

SELF-DISCLOSURE, EGO-STRENGTH, AND LOCUS
OF CONTROL AMONG COLLEGE FEMALES

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

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

BY
MARY LUCILLE S. ISAACSON, B. A.

DENTON, TEXAS
AUGUST, 1978

Thesis
T1978
I734
C.2

The Graduate School
Texas Woman's University

Denton, Texas

June 21 1978

We hereby recommend that the Thesis prepared under
our supervision by Mary Lucille S. Isaacson
entitled Self-Disclosure, Ego-Strength, and Locus
of Control among College Females

be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts.

Committee:

Dr. [Signature]

Chairman

Virginia Jolley

Robert P. Kuttigfield

Accepted:

Phyllis Bridges
Dean of The Graduate School

1-73669

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Iris Amos who directed this thesis and whose patient guidance proved invaluable throughout this research effort. My gratitude is also extended to the other members of my committee, Drs. Virginia Jolly and Robert P. Littlefield, for their whole-hearted support and encouragement.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this thesis to my husband, Jimmy, who was continually available to reassure and encourage me when I was discouraged, and whose undaunted confidence in me inspired me to achieve this goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Statement of the Problem	
II. METHOD.	16
Subjects	
Instruments	
Procedure	
III. RESULTS	20
IV. DISCUSSION.	28
Limitations	
Suggestions for Future Research	
V. SUMMARY	33
APPENDICES	35
Appendix A: Questionnaire I--The Internal- External Locus of Control Scale	
Appendix B: Questionnaire II--Jourard's Self-Disclosure Questionnaire	
Appendix C: Questionnaire III--Factor C Items--16PF	
Appendix D: Permissions and Approval to Do Research	
REFERENCES	60

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Means and Standard Deviations of Locus of Control, Ego-Strength, and Self-Disclosure Scores of 150 Female Subjects.	21
2. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations between Locus of Control, Ego-Strength, and Self-Disclosure Scores and Fisher's Z-transformation of r	21
3. Summary Table of a One-dimensional Analysis of Variance for Repeated Measures on the Target Groups.	24
4. Tukey's Multiple Pair-Wise Comparison Procedure on Target Groups.	25

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The late Sidney M. Jourard pioneered the extensive research done over the past 20 years on self-disclosure. Jourard's concept has had wide appeal in applied settings, both as a desirable therapist characteristic and as a desirable client goal. Jourard (1964, 1968, 1971) defined self-disclosure as the process of willingly making one's self and one's experience fully known to another person. He argued that the inability or unwillingness to establish close, confiding relationships with others is a characteristic of certain forms of personality maladjustment (Jourard, 1971). A person with a healthy personality displays the ability to make one's self fully known to at least one other significant human being (Jourard, 1964). It has also been suggested that the relationship between self-disclosure and mental health, or maximum psychological adjustment, is curvilinear, that is, a person who never or rarely discloses the self may be unable to form close relationships with others; the person who discloses the self not only to someone close, but to anyone, may be perceived by others as maladjusted. A person may be unable to form

close relationships because of preoccupation with the self; a person who is a moderate discloser may disclose a great deal to someone close and be able to maintain moderately close relationships with others. Cozby (1974) concludes that persons with positive mental health are characterized by high disclosure to a few significant others and medium disclosure to others in the social environment; individuals who are poorly adjusted are characterized by either high or low disclosure to everyone in the environment.

Many investigators have attempted to relate self-disclosure to measured personality characteristics and psychological adjustment on standardized tests, such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), the Rorschach, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. The one consistent finding coming from research using the MMPI is that low self-disclosers score higher on the Si scale (Goodstein & Reinecker, 1974). Jourard (1971) and Mullaney (1964) found a negative correlation between self-disclosure and the MMPI Si scale. However a low negative correlation between the F, D, Pt, and Sc scales and reported self-disclosure was found, as well as a positive correlation with the K scale (Goodstein & Reinecker, 1974), but Himelstein and Lubin (1966) found a negative correlation between the K scale and reported self-disclosure. Smith

used the MMPI to explore the relationship between personal adjustment and self-disclosure (Jourard, 1964). He had a group of "normals" and "abnormals" as measured by the MMPI. Both groups differed from controls who were randomly selected college students. He found that the group with normal profiles reported less disclosure than the group with abnormal profiles. However, these two groups showed substantially less disclosure than the control group.

Jourard (1961) used the Rorschach to determine if low disclosers give fewer responses to the Rorschach plates than higher disclosers; he found that productivity on the Rorschach was positively correlated with a measure of the extent of self-disclosure to selected significant others.

The data from a study (Jourard, 1971) using the Tennessee Department of Mental Health Self-Concept Scale were construed as evidence that attitudes of self-acceptance are a factor in self-disclosing behavior. Shapiro (1968) also found significant positive relationships between self-disclosure and self-concept scores using the same scale.

In Worthy, Gary, & Kahn's (1969) study, 48 unmarried female undergraduates were placed in small groups and each subject exchanged self-disclosing notes on various topics of known intimacy value. Prior to this, they were administered Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale. Worthy et al. (1969)

found no relationship between scores on this scale and actual self-disclosure.

Halverson & Shore (1969) gave the California F Scale and a modified version of Jourard's Self-Disclosure Questionnaire to 53 Peace Corps trainees. They found that self-disclosure was negatively correlated with authoritarianism and positively correlated with interpersonal flexibility.

Taylor, Altman, and Frankfurt (1973) used the MMPI, the EPPS, and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale in their study of 100 naval recruits. Their findings corroborated those of Worthy et al. (1969) in that no relationship was found between self-disclosure and dogmatism. On the EPPS, traits reflecting positive social orientation were also associated with high self-disclosure, especially to close friends. Taylor et al. (1973) summarized that their results gave some, but weak, support to the theory that psychological adjustment is associated with the willingness to be open with others.

The Pederson Personality Inventory, Gough Femininity Scale, and Jourard's 60- and 25-item self-disclosure questionnaires were administered to 56 males and 51 females (Pederson & Higbee, 1969). They found significant positive relationships between scores on the Neuroticism, Cycloid disposition, and Thinking Introversion scales and reported

self-disclosure for males. Obtained correlations for females were not significant.

In a similar study, Pederson and Breglio (1968) administered the Pederson Personality Inventory, Gough Femininity Scale and a five-question, written self-description instrument (as a measure of self-disclosure) to 26 males and 26 female undergraduates. They found a positive relationship between Neuroticism and Cycloid disposition scales and self-disclosure for male subjects. Again, the obtained correlation for female subjects was not significant.

In a more recent study, Shere (1973) noted that involving oneself in close interpersonal relationships creates possibilities for experiencing conflict and frustration, which are dealt with by means of defense mechanisms. He hypothesized that defenses characterized as particularly maladaptive would relate negatively to self-disclosure, an adjustive process, while defenses characterized as more adaptive would have a positive relationship to self-disclosure. Shere administered a 48-item self-report questionnaire of past self-disclosure, the Defense Mechanism Inventory, and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale to 100 male college students. He used all males as subjects because it has been shown in previous research that males disclose less than females, and he assumed that males would therefore defend to greater

extent against self-disclosing behavior. The results suggested that overall interpersonal style associated with defense preference was more important than the adjustment nature of defenses in determining past self-disclosure. This indicates that the literature suggesting a direct positive relationship between self-disclosure and adjustment must recognize that differences in interpersonal style (apart from adjustment per se) may affect the disclosure process. Also, the results showed a nonsignificant relationship between self-disclosure and flexibility of defense; the relationship between social desirability and defense preference was not significant.

Regardless of the measure employed, the research provides little empirical support for Jourard's postulate that psychological adjustment is a correlate of self-disclosure. The results of these studies are conflicting and inconclusive. It is obvious that there is a great need not only for replication studies, but also for additional research using other measures of personality which also include actual and reported self-disclosure.

Regarding the subject of self-disclosure, it should not be surprising that one is most likely to self-disclose to those to whom one has previously disclosed. Targets are those persons who are the recipients of self-disclosure. This study focuses on disclosure to five different target

persons: Mother (M), Father (F), Best Female Friend (BFF), Best Male Friend or Spouse (BMF), and Clergyman (Clgy). The last represents an addition to those targets previously reported in the literature. This addition was made in an effort to measure the amount of disclosure to Clergyman and to compare this with the other target groups. Many organized religions give members the opportunity to disclose wrongdoings or personal problems in "confession" to a member of the ministry. Clergymen, as confessors and counselors, are ethically bound to observe confidentiality, as are therapists. Therefore, a person may feel more comfortable disclosing personal information to the clergy rather than to someone else. The question of interest here is how much, if any, disclosure is received by the clergy from the laity?

Many researchers have found that same-sexed friends are more frequently the recipients of self-disclosure than opposite-sexed friends (Dimond & Munz, 1967; Himelstein & Lubin, 1966; Jourard, 1964, 1971; Jourard & Lasakow, 1958; Jourard & Richman, 1963; West & Zingle, 1969). However, Komarovsky (1974) found that the female friend, rather than the male friend, emerged as the preferred target for males. Mothers are more frequently the targets of self-disclosure by both high school and college students regardless of sex (Jourard & Lasakow, 1958; Komarovsky, 1974; Rivenbark, 1971; Ryckerman, Sherman, & Burgess, 1973; Woodyard & Hines, 1973).

The literature indicates that for the female subjects in this study, Mother and Best Female Friend are the probable preferred targets of disclosure.

In an attempt to identify separate personality characteristics and to measure psychological adjustment, although not in relation to self-disclosure, R. B. Cattell and others have done extensive research using the Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire (16PF) (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970). In a series of carefully planned studies, Cattell evaluated and isolated the pure factor of Ego-Strength (Factor C) from a thorough and comprehensive factor analysis; the validity coefficients obtained using a combination of 16PF Forms C and D were .68 and .81 on Factor C ($n = 606$) (Cattell et al., 1970).

Factor C is described as one of dynamic integration and maturity versus uncontrolled, disorganized and general emotionality (Cattell et al., 1970). The person low on ego-strength (C-) is easily annoyed by things and people, is dissatisfied with the world situation, his family, the restrictions of life, his own health, and the person feels unable to cope with life. This person shows generalized neurotic responses in the form of phobias, psychosomatic disturbances, sleep disturbances, and hysterical and obsessive behavior. It has been observed clinically that most disorders show low ego-strength scores; it is the major

contributor pathologically, being found in neurotics, psychotics, alcoholics, drug addicts, etc. (Cattell et al., 1970). On the other hand, the person high on ego-strength (C+) is more likely to be a leader, emotionally mature, stable, calm, reality oriented, and able to adjust to difficulties thrown upon one.

Cattell et al. (1970) discuss previous research which utilized a population comparable to the one which was used in this study, 176 female nursing students. This study found that the mean for this group on Factor C was 6.2 (SD = 2.1). A similar study of 299 British female nursing students also indicated that this group fell within the moderate range (M = 5.2; SD = 1.7) (Cattell et al., 1970). As yet, no research has studied the relationship between ego-strength and self-disclosure.

J. B. Rotter has also attempted to measure psychological adjustment by studying the manner in which a person perceives and reacts to a reinforcing or rewarding event in the environment; a perception Rotter (1966) has termed locus of control. When a person perceives a reinforcement as not being entirely contingent on his or her own action, that is, as a result of luck, fate, or under the control of powerful others, then this is labeled as a belief in external control (Rotter, 1966). Conversely, a belief in internal control is one in which a person perceives that an event is contingent

upon his or her own behavior or upon his or her own relatively permanent characteristics. In his comprehensive monograph, Rotter (1966) suggests that lack of "ego control" can be defined as a form of maladjustment in that a person lacks confidence and the ability to deal with reality. Furthermore, he states that the relationship between internal versus external locus of control and ego control is not yet clear, but there are indications that people at the extreme ends of the I-E continuum are probably maladjusted and that there is a curvilinear relationship between "ego control" and internal versus external control of reinforcement. Possibly, this curvilinear relationship may also exist between locus of control and ego-strength.

Other personality factors have been related to locus of control. Rotter (1966) discusses research that implied that a belief in chance or luck was characterized by less productivity and thus related to a general passivity; belief in luck was also seen as a defense behavior enabling people to preserve their self-esteem in the face of failure. Discussing the concept of alienation, Rotter (1966) linked this concept to powerlessness and noted that a person who is alienated feels unable to control his or her own destiny. It has also been suggested that people who are high on the need for achievement probably have some belief in their

own ability to determine the outcome of their efforts (Rotter, 1966).

Much research has been done using the I-E Scale; one study sampled 605 female undergraduate psychology students. Possible scores range from zero to 23 with higher scores representing high externals. The mean for this group was 8.42 (SD = 4.06) (Rotter, 1966).

In a study correlating the personality factors of the 16PF and the I-E Scale, Jacobs (1976) found that for the 200 undergraduates tested (84 males, 116 females), 16PF variables significantly but modestly related to I-E scores. The correlation between Factor C and scores on the I-E Scale was -.29.

Little research has been done studying the relationship between self-disclosure and locus of control. One study involved the administration of Rotter's I-E Scale and Jourard's Self-Disclosure Questionnaire to 80 college students (Ryckerman, Sherman, & Burgess, 1973). The results offered significant but weak support for the predictions of the study ($F = 3.70$, $p < .10$): First, it was found that high externals tended to disclose less information about themselves than internals, regardless of the intimacy levels of the information being revealed. On the basis of a maximum self-disclosure score of 192, the mean for the externals was 93.04; the mean for the internals was 107.52. Externals

disclosed 48% of all possible information about themselves, while internals disclosed 56%. Second, the findings of earlier studies were replicated which indicated that females tend to disclose more information than males, and that subjects disclose the least amount of information to their fathers when compared to all other target groups.

Kaplan (1974) studied the effects of self-instructing model, behavior rehearsal, and internal-external instructions upon self-disclosure. Eighty college females were selected on the basis of the I-E Scale and divided into high and low scores. Internal instructions, which stressed that it was the subject's responsibility to evaluate her own behavior in an interview-like situation, and external instructions, which stated that the experimenter would evaluate the subject's performance, were combined with one of four modeling conditions: (a) a highly self-disclosing tape-recorded model; (b) the same model with additions in the tape in which the model structured her responses with self-instructions; (c) this same model without self-instructions, but with opportunities in the tape for the subject to practice self-disclosing responses following a booklet with questions which she could answer about herself and her feelings; and (d) a control group. The results indicated that externalizers tended to disclose more than internalizers. This finding conflicts with the findings of

Ryckerman et al. (1973). Kaplan also found that internal instructions tended to elicit more self-disclosure than external instructions, a result which conflicts with her first finding. Another result of her study indicated that the presence of models tended to facilitate self-disclosure, but the model-plus-rehearsal condition and self-instructing model were especially facilitative in eliciting self-disclosure in areas more threatening to the subject. The modeling and instructional manipulations tended to have differential effects upon internalizer and externalizers, suggesting that research into behavior modification techniques must take into account individual differences.

However, another study (Fraum, 1975) suggested that individual differences (based on sex of the subject, locus of control, and volunteer versus nonvolunteer) for preferred interpersonal distance were not significantly related to the amount of self-disclosure as a function of interpersonal distance during an interview. This study emphasized the importance of situational variables rather than individual variables in producing differences in self-disclosure in an interview situation. Clearly, the research is inconclusive regarding the relationship of locus of control and self-disclosure.

Statement of the Problem

The three variables of self-disclosure, locus of control, and ego-strength have been identified as personality constructs in the literature: Jourard (1964) states that self-disclosure to a significant other is a symptom of personality health and an indication of maximum psychological health; Rotter (1966) states that a person lacking ego control is psychologically maladjusted in that the person lacks confidence and the ability to face reality; both Jourard and Rotter hypothesize a curvilinear relationship between scores on their respective measures and adjustment. Cattell et al. (1970) have identified Factor C as an independent personality construct and as a measure of emotional stability and reality orientation. A search of the literature revealed that as yet, no research has been undertaken to examine the interrelationship of these three variables. The current study was designed to test three major null hypotheses:

1. There will be no correlation between the scores obtained on:

- (a) locus of control and ego-strength,
- (b) locus of control and self-disclosure, and
- (c) ego-strength and self-disclosure

by the same subjects.

2. The obtained coefficient of multiple correlation between locus of control, ego-strength, and self-disclosure will equal zero.

3. There will be no difference between mean disclosure of each target group (Mother, Father, Best Female Friend, Best Male Friend or Spouse, and Clergyman).

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were solicited from freshman psychology classes on the Denton campus of Texas Woman's University. They received bonus points in return for participating in the study. One hundred and fifty female undergraduates served as volunteer participants. The mean age of the subjects was 20.07. Subjects met at a reserved classroom, were informed of the study, and then given the opportunity to ask questions and/or decline participation. Before participating in the study, subjects signed informed consent statements which are kept on file in the Psychology Department, CFO 714, Texas Woman's University.

Instruments

Three questionnaires were administered in randomized order to account for order effect. Also, the questionnaires were numbered to insure the subjects' anonymity. To assess level of self-disclosure, Jourard's Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (SD-60) (Jourard & Lasakow, 1958) was given. The SD-60 consists of 60 items divided into six sections of 10 items each. The subject indicated on an answer sheet the

extent to which she disclosed herself to various target persons on a three-step scale. Possible scores range from zero to 600. A copy of the SD-60 can be found in Appendix B. The SD-60 has been shown to have a split-half reliability of .94 (Jourard & Lasakow, 1958). Panyard (1971) obtained a split-half reliability coefficient of .70 for the SD-60 using a similar group of subjects.

The Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (I-E Scale) is a 29-item forced-choice test including six filler items intended to make the purpose of the test more ambiguous. Possible scores range from zero to 23. The test-retest reliability coefficients range from .49 to .83 and validity coefficients range from .65 to .79 (Rotter, 1966).

The items measuring ego-strength (Factor C) were extracted from Form C of the 16PF since this was the factor pertinent to this study. These items (4, 21, 38, 55, 72, 89) are multiple choice in which particular choices are assigned weights which make up the Factor C score. The range of possible scores are from zero to 12. The test-retest reliability coefficients range on all source traits from .54 to .93 (Cattell et al., 1970). Copies of the I-E Scale and the Factor C items can be found in Appendices A and C respectively.

Procedure

Volunteer subjects arrived at a reserved classroom at an appointed time, informed of the study, and given the opportunity to ask questions, sign an informed consent statement, or to decline participation in the study. The three questionnaires and answer sheets were distributed and each one explained. Any questions were answered at this time, then the subjects began to fill out the questionnaires. The time required to complete the questionnaires ranged from 45 minutes to an hour.

The .05 level of significance was used on all data analyses. Means, standard deviations, and Pearson product-moment correlations were obtained on all three variables. Using a z-test of Fisher's Z-transformation of r (Glass & Stanley, 1970) the three correlation coefficients were tested to determine if they were significantly different from zero. A multiple regression equation (Glass & Stanley, 1970) was obtained; an F-ratio was obtained and tested for significance (Kerlinger & Pedhazur, 1973). Disclosure to the target groups was analyzed by a one-dimensional analysis of variance for repeated measures (Dayton, 1970).

From previous research (Rotter, 1966) using the I-E Scale, a mean of 8.42 and standard deviation of 4.06 were obtained ($n = 605$). Lower scores on the I-E Scale comprise

the "Internal" end of the scale; higher scores comprise the "External" end of the scale. Therefore, for purposes of the present study, "Internal" was defined as those subjects having a score from zero to 7 inclusive; scores from 13 to 23 inclusive were defined as "External." Means of Internals and Externals were tested for significance. Also, the means of total I-E scores for Rotter's (1966) sample and this current sample were tested for significance using a two-sample t-test.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The reader will recall that the purpose of this study was to determine the interrelationship between locus of control, ego-strength, and self-disclosure and the extent to which self-disclosure scores can be predicted by combining scores on these other two selected variables. Also, this study attempted to corroborate findings of previous research by analyzing disclosure to various target groups. Statistics of interest (means and standard deviations) for locus of control, ego-strength, and self-disclosure scores for 150 female subjects are shown in Table 1.

The results of the Pearson product-moment correlation between locus of control and ego-strength scores yielded an $\underline{r} = -.339$. A Fisher's Z-transformation was computed in order to determine if the obtained \underline{r} was significantly different from zero. As shown in Table 2, the computed $\underline{z} = -4.284$, $p < .01$. Subsequently, the sub-hypothesis 1.(a) that there would be no correlation between locus of control and ego-strength scores was rejected.

Sub-hypothesis 1.(b) which stated that there would be no correlation between locus of control and self-disclosure

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Locus of Control,
Ego-Strength, and Self-Disclosure Scores
of 150 Female Subjects

	Means	Standard Deviations
Locus of Control	10.880	3.518
Ego-Strength	7.340	2.363
Self-Disclosure	281.960	74.703

Table 2

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations between Locus
of Control, Ego-Strength, and Self-Disclosure
Scores and Fisher's Z-transformation of r

	X	Y	Z	Z _r	z
X Locus of Control	-	-.339	-.045	-.353	-4.284**
Y Ego-Strength		-	.201	-.045	-.546
Z Self-Disclosure			-	.201	2.476*

*p < .05.

**p < .01.

scores was retained. It can be seen in Table 2 that the Pearson product-moment correlation between these two variables resulted in an $\underline{r} = -.045$. The Fisher's Z-transformation of this coefficient ($\underline{z} = -.546$) was non-significant.

The correlation between ego-strength and self-disclosure was $\underline{r} = .201$. Again referring to Table 2, the Fisher's Z-transformation of this value resulted in a $\underline{z} = 2.476$, $\underline{p} < .05$. Consequently, the sub-hypothesis 1.(c) that there would be no correlation between these two variables was rejected.

The multiple prediction equation was computed in order to estimate self-disclosure scores from a linear combination of ego-strength and locus of control scores. Using raw score formulas, the multiple prediction equation was as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = .552X_{i1} + 6.639X_{i2} + 227.223.$$

Thus, the predicted self-disclosure score is obtained by substituting the locus of control score and the ego-strength score into the formula:

$$\text{Predicted self-disclosure score} = (.552)(\text{I-E score}) + (6.639)(\text{Factor C score}) + 227.223.$$

The multiple correlation coefficient is a special case of the Pearson product-moment correlation between actual and predicted self-disclosure scores and is a measure of how

well the best linear weighting of locus of control and ego-strength scores predicts or correlates with self-disclosure scores. The obtained coefficient of multiple correlation was computed to be .2024.

An F-ratio was then obtained in order to determine if the multiple correlation coefficient was significantly different from zero. The results yielded an $F(2,147) = 3.142$, $p < .05$. Therefore, the second major hypothesis was rejected.

Finally, to examine Hypothesis 3, self-disclosure scores were broken down into target group means. That is, a mean was generated for each target group (Mother, Father, Best Female Friend, Best Male Friend, Clergyman), and analyzed by a one-dimensional analysis of variance for repeated measure (Dayton, 1970). Table 3 is the summary table for this analysis which indicates that the third major hypothesis of no difference between these means was rejected at the .001 level. Tukey's Multiple Pair-Wise Comparison Procedure (Glass & Stanley, 1970) was used to determine which target groups were significantly different. As shown in Table 4, the target groups of Mother and Father were significantly different ($q(5,745) = 8.876$, $p < .005$). Mother and Best Female Friend were not significantly different ($q(5,745) = 1.236$), which was also true of Mother and Best Male Friend ($q(5,745) = 2.803$). Also, the means

Table 3

Summary Table of a One-dimensional Analysis of Variance
for Repeated Measures on the Target Groups

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Groups	4	443548.000	110887.000	217.744*
Subjects	149	166301.000	1116.114	
Interaction	596	303516.000	509.255	
Total	749	913365.000		

*p < .001

Table 4

Tukey's Multiple Pair-Wise Comparison
Procedure on Target Groups

Pair-Wise Comparisons	$\bar{X}.j - \bar{X}.j^*$	q
Mother = Father	24.214	8.876**
Mother = Best Female Fr.	3.374	1.236
Mother = Best Male Fr.	7.647	2.803
Mother = Clergyman	65.940	24.172**
Father = Best Female Fr.	-20.840	-7.639**
Father = Best Male Fr.	-16.567	-6.073**
Father = Clergyman	41.726	15.295**
Best Female Fr. = Best Male Fr.	4.273	1.566
Best Female Fr. = Clergyman	62.566	22.935**
Best Male Fr. = Clergyman	58.293	21.368**

**p < .005 (Degrees of freedom: J = 5; v = 745)

for Best Female Friend and Best Male Friend were not significantly different ($q(5,745) = 1.566$). Mean disclosure to Mother and Clergyman was significantly different ($q(5,745) = 24.172, p < .005$). Mean disclosure to Father was significantly different from mean disclosure to the targets of Best Female Friend ($q(5,745) = -7.639, p < .005$), Best Male Friend ($q(5,745) = -6.073, p < .005$), and Clergyman ($q(5,745) = 15.295, p < .005$). The mean of the target group Best Female Friend was significantly different from Clergyman ($q(5,745) = 22.935, p < .005$); the mean of Best Male Friend also differed significantly from Clergyman ($q(5,745) = 21.368, p < .005$).

In summary, the null hypotheses stating that the correlations between locus of control and ego-strength and between ego-strength and self-disclosure were rejected. However, the null hypothesis that the correlation between locus of control and self-disclosure would equal zero was retained. The multiple correlation between the self-disclosure scores and the linear combination of the locus of control and ego-strength scores was significant, thus the second major hypothesis was rejected. The hypothesis that mean disclosure to each target group would not differ was rejected. It was found that Mother, Best Female Friend, and Best Male Friend were the preferred targets

of disclosure and that Father and Clergyman were the least preferred targets of disclosure.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The results support the findings of Jacobs (1976) who found a negative relationship between ego-strength and internal-external locus of control. In the current study, subjects scoring higher on ego-strength tended to score lower on the I-E Scale. Conversely, subjects obtaining a low score on ego-strength tended to score high on locus of control.

The correlation coefficient between locus of control and self-disclosure was not significant. It was previously stated that those subjects scoring from zero to 7 inclusive were defined as "Internals" and those subjects scoring from 13 to 23 inclusive on the I-E Scale were defined as "Externals." The mean of the Internals was 277.26; the mean of the Externals was 271.47. A t-test was calculated on these means which yielded a nonsignificant t value of .00032.

Ryckerman et al. (1973) found that high externals tended to disclose less information about themselves than internals. These findings were significant, but weak ($F = 3.70$; $p < .10$). Even though other personality factors have been related to locus of control, it is evident that

self-disclosure is not related to this variable to any large degree.

It is possible that the population sampled in this study is different from those in other studies. Ryckerman et al. (1973) sampled male and female college students. Rotter (1966) sampled 605 female undergraduate psychology students and obtained a mean of 8.42 (SD = 4.06) on the I-E Scale. In this present study, 150 female undergraduate psychology students yielded a mean of 10.880 (SD = 3.518), significantly above that of Rotter's study ($t = 6.56$; $p < .01$). The students in the current sample are largely nursing majors and attend Texas Woman's University, a previously all-female, and still, by far, a predominantly female university. It is possible that the type of female who chooses to attend a predominantly female university is different in personality structure than the female who elects to attend a co-ed university.

The results indicated a positive relationship between ego-strength and self-disclosure scores. A person who scores high on ego-strength tends to score high on self-disclosure; a low score on ego-strength tends to yield a low self-disclosure score.

The mean for Factor C was also slightly higher ($\bar{X} = 7.340$) for this sample than previously reported in the literature. In a sample of a similar population, Cattell

et al. (1973) obtained a mean of 6.2 for 176 female nursing students. However, there was no significant difference between these two means ($t = 1.425$).

The multiple correlation between self-disclosure and the two predictor variables was computed to be .2024 which accounted for only 4% of the variance in the criterion variable. However, R^2 was found to be significantly different from zero ($F(2,147) = 3.142, p < .05$). It can be seen from examining the multiple regression equation that locus of control scores did not contribute to the successful prediction of self-disclosure to the same degree as ego-strength scores.

In analyzing differences in self-disclosure to the various target persons, it was believed that "Mother" and "Best Female Friend" would be the preferred targets and that "Father" the least preferred target. The study supported this belief as well as corroborated the findings of previous research (Dimond & Munz, 1967; Himelstein & Lubin, 1966; Jourard, 1964, 1971; Jourard & Lasakow, 1958; Jourard & Richman, 1963; Komarovsky, 1974; Rivenbark, 1971; Ryckerman et al., 1973; West & Zingle, 1969; Woodyard & Hines, 1973). The means of the target groups indicated that most-to-least disclosure occurred in the following order:

(a) Mother; (b) Best Female Friend; (c) Best Male Friend; (d) Father; and (e) Clergyman. The analysis of variance

indicated that Best Male Friend was not significantly different from Mother and Best Female Friend, a result not previously found in the literature. Same-sexed friends are reported as more frequent recipients of self-disclosure than opposite-sexed friends. Therefore, even though Best Male Friend is the third most preferred target of self-disclosure, it is surprising that this group is not significantly different from the two more preferred targets, Mother and Best Female Friend. Komarovsky (1974) administered the SD-60 to 62 undergraduate males and found that the highest disclosure was to the Best Female Friend. In fact, highest disclosure was in areas regarding the more intimate and more guarded aspects of the self. Possibly, the more open and permissive attitudes toward sex and the expression of one's sexuality that have been and are still evolving account for these findings.

Limitations

The population sampled in this study limits the generalizability of the results, as well as the fact that the participants are volunteers. It also must be kept in mind that the self-disclosure questionnaire is a self-report measure which does not assess actual or observed self-disclosure. No faking or lying measures were taken as the

investigator assumed that all participants answered all items as accurately and as honestly as possible.

Suggestions for Future Research

Evidently locus of control is not a predictor of self-disclosure under the conditions of this study and for this sample. Consequently, it is suggested that, along with Factor C, the relationship of other personality factors from the 16PF and self-disclosure be studied. It is possible that since no research has been done relating the 16PF and Jourard's SD-60, a more comprehensive study can be made in determining how measures of psychological adjustment relate to one's level of self-disclosure. Certainly, the 16PF would be a viable instrument to employ in explaining this relationship.

Also, it is suggested that the relationship between I-E scores and observed or actual self-disclosure be examined. Self-descriptive essays or actual disclosure in a dyadic situation could be related to internal-external locus of control scores to compare the results with the findings of this study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

This study examined the interrelationship between self-disclosure, locus of control, and ego-strength and sought to determine prediction of self-disclosure from scores on these other selected variables. Jourard's Self-Disclosure Questionnaire, the Internal-External Locus of Control Scale, and Factor C items of the 16PF were administered to 150 female freshman psychology students of Texas Woman's University. Self-disclosure was significantly and positively related to ego-strength ($r_{yz} = .201$; $p < .05$); the relationship between locus of control and self-disclosure was low and negative and not significant ($r_{xz} = -.045$); and the relationship between locus of control and ego-strength was significant and negative ($r_{xy} = -.339$; $p < .01$).

Ego-strength scores were found to be successful predictors of self-disclosure; locus of control scores did not contribute to the prediction of self-disclosure.

"Mother," "Best Female Friend," and "Best Male Friend" were the most preferred targets of disclosure; "Father" and "Clergyman" were the least preferred targets.

Since ego-strength was found to be a successful predictor of self-disclosure, it was suggested that the relationships between other personality factors of the 16PF and self-disclosure be examined.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE I

QUESTIONNAIRE I

The Internal-External Locus of Control Scale

Instructions

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief: obviously there are no right or wrong answers.

Your answers to the items on this inventory are to be recorded on a separate answer sheet which is loosely inserted in the booklet. Remove this answer sheet now. Do not put your name on this answer sheet; instead write the number you see in the upper right hand corner on the front page of the booklet.

Please answer these items carefully but do not spend too much time on any one item. Be sure to find an answer for every choice. Find the number of the item on the answer

sheet and black-in the space under the number 1 or 2 which you choose as the statement more true.

In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you more strongly believe to be true as far as you're concerned. Also try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be influenced by your previous choices.

Now you may begin.

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.
2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4.
 - a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
 - b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
5.
 - a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
 - b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.
6.
 - a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
 - b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
7.
 - a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
 - b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
8.
 - a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
 - b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.
9.
 - a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.

- b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.
- 10.
 - a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
 - b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.
- 11.
 - a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
 - b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
- 12.
 - a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
 - b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
- 13.
 - a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
 - b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.
- 14.
 - a. There are certain people who are just no good.
 - b. There is some good in everybody.

15. a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
 b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
 b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
 b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
 b. There really is no such thing as "luck."
19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
 b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
 b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

- 21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
- 22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
- 23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.
- 24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.
- 25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
- 26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.

- b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.
- 27.
 - a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
 - b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.
- 28.
 - a. What happens to me is my own doing.
 - b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
- 29.
 - a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
 - b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE II

QUESTIONNAIRE II

Jourard's Self-Disclosure Questionnaire

Instructions

This questionnaire has an answer sheet which has columns with the headings "Mother," "Father," "Best Female Friend," "Best Male Friend or Spouse," and "Clergyman." You are to read each item on the questionnaire, and then indicate on the answer sheet the extent that you have talked about that item to each person; that is, the extent to which you have made yourself known to that person.

Use the following rating scale to describe the extent that you have talked about each item.

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

QUESTIONNAIRE II ANSWER SHEET

	<u>Mother</u>						<u>Father</u>						<u>Best Female Friend</u>						<u>Best Male Friend or Spouse</u>						<u>Clergyman</u>					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	A	B	C	D	E	F	A	B	C	D	E	F	A	B	C	D	E	F	A	B	C	D	E	F
1																														
2																														
3																														
4																														
5																														
6																														
7																														
8																														
9																														
10																														

Questionnaire II

Category A: Attitudes and Opinions

1. What I think and feel about religion; my personal religious views.
2. My personal opinions and feelings about other religious groups than my own, e.g., Protestants, Catholics, Jews, atheists.
3. My views on communism.
4. My views on the present government--the president, government, policies, etc.
5. My views on the question of racial integration in schools, transportation, etc.
6. My personal views on drinking.
7. My personal views on sexual morality--how I feel that I and others ought to behave in sexual matters.
8. My personal standards of beauty and attractiveness in women--what I consider to be attractive in a woman.
9. The things that I regard as desirable for a man to be--what I look for in a man.
10. My feeling about how parents ought to deal with children.

Category B: Tastes and Interests

1. My favorite foods, the ways I like food prepared, and my food dislikes.
2. My favorite beverages, and the ones I don't like.
3. My likes and dislikes in music.
4. My favorite reading matter.
5. The kinds of movies that I like to see best; the TV shows that are my favorites.
6. My tastes in clothing.
7. The style of house, and the kinds of furnishing that I like best.
8. The kind of party, or social gathering that I like best, and the kind that would bore me, or that I wouldn't enjoy.
9. My favorite ways of spending spare time, e.g., hunting, reading, cards, sports events, parties, dancing, etc.
10. What I would appreciate most for a present.

Category C: Work or Studies

1. What I find to be the worst pressures and strains in my work.
2. What I find to be the most boring and unenjoyable aspects of my work.
3. What I enjoy most, and get the most satisfaction from in my present work.

4. What I feel are my shortcomings and handicaps that prevent me from getting further ahead in my work.
5. What I feel are my special strong points and qualifications for my work.
6. How I feel that my work is appreciated by others (e.g., boss, fellow workers, teacher, husband, etc.).
7. My ambitions and goals in my work.
8. My feelings about the salary or rewards that I get for my work.
9. How I feel about the choice of career that I have made--whether or not I'm satisfied with it.
10. How I really feel about the people that I work for, or work with.

Category D: Money

1. How much money I make at my work, or get as an allowance.
2. Whether or not I owe money; if so, how much.
3. Whom I owe money to at present; or whom I have borrowed from in the past.
4. Whether or not I have savings, and the amount.
5. Whether or not others owe me money; the amount, and who owes it to me.
6. Whether or not I gamble; if so, the way I gamble, and the extent of it.

7. All of my present sources of income--wages, fees, allowance, dividends, etc.
8. My total financial worth, including property, savings, bonds, insurance, etc.
9. My most pressing need for money right now, e.g., outstanding bills, some major purchase that is desired or needed.
10. How I budget my money--the proportion that goes to necessities, luxuries, etc.

Category E: Personality

1. The aspects of my personality that I dislike, worry about, that I regard as a handicap to me.
2. What feelings, if any, that I have trouble expressing or controlling.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. Things in the past or present that I feel ashamed and guilty about.
6. The kinds of things that make me just furious.
7. What it takes to get me feeling real depressed or blue.

8. What it takes to get me real worried, anxious, and afraid.
9. What it takes to hurt my feelings deeply.
10. The kinds of things that make me especially proud of myself, elated, full of self-esteem or self-respect.

Category F: Body

1. 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.
2. How I wish I looked: my ideals for overall appearance.
3. My feelings about different parts of my body--legs, hips, waist, weight, chest or bust, etc.
4. Any problems and worries that I had with my appearance in the past.
5. Whether or not I now have any health problems--e.g., trouble with sleep, digestion, female complaints, heart condition, allergies, headaches, piles, etc.
6. Whether or not I have any long-range worries or concerns about my health, e.g., cancer, ulcers, heart trouble.
7. My past record of illness and treatment.
8. Whether or not I now make special effort to keep fit, healthy, and attractive, e.g., calisthenics, diet.
9. My present physical measurements, e.g., height, weight, waist, etc.

10. My feelings about my adequacy in sexual behavior--
whether or not I feel able to perform adequately in
sex-relationships.

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE III

QUESTIONNAIRE III

Factor C Items--16PF

1. When going to bed, I:
 - a. drop off to sleep quickly,
 - b. in between,
 - c. have difficulty falling asleep.
2. I always have lots of energy at times when I need it.
 - a. yes,
 - b. in between,
 - c. no.
3. Minor distractions seem:
 - a. to irritate me,
 - b. in between,
 - c. not to bother me at all.
4. Things go wrong for me:
 - a. rarely,
 - b. occasionally,
 - c. frequently.
5. I have occasionally had a brief touch of faintness, dizziness, or light-headedness for no apparent reason.

- a. yes,
- b. uncertain,
- c. no.

6. I am bored:

- a. often,
- b. occasionally,
- c. seldom.

APPENDIX D

PERMISSIONS AND APPROVAL
TO DO RESEARCH

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

Human Research Committee

Name of Investigator: Lou Isaacson Center: Denton

Address: 803 Anna Date: 3-31-78

Denton, Texas 76201

Dear Lou Isaacson:

Your study entitled Self-disclosure, ego strength, and locus of control among college females has been reviewed by a committee of the Human Research Review Committee and it appears to meet our requirements in regard to protection of the individual's rights.

Please be reminded that both the University and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare regulations require that written consents must be obtained from all human subjects in your studies. These forms must be kept on file by you.

Furthermore, should your project change, another review by the Committee is required, according to DHEW regulations.

Sincerely,

C. K. Rozier

Chairman, Human Research
Review Committee
at Denton.

cc: Graduate Office

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

DENTON, TEXAS 76204



THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
P.O. Box 22479, TWU STATION

April 12, 1978

Mrs. Mary Lucille S. Isaacson
803 Anna
Denton, Texas 76201

Dear Mrs. Isaacson:

I have received and approved the Prospectus for your re-
search project. Best wishes to you in the research and writing
of your project.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Phyllis Bridges'.

Phyllis Bridges
Dean of the Graduate School

PB:dd

cc: Dr. Iris Amos
Dr. Paul Thetford
Graduate Office

*The
University
of
Connecticut*

STORRS, CONNECTICUT 06268

THE COLLEGE OF
LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES
Department of Psychology

February 20, 1978

Mrs. Lou Isaacson
803 Anna
Denton, Texas 76201

Dear Mrs. Isaacson:

You have my permission to use the I-E Scale
for your research.

Very truly yours,



Julian B. Rotter
Professor of Psychology

JBR/isw

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Cattell, R. B., Eber, H. W., & Tatsuoka, M. M. Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF). Champaign, Ill.: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1970.
- Cozby, P. C. Self-disclosure: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 79(2), 73-91.
- Dayton, C. M. The design of educational experiments. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1970.
- Dimond, R. E., & Munz, D. C. Ordinal position of birth and self-disclosure in high school students. Psychological Reports, 1967, 21, 829-833.
- Fraum, R. M. The effects of interpersonal distance on self-disclosure in a dyadic interview situation. Dissertation Abstracts, 1975, 35 (8-B), 4170.
- Glass, G. V., & Stanley, J. C. Statistical methods in education and psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Goodstein, L. D., & Reinecker, V. M. Factors affecting self-disclosure: A review of the literature. Progress in Experimental Personality Research, 1974, 7, 49-77.
- Halverson, C. F., Jr., & Shore, R. E. Self-disclosure and interpersonal functioning. Journal of Consulting

- and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 213-217.
- Himelstein, P., & Lubin, B. Attempted validation of the self-disclosure inventory by the peer-nomination technique. Journal of Psychology, 1965, 61, 13-16.
- Jacobs, K. W. 16PF correlates of Locus of Control. Psychological Reports, 1976, 38, 1170.
- Jourard, S. M. Rorschach productivity and self-disclosure. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1961, 13, 232.
- Jourard, S. M. The transparent self. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand-Reinhold, 1964.
- Jourard, S. M. Disclosing man to himself. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand-Reinhold, 1968.
- Jourard, S. M. Self-disclosure: An experimental analysis of the transparent self. New York: Wiley, 1971.
- Jourard, S. M., & Lasakow, P. Some factors in self-disclosure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 91-98.
- Jourard, S. M., & Richman, P. Disclosure output and input in college students. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1963, 9, 141-148.
- Kaplan, S. J. The effects of a self-instructing model, behavior rehearsal, and internal-external instructions upon self-disclosure. Dissertation Abstracts, 1974, 34 (10-B), 5196.

- Kerlinger, F. N., & Pedhazur, E. J. Multiple regression in behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Komarovsky, M. Patterns of self-disclosure of male undergraduates. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, 36(4), 677-686.
- Mullaney, A. J. Relationships among self-disclosive behavior, personality and family interaction. Dissertation Abstracts, 1964, 24, 4290.
- Panyard, C. M. Method to improve the reliability of the Jourard self-disclosing questionnaire. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 606.
- Pederson, D. M., & Breglio, V. J. Personality correlates of actual self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1968, 22, 495-501.
- Pederson, D. M., & Higbee, K. L. Personality correlates of self-disclosure. Journal of Social Psychology, 1969, 78, 81-89.
- Rivenbark, W. H. Self-disclosure among adolescents. Psychological Reports, 1974, 36(4), 677-686.
- Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80(1, Whole No. 609).
- Ryckerman, R. M., Sherman, M. F., & Burgess, G. M. Locus of control of public and private information by

college men and women: A brief note. Journal of Psychology, 1973, 84, 317-318.

Shapiro, A. The relationship between self-concept and self-disclosure. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1968, in Goodstein, L. D., & Reinecker, V. M. Factors affecting self-disclosure: A review of the literature. Progress in Experimental Personality Research, 1974, 7, 49-77.

Shere, S. H. The relationship between self-disclosure and psychological defense. Dissertation Abstracts, 1973, 33 (11-B), 5525.

Taylor, D. A., Altman, I., & Frankfurt, L. P. Personality correlates of self-disclosure. Unpublished mimeographed report, 1968, in Altman, I., & Taylor, D. A. Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc., 1973.

West, L. W., & Zingle, H. S. A self-disclosure inventory for adolescents. Psychological Reports, 1969, 24, 439-445.

Woodyard, H. D., & Hines, D. A. Accurate compared to inaccurate self-disclosure. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1973, 13(3), 61-67.

Worthy, M., Gary, A. L., & Kahn, G. M. Self-disclosure as an exchange process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 59-63.