

44967



National Library of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/NOM DE L'AUTEUR EVA E. SKOE

TITLE OF THESIS/TITRE DE LA THÈSE Personality Characteristics that relate to self-disclosure: An Exploratory Study

UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITÉ Simon Fraser University

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE M.A.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE 1980

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE Dr. S. Kinszky

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/DATE: Feb. 27/80 SIGNED/SIGNÉ _____

PERMANENT ADDRESS/RÉSIDENCE FIXÉ _____



National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS THAT RELATE TO
SELF-DISCLOSURE: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY

by

Eva Elisabeth Skoe

B.A.(Hons), Simon Fraser University, 1976

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department

of

Psychology

© Eva Elisabeth Skoe 1980

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

February 1980

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without permission of the author.

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

Personality Characteristics that Relate to
Self-disclosure: An Exploratory Study

Author: _____

(signature)

EVA E. SKOE

(name)

Feb. 27 1980

(date)

APPROVAL

Name: Eva Elisabeth Skoe

Degree: Master of Arts

Title of thesis: Personality Characteristics that Relate to
Self-Disclosure: An Exploratory Study

Examining Committee:

Chairman: Dr. Vito Modigliani

Sheldon Ksionzky
Senior Supervisor

~~Raymond Koopman~~

Ronald Roesch

~~Raymond Corrado~~
External Examiner
Criminology Department
Simon Fraser University

Date Approved: February 6, 1980

ABSTRACT

This study investigated personality characteristics that relate to the degree of self-disclosure. Using the Bem Q-Sort technique, the subjects (75 male and 75 female single undergraduate students under the age of 30) were required to describe separately the personality of the person they disclose to the most and the least, as well as their own personality. In addition, a self-report inventory was administered in order to measure disclosure to each target. Factor analysis revealed that there were several personality types that people disclose to the most and the least. A closer examination of the various types made it possible to identify some personality characteristics that may facilitate self-disclosure and some personality characteristics that may inhibit disclosure. As hypothesized, the results showed that both males and females generally tend to see themselves as more similar to the person they disclose to the most than the person they disclose to the least. This may have important implications for the therapeutic relationship with regard to matching clients with therapists on the basis of perceived personality similarity. The hypothesis that females would disclose more than males was supported but only with regard to the MOST target ($p < .01$). This indicates that females are more open with their preferred target but they are not necessarily more disclosing in general. With regard to sex of the target, the hypothesis that there would be more

female than male MOST targets was not supported. However, the hypothesis that there would be more male than female LEAST targets was confirmed but only with regard to male subjects ($p < .001$).

Significantly higher proportions of family as LEAST versus MOST targets were found for both sexes ($p < .001$) which indicate that few subjects were willing to disclose to members of their own family. The results of this study contradict the notion of a general tendency to disclose. Finally, no differences were found between high and low disclosers in terms of how they described their targets or themselves.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to the members of my committee, Drs. Ksionzky, Koopman, Roesch and Corrado, for their invaluable help and support throughout this project. Also, I wish to thank the many friends and fellow students who have expressed their interest in the study by participating in various stages of the research. A special thank you to Leah Griffiths for taking time to proofread the manuscript and to Bill Glackman and Polly Haddow for their assistance in the production of the final copy. Finally, I am grateful to my husband, Anders, for inspiring and encouraging me to pursue a career in Psychology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
List of Tables	vii
List of Appendices	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
Definition	2
Measurement	4
Discloser Characteristics	7
Target Characteristics	10
The Objectives of this Study	22
METHOD	27
Subjects	27
Measures	27
Procedure	30
RESULTS	31
DISCUSSION	37
TABLES	58
APPENDICES	93
REFERENCES	113

LIST OF TABLES

1. Males - Most Q-Sort Factor Loadings	58-59
2. Males - Least Q-Sort Factor Loadings	60-61
3. Males - Self Q-Sort Factor Loadings	62-63
4. Females - Most Q-Sort Factor Loadings	64-65
5. Females - Least Q-Sort Factor Loadings	66-67
6. Females - Self Q-Sort Factor Loadings	68-69
7. Name of, % of Variance Accounted for by, and number of People Assigned to each Q-Sort Factor	70
8. Male Most Types	71
9. Male Least Types	72
10. Male Self Types	73
11. Female Most Types	74
12. Female Least Types	75
13. Female Self Types	76
14. Males - MOST/SELF Types Contingencies	77
15. Males - LEAST/SELF Types Contingencies	78
16. Females - MOST/SELF Types Contingencies	79
17. Females - LEAST/SELF Types Contingencies	80
18. Males - Self-Disclosure Inventory Means	81
19. Females - Self-Disclosure Inventory Means	82
20. T-Tests between Males and Females on Self-Disclosure Scores	83

LIST OF TABLES continued

21. Males - Target Sex Contingencies	84
22. Females - Target Sex Contingencies	85
23. Males - Target Relationship Contingencies	86
24. Females - Target Relationship Contingencies	87
25. Males - MOST Types and Relationship Contingencies	88
26. Males - LEAST Types and Relationship Contingencies	89
27. Females - MOST Types and Relationship Contingencies	90
28. Females - LEAST Types and Relationship Contingencies	91
29. Q-Sort Correlations between High and Low Disclosers	92

LIST OF APPENDICES

A. The BEM Q-Sort Items	93-100
B. Self-Disclosure Inventory	101-102
C. Self-Disclosure Inventory Items Arranged by Area	103-105
D. Instructions - Part One	106-110
E. Instructions - Part Two	111-112

INTRODUCTION

Research interest in the area of self-disclosure has increased considerably in recent years. A review of the literature shows that prior to 1960 there were fewer than 10 journal articles concerning self-disclosure while in the last couple of years several hundred articles have been published. Many sociologists as well as psychologists consider the act or process of self-disclosure to be of considerable importance in terms of psychological growth (e.g. Jourard, 1964; Mowrer, 1961; Rogers, 1958), constructive personality change (e.g. Truax & Carkhuff, 1965), progress and outcome in psychotherapy (e.g. Truax, 1968; Strassberg, Roback, D'Antonio & Gabel, 1977), mental and physical health (e.g. Chaikin, Derlega, Bayma, & Shaw, 1975; Derlega & Chaikin, 1975; Handkins & Munz, 1978; Jourard, 1971), interpersonal learning (e.g. Allen, 1973), development of socialized thought and accurate reality testing (e.g. Vondracek & Vondracek, 1971) and development and maintenance of interpersonal relationships (e.g. Altman & Taylor, 1973; Goodstein & Reinecker, 1977; Levinger & Senn, 1967). Self-disclosure is probably the main means for human beings to get to know each other as well as a useful, maybe even necessary, means of self-knowledge. Jourard (1964) states that "it seems to be another empirical fact that no man can come to know himself except as an outcome of disclosing himself to another person" (p. 5). The process and determinants of self-disclosure are of particular concern to clinical psychologists since the client's

willingness and/or ability to disclose him/herself to the therapist is generally considered essential for successful psychotherapy. Truax and Carkhuff (1965) point out that the role of the therapist in both traditional psychotherapy and in counseling has been based upon attempts to facilitate the process of self-disclosure. Consequently, research findings on this process have implications for the practice of psychotherapy, for the training and possibly selection of psychotherapists, for the prevention of psychological disturbance, as well as for the general understanding of personality and personality change.

Definition

Self-disclosure has been variously defined in the literature, and the lack of a uniform definition poses a problem in this research area. As McCarthy and Betz (1978) point out, studies of self-disclosure have frequently utilized definitions that are too vague to permit replication of the study or to communicate clearly how the response is to be accomplished. To date, little effort has been made to distinguish clearly and systematically between what self-disclosure is and what it is not. For example, Cozby's (1973) definition "any information about himself which Person A communicates verbally to a Person B" fails to distinguish self-disclosure from general verbal information. In many cases there is lack of agreement among investigators as to the kinds of responses that should be labelled as self-disclosing. While Cozby (1973) indicates that

self-disclosure is verbally communicated, Shapiro, Krauss and Truax (1969) indicate that self-disclosure may be accomplished through nonverbal, as well as verbal, behaviors. In a recent study, McCarthy and Betz (1978) distinguish between "self-disclosing responses" which are statements referring to past history or personal experiences and "self-involving responses" which are here-and-now reactions and feelings to persons or situations. Most definitions in the literature however, do not distinguish between past- or present-centered self-information (e.g. Bayne, 1977; Derlega & Chaikin, 1975; Jourard, 1964; Kleck, 1968; Pedersen & Breglio, 1969a; Persons & Marks, 1970; Vondracek & Marshall, 1971). After reviewing existing definitions, it was decided to use the following definition of self-disclosure for the purposes of this study: "Verbal communication of personal and intimate information about oneself". This definition was chosen because it specifies that the self-portrayal is verbal and that self-disclosure concerns both personal and intimate aspects of one's life. It seems reasonable to suggest that self-disclosure is the opposite of self-concealment which has also been referred to as discretion or a need (or liking) for privacy (e.g. Cozby, 1973; Maslow, 1968). Whether a person chooses to self-disclose or to self-conceal is probably a function of the personality characteristics of both the discloser and the listener, the relationship between them, as well as situational characteristics, and a variety of interactions among these variables.

Measurement

The major impetus for research in self-disclosure was provided by Jourard's elaboration of the phenomena, his development of a paper and pencil measure of individual differences in self-disclosure (Jourard & Lasakow, 1958) and subsequent research using this measure which he has summarized (Jourard, 1971). The original instrument consisted of 60 items - 10 items in each of six areas of personal information: Attitudes and Opinions, Tastes and Interests, Work (or Studies), Money, Personality and Body. Subjects were asked to respond to each item by indicating the extent to which the information has been made known to four target persons: Mother, Father, Male Friend, Female Friend. Items were rated as: 0 - no disclosure; 1 - disclosure in general terms; 2 - full and complete disclosure. Variations of the measure such as shorter forms, different targets, different items and different scoring have been employed by Jourard and other investigators (e.g. Himmelstein & Lubin, 1965; Hurley & Hurley, 1969; Morgan & Evans, 1977; Pedersen & Higbee, 1969a; West & Zingle, 1969). The most relevant parameters to measure with regard to self-report inventories are amount and intimacy of disclosure.

The proportion of intimate and less intimate items seems important in the structure of a self-report questionnaire. Jourard, using his original 60-item questionnaire (JSDQ-60), found a high disclosure cluster consisting of Tastes and Interests, Attitudes and Opinions and Work, and a low disclosure cluster consisting of Money, Personality and Body (Jourard & Lasakow, 1958). This has led to the

suggestion that people are more willing to disclose "public" rather than "private" information (e.g. Allen, 1973; Cravens, 1975; Doster & Strickland, 1971; Fitzgerald, 1963). The content areas of Money, Personality and Body may be viewed as more intimate by people and therefore less is disclosed in these areas. In fact, consensus among people as to the degree of intimacy or risk of various items has been found (e.g. Jourard, 1971; Norton, Feldman, & Tafoya, 1974; Strassberg & Anchor, 1975; Taylor & Altman, 1966). There is also cross-cultural agreement. Similar patterns of disclosability have been found by various investigators among American and British (Jourard, 1961c), Middle-Eastern (Melikian, 1962) and German (Plog, 1965) subjects. However, it should be noted that this agreement is based upon research employing only two independent populations; college students and sailors. It is possible that other populations, such as older, married people with different working and living conditions would rate items differently in terms of intimacy.

In recent years the trend has been to use self-disclosure as the dependent as well as the independent variable and to measure self-disclosure behaviorally. For example, some researchers have looked at written disclosure in essays (e.g. Burhenne & Mirels, 1970; Ebersole, McFall, & Brandt, 1977) and other researchers have investigated verbal disclosure, usually tape-recorded to facilitate scoring (e.g. Kohen, 1975; McGuire, Thelen, & Amolsch, 1975; Mann & Murphy, 1975; Simonson, 1976). Cozby (1973) summarizes the three

basic parameters of self-disclosure as: a) breadth or amount of information disclosed; b) depth or intimacy of information disclosed; c) duration or time spent describing each item of information. In addition to these three parameters which are commonly employed, Brooks (1974) used a fourth parameter: style or emotional involvement of the subject (scored on how a person talks about him/herself, e.g. mechanical and distant versus self-involved and betraying affect).

Chelune (1975) reviewed the basic parameters of disclosure and proposed what he called "two additional dimensions of disclosing behavior" (p. 81): "Affective manner of presentation" and "Flexibility of disclosure pattern". However, only one of these is an addition as the first-mentioned is almost identical to the parameter proposed by Brooks (1974). "Flexibility of disclosure pattern" relates to ability to adapt readily to situational demands. Some investigators found a high positive correlation between depth and time (e.g. Doster, 1975; Ebersole et al., 1977; Pedersen & Breglio, 1968a). Depth of disclosure increased with greater time spent talking on topics. Pedersen and Breglio (1968a) suggested that duration of disclosure may be substituted for depth as duration is a much more immediate, objective and reliable measure. This suggestion, however, is not supported by their findings in another study (Pedersen & Breglio, 1968b) where females disclosed more in depth than males but were not more verbose. Their greater disclosure was a result of what they said and not how many words they used to say it. There are also other studies reporting that intimacy or depth and duration appear to be

independent (e.g. Cozby, 1973; Vondracek, 1969). Thus it seems valid to measure these two parameters.

In conclusion, it is important to bear in mind the differences in measurements when evaluating research findings in the area of self-disclosure. Numerous researchers have used either a modification of the JSDQ-60 or developed their own measure to obtain data on disclosure. These modifications may affect the reliability and validity of the instruments and the different measures make it difficult to compare research findings.

Discloser characteristics

Self-disclosure has been extensively examined with regard to the discloser's characteristics and has been researched in relation to various theories such as Social Accessibility (e.g. Rickers-Ovsiankina, 1956; Rickers-Ovsiankina & Kusmin, 1958), Harvey, Hunt & Schroder Personality Systems Theory (e.g. Tuckman, 1966), Kelly's Personal Construct Theory (e.g. Neimeyer & Neimeyer, 1977), Social Exchange Theory (e.g. Worthy, Gary, & Kahn, 1969; Davis & Sloan, 1974) and Social Penetration Theory (e.g. Taylor, 1968; Altman & Taylor, 1973; Taylor & Oberlander, 1969; Taylor, Altman, & Sorrentino, 1969; Tognoli, 1969). With regard to discloser's characteristics and individual differences, sex has been mentioned as a powerful predictor of self-disclosure (e.g. Allen, 1973). Numerous investigations have reported that females disclose more than males (e.g. Annis & Perry, 1977; Jourard & Landsman, 1960; Jourard &

Lasakow, 1958; Jourard & Richman, 1963; Himelstein & Lubin, 1965; Hood & Back, 1971; Kraft & Vraa, 1975; Levinger & Senn, 1967; Pederson & Higbee, 1969a; Rivenbark, 1971). Greater self-disclosure by females may be a function of cultural norms and child-rearing practices which tend to encourage women and discourage men from disclosing. Balswick and Balkwell (1977) state that the sex-role socialization literature amply documents that male children are encouraged from an early age to be less open or expressive than female children. Thus one may expect females to have a greater propensity to self-disclose than males. However, a number of studies have reported no sex differences in self-disclosure (e.g. Balswick & Balkwell, 1977; Brooks, 1974; Doster & Strickland, 1969; Halpern, 1977; Kohen, 1975; Plog, 1965; Rickers-Ovsiankina & Kusmin, 1958; Vondracek & Marshall, 1971; Weigel, Weigel, & Chadwick, 1969) and one study (Vondracek, 1970) found a trend toward male subjects receiving higher amount of disclosure scores than females. The lack of standard methods for measuring self-disclosure may account for some of the contradictory findings in the literature. As Cozby (1973) points out, despite such differences there has been a tacit assumption in the literature that the various measures are equivalent. In order for the nature of any sex differences to be found, researchers must pay greater attention to various factors which may discriminate between males and females, e.g. written versus verbal disclosure; type of: items, targets, target characteristics, situations and disclosure parameters used. For example, as already mentioned, Pedersen and Breglio (1968b) found that

females disclosed more intimate information about themselves than males, but they did not use more words to describe themselves. Thus, in this study the type of parameter measured distinguished between the sexes.

Other variables studied with regard to the discloser are: nationality, race, religion, birth order and age. Americans have been reported to disclose more than either German (Plog, 1965) or British (Jourard, 1961c). Whites have been found to be higher in self-disclosure than blacks (Diamond & Hellkamp, 1969; Jourard & Lašakow, 1958). Comparing Baptists, Catholics, Jews and Methodists, Jourard (1961b) found that Jewish males were higher in self-disclosure than all other groups. Later-borns report higher amounts of self-disclosure, and first-borns report particularly high amounts of disclosure to mothers (Allen, 1973). Studying college students ranging in age from 17 to 55 years, Jourard (1961a) found that self-disclosure to opposite-sexed peers (ie. spouses) increased, while self-disclosure to all other targets decreased. Males 40 and over tended to report decreasing self-disclosure to wives.

Self-disclosure and mental health have been extensively studied. Jourard (1963, 1964) argued that self-disclosure is a prerequisite for a healthy personality, proposing that low disclosure is indicative of a repression of self and an inability to grow as a person. Both Jourard and Cozby (1973) suggested that the relationship between mental health (or adjustment) and self-disclosure is curvilinear. That is, both too little or too much disclosure may be maladaptive.

In spite of much research, the relationship between mental health and self-disclosure tendencies is not clear. Some studies report a positive relationship (e.g. Halverson & Shore, 1969; Truax & Carkhuff, 1965), some report a negative relationship (e.g. Cozby, 1972; Persons & Marks, 1970) and some studies found no relationship (e.g. Stanley & Bownes, 1966). There is evidence that neuroticism is related to inappropriate and non-reciprocal patterns of disclosure rather than to any characteristically high or low level of disclosure (e.g. Chaikin et al., 1975; Mayo, 1968).

Both with regard to mental health and various personality concepts the findings are generally inconclusive and often contradictory. There may be several reasons for this confusion. As has been mentioned earlier, there is a lack of consistency both in operational definitions of various concepts (e.g. self-disclosure and mental health) and in measurement. Also, as Altman and Taylor (1973) point out, it may be unrealistic to expect to find specific trait-disclosure relationships. They propose that personality determinants do not function unilaterally but operate rather in conjunction with features of the relationship (e.g. type and time) and the setting (e.g. formal versus informal).

Target characteristics

Although self-disclosure has become a widely researched topic, few studies have paid systematic attention to target (person to whom the self-disclosures are directed) characteristics which may influence

self-disclosure. As self-disclosure by definition always involves more than one person (a discloser plus one or more targets), it is necessary to investigate the influence of various target variables in order to gain a better understanding of the process of self-disclosure. There are several variables related to the target which may influence self-disclosure, e.g. status, sex, familiarity, positiveness, self-disclosure, relationship to discloser and personality.

Little research has been done on the influence of status on self-disclosure, but there seems to be general agreement that disclosure by a low-status individual to a high-status individual is more appropriate than disclosure in the reverse direction and that self-disclosure among peers is the most appropriate. Slobin, Miller and Porter (1968) studied the disclosure patterns of workers within a business organization. They found that most disclosures were made to peers (fellow workers) and that disclosure to immediate supervisors was greater than disclosure to subordinates. The research of Derlega and Chaikin (1975) support these findings. Derlega and Chaikin (1975) suggest that the dynamics behind these results may reflect the notion that the discloser is placing himself symbolically on a comparable level with his target. Since few people desire to reduce their status, self-disclosure to a lower status individual is regarded as somewhat inappropriate or unusual. Another explanation as proposed by Cozby (1973) is that disclosure to superiors may be an ingratiation technique.

With regard to target sex there is evidence in the literature that self-disclosure to a female is more common than to a male. Several studies suggest that females receive more disclosures than males (e.g. Brodsky & Komarides, 1968; Brooks, 1974; Goodstein & Russell, 1977; Jourard & Richman, 1963; Kleck, 1968; Komarovsky, 1973). In a study of male college students, Komarovsky (1973) reported that for all aspects of the self, the closest female friend was the preferred target. Brodsky and Komarides (1968) also studied self-disclosure among males (65 military prisoners). They found that among all the given targets (mother, father, closest male friend, closest female friend, closest prisoner friend, next-closest prisoner friend, closest staff person and next-closest staff person) the greatest amount of disclosure was reported to closest female friend and next to mother. Goodstein and Russell (1977) using a sample of 31 females found that the subjects reported significantly more disclosure to females than males. Brooks (1974) concluded that the presence of a female facilitates self-disclosure as the results of her study showed that both sexes disclosed more to female than male interviewers. In conclusion, it seems that sex of the target is an important variable to consider when studying self-disclosure. Interestingly, within the area of counseling, there are writers who feel that "the counselor is a woman" (e.g. Farson, 1954; McClain, 1968). Farson's thesis is that the work of the counselor calls for behaviors that are closer to the social expectations for women than men. Our culture tends to see the feminine role as "tender, gentle, loving, dependent, receptive,

passive, more concerned with interpersonal relations than with things" while the masculine role is seen as "clever, tough, strong, courageous, independent, more concerned with things than with people" (McClain, 1968). There is research evidence that sex role behavior has a more powerful effect of self-disclosure than biological sex. Feldstein (1979) found that males disclosed most to feminine female counselors and disclosed least to masculine female counselors. Females disclosed most to feminine male counselors and disclosed least to masculine male counselors. Thus, it seems that the behavior and personality characteristics displayed by a person is more important than his/her gender and that "femininity" per se may encourage self-disclosure.

Generally, the preferred target is a person who is in a close relationship with the discloser and therefore someone that the discloser is familiar with or knows relatively well. Although it has been found that people are willing to disclose intimately to strangers under certain circumstances, e.g. the "stranger on the train" phenomenon and disaster situations, it seems reasonable to state that usually target familiarity facilitates self-disclosure. Ebersole et al. (1977) found that whether or not the subject was acquainted with the experimenter from classroom contact with him as professor proved to be a potent determinant of self-disclosure. The subjects who had the experimenter as an instructor wrote longer and more personal essays than subjects unfamiliar with the experimenter. However, in this study it is possible that the effect of familiarity was

confounded with motivation due to the specific relationship, that is, teacher-student. The students who had the experimenter as their teacher may have been more motivated to try to please or impress the experimenter by being more cooperative than the other subjects. Other studies show that self-disclosure increases over the amount of time people interact. Taylor (1968) administered self-disclosure questionnaires to college roommates on repeated occasions over the course of one semester. The questionnaires, prescaled for intimacy, assessed what the subjects had told their roommates about themselves, the social activities they engaged in together, interpersonal exchange of biographical demographic nature and the attitudes and values they had in common. As the semester progressed, the subjects reported disclosure of an increasingly greater amount of information to one another, engaged in more joint activities, and became more accurate in assessing each other's biographical-demographic characteristics and in estimating each other's attitudes and values. Disclosure at various levels of intimacy increased at different rates. Superficial information initially increased rapidly and then leveled off, while more intimate information increased more gradually over time. Colson (1968) and Frankfurt (1965) support these findings. Jourard and Landsman (1960), employing a small male sample (N=9), found that self-disclosure was highly correlated with the degree to which they knew the targets while liking was only slightly correlated with disclosure. People may disclose more to a person they know well because they trust the person and/or because they already have some

investment in the person and self-disclosure may be a means of continuing building the relationship. Also, people are probably generally more willing to take the time to talk and listen to people they know well rather than acquaintances or strangers. In addition, social norms and expectancies may account for the effect of familiarity.

While Jourard and Landsman (1960) found that knowing, not liking was important for self-disclosure, a number of other studies show that self-disclosure is a function of how well liked the targets are. Social approval, mutual dependency as well as liking have been found to have a facilitative effect on self-disclosure (e.g. Altman & Haythorn, 1965; Fitzgerald, 1963; Gelman & McGinley, 1978; Halvorson & Shore, 1969; Jourard, 1959; Jourard & Lasakow, 1958; Kent, 1975; Kohlen, 1975; Taylor et al., 1969). Liking appears to be particularly important for disclosure of more intimate topics (e.g. Frankfurt, 1965; Worthy et al., 1969). Two verbal behavioral aspects of the target which have been found to encourage and increase self-disclosure are providing positive feedback or evaluation and self-disclosure. These behaviors may communicate to the other person that he/she is being liked and/or trusted and thus serve as an encouragement to open up and to continue to disclose. They may also convey the target's interest, acceptance and understanding. Colson (1968) found that the amount and depth of disclosure varied according to the feedback provided, being greatest with positive feedback, intermediate with no feedback and least with negative feedback. Taylor et al. (1969)

report that target's agreement with the discloser's views elicited more disclosure from the subjects than disagreement. In a study on differential effectiveness of interviewer interventions, Powell (1968) found that honest disclosure from the interviewer was maximally effective. College students whose personal references were followed by similar personal references by the interviewer showed significantly greater increases in the frequency of positive and negative self-references than subjects questioned by a non-disclosing interviewer.

Target's self-disclosing behavior has more or less consistently been found to be an important determinant of self-disclosure, both in terms of breadth and depth. This phenomenon, known as "reciprocity" or the "dyadic effect" (self-disclosure begets self-disclosure) as Jourard called it, is supported by several studies (e.g. Becker & Munz, 1975; Chittick & Himelstein, 1967; Ehrlich & Graeven, 1971; Gaebelin, 1976; Jourard, 1969; 1971; Levinger & Senn, 1967; Rivenbark, 1971; Tognoli, 1969; Vondracek & Vondracek, 1971). Morgan and Evans (1977) found that in a series of exchanges in a dyad it was not important whether the experimenter's self-disclosure came before or after subjects were given the opportunity to self-disclose. The results also suggested that whether or not one self-discloses spontaneously has an effect on others disclosures. This corroborates Jourard's (1964) view that to encourage self-disclosure on the part of others one should be, or at least appear to be, willing to disclose spontaneously. Research findings demonstrate that target's

self-disclosure affect subjects' perceptions of the target as well as subjects' self-disclosure. In a recent study on perceptions of counselor characteristics Merluzzi, Banikiotes and Missbach (1978) found that high disclosing counselors were perceived as more attractive but less trustworthy than low disclosers. Some studies support the hypothesis that disclosing targets are perceived and evaluated more favorably on a variety of dimensions, e.g. they were liked better, perceived as warmer, more sensitive and honest and as possessing a better self-concept (e.g. Nilsson, Strassberg, & Bannon, 1979; Simonson, 1976). Other studies suggest that too much or too intimate self-disclosure on the part of the target as well as too little self-disclosure may cause the target to be evaluated less favorably than moderate disclosure (e.g. Cozby, 1972; Davis & Sloan, 1974; Tognoli, 1967; Worthy et al, 1969). This supports the hypothesis of Cozby (1972, 1973) that the relationship between self-disclosure and liking is curvilinear and that "reciprocity becomes less powerful as a determinant of subjects' responses at high level of intimacy" (Cozby, 1973, p. 155). For example, Chaikin and Derlega (1974) found that the nonintimate "normbreaker" was rated as "cold" while the intimate "normbreaker" was seen as "maladjusted". Mann and Murphy (1975) report that subjects viewed the interviewer as more empathetic, warm and congruent when she emitted an intermediate number of self-disclosures as opposed to many or no disclosures. There is some evidence that the optimal amount of self-disclosure may depend on both target and discloser. Gelman and McGinley (1978) found

that people are more attracted to others whose self-disclosure is similar to their own level of disclosure and that this attraction has an effect on the other's disclosure.

Another factor that may influence self-disclosure is the type of relationship between discloser and target. Cozby (1973) suggests that love results in greater disclosure than liking. This suggestion is based on the findings that disclosure to spouse is greater than to any other target (Jourard & Lasakow, 1958) and that females, according to Rubin (1970), love their same-sex friends more than males do. Rubin's view provides a reason for the finding that women tend to disclose more to their same-sex friends than males do. Goodstein and Russell (1977) found that subjects disclose significantly more to friends than relatives. This corroborates the findings of Jourard and Richman (1963) and Plog (1965) that same-sex friend tended to be preferred over either parent as a target for disclosure. Both males and females have been found to disclose more to their mothers than their fathers (e.g. Jourard & Richman, 1963; Kleck, 1968; Pedersen & Higbee, 1969b). In a study on self-disclosure and relationship to the target person, Pedersen and Higbee (1969b) investigated various descriptions of the relationship between the discloser and the target which may be important correlates of the amount of disclosure to the target. The subjects rated four targets (mother, father, best male friend, best female friend) on eleven adjective pairs (e.g. close-distant, warm-cold, rejecting-accepting, disliking-liking, fair-unfair). The only adjectives which correlated significantly with disclosure to

mother for males were close and warm. For females, disclosure to mother was significantly correlated with close, accepting, interested, friendly and good. However, disclosure to the father involved more adjectives. The disclosure of males to their fathers were related to the traits of close, warm, liking, interested, friendly, fair, unselfish and good. The disclosure of females to their fathers were related to warm, accepting, liking, interested, friendly and good. It was suggested that the disclosure of children to their mothers is more independent of how their mothers relate to them than disclosure to their fathers is of how their fathers relate to them. For both sexes, the disclosure to their best same-sex friend was not related to any ratings of their relationship with that friend. Males were more discriminating than females in their disclosure to the opposite-sex friend. Nine scales (close, warm, accepting, liking, trustful, interested, friendly, fair, unselfish) were related to disclosure to best female friend, while for females only close, warm and liking were related to disclosure to best male friend. The authors suggested that for women affection in the relationship has more to do with disclosure than the characteristics of the male involved in the relationship. It was interesting to note that people apparently are not too discriminating as to what the relationship is like with their best same-sex friends in disclosing to him/her.

To date, this is the only study which has investigated the influence of target personality characteristics on self-disclosure. However, the adjective pairs were not factor analyzed to determine

more general target characteristics which relate to disclosure. Also, the subjects were instructed to focus on the relationship, not on the person in general. There may, however, be a number of general target personality characteristics which affect willingness to disclose. Within the area of psychotherapy, there is evidence that the personality of the therapist influence the process and outcome of therapy (e.g. Allen, 1967; Carkhuff, 1969; Gurman, 1977; Kramer, Rappaport, & Seidman, 1979). For example, Allen (1967) reports that there is a growing body of data which suggest that the outcome of counseling is more closely related to the personality qualities of the counselor than to his technical background. With regard to relevant personal qualities, the importance of factors such as empathy, warmth and genuineness has been supported by both clinicians and researchers (e.g. Carkhuff, 1969; Gurman, 1977; Halpern, 1977; Kramer et al., 1979; Rogers, 1958). Simonson (1976) found that subjects exposed to a warm therapist disclosed significantly more than subjects exposed to a cold therapist. Review of the literature suggest that there are several other qualities that should be considered. In an analogue study Lin (1973) found that counselor self-confidence was linearly related to interviewees' perception of the counselors as empathic, warm and genuine. Heigl-Evers and Heigl (1976) described and analyzed personality characteristics of professional psychotherapists. Personality characteristics considered ideal included psychological curiosity, tenacity in pursuit of truth, empathy for the suffering individual, high intelligence and motivation. Parloff, Waskow, and

Wolfe (1978) list the following qualities that at times have been advanced as those to which all prospective therapists should aspire: objectivity, honesty, capacity for relatedness, emotional freedom, security, integrity, humanity, commitment to the patient, intuitiveness, patience, perceptiveness, empathy, creativity and imaginativeness. In a recent counseling analogue study, Feldstein (1979) investigated the effects of counselor sex and sex role on self-disclosure. Two male and two female counselors were trained to roleplay both a masculine and a feminine counseling role. The counselor roles varied in three ways: a) Counseling interventions of the masculine sex-typed counselor were more action oriented (e.g. use of confrontation), whereas the feminine sex-typed counselor employed more responsive interventions (e.g. reflection of feeling). b) The affect of the feminine sex-typed counselor was warm, supportive, and emotional, and the affect of the masculine sex-typed counselor was cognitive, assertive and controlled. c) The nonverbal behavior of the feminine sex-typed counselor included a softer voice, more smiling, more body lean, and more head nods than the masculine sex-typed counselor, whereas the nonverbal behavior of the masculine sex-typed counselor included a louder voice, more postural relaxation, and more shifts in leg movements. The finding that both female and male subjects disclosed most to feminine counselors, suggest that counselor sex role had a more powerful effect than the biological gender of the counselor as previously mentioned with regard to target sex. This in turn suggests that certain stereotyped feminine characteristics such

as warm, supportive and emotional are more facilitative on self-disclosure than certain stereotyped masculine characteristics such as assertive, cognitive and controlled. Researchers have traditionally been concerned mainly with characteristics which facilitate self-disclosure and have to a large extent neglected characteristics which may inhibit self-disclosure. Study of both is necessary in order to delineate the requisite characteristics that facilitate self-disclosure. For example, Gurman (1977) reports that dogmatic counselors were seen by patients as providing unfavorable therapeutic climate and that dogmatic people are characterized by more defensive behavior in interpersonal transactions. This corroborates the findings of Bergin (1966) that therapists who were more anxious, conflicted and defensive were least likely to promote change in their patients. Thus in summary, there is evidence that personality characteristics such as cold, dogmatic, defensive, anxious, assertive, etc. may inhibit self-disclosure and therapeutic progress while characteristics such as warm, empathic, understanding, emotional, honest, open, self-confident, etc. may facilitate self-disclosure and the therapeutic process.

The Objectives of this Study

As there is an apparent lack of research on the influence of the target's personality on self-disclosure, the main objective of this study was to investigate personality characteristics in a non-therapeutic context that relate to self-disclosure. The

methodology involved subjects describing the personality of the person they disclose to the most and the least as well as their own personality. Although no predictions were made about the specific characteristics, as this study is essentially exploratory in nature, it was expected that some personality characteristics similar to those mentioned above would be identified that may facilitate self-disclosure while other characteristics would be identified that may inhibit self-disclosure. Research findings in this specific area may contribute significantly to knowledge and understanding of the self-disclosure process as well as the dynamics behind relationships in general. Also, as mentioned earlier, the client's disclosure is generally considered essential for effective psychotherapy. The delineation of target personality characteristics that facilitate self-disclosure is therefore important for selection and training of clinical psychologists and counselors.

The second objective of this study was to investigate the relationship between how subjects perceive themselves and how they perceive the people they disclose to the most and the least. Jourard (1964) points out that in accordance with his data the subjects tended to disclose more about themselves to people who resembled them in various ways than to people who differed from them. This led him to propose that "disclosure is a byproductof the perception or belief that the target person is similar to self" (p. 15). The similarity which he thought was most crucial is similarity in values. Attitude or value similarity and attraction have been found to be

correlated by several investigators (e.g. Byrne, 1969; Chaikin & Derlega, 1976; Gelman & McGinley, 1978; Marcus, 1976; Newcomb, 1961; Precker, 1959). Concerning attraction, similarity in personality characteristics as well as similarity in attitudes have been studied. Several studies support the similarity hypotheses. Schooley (1936) examined personality resemblances among married couples using a battery of tests, and found that men and women tend to marry persons similar to themselves in all the characteristics measured in her study. Izard (1960) found that personality similarity was a facilitator of interpersonal positive affect. Studying personality and social choice, Lindzey and Urdan (1954) found that in general pairs of individuals who chose to live with one another appeared to be more alike on personality measures than individuals who rejected each other. In the area of psychotherapy, Lasky and Salomone (1977) report that therapist-patient similarities are directly related to psychotherapy outcome in many diverse areas such as social class, values and compatibility of orientation to interpersonal relations. Persons and Marks (1970) report that subjects' intimacy was significantly greater on all dependent measures when the interviewer and interviewee had the same personality type in terms of MMPI codes. Reviewing studies on therapist-patient personality similarity, Parloff et al. (1978) concluded that although widely varying methodologies of various degrees of scientific adequacy have been employed in these studies and quite divergent personality characteristics have served as the basis for forming therapist-patient combinations, weak

relationships between similarity and compatibility variables and therapy outcome prevail. Most studies have investigated the effects of actual similarity in terms of various measurements, e.g. the MMPI and the Myer-Briggs Type Indicator. However, it is possible that perceived similarity is even more important for therapeutic effectiveness and for facilitating self-disclosure. After a review of empirical studies related to therapist-client matching, Luborsky, Chandler, Auerbach, and Cohen (1971) reached the conclusion that "a feeling of similarity" seems to provide a more significant relationship between the therapist and the patient and therefore a better outcome to treatment. In light of the research findings cited above it was hypothesized that the subjects would describe themselves as more similar to the person they disclose to the most than the person they disclose to the least.

With regard to discloser sex, it was hypothesized that females would disclose more than males, as the literature suggests that females are generally higher disclosers than males. Concerning target sex, it was also hypothesized that there would be more female than male preferred targets and more male than female non-preferred targets, as there is evidence that disclosure to a female is more common than to a male.

Finally, this study examined whether high and low disclosers would differentially perceive targets' personality characteristics. For example, research in the area of affiliation has found that more sociable people are more sensitive to person cues related to

friendship than less sociable people (e.g. Mehrabian & Ksionzky, 1974). It is possible that different characteristics are important for high and low disclosers.

Although the literature indicate that self-disclosure may be a multidimensional construct (e.g. the five parameters mentioned earlier), for purposes of this study an attempt will be made to measure self-disclosure as a single score averaged over various topic areas and degree of intimacy. The reasons for doing so are that, according to Goodstein and Reinecker (1974), there seems to be no major advantage in using weighted scores and that most investigators have used unweighted, overall scores.

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects were 75 male and 75 female undergraduate psychology students at Simon Fraser University who volunteered to take part in the study. As previous research indicates that people disclose more to their spouses than to any other targets and that disclosure decreases with age (Jourard, 1971) the subjects were selected on the basis of being single and under 30 years of age.

Measures

Two kind of instruments were administered to all the subjects.

A) BEM Q-Sort Technique

The BEM Q-Sort Technique was selected because it has been demonstrated to be a useful technique for describing a person's personality characteristics (Bem & Funder, 1978, Block & Peterson, 1955, Block, 1961, Block, 1977). The instrument lends itself to an analytic strategy which permits one to assess the degree of similarity between one or several pairs of "personalities" by correlating the Q-sorts and then factor analyzing the correlations. Test-retest reliabilites of .8 and .9 are conventional (Block, 1961).

The BEM Q-sort utilizes the set of items devised by Jack Block (1961), called the California Q-set which was designed for use by professional clinical psychologists and psychiatrists. Bem and his

associates modified the set slightly by adding simplifying paraphrases in parentheses below the original items so that non-professionals could sort their acquaintances as well as themselves (Bem & Funder, 1978).

The test consists of 100 descriptive personality statements (see Appendix A) which are sorted by the subject into 9 categories, ranging from the least (1) to the most (9) characteristic of the person being described. Statements considered neither characteristic nor uncharacteristic of the individual are placed into middle categories. The number of items distributed into each category is constrained to be 5,8,12,16,18,16,12,8,5 respectively. After the sorting, the placement of each item is recorded on a record sheet. Thus each item receives a score from 1 to 9 and a forced symmetric distribution is employed with a mean of 5 and a standard deviation of 2.0889.

For purposes of this study, the 100 items were printed separately on 3 x 2 cards to permit easy arrangement and re-arrangement. The cards were shuffled prior to next sorting. Subjects were required to do three sortings, one describing the person to whom they disclose the most (MOST), one describing the person to whom they disclose the least (LEAST) and one describing themselves (SELF).

B) Self-Disclosure Inventory

In order to obtain a measure of self-disclosure to each target a self-report inventory was formed by selecting 39 items from a battery of 671 statements dealing with various aspects of the self (Taylor and

Altman, 1966). The 671 items, consisting of 13 topic categories, had been scaled for intimacy by three independent populations, male college students, sailors (Taylor & Altman, 1966) and female university students (Ksionzky, 1979). Taylor and Altman (1966) report that use of 35 and 70 item instruments developed from the item pool yielded split-half and alternate-form reliabilities of .82 to .86. From each topical category three items were selected, one with high, one with medium and one with low intimacy value. Two criteria were used for the selection: 1) high agreement between the three populations in terms of intimacy value and topical category and 2) low standard deviation. Copy of the Self-Disclosure Inventory is given in Appendix B, and the area grouping of the items is given in Appendix C. Each item refers to a potential topic for self-disclosure. Subjects were asked to rate the extent to which they have talked about each topic twice, once for the MOST target and once for the LEAST target. The rating scale (Jourard, 1971) was as follows:

0: Have told the person nothing about this aspect of me.

1: Have talked in general terms about this.

The person has only a general idea about this aspect of me.

2: Have talked in full and complete detail about this item to the person. He/she knows me fully in this respect and could describe me accurately.

A MOST total and a LEAST total were obtained by simple summation of the items. From these totals two scores were derived for each subject, a disclosure score (MOST + LEAST) and a discrimination score (MOST - LEAST).

Procedure

The subjects were run in groups from 2 to 12 people. They were seated two to a table and provided all necessary material. The subjects were first presented with the Q-sort task and asked to read the instructions, part one (see Appendix D) carefully. When this had been done, the experimenter gave a brief demonstration of how to fill out the record sheets. In the space on the record sheet labelled "PERSON BEING DESCRIBED" the subjects were asked to write simply "MOST", "LEAST" or "SELF". The card deck given to each subject had been pre-shuffled by the Experimenter and subjects were told to re-shuffle the cards after each sorting. The Q-sorts were done in the sequence MOST, LEAST, SELF. After completing the Q-sort task the subjects were presented with the Self-Disclosure Inventory and asked to read the instructions, part two (see Appendix E) carefully. The Self-Disclosure Inventory was completed in the sequence MOST, LEAST. The subjects were required to state the targets' age and the length of time they have known the targets. This information was requested in order to encourage the subjects to describe a real rather than a fictional person. No time-limit was imposed for the tasks. Due to other commitments some subjects had to complete the tasks in two sessions.

RESULTS

All analyses of both Q-sort and self-report data were conducted separately on males and females. Average time for completing the tasks was approximately 2 1/2 hours. Four subjects returned the data within one hour. The results from these subjects were discarded because their completion time was too short for the time required to do the tasks properly. These subjects were replaced by four new subjects.

As the task was long and tedious, the data were also checked for outliers using two different approaches. The first approach was to look for large negative loadings in the rotated Q-sort factor loadings. Two males and two females were discarded on this basis. The reasons for this will be given in the section below describing the factor analysis. The second approach was to look at both Q-sort and self-report data simultaneously and used BMD10M with a cut-off of $p < .01$ to identify outliers. The BMD10M program is a multivariate approach that looks at the Mahalanobis distance of each subject from the mean of all subjects. The variables from the Q-sort were the MOST-LEAST, MOST-SELF and LEAST-SELF correlations among each person's Q-sort. The variables from the self-report data were each person's MOST total and LEAST total. Four males and two females were discarded using this criterion. Thus the final number of subjects were 69 males and 71 females.

The Q-sort data were analyzed by Principal Component Analysis with varimax and direct oblimin rotations. Data for MOST, LEAST and SELF were analyzed separately. The analysis looked at the correlations among the subjects over the items. Factor loadings were thus found for each person. The factor scores correspond to item scores describing hypothetical "types" of people. In the orthogonal case the factor loadings are the correlations between each person's actual Q-sort and the hypothetical "types". In the oblique case the factor loadings are regression weights for predicting each person's Q-sort from the factor scores. It was expected that for each subject there should be at least one factor on which the subject's Q-sort had a high positive loading and no factors on which there were large negative loadings. This was the case for most subjects. However, there were four subjects for whom the strongest loading was not positive but negative irrespective of rotation used. The most plausible explanation for these anomalies is that these subjects reversed, or otherwise did not follow instructions. The data from these four subjects were discarded. Varimax rather than direct oblimin rotations were used because the varimax rotations resulted in fewer large negative loadings and thus more interpretable data.

Horn's test (Horn, 1965) was used to determine an approximate number of factors. For each sex and each condition (MOST, LEAST, SELF) an upper and lower bound to the number of factors was found. The precise number of factors was determined by examining the rotated results at each number of factors choosing the number of factors which

seemed most interpretable. In order to achieve interpretability with the LEAST results it was necessary to keep fewer factors than specified by Horn's test. Each factor has been named and will be referred to as a "type". The factor loadings are presented in Tables 1-6. Table 7 shows name of, % of variance accounted for by, and number of people assigned to each Q-sort factor. The items whose scores were most extreme on the factors found in the MOST, LEAST and SELF Q-sorts are listed in Tables 8-13.

In order to see if certain SELF types tended to select certain MOST and LEAST types each person was assigned to the factor on which he/she loaded highest. This was done for MOST, LEAST and SELF. Four males and four females were eliminated in the LEAST condition because their highest loading was negative. Also, one male in the MOST condition was eliminated for the same reason. This problem did not occur for SELF or female MOST. The contingencies tables relating SELF to MOST and to LEAST are given in Tables 14-17. For males there was no significant relation between SELF and MOST. However, there was a marginal, but not significant relationship between SELF and LEAST ($p < .10$). For females there was a marginal, but not significant relationship between SELF and MOST ($p < .10$) and no significant relationship between SELF and LEAST.

The hypothesis that people see their MOST target as more similar to SELF than their LEAST target, was tested by correlating each person's Q-sort for MOST, LEAST and SELF. Then a Sign Test was done to see if the MOST-SELF correlation was generally higher than the

LEAST-SELF correlation. For 77% of the subjects, both male and female, the MOST-SELF correlation was higher than the LEAST-SELF correlation. This proportion is significantly different from 50% at the level $p < .00001$. Thus the hypothesis was supported.

The Self-Disclosure means both by item and for the totals are given in Tables 18-19. All the mean differences were significantly different from 0 at $p < .01$ with the Bonferroni-Dunn correction (Miller, 1966) with the following exceptions. For males, item 10 was significantly different at $p < .05$ and items 32 and 38 were not significantly different. For females, items 3, 10, 32 and 38 were not significantly different.

The Total and Difference scores as well as MOST and LEAST totals for each item were factor analyzed. For males 12 factors for the Total, 13 for Difference, 14 factors for MOST total and 11 factors for LEAST total were found. For females 13 factors were found for all the above conditions. As the Self-Disclosure Inventory consisted of 13 topic areas these findings suggest that both the tendency to disclose and to discriminate is topic specific. It must be recognized that any single score is an average over independent areas.

T-tests between male and female subjects were done on MOST and LEAST scores in order to test the hypothesis that females disclose more than males (see Table 20). Only MOST was found to significantly discriminate between the sexes ($p < .01$).

Male MOST targets ranged in age from 18 to 55, mean 23.6 years. Male LEAST targets ranged in age from 7 to 86, mean 32.3 years.

Female MOST targets ranged in age from 17 to 54, mean 24 years.

Female LEAST targets ranged in age from 16 to 84, mean 36.5 years.

For males, the length of time the discloser has known the MOST and LEAST targets ranged from 1 to 29, mean 6.8 years, and from 1 to 29, mean 10.2 years respectively. For females, the length of time the discloser has known the MOST and LEAST targets ranged from 1 to 26, mean 5.7 years, and from 1 to 28, mean 13.2 respectively.


In order to test the hypotheses that there would be more female than male MOST targets and more male than female LEAST targets, contingencies tables were constructed and chi square tests completed (see Tables 21-22). For males, significant greater proportions of male LEAST than male MOST ($p < .0005$) and male LEAST than female LEAST ($p < .000005$) were found as well as a borderline, but not significant greater proportion of female than male MOST targets ($p < .08$). For females there were no significant differences.

To assess the association between the relationships of the subject to his/her MOST and LEAST targets, contingencies tables were constructed and chi square tests were performed (see Tables 23-24). No significant overall associations were found for either males or females. To test whether the marginal frequencies for MOST were different from the marginal frequencies for LEAST, Stuart's test of marginal homogeneity was used (Stuart, 1955). For both males and females, the chi squares were significant at the $p < .001$ level.

Contingencies tables were constructed and chi square tests were conducted in order to discover which Q-sort type relates to which

relationship (see Tables 25-28). There were no significant associations for males. However, for females the association between the MOST Q-sort types and MOST Relationship was significant at the $p < .05$ level.

To determine whether there was any difference between high and low disclosers in terms of how they describe the MOST and LEAST targets as well as themselves, the subjects were divided into two groups (High and Low) based on their self-disclosure scores. This was accomplished by using both the discloser score (MOST + LEAST) and the discrimination score (MOST - LEAST). The average Q-sorts for the two groups were calculated and correlated using Pearson's Correlation. The correlations were all high (see Table 29) thus indicating no substantial differences between the groups. A similar analysis in which the subjects were split into three and four groups was also conducted. Similar results were obtained. The correlations were uniformly high.



DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this study was to attempt to identify target personality characteristics that relate to self-disclosure. The identification and delineation of the characteristics that facilitate or inhibit disclosure may have important implications for selection and training of clinical psychologists and counselors. Several personality types were found both for targets disclosed to the most and for targets disclosed to the least. For males, MOST factor 1 represents a type of individual that can best be characterized as someone who is highly principled, intelligent and autonomous. This type is self-assured and independent and at the same time pleasant to be with in that he/she has a sense of humour as well as being calm and relaxed without a brittle ego-defense system or self-pity. The qualities of integrity and self-confidence undoubtedly contribute to this kind of individual being disclosed to the most. Such individuals are likely turned to to help resolve issues and problems. Their intellectual capacity coupled with a consistent ethical behavior calms the concern of vulnerability associated with disclosing personal material. He/she is a type of person that elicits respect and trust from other people.

The second type who is disclosed to by males is a loving, giving individual who is oriented to and values other people. This kind of person has a lot of warmth, is sympathetic and concerned about others'

problems, develops close, intimate relationships and treats others with respect rather than in a condescending or manipulative manner. At the same time this type is uncertain, hesitant, lacking in self-assurance. He/she is described as being basically anxious, requiring reassurance from other people and unlikely to take risks in life as he/she does not push or stretch his/her limits. Nor is this type power-oriented in his/her relationship with others. This lack of power-orientation may stem from a regard for other people and also from his/her insecurities which is inconsistent with a power-oriented approach to life. Probably the characteristics which make this type of individuals valued as persons to disclose to are their nurturance, warmth, generosity and concern for people and their lack of power-orientation. Disclosing to another increases ones vulnerability and submissiveness vis a vis the other. Therefore, individuals who are not power-oriented may be less threatening, particularly if they communicate responsibility and a high regard for others.

The last type who is disclosed to the most by males represents the male stereotype "macho" individual who is highly assertive, ambitious and attractive. This kind of a person knows what he/she wants and expresses his/her goals openly and does not like to be dominated by others. He/she is more action- and achievement-oriented than concerned with philosophical or intellectual matters. Males probably like to talk to such a person because he/she represents an "ideal" type, being good-looking, lively and outgoing that they want to identify with and therefore are attracted to and feel comfortable with.

The three MOST types are different kind of individuals that are probably disclosed to for different reasons. The first type may be sought out as the expert to solve problems and to get an intelligent, cognitive view and debate on various issues. On the other hand, Type 2 is the kind of individual one would turn to for the more emotional kind of disclosure which requires no specific answers or solutions but rather a sympathetic, supportive ear. Type 3 is a person that males can discuss goals and plans in life with and who will give direct, honest opinions. In summary, Type 1 is more like the ideal teacher who provides cerebral insight and inspiration for learning and growth. Type 2 is the motherfigure turned to for love and understanding while Type 3 is the ideal peer figure who serves as a model for behavior.

With regard to the types described by males as LEAST targets, Factor 1 is an ideal kind of a person who is dependable, intelligent, productive and in addition has a sense of humor. This person has personal strength in that he/she is not self-pitying, fearful or maladaptive when under stress. However, while this type is popular and liked by other people, he/she may also arouse feelings of jealousy and competition and thus be threatening to males. They may want to know and try to impress such a person, but they may not want to be fully known or intimate with him/her in order not to lose face or to give the person an advantage over them. Therefore, this kind of an individual is not seen as a preferred target for self-disclosure. While MOST 1 is similar in many respects to LEAST 1, characteristics

such as autonomous, ethical, calm and not negativistic may explain why males would disclose to this type rather than to the highly productive and probably very successful LEAST 1.

The second type disclosed to the least by males is best characterized as an uncertain, insecure person who is highly conservative and moralistic, and therefore probably judgmental of others. These characteristics are dominant and this may be the main reason why males do not turn to this kind of a person for disclosure although he/she is also giving and dependable. LEAST 2 is a person who is very "straight", accepts the standards and values set by others and does not take risks in life by pushing his/her limits. Males probably do not feel comfortable with such an insecure, yet strongly moralistic person. Their vulnerability and their conservative view of life may not encourage much trust or respect. Rather than thinking for themselves, the LEAST 2 type of a person would probably tend to give stereotyped answers and views on various issues.

LEAST factor 3 represents a lively, outgoing but highly self-centered person who is mainly interested in having a good time. This kind of a person pushes limits to see what he/she can get away with and does not "delay gratification". He/she is not turned to for advice, nor for self-disclosure probably because he/she is talkative, but hardly a good listener as he/she is self-indulgent rather than concerned with other people. Nor does this kind of person have insight with regard to important problems. Thus males would probably find this egocentric type of little value as a confidant.

The last type that males disclose to the least is best described as an anti-social, arrogant, power-seeking individual who is skeptical of others and treats them in a manner that does not make him/her accepted or well-liked. This person is ambitious on his/her own behalf and does not behave in a giving or sympathetic manner towards other people. This is the kind of individual who would tell people what to do and when to do it in a condescending manner. Although he/she claims to be objective or rational and appears to have a high degree of intelligence, his/her manner or style of interpersonal relations is off-putting and not conducive to close, warm relationships. Therefore, it is not surprising that males do not like to disclose and become vulnerable to this type.

As with the MOST targets, there are probably different reasons why males do not like to talk to the four LEAST types. Type 1 may be too successful and therefore threatening while Type 2 displays moralistic, conservative attitudes and views that discourage self-disclosure. The other two types interact with people in a manner that inhibits disclosure by coming across as being either too self-indulgent, shallow and insensitive or by seeing him/herself as superior to others and therefore lacking in empathy or insight. Thus all the LEAST targets have characteristics which may arouse negative feelings in males which discourage them from being fully open with their personal lives. On the other hand, the MOST types have personality characteristics which facilitate self-disclosure as they are either strong, independent, considerate and assertive or loving and warm.

For females, MOST factor 1 represents a type of individual who is the ideal father- or priest-figure. He/she is highly concerned with philosophical problems, enjoys esthetic impression such as beauty in nature, art or music and does not tend to perceive many different contexts in sexual terms. This is a very cerebral person who values intellectual matters and who seems to have a high degree of intellectual capacity. In many ways, this type seems as the perfect person to disclose or confess to as he/she is also considerate of other people, compassionate and giving and not manipulative, deceitful or opportunistic. Females probably feel comfortable and safe disclosing to this kind of an individual as he/she is highly ethical and does not judge people in conventional terms.

The second type who is disclosed to by females is an outgoing, lively extrovert who is more action-oriented than concerned with philosophical problems, such as the meaning of life. Nor is he/she fearful, prone to guilt feelings or sensitive to esthetic impressions. He/she is more concerned with sensuous experiences and, consistent with this, he/she is interested in members of the opposite sex. This kind of a person is probably disclosed to the most because some females enjoy the company of such a light and lively person. Also, he/she is highly assertive which means that females can rely upon the person giving them honest, direct opinions.

The last MOST type is best characterized as someone who is basically anxious, emotionally immature and insecure. This kind of an individual seeks reassurance from others, ruminates and is moody and

guilt ridden. Due to his/her lack of self-esteem this kind of a person is not ambitious, productive or assertive. On the other hand, he/she does have the capacity for close relationships which may explain why some females prefer to talk to this rather immature type of a person.

In summary, for females MOST type 1 is probably sought out for guidance, insight and problem solving, while type 2 is turned to for direct, honest views on various matters. Type 3 may be sought out as the non-threatening, non-competitive person who may make females feel somewhat superior and therefore good about themselves. Type 1 is a kind of person females probably admire and respect, type 2 is a person they may enjoy to be with and type 3 is the kind of person who makes them feel wanted and needed.

For females, LEAST factor 1 is a type of person who is highly productive and intelligent. He/she is ambitious and gets things done without being guileful or manipulative. This is probably a very successful person as he/she has a lot of personal strength coupled with a high aspiration level for self. For example, he/she is responsible and in control of him/herself. Also, this person is not negativistic, self-pitying or self-defeating. Nor does he/she give up in the face of frustration and adversity. This is not the kind of characteristics one would expect to define a person who is not disclosed to. However, it is possible that females as well as males are threatened by this very productive, strong individual who may arouse feelings of inferiority and jealousy. MOST factor 1 is similar

to LEAST factor 1 but MOST factor 1 possesses some very humane characteristics such as sympathetic, warm and giving which is lacking in LEAST factor 1. While both types may elicit respect and admiration, MOST 1 has the added qualities of human love and unselfishness that may explain why this type is disclosed to more than the productive, ambitious LEAST 1.

The second type that is disclosed to the least by females is a person who is highly interested in the opposite sex and who regards self as physically attractive. This type has some psychopathic characteristics, eg. he/she is deceitful, manipulative, opportunistic, self-indulgent and pushes limits to see what he/she can get away with while he/she does not readily feel guilt and is not submissive. Overall, this type communicates extreme selfishness and lack of both conscience and concern for others which undoubtedly contribute to why females do not like to disclose and make themselves vulnerable to such a person.

Factor 3 of the LEAST targets is best characterized as someone who is legalistic, self-defensive and who does not cope well with frustrations. This person is not calm, warm or compassionate. Moreover, he/she does not have insight into own motives and behavior which is consistent with a highly irritable, defensive personality. As this person does not behave in a considerate manner, it is understandable why he/she also does not arouse nurturant feelings in others. Nor is he/she turned to for advice or reassurance. Thus this type displays many characteristics which would make him/her undesirable as a target for self-disclosure.

LEAST, factor 4 is best described as the female stereotype or a mother figure. This person is conforming and unsure about self and therefore seeks reassurance from others. He/she is also very unselfish, giving and warm in ~~their~~ relationship with others.

Consistent with the "house-mouse" stereotype, this person is not seen as intelligent, nor is he/she interested in cognitive matter or philosophical problems. Moreover, this type tends to judge self and others in conventional terms. Some females today may not want to disclose to such a female stereotype because they reject that for which she stands. MOST factor 3 is similar to LEAST factor 4. However, it may be that MOST factor 1 somehow makes females feel wanted and needed by being childlike, anxious and dependent, while LEAST factor 4 makes females feel smothered by being overly motherly.

In summary, LEAST factor 1 may not be turned to for self-disclosure as he/she is too threatening, making females feel inferior by being too productive, ambitious and too cognitive oriented. The personality of factors 2 and 3 may inhibit disclosure as these types are egocentric, dogmatic and defensive. LEAST factor 4 may simply be too much like a conventional mother-type. On the other hand, the MOST types may all have characteristics that make females feel good about them and themselves which again may facilitate self-disclosure. Factor 1 is the highly respected and trusted intellectual with high values and principles. Factor 2 is the happy, outgoing type who enjoys life and factor 3 is the child-like, immature person who may arouse nurturant feelings in females.

Comparison of the male and female target types indicates that the sexes generally agree on the kind of people they do or do not disclose to. Both male and female MOST targets involved three general types of individuals: the ideal, principled intellectual, the vulnerable person and the extrovert. With regard to the LEAST targets, both gender described four different kind of individuals: the ideal, the narcissist, the mother-figure and the anti-social. From the data, no single set of characteristics which facilitate or inhibit self-disclosure can easily be defined. Some of the MOST and LEAST types are similar in many ways and several characteristics apply both to the types disclosed to the most and to the types disclosed to the least, e.g. highly characteristic: intelligent, dependable, giving, responds to humor, assertive, anxious, talkative and highly uncharacteristic: deceitful, self-pitying, self-defeating. However, a closer examination of the characteristics that are either highly characteristic and highly uncharacteristic of only the MOST targets or of only the LEAST targets makes it possible to isolate some characteristics that may discriminate between the two kind of targets. For males, the items highly characteristic of only the MOST targets include: warm, sympathetic, good-looking, calm, and autonomous. The highly uncharacteristic items include: negativistic, flat affect and distant. Items highly characteristic of only the LEAST targets include: gives advice, moralistic, conservative, self-indulgent, values power, pushes limits, critical, condescending, and defensive. The highly uncharacteristics items include: turned to

for advice, sympathetic, giving, able to see to heart of important problems, and arouses liking. For females, items highly characteristic of only the MOST targets include: giving, philosophical, and esthetical. The highly uncharacteristic items include: condescending, and conventional. Items highly characteristic of only the LEAST targets include: pushes limits, self-indulgent, ambitious, self-defensive, moralistic, conventional, and deceitful. The highly uncharacteristic items include: feels guilty, calm, insight, warm, sympathetic, arouses nurturant feelings, turned to for advice, and intelligent. The characteristics related to the MOST targets cited above may facilitate self-disclosure for males and females respectively while the characteristics related to the LEAST targets may inhibit disclosure. The influence of these personality characteristics on self-disclosure could be the subject for further research.

Defensive, moralistic, and self-indulgent were seen by both male and female subjects as highly characteristic only of LEAST targets. This supports the findings of Gurman (1977) and Bergin (1966) that dogmatic, defensive therapists provide an unfavorable therapeutic climate. There were also some support for the view held by numerous researchers (e.g. Carkhuff, 1969; Halpern, 1977; Kramer et al, 1979, Rogers, 1958) that empathy and warmth facilitate self-disclosure and the therapeutic relationship. For both sexes, sympathetic, which is related to empathic, was highly characteristic of MOST targets and highly uncharacteristic of LEAST targets. For males, warm was seen as

highly characteristic of only a MOST target, and highly uncharacteristic of only a LEAST target. For females, warm was highly characteristic of both MOST and LEAST targets, but highly uncharacteristic of only a LEAST target.

In addition to describing the people they disclose to the most and the least, the subjects were also required to describe their own personality in order to investigate the relationship between how people perceive themselves and how they perceive their targets. More specifically, it was expected that people would see themselves as more similar to their MOST than their LEAST targets. For males, SELF factor 1 represents a type of individual that is almost priest-like in characteristics. He is highly concerned with philosophical problems, and enjoys and values beauty for example in nature, music or art. In addition, he is very dependable as he has a consistent personality, does not change in behavior or attitudes and behaves in an ethical manner. Nor is he deceitful, hostile or self-pitying. This kind of a person is able to see to the heart of important problems and values his own independence.

The second SELF type is a kind of person who is introverted and spends his time daydreaming. He is very concerned with himself and does not feel self-satisfied. In contrast to the mature, independent Factor 1 type, this kind of an individual does not have a consistent personality but is rather fluctuating in moods and behavior.

While type 2 is rather introverted and unsure about himself, type 3 represents the lively, emotional, extroverted male who enjoys having

a good time with other people. In contrast to type 1, this kind of a male is not concerned with philosophical problems, nor does he value or particularly enjoy beauty in music, art, etc. He is more of the "life-of-the-party" man who is interested in girls and probably popular as he is both humorous and warm.

SELF factor 4 on the other hand, represents an undoubtedly much less socially attractive type. This male is highly ambitious, prides himself on being rational and/or objective. He values his own independence and does not give up when faced with frustration or adversity. However, his social skills and attitudes with regard to interpersonal relationships leave a lot to be desired as he is skeptical and distrustful of other people in general. Consistent with this kind of an attitude, he does not treat people with sympathy or consideration. Nor is he giving, cheerful or skilled in social techniques of play and humor. Moreover, he is not socially perceptive of interpersonal cues and does not tend to arouse liking and acceptance in people.

For males, two of the SELF types represent males that apparently feel good about themselves and their interpersonal relationships. Type 1 is the ideal father, priest kind of male that values the "higher" things in life while Type 3 is the popular, more worldly-oriented male who enjoys life in general and girls in particular. Types 2 and 4 on the other hand, would probably be more socially isolated, type 2 because of his dissatisfaction with life in general and himself in particular, and type 4 because of his arrogant,

stand-offish, uncharming way of relating to people. Most males described themselves as the ideal (SELF 1) and the extrovert (SELF 3). Only 17% saw themselves as the introverted type (SELF 2) and only 5% as the anti-social (SELF 4). MOST factor 1, the ideal, principled intellectual was the most popular target for disclosure regardless of how males see themselves. Thus, for males there was no indication that certain SELF types prefer to disclose to certain MOST TYPES.

For females, the first SELF factor represents the well-adjusted, self-actualized and/or liberated female who is highly assertive and who values her independence. Contrary to the stereotyped female house-mouse, this person has high aspiration for herself. She is sure of herself and has gained insight into her own motives and behavior. Therefore, she does not need or seek reassurance from others and she does not judge people according to conventional terms. She knows what she wants and how to get it. She is not self-defeating, fearful or anxious and does not give up when facing frustration or adversity.

Factor 2 on the other hand, represents the stereotyped mother-figure. This female does not behave in an assertive or non-conforming manner. She is rather a dependable, responsible person who is loving, giving, warm and protective of those close to her. Her concerns are not so much where she wants to go as how to please and care for those around her. Therefore, she behaves in a considerate manner, seeks reassurance from others and does not express hostile feelings directly.

The last SELF type is best characterized as a neurotic female who typically feels anxious, guilty and who is highly emotional and unsure of herself. She does not feel satisfied with herself and seeks reassurance instead from others. All three female SELF types appear to correspond to common stereotypes. Type 1 is the new ideal, assertive, liberated woman who is achievement-oriented and independent. Type 2 is the classical nurturant mother figure while type 3 is the emotional, neurotic female.

For females the most popular targets for disclosure were MOST factor 1, the "ideal" which is likely to be same-sex friend and MOST factor 2, the "Extrovert" which is likely to be opposite-sex friend. MOST factor 3, the "vulnerable" is likely to be same-sex friend. The well-adjusted, liberated female (SELF 1) and the neurotic female (SELF 3) tend to disclose to the ideal type while the stereotyped motherly female (SELF 2) tends to disclose most to the extrovert. However, the latter relationship was borderline, but not significant. These findings suggest that for females self-disclosure may be a function of both target and discloser personality characteristics.

As hypothesized the results show that both males and females generally tend to see themselves as more similar to their MOST target than their LEAST target. The reason for this may be that people believe they have more in common with others of similar personality and therefore feel comfortable, accepted and understood. This finding may have important implications for the therapeutic relationship with regard to matching clients with therapists on the basis of perceived

personality similarity. However, this needs to be further tested with different populations, e.g. mental health in- and out-patients. It may also be that self-disclosure affects the way we perceive our preferred targets. In other words, having disclosed to a person, people may then believe that they have more in common, including a similar personality. "I find it easy to confide in him/her, therefore we must be compatible in personality".

The hypothesis that females would disclose more than males was supported, corroborating the findings of numerous studies (e.g. Annis & Perry, 1977; Jourard & Landsman, 1960; Jourard & Lasakow, 1958; Hood & Bach, 1971; Kraft & Vraa, 1975). However, the results show that females disclose significantly more than males only to the MOST targets, not to the LEAST targets. This indicates that females are more open with their preferred target but they are not necessarily more disclosing in general. With regard to target sex, the hypothesis that there would be more female than male MOST targets was not supported although both sexes reported more female than male MOST targets. The difference was not significant for females and borderline, but not significant for males. However, the hypothesis that there would be more male than female LEAST targets was confirmed but only with regard to the male subjects. For males, there was a significantly greater proportion of male than female LEAST targets (54 versus 15) and also a significantly greater proportion of male LEAST than male MOST targets (54 versus 28). Females reported slightly more females than males as both MOST and LEAST targets. These findings

suggest that males do not like to disclose to males but instead tend to turn to females for self-disclosure. It may be that females possess some as yet undefined, specific characteristics which make them less threatening and/or more facilitating for self-disclosure than males. Another reason may be that this culture's male role ("macho", tough, strong, independent, competitive) makes it difficult for males to self-disclose and be thus become vulnerable to other males. Females may be generally seen as less competitive and more emotional, understanding and interested in personal and intimate matters while males may be generally seen as intellectual and more interested in "objective" matters. These results support the view of Jourard (1961) who states that "Women, trained toward motherhood and a comforting function both engage in and receive more self-disclosure than men" (p. 49). According to Jourard, women consequently are richer in empathy and self-insight and also stronger or healthier both physically and mentally.

With regard to the type of relationship between discloser and target, it was interesting to note the significantly higher proportions of "Family" as LEAST versus MOST targets for both sexes. Evidently few people want to disclose to members of their family (e.g. mother, father, siblings). Instead, they prefer to disclose to friends. This supports the findings of several studies (e.g. Goodstein & Russell, 1977; Jourard & Richman, 1963; Plog, 1965) but contradicts the findings of Jourard (1958) that both sexes disclose most to mother. Jourard (1958) assessed how much the subjects had

disclosed to four specified targets, mother, father, same-sex friend, and opposite-sex friend. In this study the subjects were required to describe and rate their self-disclosure to the two persons they currently disclose to the most and the least. The different instructions may account for the discrepancy in the findings. There may be several reasons why people do not want to disclose to members of their family, e.g. high expectations or pressure which encourage upholding a certain image or role, fear that everybody in the family will know, desire for independence and privacy from family, etc. As the family relationship is an important aspect of life with regard to both personal and social development, the reasons for this apparent reluctance to be open with one's own family may be worth further investigation. The data also show that males chose significantly more opposite-sex friends as their preferred than their non-preferred targets. For males, the two most frequently chosen LEAST targets were "Same sex friend" and "Family" in that order. The two most frequently chosen MOST targets were "Opposite sex friend" and "Same sex friend". This indicates that males are more hesitant in their disclosures to same-sex friends than opposite-sex friends which again contradicts the findings of Jourard (1958) who reports that males disclose less to opposite-sex friends than to same-sex friends. However, it corroborates the findings of several other studies (e.g. Brodsky & Komarides, 1968; Komarowsky, 1973) that the closest female friend was the preferred self-disclosure target for male subjects. The results also indicate that "Work" relationships do not facilitate

self-disclosure as this category only appeared as LEAST targets. Concern with image, competition and future possibilities in the job market may be reasons why males do not want to disclose to people they work with. For females, the most frequently chosen LEAST targets were by far "Family" which constituted over 60% of the LEAST target population. On the other hand, only 10% of the MOST targets was "Family". Females tended to disclose to same-sex and opposite-sex friends approximately equally.

It should be noted that the analysis of the self-report data contradicts the notion of a general dimension or tendency to disclose regardless of topic area. The number of factors found for the Self-Disclosure Inventory roughly corresponds to the number of topic areas. This shows that a person may be a high discloser in one area but not in another. Thus the use of an overall single score for each subject to define high versus low disclosure is not justified. This may account for why dividing the subjects into high and low disclosers based on overall scores failed to detect any differences between the groups in terms of how they described MOST, LEAST or SELF. It is possible that the use of subtotals rather than totals might have led to different results. Another possibly effective approach may be to divide the subjects into high and low disclosers based on their scores on the items which discriminate highly between MOST and LEAST (e.g. items pertaining to sex). It is recommended that future research on self-disclosure pay closer attention to various topic areas and individual differences within these.

In conclusion, with regard to the main objective of this study, the results indicate that there are several personality "types" that people disclose to the most and the least. Although no single set of characteristics which facilitate or inhibit self-disclosure can readily be defined, the data indicate several personality characteristics that could be considered for future research on the impact of target personality on self-disclosure. Also, this study contributes to the literature on therapist characteristics by supporting previous studies regarding the influence of characteristics such as warm, empathic and defensive and by suggesting additional personality characteristics that may enhance or impede the therapeutic relationship.

There may be an interaction between various variables, e.g. sex, type of relationship, discloser and target personality characteristics, which determine self-disclosure. For future research it may be worthwhile to collect data on both male and female targets in order to compare male and female personality characteristics which may affect self-disclosure. It may also be useful to have subjects state reasons why they disclose most and least to targets. In this study the subjects were required to describe and rate their self-disclosure to people they know well. It is possible that personality per se is more important for self-disclosure in new or short-term relationships, such as the therapist/client relationship, where little is known about the person and little interaction has taken place. This suggestion could be tested by for example having

5

subjects describe the personality of the individuals they do disclose to the most and the least as well as the personality of the individuals they would or would not disclose to. This would permit a comparison between their actual and their ideal targets which may provide indications of important personality characteristics that encourage or discourage self-disclosure at different stages of the acquaintance process. The influence of personality on self-disclosure should also be tested behaviorally. Using a patient/therapist scenario, Simonson (1976) has already demonstrated the effect of perceived personality on self-disclosure. He found that subjects expecting to see a "warm" therapist reciprocated disclosure more than those expecting a "cold" therapist. A similar approach or using role-playing could be employed to test the effects of various personality characteristics. Moreover, as factors such as warmth and empathy are rather non-specific, it may be worthwhile to attempt to explicate what behavioral cues, e.g. eye contact, facial expressions, body movement, vocal cues, etc., communicate the target's warmth and empathy. Further research controlling for the possibly confounding effects of variables such as sex, type and length of relationship is necessary to clarify the influence of target personality characteristics on self-disclosure.

Table 1
Males - MOST Q-Sort Factor Loadings

Subject Number	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3
M1	0.65889	0.23212	0.29415
M2	0.40546	-0.17899	0.48854
M3	0.41416	0.15746	0.11884
M4	0.74126	0.20128	0.03465
M5	0.16696	-0.30437	0.15484
M6	0.36665	0.35931	0.03426
M7	0.73039	-0.06445	0.12997
M8	0.36050	0.52478	0.07893
M10	0.75386	0.13347	0.01480
M11	0.80140	0.17624	0.16420
M13	0.12542	-0.16597	0.66873
M14	0.61894	-0.07134	0.12852
M15	0.38958	-0.24051	-0.00203
M16	0.72865	0.26362	0.22177
M17	0.44785	0.34293	0.20248
M19	0.60349	0.18386	-0.01858
M21	0.13878	0.49655	0.47016
M23	0.30700	0.32783	-0.05758
M24	0.34866	0.61134	-0.01567
M25	0.59702	0.05341	0.36360
M26	0.61921	0.44201	-0.03659
M27	0.00893	0.47469	-0.23411
M28	0.38437	0.27454	0.21290
M29	0.21205	0.42148	-0.12331
M30	-0.04905	0.06639	0.63249
M31	0.14137	0.32749	0.38928
M32	0.35659	0.39199	0.40755
M34	0.44689	0.24042	0.34414
M35	0.39705	0.52299	0.19419
M36	0.22562	0.69989	0.01819
M37	0.02197	0.60325	0.04826
M38	0.70117	0.33323	-0.03006
M39	0.75865	0.12761	-0.02637
M40	0.38421	0.31640	0.15251

Table 1 continued
 Males - MOST Q-Sort Factor Loadings

Subject Number	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3
M41	-0.13300	-0.08177	0.66707
M42	0.68025	0.21627	0.24465
M43	0.61645	0.24469	0.03307
M44	0.55696	0.31886	0.29265
M45	0.49462	0.20648	0.30011
M46	0.65505	0.41530	0.18044
M47	0.70162	-0.05237	-0.02486
M48	0.27260	0.43186	-0.01731
M49	0.23798	0.49079	0.37943
M50	0.56498	0.20189	0.07324
M51	0.59036	0.03058	0.19476
M52	0.57740	0.18047	0.35870
M53	-0.32099	0.46357	0.00711
M54	0.54486	0.00505	-0.04239
M55	0.07731	0.63631	0.07627
M56	0.45770	0.34383	0.32384
M57	0.43387	-0.10902	0.33440
M58	0.18634	-0.19128	0.61073
M59	0.05489	0.59653	0.22920
M60	0.16523	-0.36666	0.45254
M61	0.04771	0.55886	0.30425
M62	0.53166	0.17289	0.32736
M63	0.15284	0.46682	0.46824
M64	0.14756	-0.17065	0.61509
M65	0.15456	0.55776	-0.02316
M66	0.55367	0.06136	0.32737
M67	0.58203	-0.07276	0.30537
M68	0.28247	0.28046	0.67439
M69	-0.03696	0.21181	0.65110
M70	0.44893	0.03257	-0.06816
M71	0.58549	0.31102	0.19916
M72	0.05194	0.13690	0.30087
M73	0.58686	0.35083	0.12026
M74	0.46890	0.53057	-0.07491
M75	0.12818	0.11809	0.63294

Table 2
Males - LEAST Q-Sort Factor Loadings

Subject Number	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
M1	0.55025	-0.03137	-0.10430	0.23164
M2	-0.02004	-0.36863	0.55750	0.19272
M3	-0.04817	0.63036	0.05151	-0.36284
M4	0.69344	0.23851	-0.01341	-0.14540
M5	-0.32321	0.51671	0.12544	0.04531
M6	0.37976	0.48055	-0.09495	0.26790
M7	0.59829	0.03329	0.40060	-0.03398
M8	0.76463	-0.18688	0.12837	0.16010
M10	0.22613	0.35745	-0.14322	0.29680
M11	0.22938	-0.25487	0.42916	0.43232
M13	-0.18534	0.69015	-0.27136	-0.03290
M14	0.63267	-0.01133	0.05615	-0.05501
M15	0.55732	-0.23701	-0.10518	0.29012
M16	0.40800	-0.07082	0.51812	-0.11633
M17	0.53054	0.20865	-0.29740	-0.05462
M19	0.51708	-0.30722	0.08974	0.01340
M21	0.20907	-0.23567	0.16940	0.50136
M23	0.33783	-0.04355	-0.11323	0.19629
M24	-0.03925	-0.24807	0.42237	-0.00698
M25	0.42486	0.21488	-0.22342	0.41690
M26	0.52606	-0.09558	0.32423	0.33550
M27	0.25643	0.13943	0.02279	0.55288
M28	-0.07744	0.21677	0.32188	-0.06216
M29	-0.19381	-0.48031	0.34559	0.25558
M30	-0.33505	-0.19918	0.25924	0.41092
M31	0.29679	-0.06267	0.27095	-0.24020
M32	-0.03444	0.29511	0.17515	-0.11714
M34	-0.02341	0.22007	-0.22996	0.51765
M35	0.45621	-0.10262	0.31098	0.08983
M36	0.20438	0.37722	0.06429	0.05368
M37	-0.35777	-0.03444	0.25962	0.52308
M38	0.09137	-0.18375	0.21145	0.07438
M39	-0.00588	0.57060	0.06619	-0.08636
M40	0.34563	0.39924	0.04497	-0.10981

Table 2 continued.

Males - LEAST Q-Sort Factor Loadings

Subject Number	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
M41	0.35808	-0.03363	0.35727	-0.06505
M42	-0.54313	0.14621	0.18691	0.22651
M43	-0.27692	0.58800	0.08207	0.11634
M44	-0.00135	0.24982	0.49376	0.26869
M45	0.35878	0.51798	-0.25249	0.09129
M46	-0.21579	0.25434	-0.14764	0.62477
M47	0.23255	0.04716	-0.05963	0.43092
M48	-0.14696	0.38672	0.12112	0.11610
M49	0.53055	0.35204	-0.12564	-0.39011
M50	0.38076	0.40677	0.13307	-0.29010
M51	-0.39116	0.04256	0.33533	0.07260
M52	0.06046	0.37201	0.01166	0.21208
M53	-0.47076	0.19190	-0.12129	-0.13178
M54	0.56824	0.32426	-0.18969	0.02025
M55	-0.07558	-0.09706	0.44625	0.57694
M56	0.32903	-0.07330	0.37478	0.43320
M57	0.01032	0.02894	0.36745	-0.03008
M58	0.44757	-0.01643	0.32056	-0.32105
M59	0.46696	0.07953	-0.38077	0.39437
M60	0.05076	0.10775	0.14184	0.52751
M61	0.62252	0.23763	-0.33218	0.02812
M62	-0.03301	0.00711	0.51532	0.18029
M63	0.68259	0.06212	-0.42062	-0.01019
M64	0.01098	0.45637	0.18302	0.20520
M65	-0.41108	-0.15045	0.59088	0.21845
M66	-0.19527	0.09299	0.58921	-0.00735
M67	0.45373	0.12332	0.10141	0.42619
M68	0.12458	0.21002	0.41979	-0.10294
M69	0.03277	0.68831	-0.17822	0.13855
M70	-0.07050	-0.00306	-0.17455	0.58109
M71	0.50306	0.07843	0.16006	0.23759
M72	-0.12492	0.14707	0.32044	-0.07158
M73	0.12648	0.13619	0.48794	-0.19147
M74	-0.05629	-0.05765	0.49395	0.11127
M75	0.00095	-0.39817	0.24894	0.62466

Table 3
Males - SELF Q-Sort Factor Loadings

Subject Number	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
M1	0.52301	0.03685	0.54711	-0.09153
M2	0.64547	0.19354	0.40193	0.16898
M3	0.47573	0.22046	0.24914	0.28494
M4	0.62854	0.14542	0.08114	0.34526
M5	0.17222	0.15045	-0.21098	0.42720
M6	0.32356	0.07524	0.51965	-0.04508
M7	0.54658	-0.02026	0.40856	0.31575
M8	0.62326	0.27045	0.28992	-0.09274
M10	0.39402	0.63293	-0.23788	0.07362
M11	0.67275	-0.10713	0.41999	0.06926
M13	0.49390	0.20996	0.26884	0.01192
M14	0.45697	0.40813	0.27223	0.12934
M15	0.18160	0.15552	0.54234	-0.02925
M16	0.71285	0.05425	0.29886	0.20828
M17	0.50583	0.11126	0.06615	0.13631
M19	0.51331	0.47247	0.05273	0.10539
M21	0.40472	0.20360	0.48202	-0.12784
M23	0.30643	0.43621	0.22264	0.07261
M24	0.10159	0.30385	0.06828	0.22378
M25	0.07923	0.62196	-0.14142	-0.04249
M26	0.31491	0.41957	0.05257	-0.20158
M27	0.26881	0.40634	0.23651	0.16141
M28	0.47067	-0.07717	0.40606	0.29001
M29	0.25295	0.19676	0.16057	0.31504
M30	0.40939	-0.03645	0.48107	0.07861
M31	0.07739	0.01690	0.47867	0.19337
M32	-0.13482	0.63325	-0.00681	-0.00064
M34	0.39455	0.34114	0.09460	0.40135
M35	0.55386	0.50344	0.10807	0.04677
M36	0.35650	0.01747	0.38151	0.27191
M37	0.28757	0.16408	0.50874	-0.35437
M38	0.34979	0.44169	0.21172	0.22509
M39	0.58681	0.25835	0.17691	0.02151
M40	0.20445	0.12329	0.42277	0.05201

Table 3 continued

Males - SELF Q-Sort Factor Loadings

Subject Number	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
M41	0.17887	0.24219	0.53446	0.03112
M42	0.62793	-0.04139	0.38267	0.21019
M43	0.66415	0.08407	0.20753	-0.44643
M44	0.69257	-0.00231	0.42302	-0.12517
M45	0.33951	0.31845	0.35631	0.36173
M46	0.23189	-0.10850	0.03522	0.64156
M47	0.35675	0.15355	0.08603	0.17412
M48	-0.16908	0.35437	0.20434	0.34946
M49	0.23259	-0.07423	0.34049	0.12912
M50	0.11746	-0.10310	0.62671	0.16423
M51	0.35583	0.11281	0.55259	-0.19320
M52	0.12951	0.42718	0.53212	-0.05511
M53	0.50197	0.02184	0.44336	0.06027
M54	0.46594	-0.07084	0.50240	0.06806
M55	0.61413	0.41110	0.11580	0.03052
M56	0.70493	0.05888	0.32125	0.18012
M57	0.46763	0.27683	0.19061	0.28194
M58	0.01047	0.59421	0.10783	0.39850
M59	0.43521	0.00257	0.41158	0.31158
M60	0.06560	0.05944	0.34150	0.62178
M61	0.50085	-0.00103	0.59149	0.21532
M62	0.31222	0.25639	0.22015	0.19744
M63	0.56538	0.29031	0.03219	0.24725
M64	0.36436	0.04070	0.62669	-0.39932
M65	0.40026	0.37740	0.51656	0.09628
M66	0.53008	0.28265	0.48753	0.09858
M67	-0.07041	0.42430	0.40874	0.23674
M68	0.01961	0.58219	0.15260	-0.17265
M69	0.24882	0.18808	0.65252	-0.15402
M70	-0.03565	0.07967	0.55491	0.25948
M71	0.24378	0.27803	0.53767	0.18475
M72	0.34726	0.09601	0.12662	0.06402
M73	0.61590	0.37172	0.33452	0.19630
M74	0.69072	-0.04329	0.28904	-0.10172
M75	0.38566	0.07152	0.41612	0.31602

Table 4
Females - MOST Q-Sort Factor Loadings

Subject Number	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3
F1	0.48105	0.33229	0.11563
F2	-0.38140	0.17540	0.43581
F3	0.41099	0.61729	0.04608
F4	0.45696	0.43535	0.11386
F5	0.53090	0.55285	0.01706
F6	0.60192	0.13926	0.10883
F7	0.49266	0.54430	-0.00116
F8	0.49175	0.51092	-0.19490
F9	-0.02815	0.23258	0.70195
F10	0.20495	0.68851	0.24398
F11	0.46358	0.66435	0.03061
F12	0.23788	0.20026	0.39470
F13	0.70836	0.41213	-0.12335
F14	0.62940	-0.02550	0.24980
F15	0.63952	0.10648	0.24380
F16	0.46784	0.38564	0.10551
F17	0.21837	0.33598	-0.23711
F18	-0.00442	0.39271	0.24482
F19	0.31989	0.28769	0.62329
F20	0.74970	0.11951	0.08167
F21	0.00918	-0.08474	0.50062
F22	0.56492	0.60234	0.13599
F23	0.32529	0.40679	0.35930
F24	0.61031	0.48798	0.06654
F25	0.40996	0.11783	-0.10441
F26	0.56733	0.34527	0.09252
F27	0.72519	0.13786	0.01943
F28	0.57188	0.25029	0.04734
F29	0.29151	0.69427	0.03315
F30	-0.03251	-0.04441	0.57519
F31	0.58661	0.57462	-0.03260
F33	0.40526	0.71357	0.18006
F34	0.07355	0.08885	0.44598
F35	0.71980	0.14579	0.22102
F36	0.41245	0.53988	0.25262
F37	0.16583	0.59945	0.31095
F38	0.57843	0.26158	0.41560
F39	0.14792	0.49826	0.14718
F40	0.14008	0.10054	0.48612

Table 4 continued
 Females - MOST Q-Sort Factor Loadings

Subject Number	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3
F41	0.06715	0.37387	0.15853
F42	-0.00536	0.64851	0.12454
F43	0.15538	0.20662	0.54538
F44	0.56611	0.34727	0.20113
F45	0.25430	0.57536	0.17205
F46	0.46922	0.48814	-0.02834
F47	0.08517	0.56548	-0.14880
F48	0.15530	0.52057	0.17440
F49	0.03184	0.58728	0.33174
F50	0.12586	0.16294	0.16954
F51	0.58806	0.20754	0.03204
F52	-0.19320	-0.27185	0.48106
F53	0.69537	0.01927	0.30882
F54	0.40789	0.61530	-0.29302
F55	0.47712	0.51670	0.23783
F56	0.18378	0.06297	0.23674
F57	0.56866	0.21624	0.31734
F58	0.72573	0.26140	0.19051
F59	0.64521	0.29505	0.24667
F60	0.11086	0.56757	0.12056
F61	0.56657	0.30007	0.18516
F62	0.64085	0.44230	0.07552
F63	0.61386	0.51512	0.11542
F64	0.21054	0.43744	0.00899
F65	0.14031	0.30621	0.52694
F66	0.63032	0.36258	0.13463
F67	0.56742	0.50484	-0.17542
F69	0.40375	-0.00091	0.49484
F70	0.42383	0.61126	-0.00646
F71	0.54134	0.13363	-0.22773
F74	0.09839	0.03619	0.45805
F75	0.55191	0.23636	0.21035

Table 5
Females - LEAST Q-Sort Factor Loadings

Subject Number	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
F1	0.04507	0.60808	0.17036	-0.03406
F2	0.48897	0.24758	0.36767	-0.25249
F3	0.22805	-0.39899	0.14273	0.09221
F4	0.01648	0.08972	0.62881	0.13525
F5	0.60453	0.01647	0.14294	0.10979
F6	0.42628	0.35438	0.44543	-0.12265
F7	-0.21210	-0.04177	0.47922	-0.24693
F8	0.09180	0.42782	0.16525	0.29674
F9	-0.19296	0.27902	0.33910	-0.33627
F10	0.70241	0.14482	0.09640	-0.10368
F11	0.22874	0.08303	0.33910	-0.13074
F12	0.01308	0.12924	0.07818	0.55328
F13	0.52968	0.14320	-0.19360	0.22587
F14	-0.01447	0.20712	0.24164	0.12328
F15	0.00329	-0.11746	0.00596	0.42996
F16	-0.06586	0.16180	-0.08196	0.50319
F17	0.01233	-0.11892	0.57695	0.30194
F18	0.00545	0.70572	0.00187	0.24200
F19	0.30242	-0.15089	-0.03158	0.16302
F20	0.35593	-0.14368	0.23961	0.13100
F21	-0.16357	0.29745	0.39879	0.31126
F22	-0.37765	0.06053	0.48589	-0.09461
F23	0.67315	-0.07904	0.00115	-0.07545
F24	0.37384	0.30677	0.04147	0.35648
F25	0.40785	-0.06347	-0.26486	0.50892
F26	0.14119	0.52370	0.28088	-0.22629
F27	-0.25710	0.28269	0.37901	0.20134
F28	0.05322	0.44623	0.43314	0.11951
F29	0.02804	0.08089	0.17942	-0.73579
F30	-0.11728	0.22488	0.59351	0.09474
F31	0.10425	0.11674	0.10732	0.59867
F33	0.68928	0.07643	0.23232	-0.31058
F34	0.33812	0.31048	0.15564	-0.16634
F35	-0.34301	-0.22859	0.50993	0.10850
F36	0.02551	0.08572	0.24419	0.03173
F37	0.53903	-0.17576	0.19693	0.02651
F38	0.26345	-0.23806	0.03428	0.40295
F39	0.14908	-0.06503	0.30839	-0.29087
F40	0.59240	0.21306	0.01511	0.03239

Table 5 continued
 Females - LEAST Q-Sort Factor Loadings

Subject Number	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
F41	0.05996	-0.15409	0.13351	0.31554
F42	0.04563	-0.21304	0.41689	0.31285
F43	-0.29968	0.34020	0.11175	0.29034
F44	0.55631	-0.27578	-0.09362	0.08483
F45	0.39275	-0.20532	0.20142	0.52678
F46	0.36052	-0.26179	0.34282	-0.12548
F47	0.27619	-0.43477	0.08736	-0.05546
F48	0.19019	-0.01032	0.17241	0.23687
F49	0.38517	-0.25569	-0.03767	0.03180
F50	0.12755	-0.48579	0.24900	0.25813
F51	0.16773	0.28475	-0.05887	0.09262
F52	0.18096	0.57819	0.01825	-0.22940
F53	0.56195	0.28453	-0.08499	0.47906
F54	0.05583	0.54469	-0.04021	0.14038
F55	-0.30011	0.37083	0.49546	0.03770
F56	0.47665	0.08073	0.03479	0.34874
F57	0.15557	-0.08696	0.55550	-0.07508
F58	0.54532	0.24121	-0.05494	0.13369
F59	-0.06647	-0.10447	0.52079	-0.14373
F60	0.70666	-0.01427	-0.15196	0.23213
F61	-0.03180	0.09348	-0.03916	0.57239
F62	-0.08772	0.45155	0.29015	0.07855
F63	0.54565	0.14132	-0.13016	0.03275
F64	0.50775	0.10959	-0.35986	-0.10210
F65	-0.02891	0.46277	-0.06827	-0.32220
F66	0.27432	0.08427	0.42473	-0.12549
F67	0.24805	0.42720	-0.06796	-0.18198
F69	0.27553	-0.02497	0.24909	0.19795
F70	0.39841	-0.19683	0.46789	0.16747
F71	0.46366	-0.31604	-0.08450	0.04356
F74	0.03405	0.28344	0.14433	0.24075
F75	0.32106	0.31813	0.37284	-0.13194

Table 6

Females - SELF Q-Sort Factor Loadings

Subject Number	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3
F1	0.53367	0.32387	0.10484
F2	0.24335	0.60209	0.33975
F3	0.46563	0.57482	-0.07258
F4	0.69524	-0.07522	0.05186
F5	0.26135	0.47950	0.19967
F6	0.55756	0.27045	0.13340
F7	0.45364	0.08111	0.57548
F8	0.52364	0.17738	0.26537
F9	0.38127	0.50054	0.13929
F10	0.44941	0.52356	-0.03878
F11	0.10931	0.40217	0.41882
F12	0.27717	0.52215	0.30373
F13	0.66119	0.43157	0.07317
F14	-0.16292	0.16868	0.62095
F15	0.09663	-0.03409	0.55782
F16	0.60133	0.21178	0.23505
F17	0.00476	0.18429	0.37104
F18	0.23170	0.41876	0.52862
F19	0.72029	0.07838	0.33973
F20	0.20615	-0.21947	0.68040
F21	0.12212	-0.05144	0.57184
F22	0.60339	0.29429	0.33727
F23	0.71357	0.10210	0.39106
F24	0.55066	0.23004	0.42669
F25	0.52051	0.21722	0.19848
F26	0.15493	0.16267	0.45405
F27	0.18299	0.16576	0.51328
F28	0.39958	0.28212	0.45438
F29	0.60911	0.36539	0.19593
F30	0.59769	0.15098	0.06349
F31	0.67117	0.41915	0.07731
F33	0.46528	0.53871	0.25232
F34	0.19662	0.39677	0.51595
F35	0.35458	0.34867	0.44555
F36	0.54155	0.19158	0.21668
F37	0.20817	0.38668	0.12245
F38	0.37456	0.11616	0.41925
F39	0.19790	0.21333	0.34960
F40	0.46886	0.39135	0.17693

Table 6 continued
 Females - SELF Q-Sort Factor Loadings

Subject Number	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3
F41	-0.05928	0.42592	0.42173
F42	0.40805	0.44625	-0.12408
F43	0.40601	0.13570	0.47797
F44	0.34137	0.27216	0.51609
F45	0.50786	0.58087	0.14183
F46	0.53669	0.28741	0.30298
F47	0.20420	0.55906	0.11701
F48	-0.05635	0.61281	0.07125
F49	0.39922	0.30811	-0.00413
F50	0.19919	0.39344	0.05185
F51	0.11439	0.53392	0.33530
F52	0.46531	0.37437	0.30773
F53	0.37786	0.63164	0.25768
F54	0.71916	0.37285	-0.05344
F55	0.39070	0.52634	0.23431
F56	0.03295	0.48137	0.30702
F57	0.61818	0.18360	0.38076
F58	0.37857	0.28204	0.42066
F59	0.66071	0.44187	0.17279
F60	0.55642	0.31088	0.27552
F61	0.45941	0.17746	0.38322
F62	0.65819	0.43105	0.06323
F63	0.15808	0.67326	0.04196
F64	0.65687	-0.00034	0.20780
F65	0.37901	0.36925	0.49201
F66	0.48703	0.38118	0.06055
F67	0.36430	0.00776	0.65917
F69	-0.02930	0.18736	0.72226
F70	0.31065	0.40005	0.54167
F71	0.41159	0.14957	0.30917
F74	0.24862	0.45234	0.33132
F75	0.57927	0.01211	0.40837

Table 7

Name of, % of Variance Accounted for by, and
Number of People Assigned to each Q-Sort Factor

	Factor	MOST	LEAST	SELF
Males				
	1	Ideal 21% 38	Ideal 13% 22	Father-figure 18% 27
	2	Vulnerable 11% 17	Mother-figure 9% 16	Neurotic 8% 12
	3.	Extrovert 10% 13	Narcissist 9% 14	Extrovert 13% 21
	4.		Anti-social 9% 13	Arrogant 6% 5
Females				
	1.	Ideal 20% 29	Ideal 12% 23	Liberated 19% 28
	2.	Extrovert 17% 27	Narcissist 8% 13	Mother-figure 13% 17
	3.	Vulnerable 8% 15	Anti-social 8% 21	Neurotic 13% 22
	4.		Mother-figure 7% 10	

Table 8
Male Most Types

Factor	Characteristic Items	Uncharacteristic Items
1. Ideal, principled intellectual.	96. Autonomous. 8. Intellectual capacity. 70. Ethical. 56. Responds to humor. 33. Calm.	78. Self-pitying. 45. Brittle ego-defense. 68. Anxious. 36. Negativistic. 55. Self-defeating. 50. Unpredictable.
2. Vulnerable, nurturant.	68. Anxious. 35. Warm. 2. Dependable 19. Seeks reassurance. 17. Sympathetic. 5. Giving.	37. Deceitful. 91. Power oriented. 27. Condescending. 48. Distant. 65. Pushes limits. 62. Rebellious.
3. Extrovert.	52. Assertive. 71. High aspiration level. 81. Good-looking. 82. Moody. 4. Talkative	14. Submissive. 97. Emotionally bland. 90. Philosophical. 100. Does not vary roles. 25. Over-controlled. 39. Unusual thinking.

Table 9
Male Least Types

Factor	Characteristic Items	Uncharacteristic Items
1. Ideal.	2. Dependable. 26. Productive. 8. Intellectual capacity. 18. Initiates humor. 56. Responds to humor. 28. Arouses liking.	78. Self-pitying. 45. Brittle ego-defense. 40. Fearful. 14. Submissive. 37. Deceitful.
2. Motherfigure.	41. Moralistic. 7. Conservative. 5. Giving. 68. Anxious. 2. Dependable. 9. Uncomfortable with uncertainty. 70. Ethical. 11. Protective of those close.	62. Rebellious. 37. Deceitful. 65. Pushes limits. 99. Self-dramatizing. 94. Hostile feelings.
3. Narcissist.	80. Interested in members of opposite sex. 56. Responds to humor. 54. Gregarious. 4. Talkative. 67. Self-indulgent. 65. Pushes limits.	29. Turned to for advice. 90. Philosophical. 83. Sees to heart of problems. 25. Over-controlled. 6. Fastidious. 51. Values intellectual matters. 60. Self-insight.
4. Anti-social, Arrogant.	1. Critical, skeptical. 91. Power-oriented. 24. "Objective". 27. Condescending. 71. High aspiration level. 8. Intellectual capacity. 12. Self-defensive. 95. Gives advice.	14. Submissive. 5. Giving. 17. Sympathetic. 28. Arouses liking. 88. Charming. 15. Skilled in play, pretending. 21. Arouses nurturant feelings. 35. Warm.

Table 10
Male Self Types

Factor	Characteristic Items	Uncharacteristic Items
1. Father-figure.	90. Philosophical. 70. Ethical. 66. Esthetic. 96. Autonomous. 75. Consistent personality. 83. Sees to heart of problems.	37. Deceitful. 50. Unpredictable. 78. Self-pitying. 38. Hostile.
2. Neurotic.	46. Daydreams. 72. Concerned with own adequacy. 82. Moody. 16. Introspective.	100. Does not vary roles. 75. Consistent personality. 74. Satisfied with self. 41. Moralistic.
3. Extrovert.	4. Talkative. 80. Interested in females. 35. Warm. 18. Initiates humor. 54. Gregarious.	90. Philosophical. 66. Esthetical. 10. Bodily symptoms when anxious. 97. Emotionally bland.
4. Arrogant.	24. "Objective". 71. High aspiration level. 1. Critical, skeptical. 79. Ruminates. 96. Autonomous. 49. Distrustful of people.	30. Gives up. 99. Self-dramatizing. 15. Skilled in play, pretending. 17. Sympathetic. 64. Socially perceptive. 5. Giving. 84. Cheerful. 28. Arouses liking.

Table 11
Female Most Types

Factor	Characteristic Items	Uncharacteristic Items
1. Ideal, principled intellectual.	90. Philosophical 66. Esthetical. 51. Values intellectual matters. 8. Intellectual capacity. 17. Sympathetic. 35. Warm. 5. Giving. 70. Ethical.	37. Deceitful. 65. Pushes limits. 63. Conventional. 97. Emotionally bland. 61. Exploits dependency. 73. Perceives contexts in sexual terms. 27. Condescending.
2. Extrovert.	18. Initiates humor. 4. Talkative. 52. Assertive. 58. Sensuous. 20. Acts quickly. 80. Interested in members of opposite sex.	90. Philosophical. 66. Esthetical. 40. Fearful. 22. Lack of personal meaning in life. 47. Feels guilty. 55. Self-defeating. 30. Gives up. 78. Self-pitying.
3. Vulnerable, neurotic.	19. Seeks reassurance. 68. Anxious. 9. Uncomfortable with uncertainty. 82. Moody. 80. Interested in members of opposite sex. 47. Feels guilty. 35. Warm. 79. Ruminates.	97. Emotionally bland. 71. High aspiration level. 94. Expresses hostile feelings directly. 26. Productive. 37. Deceitful.

Table 12
Female Least Types

Factor	Characteristic Items	Uncharacteristic Items
1. Ideal.	26. Productive. 8. Intellectual capacity. 51. Values intellectual matters. 2. Dependable. 71. High aspiration level.	37. Deceitful. 73. Perceives contexts in sexual terms. 36. Negativistic. 78. Self-pitying. 30. Gives up. 55. Self-defeating.
2. Narcissist.	80. Interested in members of opposite sex. 37. Deceitful. 65. Pushes limits. 31. Regards self as physically attractive. 67. Self-indulgent. 52. Assertive.	14. Submissive. 78. Self-pitying. 25. Over-controlled. 47. Feels guilty. 79. Ruminates.
3. Anti-social.	34. Irritable. 12. Self-defensive. 82. Moody. 41. Moralistic.	33. Calm. 21. Arouses nurturant feelings. 60. Self-insight. 29. Turned to for advice. 35. Warm. 17. Sympathetic. 15. Skilled in play, pretending. 73. Perceives contexts in sexual terms. 14. Submissive.
4. Mother-figure.	19. Seeks reassurance. 35. Warm. 63. Conventional. 5. Giving.	8. Intellectual capacity. 97. Emotionally bland. 51. Values intellectual matters. 62. Rebellious. 90. Philosophical.

Table 13
Female Self Types

Factor	Characteristic Items	Uncharacteristic Items
1. Liberated Woman.	52. Assertive. 96. Autonomous. 60. Self-insight. 71. High aspiration level.	55. Self-defeating. 30. Gives up. 40. Fearful. 19. Seeks reassurance. 36. Negativistic. 63. Conventional. 68. Anxious. 78. Self-pitying. 45. Brittle ego-defense. 13. Thinskinned. 41. Moralistic.
2. Motherfigure.	2. Dependable. 5. Giving. 11. Protective of those close. 17. Sympathetic. 19. Seeks reassurance. 35. Warm.	52. Assertive. 62. Rebellious. 37. Deceitful. 61. Exploits dependency. 90. Philosophical. 94. Expresses hostile feelings directly. 65. Pushes limits.
3. Neurotic.	68. Anxious. 47. Feels guilty. 19. Seeks reassurance.	97. Emotionally bland. 100. Does not vary roles. 74. Satisfied with self.

Table 14
Males - MOST/SELF Types Contingencies

SELF	MOST			Total
	1. Ideal	2. Vulnerable	3. Extrovert	
1. Father-figure	19	6	4	29
2. Neurotic	5	4	3	12
3. Extrovert	11	6	5	22
4. Arrogant	3	1	1	5
Total	38	17	13	68

Chi square for association = 2.51062 df=6 p=.8673

Table 15
Males - LEAST/SELF Types Contingencies

SELF	LEAST				Total
	1. Ideal	2. Motherfigure	3. Narcissist	4. Anti-social	
1. Ideal	9	4	10	4	27
2. Neurotic	5	3	3	1	12
3. Extrovert	8	7	1	5	21
4. Arrogant	0	2	0	3	5
Total	22	16	14	13	65

Chi square for association = 16.43771 df=9 p=.0583

Table 16
Females - MOST/SELF Types Contingencies

SELF	MOST			Total
	1. Ideal	2. Extrovert	3. Vulnerable	
1. Liberated	15	10	4	29
2. Motherfigure	3	11	6	20
3. Neurotic	11	6	5	22
Total	29	27	15	71

Chi square for association = 8.35274 df=4 p=.0795

Table 17
Females - LEAST/SELF Types Contingencies

SELF	LEAST				Total
	1. Ideal	2. Narcissist	3. Anti-social	4. Motherfigure	
1. Liberated	10	5	9	4	28
2. Motherfigure	8	2	3	4	17
3. Neurotic	5	6	9	2	22
Total	23	13	21	10	67

Chi square for association = 5.94669 df=6 p=.4292

Table 18

Males - Self-Disclosure Inventory Means

Item	Most	SD	Least	SD	Sum	SD	Diff.	SD
1	1.54	.58	.30	.49	1.84	.80	1.23	.73
2	1.51	.68	.80	.72	2.30	1.06	.71	.91
3	1.45	.72	.77	.83	2.22	1.25	.68	.92
4	1.35	.64	.28	.45	1.62	.87	1.07	.67
5	1.55	.56	.87	.64	2.42	.93	.68	.76
6	.65	.70	.17	.42	.83	.94	.48	.68
7	1.49	.59	.46	.61	1.96	.93	1.03	.75
8	1.43	.74	.72	.77	2.16	1.22	.71	.88
9	.97	.86	.33	.56	1.30	1.17	.64	.86
10	.91	.74	.52	.70	1.43	1.14	.39	.88
11	1.28	.71	.68	.72	1.96	1.16	.59	.83
12	.74	.74	.14	.39	.88	.98	.59	.67
13	1.14	.77	.38	.57	1.52	1.04	.77	.88
14	1.58	.65	.87	.78	2.45	1.11	.71	.93
15	1.12	.74	.43	.53	1.55	1.01	.68	.80
16	.94	.75	.49	.68	1.43	1.19	.44	.78
17	1.03	.80	.51	.74	1.53	1.37	.52	.72
18	1.26	.74	.19	.49	1.45	.90	1.07	.88
19	1.20	.61	.32	.47	1.52	.76	.88	.78
20	.81	.83	.07	.26	.88	.88	.74	.85
21	1.54	.56	.93	.65	2.46	1.04	.61	.62
22	1.70	.55	1.10	.62	2.80	.95	.59	.69
23	1.58	.55	.84	.78	2.42	1.06	.74	.83
24	1.86	.39	1.41	.71	3.26	.93	.45	.68
25	1.03	.79	.57	.70	1.59	1.25	.46	.80
26	1.74	.56	.75	.67	2.49	.99	.99	.74
27	1.36	.66	.83	.62	2.19	1.07	.54	.70
28	1.72	.54	1.33	.66	3.06	.92	.39	.77
29	1.77	.46	1.51	.70	3.28	.97	.26	.68
30	.83	.84	.20	.44	1.03	1.07	.62	.81
31	1.64	.59	1.13	.66	2.77	1.07	.51	.66
32	1.29	.71	1.03	.80	2.32	1.19	.26	.93
33	.84	.80	.36	.57	1.20	1.12	.48	.82
34	1.62	.55	.91	.61	2.54	.96	.71	.64
35	1.62	.52	1.04	.58	2.67	.85	.58	.70
36	1.07	.79	.17	.42	1.25	.96	.90	.83
37	1.70	.52	1.03	.64	2.72	.92	.67	.72
38	.72	.84	.55	.78	1.28	1.20	.17	1.08
39	1.39	.57	.86	.65	2.25	.98	.54	.74
Total	50.97		25.87		76.84		25.10	

Table 19

Females - Self-Disclosure Inventory Means

Item	Most	SD	Least	SD	Sum	SD	Diff.	SD
1	1.58	.60	.28	.51	1.86	.76	1.30	.82
2	1.44	.71	.58	.71	2.01	1.05	.86	.96
3	1.56	.65	1.24	.75	2.80	1.09	.32	.88
4	1.49	.69	.20	.44	1.69	.90	1.30	.73
5	1.68	.53	.92	.65	2.59	.92	.76	.75
6	1.07	.76	.37	.64	1.44	1.04	.70	.95
7	1.70	.49	.51	.61	2.21	.89	1.20	.65
8	1.65	.64	1.21	.81	2.86	1.16	.44	.87
9	.96	.87	.30	.57	1.25	1.02	.66	1.06
10	.77	.74	.56	.75	1.34	1.30	.21	.74
11	1.46	.69	.96	.78	2.42	1.23	.51	.83
12	1.31	.77	.65	.78	1.96	1.28	.66	.86
13	1.46	.73	.45	.73	1.92	1.20	1.01	.84
14	1.35	.76	.79	.79	2.14	1.31	.56	.82
15	1.30	.68	.41	.65	1.70	1.09	.89	.77
16	1.28	.83	.62	.70	1.90	1.23	.66	.93
17	1.30	.82	.80	.84	2.10	1.40	.49	.89
18	1.35	.78	.11	.32	1.46	.88	1.24	.80
19	1.27	.72	.27	.48	1.54	.94	1.00	.78
20	1.27	.84	.21	.45	1.48	1.04	1.06	.86
21	1.45	.67	.66	.63	2.11	1.02	.79	.81
22	1.82	.46	.99	.75	2.80	.89	.83	.86
23	1.75	.47	.93	.76	2.68	1.03	.82	.74
24	1.83	.38	1.24	.64	3.07	.87	.59	.60
25	1.08	.82	.69	.73	1.77	1.35	.39	.77
26	1.76	.49	.72	.70	2.48	.98	1.04	.71
27	1.54	.61	.72	.66	2.25	.98	.82	.80
28	1.83	.45	1.30	.74	3.13	1.01	.54	.69
29	1.68	.56	1.13	.68	2.80	1.06	.55	.63
30	.89	.89	.13	.34	1.01	1.05	.76	.84
31	1.65	.56	.94	.75	2.59	1.06	.70	.80
32	1.32	.67	1.31	.75	2.63	1.10	.01	.90
33	1.17	.79	.35	.64	1.52	1.11	.82	.92
34	1.59	.60	.76	.73	2.35	1.07	.83	.79
35	1.96	.20	1.10	.61	3.06	.63	.86	.66
36	1.10	.86	.10	.38	1.20	.97	1.00	.93
37	1.80	.44	1.07	.72	2.87	.97	.73	.70
38	.82	.83	.70	.78	1.52	1.18	.11	1.10
39	1.52	.65	.92	.71	2.44	1.01	.61	.92
Total	55.80		27.17		82.97		28.63	

Table 20
T-Tests between Males and Females on Self-Disclosure Scores

	Mean	Standard Deviation	T value	2-tail Prob.
MOST				
Males	50.97	10.76		
Females	55.80	9.93	-2.76	0.007
LEAST				
Males	25.87	9.98		
Females	27.17	9.45	-0.79	0.430

Table 21
MALES - Target Sex Contingencies

MOST	LEAST		Total
	Male	Female	
Males	19	9	28
Females	35	6	41
Total	54	15	69

Chi square for association = 2.05708 df=1 p=.1515

Chi square for marginal homogeneity = 3.7 p < .0005

Chi square for MOST marginal = -1.44 p < .08

Chi square for LEAST marginal = 4.57 p < .000005

Table 22
Females - Target Sex Contingencies

MOST	LEAST		Total
	Male	Female	
Male	14	17	31
Female	17	23	40
Total	31	40	71

Chi square for association = 0.00029 df=1 p=.9864

Table 23
Males - Target Relationship Contingencies

MOST	LEAST				Total
	Family	Opposite Sex Friend	Same Sex Friend	Work	
Family	4	0	3	0	7
Opposite Sex Friend	9	3	20	4	36
Same Sex Friend	11	2	11	2	26
Work	0	0	0	0	0
Total	24	5	34	6	69

Chi square for association = 4.47624 df=6 p=.6125

Chi square for marginal homogeneity = 32.94 df=3 p < .001

Table 24
Females - Target Relationship Contingencies

MOST	LEAST			Total
	Family	Opposite Sex Friend	Same Sex Friend	
Family	3	2	2	7
Opposite Sex Friend	18	5	7	30
Same Sex Friend	21	3	10	34
Total	42	10	19	71

Chi square for association = 2.43986 df=4 p=.6464

Chi square for marginal homogeneity = 29.16 df=2 p<.001

Table 25
Males - MOST Types and Relationship Contingencies

MOST	RELATIONSHIP			Total
	Family	Opposite Sex Friend	Same Sex Friend	
1. Ideal	3	18	17	38
2. Vulnerable	3	12	2	17
3. Extrovert	1	6	6	13
Total	7	36	25	68

Chi square for association = 9.66887 df=6 p=.1393

Table 26

Males - LEAST Types and Relationship Contingencies

LEAST	RELATIONSHIP				Total
	Family	Opposite Sex Friend	Same Sex Friend	Work	
1. Ideal	9	1	11	1	22
2. Motherfigure	8	1	6	1	16
3. Narcissist	2	3	7	2	14
4. Anti-social	4	0	8	1	13
Total	23	5	32	5	65

Chi square for association = 9.72501 df=9 p=.3732

Table 27
Females - MOST Types and Relationship Contingencies

MOST	RELATIONSHIP			Total
	Family	Opposite Sex Friend	Same Sex Friend	
1. Ideal	4	8	17	29
2. Extrovert	1	18	8	27
3. Vulnerable	2	4	9	15
Total	7	30	34	71

Chi square for association = 10.86062 df=4 p=.0282

Table 28

Females - LEAST Types and Relationship Contingencies

LEAST	RELATIONSHIP			Total
	Family	Opposite Sex Friend	Same Sex Friend	
1. Ideal	13	3	7	23
2. Narcissist	5	3	5	13
3. Anti-social	16	3	2	21
4. Motherfigure	5	0	5	10
Total	39	9	19	67

Chi square for association = 9.20321 df=6 p=.1625

Table 29
Q-Sort Correlations between High and Low Disclosers

Groups	Most	Least	Self
Males			
-Discrimination	.93	.73	.93
Discloser	.93	.53	.92
Females			
Discrimination	.94	.68	.96
Discloser	.94	.62	.94

APPENDIX A: The BEM Q-Sort Items

6

THE BEM-MODIFIED BLOCK Q-SORT ITEMS

1. Is critical, skeptical, not easily impressed.
2. Is a genuinely dependable and responsible person.
3. Has a wide range of interests.
Regardless of how deep or superficial the interests may be.
4. Is a talkative individual.
5. Behaves in a giving way toward others.
Regardless of the motivation involved.
6. Is fastidious.
(A perfectionist, fussy about minor things.)
7. Favors conservative values in a variety of areas.
(Favors preserving traditional practices, values, and conditions.)
8. Appears to have a high degree of intellectual capacity.
This item refers to capability, not necessarily performance.
Also, originality is not assumed.
9. Is uncomfortable with uncertainty and complexities.
10. Anxiety and tension find outlet in bodily symptoms.
Low Placement implies that the body does not react at all to stress (e.g., person does not perspire, shake or have other bodily signs of nervousness.) High placement implies bodily dysfunction or physical illness caused by stress.
11. Is protective of those close to him or her.
Low Placement implies person acts in under-protective, unconcerned manner. Medium Placement implies appropriate degree of concern. High Placement implies over-protective.
12. Tends to be self-defensive.
(Quick to protect or defend self from criticism; tends to deny criticism; humorless about own shortcomings.)
13. Is thin-skinned; sensitive to anything that can be construed as criticism or an interpersonal slight (e.g. rudeness or insult).
14. Genuinely submissive; accepts domination comfortably.

15. Is skilled in social techniques of imaginative play, pretending, and humor. (E.g., would be good at charades.)
16. Is introspective and concerned with self as an object. (Thinks about self; examines own thoughts and feelings.) Does not necessarily imply insight or mean that person understands self well, however.
17. Behaves in a sympathetic or considerate manner.
18. Initiates humor. (E.g., makes jokes or tells humorous stories.)
19. Seeks reassurance from others.
20. Has a rapid personal tempo; behaves and acts quickly.
21. Arouses nurturant feelings in others. (Others like to take care of and protect; causes others to feel motherly or fatherly toward him/her.)
22. Feels a lack of personal meaning in life.
23. Extrapunitive; tends to transfer or project blame. (Tends to blame others for own failures or faults.)
24. Prides self on being "objective," rational.
25. Tends toward over-control of needs and impulses; binds tensions excessively; delays gratification unnecessarily. (Holds everything in; keeps a tight rein on his or her emotions; postpones pleasure unnecessarily.)
26. Is productive; gets things done.
27. Shows condescending behavior in relations with others. (Acts as if self is superior to others.)
Low Placement implies only absence of acting superior, not necessarily acting as if all people are equal or that self is actually inferior to others.
28. Tends to arouse liking and acceptance in people.
29. Is turned to for advice and reassurance.
30. Gives up and withdraws where possible in the face of frustration and adversity.
Low Placement implies person tries even harder when obstacles appear. High Placement implies generally defeatist, gives up easily.

31. Regards self as physically attractive.
32. Seems to be aware of the impression he or she makes on others.
33. Is calm, relaxed in manner.
34. Over-reactive to minor frustrations; irritable.
35. Has warmth; has the capacity for close relationships; compassionate.
36. Is subtly negativistic; tends to undermine and obstruct or sabotage.
37. Is guileful and deceitful, manipulative, opportunistic.
(Exploits and takes advantage of people and situations.)
38. Has hostility towards others.
Feelings of hostility are intended here, regardless of how or whether they are actually expressed.
39. Thinks and associates ideas in unusual ways; has unconventional thought processes.
40. Is vulnerable to real or fancied threat; generally fearful.
41. Is moralistic.
(Judges self and others strongly in terms of right and wrong.)
Regardless of the particular nature of the moral code.
42. Reluctant to commit self to any definite course of action; tends to delay or avoid action.
43. Is facially and/or gesturally expressive.
44. Evaluates the motivation of others in interpreting situations.
(Tries to figure out the intentions behind other people's actions.)
Accuracy of evaluation not assumed.
Low Placement implies insensitivity to intentions of others.
High Placement implies preoccupation or over-concern with intentions of others.
45. Has a brittle ego-defense system; has a small reserve of integration; would be disorganized and maladaptive when under stress or trauma.
(Does not cope well, when under stress or strain.)

46. Engages in personal fantasy and daydreams, fictional speculations.
47. Has a readiness to feel guilt.
Feelings of guilt are intended here, regardless of how or whether they are actually expressed.
48. Keeps people at a distance; avoids close interpersonal relationships.
49. Is basically distrustful of people in general; questions their motivations.
50. Is unpredictable and changeable in behavior and attitudes.
51. Genuinely values intellectual and cognitive matter.
Ability or achievement is not implied here.
52. Behaves in an assertive fashion.
(Speaks up to get what he or she wants; not afraid to express opinions.)
This refers to how the person acts, not how he or she might feel while doing so.
53. Various needs tend toward relatively direct and uncontrolled expression. Unable to delay gratification.
(Has little self-control; expresses emotions impulsively; unable to postpone pleasure.)
54. Emphasizes being with others; gregarious.
(Characteristically prefers to be with others rather than alone).
55. Is self-defeating.
(Acts in ways which undermine, sabotage, or frustrate his or her own goals and desires.)
56. Responds to humor.
(Appreciates humor.)
57. Is an interesting, arresting person.
58. Enjoys sensuous experiences - including touch, taste, smell, physical contact.
59. Is concerned with own body and the adequacy of its physiological functioning.
60. Has insight into own motives and behavior.
(Knows and understands self well.)

61. Creates and exploits dependency in people.
(Causes others to be dependent and then takes advantage of this dependency.) Regardless of how this is done, e.g. by punishing them, spoiling them, etc. Low Placement implies person respects and encourages independence and individuality of others.
62. Tends to be rebellious and non-conforming.
63. Judges self and others in conventional terms like "popularity," "the correct thing to do," social pressures, etc.
64. Is socially perceptive of a wide range of interpersonal cues.
(Is alert to clues which reveal how others are thinking or feeling.)
65. Characteristically pushes and tries to stretch limits; sees what he/she can get away with.
66. Enjoys esthetic impressions; is esthetically reactive.
(E.g., appreciates or is moved by works of art, beautiful music, drama, etc.)
67. Is self-indulgent.
(Reluctant to deny self pleasure; tends to spoil self with pleasurable activities.)
68. Is basically anxious.
(Nervous, worries a lot underneath.)
69. Is sensitive to anything that can be construed as a demand.
This refers only to being alert to or aware of demands, regardless of how or whether the person responds to them.
70. Behaves in an ethically consistent manner; is consistent with own personal standards.
71. Has high aspiration level for self.
(Ambitious; sets very high goals for self.)
72. Concerned with own adequacy as a person, either at conscious or unconscious levels.
(Worries about being inadequate as a person. Can be true even if person seems self-satisfied on the surface.)
73. Tends to perceive many different contexts in sexual terms; eroticizes situations.
(Sees sexual overtones in most interactions.)
74. Is subjectively unaware of self-concern; feels satisfied with self.

75. Has a clear-cut, internally consistent personality.
76. Tends to project his/her own feelings and motivations onto others.
(Tends to see feelings and motives in others which he/she prefers not to recognize in self.)
77. Appears straightforward, forthright, candid in dealing with others.
78. Feels cheated and victimized by life; self-pitying.
79. Tends to ruminate and have persistent, pre-occupying thoughts.
(Ruminate: To think about or mull over in one's mind.)
80. Interested in members of the opposite sex.
Low Placement implies only absence of such interest, not dislike of the opposite sex or homosexual interest.
81. Is physically attractive; good-looking.
The culture's definition of physical attractiveness is to be applied here.
82. Has fluctuating moods.
83. Able to see to the heart of important problems.
84. Is cheerful.
Low Placement implies unhappiness or depression.
85. Emphasizes communication through action and non-verbal behavior.
(Prefers to express self through deeds, actions, or non-verbal communication, rather than through talking.)
86. Handles anxiety and conflict by, in effect, refusing to recognize their presence; repressive or dissociative tendencies.
(Tends to deny unpleasant thoughts, conflicts or feeling; prefers to believe they don't exist.)
87. Interprets basically simple and clear-cut situations in complicated and particularizing (i.e. detailed) ways.
88. Is personally charming.
89. Compares self to others. Is alert to real or fancied differences between self and other people.
90. Is concerned with philosophical problems; e.g. religions, values, the meaning of life, etc.

91. Is power oriented; values power in self and others.
92. Has social poise and presence; appears socially at ease.
- 93a. Behaves in a masculine style and manner.
The culture's definition of masculinity is to be applied here.
If person is female, use 93b.
- 93b. Behaves in a feminine style and manner.
The culture's definition of femininity is to be applied here.
If person is male, use 93a.
94. Expresses hostile feelings directly.
95. Tends to proffer advice.
(Proffer: Offer or give.)
96. Values own independence and autonomy.
(Autonomy: Freedom to act and think without help or interference from others.)
97. Is emotionally bland; has flattened affect.
(Tends not to experience strong or intense emotions.)
98. Is verbally fluent; can express ideas well.
99. Is self-dramatizing; histrionic.
(Theatrical; exaggerates emotion.)
100. Does not vary roles; relates to everyone in the same way.

APPENDIX B: Self-Disclosure Inventory

Self-Disclosure Inventory

Subject Number: _____ Sex: _____ Age: _____

Person you disclose to the MOST about your personal life

Sex: _____ Age: _____ Relationship: _____ Time known: _____

1. My sex life.
 2. My feelings about borrowing money from a buddy.
 3. How much religious training I had as a child.
 4. Persons with whom I have had sexual experiences.
 5. My pet peeves.
 6. What kind of furniture I would like to have after I get married.
 7. Weaknesses that I feel I have in my personality.
 8. The religious denomination to which I belong.
 9. Whether or not I ever lied to my boss.
 10. Which I feel is more important - domestic or foreign policies.
 11. How I feel about girls' new fashion styles.
 12. The kind of wedding I want to have.
 13. Whom I like better, my father or my mother.
 14. My total financial worth, including property, savings, insurance, etc.
 15. Whether or not I have ever let down a friend.
 16. What animals make me nervous.
 17. My favorite colour.
 18. How I feel about a person after having had sexual relations with him/her.
 19. The things in my past or present life about which I am most ashamed.
 20. The parts of my body I am most ashamed for anyone to see.
 21. Dangerous things I have done.
 22. Whether I am a "listener" or a "talker" in social conversations.
 23. The way I behave when I am around my parents.
 24. My favorite subjects in school.
 25. The number of colds I usually have per year.
 26. The kind of person I would like to date.
 27. How strong I am.
 28. The most recent trip I have taken.
 29. My favorite sports.
 30. Things that I would not want people to find out about me if I ever ran for a political office.
 31. Whether or not I like to tell amusing jokes and stories.
 32. Where my aunts, uncles, cousins live.
 33. Times it would be all right to go against my religious beliefs.
 34. The extent to which I am the kind of person who puts things off.
 35. Things that anger me.
 36. How frequently I would want to engage in sex with my spouse.
 37. My feelings about people who are not of the same race that I am.
 38. The amount of money I received for allowance when I was a child.
 39. Things I had trouble with in school.
-

APPENDIX C: Self-Disclosure Inventory Items Arranged by Area

Self-Disclosure Inventory Items Arranged by Area

Area	Items	Intimacy
1. Religion.	33	H
	3	M
	8	L
2. Own Marriage and Family.	36	H
	12	M
	6	L
3. Love, Dating, Sex.	1	H
	4	H
	18	H
	26	M
4. Parental Family.	13	H
	23	M
	32	L
5. Physical Condition and Appearance.	20	H
	27	M
	25	L
6. Money, Property.	14	H
	2	M
	38	L
7. Government and Politics, Current Events and Social Issues.	30	H
	37	M
	10	L
8. Emotions, Feelings.	19	H
	35	M
	16	L
9. Interests, Hobbies, Habits.	21	M
	29	L
	28	L
10. Relationships with Other People.	15	H
	22	M
	31	L

Self-Disclosure Inventory Items Arranged by Area (Con't.)

Area	Items	Intimacy
11. Personal Attitudes, Values, Ethics and Self-Evaluation.	7	H
	34	M
	11	L
12. School; Work.	9	H
	39	M
	24	L
13. Biographical Characteristics.	5	M
	17	L

APPENDIX D: Instructions - Part One

Instructions - Part One

You are taking part in a study on self-disclosure, that is, verbal communication of personal and intimate information about oneself, e.g. thoughts, feelings, experiences.

Step 1

Among all the people you know well enough to describe the personality of, please select:

- a) the person you disclose to the MOST about your personal life.
- b) the person you disclose to the LEAST about your personal life.

On the piece of paper given you, please write down these two persons' first names, sex, age, relationship to you (e.g. friend, teacher, mother, father, etc.), and how long you have known them.

Step 2

You have been given a set of 100 descriptive personality statements typed on individual cards. Please sort the cards to describe the personality of the person you disclose to the MOST about your personal life. The attached instruction sheets will tell you how to proceed.

Step 3

In the same manner please sort the same 100 cards to describe the personality of the person you disclose to the LEAST about your personal life.

Step 4

In the same manner please sort the same cards to describe your own personality.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR
THE Q-SORT PERSONALITY DESCRIPTION

The Q-Sort Deck

The Q-sort is a set of 100 descriptive personality statements typed on individual cards. To describe an individual's personality, the "sorter" arranges the cards into groups ranging from statements which are least characteristic to statements which are most characteristic of the individual being described. The Q-sort is not a personality test; there is no "score" which the person receives. Rather, the Q-sort provides a systematic way of comparing different personalities with one another.

The Q-Sort Items

The Q-sort statements or items were originally written to be sorted by professional psychologists and psychiatrists. We have found, however, that people without professional training can sort them quite well if some of the specialized vocabulary is explained or clarified. Many items state the same basic idea in several ways so that if a particular phrase or word is not clear, the meaning of the item can still be grasped from one of the alternative phrases. In some cases, additional rewordings or explanations have been placed in parentheses to further clarify the meaning of the item.

Example

99. Is self-dramatizing; histrionic.

(Theatrical; exaggerates emotion.)

Other items contain explanations in the lower half of the card which clarify ambiguities or explain what the item would mean if it were placed at the low or uncharacteristic end of the sort.

Example

80. Interested in members of the
opposite sex.

Low Placement implies only absence
of such interest, not dislike of the
opposite sex or homosexual interest.

The Q-Sort Task

Q-sorting is not easy, particularly the first time when the items are still unfamiliar. On the other hand, most people find the task rather enjoyable and report that they learn a lot by doing it. The first Q-sort takes about 40 minutes to complete; subsequent Q-sorts go much faster, averaging 30 minutes or less for most sorters.

The value of the Q-sort method naturally depends upon the willingness of the sorter to give a thoughtful, candid, and accurate description, avoiding the temptation to present an overly favorable (or unfavorable) picture of the person being described. Saints and angels can perhaps be described by placing only favorable items at the characteristic end of the scale and only unfavorable items at the uncharacteristic end; real people cannot be. Remember, Q-sorts are not tests; we do not score them for "saintliness." What we need are honest and accurate descriptions of real people.

The Q-Sort Procedure

A completed Q-sort has 9 groups or categories arranged from left to right, as shown below. The higher the category number, the more characteristic the items in that category are of the person being described. Thus Category 1 on the far left contains the 5 items MOST UNCHARACTERISTIC of the person; Category 5 in the middle contains 18 items NEITHER CHARACTERISTIC NOR UNCHARACTERISTIC; and Category 9 on the far right contains the 5 items MOST CHARACTERISTIC of the person. Each category must contain exactly the number of cards designated.

CATEGORY								
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5	8	12	16	18	16	12	8	5
cards	cards	cards	cards	cards	cards	cards	cards	cards
MOST UNCHARACTERISTIC								MOST CHARACTERISTIC

Although you may proceed in any way you find most comfortable, many people find it easiest to proceed as follows:

- Sort the cards into three piles. Place items that seem uncharacteristic on the left, and all others in the middle. At this point there is no need to pay attention to how many go into each pile, but since half of the items will eventually go into the middle three categories, you can feel fairly free about putting items about which you are uncertain into the middle pile.

2. Next, sort the right hand pile (the "characteristic" group into the high numbered categories, placing the most characteristic items into Category 9, the next most characteristic items into Category 8; and so forth until you have used up all the cards. In this step, you should pay attention to the actual number of cards required in each category. (Note: The order of the cards within a category is unimportant.)
3. Now sort the left hand pile into the low numbered categories, placing the most uncharacteristic items in Category 1. Follow the same procedure used in step 2.
4. Now sort the middle pile into the middle categories, making any adjustments needed with the cards already sorted into adjacent categories.
5. Check to make sure you have the correct number of cards in each category and make any final adjustments you wish. Record your sort onto the record sheet provided.

THANK YOU. WE APPRECIATE YOUR HELP.

APPENDIX E: Instructions - Part Two

Instructions - Part Two

Step 1

The self-report questionnaire you have been given has the heading MOST, which refers to the person you selected as the one you disclose to the most about your personal life. Firstly, fill out the blanks on the top of the questionnaire. Then read each item on the questionnaire and indicate the extent that you have talked about that item to him/her, that is the extent to which you have made yourself known to that person. Use the following rating scale to describe the extent that you have talked about each item:

- 0: Have told the person nothing about this aspect of me.
- 1: Have talked in general terms about this. The person has only a general idea about this aspect of me.
- 2: Have talked in full and complete detail about this item to the person. He/she knows me fully in this respect and could describe me accurately.

Step 2

Please repeat the same procedure for the questionnaire with the heading LEAST, which refers to the person you selected as the one you disclose to the least about your personal life.

When you have finished, please give the completed material to the experimenter.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

References

- Allen, J. G. Implications of research in self-disclosure for group psychotherapy. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1973, 23, 306-321.
- Allen, T. W. Effectiveness of counselor trainees as a function of psychological openness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 35-40.
- Altman, I., & Haythorn, W. W. Interpersonal exchange in isolation. Sociometry, 1965, 28, 411-426.
- Altman, I., & Taylor, D. A. Social penetration. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973.
- Annis, L. V., & Perry, D. F. Self-disclosure modeling in same-sex and mixed-sex unsupervised groups. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 370-372.
- Balswick, J. O., & Balkwell, J. W. Self-disclosure to same- and opposite-sex parents: an empirical test of insights from role-theory. Sociometry, 1977, 40(3), 282-286.
- Bayne, R. The meaning and measurement of self-disclosure. British Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 1977, 5(2), 159-166.
- Becker, J. F., & Munz, D. C. Extraversion and reciprocation of interviewer disclosures. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 593.
- Bem, D. J., & Funder, D. C. Predicting more of the people more of the time. Psychological Review, 1978, 85. (preprint)
- Bergin, A. E. Some implications of psychotherapy research for therapeutic practice. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1966, 71, 235-246.
- Block, J. The Q-sort Method in Personality Assessment and Psychiatric Research. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1961.
- Block, J. Advancing the psychology of personality: paradigmatic shift or improving the quality of research? In D. Magnusson and N. S. Endler (Eds.) Personality at the Crossroads: Current Issues in Interactional Psychology. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1977.
- Block, J., & Peterson, P. Some personality correlates of confidence, caution and speed in a decision situation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 34-41.

- Brodsky, S. L., & Komaridis, G. V. Self-disclosure in prisoners. Psychological Reports, 1968, 23, 403-407.
- Brooks, L. Interactive effects of sex and status of self-disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 6, 469-474.
- Burhenne, D., & Mirels, H. L. Self-disclosure in self-descriptive essays. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 35, 409-413.
- Byrne, D. Attitudes and attraction. In L. Erkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. Vol. 4, New York: Academic Press, 1969.
- Carkhuff, R. R. Helping and Human Relations. A primer for lay and professional helpers. Vol. 1. Selection and training. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Chaikin, A. L., & Derlega, V. J. Liking for the norm-breaker in self-disclosure. Journal of Personality, 1974, 42, 117-129.
- Chaikin, A. L., Derlega, V. J., Bayma, B., & Shaw, J. Neuroticism and disclosure reciprocity. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 13-19.
- Chaikin, A. L., & Derlega, V. J. Self-disclosure. In J. W. Thibaut, J. T. Spence, & R. C. Carson (Eds.), Contemporary topics in social psychology. Morristown: General Learning Press, 1976.
- Chelune, G. J. Self-disclosure: An elaboration of its basic dimensions. Psychological Reports, 1975, 36, 79-85.
- Chittick, E. V., & Himelstein, P. The manipulation of self-disclosure. The Journal of Psychology, 1967, 65, 117-121.
- Colson, W. N. In J. Altman & D. A. Taylor, Social Penetration. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Cozby, P. C. Self-disclosure, reciprocity, and liking. Sociometry, 1972, 35, 151-160.
- Cozby, P. C. Self-disclosure: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 79, 73-91.
- Cravens, R. W. The need for approval and the private versus public disclosure of self. Journal of Personality, 1975, 43, 503-514.
- Davis, J. D., & Sloan, M. L. The basis of interviewee matching of interviewer self-disclosure. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 13, 359-367.

- Derlega, V. J., & Chaikin, A. L. Sharing intimacy what we reveal to others and why. New Jersey: Prentice-Stall Inc., 1975.
- Diamond, R. E., & Hellkamp, D. T. Race, sex, ordinal position of birth, and self-disclosure in high school students. Psychological Reports, 1969, 25, 235-238.
- Doster, J. A. Individual differences affecting interviewee expectancies and perceptions of self-disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 3, 192-198.
- Doster, J. A., & Strickland, B. R. Perceived childrearing practices and self-disclosure patterns. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 382.
- Doster, J. A., & Strickland, B. R. Disclosing of verbal material as a function of information requested, information about the interviewer and interviewee differences. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37, 187-194.
- Ebersole, P., McFall, M., & Brandt, C. Imitation and prior classroom contact as determinants of reciprocal self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1977, 41, 87-91.
- Ehrlich, H. J., & Graeven, D. B. Reciprocal self-disclosure in a dyad. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1971, 7, 389-400.
- Farson, R. E. The counselor is a woman. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1954, 1, 221-223.
- Feldstein, J. C. Effects of counselor sex and sex role and client sex on clients' perceptions and self-disclosure in a counseling analogue study. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1979, 26(5), 437-443.
- Fitzgerald, M. P. Self-disclosure and expressed self-esteem, social distance, and areas of the self revealed. Journal of Psychology, 1963, 56, 405-412.
- Frankfurt, L. P. In J. Altman, & D. A. Taylor, Social Penetration. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Gaebelein, J. W. Self-disclosure among friends, acquaintances and strangers. Psychological Reports, 1976, 38, 967-970.
- Gelman, R., & McGinley, H. Interpersonal liking and self-disclosure. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46(6), 1549-1551.

- Goodstein, L. D., & Reinecker, V. M. Factors affecting self-disclosure: A review of the literature. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), Progress in experimental personality research (Vol. 7). New York: Academic Press, 1974.
- Goodstein, L. D., & Russell, S. W. Self-disclosure: a comparative study of reports by self and others. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 365-369.
- Gurman, A. S. Therapist and patient factors influencing the patient's perception of facilitative therapeutic conditions. Psychiatry, 1977, 40, 218-231.
- Halpern, T. P. Degree of client disclosure as a function of past disclosure, counselor disclosure, and counselor facilitativeness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24(1), 41-47.
- Halvorson, C. F., Jr., & Shore, R. E. Self-disclosure and interpersonal functioning. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 213-217.
- Handkins, R. E., & Munz, D. C. Essential Hypertension and self-disclosure. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1978, 34(4), 870-875.
- Heigl-Evers, A., & Heigl, F. On cultivating the professional personality of a psychotherapist. Praxis der Psychotherapie, 1976, 21(1), 1-9.
- Himmelstein, P., & Lubin, B. Attempted validation of the self-disclosure inventory by the peer nomination technique. Journal of Psychology, 1965, 61, 13-16.
- Hood, T. C., & Back, K. W. Self-disclosure and the volunteer: a source of bias in laboratory experiments. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 17, 130-136.
- Horn, J. L. A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis. Psychometrika, June 1965, 30(2), 179-185.
- Hurley, J. R., & Hurley, S. J. Toward authenticity in measuring self-disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 271-274.
- Izard, E. C. Personality similarity and friendship. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 51, 47-51.
- Jourard, S. M. Self-disclosure and other-cathexis. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 428-431.
- Jourard, S. M. Age trends in self-disclosure. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1961, 7, 191-197. (a)

- Jourard, S. M. Religious denomination and self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1961, 8, 446. (b)
- Jourard, S. M. Self-disclosure in British and American college females. Journal of Social Psychology, 1961, 54, 315-320. (c)
- Jourard, S. M. Personal adjustment: an approach through the study of healthy personality. New York: Macmillan, 1963.
- Jourard, S. M. The transparent self. Princeton, N.J.: Van-Nostrand, 1964.
- Jourard, S. M. The effects of experimenters' self-disclosure on subjects' behavior. In C. Spielberger (Ed.), Current topics in community and clinical psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1969.
- Jourard, S. M. Self-disclosure: an experimental analysis of the transparent self. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1971.
- Jourard, S. M., & Landsman, M. J. Cognition, cathexis, and the "dyadic effect" in men's self-disclosing behavior. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1960, 6, 178-186.
- Jourard, S. M., & Lasakow, P. Some factors in self-disclosure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 91-98.
- Jourard, S. M., & Richman, P. Disclosure output and input in college students. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1963, 9, 141-148.
- Kent, J. H. Relation of personality, expectancy, and situational variables to self-disclosing behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 1, 120-121.
- Kerkchhoff, A. C., & Davis, K. E. Value consensus and need complementarity in mate selection. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27.
- Kleck, R. E. Self-disclosure patterns of the non-obvious stigmatized. Psychological Reports, 1968, 23, 1239-1248.
- Kohen, J. A. The development of reciprocal self-disclosure in opposite-sex interaction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 404-414.
- Komarovsky, M. Some problems in role analysis. American Sociological Review, 1973, 38, 649-662.
- Kraft, L. W., & Vraa, C. W. Sex composition of groups and pattern of self-disclosure by high school females. Psychological Reports, 1975, 37, 733-734.

- Kramer, J. A., Rappaport, J., & Seidman, E. Contribution of personal characteristics and interview training to the effectiveness of college student mental health workers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1979, 26(4), 344-351.
- Ksionsky, S. Unpublished Manuscript, Simon Fraser University, 1979.
- Lasky, R. G., & Salomone, P. R. Attraction to psychotherapy: influences of therapist status and therapist-patient age similarity. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1977, 33(2), 511-516.
- Levinger, G., & Senn, D. J. Disclosure of feelings in marriage. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1967, 13, 237-249.
- Lin, T. T. Counseling relationship as a function of counselor self-confidence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 293-297.
- Lindzey, G., & Urdan, J. A. Personality and social choice. Sociometry, XVII, 1954, 47-63.
- Luborsky, L., Chandler, M., Auerbach, A. H., & Cohen, J. Factors influencing the outcome of psychotherapy: a review of quantitative research. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 75(3), 145-185.
- McCarthy, P. R., & Betz, N. E. Differential effects of self-disclosing versus self-involving counselor statements. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25(4), 251-256.
- McClain, E. W. Is the counselor a woman? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1968, 46, 444-448.
- McGuire, D., Thelen, M. H., & Amolsch, T. Interview self-disclosure as a function of length of modeling and descriptive instructions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 356-362.
- Mann, B., & Murphy, K. C. Timing of self-disclosure, reciprocity of self-disclosure, and reactions to an initial interview. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 304-308.
- Marcus, B. B. Self-disclosure as a function of attitude similarity and physical attractiveness. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 3155B.
- Maslow, A. H. Toward a psychology of being. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1968.
- Mayo, P. R. Self-disclosure and neurosis. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 7, 140-148.

- Mehrabian, A., Ksionzky, S. A Theory of Affiliation. Boston, Mass. Lexington Books, 1974.
- Melikian, L. H. Self-disclosure among university students in the Middle East. Journal of Social Psychology, 1962, 57, 257-263.
- Merluzzi, T. V., Banikiotes, P. G., & Missbach, J. W. Perceptions of counselor characteristics: contributions of counselor sex, experience and disclosure level. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1978, 25(5), 479-482.
- Miller, R. P. Simultaneous statistical inference. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Morgan, R. N., & Evans, J. F. Comparison of reinforcing and modeling techniques for promoting self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1977, 40, 367-371.
- Mowrer, O. H. The crisis in psychology and religion. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1961.
- Neimeyer, R. A., & Neimeyer, G. J. A personal construct approach to perception of disclosure targets. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1977, 44, 791-794.
- Newcomb, T. M. The acquaintance process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
- Nilsson, D. E., Strassberg, D. S., & Bannon, J. Perceptions of counselor self-disclosure: an analogue study. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1979, 26(5), 399-404.
- Norton, R., Feldman, C., & Tafoya, D. Risk parameters across types of secrets. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 5, 450-454.
- Parloff, M. B., Waskow, I. E., & Wolfe, B. E. Research on therapist variables in relation to process and outcome. In S. L. Garfield, & A. E. Bergin, (Eds), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change. Second edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.
- Pedersen, D. M., & Breglio, V. J. The correlation of two self-disclosure inventories with actual self-disclosure: a validity study. Journal of Psychology, 1968, 68, 291-298. (a)
- Pedersen, D. M., & Breglio, V. J. Personality correlates of actual self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1968, 22, 495-501. (b)
- Pedersen, D. M., & Higbee, K. L. Personality correlates of self-disclosure. Journal of Social Psychology, 1969, 78, 81-89. (a)

- Pedersen, D. M., & Higbee, K. L. Self-disclosure and relationship to the target person. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1969, 15, 213-220. (b)
- Persons, R. W., & Marks, P. A. Self-disclosure with recidivists: optimum interviewer-interviewee matching. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1970, 76, 387-391.
- Plog, S. C. The disclosure of self in the United States and Germany. Journal of Social Psychology, 1965, 65, 193-203.
- Powell, W. J. Differential effectiveness of interviewer interventions in an experimental interview. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32(2), 210-215.
- Precker, J. A. Similarity of valuing as a factor in selection of peers and near-authority figures. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 47, 406-414.
- Rickers-Ovsiankina, M. A. Social accessibility in three age groups. Psychological Reports, 1956, 2, 283-294.
- Rickers-Ovsiankina, M. A., & Kusmin, A. A. Individual differences in social accessibility. Psychological Reports, 1958, 4, 391-406.
- Rivenbark, W. H. Self-disclosure patterns among adolescents. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28, 35-42.
- Rogers, C. R. The characteristics of a helping relationship. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1958, 37, 6-16.
- Rubin, Z. Measurement of romantic love. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16, 265-273.
- Schooley, M. Personality resemblances among married couples. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1936, 32, 340-347.
- Shapiro, J. G., Krauss, H. H., & Truax, C. B. Therapeutic conditions and disclosure beyond the therapeutic encounter. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16(4), 290-294.
- Simonson, N. R. The impact of therapist disclosure on patient disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 3-6.
- Slobin, D. F., Miller, S. H., & Porter, L. W. Forms of address and social relations in a business organization. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 8, 289-293.
- Stanley, G., & Bownes, A. F. Self-disclosure and neuroticism. Psychological Reports, 1966, 18, 350.

- Strassberg, D. S., & Anchor, K. N. Rating intimacy of self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1975, 37, 562.
- Strassberg, D. S., Roback, H., D'Antonio, M., & Gabel, H. Self-disclosure: a critical and selective review of the clinical literature. Comprehensive Psychiatry, 1977, 18(1), 31-39.
- Stuart, A. A. Test for homogeneity of the marginal distribution in a two-way classification. Biometrika, 1955, 42, 412-416.
- Taylor, D. A. The development of interpersonal relationships: social penetration process. Journal of Social Psychology, 1968, 75, 79-90.
- Taylor, D. A., & Altman, I. Intimacy-scaled stimuli for use in studies of interpersonal relations. Psychological Reports, 1966, 19, 729-730.
- Taylor, D. A., Altman, I., & Sorrentino, R. Interpersonal exchange as a function of rewards and costs and situational factors: expectancy confirmation-disconfirmation. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1969, 5, 324-339.
- Taylor, D. A., & Oberlander, L. Person-perception and self-disclosure: motivational mechanisms in interpersonal processes. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1969, 4, 14-28.
- Tognoli, J. Response matching in interpersonal information exchange. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 8, 116-123.
- Truax, C. B. Therapist interpersonal reinforcement of client self-exploration and therapeutic outcome in group psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 225-231.
- Truax, C. B., & Carkhuff, R. R. Client and therapist transparency in the psychotherapeutic encounter. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12, 3-9.
- Tuckman, B. W. Interpersonal probing and revealing and systems of integrative complexity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 655-664.
- Vondracek, F. W. The study of self-disclosure in experimental interviews. Journal of Psychology, 1969, 72, 55-59.
- Vondracek, S. I. The measurement and correlates of self-disclosure in preadolescents. Dissertation Abstracts-International, 1970, 30, 5230-B.
- Vondracek, F. W., & Marshall, M. J. Self-disclosure and interpersonal trust: an exploratory study. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28, 235-240.

- Vondracek, S. I., & Vondracek, F. W. The manipulation and measurement of self-disclosure in preadolescents. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1971, 17, 51-58.
- Weigel, R. G., Weigel, V. M., & Chadwick, P. C. Reported and projected self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1969, 24, 283-287.
- West, L., & Zingle, H. W. A self-disclosure inventory for adolescents. Psychological Reports, 1969, 24, 439-445.
- Worthy, M., Gary, A. L., & Kahn, G. M. Self-disclosure as an exchange process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 50-63.