

SOME ASPECTS OF SELF-ESTEEM AND SELF-DISCLOSURE

---

A THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS  
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF  
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

BY

LOVENE GOINS

---

HOUSTON, TEXAS

MAY 1980

To

John Paul Goins and Timothy Stephen Goins,  
two sons who have brought  
much joy to our home

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Definition of Terms.....	1
Purpose.....	6
Subsequent Chapters.....	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	8
Self-Esteem.....	9
Self-Disclosure.....	39
Relationships between and within Self-Esteem and Self-Disclosure.....	60
III. METHODOLOGY.....	63
Hypotheses.....	63
Limitations.....	73
Subjects.....	74
Procedure.....	74
Statistics.....	75
IV. RESULTS.....	77
Tests of Hypotheses.....	77
V. ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH.....	83
Hypothesis 1.....	84
Hypothesis 2.....	86
Hypothesis 3.....	87
Suggested Research.....	88
Summary.....	89
APPENDIXES.....	95
A. TENNESSEE SELF-CONCEPT SCALE.....	95
B. SELF-DISCLOSURE QUESTIONNAIRE.....	100

C. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA.....	105
REFERENCES.....	108

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Students' Readiness to Confide in Different Settings.....	70
2. Summary of Self-Esteem and Self-Disclosure Scores...	78
3. Wilcoxon Matched Pairs of Self-Disclosure Topics....	80
4. Wilcoxon Matched Pairs of Self-Disclosure Targets...	82

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Two facets of personality are self-esteem and self-disclosure (Jourard, 1964). Because research is inconclusive regarding their correlation and properties, additional research may provide insight to their characteristics and effects. This introductory chapter will discuss the concepts of self and self-esteem and self-disclosure, the purpose of this study, and the topics of subsequent chapters.

#### Definition of Terms

In order to examine the relationship of self-esteem and self-disclosure, one must first consider the concept of self.

Origin and growth provide a foundation to the definition of self. The self is not others; yet it is born and grows through interpersonal relations (May, 1953). Shavelson, Hubner, and Stanton (1976) agreed that an individual's self-perception stems from environmental experiences and reinforcements, and the response to self from significant others, particularly family and friends. May (1953) stressed one's not being just a product of others but also having a capacity to experience and to create. Although at least partially formed by others and interacting with them in many roles, the self is an entity, one who knows he plays these roles.

The self is a feeling of unity, of internal sensibility, and of individual existence (Duval & Wicklund, 1972). This unified being has a framework of responsibilities to itself: goals in life, priorities, sense of responsibility, inner courage, quality of personal relationships, sources of emotional support, and role of love in life. It is this framework which aids in playing these many roles (Menninger, 1972).

Constructs are another way of defining the self. Shavelson et al. (1976) summarized the self-concept studies as the within-construct definition and the between-construct definition. The within-construct includes observable quantities which are structural components: academic, social, and physical self-concepts. The between-construct definition, according to Shavelson et al. (1976), includes observable external components, for example, the relationship of academic self-concept to achievement. Krishnamurti (1954) was more detailed in his listing of components of the self: idea, memory, experience, intentions, race, group, will-to-be, and the collective memory of unconsciousness as well as consciousness.

Variation exists regarding the types of selves and the quality of self-awareness. Types differ according to externality. Duval and Wicklund (1972) discussed externals, those who believe outside forces mold their lives, versus internals, those who believe they personally control their own lives. The conclusions of Duval and Wicklund were derived from Wylie

(1968), who had discussed the difference of self as doer and self as passive entity, and from De Charms (1968), who had discussed the self as origin, a controller of environment, and the self as pawn, a being manipulated by the environment. Another difference occurs in quality of self-awareness. The rigid and limited self-awareness of a child is concrete. The neurotic's self-awareness is autistic, compartmentalized, egocentric, and extreme (all-or-nothing). The personal awareness of a mature, healthy person, however, is integrated, socialized, and realistic (Short, 1953). The evaluation depends upon a person's report of himself (self-concept) or the inferred self-concept, which is deduced from a person's physical or symbolic responses to situations (Shavelson et al., 1976). The self is all of the values and traits one acknowledges as definitions of himself (Bills, Vance, and McLean, 1951), including among other characteristics the sensory, imaginal, emotional, and conceptual (Murphy, 1975).

### Self-Esteem

Self-esteem is defined as an individual's perception of his value. Morval and Morval (1971-1972) defined self-esteem as the value that an individual attributes to himself. Jourard (1957) stated that a self-cathexis score (SC), a summary score, indicates the degree to which an individual likes or dislikes his own traits and is, thus, an index of self-esteem. More specifically, Silber and Tippet (1965) defined self-esteem as

attitudes of contentment an individual has about himself which reflect the relationship between his self-image and his ideal self-image. Greiger (1975) also emphasized this self-evaluative process. Good and Good (1975) included several feelings --superiority, adequacy, worthiness, and independence--and their opposites.

Although it might be argued that self-concept is a cognitive view of self and self-esteem is an affective view, Shavelson et al. (1976) in their extensive study of self-concept stated that self-concept and self-esteem are used interchangeably in the literature. These writers presented seven features of self-esteem/self-concept: organization (the recoding of diverse experiences into simpler categories), multifacets (areas such as school, social acceptance, physical attractiveness, and ability), hierarchy (division of academics into subject areas, such as foreign languages, and of subject areas into courses, such as Spanish II), stability (the higher on the hierarchy the more stable the self-esteem), development (changing significance of different parts of one's world as one matures), evaluation, and differentiation (the closer self-esteem is identified with a specific situation, the closer is the relationship between self-esteem and behavior in the situation). While such features as organization are more cognitive, other features such as evaluation unquestionably are included in the affective domain. Evaluation, a de-

scription of oneself in a particular situation, can be made against absolute standards, such as the ideal self, or it can be made against relative standards, such as peers or assumptions of the evaluations of significant others. In short, Shavelson et al. maintained that a person's perception of himself is formed through his experience with his environment. One's self-perceptions influence his acts, which in turn influence his self-perceptions.

Gaylin (1966) considered self-esteem as integration into the social order:

Psychological health is taken to mean a form of self-esteem or personal comfort which generally articulates with society standards. This definition allows for possible exception, as in the case of men of vision who may be psychologically healthier than their environment (pp. 494-495).

Brissett (1972), however, defined self-esteem as having two sociopsychological processes: self-evaluation and self-worth. The former is the "conscious judgment" pertaining to the social importance or significance of the self, and the latter is the "feeling of self." Self-evaluation revolves around extrinsic validation, whereas self-worth grows from intrinsic self-actualizing experiences. In summary, self-esteem, essentially, is an individual's perception of his value.

### Self-Disclosure

Self-disclosure is defined as the personality attribute (Cozby, 1973) by which one makes oneself known to others (Jou-

rard & Lasakow, 1958); it is the act of making the primary aspect of one's personal world, including thoughts and feelings, known to others (Steele, 1974). Thus, it involves both what and to whom a person reveals self (Seffinger, 1974). Some of its components include privacy, importance, immediacy, risk taking, motive, anxiety, evaluation, and authenticity (Adler, 1973). Additional factors include the affective manner of presentation and flexibility of the disclosure pattern (Chelune, 1975). In-depth therapeutic self-disclosure pertains specifically to comments about the self which alter or dispute the subject's usual defensive portrayal of self, directly verbalized conscious revelations of motives, and comments about the self which are compatible with unexpressed motive (Adler, 1973). In summary, self-disclosure is portrayed in patterns which change as the individual, relationship, and situational factors vary (Allen, 1973).

#### Purpose

Research findings regarding some aspects of self-esteem and self-disclosure differ. For example, the research of MacDoniels (1973) found that high self-esteem subjects were not significantly more open in their expression than subjects with low self-esteem; yet the research of Shapiro (1968) and others indicated that subjects high in self-esteem were high in self-disclosure. Further, Woodyard and Hines (1973) found no sex difference in self-disclosers. However, the research

of Jourard (1964) indicated that females disclose more than males. Jourard's research generally indicated that appropriate timing and appropriate self-disclosure elicit equivalent disclosure and build interpersonal relationships; yet some research indicated that the initiator had some regret and anxiety as a result of having disclosed. Such discrepancies call for additional research regarding the correlation of self-esteem and self-disclosure and the comparative degree of self-disclosure according to subject area and target.

#### Statement of Problem

This thesis proposes: (1) to determine the relationship between self-esteem and self-disclosure, each a facet of personality, (2) to show that spouses receive greater self-disclosure than other family members or friends; and (3) to show that people disclose more with regard to neutral topics than to personal topics.

#### Subsequent Chapters

Subsequent chapters shall contain detailed background information on self-esteem and self-disclosure, a discussion of testing methods and results, and the implications of the research.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

May (1953) considered man's awareness of self--i.e., man's ability to view himself as though from an external perspective--as the distinctive feature of man. Such self-consciousness, May stated, is the basis for man's thinking abstractly, orienting himself historically, influencing society, creating beauty, acting ethically, and empathizing. Joy, not ephemeral happiness, results from one's feeling of fulfilling his potentialities as a person. This sense of worth enables man to affirm himself against all other beings and the inorganic world, if necessary.

May (1953) stated that these blessings, however, are accompanied by the curse of anxiety and inward crises. Being objectively self-aware makes one increasingly self-critical (Duval & Wicklund, 1972). The self who is judging is the subject, and the self who is being judged is the object (Strauss, 1959). Duval and Wicklund (1972) refer to these as "I" and "me" respectively.

Rogers (1956) attested to the importance of self-acceptance by stating that personal growth and effective human relations begin with self-acceptance. He stated that in his experience it is in the long run counter-productive in human

relations to act as something one is not. Maslow (1971) succinctly elaborated upon the relationship between the value of the self and the willingness to reveal that self through communication: "Many of the communication difficulties between persons are the byproduct of communication barriers within the person....the person can communicate to a person only that which he is worth" (p. 155).

Therefore, this chapter is a review of the professional literature regarding these two related aspects of self: self-esteem and self-disclosure.

### Self-Esteem

Among the topics examined by the extensive literature of self-esteem are evidence supporting the existence of self-esteem, factors affecting self-esteem, maintenance of self-esteem, and importance of self-esteem.

#### Evidence Supporting the Existence of Self-Esteem

The effects of self-esteem are manifested in numerous ways: attitudes and values, personality factors, responses to situations, interactions with others, and self-awareness.

Attitudes and values. Bills, Vance, and McLean (1951) defined attitude as an evaluation. The self-esteem of a person affects his attitudes and values regarding abilities, emotions, issues, people, sex, gender, and persuasion.

Attitudes toward abilities encompass success and interest, control over events, competence and satisfaction, academic

performance, and tasks. Stotland (1961) reported that possibilities of success in various activities affected the level of interest of subjects of low self-esteem more than the level of interest of subjects of high self-esteem. The analysis of Christian (1973) indicated that subjects with high esteem felt personal control while subjects with lower esteem felt the power of chance and circumstance. Ryckman and Cannon (1975) expanded by stating that higher self-esteem subjects believe not only that they have more personal control over events but also that they are freer from others' control and that their environments provide reinforcers occurring in a more predictable pattern than do lower self-esteem subjects. Lombardo and Berzonsky (1975) agreed that externals (those expecting reinforcement to be controlled by sources outside the self) have lower self-esteem than internals (those expecting reinforcement as a result of their own efforts). Another attitude involves competence and satisfaction. Only high self-esteem subjects, according to Greenhaus and Badin (1974), tend to have the higher level of performance predict the greater degree of satisfaction. Yet another attitude pertains to academics. Low self-esteem undergraduates predicted getting lower examination grades than did those with higher self-esteem (Morrison, Thomas, & Weaver, 1973). Golberg (1973) reported that high self-esteem college students had higher need-achievement scores and considered academic degrees more im-

portant than did the low self-esteem subjects. Task or job is another subject eliciting varying attitudes according to self-esteem. The research of Patrick (1973) supported his hypothesis that pride in competence is the motivation for professional women's achievement while approval is the motivation for homemakers. Waters and Roach (1972) found that subjects with high self-esteem had a higher correlation of success in performing a task and liking a task than subjects with low self-esteem.

As well as including abilities, attitudes also involve emotions. Hostility and love are two emotions whose relationship to self-esteem has been examined. The research of Toews (1966) revealed that high self-esteem girls manifested less overt hostility than those of low self-esteem. Günther (1940) stated that a person of low self-esteem seeks to enhance his self-esteem by fleeing from his own identity, turning for assistance toward another individual, and ultimately using that person. More specifically, Dion and Dion (1975) reported that low self-esteem subjects expressed greater love, liking, and trust toward their romantic partners, judged their partners more favorable, and had less trait congruency between ideal self and romantic partner than high self-esteem subjects; however, subjects who had high self-esteem coupled with low defensiveness revealed more frequent romantic love experiences than other subjects. Günther (1940) contended that only when

one values self can he give love to another.

Attitudes are closely bound to political and social issues. One of these issues is women's liberation. Miller (1973), in testing young adult males in small, private, predominantly male colleges and in the general population, found that those with low levels of self-esteem tended to have negative attitudes toward women's liberation. However, with regard to overpopulation and the intention to limit family size, Fischer (1972) found no relationship between self-esteem and this issue.

A relationship exists between self-esteem and attitudes toward people. First of all, responses to groups are affected by self-esteem. Silverman (1964) stated that high self-esteem subjects were more concerned about group expectations than were low self-esteem subjects when group expectations were low and subjects had succeeded. On the other hand, subjects with low self-esteem were more concerned when expectations were high and subjects had failed. Furthermore, one's attitudes toward individuals as well as toward groups are related to self-esteem. According to Murstein and Beck (1972), marital adjustment is correlated with self-acceptance. Still another aspect of attitude toward people involves racial preference. Harris and Braun (1971), investigating racial preference of Negro children from an inner city and a suburban school, found that subjects with higher self-esteem made more Negro prefer-

ence choices of the Clark and Clark dolls test than did lower self-esteem subjects. The final aspect of attitude toward people is self and others. McCarthy and Brodsky (1970) reported that higher self-concept subjects under both anonymous and standard conditions were members of the high social desirability group.

Self-esteem is also related to sexual values. Berman and Osborn (1975) reported a positive relationship between sexual permissiveness and self-esteem for males but not for females. This was consistent with the concept of males, but not females, being socialized to relate dating success with permissiveness. Perlman (1974), in sampling college students from a small residential college in New York state and a large Canadian university, found no significant relationship between sexual permissiveness and self-esteem for the moderate (Canadian) sample but more sexual permissiveness for high self-esteem subjects in the liberal (New York) sample. Thus, Perlman's research supported Stratton and Spitzer's (1967) belief that the relationship of permissiveness and self-esteem is dependent on cultural norms.

Another variable relating to self-esteem is gender value. Apperson (1974) reported that self-esteem is negatively related to deference in women and dominance in men. Schonbar (1973) proposed that neurotic problems related to sex-role identity stem from low self-esteem. The findings of Rogers' (1969) re-

search on conformity and self-esteem suggest that the female sex role has less social value than the male sex role.

Finally, self-esteem is related to persuasion or attitudinal change. The factors of attitudinal change are familiarity, coping ability, optimism-pessimism, threat, failure, complexity, sex, and effectiveness. High self-esteem subjects gave evidence of more anticipatory attitude change than did low self-esteem subjects on familiar items, though not on unfamiliar items (Dinner, Lewkowicz & Cooper, 1972). Dabbs (1964) reported that high and low self-esteem subjects differ in how they typically adjust: either actively approaching and attempting to cope with their environment or reacting in a noncoping way. Cohen (1959a) stated that high self-esteem subjects protect themselves by repressing, denying, or ignoring impulses which are challenging or conflicting while low self-esteem subjects project or regress. Furthermore, according to Dabbs (1964), copers more than noncopers influence high self-esteem subjects while noncopers more than copers influence low self-esteem subjects. Likewise, high and low self-esteem subjects contrast in their approaches to optimism and pessimism. Leventhal and Perloe (1962) found:

...subjects high in self-esteem were influenced more by optimistic communications than by threatening communications while subjects low in self-esteem showed the opposite pattern, but these results occurred only among subjects who received communications from sources dissimilar to subjects with respect to personality characteristics (p. 388).

Silverman (1964) agreed, stating that generally subjects of high self-esteem are less responsive to self-devaluating stimuli than to self-enhancing stimuli, while subjects of low self-esteem exhibit the opposite pattern. Silverman added that having experienced failure in performing a need-related behavior decreased persuasibility for high self-esteem subjects and increased it for low self-esteem subjects.

† Concept of threat is another variable involved in self-esteem and persuasibility. Gollob and Dittes (1965), in manipulating self-esteem, discovered that the subjects with lowered self-esteem had increased persuasibility whenever the proponent's opinion was non-threatening and clearly presented. However, if the proponent's opinion was perceived as an increased threat, persuasibility decreased with subjects of lowered self-esteem. Silverman (1964) reported that both high and low self-esteem groups were more persuasible after failure than after success. Gollob and Dittes (1965) also reported that lowered self-esteem decreased persuasibility when the message was complex. Sex is yet another variable considered in regards to persuasibility and self-esteem. In testing first-graders, Lesser and Abelson (1959) found a negative correlation for persuasibility and self-esteem for boys but non-significance for girls. Silverman, Ford, and Morganti (1966), in testing college students, continued finding a negative correlation for males but varying correlations for females.

Finally, subjects of high self-esteem contrast with subjects of low self-esteem in effectiveness and perceptions of effectiveness of influence with subjects of high self-esteem exceeding those of low self-esteem (Cohen, 1959b). Contrary to others' research, Spillman (1974) reported susceptibility to persuasion was not affected by overall level of self-esteem.

➤ Personality factors. A person's self-esteem can be associated with certain personality factors. Among the factors studied are achievement, power, and approval. The value of maintaining self-esteem is so great that, according to Spillman (1974), subjects reorganize cognitively more for protection of self-esteem than reduction of inconsistencies in these factors. Thus, self-esteem appears more vulnerable to threat than do these personality factors.

One personality factor related to self-esteem is achievement. According to Pedersen (1965), "subjects with high ego strength have greater unconscious concern for achievement than subjects with low ego strength" (p. 691).

Power needs are also related to self-esteem. However, Schimel, Tauber, Zaphiropoulos, and Salzman (1972) distinguished between the obsessional or negativistic person who engages in a power struggle in all interactions and a non-obsessional or normal person who feels that power is essential for maintaining self-esteem and developing interpersonal maturity. This is power used for self-direction. The normal person does not have

a power-over value in which the individual depends upon the control or illusion of control over others and objects for self-esteem.

Another personality factor is that of approval. The research of Glazer (1973) lent support to other findings that high need to publicly evaluate oneself in socially desirable terms is associated with low self-esteem.

✓ Responses to situations. Self-esteem is evidenced in responses to numerous situations--academic, job or task, anxiety or threat, and success versus failure.

The closer the measurement of self-esteem is identified with specific academic situations the greater the correlation. Simpson and Boyle (1975) reported that the relationship between the actual performance on a college midterm examination and self-esteem was strongest for self-esteem task measures (sub-categories of esteem, such as ability to conjugate Latin verbs), next strongest for self-esteem specific measures (categories of esteem, such as language ability), and non-significant for self-esteem global measures (overall self-esteem). College subjects scoring low on the school self-esteem scale of the Coopersmith inventory (the correlation of self-esteem to academic performance) say less in class, contribute a smaller proportion of their thoughts to class discussion, and sit farther back in the classroom than subjects with high self-esteem

(Morrison & Thomas, 1975).

Career choice has been related to self-esteem. Maier and Herman (1974) reported that vocationally-decided subjects and vocationally-undecided subjects represent different self-esteem populations. Self-esteem itself may act as a moderator in vocational choice. High-esteem subjects appear to be more likely to choose occupations which they perceive to capitalize on their high abilities (Korman, 1966, 1967).

A number of researchers have investigated the relationships of self-esteem to work performance. Shapiro and Wahba (1974) found that the work performance of employees of a steel products company was not affected by self-esteem. However, Wiener (1973) on a word-sorting task found increased productivity for high self-esteem conditions. Shrauger (1972) discovered that even though a subject's overall self-esteem was not related to actual performance on a concept-attainment task, high specific self-esteem (self-esteem related to a sub-category of work or interests) subjects had better performance than low specific self-esteem (self-esteem related to a category of work or interests) subjects.

Several other variables are considered interwoven with self-esteem and work performance. Of primary consideration is salary or pay. Regardless of self-esteem, Cosentino (1973) concluded that under and over paying subjects does not affect work quantity or quality even at very short time intervals.

The results of Kessler (1972) were quite different. Kessler induced salary inequities while raising subjects' self-esteem. Regardless of salary, the result was work quality increased when self-esteem was enhanced. The results of Heckler and Wiener (1974) were still different, for they discovered that high self-esteem subjects performed with high quality under both low and high pay conditions. However, subjects with low self-esteem had high performance only under high pay conditions. (Results on productivity generally show that pay is an important motivator.) Thus, Heckler and Wiener's research supports the concept that high quality more than high quantity are correlated to high self-esteem. Another variable considered in work and in self-esteem is race. Bharucha-Reid (1973), in exploring organized behavior under stress, decided that race is a highly effective variable. White subjects perform better under control-failure conditions while blacks perform better under low self-esteem conditions. Still another variable is response to audience. Although high specific self-esteem subjects reacted non-significantly to an audience, low specific self-esteem subjects performed a concept-attainment task more poorly under an audience condition than under a non-audience condition (Shrauger, 1972). Yet another variable is group orientation. Wilson (1974) reported that males who were primarily esteem-oriented produced significantly greater in an egalitarian structure while males who were basically safety-

oriented were more productive in a hierarchial social structure. Still another consideration is use of a partner. Gineste (1973) found that the more one was uncertain of one's own performance the greater was the tendency to choose a partner. All of these particulars are indications of levels of self-esteem.

Other responses to situations which show varying effects of levels of self-esteem pertain to anxiety or threat. Wilson and Aronoff (1973) reported self-esteem subjects are lower on anxiety than are safety-oriented subjects. In fact, Rosenberg (1962) found a definite inverse relationship between self-esteem and anxiety level in a sample of 5077 students. According to Brown (1974), high self-confidence subjects were not affected by stress compared to low self-confidence subjects.

Persons of different levels of self-esteem also respond differently to success and failure situations. Shrauger and Rosenberg (1970) found that high self-esteem subjects responded differently than did low self-esteem subjects following success and failure feedback on performance with high self-esteem subjects performing better after success feedback and with low self-esteem subjects performing more poorly after failure; however, the reverse was not true: no significant changes in performance occurred for high self-esteem subjects who experienced failure feedback or for low self-esteem subjects who experi-

enced success feedback.

① Interactions with others. A major relationship exists between self-esteem and interactions with others. Berger (1952) reported a positive correlation between acceptance of others and acceptance of self. Maslow (1971) supported Berger's research by obtaining subjects' reactions to photographs: "secure people tended to see photographed faces as more warm than did insecure perceivers" (p. 166). Such perception is father to the deed, according to Phillips' (1951) research:

...individuals who are prone to express negative attitudes toward others, to be constant faultfinders, also harbour negative self attitudes. Conversely, those who seem to like and respect themselves are inclined to be positive, at least, in their attitudes toward others and to be generally less critical of those around them (p. 79).

This behavior exists for both clinical and non-clinical populations. Responses to others are revealed in a number of ways: attitude toward an accepting person, similarity, evaluative feedback, competition, touch, and gossip.

Self-esteem can be related to one's attitude toward an accepting person. Walster (1965) confirmed her prediction that a person temporarily low in self-esteem is more inclined to like an affectionate, accepting person than is a person temporarily high in self-esteem. Jones, Knurek, and Regan (1973) broadened their report by measuring the self-report rating scales but not limiting the liking to temporary self-

esteem conditions.

Self-esteem is related to perceptions of similarity with others. First, Shrauger and Patterson (1974) found that the dimensions which are viewed as relevant for describing oneself are used more frequently in describing others than are the qualities viewed as less significant for describing oneself. Contrary to Stotland and Hillmer (1962), who stated that the higher one's self-esteem the lower one's assumption of similarity, Fitzgerald (1965) reported that high self-esteem girls assumed more similarity between themselves and the average girl than did girls of low self-esteem. Such evaluation using similarity has consequences upon strangers and friends. Johnson, Gormly, and Gormly (1973) found that high self-esteem subjects were not affected by agreement-disagreement manipulation. Kipnis (1961) stated:

Subjects who ascribed relatively "good" personality traits to their best friends as compared with themselves changed their self-evaluation so that they later ascribed more positive traits to themselves. Subjects who gave their best friends relatively poor descriptions changed their self evaluations in a negative direction...Subjects who ascribed more negative traits to their best friends than to themselves broke off their friendships more frequently than did subjects who ascribed more positive traits to their best friends than to themselves (p. 465).

Another aspect of responses to others relates self-esteem to evaluative feedback. Jones (1973) explored the contrast of self-esteem theory, which predicts that the higher one evaluates himself the less one is likely to reciprocate evaluations from others. Jones concluded that studies relevant to these

theories support self-esteem theory.

Other psychologists discussed more detailed aspects of evaluative feedback in relationship to self-esteem. Shrauger and Lund (1975) reported that subjects with high self-esteem judged that an interviewer's competence, bias, and knowledge of the subject varied according to the type of evaluative feedback more than did subjects with low self-esteem. Koeck and Guthrie (1975) reported that high self-esteem subjects reciprocated evaluations. They rated a confederate lower if receiving an average or unfavorable evaluation. High self-esteem subjects agreed with a favorable evaluation but disagreed with an unfavorable evaluation. Low self-esteem subjects started with a less favorable first rating of the confederate than did high self-esteem subjects and even decreased the favorability more in a second rating. The decrease was only slightly less when the confederate gave the subject a favorable evaluation than when an unfavorable evaluation was received.

Hewitt and Goldman (1974) reported that low self-esteem subjects increased their liking of a positive evaluator and decreased their liking of a negative evaluator. High self-esteem subjects with high social-desirable score evidenced no changes in liking for either positive or negative evaluators. However, they suggested that the test results had not been valid, that a sizeable proportion of high self-esteem subjects should be re-classified as low self-esteem subjects, for sub-

jects with high self-esteem and high social-desirable scores had a pattern like that of low self-esteem subjects. This sub-group, according to Hewitt and Goldman, had possibly obtained high self-esteem scores through wishing to present themselves in a favorable rather than a realistic manner. In contrast, Tognoli and Keisner (1972) found no self-esteem effect associated with response to another person's evaluation. They reported that whenever subjects were exposed to positive feedback the greatest attraction occurred and that whenever subjects were exposed to negative feedback the least attraction occurred. Both of these conditions occurred regardless of level of self-esteem.

② ✓ Competition is yet another variable related to self-esteem. Hayden (1958) reported an inverse relationship between self-esteem and conflict. While generally agreeing with Hayden, Mettee and Riskind (1974) presented data which showed that a competitor's clear superior ability and promotion can reduce threat to self-esteem resulting from negative comparisons by making these comparisons irrelevant.

Touch, also, is descriptive of responding to others. Silverman, Pressman, and Bartel (1973) reported in studying male and female undergraduates that the higher the self-esteem the more intimate the tactile communication, especially when communicating with a female.

A final factor in responding to others is gossip. Rad-

low and Berger (1959) found for male liberal arts students in a small Southern college a negative relationship between self-esteem and gossiping regarding readiness in informing casual acquaintances about a best friend's illness.

Self-awareness. A major factor supporting the existence of self-esteem is self-awareness and its opposite, self-deception. The latter is undesirable, for only by knowing and accepting oneself can one achieve good mental health (Jourard, 1964). Murphy (1975) presented numerous methods for coping with self-deception. The techniques of coping ranged from sheer fiat (being determined to end self-deception) and intellectualizing (ascribing names for bad habits) to Aristotle's logic of deductive reasoning and Francis Bacon's method of inductive reasoning. Murphy also included Freud's defense mechanisms, Perls' interval scanning (bringing the mapped subjective world into the objective world), Jung's analytical psychology (being open to potentialities not yet catalogued by today's science), Rogers' client-centered therapy, the psychological systems of Asia (particularly Zen and Yoga), and Moreno's psychodrama (viewing or role playing).

Christian (1973) addressed the question of the positive-negative nature of self-awareness. Christian reported that high and low self-esteem subjects did not differ on positive self-esteem but that high self-esteem subjects characteristically had an absence of negative self-esteem.

Authorities differ on the consequences of self-awareness. Ickes (1974) found no support for his hypothesis that objective self-awareness would increase the self-esteem of high self-esteem subjects and decrease that of low self-esteem subjects. Duval and Wicklund (1972) believe that objective self-awareness typically lowers self-esteem:

Subjects in the presence of a dissimilar other were objectively self aware a good part of the time--hence their lowered self-esteem and it is also consistent that those who confronted a similar other were relatively less objectively self aware--thus higher self-esteem (p. 28).

Huntley (1940) reported that, when subjects were aware that their self-evaluations would be seen or heard by others, the subjects' need for positive self-esteem required that subjects judge themselves slightly above average on self-rating scales. Believing others would not know their evaluations, subjects revealed both feelings of insufficiency and striving for self-esteem. However, Herbert, Gelfand, and Hartmann (1969) found that specific self-evaluations have little predictive value for behaviors in other settings.

### Factors Affecting Self-Esteem

Numerous potential factors affecting self-esteem have been identified. The most notable involves the effect of significant others although such characteristics as birth order, gender, age, race, socio-economic status, academic performance, task, occupational background, physical activity, and physical traits and condition have all been cited. Other pos-

sible factors could include intellect and nationality. In contrast, Quen (1967) reported a general finding that past history of success and failure experiences determine self-esteem level. It would seem reasonable that many of the preceding factors which may affect self-esteem could influence the individual's view of his own success or failure. This suggests that there need not be a disagreement between the experiential and situational views regarding the genesis of self-esteem.

4 Significant others. One's family (particularly parents, spouse, and children), one's peers, and others are basic contributors to a person's self-esteem. Styles of parenting typically generate styles of children's self-regard. Over-indulgent parenting yields an exaggerated self-regard; both rejecting-indifferent and authoritarian-autocratic parenting cause children's low self-regard (McDavid & Garwood, 1978). In contrast, authoritative (democratic, but not permissive) parenting builds children's realistic, positive self-esteem (Conger, 1977).

Family interaction patterns have been shown to correlate to self-esteem. Parents of high and medium self-esteem children, in the study by Newirth (1971), had a symmetrical relationship, one of equals, while the parents of low self-esteem children had a complementary relationship of unequal partners. For low self-esteem boys, the father was the more

"vengeful" parent and the mother the more "cooperative." For low self-esteem girls, the mother was the more "vengeful" or "competitive" parent and the father the more "cooperative." Furthermore, fathers of low-esteem boys were more competitive with their offspring than were fathers of high and medium self-esteem boys. In addition to interaction patterns, some identification patterns appear to be related to self-esteem. Jourard (1957) strongly supported the parents' role:

Parents' personalities may have served not only as a model for the "real self" of the subjects but also as the model for their self-ideals. Most psychoanalysts, in fact, trace the origin of the self-ideal (superego and ego-ideal) to identification with parents...Identification with parents, feelings and attitudes to parents and self-esteem all cohere as a syndrome (p. 380).

Later Hollender (1973) found no relationship between self-esteem of males and parental identification, although he discovered a positive correlation between self-esteem of females and parental identification.

Not only the family of one's childhood but also that of his adulthood affect one's self-esteem. Both marital status and compatibility are important factors. Frerichs (1973) reported that married nursing students were found to have higher self-esteem levels ( $p < .01$ ) than their unmarried classmates. Furthermore, Kelly (1941) found that subjects with a higher degree of marital compatibility tended to rate themselves above average on most personality traits. Other important considerations are life style and family size. Lewis (1972) in-

investigated 73 American born white married women aged 35-45 who had been married at least ten years and who had some education beyond high school. The women were divided into groups based on the number of their children and whether they voluntarily had limited themselves to more than one child. Although all women had experienced a traditional childhood, adolescence, and adulthood (at least in interests and values), the women involuntarily having a small family contrasted in self-esteem to those with three children. Women with three children had the highest self-esteem of the groups investigated, while the women involuntarily having a small family experienced an increased separation from their earlier values and life styles accompanied by increased isolation from their sources of support for self-esteem. Thus, in numerous ways family patterns influence self-esteem.

Involvement with peers and others is another determinant of self-esteem. Todoroski (1972) reported that although one's peers change both in number and constituents, the awareness of being accepted by peers was positively related to self-acceptance. Likewise, Gergen and Morse (1967) affirmed "the greater the degree to which significant others are judged to differ in their perceptions of an individual, the less consistent will be his view of self" (p. 208). Gergen and Morse also observed that "the greater the range of significant others encountered by a person during his developmental years, the less consistent

his view of self" (p. 208). Douglas (1970), confirming a positive relationship between attitudes toward social activities and self-esteem, validated the importance of others in the development of the self-image.

⑧ Other factors. One potential contributor to self-esteem, birth order, appears to be ineffective. Purpura (1971), sampling 122 first-borns and 189 later-borns, discovered no correlation between birth-order and self-esteem. Likewise, the research of Bartelt (1973) rejected the hypothesis that first-born children would have lower self-esteem than second-born children.

Another variable determining self-esteem is gender. The information Bartelt (1973) received from questionnaire responses of high school students and material from school records generated his hypothesis that males have higher self-concept than females. Rogers (1969) agreed that stereotypes persist in spite of the much publicized changes in attitudes toward sex-roles. Past research has established a positive relationship between male dominance and social status and between social status and self-esteem. Her present finding that achievement-oriented females fear success and that this anxiety relates to a loss of social acceptability supports the view that traditional sex roles produce lower self-esteem in women. Whereas young adult men begin to evaluate themselves positively, young women continue expressing dissatisfaction

with themselves. Spence, Helmreich and Stapp (1975) stated, to the contrary, that self-concepts are not distorted by role expectations: a positive correlation existed between femininity on the female-valued self items and masculinity on the male-valued items, and both femininity and masculinity were significantly related to self-esteem.

✓ Age is also a factor in self-esteem. In the high school years, students have increasing self-esteem with increasing age (Stein, 1970). Grade eleven self-esteem scores exceeded those of grade ten, and grade twelve scores were the highest of all. Lyell (1973) reported that age seems to be a factor regarding self-esteem for males only. Both adolescent males and females express self-discontent, yet only young adult males evaluate themselves positively. Young adult females do not. Ziller and Grossman (1967), in studying both neuro-psychiatric patients and control subjects, found increasing age of adults resulted in decreasing self-esteem.

✓ Another variable affecting self-esteem is race. Addy (1974) showed significant race differences both in self-regard and regard for others. He found black females to be the lowest on these measures. Williams and Byars (1968), who focused on self-esteem of Negro adolescents in Southern communities, concluded these Negro subjects were low in self-confidence, were defensive in self-descriptions, and were confused regarding their self-identity. Hill, Hayes, and Young (1975) stressed

importance of understanding black youth as a means to assist them in developing their self-esteem.

Another possible factor contributing to self-esteem is socio-economic status. Although the research of Luck and Heiss (1972) indicated that self-esteem was not positively related to socio-economic status, others have differed. Ziller, Hagey, Smith, and Long (1969) stated that "higher self-esteem was found to be associated with...socio-economic status..." (p. 93). In fact, Schwendiman, Larsen, and Dunn (1970) found significant differences between welfare clients and middle-class college students. The longer the former received welfare the lower the self-esteem.

The research of Smith and Bordonaro (1975) showed that those persons receiving unexpectedly high socio-economic placement, although gaining satisfaction with the position, received lowered self-esteem; in contrast, those persons receiving unexpectedly low placement gained position dissatisfaction but received lowered self-esteem only if the one doing the placement were attitudinally similar.

Yet another factor of self-esteem is academic performance. Stein (1970) reported a significant correlation between achievement and self-esteem for high school seniors. Whereas both sexes approached college with high goals and expectations, freshmen women were less optimistic in forecasting their grades for the first semester than were freshmen men. However, women

forecast greater gains over the next two years.

Both the nature of a task and the degree of competence with which it is accomplished potentially influence self-esteem. Harvey and Kelley (1974) researched attitudes toward competence. Their research suggested that a subject's believing he had exerted effort and had succeeded with respect to a difficult job assisted the subject in having a strong sense of judgmental competence, thus increasing his self-esteem. Patrick (1973) and London and Klimoski (1973) studied the nature of tasks. Patrick found that no differences exist between professionals and homemakers in fear of success. Nor did professionals manifest higher self-esteem and greater belief in their own power. London and Klimoski reported that subjects whose jobs were perceived as having optimal job complexity had significantly higher effectiveness self-ratings than subjects whose jobs were perceived as having high complexity. Perceived optimal job complexity also produced higher job-satisfaction ratings than low-complexity jobs.

An additional factor of self-esteem is occupational background. High school students whose fathers had professional, clerical, sales or farming occupations scored significantly higher on self-esteem than students whose fathers had skilled or unskilled labor occupations, according to Stein (1970). The research of Luck and Heiss (1972) positively related self-esteem to intergenerational occupational mobility and compe-

tence in occupational role. Kay and Meyer (1965) found certain performance appraisal techniques had consequences upon self-esteem. A manager's pointing up improvement needs in a subordinate is likely to elicit a subordinate's perceptions of threat to self-esteem, defensive behavior, and lowered occupational self-esteem.

Varying levels of physical activity may also relate to self-esteem. Rothfarb (1970) indicated that a college-age man who regularly exercises has a tendency to like himself, to be confident, and to feel valuable. Kleiber (1973) stated, however, that excessive involvement in physical activities may preclude self-discovery and self-awareness. According to Huntley (1940), such unawareness would negate positive self-esteem.

Both physical traits and condition influence self-esteem. Mathes and Kahn (1975) substantiated that physical attractiveness is positively correlated with self-esteem for women but not for men. Lechelt (1975) positively correlated significantly physical height and personal esteem ratings by undergraduate males. Cormier (1973) reported that drug addicts had low self-esteem. Rosa and Mazur (1974), in replicating the study of Rosenberg (1962), concurred with his findings that self-esteem and psychosomatic symptoms are negatively correlated. Lee (1972), after studying hospitalized veterans, noted that subjects high in self-esteem complained less than

other subjects.

In summation, the level of self-esteem is directly related to a person's degree of actual success in roles which are of greatest importance to him (Platt & Spivack, 1973). The factors of birth order, gender, age, race, socio-economic status, academic performance, task, occupational background, physical activity, physical traits and condition help mold the subject's values and interpret his success in this value system.

#### Maintenance of Self-Esteem

The concern which one has toward maintaining or improving self-esteem is evident in verbal recall. McElvaney (1958) investigated subjects' recall regarding trait words purportedly attributed to subjects. On delayed recall, subjects remembered desirable and undesirable words better than neutral words.

One stabilizing force for esteem is high rate of reinforcement. Wener (1973) discovered that subjects perceiving a high rate of reinforcement were significantly less anxious and more self-confident than subjects perceiving a low rate of reinforcement. Neistein and Katkovsky (1974) stated that their findings not only supported the prediction of a direct relationship between stimulus response and self-esteem but also suggested inconsistent reinforcement may cause negative self-evaluation.

Defense mechanisms play a major role in maintaining self-esteem. Crandall (1972) concluded that it is false to state that self-esteem is negatively related to coping. The results of Millimet and Gardner (1972) demonstrated strong support for defensiveness. Lampl (1968) found high self-esteem subjects were significantly more defensive than were low self-esteem subjects. Berger (1973) found extremely high or low self-esteem subjects were more defensive than were moderate self-esteem subjects when the esteem was threatened. Silverman (1964) concurred that moderate subjects were less inclined to use defense mechanisms and stated that this is consistent with the concept that moderate self-esteem subjects are most socially adjusted of high-moderate-low groups. Even within categories, degrees of defensiveness vary. Schneider and Turkat (1975) contrasted defensive high self-esteem subjects and genuine high self-esteem subjects. The defensive ones presented themselves more positively after failure than success and to a greater extent than did the genuine subjects.

Wurster, Bass, and Alcock (1961) stated that to maintain or increase self-esteem, individuals use rationalization, identification, and projection. Particular kinds of defenses, however, are typically used by different groups. Leventhal and Perloe (1962) reported a positive relationship between high self-esteem and avoidance. Slagle (1965) discussed the

relationship of several defense mechanisms to self-esteem:

- (1) denial is significantly related to high self-esteem regardless of reality;
- (2) withdrawal is significantly related to lack of realism irrelevant of self-esteem;
- (3) evasion is significantly related to unrealistically high self-esteem;
- (4) turning against the self is related to low self-esteem irrelevant of realism;
- (5) projection is related to unrealistic levels of self-esteem regardless of abilities.

Dabbs (1964) summarized the differences and explained the reasons for these differences in defenses:

Avoidance defenses (which reduce anxiety by denying the presence of danger) are more common among individuals reporting high self-esteem while sensitizing defenses (which reduce anxiety by preparing the individual to face danger) are more common among those reporting low self-esteem....High esteem individuals reject pessimistic communications (which would force them to consider danger) and low self-esteem individuals reject optimistic communications (which would not prepare them for possible danger). (pp. 173-174)

Research has been conducted into numerous techniques for changing self-esteem but, since only marginally related to the purpose of this thesis, shall not herein be presented.

#### Importance of Self-Esteem

While most, perhaps all, psychologists agree that an individual needs to be realistic about specific facets of his

entity--personality, appearance, abilities, values, status, etc.--not all agree about the desirability of overall levels of esteem. Buss and Gerjuoy (1957) scaled self-esteem similarly to other components of personality: the golden mean became the ideal. Low intensity corresponded to an insufficiency and high intensity corresponded to excessiveness. The greater the deviation from the mid-point, the greater the abnormality. They provided a validated list of categories ranging from high intensity (self-exalting) to low intensity (self-abasing). Penney (1974) suggested that individuals who report high levels of self-esteem are less mature than self-critical people. McDavid and Garwood (1978) stated, "Ideally, then, the growing child (and the productive adult also) should maintain a modest, challenging gap between the perceived self and the ideal self" (p. 460).

Many psychologists, however, describe levels of esteem as high, medium, and low with "high" being preferable. Briggs (1967) stated that high self-respect is based on the convictions of being lovable and being worthwhile. High self-concept is not a noisy conceit, as Buss and Gerjuoy (1957) implied, but a quiet feeling of self-worth; conceit is only a disguise for low self-esteem.

The preponderance of articles attest to the importance of self-esteem. Shavelson, Hubner, and Stanton (1976) even

discussed the improvement of a student's self-esteem as an educational outcome in its own right. Beery (1975) stated that the self-esteem, not external academic high performance, of a student-client should be the goal of a counselor. Not only can self-esteem help to explain and predict how one acts and, thus, provide insight into motivation, but a positive self-image is essential for good mental health.

### Self-Disclosure

Factors which relate to self-disclosure include the situational stimuli eliciting self-disclosure, the nature of the discloser, the nature of the recipient, the content of the disclosure, its consequences, and its importance.

#### Situational Stimuli

Numerous stimuli contribute to self-disclosure. Their number and strength vary: a greater variety of stimuli generate a low degree of self-disclosure (Sherman & Goodson, 1975).

Most research indicates that one of the strongest facilitators of self-disclosure is the disclosure of others. Jourard and Landsman (1960) found a high correlation of self-disclosure to disclosure received. Serfat and Smyth (1973) found that a subject's conversational partner's questions and statements had significant influence upon a subject's self-disclosure. In fact, subjects tended to disclose about the same amount of information as they had received (Panyard, 1973). Likewise, Derlega, Harris, and Chaikin (1973) found that read-

iness for self-disclosure was positively related to the disclosure of another, regardless of the degree of liking for the initial discloser.

This disclosure pattern exists also in professional experiences. Robison (1974) stated that the therapist's using examples of experiences is a technique to facilitate disclosure. Nosanchuk (1973) declared that mutual disclosure technique of interviews resulted in slightly higher level of self-disclosure than traditional oral or written technique. Both Turoczi (1973) and Chafey (1974) verified that a disclosing counselor does facilitate client disclosure. Simonson (1976) found no distinction of patients' self-disclosure between patients of non-disclosing therapists and personally disclosing, warm therapists. However, Simonson found that moderate self-disclosing therapists elicited more patient disclosure than did warm, non-disclosing or personally disclosing therapists. Indeed, reinforcement and control conditions are not as great facilitators of length or depth of intimacy of self-disclosure as are disclosure conditions (Olson, 1973). In short, the best predictor of self-disclosure is how much the subject perceives his confederate is disclosing to him (Boyum, 1973). Such cases, stated Derlega, Walmer, and Furman (1973), support Jourard's dyadic effect, the input-output correlation (Jourard, 1964).

Some psychologists refuted the position that others'

disclosure acts as a stimulus. Stunkel (1973) found that high impulsive personalities after encountering the disclosing interviewer were inhibited in their self-disclosure. MacDoniels (1973) stated that subjects exposed to a highly open leader did not significantly have more self-disclosure than subjects whose leader was not highly open. Stunkel (1973) reported somewhat more affirmatively that some interviewees may not respond positively to interviewer self-disclosure. High impulsive subjects may not respond positively to interviewer self-disclosure. High impulsive subjects may not imitate the disclosures of others as readily as do low impulsives. Other researchers give restricted support to the strength of others' disclosure on self-disclosure. Mann and Murphy (1975) proclaimed that a moderate level of interviewer self-disclosure may best facilitate imitation of disclosure. While Hayward (1974) said that there is some support for the effectiveness of therapist self-disclosure therapy, Davis and Skinner (1974) emphasized that interview disclosure was strongly aided by disclosure on the part of the interviewer. He qualified his comments, however, by stating that the disclosure was maintained at a high level only if the interviewer sustained his disclosure rate. The majority of research, however, attests to the effectiveness of the disclosure of others on self-disclosure. In essence, self-disclosure generates self-disclosure from another (Chafey, 1974).

Since instructions often require verbal responses, another possible stimulus for self-disclosure involves instructions given to a subject. Stunkel (1973) confirmed that low ambiguity instructions facilitated significantly more self-disclosure than did the high ambiguity instructions. However, high ambiguity instructions produced self-disclosure when the instructions were paired with modeling.

To examine the effectiveness of modeling, one must first consider the definition of "model." A model is an individual establishing a pattern for emulation. Whereas others' disclosure exists in a dyad involving the subject, a model could be in a situation not directly involving the subject. Jongsma (1973) reported that there was generally no supporting data for expected effects of modeling. More psychologists, however, produced positive results either with models alone or in combination with other techniques. Stone and Stebbins (1975) discovered that a video model group ranked first in effectiveness and an audio-model group ranked second. McAllister (1974) attested to significant modeling effect for subjects exposed to high disclosure models as compared to subjects exposed to low self-disclosure models. According to Jourard (1964), models tended to increase self-disclosure, but a model combined with a rehearsal condition and a self-instructing model were even more helpful in bringing forth threatening self-disclosure. Stone and Gotlib (1975), in

agreement, asserted that either instructions or modeling as single stimulus or combined stimuli increased the frequency of self-disclosure but that the effects of the combined stimuli were not greater than the effects of the single stimulus.

Verifying the findings of Jourard (1964.), Sarason, Ganzer, and Singer (1972) reported that exposure to any model significantly affected subjects' later verbal outputs and correlated to the favorable, unfavorable, and anxiety-related self-references previously made. The non-defensive model assisted the subjects' disclosures of negative attributes for all topics. In fact, the model was the only stimulus that significantly promoted disclosure for the highly defensive group. The weight of research supports the analysis of Doster and Brooks (1974) that subjects have higher levels of quantity and intimacy after modeling conditions than in no-modeling situations.

Another important variable in self-disclosure involves the situation, the set of surrounding circumstances, of the self-disclosure. Kent (1975) discovered that comprehension of situational contexts is an excellent indicator of how a person feels internally and of how one replies to awareness-disclosure questions. Situation is so important that, according to Nosanchuk (1973), it is more significant than sex factors and interview experiences. There are numerous

situational stimuli which affect self-disclosure. For example, D'Augelli, Deyss, Guerney, Hershenberg, and Sborofsky (1974) found that as the counselors' empathy, respect, and immediacy improved, so did subjects' self-disclosure.

Another situation variable which relates to self-disclosure is pairings. The dyad forming a pairing consists of a self-discloser and a recipient. Barnes (1973) declared that certain pairings form an optimal situation for self-disclosure. A-type subjects he defined as cautious, submissive individuals who are uninclined to seek variety or sensual pleasure for its own sake; B-type subjects are the opposite: risk-taking, dominant, variety-seeking. His hypotheses that A-type therapists are more compatible with schizophrenics than B-type therapists and that B-type therapists are more compatible with neurotic patients than are A-type therapists were substantiated. Taylor (1968) reported that, while mutual activities and self-disclosure of roommates increased over time, non-intimate information about the self occurred to a greater extent than did intimate.

Still another aspect of the situation pertains to eye contact. Ellsworth and Ross (1975) reported that direct gaze facilitated intimacy between females and resistance between males and that gaze avoidance had contrary consequences. Libby and Yaklevich (1973) wrote that subjects high in need abasement more frequently looked away than did subjects low

in need abasement; subjects high in nurturance, however, sustained eye contact more than did subjects low in nurturance. Paradis (1972) stated that both negative and positive disclosers were more prone to like and to look at the interviewer who sought a high degree of eye contact.

An additional element in the situation of self-disclosure is distance between discloser and recipient. Dietch and House (1975) verified their predictions that self-disclosures were not as intimate at a close interactional distance as at a farther distance. However, Pedersen (1973) reported that for male subjects personal space was related to self-disclosure toward mother, father, best male friend, and best female friend. Some research has explored the subject of distance at a more intimate level--physical contact. Although Dawson (1973) found that touch is not intrinsically a power form of nonverbal communication and that the context of its occurrence determines its meaning and influence, Cooper and Bowles (1973), in analyzing an encounter group, deduced that physical and body contact exercises within such a group would reduce obstacles and increase self-disclosure.

Another component of a situation deals with movement. According to Gardner (1973), an increase in a male counselor-actor's body motion caused the subjects to like him more and to allege that they would have higher self-disclosure toward the counselor. However, toward a female counselor-actor, the

subjects had a contrasting reaction: as her body motion decreased, they perceived her as more likable and announced they would self-disclose more to her.

Even pauses are relevant in a situation stimulating self-disclosure. Having studied vocal cues, Fischer and Apostol (1975) recommended for further research their hypothesis that increasing total pause time will lead to perceptions of increasing self-disclosure.

Subjects differ in the amount of self-disclosure occurring in public versus private situations. High-need-for-approval subjects self-disclosed more intimately in public than in private conditions, according to Cravens (1975). On the other hand, subjects who were low-and moderate-need self-disclosed more intimately in private than in public.

Group unity is another situation variable. Although not anticipated, only males significantly participated with self-disclosure when perceiving group cohesiveness--cooperation, ideas, norms, liking, and influence (Johnson & Ridener, 1974). Robbins (1966) found that subjects were more willing to disclose more to a high-cohesive group than to a low-cohesive group.

A discloser's expectancies of others' responses and reactions is also a variable of a situation. Kent (1975) as-

serted that comprehension of subjective expectancies is also a good indicator of what a person feels internally and of how he will reply to awareness-disclosure questions. Kopfstein (1974) found that girls with lower expectancies of favorable outcomes were less inclined to self-disclose than those with higher expectancies. Wilson and Rappaport (1974) antedated the findings of Kent (1975) by discovering that the specific expectancy manipulation and the intimacy level of topics significantly affected self-disclosure.

There is one situation which prevents rather than enhances self-disclosure. According to Sundstrom (1974), goal blocking (preventing or delaying one from obtaining his objective) led to withdrawal from interaction and, thus, inhibited self-disclosure.

Finally, psychodrama can act as a stimulus. Both through the dramatic enactment itself and the sharing sessions which follow, group members experience self-confrontation. The self-disclosure of the sharing sessions is then considered group property for each person of the group to incorporate for group growth (Barbour, 1972). In short, stimulus material is at least a partial determiner of the degree of self-revelation one has (Hamsher and Farina, 1967).

#### Nature of the Self-Discloser

There are many characteristics of the self-discloser which may be related to the act of disclosure. These include per-

sonality factors, personal characteristics, and demographic variables.

Most research has found that dogmatism, the maintaining of religious principle or opinion, is not a major factor of the self-discloser. In fact, Field (1975), Gitter, Antonellis and Cohen (1975), and Goldstein (1973) all concluded that dogmatism did not affect their subjects' self-disclosure. Davis, Frye, and Joure (1975), however, found that low dogmatics had more self-disclosure, gave more attention to the here-and-now aspects of a T-group, were less apt to give negative feedback, and were less inclined to reject the group. Jourard (1961a, 1964) reported that religious preference did not differ in degree of self-disclosure among females; however, Jewish male college students disclosed more than their Catholic, Methodist, and Baptist male peers.

Self-disclosers' anxiety, especially if coupled with defensiveness, has varying consequences upon self-disclosure. Although Cutter, Samaraweera, Fish, Morris, and Merritt (1974) negated the significance in the tension-anxiety factor related to openness, Doster (1975) reported its significance:

- (1) Low-defensive, low-anxious subjects were higher participants in interviews than other subjects.
- (2) Low-defensive, high-anxious subjects understood requirements but were inhibited in their responses.
- (3) High-defensive, low-anxious subjects did not even

receive correct impressions of requirements.

- (4) High-defensive, high-anxious subjects, surprisingly, felt compelled to comply and, therefore, were not the most avoidant group as was expected.

Whether a self-discloser is a repressor or a sensitizer is also related to self-disclosure. A repressor is one who suppresses, restrains, or forces memories, ideas, or fears into the subconscious mind; a sensitizer is one who is responsive to external conditions or stimulation. Repressors significantly self-disclosed more during the first four hours of therapy than did sensitizers, according to Baldwin (1974). Earlier, Dudgeon (1973) had stated that sensitizers decreased in amount of self-disclosure from the first to the second interview and the repressors, upon direction, became more self-disclosing.

Internalizers are those who expect reinforcement as a result of their own efforts, and externalizers are those who expect reinforcement to be controlled by sources outside the self. While internalizers and externalizers partially resemble definitions of repressors and sensitizers, respectively, research results with these groups are contradictory. Ellison (1972) found that internal subjects were significantly more willing to disclose highly intimate information about themselves than external subjects and suggested that possibly this situation stemmed from internalizers' seeing themselves as more

responsible for their personal outcomes and not being as threatened by the possibility of negative feedback. Furthermore, Kopfstein and Kopfstein (1973) reported that subjects with higher needs for social approval were more evasive than subjects with lower needs. In contrast, Doster and Slaymaker (1972) commented that subjects low in need for social approval lowered disclosure as their interview role was made clearer. Kaplan (1974) discovered that externalizers generally tended to disclose more than did internalizers during his experiment. Sousa-Poze, Shulman and Rohrberg (1973) concurred in this finding.

No significant difference exists in self-disclosure patterns for subjects according to birth order (Goldstein, 1973; Ohlson, 1974). However, the significance of a self-discloser's personal attractiveness upon self-disclosure varies according to sex. Cash and Soloway (1975) reported that male-female dyads had contrasting patterns among males and females according to their self-perception of attractiveness with males disclosing more and females disclosing less the more attractive they deemed themselves. Further, a substantial contributing factor to self-disclosure is the age of the one self-disclosing. In particular, self-derogation is dependent upon a subject's age (Kaplan, 1971). In general, as people get older, they disclose less, especially to parents and same-sex friends. Although disclosure to an opposite-sex friend or spouse in-

creases from age seventeen until sometime in the fifties, disclosure thereafter drops off (Jourard, 1964).

Research findings differ on the effect of marital status upon self-disclosure. Ohlson (1974) found that subjects from a divorced home did not differ significantly in disclosure from subjects from a non-divorced home. Similarly, Pasternack and Van Landingham (1972) reported no significant difference in self-disclosure of married women and undergraduate females. However, Jourard (1958) found a difference in self-disclosure by marital status of subjects. Spouses disclose more to each other than any other group (Jourard, 1964). Silverman (1974) implied that an individual's adjustment in marriage is directly related to his sharing of thoughts and experiences. The individuals more satisfied with their marriages, according to Webb (1972), were like their spouses in having the qualities of high self-acceptance and high self-disclosure.

Pedersen and Breglio (1968b) reported that less emotionally stable males were more inclined to disclose more about their personality, health, and physical appearance than stable males. Further, Plym (1967) stated that his study had failed to confirm Jourard's self-disclosure theory of correlating the coefficients of self-disclosure and illness/absenteeism. However, Pearce and Wiege (1973), in summarizing self-disclosure literature, emphasized that willingness to self-disclose has generally been considered an outgrowth of personal health and satisfaction.

Some psychologists have reported no essential difference in disclosure by sexes in America (Ohlson, 1974; Goldstein, 1973), nor were any found within the German-Austrian culture (Plog, 1965). The sex of the subject failed to affect significantly length and depth of disclosure (Olson, 1973), or eye-contact and eye-downcast behavior (Christenson, 1973). Although females report more disclosure, no significant relationship has been shown between sex and self-disclosure (Bath and Daly, 1972; Turoczi, 1973).

Other psychologists, however, have found sex differences in disclosure patterns. Chelune (1975) suggested that self-disclosure plays a differing role in male and female defensive orientations. Pedersen and Breglio (1968b) stated that females revealed more than males on all topics except money. Kopfstein and Kopfstein (1973) reported that males were not as self-disclosive as females, particularly about negative characteristics, Annicchiarico (1973) found that opposite-sex dyads showed significantly higher disclosure than same-sex dyads; Brooks (1974) reported that dyads having a female resulted in more disclosure than all-male dyads. Ryckman, Sherman, and Burgess (1973) and Jourard (1958; 1964) concluded that females disclosed more than did males.

Nationality, the country of self-disclosers' origin and citizenship, relates to self-disclosure. Plog (1965) stated that Americans were higher self-disclosers than German-Aus-

trians. Jourard (1964), likewise, pronounced Americans to be larger self-disclosers than Far Easterners. Although Jourard reported that Puerto Rican girls disclosed more about themselves to their mothers than did American girls, Americans had higher self-disclosure to their fathers, best male friends, and best female friends. Among males American males self-disclosed more to all four target persons. Consistent with these general patterns, Jourard (1961b) found that American females were greater self-disclosers than English co-eds. Agreeing with Jourard, Todd and Shapira (1974) stated that American subjects were more self-disclosing than the British. Jourard (1964) concluded that, in general, Americans had higher self-disclosure than any other cultural group.

The race of a self-discloser is a definite indicator of degree of self-disclosure. Although Braithwaite (1973) found that both black and white inmates manifested distrust for other races, whites disclosed greater distrust than did blacks. This research may indicate greater distrust or may indicate propensity for greater disclosure by whites, as found by Jourard (1958).

#### Nature of the Recipient

Allen (1973) reported that there was substantial consistency in recipients of disclosure. Jourard (1964), likewise, found different targets of information. As with the discloser, characteristics of the recipient which appear to be related to

self-disclosure are personality, personal characteristics, and demographic variables.

Certner (1973) reported a positive relationship between self-disclosure and liking patterns. Kohen (1975) revealed that a female's disclosure was, in fact, more often related to liking for the recipient than the latter's self-disclosure. Knecht, Lippman, and Swap (1973) reported that subjects' perceptions of others' being attitudinally similar generated liking for the latter. Only Jourard and Landsman (1960) reported that liking was only slightly correlated with disclosure.

Ellison and Firestone (1974) and Jackson and Pepinsky (1972) reported a significant relationship between trust in the recipient and the nature and amount of disclosure. Traux, Altmann, and Whittmer (1973) found that whenever a friend provides high levels of empathy, warmth, and genuineness, self-disclosure for a male indicates positive adjustment. Lack of such empathy and presence of self-disclosure indicate maladjustment for males. For females the researchers found no particular relationship between self-disclosure and adjustment.

Although Pearce and Wiege (1973) could not support their hypothesis that disclosure correlates to subjects' perception of their relationship to the recipient, Jourard and Landsman (1960) maintained that the amount of self-disclosure is highly correlated with the degree to which subjects know recipients.

Jourard reported that the amount of self-disclosure one willingly imparts is correlated to the degree of perceived closeness of the relationship. A very important target group of self-disclosure is the family. Subjects' self-disclosure to parents is related to their perceptions of parental nurturance (Doster and Strickland, 1969). Within one's pre-adult family, the mother is more likely to be the primary recipient. Married individuals, while maintaining a constant level of disclosure, redistribute their disclosure so that the spouse is the major recipient of all categories of disclosure (Jourard, 1964).

Kuiken, Rasmussen, and Cullen (1974) stated that males, in considering compatibility of T-groups took into account social and political attitudes, whereas females focused on personal-social relationships. Sote and Good (1974), in exploring similarity to a stranger in self-disclosing situations, found greater attraction to the stranger for high self-disclosing females but not for low self-disclosing females.

Cash and Soloway (1975) stated that disclosure was positively related to partner-rated attractiveness, particularly for men. Derlega, Walmer, and Furman (1973) were unable to confirm their predictions that females would disclose more to a conventionally dressed confederate who had dispensed intimate information than to an unconventionally dressed confederate.

Just as college-aged males are most revealing to their same-sex friend (Jourard, 1964), both English and American girls reveal more to females than to males. Wiebe and Williams (1972) reported that a male was equally likely to reveal himself to either his father or to his mother but that a female was more likely to disclose to her mother. Jourard (1964) similarly reported that college-aged males self-disclosed to their parents about equally but less than did females; however, college-aged females disclosed less to their fathers than to their mothers and same-sex friend.

Although Chittick and Himelstein (1967) found that self-disclosure is not affected by ascendant-submissive rating (whether the target is of higher or lower status), Wurster, Bass, and Alcock (1961) stated:

We are more likely to interact the more we esteem or value each other....Social esteem appears to make a friend equally desirable as the recipient of either socially or scholastically favorable information about oneself....We follow the esteemed person because we believe him to have the ability and the power as a person to reward or punish us (pp. 650, 562, 653).

### Content of the Self-Disclosure

Frequency and depth of self-disclosure vary considerably with the topic. By examining the frequency of themes for written secrets obtained anonymously from 359 undergraduates, Norton, Feldman, and Tafoya (1974) concluded that secrets relating to sex, mental health, and violence or destruction were perceived as the most risky. Jourard (1964)

reported that money, body, and personality are topics of less frequent and intensive disclosure than are attitudes and opinions, work or studies, and tastes and interests.

### Consequences

Although Jourard (1964) believes that self-disclosure appropriate to target, situation, content, and discloser is a positive indicator and facilitator of good mental health, he thinks that inappropriate self-disclosure is a sign of maladjustment. Regardless of appropriateness, some consequences remain constant. Klassen, Hornstra, and Anderson (1975) found a small but consistent inverse relationship between symptom-mood reporting (announcement of emotional states) and social desirability (psychological attractiveness).

Shere (1973) said that because self-disclosure results from and causes close interpersonal relationships and such relationships create possibilities for conflict and frustration, defense mechanisms are employed. The preferences for particular defense mechanisms are even more important than adjustment in determining self-disclosure with significant others. Green and Murray (1973) added that high self-disclosure followed by personal threat is a strong antecedent of angry aggression.

Although psychotherapy leads to self-disclosure, ironically the subjects more likely to defect from psychotherapy had earlier patterns of greater self-disclosure than did the

subjects who remained (Heilburn, 1973). Likewise, Davis and Sloan (1974) presented the costliness of self-disclosure in their research of undergraduates. The more interviewers self-disclosed, the less favorably the undergraduates viewed them.

In spite of negative possible consequence, positive consequences can and do exist. Both the intimacy of the topic and the similarity-dissimilarity of target and recipient have highly significant effects (Petzelt, 1974). When the target responds with acceptance and reciprocation, trust ensues (Johnson & Noonan, 1972). Warm human bonds can be built by self-disclosure. Although for men self-disclosure is sometimes threatening and sometimes rewarding, women's level of friendship is higher after intimate self-disclosure. In general the level of friendship does increase because of intimate and nonintimate self-disclosure (Walker, 1973).

#### Importance of Self-Disclosure

Self-disclosure is important for an individual in therapy, general life adjustment, numerous academic endeavors and occupations, and interpersonal relationships. Allen (1973) emphasized the importance of self-disclosure in the therapeutic process. Jourard (1959) agreed that self-revelation is a basic feature in attainment of mental health. Furthermore, Jourard (1964) contrasted mental health conditions according to self-disclosure: "'Real' self-disclo-

sure is both a symptom of...and means of ultimately achieving healthy personality" (p. 24). Conversely, "neurotic people and people with 'socially patterned defects'...are all persons who display varying degrees of self-alienation" (p. 115). Sinha (1974) elaborated by commenting that psychotherapy, counseling, teaching, and other clinical activities are all designed to assist individuals who are lacking in communication skills. Without disclosure each of these fields would fail.

Therapy is not the only benefactor of self-disclosure. Shere (1973) cited both theoretical and empirical support that self-disclosure is positively related to adjustment. Mentally healthy people not only perceive all reality (themselves included) more realistically but also are more expressive and more completely honest than those with poorer mental health, according to Maslow (1971).

Jourard (1964) noted that scores of self-disclosure were highly related to nurses' attaining good grades in nursing school. Pedersen and Breglio (1968a) commented that Jourard's finding indicate that self-disclosure may be an "important nonintellectual factor predictive of success" in several professions: counseling, psychotherapy, teaching, etc. (p. 291). Granoff (1971) expanded upon the merits of self-disclosure by including all interpersonal relationships; the degree of satisfaction which one receives is positively related with

positive meaning of self-disclosing behaviors. Derlega and Chaikin (1975) analyzed the dynamics of self-disclosure in the forming of friendships, marriage, and other social relationships. Jourard (1964), the most prolific writer on the topic, commented that being transparent to others is necessary for being known to oneself, a condition which is imperative for good mental health. He summarized: "Perhaps honesty really is the best policy, in this case, a health-insurance policy" (p. 185).

Relationships between and within  
Self-Esteem and Self-Disclosure

The literature strongly suggests that self-esteem and self-disclosure are two important facets of personality. Further, based on the relationships of both variables with other intervening variables, it is reasonable to suggest a relationship between them. Petersen (1972) stated that self-disclosure was significantly related to changes in self-esteem. Vosen (1967) found that the relationship between the quantity of self-disclosure and self-esteem was linear and not fully dependent upon situation. The strongest support came from Shapiro (1968). In working with 105 males and 105 females and administering the Tennessee Department of Mental Health Self-Concept Scale, Maudsley Personality Inventory, and the Swenson Adaptation of Self-Disclosure Questionnaire, he found that high self-esteem subjects were high in self-

disclosure, high in extraversion and low in neuroticism; that low self-concept subjects were lower in self-disclosure and extraversion and higher in neuroticism; and that subjects of moderate self-concept fell between the two extreme groups. Some research did, however, negate positive correlation. Doyne (1972) reported that low and medium disclosers had higher self-esteem than did high disclosers. Some research, such as that of Kinsler (1973) gave only moderate support for positive correlation. Kinsler commented that his experiment provided limited support for the concept that an identity of some kind is essential prior to an individual's having open, intimate interactions with others.

In addition, the literature suggests relationships between aspects of self-disclosure. Fitzgerald (1963) discovered that certain areas of the personality were more freely disclosed than others and some areas were not discussed at all. Jourard (1964) reported that high disclosure clusters included attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, and work; and that low disclosure clusters contained money, personality, and body. Also, Jongsma (1973) warned future researchers to avoid treating all topics of the same rated intimacy level as equivalent in generating self-disclosure.

Fitzgerald (1963) stated that there is fairly uniform restriction as to whom one gives information about the self. Jourard (1964) revealed that there was significant difference

in target-person on the part of the unmarried and the married groups.

Thus, the literature suggests relationships do exist between and within self-esteem and self-disclosure.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

Methodology includes the hypotheses to be tested, the instruments used to assess self-esteem, the subjects to whom these test instruments were administered, and the statistics used to test the three hypotheses and to supply other pertinent data.

#### Hypotheses

To examine the relationship between self-esteem and self-disclosure and the pertinent relationships within self-disclosure as suggested by the literature, the following hypotheses were tested. The first hypothesis stated that positive correlation exists between self-esteem and self-disclosure. The second hypothesis was that in the areas of attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, and work or studies subjects are more likely to self-disclose than in the areas of money, personality, and body. In addition, certain questions pertaining to sexual practices or attitudes and to financial worth, especially, within these more restricted categories have lower self-disclosure than the category as a whole. The third hypothesis was that spouses are more likely to be recipients of greater disclosure than are other family members or friends.

### Self-Esteem and "The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale"

In generally assessing self-esteem and in particularly using "The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale" (Fitts, 1965), one needs to consider general cautions as well as the instrument itself. This scale is presented in Appendix A.

General Cautions. Among the general cautions of measuring self-esteem are wise selection of items, accuracy of reporting, and accuracy of test interpretation. Shavelson, Hubner, and Stanton (1976) commented on the difficulty of choosing the self-esteem population of items from which representative ones may be chosen. Furthermore, the research of Ziller, Hagey, Smith, and Long (1969) indicated that self-acceptance and social-acceptance are so intertwined that self-esteem measurements based solely upon verbal self-reports have questionable validity. Also, Smith (1960) noted that some aspects of the self-esteem may not receive sufficient attention if the test is constructed so that the self-ratings are merely added.

Accuracy of reporting may be questioned. Subjects may select answers which they consider to be socially desirable. Subjects may be either unable or unwilling to reveal their true self-esteem (Shavelson, Hubner, & Stanton, 1976). Conversely, subjects may rank themselves harshly, as in the experiments conducted by Regan, Gosselink, Hubsch, and Ulsh (1975).

Inaccurate reporting by subjects may be further confounded by the lack of agreement in test interpretation. Shavelson, Hubner, and Stanton (1976) commented that data is often not available to test rival interpretations of self-esteem evaluations. They also noted both inadequate validation of interpretations of self-esteem measurements and statistical data on the equivalence of current self-esteem measurements. Furthermore, they warned of the hazards in generalizing interpretations across subject populations.

A variation in interpretation has produced a proliferation of instruments. These instruments have focused on a variety of facets of self-concept including (1) stable versus changing self-concept, (2) learning versus reinforcement, creation of dissonance, or arousal of needs and defenses as methods for changing self-concept, (3) situation versus phenomenon versus internalization as determinants of self-concept, (4) normative standard versus absolute personal standard versus non-evaluation as types of evaluation of self-concept, and (5) unidimensional versus multidimensional self-concept (Shavelson, Hubner, & Stanton, 1976). Of these bases, the unidimensional versus multidimensional self-concept as represented by "The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale" was chosen for the present research. By using "The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale," this research replicated, in part, Shapiro's (1968) study of the correlation of self-esteem and

self-disclosure.

"The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale" (Fitts, 1964) was used to measure self-esteem. (For the purposes of this study, self-concept was equated to self-esteem.) This test is "simple for the subject, widely applicable, well standardized, and multi-dimensional in its description of the self-concept" (Fitts, 1965, p. 1).

Description. The test consists of 100 self-descriptive statements to which the subject responds as follows:

- (1) completely false,
- (2) mostly false,
- (3) partly false and partly true,
- (4) mostly true,
- (5) completely true.

Of these items 90 assess the self-concept and 10 self-criticism, the latter being MMPI lie scale items. The aspects of the self scaled are identity, self-satisfaction, behavior, physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self, and social self. A sample of 626 persons of differing age, sex, race, and socio-economic backgrounds was used as the norm for "The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale" (Buros, 1972).

Reliability. The instrument has demonstrated satisfactory reliability. Total retest reliability is in the high .80's (Buros, 1972). The total positive score reveals over-

all self-esteem (Buros, 1972); the reliability of total positive is .92 (Fitts, 1965).

Validity. "The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale" has validity. Content validity was judged by a selected panel of psychologists. The panel considered a pool of questions; only those items receiving unanimous agreement by the seven clinical psychologists serving as judges were retained (Fitts, 1965). Furthermore, the instrument has shown predictive validity in its ability to distinguish between normal and disturbed individuals. In keeping with "personality theory and research which suggest that groups which differ on certain psychological dimensions should differ also in self-concept," a psychiatric patient group generally shows a "wider spread of scores" than a norm group on "The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale" (Fitts, 1965, p. 17).

#### Self-Disclosure and "The Self-Disclosure Questionnaire"

As with self-esteem, one needs to consider general cautions when measuring self-disclosure.

General Cautions. Adler (1973) cautioned against the face validity of self-disclosure research since authentic self-disclosure is highly complex and multi-dimensional. In fact, Buss and Gerjuoy (1957), in reviewing self-disclosure studies, reported that most researchers found wide disparities between subjects' stated and actual behaviors. Two self-disclosure problems may occur: inaccurate self-disclo-

sure and inappropriate self-disclosure.

Woodyard and Hines (1973) in their research cited reasons for honesty and dishonesty in self-disclosure. Subjects made true disclosures to maintain good interpersonal relationships. They gave inaccurate (deceptive) disclosures as defenses to avoid embarrassing others, admitting weaknesses, or hurting others. Jourard (1958) discussed the tendency to "misrepresent self to others," to "market personality," to be "(an) other directed character," and to be a "self-alienated individual."

Chaikin, Derlega, Bayma, and Shaw (1975) noted that normal males responded in disclosure intimacy similar to their partners while neurotics disclosed at a moderate intimacy level regardless of partner's intimate or superficial disclosure. The psychologists suggested that neurotic disclosure is related to inappropriate or nonnormative disclosure, not necessarily too high or low self-disclosure. Hamsher and Farina (1967) observed that in the problem of over-disclosure possibly the subjects are "troubled to a degree" which compels them "despite themselves to communicate openly when given an opportunity." Chaikin and Derlega (1974) reported the perceptions of appropriateness of 240 undergraduates. The first half perceived intimate self-disclosure to a stranger or an acquaintance as less appropriate and more maladjusted than self-nondisclosure while either self-disclo-

sure or self-nondisclosure to a friend was viewed as appropriate. The second half, considering a different set of targets, perceived self-disclosure to someone either older or younger as less appropriate than nondisclosure. Timing is also important. Disclosure of a good fortune early in a relationship is generally considered unattractive. However, correct timing for reporting negative experiences depends upon the agent responsible for the event. If the self-discloser were responsible for his own misfortune, early disclosure is better than later in an interview. However, if the person were not responsible for his own misfortune, later disclosure is viewed as preferable (Jones and Gordon, 1972).

According to appropriateness with 15 being the most appropriate, Jourard (1968, p. 28) charted target-persons as stated by W. R. Rivenbark III (1963, 1964) in his unpublished research at the University of Florida (Table 1).

Thus, both accuracy and appropriateness are considered essential features for self-disclosure to be a symptom of good mental health. The instrument chosen to measure self-disclosure for this present research was "The Self-Disclosure Questionnaire," normalized on 300 students, by S. M. Jourard (1958, 1964). Description, reliability, and validity were important considerations in selecting the form of sixty questions (SD-60) of "The Self-Disclosure Questionnaire" (Jourard, 1964). SD-60 is presented in Appendix B.

TABLE 1

## STUDENTS' READINESS TO CONFIDE IN DIFFERENT SETTINGS \*

<u>Setting</u>	<u>Male Rank</u>	<u>Female Rank</u>
Tell a radio or TV audience	1	1
Tell a stranger on a bus or train	2	2
Tell at a cocktail party with friends and strangers present	3	3
Write on an application for a job or club membership	4	4
Write in an autobiography for publication	5	5
Tell in a bull session with friends	6	6
Tell an interviewer for scientific purposes	7	7
Write in a letter to a friend	8	8
Write in an anonymous questionnaire for scientific purposes	9	11
Tell a priest or minister	10	10
Tell a psychotherapist	11	14
Write in a secret diary	12	9
Tell my closest parent	13	12
Tell my best same-sex friend	14	13
Tell my best opposite-sex friend or spouse	15	15

\* W. R. Rivenbark III, Unpublished Research (University of Florida: 1963, 1964), p. 28.

Description. In Jourard's SD-60 four target persons are defined: father, mother, spouse or fiancé(e), and best friend. With respect to each target, subjects indicate the level of self-disclosure for each of the sixty questions as follows:

- (1) have told the other person nothing about this aspect of me,
- (2) have talked in general terms about this item (The other person has only a general idea about this aspect of me.),
- (3) have talked in full and complete detail about this item to the other person (He knows me fully in this respect and could describe me accurately),
- (4) have lied or misrepresented myself to the other person so that he has a false picture of me.

The six categories of topics include attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, work or studies, money, personality, and body. Each category of the SD-60 has ten questions. For this study a few modifications were instituted. Two questions were rephrased in light of the women's liberation movement. The original question, "My personal standards of beauty and attractiveness in women--what I consider to be attractive in a woman," now reads "My personal standards of physical attractiveness in people." Also, the question, "The things I regard as desirable for a man to be--what I look for in a man" now reads "The traits that I regard as desirable for a person of the opposite sex to have--what I look for in a person of the opposite sex." One question takes

into account the increased availability of drugs within the last decade: Jourard's question "My personal views on drinking" has been expanded to three questions: "My personal views on drinking," "My personal views on marijuana," and "My personal views on other drugs."

Reliability. The Jourard self-disclosure questionnaires of 15, 25, 35, 45, and 60 items have satisfactory reliability. Odd-even coefficients for larger sub-totals run in the .80's and .90's. Correlation of the sub-total sums of the odds-evens for the 60-question test was .94, thus showing consistent responses regarding target persons and aspects of self (Jourard, 1964).

Validity. "The Self-Disclosure Questionnaire" has construct validity, discrimination between groups, and correlations with other measures. First, Pedersen and Higbee (1968) maintained that construct validity exists for "The Self-Disclosure Questionnaire" of 60 items (SD-60) and for "The Self-Disclosure Questionnaire" of 25 items (SD-25), both constructed by Jourard, since the multi-trait multi-method matrices exhibited both convergent and discriminant validity. Second, discrimination between groups exists. Differences between targets in mean disclosure score and differences in mean disclosure score classified by aspects of self were significant at  $p < .01$ . Last, the instrument correlates with other measures. Jourard (1964), in reporting the greater

disclosure of females than males, stated that the "size of sex-difference was in a non-chance way among groups who differed in their performance on the Minnesota Multi-phasic Personality Inventory" (p. 180). Pedersen and Breglio (1968a), in designing a Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (SDQ), constructed open-ended questions regarding the areas of interests, personality, studies, body, and money to test the validity of Jourard's SD-60 and SD-25, tests constructed in multiple choice format regarding the topics of attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, work or studies, money, personality, and body. The SD's yielded actual depth of self-disclosure by the sum of the sub-scores; whereas, the SDQ yielded amount of disclosure by the quantity of words given in response. The correlation of depth and amount of disclosure was .84.

#### Limitations

Several limitations exist regarding these two tests chosen. First, cultural taboos were not considered. (Such taboos could preclude certain topics from being considered appropriate for self-disclosure. If high self-esteem subjects had high-cultural identity, these topics would tend to be screened for low self-disclosure.) Furthermore, unrealistic high self-esteem and neurotic overdisclosure were not provided for. (An exalted self-esteem could cause one to overdisclose from confidence. On the other hand, neurotic over-

disclosure could indicate a defense technique to compensate for low esteem.) Last of all, the usual problems of pencil and paper tests as well as that of Likert scaling exist: subjects are not always conscious of their motivation, and even when conscious of their emotions do not always report with one hundred per cent accuracy; Likert scaling raises the question of psychological meaning in forced choice. (The psychological meaning may not be consistent from subject to subject. In addition, the psychological distance from point to point may not be consistent.)

#### Subjects

The subjects selected for this study were 111 students from selected psychology and sociology classes at a community college in Texas. The majority of the subjects represented the immediate cities, which flank an industrial corridor, and the adjacent rural environs. High school and General Educational Developmental (GED) Test graduates as well as a few concurrently enrolled high school students were subjects. The mean age was approximately 24. Racial minorities were less than ten per cent. The subjects' economic backgrounds were heterogeneous clustering toward middle class.

#### Procedure

During one class hour in the Fall 1979 semester, students in selected day and night psychology and sociology classes were read a statement regarding their being anonymous, volun-

tary subjects for the research of a thesis. After signing and submitting consent forms, students answered a demographic questionnaire (collected to verify the representative sampling of the students of a particular college), "The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale" and Jourard's "Self-Disclosure Questionnaire" (SD-60). All tests were hand-scored by the examiner.

### Statistics

The following tests were selected for the three hypotheses which were established. To test the relationship between self-esteem and self-disclosure, the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to correlate the score from "The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale" and the total score from the "Self-Disclosure Questionnaire" (SD-60). A question existed whether the data could be called intervally scaled, but examination of the data suggested ordinal data for both self-esteem and self-disclosure. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used, therefore, because it "is especially useful when the original data are ranks" (Glass & Stanley, 1970, p. 176). The significance of this correlation was tested at .05 level of significance.

To test the relative strength between topics, Wilcoxon Matched Pairs tests were used to compare self-disclosure scores for each of the following pairs of categories: attitudes and opinions versus money, attitudes and opinions

versus personality, attitudes and opinions versus body, tastes and interests versus money, tastes and interests versus personality, tastes and interests versus body, work or studies versus money, work or studies versus personality, and work or studies versus body. Wilcoxon Matched Pairs tests were also used to compare the following sub-topics within categories to the total scores of their respective categories: the category of money versus the sub-topic of total financial worth, and the category of personality versus the sub-topic of sexual practices and attitudes. Wilcoxon Matched Pairs tests were used because of ordinal data and dependent pairs. All pairs were tested at the .05 level of significance.

To examine the hypothesis that certain target persons receive greater disclosure, Wilcoxon Matched Pairs tests were used to compare the following targets: spouse or fiancé(e) versus mother, spouse or fiancé(e) versus father, and spouse or fiancé(e) versus best friend. Again, Wilcoxon Matched Pairs tests were used because, according to Siegel (1956), "when the measurement is in an ordinal scale both within and between pairs, the Wilcoxon test should be used" (p. 93). The level of significance was .05 for all tests.

Finally, demographic data was converted to percentages and is presented in the Appendix.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

Statistics for this research include a reporting of demographic data as well as a statistical report of hypotheses and other data. One hundred eleven students from selected psychology and sociology classes of a Texas community college were the subjects. Appendix C tabulates by percentages the following biographical data of subjects: sex, age, race, order of birth, siblings, marital status, total marriages, sons, daughters, religious preference, religious viewpoint, political preference, political viewpoint, years lived in the county, grade point average, family income, employment, and primary educational goal.

#### Tests of Hypotheses

##### Hypothesis 1

The null form of the first hypothesis was that no positive correlation exists between self-esteem and self-disclosure. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient for self-esteem and self-disclosure was .285. Although the correlation was positive as the alternative hypothesis had stated, the level of significance was .38. Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected at a .05 level of significance. A summary of the self-esteem and total self-disclo-

sure scores is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2

## SUMMARY OF SELF-ESTEEM AND SELF-DISCLOSURE SCORES

	<u>Self-Esteem</u>	<u>Self-Disclosure</u>
Maximum Possible Score	5.00	4.00
Actual Range	2.16 to 4.66	2.14 to 3.89
Mean	3.71	3.07
Standard Deviation	.38	.22
Median	3.72	3.08
Semi-interquartile Range	.19	.22

Hypothesis 2

The null form of the second hypothesis stated that there would be no difference in amount of disclosure relative to content area. Specifically, the categories of money, personality, and body would not differ in disclosure levels from attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, and work or studies. In addition, certain questions pertaining to sexual practices or attitudes and to financial worth within these more restricted categories have equal self-disclosure when compared with respective categories as a whole. This hypothesis was tested in a series of pairwise comparisons between the category group of money, personality, and body, and the category group of attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, and work or studies. Further, the question

of total financial worth was compared to the category of money and the question of sexual practices and attitudes was compared to the category of personality. The Wilcoxon Matched Pairs test was used in all cases. The findings are summarized in Table 3. All tests achieved a significance level of less than .001. The three categories of attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, and work or studies were found to be significantly greater in disclosure level than money, personality, and body ( $p < .0001$ ). The greatest difference was found between tastes and interests (disclosed more) and personality (disclosed less). The least difference was found between the categories of attitudes and opinions (disclosed more) and money (disclosed less). However, all differences were so great that it may be questionable to place any emphasis on the ordering of those differences. A change of score in only one item could change the rank order of the differences.

In addition to the tests between categories, two sub-topics within a category of self-disclosure were compared to their respective categories. The category of money was found to differ significantly from the sub-topic of total financial worth ( $p < .0017$ ,  $T=1672.5$ ,  $z=-2.93$ ). Also, the category of personality was significantly different from the sub-topic of sexual attitudes and practices ( $p < .00003$ ,  $T=433.5$ ,  $z=-7.45$ ).

TABLE 3

## WILCOXON MATCHED PAIRS OF SELF-DISCLOSURE TOPICS

	Attitudes and Opinions vs. Money	Attitudes and Opinions vs. Personality	Attitudes and Opinions vs. Body	Tastes and Interests vs. Money	Tastes and Interests vs. Personality	Tastes and Interests vs. Body	Work or Studies vs. Money	Work or Studies vs. Personality	Work or Studies vs. Body
T	1735	1473.5	1533	1218.5	874	967	1401.5	988	1477
N*	107	107	104	107	108	105	104	105	106
(MEAN) $\mu$ T	2889	2889	2730	2889	2943	2782.5	2730	2782.5	2835.5
(STANDARD DEVIATION) $\sigma$ T	321.75	321.75	308.37	321.75	326.25	312.81	308.37	312.81	317.27
z	-3.59	-4.40	-3.88	-5.19	-6.34	-5.80	-4.31	-5.74	-4.28
LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001

\*In accordance with procedure from Wilcoxon Matched Pairs, pairs with 0 difference were eliminated from the 111 pairs.

### Hypothesis 3

The null form of the third hypothesis was that there would be no difference in amount of disclosure relative to target-person. Specifically, the amount of disclosure received by spouse or fiancé(e) would not differ from that received by father, mother, or best friend. Only those subjects who had spouses or fiancé(e)s were used for target-person comparisons. (These numbered 65 out of 111 subjects.) The Wilcoxon Matched Pairs test was used in these pairwise comparisons. The findings are summarized in Table 4. All tests indicated greater disclosure to spouse or fiancé(e) at a significance level of less than .001. The greatest difference was between spouse or fiancé(e) and mother, while the least difference was between spouse or fiancé(e) and best friend. Again, the differences were all so great that a meaningful order is questionable.

TABLE 4  
 WILCOXON MATCHED PAIRS OF SELF-DISCLOSURE TARGETS

	Spouse or Fiancé(e) vs. Mother	Spouse or Fiancé(e) vs. Father	Spouse or Fiancé(e) vs. Best Friend
T	135.5	145.5	301
N*	65	62	65
MEAN= $\mu$ T	1072.5	976.5	1072.5
STANDARD DEVIATION= $\sigma$ T	153.02	142.63	153.02
z	-6.12	-5.83	-5.04
LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE	< .001	< .001	< .001

\*In accordance with procedure from Wilcoxon Matched Pairs, pairs with 0 difference were eliminated from the 111 pairs.

## CHAPTER V

### ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH

Most of the data was, as expected, in keeping with the known features of the population of the college. A few findings, however, were not typical. Whereas the college population is more nearly one third female and two thirds male, the reverse was true of the sample. This is explained by the fact that more males cluster in the vocational courses and more females in the social science branch of the humanities. In fact, no student in the sample listed crafts as a career.

The mean age of the sample was about three years younger than the mean age of the college population. This can be attributed to the tendency of younger students to cluster in academic classes rather than in vocational courses.

The approximately 7% racial minority of the sample is less than the college racial minority of 18%. Whereas in the sixties many college blacks were studying social science, a higher percentage are now pre-law or vocational students. This general situation could have affected the percentage of students enrolled in the social science classes tested.

College data is not available for the number of siblings, but nearly sixty percent listed three or more siblings, a number which is higher than the national average.

An unexpected finding was that the data indicated that over 40% of the sample reported a family income of \$25,000 or above. The fact that this is an industrial, fast-growing area no doubt accounts for this. The majority of demographic items are in accordance with the area in general and the college in particular.

#### Hypothesis 1

Though no significant relationship was found between self-esteem and self-disclosure, a finding of a small positive (non-significant) correlation was not completely unexpected. The pairings of several individual studies suggest a positive correlation between self-esteem and self-disclosure. Newirth (1971) found that medium and high self-esteem children had parents who treated each other symmetrically (i.e., as equals), and Jourard (1964) reported that one is more likely to self-disclose according to the perceived closeness of a relationship. It would appear that an environment of equality would generate higher disclosure for higher esteem individuals. Stein (1970) found that self-esteem rises during the high school years. As one comes to believe he has more personal control over events and is freer from others' control, his esteem rises (Ryckman and Cannon, 1975). Ziller and Grossman (1967) reported that self-esteem decreases with the increasing age of adults. The power shifting to a different generation could, thus, account for the decreasing

self-esteem of older adults. Likewise, self-disclosure rises from age seventeen until sometime in the fifties and then drops off (Jourard, 1964). Thus, the graphs of self-esteem by age and self-disclosure by age suggest a positive correlation. As previously commented, self-esteem rises as one feels he has control over the environment (Ryckman and Cannon, 1975). Likewise, internalizers (those who expect reinforcement as a result of their own efforts and are, therefore, not threatened by negative feedback) are more willing to self-disclose than externalizers (those who see their reinforcement coming from sources outside themselves), according to Ellison (1972). Again, the pairing of self-esteem to environmental viewpoint and self-disclosure to environmental viewpoint suggests a positive correlation between self-esteem and self-disclosure. Phillips (1951) reported that individuals who "like and respect themselves are inclined to be positive, at least, in their attitudes toward others" (p. 79). Such a positive attitude would suggest begetting self-disclosure. Both Certner (1973) and Kohen (1975) reported a positive relationship between self-disclosure and liking patterns. According to Jourard (1964), appropriate self-disclosure is vital for good mental health. In fact, Traux, Altmann, and Whittmer (1973) found that a lack of self-disclosure toward an empathetic, genuine friend

indicates maladjustment for males.

On the other hand, the pairings of several studies suggest a negative correlation between self-esteem and self-disclosure. Bartelt (1973) and Rogers (1969) reported higher self-concepts for males than for females, yet Jourard (1964) found females self-disclose more than males. These findings suggest a negative relationship between self-esteem and self-disclosure. Another finding which cast doubt upon a positive correlation of self-esteem and self-disclosure was that of Pedersen and Breglio (1968b), who reported that less stable males were inclined to disclose more about themselves--personality, health, and physical appearance--than were stable males.

The correlational studies of self-esteem and self-disclosure also produced varying results ranging from the strong support of Shapiro (1968) to the moderate support of Kinsler (1973) to a negative correlation by Doyne (1972). Two explanations exist regarding the finding of this research of a small positive (non-significant) correlation. First, possibly there may not be a relationship. Further, it is possible that the selected classes of psychology and sociology provided an overly homogeneous sample. Perhaps both factors are at work.

### Hypothesis 2

As hypothesized, the topics of attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, and work and studies were disclosed

significantly more than the topics of money, personality, and body. Also, as the alternative hypothesis forecast, certain questions pertaining to sexual practices or attitudes and to financial worth within these more restricted categories had significantly lower self-disclosure. Fitzgerald (1963) and Jongsma (1973) spoke of certain features of the personality being disclosed more than others. In particular, Norton, Feldman, and Tafuya (1974) reported that secrets pertaining to sex, mental health, and violence or destruction are considered most risky and not likely to be disclosed as readily. Jourard (1964) ran many tests on his self-disclosure format. All validated his assertion that attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, and work and studies are self-disclosed more than are personality, body, and money. Part of the procedures and results of this thesis replicated his research.

### Hypothesis 3

As expected, the alternative hypothesis that one self-discloses more to spouses than to any other family members or friends was supported. Both Fitzgerald (1963) and Jourard (1964) indicated target selectivity. Jourard and Landsman (1960) reported a high correlation between self-disclosure and the degree to which subjects know recipients. Jourard (1964) concurred that amount of self-disclosure is correlated to the perceived closeness of the relationship. Sil-

verman (1974) suggested that an individual's adjustment in marriage is directly related to the sharing of thoughts and experiences. The marriages providing most satisfaction are those in which spouses are high self-disclosers (Webb, 1972). Jourard (1958) stated that spouses disclose more to each other than any other group. Jourard (1964) stressed the quality and quantity of information received by the spouse.

#### Suggested Research

This study presents several problems for additional research. First, the finding for hypothesis 1 regarding the correlation of self-esteem and self-disclosure was inconclusive, and previous research had been contradictory. This research yielded a non-significant positive correlation. Therefore, replication might be helpful to arrive at more precise findings provided the sample were heterogeneous. One possibility would be first semester college English classes. This would be a more representative sampling of student population. Second, although this research and previous research have been decisively similar in determining topics of greatest disclosure, practically all the research has dealt with college populations. Additional research of hypothesis 2 regarding topics of disclosure might prove helpful if replicated with different populations--high school, intermediate school, adult professionals, adult laborers, etc.

### Summary

The self is a conscious entity that is partially formed by others and interacts with others (May, 1953), yet has a framework of responsibilities to itself (Menninger, 1972). Self-esteem is the value that an individual attributes to himself (Morval & Morval, 1971-1972). Self-disclosure is the making of oneself known to others (Jourard & Lasakow, 1958).

### Review of Literature

In exploring the extensive literature of self-esteem, this study presented evidence supporting the existence of self-esteem, factors affecting self-esteem, maintenance of self-esteem, and importance of self-esteem. An individual's self-esteem affects his attitudes and values regarding abilities, emotions, issues, people, sex, gender, and persuasion. A person's self-esteem can be associated with certain personality factors such as achievement, power, and approval. Furthermore, self-esteem is evidenced in responses to numerous situations--academic, job or task, anxiety or threat, and success versus failure. In addition, Berger (1952) reported a positive correlation between acceptance of others and acceptance of self. Self-awareness, yet another factor supporting the existence of self-esteem, is, according to Jourard (1964), desirable, for only by knowing and accepting oneself can one achieve good mental health. Duval and Wick-

lund (1972), however, believe that objective self-awareness lowers self-esteem.

Among the potential factors affecting self-esteem are significant others (particularly parents, spouse, children, and peers), birth order, gender, age, race, socio-economic status, academic performance, task, occupational background, physical activity, and physical traits and condition. Quen (1967) stated that past success and failure experiences determine self-esteem level. All of the factors cited, therefore, could influence an individual's self-esteem by influencing his view of his own success or failure.

Esteem is stabilized by a high rate of reinforcement. In addition, defense mechanisms, though varying by kind according to level of self-esteem of individuals, maintain self-esteem. Although disagreeing about the ideal level of self-esteem, the preponderance of articles attest to the importance of self-esteem.

Like self-esteem, self-disclosure has a number of related factors--situational stimuli, the nature of the discloser, the nature of the recipient, the content of the disclosure, its consequences, and its importance. The majority of research, typified by that of Jourard and Landsman (1960), found a high correlation between self-disclosure and the disclosure received. Other situations impinging upon self-disclosure include use of a model, pairings, eye con-

tact, distance between discloser and recipient, body movement, conversational pauses, public versus private circumstances, group unity, discloser's expectancies of others' responses and situations, goal blocking, and psychodrama.

The nature of the discloser includes personality factors, personal characteristics, and demographic variables. While dogmatism and birth order are not major factors of self-disclosure, anxiety, especially if coupled with defensiveness, has varying effects upon self-disclosure. Other significant variables include whether the self-discloser is a repressor or sensitizer, internalizer or externalizer, and male or female. Also relevant are age, marital status, nationality, and race.

The nature of the recipient, likewise, consists of personality, personal characteristics, and demographic variables. Although researchers find substantial consistency in recipients of self-disclosure, certain aspects such as liking yield varying degrees of disclosure. Trust, familiarity with the recipient, attitudes, attractiveness, sex, and hierarchial relationships are also considered.

Frequency and depth of self-disclosure vary considerably according to topic with sex, mental health, and violence perceived as most risky (Norton, Feldman, and Tafuya, 1974).

Despite possible negative consequences, positive consequences such as an increased level of friendship generally

result from self-disclosure that is appropriate to the target, situation, and content. Such self-disclosure is both a facilitator and an indicator of good mental health (Jourard, 1964).

### Methodology

The literature suggests relationships do exist between and within self-esteem and self-disclosure. To examine these possible relationships, several hypotheses were tested. The first hypothesis stated that positive correlation exists between self-esteem and self-disclosure. The second hypothesis was that in the areas of attitudes and opinions, tastes and interests, and work or studies subjects are more likely to self-disclose than in the areas of money, personality, and body. Also, certain questions relating to sexual practices or attitudes and to financial worth within these more restricted categories have lower self-disclosure than the category as a whole. The third hypothesis was that spouses are more likely to be recipients of greater disclosure than are other family members or friends.

To assess self-esteem, "The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale" was administered; to measure self-disclosure, Jourard's "Self-Disclosure Questionnaire" of sixty items (SD-60) was administered. The subjects selected for the study were 111 students from selected psychology and sociology classes at a community college in Texas. The test instruments were ad-

ministered anonymously during day and night class periods.

To test the relationship between self-esteem and self-disclosure, the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to correlate the score from "The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale" and the total score from the "Self-Disclosure Questionnaire" (SD-60). To test the relative strength of disclosure between topics and to compare sub-topics within categories to the total scores of the respective categories, the Wilcoxon Matched Pairs tests were used. Likewise, the Wilcoxon Matched Pairs was used to compare the disclosure level to different targets. The level of significance tested was .05 for all tests.

### Results

The first hypothesis regarding the degree of correlation between self-esteem and self-disclosure could not be rejected ( $p=.38$ ) although there was a positive correlation as expected. In testing the second hypothesis, the differences in disclosure level between selected topics of self-disclosure were all found to be significant ( $p<.001$ ) as were the differences between two sub-topics and their respective topics ( $p<.001$ ). Finally, the differences in disclosure level between target persons stated in the third hypothesis were all significant with the categories of spouse or fiancé(e) receiving the greatest disclosure in each case.

### Assessment

The results of the second hypothesis (differences among topics) and the third hypothesis (differences among targets) generally confirmed previous research. Previous research pertaining to the first hypothesis had been contradictory; therefore, non-support for the first hypothesis (correlation of self-esteem and self-disclosure) was not altogether unexpected. Possibly a more representative sample of student population would have yielded a more decided result for the first hypothesis. Likewise, replication of testing of the second hypothesis might prove helpful if subjects were from non-college populations.

APPENDIX A

TENNESSEE SELF-CONCEPT SCALE

by William H Fitts

Instructions: The following statements are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please respond to them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Do not omit any item.

Responses: 1-completely false  
2-mostly false  
3-partly false and partly true  
4-mostly true  
5-completely true

- \_\_\_1. I have a healthy body.
- \_\_\_2. I like to look nice and neat all the time.
- \_\_\_3. I am an attractive person.
- \_\_\_4. I am full of aches and pains.
- \_\_\_5. I consider myself a sloppy person.
- \_\_\_6. I am a sick person.
- \_\_\_7. I am neither too fat nor too thin.
- \_\_\_8. I am neither too tall nor too short.
- \_\_\_9. I like my looks just the way they are.
- \_\_\_10. I don't feel as well as I should.
- \_\_\_11. I would like to change some parts of my body.
- \_\_\_12. I should have more sex appeal.
- \_\_\_13. I take good care of myself physically.
- \_\_\_14. I feel good most of the time.
- \_\_\_15. I try to be careful about my appearance.
- \_\_\_16. I do poorly in sports and games.

- \_\_17. I often act like I am "all thumbs."
- \_\_18. I am a poor sleeper.
- \_\_19. I am a decent sort of person.
- \_\_20. I am a religious person.
- \_\_21. I am an honest person.
- \_\_22. I am a moral failure.
- \_\_23. I am a bad person.
- \_\_24. I am a morally weak person.
- \_\_25. I am satisfied with my moral behavior.
- \_\_26. I am as religious as I want to be.
- \_\_27. I am satisfied with my relationship to God.
- \_\_28. I wish I could be more trustworthy.
- \_\_29. I ought to go to church more.
- \_\_30. I shouldn't tell so many lies.
- \_\_31. I am true to my religion in my everyday life.
- \_\_32. I do what is right most of the time.
- \_\_33. I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong.
- \_\_34. I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead.
- \_\_35. I sometimes do very bad things.
- \_\_36. I have trouble doing the things that are right.
- \_\_37. I am a cheerful person.
- \_\_38. I have a lot of self-control.
- \_\_39. I am a calm and easy going person.
- \_\_40. I am a hateful person.

- \_\_\_41. I am a nobody.
- \_\_\_42. I am losing my mind.
- \_\_\_43. I am satisfied to be just what I am.
- \_\_\_44. I am as smart as I want to be.
- \_\_\_45. I am just as nice as I should be.
- \_\_\_46. I am not the person I would like to be.
- \_\_\_47. I despise myself.
- \_\_\_48. I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do.
- \_\_\_49. I can always take care of myself in any situation.
- \_\_\_50. I solve my problems quite easily.
- \_\_\_51. I take the blame for things without getting mad.
- \_\_\_52. I change my mind a lot.
- \_\_\_53. I do things without thinking about them first.
- \_\_\_54. I try to run away from my problems.
- \_\_\_55. I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble.
- \_\_\_56. I am an important person to my friends and family.
- \_\_\_57. I am a member of a happy family.
- \_\_\_58. I am not loved by my family.
- \_\_\_59. My friends have no confidence in me.
- \_\_\_60. I feel that my family doesn't trust me.
- \_\_\_61. I am satisfied with my family relationships.
- \_\_\_62. I treat my parents as well as I should. (Use past tense if parents are not living.)
- \_\_\_63. I understand my family as well as I should.

- \_\_64. I am too sensitive to things my family say.
- \_\_65. I should trust my family more.
- \_\_66. I should love my family more.
- \_\_67. I try to play fair with my friends and family.
- \_\_68. I do my share of work at home.
- \_\_69. I take a real interest in my family.
- \_\_70. I quarrel with my family.
- \_\_71. I give in to my parents. (Use past tense if parents are not living.)
- \_\_72. I do not act like my family thinks I should.
- \_\_73. I am a friendly person.
- \_\_74. I am popular with women.
- \_\_75. I am popular with men.
- \_\_76. I am mad at the whole world.
- \_\_77. I am not interested in what other people do.
- \_\_78. I am hard to be friendly with.
- \_\_79. I am as sociable as I want to be.
- \_\_80. I am satisfied with the way I treat other people.
- \_\_81. I try to please others, but I don't overdo it.
- \_\_82. I should be more polite to others.
- \_\_83. I am no good at all from a social standpoint.
- \_\_84. I ought to get along better with other people.
- \_\_85. I try to understand the other fellow's point of view.
- \_\_86. I see good points in all the people I meet.
- \_\_87. I get along well with other people.

- \_\_88. I do not feel at ease with other people.
- \_\_89. I do not forgive others easily.
- \_\_90. I find it hard to talk with strangers.
- \_\_91. I do not always tell the truth.
- \_\_92. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.
- \_\_93. I get angry sometimes.
- \_\_94. Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross.
- \_\_95. I do not like everyone I know.
- \_\_96. I gossip a little at times.
- \_\_97. Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke.
- \_\_98. At times I feel like swearing.
- \_\_99. I would rather win than lose in a game.
- \_\_100. Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.

APPENDIX B

SELF-DISCLOSURE QUESTIONNAIRE\*

Instructions: Indicate in the appropriate blank the extent (1-4) that you have talked about each of the following items to the individuals listed in the columns; that is, the extent to which you have made yourself known to each person. Delete the numbers pertaining to spouse or fiancé(e) if you do not have a spouse or fiancé(e).

1. Have lied or misrepresented myself to the other person so that he has a false picture of me.
2. Have told the other person nothing about this aspect of me.
3. Have talked in general terms about this item. (The other person has only a general idea about this aspect of me.)
4. Have talked in full and complete detail about this item to the other person. (He knows me fully in this respect and could describe me accurately.)

	M	F	S	F	B	F
	o	a	p	i	e	r
	t	p	o	a	s	i
	h	o	u	s	e	e
	e	r	r	c	n	d
	r	r	e	é	d	
				(e)		
I. Attitudes and opinions						
A. What I think and feel about religion; my personal religious views						
B. My personal opinions and feelings about other religious groups than my own, e.g., Protestants, Catholics, Jews, atheists						
C. My views on communism						
D. My views on the present government--the president, government policies, etc.						
E. My views on the question of racial integration in schools, transportation, etc.						
F. My personal views on drinking						
G. My personal views on marijuana						

\*S. M. Jourard, The Transparent Self (Princeton: D. Van Company, Inc., 1964), pp. 161-163.

	M o t h e r	F a t h e r	S p o u r s e	F r i e n d s (e)	B e n e f i c i a r y
H. My personal views on other drugs					
I. My personal views on sexual morality --how I feel that I and others ought to behave in sexual matters					
J. My personal standards of physical at- tractiveness in people					
K. The traits that I regard as desirable for a person of the opposite sex to have--what I look for in a person of the opposite sex					
L. My feelings about how parents ought to deal with children					

## II. Tastes and interests

A. My favorite foods, the ways I like food prepared, and my food dislikes					
B. My favorite beverages and the ones I don't like					
C. My likes and dislikes in music					
D. My favorite reading matter					
E. The kinds of movies that I like to see best: the TV shows that are my favorites					
F. My tastes in clothing					
G. The style of house and the kinds of furnishings that I like best					
H. The kind of party or social gather- ing that I like best, and the kind that would bore me or that I would- n't enjoy					
I. My favorite ways of spending spare time, e.g., hunting, reading, cards, sports events, parties, dancing, etc.					
J. What I would appreciate most for a present					

## III. Work (or studies)

A. What I find to be the worst pres- sures and strains in my work					
B. What I find to be the most boring and unenjoyable aspects of my work					

	M o t h e r	F a t h e r	S p o u s e	F r i e n d (e)	B e n e f i c i a r y
C. What I enjoy most and get the most satisfaction from in my work					
D. What I feel are my shortcomings and handicaps that prevent me from working as I'd like to or that prevent me from getting further ahead in my work					
E. What I feel are my special strong points and qualifications for my work					
F. How I feel that my work is appreciated by others (e.g., boss, fellow-workers, teacher, husband, etc.)					
G. My ambitions and goals in my work					
H. My feelings about the salary or rewards that I get for my work					
I. How I feel about the choice of career that I have made--whether or not I'm satisfied with it					
J. How I really feel about the people that I work for or work with					

IV. Money

A. How much money I make at my work or get as an allowance					
B. Whether or not I owe money; if so, how much					
C. Whom I owe money to at present; or whom I have borrowed from in the past					
D. Whether or not I have savings and the amount					
E. Whether or not others owe me money; the amount, and who owes it to me					
F. Whether or not I gamble; if so, the way I gamble and the extent of it					
G. All of my present sources of income--wages, fees, allowance, dividends, etc.					
H. My total financial worth, including property, savings, bonds, insurance, etc.					
I. My most pressing need for money right now, e.g., outstanding bills, some major purchase that is desired or needed					

	M o t h e r	F a t h e r	S p o u s e	F r i e n d (e)	B r o t h e r	F r i e n d
J. How I budget my money--the proportion that goes to necessities, luxuries, etc.						

## V. Personality

A. The aspects of my personality that I dislike, worry about, that I regard as a handicap to me						
B. What feelings, if any, that I have trouble expressing or controlling						
C. The facts of my present sex life--including knowledge of how I get sexual gratification; any problems that I might have with whom I have relations, if anybody						
D. Whether or not I feel that I am attractive to the opposite sex; my problems, if any, about getting favorable attention from the opposite sex						
E. Things in the past or present that I feel ashamed and guilty about						
F. The kinds of things that just make me furious						
G. What it takes to get me feeling very depressed and blue						
H. What it takes to get me worried, anxious, and afraid						
I. What it takes to hurt my feelings deeply						
J. The kinds of things that make me especially proud of myself, elated, full of self-esteem or self-respect						

## VI. Body

A. My feelings about the appearance of my face--things I don't like and things that I might like about my face and head--nose, eyes, hair, teeth, etc.						
B. How I wish I looked: my ideals for overall appearance						

	M o t h e r	F a t h e r	S p o r t s	F r i e n d (e)	B e n e f i t
C. My feelings about different parts of my body--legs, hips, waist, weight, chest, or bust, etc.					
D. Any problems and worries that I had with my appearance in the past					
E. Whether or not I now have any health problems--e.g., trouble with sleep, digestion, female complaints, heart condition, allergies, headache, piles, etc.					
F. Whether or not I have any long-range worries or concerns about my health, e.g., cancer, ulcers, heart trouble					
G. My past record of illness and treatment					
H. Whether or not I now make special efforts to keep fit, healthy, and attractive, e.g., calisthenics, diet					
I. My present physical measurements, e.g., height, weight, waist, etc.					
J. My feelings about my adequacy in sexual behavior--whether or not I feel able to perform adequately in sex relationships					

## APPENDIX C

### DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

1. Sex: (a) male - 31.53%, (b) female - 67.57%, (c) no response - .90%
2. Age (mean - 23.89 years): (a) 17-20 years - 55.86%, (b) 21-25 years - 18.02%, (c) 26-30 years - 8.11%, (d) 31-40 years - 12.61%, (e) 41 years or over - 5.41%
3. Race: (a) Afro-American - 1.80%, (b) American Indian - .00%, (c) Oriental - .00%, (d) Spanish surname - 5.41%, (e) white - 91.89%
4. Order of birth: (a) first - 28.83%, (b) middle - 41.44%, (c) last - 29.73%
5. Siblings: (a) 0 - 3.60%, (b) 1 - 18.92%, (c) 2 - 16.21%, (d) 3 - 32.43%, (e) 4 or more - 27.93%, (f) no response - .90%
6. Marital status: (a) married - 39.64%, (b) single - 55.86%, (c) divorced - 3.60%, (d) widowed - .00%, (e) separated - .90%
7. Total marriages: (a) 0 - 55.86%, (b) 1 - 36.94%, (c) 2 - 7.21%, (d) 3 - .00%, (e) 4 or more - .00%
8. Sons: (a) 0 - 77.48%, (b) 1 - 17.12%, (c) 2 - 5.41% (d) 3 - .00%, (e) 4 or more - .00%
9. Daughters: (a) 0 - 72.07%, (b) 1 - 16.22%, (c) 2 - 7.21%,

- (d) 3 - 3.60%, (e) 4 or more - .00%, (f) no response - .90%
10. Religious preference: (a) Catholic - 24.32%, (b) non-Catholic Christian - 69.37%, (c) Jewish - .90%, (d) other - 4.5%, (e) no response - .90%
  11. Religious viewpoint: (a) conservative - 18.92%, (b) moderate - 61.26%, (c) liberal - 19.82%
  12. Political preference: (a) Democrat - 43.34%, (b) Republican - 24.32%, (c) independent - 27.03%, (d) other - 6.31%
  13. Political viewpoint: (a) conservative - 15.32%, (b) moderate - 63.06%, (c) liberal - 27.72%, (d) no response - .90%
  14. Years lived in this county: (a) 0-.9 year - 13.51%, (b) 1.0-1.9 years - 6.30%, (c) 2.0-4.9 years - 8.10%, (d) 5.0-9.9 years - 11.71%, (e) 10 or more years - 60.36%
  15. Grade Point Average: (a) 1-1.5 - .90%, (b) 1.6-2.0 - .90%, (c) 2.1-2.9 - 27.93%, (d) 3.0-3.5 - 39.64%, (e) 3.6-4.0 - 30.63%
  16. Family income: (a) \$0-\$4,999 - .90%, (b) \$5,000-\$9,999 - 5.40%, (c) \$10,000-\$17,999 - 19.82%, (d) \$18,000-\$24,999 - 32.43%, (e) \$25,000 or above - 41.44%
  17. Employment: (a) full-time outside home - 33.33%, (b) part-time outside home - 38.74%, (c) full-time homemaker - 11.71%, (d) none of the preceding - 16.22%
  18. Primary educational goal: (a) professional career - 72.07%,

(b) semi-professional career - 18.92%, (c) crafts career  
- .00%, (d) personal enrichment - 9.01%

## REFERENCES

- Addy, M. F. Changes in self-regard and regard for others as a function of interaction group experiences (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(10-A), 6376. (University Microfilms No. 74-8462)
- Adler, L. E. The dimensions of self-disclosure from three vantage points (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34(5-B), 2294-4495. (University Microfilms No. 73-28,178)
- Allen, J. G. Implications of research in self-disclosure for group psychotherapy. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1973, 23(3), 306-321.
- Annicchiarico, L. K. Sex differences in self-disclosure as related to sex and status of interviewer (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34(5-B), 2296. (University Microfilms No. 73-25,972)
- Apperson, J. Sex, self-esteem and psychological motivation for sexual behavior (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(12-B, Pt. 1), 6205. (University Microfilms No. 74-13,858)
- Baldwin, B. A. Self-disclosure and expectations for psychotherapy in repressors and sensitizers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21(5), 455-456.
- Barbour, A. The self disclosure aspect of the psychodrama sharing session. Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama, 1972, 25(4), 132-138.
- Barnes, D. F. A and B college students as interviewers of schizophrenic and neurotic inpatients: A test of the interaction hypothesis (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34(3-B), 1269. (University Microfilms No. 73-20,572)
- Bartelt, P. W. Birth order of siblings and differences in orientation toward parents (Doctoral dissertation, The

Ohio State University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(8-A), 4556. (University Microfilms No. 73-1933)

- Bath, K. E., & Daly, D. L. Self-disclosure: Relationships to self-described personality and sex differences. Psychological Reports, 1972, 31(2), 623-628.
- Beery, R. G. Fear of failure in the student experience. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1975, 54(4), 191-203.
- Berger, C. R. Attributional communication, situational involvement, self-esteem and interpersonal attraction. Journal of Communication, 1973, 23(3), 284-305.
- Berger, E. M. The relation between expressed acceptance of self and expressed acceptance of others. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 778-782.
- Berman, J., & Osborn, D. Specific self-esteem and sexual permissiveness. Psychological Reports, 1975, 36(1), 323-326.
- Bharucha-Reid, R. P. Organized behavior under stress (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(11-B), 5484. (University Microfilms No. 73-12,481)
- Bills, R. E., Vance, E. L., & McLean, O. S. An index of adjustment and values. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1951, 15, 257-261.
- Boyum, R. K. Improving self-disclosure in an educational setting through self-help methods (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(7-A), 3368. (University Microfilms No. 73-256)
- Braithwaite, R. A paired study of self-disclosure of black and white inmates. Journal of Non-White Concerns in Personnel & Guidance, 1973, 1(2), 86-94.
- × Briggs, D. C. Your Child's Self-Esteem. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1967.
- × Brissett, D. Toward a clarification of self-esteem. Psychiatry, 1972, 35(3), 255-263.
- Brooks, L. Interactive effects of sex and status on self-

- disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21 (6), 469-474.
- Brown, E. M. The effects of a stressor on a specific motor task on individuals displaying selected personality factors (Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(8-A, Pt. 1), 4830. (University Microfilms No. 74-2866)
- Buros, O. K. (Ed.). The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook (Vol. 2). Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1972.
- Buss, A. H., & Gerjuoy, H. The scaling of terms used to describe personality. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 361-369.
- Cash, T. F., & Soloway, D. Self-disclosure correlates of physical attractiveness: An exploratory study. Psychological Reports, 1975, 36(2), 579-586.
- Certner, B. C. Exchange of self-disclosures in same-sexed groups of strangers. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1973, 40(2), 292-297.
- Chafey, R. L. The effects of counselor self-disclosure on the self-disclosure of clients with high and low pre-counseled levels of self-disclosure in a counseling analogue (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34 (8-A, Pt. 1), 4731. (University Microfilms No. 73-32,429)
- Chaikin, A. L., Derlega, V. J., Bayma, B., & Shaw, J. Neuroticism and disclosure reciprocity. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43(1), 13-19.
- Chaikin, A. L., & Derlega, V. J. Variables affecting the appropriateness of self-disclosure. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42(4), 588-593.
- Chelune, G. J. Sex differences and relationship between repression-sensitization and self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1975, 37(3, Pt. 1), 920.
- Chittick, E. V., & Himelstein, P. The manipulation of self-disclosure. Journal of Psychology, 1967, 65(1), 117-121.
- Christenson, M. A. Aspects of visual behavior in relation

to sex of subject and expressions of affect (Doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(7-B), 3298-3299. (University Microfilms No. 73-38)

× Christian, K. A method of assessing self-esteem through numerical self-reports (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Davis, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34(2-B), 869-870. (University Microfilms No. 73-19,076)

Cohen, A. R. Situational structure, self-esteem, and threat-oriented reactions to power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in Social Power. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1959, pp. 35-52. (a)

Cohen, A. R. Some implications of self-esteem for social influence. In C. I. Hovland & I. L. Janis (Eds.), Personality and Persuasibility. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959, pp. 102-120. (b)

Conger, J. J. Adolescence and Youth Psychological Development in a Changing World (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1977.

Cooper, C. L., & Bowles, D. Physical encounter and self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1973, 33(2), 451-454.

Cormier, D. Self-acceptance and addiction to hard drugs. Toxicomanies, 1973, 6(2), 111-133.

Cosentino, J. A test of the effects of equity theory, esteem, and security (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(10-B), 5042. (University Microfilms No. 73-8853)

Cozby, P. C. Self-disclosure: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 79(2), 73-91.

× Crandall, R. On the relationship between self-esteem, coping, and optimism. Psychological Reports, 1972, 30(2), 485-486.

Cravens, R. W. The need for approval and the private versus public disclosure of self. Journal of Personality, 1975, 43(3), 503-514.

Cutter, H. S. G., Samaraweera, A. B., Fish, R. A., Morris,

- L, & Merritt, R. Emotional openness and mood change in marathon group psychotherapy. International Journal of the Addictions, 1974, 9(5), 741-748.
- Dabbs, J. M., Jr. Communicator characteristics, and attitude change. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 69, 173-181.
- D'Augelli, A. R., Deyss, C. S., Guerney, B. G., Hershenberg, B., & Sborofsky, S. L. Interpersonal skill training for dating couples: An evaluation of an educational mental health service. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21(5), 385-389.
- Davis, J. D., & Skinner, A. E. Reciprocity of self-disclosure in interviews: Modeling or social change? Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 1974, 29(6), 779-784.
- Davis, J. D., & Sloan, M. L. The basis of interviewee matching of interviewer self-disclosure. British Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology, 1974, 13(4), 359-367.
- Davis, T. B., Frye, R. L., & Joure, S. Perceptions and behaviors of dogmatic subjects in a T-group setting. Perceptual & Motor Skills, 1975, 41(2), 375-381.
- Dawson, C. Affect and self-disclosure as a function of touch in an interview between strangers (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34(6-B), 2925. (University Microfilms No. 73-29,822)
- De Charms, R. Personal Causation. New York: Academic Press, 1968.
- Derlega, V. J., & Chaikin, A. L. Sharing Intimacy: What We Reveal to Others and Why. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975.
- Derlega, V. J., Harris, M. S., & Chaikin, A. L. Self-disclosure reciprocity, liking and the deviant. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1973, 9(4), 277-284.
- Derlega, V. J., Walmer, J., & Furman, G. Mutual disclosure in social interactions. Journal of Social Psychology, 1973, 90(1), 159-160.
- Dietch, J., & House, J. Affiliative conflict and individual

- differences in self-disclosure. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 1975, 6(2), 69-75.
- Dinner, S. H., Lewkowicz, B. E., & Cooper, J. Anticipatory attitude change as a function of self-esteem and issue familiarity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 24(3), 407-412.
- Dion, K. K., & Dion, K. L. Self-esteem and romantic love. Journal of Personality, 1975, 43(1), 39-57.
- Doster, J. A. Individual differences affecting interviewee expectancies and perceptions of self-disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22(3), 192-198.
- Doster, J. A., & Brooks, S. J. Interviewer disclosure modeling, information revealed, and interviewee verbal behavior. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42(3), 420-426.
- Doster, J. A., & Slaymaker, J. Need approval, uncertainty anxiety, and expectancies of interview behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19(6), 522-528.
- Doster, J. A., & Strickland, B. R. Perceived child-rearing practices and self-disclosure patterns. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33(3), 382.
- × Douglas, L. A comparative analysis of the relationships between self-esteem and certain selected variables among youth from diverse racial groups (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31(2-A), 641-642. (University Microfilms No. 70-14,501)
- Doyne, S. E. The relationship between self-disclosure and self-esteem in encounter groups (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33(4-B), 1786. (University Microfilms No. 72-25,379)
- Dudgeon, T. B. The effect of status and task manipulations on the interview responsivity of sensitizing and repressing juvenile delinquents (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(8-B), 3933-3934. (University Microfilms No. 73-2660)
- Duval, S., & Wicklund, R. A. A Theory of Objective Self Awareness. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1972.

- Ellison, C. W. The development of interpersonal trust as a function of self-esteem, status, and style (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33(5-B), 2319-2320. (University Microfilms No. 72-28,425)
- Ellison, C. W., & Firestone, I. J. Development of interpersonal trust as a function of self-esteem, target status, and target style. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29(5), 655-663.
- Ellsworth, P., & Ross, L. Intimacy in response to direct gaze. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1975, 11(6), 592-613.
- Field, T. F. Relationship of dogmatism to self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1975, 36(2), 594.
- Fischer, E. H. Birth planning of youth: Concern about overpopulation and intention to limit family size. American Psychologist, 1972, 27(10), 951-958.
- Fischer, M. J., & Apostol, R. A. Selected vocal cues and counselor's perceptions of genuineness, self-disclosure, and anxiety. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22(2), 92-96.
- Fitts, W. F. "Tennessee Self Concept Scale." Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1964.
- Fitts, W. F. Tennessee Self Concept Scale Manual. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.
- Fitzgerald, M. P. Self-disclosure and expressed self-esteem, social distance, and areas of the self revealed. Journal of Psychology, 1963, 56(2), 405-412.
- Fitzgerald, M. P. The relationship between expressed self-esteem and assumed similarity. Journal of Psychology, 1965, 60(2), 181-191.
- Frerichs, M. Relationship of self-esteem and internal-external control to selected characteristics of associate degree nursing students. Nursing Research, 1973, 22(4), 350-352.
- Gardner, J. A. The effects of body motion, sex of counselor and sex of subject on counselor attractiveness and subject's self-disclosure (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973,

34(5-B), 2237. (University Microfilms No. 73-25,548)

Gaylin, N. L. Psychotherapy and psychological health: A Rorschach function and structure analysis. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 30, 494-500.

Gergen, K. J., & Morse, S. J. Self-consistency: Measurement and validation. Proceedings of the 75th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1967, 207-208.

Gineste, M. D. Uncertainty concerning performance and choice of a work partner. Année Psychologique, 1973, 73(2), 555-564. (Abstract in English)

Gitter, A. G., Antonellis, R., & Cohen, S. Candor of communication about self. CRC Report, 1975, No. 69.

Glass, G. V., & Stanley, J. C. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1970.

Glazer, V. I. The relationship of high approval motivation to differences in reported self-esteem (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Florida, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(7-B), 3301-3302. (University Microfilms No. 73-562)

Goldberg, C. Some effects of fear of failure in the academic setting. Journal of Psychology, 1973, 84(2), 323-331.

Goldstein, D. The effect of inner circle strategy pretraining upon self-disclosure in the initial counseling session (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(10-B), 5016. (University Microfilms No. 73-8860)

Gollob, H. F., & Dittes, J. E. Effects of manipulated self-esteem on persuasibility depending on threat and complexity of communication. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2(2), 195-201.

× × Good, R., & Good, K. C. A measure of self-esteem. Psychology, 1975, 12(2), 32-34.

Granoff, M. An analysis of meanings and consequences of self-disclosing behavior (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 31(11-A), 5844. (University Microfilms No. 71-11,543)

Green, R. A., & Murray, E. J. Instigation to aggression as a

function of self-disclosure and threat to self-esteem. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 40 (3), 440-443.

- × Greenhaus, J. H., & Badin, I. J. Self-esteem, performance, and satisfaction: Some tests of a theory. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59(6), 722-726.
- × Grieger, R. Self-concept, self-esteem and rational theory: A brief perspective. Rational Living, 1975, 10(1), 13-17.
- Günther, --. Das Verhältnis des Menschen zu sich selbst. (The relationship of man to himself.) Wehrpsychol. Mitt., 1940, 2(12), 36-46. (Abstract in English)
- Hamsher, J. H., & Farina, A. "Openness" as a dimension of projective test responses. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 525-528.
- Harris, S., & Braun, J. R. Self-esteem and racial preference in black children. Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1971, 6(Pt. 1), 259-260.
- Harvey, J. H., & Kelley, H. H. Sense of own judgmental competence as a function of temporal pattern of stability-instability in judgment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29(4), 526-538.
- × Hayden, R. G. An experimental study regarding the effects of social marginality and authoritarianism on self-esteem (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1958). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1958, 19, 898. (University Microfilms No. 58-3333)
- Hayward, R. H. Process and outcome consequences of therapist self-disclosure (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(12-B, Pt. 1), 6210-6211. (University Microfilms No. 74-12,378)
- Hechler, P. D., & Wiener, Y. Chronic self-esteem as a moderator of performance consequences of expected pay. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1974, 11(1), 97-105.
- Heilbrun, A. B. History of self-disclosure in females and early defection from psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20(3), 250-257.

- × Herbert, E. W., Gelfand, D. M., & Hartmann, D. P. Imitation and self-esteem as determinants of self-critical behavior. Child Development, 1969, 40, 421-430.
- Hewitt, J., & Goldman, M. Self-esteem, need for approval, and reactions to personal evaluations. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1974, 10(3), 201-210.
- Hill, J. R., Hayes, E. J., & Young, H. The changing American social order: Implications for counselors. Journal of Non-White Concerns in Personnel and Guidance, 1975, 3(2), 59-65.
- × Hollender, J. W. Self-esteem and parental identification. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1973, 122(1), 3-7.
- Huntley, C. W. Judgments of self based upon records of expressive behavior. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1940, 35, 398-427.
- Ickes, W. J. A transfer of self-affect model of interpersonal attraction (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(9-B), 4699. (University Microfilms No. 74-5259)
- Jackson, R. H., & Pepinsky, H. B. Interviewer activity and status effects upon revealingness in the initial interview. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1972, 28(3), 400-404.
- Johnson, C. D., Gormly, J., Gormly, A. Support for the competence-reinforcement model of attraction. Journal of Research in Personality, 1973, 7(2), 165-172.
- Johnson, D. L., & Ridener, L. R. Self-disclosure, participation, and perceived cohesiveness in small group interaction. Psychological Reports, 1974, 35(1, Pt. 2), 361-362.
- Johnson, D. W., & Noonan, M. Effects of acceptance and reciprocation of self-disclosures on the development of trust. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19(5), 411-416.
- Jones, E. E., & Gordon, E. M. Timing of self-disclosure and its effects on personal attraction. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 1972, 24(3), 358-365.
- × Jones, S. C. Self- and interpersonal evaluations: Esteem

- theories versus consistency theories. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 79(3), 185-199.
- Jones, S. C., Knurek, D. A., & Regan, D. T. Variables affecting reactions to social acceptance and rejection. Journal of Social Psychology, 1973, 90(2), 269-284.
- Jongsma, A. E. The effects of experimenter modeling, trust and trust-worthiness on subject's reciprocal self-disclosure (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34(3-B), 1277. (University Microfilms No. 73-20,549)
- Jourard, S. M. Identification, parent-cathexis, and self-esteem. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 375-380.
- Jourard, S. M. A study of self-disclosure. Scientific American, 1958, 198(5), 77-82.
- Jourard, S. M. Healthy personality and self-disclosure. Mental Hygiene, New York, 1959, 43, 499-507.
- Jourard, S. M. Religious denomination and self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1961, 8, 446. (a)
- Jourard, S. M. Self-disclosure patterns in British and American college females. Journal of Social Psychology, 1961, 54, 315-320. (b)
- Jourard, S. M. The Transparent Self. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1964.
- Jourard, S. M. Disclosing Man to Himself. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1968.
- Jourard, S. M., & Landsman, M. J. Cognition, cathexis, and the dyadic effect in men's self-disclosing behavior. Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 1960, 6, 178-185.
- Jourard, S. M., and Lasakow, P. Some factors in self-disclosure. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 91-98.
- Kaplan, H. B. Age-related correlated of self-derogation: Contemporary life space characteristics. Aging & Human Development, 1971, 2(4), 305-313.
- Kaplan, S. J. The effects of a self-instructing model, be-

- havior rehearsal, and internal-external instructions upon self-disclosure (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(10-B), 5196. (University Microfilms No. 73-32,126)
- Kay, E., & Meyer, H. H. Effects of threat in a performance appraisal interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1965, 49(5), 311-317.
- Kelly, E. L. Marital compatibility as related to personality traits of husbands and wives as rated by self and spouse. Journal of Social Psychology, 1941, 13, 193-198.
- Kent, J. H. Relation of personality, expectancy, and situational variables to self-disclosing behavior. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 120-121.
- Kessler, J. J. Self-esteem and inequity dissonance as factors in under-compensation (Doctoral dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33(1-B), 478. (University Microfilms No. 72-18,700)
- Kinsler, P. J. Ego identity status and intimacy (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York, Buffalo, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(8-B), 3946. (University Microfilms No. 73-5136)
- Kipnis, D. M. Changes in self-concepts in relation to perception of others. Journal of Personality, 1961, 29, 449-465.
- Klassen, D., Hornstra, R., & Anderson, P. B. Influence of social desirability on symptom and mood reporting in a community survey. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43(4), 448-452.
- Kleiber, D. A. Free time activity and sense of competence in college students (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(9-A), 4944-4945. (University Microfilms No. 73-7590)
- Knecht, L., Lippman, D., & Swap, W. Similarity, attraction, and self-disclosure. Proceedings of the 81st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1973, 8, 205-206.
- Koeck, R., & Guthrie, G. M. Reciprocity in impression forma-

- tion. Journal of Social Psychology, 1975, 95(1), 67-76.
- Kohen, J. Liking and self-disclosure in opposite sex dyads. Psychological Reports, 1975, 36(3), 695-698.
- Kopfstein, J. H. Need for approval, expectancy for consequences, and behavior in Gestalt experiments (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(8-B), 4048. (University Microfilms No. 74-3894)
- Kopfstein, J. H., & Kopfstein, D. Correlates of self-disclosure in college students. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1973, 41(1), 163.
- \* Korman, A. K. Self-esteem as a moderator of the relationship between self-perceived abilities and vocational choice. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51(1), 65-67.
- Korman, A. K. Self-esteem variable in vocational choice. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1966, 50(6), 479-486.
- Krishnamurti, J. The First and Last Freedom. Wheaton, Illinois: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1954.
- Kuiken, D., Rasmussen, R. V., & Cullen, D. Some predictors of volunteer participation in human relations training groups. Psychological Reports, 1974, 35(1, Pt. 2), 499-504.
- Lampl, M. Defensiveness, dogmatism, and self-esteem. (Doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1968, 29(6-B), 2194. (University Microfilms No. 68-17,171)
- Lechelt, E. C. Occupational affiliation and ratings of physical height and personal esteem. Psychological Reports, 1975, 36(3), 943-946.
- Lee, R. E. A note on the relationship of critical behavior and self-esteem in the hospitalized veteran. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 1972, 9(2), 130-131.
- Lesser, G. S., & Abelson, R. P. Personality correlates of persuasibility in children. In C. I. Hovland and I. L. Janis (Eds.), Personality and Persuasibility. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.
- Leventhal, H., & Perloe, S. I. A relationship between self-esteem and persuasibility. Journal of Abnormal Social

Psychology, 1962, 64(5), 385-388.

- Lewis, E. J. Psychological determinants of family size: A study of white middle class couples, age 35-45 with zero, one, or three children (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33(5-B), 2349. (University Microfilms No. 72-29,133)
- Libby, W. L., & Yaklevich, D. Personality determinants of eye contact and direction of gaze aversion. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 1973, 27(2), 197-206.
- Lombardo, J. P., & Berzonsky, M. D. Locus of reinforcement control, self-image disparity, and self-acceptance: A replication. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1975, 127(1), 147-148.
- London, M., & Klimoski, R. J. Self-esteem and job complexity as moderators of attitudes toward work and effectiveness as seen by self, supervisors, and peers. Proceedings of the 81st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, Canada, 1973, 8, 599-600.
- Luck, P. W., & Heiss, J. Social determinants of self-esteem in adult males. Sociology and Social Research, 1972, 57(1), 69-84.
- \* Lyell, R. G. Adolescent and adult self-esteem as related to cultural values. Adolescence, 1973, 8(29), 85-92.
- MacDoniels, J. W. Factors related to the level of open expression in small group laboratory learning experiences (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(11-A), 6488-6489. (University Microfilms No. 73-11,921)
- Maier, D., & Herman, A. The relationship of vocational decisiveness and satisfaction with dogmatism and self-esteem. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1974, 5(1), 95-102.
- 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(4), 304-308.
- Maslow, A. H. The Farther Reaches of Human Nature. New York: The Viking Press, 1971.
- ++ Mathes, E. W., & Kahn, A. Physical attractiveness, happiness,

neuroticism, and self-esteem. Journal of Psychology, 1975, 90(1), 27-30.

May, R. Man's Search for Himself. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1953.

McAllister, A. D. Interviewee self-disclosure as a function of level and identity of self-disclosing models (Doctoral Dissertation, Emory University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(7-B), 3502-3503. (University Microfilms No. 74-453)

McCarthy, B. W., & Brodsky, S. L. The effects of Marlowe-Crowne and instructional social desirability sets on the Self-Concept Scale. Journal of Psychology, 1970, 74(2), 237-238.

McDavid, J. W., & Garwood, S. G. Understanding Children. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath & Company, 1978.

McElvaney, C. T. Recall of positively and negatively affective material related to self-esteem (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1957). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1958, 18, 1495-1496. (University Microfilms No. 58-1346)

Menninger, R. Responsibility to self. Menninger Perspective, 1972, 3(4), 15-19.

Mettee D. P., & Riskind, J. Size of defeat and liking for superior and similar ability competitors. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1974, 10(4), 333-351.

Miller, T. W. Male self-esteem and attitudes toward women's roles. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973, 14(5), 402-406.

Millimet, C. R., & Gardner, D. F. Induction of threat to self-esteem and the arousal and resolution of affect. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1972, 8(5), 467-481.

Morrison, T. L., & Thomas, M. D. Self-esteem and classroom participation. Journal of Educational Research, 1975, 68(10), 374-377.

Morrison, T. L., Thomas, M. D., & Weaver, S. Self-esteem and self-estimates of academic performance. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1973, 41(3), 412-415.

Morval, M., & Morval, J. Concerning the concept of self-

esteem and some possibilities of its measurement. Bulletin de Psychologie, 1971-1972, 25(2-4), 145-150. (Abstract in English)

Murphy, G. Outgrowing Self-Deception. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1975.

Murstein, B. I., & Beck, G. D. Person perception, marriage adjustment, and social desirability. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1972, 39(3), 396-403.

Neistein, S., & Katkovsky, W. The effects of inconsistent reinforcement on the negative self-reinforcing behavior of high and low self-esteem individuals. Journal of Personality, 1974, 42(1), 78-92.

Newirth, J. W. Self-esteem and family interaction patterns: An experimental approach (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 31(B), 6265. (University Microfilms No. 71-8017)

Norton, R., Feldman, C., & Tafoya, D. Risk parameters across types of secrets. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21(5), 450-454.

Nosanchuk, M. F. The comparative effects of different methods of interviewing on self-disclosing behavior (Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(10-A), 5498. (University Microfilms No. 73-6176)

Ohlson, E. L. The effects of the female-based family and birth order on the ability to self-disclose. Journal of Psychology, 1974, 87(1), 59-69.

Olson, G. K. The effects of interviewer self-disclosing and reinforcing behavior upon subject self-disclosure (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(11-A), 6096. (University Microfilms No. 73-12,017)

Panyard, C. M. Self-disclosure between friends: A validity study. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20(1), 66-68.

Paradis, M. H. The effects of eye contact on positive and negative self-disclosure (Doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33(6-B), 2795. (University Microfilms No. 73-31,292)

- Pasternack, T. L., & Van Landingham, M. A comparison of the self-disclosure behavior of female undergraduates and married women. Journal of Psychology, 1972, 32(2), 233-240.
- Patrick, T. A. Personality and family background characteristics of women who enter male-dominated professions. (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34(5-A), 2396. (University Microfilms No. 73-24,076)
- Pearce, W. B., & Wiege, B. Relationship with and self-disclosure to friends. Perceptual & Motor Skills, 1973, 37(2), 610.
- Pedersen, D. M. Ego strength and discrepancy between conscious and unconscious self-concepts. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1965, 20, 691-692.
- Pedersen, D. M. Self-disclosure, body-accessibility, and personal space. Psychological Reports, 1973, 33(3), 975-980.
- Pedersen, D. M., and 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(2), 495-501. (b)
- Pedersen, D. M., & Higbee, K. An evaluation of the equivalence and construct validity of various measures of self-disclosure. Educational & Psychological Measurement, 1968, 28(2), 511-523.
- Penney, R. Self-esteem and the search for self-awareness. (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(9A, Pt. 2), 6108. (University Microfilms No. 74-6105)
- Perlman, D. Self-esteem and sexual permissiveness. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, 36(3), 470-473.
- Petersen, D. J. The relationship between self-concept and self-disclosure of underachieving college students in group counseling (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33(5-B), 2354. (University Microfilms No. 72-29,563)

Petzelt, J. A. Self-disclosure and interpersonal attraction: The intimacy value and attitudinal similarity of the content of the disclosure (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(8-B), 4026.

+ Phillips, E. L. Attitudes toward self and others: A brief questionnaire report. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1951, 15, 79-81.

Platt, J. J., & Spivack, G. Performance in important areas of life as a source of positive self-regard. Proceedings of the 81st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, Canada, 1973, 8, 235-236.

Plog, S. C. The disclosure of self in the United States and Germany. Journal of Psychology, 1965, 65(2), 193-203.

Plym, D. L. Employee self-disclosure as related to illness-absenteeism, self-perceived wellness and job satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1966). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1967, 27(8-A), 2617-2618. (University Microfilms No. 67-1083)

\*\* Purpura, P. A. A study of the relations between birth-order, self-esteem and conformity (Doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 31(10-B), 6266. (University Microfilms No. 71-8737)

Quen, J. F. The effect of dissonance in self-esteem on susceptibility to social influence (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1967, 27(8-A), 2618. (University Microfilms No. 67-422)

+ Radlow, R., & Berger, P. Relationship of degree of self-esteem to gossiping behavior. Journal of Social Psychology, 1959, 50, 153-155.

Regan, J. W., Gosselink, H., Hubsch, J., & Ulsh, E. Do people have inflated views of their own ability? Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 1975, 37(2), 295-301.

Rivenbark III, W. R. Unpublished Research, University of Florida, 1963, 1964.

Robbins, R. B. The effects of cohesiveness and anxiety on self-disclosure under threatening conditions (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1965). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1966, 27(6-B), 2145. (University Microfilms No. 65-14,502)

- Robison, P. D. The effects of level of therapist self-disclosure on high and low disclosing subject's perception of the therapist (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34 (12-B, Pt. 1), 6223. (University Microfilms No. 74-13,141)
- Rogers, C. R. What Understanding and Acceptance Mean to Me. A talk given to the 12th annual conference of the Illinois Guidance Personnel Association, Urbana, Illinois, October 6, 1956.
- Rogers, D. Child Psychology. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1969.
- Rosa, E., & Mazur, A. Validity test of the relation between self-esteem and psychosomatic symptoms. Humboldt Journal of Social Relations, 1974, 1(2), 144-145.
- Rosenberg, M. The association between self-esteem and anxiety. Journal of Psychiatric Research, 1962, 1(2), 135-152.
- Rothfarb, H. I. A study of the psychological needs and self-esteem of college men who exercise regularly (Doctoral dissertation, Boston College, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31(6-A), 2727. (University Microfilms No. 70-25,586)
- Ryckman, R. M., and Cannon, D. W. Multidimensionality of locus of control and self-esteem. Psychological Reports, 1975, 37(3, Pt. 1), 786.
- Ryckman, R. M., Sherman, M. F., & Burgess, G. D. Locus of control and self-disclosure of public and private information by college men and women: A brief note. Journal of Psychology, 1973, 84(2), 317-318.
- Sarason, I. G., Ganzer, V. J., & Singer, M. Effects of modeled self-disclosure on the verbal behavior of persons differing in defensiveness. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1972, 39(3), 483-490.
- Schimmel, J. L., Tauber, E. S., Zaphiropoulos, M. L., & Salzman, L. The power theme in the obsessional. Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 1972, 9(1), 1-28.
- Schneider, D. J., & Turkat, D. Self-presentation following success or failure: Defensive self-esteem models. Journal

- of Personality, 1975, 43(1), 127-135.
- Schonbar, R. Group co-therapists and sex-role identification. American Journal of Psychotherapy, 1973, 27(4), 539-547.
- Schwendiman, G., Larsen, K. S., & Dunn, F. Social position, social desirability and self-esteem. Psychological Reports, 1970, 27(1), 117-118.
- Seffinger, D. J. Deviance: A study in the perpetuation of stigmatization using persons with a hearing impairment (Doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(10-B), 5209. (University Microfilms No. 74-7941)
- Sermat, V., & Smyth, M. Content analysis of verbal communication in the development of relationship: Conditions influencing self-disclosure. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 1973, 26(3), 332-346.
- Shapiro, A. Relationship between self-concept and self-disclosure (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1968, 29, 1180B. (University Microfilms No. 68-1200,615)
- Shapiro, H. J., & Wahba, M. A. Frederick W. Taylor: 62 years later. Personnel Journal, 1974, 53(8), 574-578.
- Shavelson, R. J., Hubner, J. J., & Stanton, G. C. Self-concept; validation of construct interpretations. Review of Educational Research, Summer, 1976, 46(3), 407-441.
- Shere, S. H. The relationship between self-disclosure and psychological defense (Doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(11-B), 5525.
- Sherman, R. C., & Goodson, J. L. The intimacy of discussion topics: A comparison of three scaling methods. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 1975, 6(6), 581-584.
- Short, M. R. Self-esteem: A study of the ethical significance of certain aspects of the dynamics of self-esteem as developed in psychiatry and Gestalt psychology (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1953). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1953, 13, 412-413. (University Microfilms No. 5206)
- Shrauger, J. S. Self-esteem and reactions to being observed

by others. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 1972, 23(2), 192-200.

\*Shrauger, J. S., & Lund, A. K. Self-evaluation and reactions to evaluations from others. Journal of Personality, 1975, 43(1), 94-108.

Shrauger, J. S., & Patterson, M. B. Self-evaluation and the selection of dimensions for evaluating others. Journal of Personality, 1974, 42(4), 569-585.

Shrauger, J. S., & Rosenberg, S. E. Self-esteem and the effects of success and failure feedback on performance. Journal of Personality, 1970, 38(3), 404-417.

Siegel, S. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Silber, E., & Tippett, J. S. Self-esteem: Clinical assessment and measurement validation. Psychological Reports, 1965, 16(3, Pt. 2), 1017-1071.

Silverman, A. F., Pressman, M. E., & Bartel, H. W. Self-esteem and tactile communication. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1973, 13(2), 73-77.

Silverman, H. Process and function in marital therapy: A psychological overview. Journal of Family Counseling, 1974, 2(1), 6-10.

o Silverman, I. Differential effects of ego threat upon persuasibility for high and low self-esteem subjects. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 69(5), 567-572.

o Silverman, I., Ford, L., & Morganti, J. Inter-related effects of social desirability, sex, self-esteem, and complexity of argument on persuasibility. Journal of Personality, 1966, 34(4), 555-568.

Simonson, N. R. The impact of therapist disclosure on patient disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23(1), 3-6.

o Simpson, C., & Boyle, D. Esteem construct generality and academic performance. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1975, 35(4), 897-904.

Sinha, V. Self-disclosure: Its clinical importance. Indian

Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1974, 1(2), 81-83.

- 68 Slagle, S. J. Self-esteem patterns of defense (Doctoral dissertation, 1965). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1965, 26(6), 3492. (University Microfilms No. 65-11,033)
- Smith, P. A. A factor analytic study of the self-concept. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 191.
- Smith, W. P., & Bordonaro, F. Self-esteem and satisfaction as affected by unexpected social status placement. Sociometry, 1975, 38(2), 223-246.
- Sote, G. A., & Good, L. R. Similarity of self-disclosure and interpersonal attraction. Psychological Reports, 1974, 34(2), 491-494.
- Sousa-Poza, J. F., Shulman, E., & Rohrberg, R. Field dependence and self-disclosure. Perceptual & Motor Skills, 1973, 36(3, Pt. 1), 735-738.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32(1), 29-39.
- 68 Spillman, B. M. Cognitive dissonance, self-esteem, and the process of self-persuasion (Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35(3-A), 1776-1777. (University Microfilms No. 74-20,486)
- Steele, D. D. Self-disclosure and peak experience in intensive small groups (Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(7-B), 3476. (University Microfilms No. 73-31,006)
- 68 Stein, S. L. The interrelationships among self-esteem, personal values, and interpersonal values (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 30(9-A), 3803. (University Microfilms No. 70-3455)
- Stone, G. L., & Gotlib, I. Effect of instructions and modeling on self-disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22(4), 288-293.
- Stone, G. L., & Stebbins, L. W. Effect of differential pre-training on client self-disclosure. Journal of Counseling

Psychology, 1975, 22(1), 17-20.

- Stotland, E. Motivation for security, certainty, and self-esteem. Journal of General Psychology, 1961, 65, 75-87.
- Stotland, E., & Hillmer, M. L., Jr. Identification, authoritarian defensiveness, and self-esteem. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1962, 64(5), 334-342.
- Stratton, J. R., & Spitzer, S. P. Sexual permissiveness and self evaluation: A question of substance and a question of method. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1967, 29 (Aug.), 434-441.
- Strauss, A. L. Mirrors and Masks: The Search for Identity. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1959.
- Stunkel, E. H. Interviewee self-disclosure among impulsive and nonimpulsive college students as a function of instructions & interviewer disclosure (Doctoral dissertation, Emory University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(11-B), 5526-5527. (University Microfilms No. 73-12,191)
- Sundstrom, E. D. A study of crowding: Effects of intrusion, goal-blocking, and density on self-reported stress, self-disclosure, and non-verbal behavior (Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(7-A), 4412. (University Microfilms No. 73-32,033)
- Taylor, D. A. The development of interpersonal relationships: Social penetration processes. Journal of Social Psychology, 1968, 75(1), 79-90.
- Todd, J. L., & Shapira, A. US and British self-disclosure, anxiety, empathy, and attitudes to psychotherapy. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1974, 5(3), 364-369.
- Todoroski, N. R. Self-acceptance and acceptance by peers (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33(5-B), 2359-2360. (University Microfilms No. 72-30,054)
- Toews, W. F. Self-esteem, perception of parental control and hostility of adolescents (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1966). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1966, 27(4-A), 1130-1131. (University Microfilms No. 66-10,519)
- Tognoli, J., & Keisner, R. Gain and loss of esteem as deter-

minants of interpersonal attraction: A replication and extension. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 23(2), 201-204.

Traux, C. B., Altmann, H., & Whittmer, J. Self-disclosure as a function of personal adjustment and the facilitative conditions offered by the target person. Journal of Community Psychology, 1973, 1(3), 319-322.

Turoczi, J. C. The effects of interviewer evaluative statements and self-disclosure on the self-disclosing behavior of interviewees (Doctoral dissertation, Lehigh University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(11-A), 5990. (University Microfilms No. 73-10,947)

Vosen, L. M. The relationship between self-disclosure and self-esteem (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1966). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1967, 27(8-B), 2882. (University Microfilms No. 67-568)

Walker, L. J. Friendship patterning as affected by intimate and non-intimate self-disclosure (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(7-B), 3326. (University Microfilms No. 73-1573)

Walster, E. The effect of self-esteem on romantic liking. Journal of Experimental & Social Psychology, 1965, 1(2), 184-197.

Waters, L. K., & Roach, D. Self-esteem as a moderator of the relationship between task-success and task-liking. Psychological Reports, 1972, 31(1), 69-70.

Webb, D. G. Relationship of self-acceptance and self-disclosure to empathy and marital need satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33(1-B), 432-433. (University Microfilms No. 72-20,551)

Wener, A. E. Depressive affect: The test of a behavioral hypothesis (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(8-B), 3967-3968. (University Microfilms No. 73-5001)

Wiebe, B., & Williams, J. D. Self-disclosure to parents by high school seniors. Psychological Reports, 1972, 31(3), 690.

Wiener, Y. Task ego-involvement and self-esteem as moderators of situationally devalued self-esteem. Journal of Applied

Psychology, 1973, 58(2), 225-232.

- 88 Williams, R. L., & Byars, H. Negro self-esteem in a transitional society. Personnel & Guidance Journal, 1968, 47(2), 120-125.
- Wilson, J. P. The effects of congruent and incongruent social structures on group performance (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34(10-A), 6749. (University Microfilms No. 73-29,806)
- Wilson, J. P., & Aronoff, J. A sentence completion test assessing safety and esteem motives. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1973, 37(4), 351-354.
- Wilson, M. N., & Rappaport, J. Personal self-disclosure: Expectancy and situational effects. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42(6), 901-908.
- Woodyard, H. D., & Hines, D. A. Accurate and inaccurate self-disclosure. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1973, 13(3), 61-67.
- 88 Wurster, C., Bass, B. M., and Alcock, W. A test of the proposition: We want to be esteemed most by those we esteem most highly. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 650-653.
- Wylie, R. C. The present status of self-theory. In E. F. Borgatta and W. W. Lambert (Eds.) Handbook of Personality Theory and Research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968, pp. 728-787.
- Ziller, R. C., & Grossman, S. A. A developmental study of the self-social constructs of normals and the neurotic personality. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1967, 23(1), 15-21.
- 88 Ziller, R. C., Hagey, J., Smith, M. D. C., & Long, R. H. Self-esteem: A self-social construct. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 84-95.