimental expectations were unknown. Future investigation most certainly should examine the expectations held by individuals of different ages regarding the behavior of professional mental health resources. If particular populations enter a counseling situation anticipating a degree of reciprocal disclosure from interviewers, then the notion of violation of commitment becomes very important. An interviewer may want to clarify his/her style as non-reciprocal in order to avoid client drop-outs due to violated expectancies. Discovering what preconceptions clients have regarding
professional behavior could serve to enhance the value of initial inter-
views in addition to decreasing the incidence of failed second appoint-
ments.

Also warranting further investigation is the issue of how much
subjects are willing to tell a stranger (no statement and/or no tape
conditions). Extended interviews, while clarifying the effects of the
therapist's behavioral violation of his/her expressed disclosing views,
could also examine whether control conditions (perhaps in the form of
information giving via tape recorder to a potential interviewer) would
still produce commensurately high SD levels.

Further clarification of sex differences, particularly differential responding to male and female therapists in relation to their
disclosure style should be attempted. Some type of post-experimental
evaluation could be employed in an attempt to determine the nature of
these differences.

The Concern Index results clearly fail to indicate a facilitative
effect for reciprocity while demonstrating a negative effect on SD when
a totally unknown interviewer (no statement condition) is also non-
reciprocal. Disclosure Depth Index results are less clear regarding
the value of reciprocity. It appears that reciprocity did produce
greater SD especially when subjects were expecting therapist SD (Figure
2) and thus the combination of clarifying therapeutic process as sharing
experience and demonstrating SD may increase disclosing behavior. This
conclusion largely holds when the tape x interviewer sex x subject sex
interaction is considered (Figure 4 a.b.) except for the willingness of
females to disclose to an unknown male and the insensitivity of male
subjects to non-reciprocity of a female psychologist.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

Attraction Variables and SD

Review of research indicates that disclosure is more likely to be correlated to liking for female than male subjects (Jourard, 1959; Jourard and Landsman, 1960; Kohen, 1975; Ehrlich & Graeven, 1971). Female self-ratings of an attraction variable (physical attractiveness) were negatively related to SD, however. The opposite was true of males (Cash & Solloway, 1975). Authors speculated that social reinforcers for attractiveness resulted in less development of interpersonal skills on the part of females. Perhaps attractive males were disinhibited from assumed cultural constraints upon male disclosure.

Relationship development in a group of clinical psychology graduate students was not based on self-revelation (Kahn & Rudestam, 1971). Pearce and Wiebe (1973) found degree of SD to best friend was not correlated to Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI) items. These results contradict presumed relationship between SD and liking postulated by Worthy, Gary and Kahn's (1969) social exchange theory in which reception of SD is perceived as a positive outcome which produces liking and therefore subsequent SD. Over ten trials of note passing, liking and SD were significantly correlated and subjects tended to send more intimate information to those from whom they had received intimate communications (Worthy, et al., 1969; Certner, 1973). Taylor, Altman and Sorrentino (1969) proposed an expansion of social exchange, social penetration theory, in which growth of interpersonal relationships proceeds systematically and gradually as a function of reward/cost.
factors, personality characteristics and situational determinants.

According to Derlega, Harris and Chaiken (1973) results of Worthy, et al. (1969) cannot be considered supportive of social exchange theory because authors did not prove that the correlation between SD input and output was dependent upon liking. To specifically examine the hypothesized necessity for SD to be accompanied by liking, authors have introduced extreme intimacy levels and "deviant" confederates (Cozby, 1972; Derlega, et al., 1973a,b). Derlega, et al. (1973a) paired female undergraduates with same-sex confederates who revealed having been caught by mother in a sexual act with either a male or female (deviant condition) partner. Subjects were willing to disclose more intimate information to the deviant other, though they did not like her as much as non-deviant, high intimate partners. Reciprocal SD, the authors suggested, follows Adams (1965) equity theory or Homans (1974) distributive justice formulation in which equality of outcomes, rather than attraction, mediates SD.

Related to SD contingent upon liking is the area linking SD to similarity of the other. Similarity, however, may involve more complex factors than liking alone, possibly following Taylor, et al. (1969). Similar SD's may cue individuals to possibility of profitable reward/cost ratios. Subjects tend toward greater liking for one whose disclosure is at a comparable level (Sermat & Smyth, 1973; Lawless & Nowicki, 1972; Sote & Good, 1974; Murphy & Strong, 1974; Knecht, et al., 1973). Attraction for inappropriate or unusual discloser has been examined by asking subjects to make judgements after reading about or observing a situation. Disclosers were better liked if they delayed in
revealing good fortune whether responsible or not; however, in case of bad fortune, liking was greater if a responsible person revealed it early, while victims of fate were better liked if they delayed (Jones & Gordon, 1972). Chaiken and Derlega (1974 a,b) found that high intimate information between strangers was viewed as inappropriate, especially if it followed low intimate input, but participants were perceived as less "warm" when non-reciprocal. Authors interpreted these results as support for social penetration theory; however, Derlega, et al. (1973 a,b) demonstrated that willingness to SD to a stranger could be very high even when that stranger's behavior, as according to these studies, would be seen as inappropriate.

Trust has been correlated with SD and measured as a function of disclosing behavior. Trust may not be differentiated from liking by subjects employing rating scales; consequently, trust is probably better assessed by performance oriented instruments such as Prisoner's Dilemma game (MacDonald, et al., 1972). SD has been shown correlated to trust dependent upon psychological and physical "distance" of the other (Jourard & Friedman, 1970; Johnson & Noonan, 1972).

Therapy and Therapy Analogues

SD on the part of help seekers is frequently considered an important, if not vital, component of therapeutic process. Research on the role of SD in therapeutic situations or analogues attempts to more precisely define parameters of SD and/or facilitate its occurrence. Interviewers possessing a facilitative manner, as originally defined by Rogers (1957), seem to elicit greater client transparency (Shapiro, et al.,
1969; Holder, et al., 1967); however, Lewis and Kraus (1971) found that induction of SD by asking personal questions of their female subjects resulted in higher rating of interviewers on BLRI, thus cause and effect remain undetermined.

Modeling of self-exploration has proven an effective means of producing or increasing levels of SD. Effects are variable when counselor/interviewer variables are considered apart from client role modeling. Jourard (1959, 1964, 1971) felt therapist disclosure was a means to client disclosure. There is some evidence, however, that the less an interviewer intrudes himself, the more personal will be client discussion. Ellison and Firestone (1974) found female college students more willing to SD to reflective rather than intrusive taped models. Rated interviewee verbal behavior was perceived as more disclosing given impersonal pre-interview tapes of the experimenter; however, subjects with low reported SD histories were attracted to personal model (Doster & Strickland, 1971). Simonson and Bahr (1974) essentially duplicated these results finding SD greater when therapist modelled disclosure was demographic; however, when modelled SD was personal in nature, para-professional therapist elicited more SD than professional.

Ellison and Firestone (1974) varied interviewer status but did not manipulate his SD level. They found greater willingness to disclose a "clinical counselor" than an undergraduate psychology major. Edelman and Snead (1972) discovered no differences in willingness to disclose according to whether therapist was described as psychiatrist, psychologist or psychiatric social worker. Brooks (1974) also found equivalent disclosure to female counselors of differing status levels. Male
counselors, however, received greater SD under high status conditions, especially if subjects were male. Telephone interviews produced no sex differences, though status was not manipulated (Janofsky, 1971).

Therapist SD modelling was seen as facilitative in studies comparing it to controls and warm, supportive model (Bundza & Simonson, 1973) and to no model controls only (Doster & Brook, 1974). Powell (1968) found negative self-references could be increased by interviewer reflection-restatement and open disclosure but not by approval-supportive remarks. Counselor disclosure is not effective, however, if given too frequently (Mann & Murphy, 1975; Giannandrea & Murphy, 1973). Jackson & Pepinsky (1972) varied interviewer activity level, without regard to interviewer SD, and failed to produce differential disclosure.

In addition to interviewer parameters, SD research also examines aspects of modelling. In general, modelling is found superior to instructions on disclosing behavior. McGuire, et al. (1975) found long demonstrative instructions produced more self-references than short demonstrative or long and short descriptions of SD. Authors concluded that increasing a demonstration increased cognitive activity and therefore responsiveness. Doster and Slaymaker (1972) concluded that a taped model did not increase willingness to SD over instructions alone but did result in a more gradual shift toward less SD with increasing topic intimacy. When subjects were asked to disclose on areas other than those modelled, Marlatt (1971) found more problem admission than when subjects were limited to modelled topics. Desire to participate in disclosing group experiences was facilitated by exposure to films presenting positive attitudes toward SD versus neutral or negative opinions; however,
viewing trust exercises alone was just as effective (MacDonald & Games (1972).

Disclosing behavior influences individual's perception of experiences. Perceived group cohesiveness has been related to high disclosing in group (Johnson & Ridener, 1964; Ribner, 1974). Levy and Atkins (1971), however, found more negative evaluation of encounter group by high disclosers. Silver (1970) reported differential SD according to subjects' perception of their status as contributors to interviewer's training. Counseling psychology students rated female clients as more disclosing when they employed unfilled rather than filled pauses (Fischer & Apostal, 1975). Trainees in clinical psychology were judged more competent and sophisticated, but not more mature, when they were disclosing in therapy (Anchor, et al., 1976).

Determination of SD in therapy involves an interweaving of many factors arising from clients, counselors, each one's perception of the other and the situation.

**Personality Correlates of SD**

Due to equivocal results of studies manipulating situational parameters of SD, researchers have sought personality correlates of SD. Many of the studies might be categorized as investigations of models of psychological defense as related to disclosure. Defensive or psychologically closed individuals are likely to report less negative information about themselves (Sarason, et al., 1972) and less reported SD in general (Halverson & Shore, 1969). Worthy, Gary and Kahn (1969) found in a note passing exercise that SD was not related to authoritarianism but that
authoritarians tended to increase liking with disclosures received if they had eye contact with the source. Counselors tend to see low dogmatic counselors as possessing greater congruence, unconditional positive regard and empathy (Wright, 1975). Results may be contrary to hypothesis when subjects are only imagining what they might do (Baldwin, 1974). Individuals who deny problems might also deny the existence of areas about which they are not willing to disclose in an imaginary situation.

Need approval has been demonstrated related to SD with conflicting results: no clear pattern of SD with need approval (Doster & Strickland, 1971), greater SD if need approval was high or low and subjects had a matching position on a measure of uncertainty anxiety (Doster, 1975), greater SD in hospitalized psychotics having intermediate scores on need approval (Anchor, et al., 1972), and less written SD associated with high need approval (Burhenne & Mirels, 1970).

High self-esteem subjects are found to be more disclosing (Fitzgerald, 1963). Self-esteem results are complicated by target characteristics (Ellison & Firestone, 1974). It might be expected that persons high in self-esteem would tend to be more actualized and inner-directed. Affective SD's of self-actualized persons were not manipulated by verbal conditioning procedures (Hekmat & Theiss, 1971) and internally controlled persons report greater JSDQ scores (Ryckman, et al., 1973). Halverson and Shore (1969) successfully correlated conceptual complexity to reported SD. Another positive personality characteristic, interpersonal trust, was not correlated to reported past SD to best friend (Vondracek & Marshall, 1971) nor judges evaluations of interview SD
(McAllister & Kiesler, 1974). Others found personality variables less salient to SD than situational manipulation (Chittick & Himelstein, 1967; Becker & Muzz, 1975).

More "situational" aspects of SD, less specifically determined as qualities of personality, such as incarceration, religious beliefs, perceptual modes and volunteering have been studied. Persons and Marks (1970) found greater intimacy when interviewer MMPI code elevations matched those of inmates. Inmate pathology was associated with greater disclosure. JSDQ scores were unrelated to diagnosis or offense category in another study with prisoners (Brodsky & Komaridis, 1968).

Both field dependency and ability to recognize ambiguous figures as human have been positively related to SD (Sousa-Poza, et al., 1973; Taylor & Oberlander, 1969). These findings suggest a certain sensitivity of high disclosers. Field dependents have been described as outgoing and gregarious. Taylor and Oberlander's (1969) disclosing subjects were not only more proficient at discriminating facial cues but also more likely to perceive animate than inanimate figures when the two were superimposed.

Male volunteers report more past SD than nonvolunteers, whereas female volunteering is related to SD dependent upon type of experiment (Hood & Back, 1971). JSDQ responses were found unrelated to volunteering for a weekend T-group (Kuiken, et al., 1974).

Religious liberalism was not related to JSDQ (Jennings, 1971) nor was religious denomination, with the exception that Jewish males were more disclosing than Baptist, Methodist and Catholic males (Jourard, 1961).

Study of the relationship between SD and personality variables
would probably benefit by making SD situations more realistic and potent and by measuring SD in ways other than through reported past SD. Practically, it seems that aspects of psychological defensiveness would influence SD if such defensiveness were successfully aroused.

**Sex Differences**

One of the early findings in SD research, which is still current, is that females report more disclosure than males (Jourard & Lasakow, 1958; Hood & Back, 1971; Ryckman, et al., 1973; Bath & Daly, 1970; Lomranz & Shapiro, 1974; Himelstein & Lubin, 1965; Jourard & Landsman, 1960; Sote & Good, 1974; Jourard & Richman, 1963; Pederson & Bregleo, 1968). Perhaps because of a characteristically higher reported SD level, females do not differ among themselves by religion as do males (Jourard, 1961); however, Stanley & Bownes (1966) found neuroticism correlated to SD to female or male friend for female subjects (thus there is range in female SD). DeLeon, et al. (1970) concluded that less dispersion of scores accounted for inability of peers to differentiate female subjects according to high, medium or low reported SD level. Jourard (1964) suggested that sex differences in reported SD reflect cultural constraints upon male behavior which are associated with less empathy and insight and even earlier death.

Sex differences in actual disclosing situations are more variable. For instance, both Davis and Sloan (1974) and Sermat and Smyth (1973) found that males described their own disclosure as being more beyond the norm than did females though females actually were more disclosing. Perhaps males are less self-revealing in familiar social situations;
however, Kohen (1975) found no sex differences in judged SD on tape recordings originally made for a study on attraction. Pederson and Breglio (1968) concluded that females and males wrote self-descriptions of similar length but females were more personal.

Certner (1973) found no sex differences in intimacy level or in liking as a function of disclosures received in a note passing study. More frequently, liking is correlated to SD for female subjects (Kohen, 1975; Jourard & Landsman, 1960). Cash and Solloway (1975) found that self-ratings of physical attractiveness were related to SD for males only, thus a type of liking or attraction for self was associated with disclosing behavior.

Jourard and Friedman (1970) found female subjects had less disclosure time as interview conditions moved from disclosing to a tape recorder, disclosing to an interviewer in another room, to disclosure with eye contact; whereas males increased disclosure time across these conditions. Brooks (1974) found that females were not more disclosing than males but that subject sex interacted with status of interviewer. Both males and females were more disclosing to female interviewer. Males were more disclosing under high status conditions. Male interviewers elicited greater SD when their status was high. Janofsky (1971) found female subjects were more disclosing in telephone interviews with strangers but that sex of interviewer (without status manipulation) had no effect on male or female subjects. Apparently different aspects of disclosing situations are salient according to subject sex. Males were more revealing than females when told information might not be kept confidential (Edelman & Snead, 1972). Chaiken and Derlega (1974 b)
concluded that although both sexes perceived SD to a stranger as inappropriate, females were even more responsive to situational contingencies. Further support for this theory comes from Sote and Good's (1974) finding that females perceive a similar disclosing other as more intelligent than a non-similar other; whereas males do not make this differentiation.

**Reciprocity/Dyadic Effect**

Jourard (1964) outlined the dyadic effect (SD begets SD) as occurring when both parties feel safe and are thus free to disclose. Worthy, Gary and Kahn (1969) describe SD as a social reward indicating liking and trust and producing reciprocation of disclosure. Reciprocity of SD in some form seems one of the strongest experimental findings in SD literature. Apparently both males and females tend to reach an equilibrium in relationship development between SD received and given (Jourard, 1959; Jourard & Landsman, 1960; Jourard and Richman, 1963). Panyard (1973) correlated amount reported disclosed to friend and amount friend reported receiving and obtained r = .63. When subjects' reported output was correlated with their judgement of SD from friend, correlation was .95 indicating individuals may perceive reciprocity to be even stronger than it is. Some authors find personal consistency in disclosure patterns rather than reciprocity (Taylor, Wheeler & Altman, 1973; Kohen, 1975). Failure to reciprocate intimacy levels in the forms of overdisclosure to low depth partner and underdisclosure to high intimate partner has been associated with neuroticism (Chaiken, et al., 1975).

Pairing of low and high disclosers has demonstrated increased depth by low disclosers (Jourard & Resnick, 1970) which carries over to
encounters with other low disclosers (Pasternack & Landingham, 1972). There is some evidence that depth of disclosure can be increased beyond pairing with a high disclosing partner if probing questions are asked (Sermat & Smyth, 1973).

Jourard and associates have considered time spent disclosing as a dependent variable and measured resulting fluctuations according to experimenter behavior. Jourard and Friedman (1970) found increased time disclosing in two groups where psychological "distance" was less. Manipulations of interviewer disclosure time (Jourard & Jaffe, 1970) and time and depth (Becker & Muzz, 1975) have shown reciprocity of both aspects of SD. Jourard and Jeffe (1970) considered their data as confirmation of Matarazzo's (1965) interview findings while Block and Goodstein (1971) critically note that speech duration may have nothing to do with quantity or quality of transparency.

Imitation effects in research employing confederates have been eliminated as sources of SD in several analyses (Davis & Skinner, 1974; Ehrlich & Graeven, 1971). In fact, greater disclosure depth has been negatively correlated with imitation (Doster and Skinner, 1974; Doster & Sloan, 1974). Doster and Sloan (1974) found highest disclosure levels when interviewer spoke on all ten topics though subjects felt he was less interested in them. In order to maintain equity, authors suggested, subjects behaved reciprocally but reciprocity, contrary to Worthy, Gary and Kahn (1969) was not necessarily rewarding.

**SD and Mental Health**

Current thinking relates SD to mental health in a curvilinear fashion. Neither too much nor too little transparency is considered
psychologically healthy (Jourard, 1964; Cozby, 1973). Research indicates that very high levels of disclosure are perceived as inappropriate according to context and target person (Taylor, et al., 1973; Chaiken, et al., 1975; Chaiken & Derlega, 1974 a,b; Cozby, 1972).

Research on mental health and SD should take into consideration the means by which adjustment or lack thereof is determined (Jourard, 1971; Cozby, 1973). Investigations with hospitalized populations made by Truax and Carkhuff (1965) and Shimkunas (1972) appear to avoid this difficulty. Truax and Carkhuff (1965) found movement towards improved adjustment associated with patient SD which, in turn, was related to therapist transparency. Disclosing group therapists have been perceived by participants as demonstrating both psychological stability and instability (Weigel, et al., 1972; May and Thompson, 1973), perhaps due to methodological differences. DeLeon and associates (1970) found no support for assumed relationship between SD and various positive personality attributes in fraternity and sorority group members. Measures of neuroticism have been associated with greater disclosure by male subjects in areas of personality and personal appearance (Pederson & Breglio, 1968) and with SD to best friends by female subjects (Stanley & Bownes, 1966).

Attempts to associate MMPI abnormality and SD are confounded by use of unsuitable statistical definitions of "deviancy." Jourard (1971) detailed research demonstrating that "normal" MMPI patterns are not necessarily indicative of statistically "average" levels of SD. Truax and Wittmer (1971) determined degree of adjustment by MMPI standards and found that least adjusted individuals reported greatest disclosure for
intimate, semi-personal and overall SD when best friend was target.

According to Jourard's (1971) data, these results are distorted as MMPI "normals" disclose less than controls.

There is some evidence that SD is related to positive adjustment (Halverson & Shore, 1969; Hekmat & Theiss, 1971; Fitzgerald, 1963). Psychological health has undergone far less quantification and measurement than has maladjustment. Cozby (1973) suggested more work with appropriate measures such as Personal Orientation Inventory.

In a review considering SD research in relation to group therapy, Allen (1973) hypothesized that SD and adjustment probably develop in parallel fashion. He stated:

... lack of SD might lead to the perception of one's conflicts, fears, and inadequacies as unique; concomitantly, self-esteem would be lowered and SD would become increasingly risky and unlikely due to fear of revealing inadequacy. On the other hand, SD may lead to consensual understanding, increased self-esteem, and an increasing capacity for SD.

Investigators into SD and mental health might continue to examine, as did Truax and Carkhuff (1965), how transparency contributes to improved functioning while developing means to facilitate this process.
APPENDIX B

Please indicate which of the following items you would be willing to discuss with Dr. Marks.*

1. What is more important to me--early marriage or a successful career. (6.10)
2. My feelings about sexy movies. (4.50)
3. The ages of my brothers and sisters. (1.32)
4. How I have felt or might feel if I ever saw my mother drunk. (9.75)
5. Problems and worries that I had with my appearance in the past. (7.42)
6. What foods are best for my health. (1.92)
7. Topics of conversation that bore me. (3.27)
8. Things which I have been sorry that I have done. (8.75)
9. The kinds of things that I don't like people watching me do. (8.85)
10. The kinds of group activities that I usually enjoy. (2.38)
11. Why some people dislike me. (8.00)
12. Times when I have felt enthusiastic. (4.10)
13. The things in my past or present life about which I am most ashamed. (9.97)
14. How many hours of sleep I need to feel my best. (2.13)
15. How satisfied I am with different parts of my body--legs, waist, weight, chest, etc. (8.50)
16. Where my parents and grandparents came from. (2.56)
17. My feelings about standards of sexual behavior before marriage. (3.83)
18. Whether or not I would lie to my wife/husband. (8.93)

*Scaled intimacy valued follow each item in parentheses. Possible values range from one to eleven.
19. Whether or not I would wear a wedding ring. (3.07)
20. My sex life. (10.25)
21. The age of girls/boys that I like to date. (3.62)
22. How may girls/boys I have dated. (5.25)
23. How often my aunts and uncles and family get together. (2.89)
24. Things I dislike about my mother. (9.15)
25. Lies that I have told my parents. (9.29)
26. Whether or not my parents spanked me as a child. (3.29)
27. Times when I have wished that I could change something about my physical appearance. (7.83)
28. Whether or not I have ever worried about having "bad breath." (5.63)
29. What animals make me nervous. (3.44)
30. What annoys me most in people. (5.89)
31. Times when I have felt quarrelsome. (5.00)
32. Lies that I have told my friends. (9.29)
33. Times when I have felt like walking away from someone. (5.60)
34. Whether or not I have ever let down a friend. (8.05)
35. Situations which make me impatient. (4.42)
36. What special effort, if any, I make to keep fit, healthy and attractive, e.g., calisthenics, diet. (6.17)
37. Times when I felt like running away from home. (6.78)
38. How often I masturbate. (10.70)
39. Whether or not I would marry a non-virgin. (9.50)
40. How frequently I like to date. (4.11)
41. What my parents did well while raising me. (6.60)
42. The parts of my body I am most ashamed for anyone to see. (8.88)
43. The most embarrassing situation I have ever been in. (8.08)
44. How much I enjoy talking with other people. (4.21)
45. How I feel about being the one to "throw a party." (3.32)
46. Times when I have been dissatisfied. (4.94)
47. The kinds of clothes that I feel look best on me. (5.00)
48. Bad habits my father or mother have. (9.29)
49. How often I have had sexual relations in my life. (9.97)
50. How frequently I would want to engage in sex with my wife/husband. (10.42)
51. What kind of furniture I would like to have after I get married. (3.00)
52. My feelings about blind dates. (3.46)
53. The physical appearance of my mother and father. (5.35)
54. How well I can hear. (2.29)
55. What it takes to hurt my feelings deeply. (9.37)
56. Whether or not I like to tell amusing jokes and stories. (2.80)
57. My feelings about people who try to impress me with their knowledge. (5.50)
58. Whether or not I tell people off when I get angry. (5.83)
59. How I feel about getting old. (6.36)
60. How much education my parents have. (5.56)
61. Guilt feelings, if any, that I have (or have had) about my sexual behavior. (10.35)
62. Whether or not I want to have any children when I get married. (6.42)
63. The age at which I would like to marry. (4.25)
64. Whether or not I have necked or made-out with a girl/boy at a movie or a drive-in. (6.50)
65. The number of colds I usually have per year. (1.91)
66. How often I like to see my friends. (5.50)
67. The kind of person I like to date. (6.40)

68. How important I think sex will be in making my marriage a good one. (8.61)

69. Who I think should make important family decisions. (5.00)

70. Where I would like to spend a honeymoon. (5.92)

71. Whether I would like to live in an apartment or a house after getting married. (3.09)

72. Whether or not I like being the leader of a group. (4.88)
APPENDIX C

PERSONAL REACTION INVENTORY

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally.

1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates. (T)

2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble. (T)

3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. (F)

4. I have never intensely disliked anyone. (T)

5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life. (F)

6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. (F)

7. I am always careful about my manner of dress. (T)

8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant. (T)

9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it. (F)

10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability. (F)

11. I like to gossip at times. (F)

12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right. (F)

13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener. (T)

14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something. (F)

15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. (F)

16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake. (T)

17. I always try to practice what I preach. (T)

18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loudmouthed, obnoxious people. (T)
19. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget. (F)

20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it. (T)

21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. (T)

22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way. (F)

23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things. (F)

24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrong doings. (T)

25. I never resent being asked to return a favor. (T)

26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. (T)

27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car. (T)

28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. (F)

29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off. (T)

30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. (F)

31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause. (T)

32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved. (F)

33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. (T)
APPENDIX D

CONFIDENTIAL RATING SCALE FOR ANTICIPATED LIKING OF INTERVIEWER

Indicate by checking one of the spaces below how much you expect that you will like your interviewer. This rating is for experimental purposes only and will not be seen by your interviewer.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

1 = I do not expect that I will like my interviewer
5 = I expect that I will like my interviewer somewhat
9 = I expect that I will like my interviewer very much
APPENDIX E

Self-disclosure statement by fictitious Dr. Marks:

I have come to believe that establishing a helpful relationship with another person requires that I communicate my feelings and beliefs as openly and honestly as possible. Although I have always expected complete frankness from clients seeking help, only recently have I decided that sharing my personal self with others is most helpful to them and to me. I have written and signed this statement to assure my clients that I intend to share myself with them completely.
APPENDIX F

COUNSELOR TAPE

Both Drs: Hello, John. I understand you want to talk with me.

J: Yes. I've been thinking about coming here for a long time. I've always had difficulty making friends and it's been bothering me more than ever lately. It seems hard to even approach people.

Both Drs: Could you tell me more about that.

J: I've been here at school for almost one semester but I don't seem to be a part of things.

R-DR: Yes, I think I understand. There was a time when I first went to college when I had trouble making friends. That was a very difficult time.

NR-DR: Yes, I think I understand. Lots of people have trouble making friends.

J: I guess what really bothers me is that I've never had a girlfriend. Oh, I've had dates but I've never been out with anyone more than once or twice. Some guys my age are married or engaged or at least going with someone.

Both DRs: You feel you are missing out on a more lasting relationship?

J: Well, maybe I just don't seem to fit in because everyone else seems to be part of a pair.

R-DR: When I was a college freshman I remember being worried that I wasn't as popular with girls as some of my friends. It sounds like we both tended to compare ourselves with others.

NR-DR: Many college freshmen worry about their popularity with girls. It sounds like you tend to compare yourself with others.

J: Yeah, and I guess I really feel on the negative end of things because of being an only child. It's like I never really had to get along with other people near my own age like I have to now that I'm away from home.

R-Dr: You know, your experience sounds something like mine. My father was in the service. Moving around a lot meant I never really had a chance to get established anywhere till I went to college. Maybe we can think about this problem together.

NR-Dr: You never really had to think about this before. Maybe we can think about this problem further.
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