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ABSTRACT

One hundred twenty female subjects between the ages of 17 and 24 were asked to disclose information to a stranger peer of the same sex. The information they disclosed was either non-personal, personal non-intimate, or personal intimate. Additionally, each pair of subjects was assigned to one of two availability of reaction groups; in one group, the subjects were instructed to provide a specific verbal reaction to each of their partner's disclosures; in the other availability of reaction group, the subjects were instructed to provide no reaction at all. Measures of interpersonal attraction were taken after each pair of subjects had interacted. Analysis of variance revealed significantly greater interpersonal attraction between the subjects instructed to provide specific reactions than between those subjects instructed not to react. Significantly greater interpersonal attraction was also found between subjects disclosing personal intimate information than between subjects disclosing non-personal information, and the scores of the subjects disclosing personal non-intimate information fell between those of the other two intimacy of information groups.
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Chapter I. Introduction

Most of us, in our day-to-day routine, are in occasional, frequent, or continual contact with other people. These contacts with other people are, for the most part, interchangeable; that is, we play specific interpersonal roles in the contacts and expect the others with whom we are in contact to play equally specific roles. While each of us may shift roles from time to time or from one contact to the next, our social competence and acceptability is dependent upon our skill in identifying the required role and executing it adequately (Goffman, 1959, p. 55). The people with whom we are in routine contact are, of course, also executing specific roles. While some people may be more skilled than others in executing the required roles, most of us manage not to make too many faux pas' or to execute the wrong role at the wrong time. Thus, most of our routine contacts with others could take place equally well if the individuals with whom we are in interpersonal contact were replaced by other, different individuals playing the same roles. Equally, each of us could be replaced by someone else playing our usual roles in contact with our routine interpersonal audience.

In reaction to such stereotypy of interaction, many of us come to develop personal identifying characteristics -- idiosyncracies or eccentricities -- that do not quite fit the usual roles we are socially required to play, i.e., we change the roles slightly in order
that we -- and our audiences -- can identify the roles as being specific to ourselves. Many educators, businessmen, administrators, etc. consider it good interpersonal practice to develop a set of more-or-less unique "identifiers," such as speech mannerisms, style of dress, or even a particular way of signing one's name.

Basically, however, we all play fairly standardized roles to fairly standardized audiences. Most of the time we may feel that our roles are well worth playing and that our audiences are well worth playing to. But seldom do any of us think to ourselves, "I am a teacher," or, "businessman," or, "father," or however else we tend to identify ourselves, "and nothing more!" We all seem to think that our roles are not really ourselves -- that we are somehow different from the roles we play and can assume the roles or discard them at will. Even considering the whole repertoire of roles that each of us plays, we each feel that there is something else left over after the roles are subtracted -- something "personal" or "individual". It is this "personalness" which we may attempt to display with our individual "identifiers" which are used to make our roles unique to ourselves even though the basic characteristics of the roles are exactly the same as those of a great many other people.

We each very much like, also, our personal identifiers to be recognized and responded to by others. We may say that people who routinely recognize and react to our idiosyncrasies are "personal"
or "warm" or "human". We like the feeling we get from such people and may even try to emulate them in their manner of interaction. And we often reward them for their interaction with us; if they are salesmen, we give them orders; if they are subordinates, we promote them; assuming, of course, that they also execute the basic role requirements competently.

Despite the number of personal identifiers we develop to modify our roles, even if most of our routine audience recognize and react to them, we may eventually come to feel that our interactions with others are somehow not "personal" enough, or that our relationships with other people are not "meaningful." We begin to think that our interactions, effective and competent though they may be, don't "signify" anything beyond the completion of the task for which we played the role in the first place. We begin to feel more and more separate from our role performances, and we begin to feel that we are, indeed, "performing." We may describe ourselves as "lonely" or, more popularly, "alienated." We may even begin to feel trapped by the roles we ourselves have developed and start seeking escape routes out of the trap.

Frequently, the first escape route we try is to perform our roles to a different and, we hope, more appreciative audience. That is, we look for an audience with their own personal identifiers different from those of our typical audience. We may resign from one job and take another, or maybe even change professions. We may change
sweethearts (or spouses) or quit bowling with one group of friends and start playing tennis with another group.

Often, however, we eventually decide that the difficulty lies not with our audience (or audiences) or their response to us, but within ourselves. We come to feel that we must somehow change ourselves to become more expressive of our "personal identity." Usually, what we mean by that is that we will change our personal identifiers with which we enliven our typical interpersonal roles. It is at this point that we might let our hair grow long, or cut it short. We may change our style of dress, or deliberately interact with other people somewhat differently than had previously been our custom.

If, in our trial-and-error changes in interacting with others, we are sufficiently broad in our experimentation, we may come to identify two supposed classes of other people; those whom one can be "with", and those with whom one interacts in a fairly stereotyped fashion. Often, we find ourselves seeking out members of the first class of other people mentioned and engaging in long, serious, and often intimate, conversations. We come to feel that we "really know" the other person and that we have somehow developed a truly "meaningful" relationship. Through the course of developing such a relationship (or relationships), we may well come to feel that we have finally found a way out of the trap of our social roles, that we have somehow become expressive of our personal identity. We may even find that we are quite comfortable with roles very similar to those we
previously thought stultifying and deadening.

It is to one aspect of this process of developing "meaningful" interpersonal relationships that the present dissertation is addressed.

It seems quite likely that the word "meaningful", in the context of the discussion above, has a number of specific connotations. It connotes, for instance, "non-typical," in the sense that a meaningful relationship is one which is somehow different and apart from one which conforms to our usual role stereotypes. In that sense, a non-meaningful relationship is one which is quite predictable from a knowledge of ordinary role requirements and a meaningful relationship is one which is not so predictable -- at least subjectively. To be involved in a subjectively unpredictable relationship implies some degree of risk, but the question is, "Risk of what?" Physical injury seems an unlikely risk here, so it probably would be best to suggest that a meaningful relationship involves some degree of risk of social injury.

The most obvious social injury is disapproval, or suspension of previous approval, and this is probably the risk involved in meaningful relationships. There would, of course, need to be some "thing" of which to disapprove -- some act or thought on the part of one individual ("A") in the relationship of which the second individual ("B") could disapprove. It would be a further requirement of such a relationship that "B" be aware of the act or thought on the part of individual "A". Since the meaningful relationship between "A" and
"B" is, by previous definition, one which is not typical, it follows that the potentially disapproved act or thought of "A" would not be something constituting a part of the public knowledge about "A" or available by simple inspection. Thus, an integral part of the role requirements of "A" in this meaningful relationship must be to disclose to "B" information about "A" which is not public knowledge and which is not available by simple inspection.

It has been previously suggested (Homans, 1950, 1961; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959) that social interaction developing from an acquaintance-ship can be characterized in terms of payoffs or outcomes; it seems appropriate to suggest that the hypothetical relationship between "A" and "B" has outcomes which can be quantified in terms of "self-disclosure", i.e., the communication process previously described between "A" and "B". Newcomb (1962) has suggested that most continuing interpersonal interactions are rewarding, and it would seem necessary that both "A" and "B" find the interaction of self-disclosure rewarding in some way in order that they continue the relationship. The question would be just how self-disclosure is rewarding to the discloser and to the target of his disclosures. "B", on receiving non-public information from "A", gains some power of disapproval over "A", and power to influence another might well be considered to be rewarding. "A", on the other hand, surrenders the power of disapproval to "B" and his reward is somewhat less obvious than is that of "B".

The rewards of self-disclosure to the discloser can be hypothesized,
at a minimum, to be social rewards of the sort involved in inter-
personal attraction. Byrne and his co-workers have suggested that
interpersonal attraction is based upon similarity of significant
attitudes (Byrne, 1961) and upon the amount of discrepancy of attitudes
within that similarity (Byrne, Clore, & Griffitt, 1967). There are
two things of note here: first, in the meaningful relationship of
"A" and "B", both may be rewarded, through self-disclosure, by
discovering that they are attracted and attractive to each other by
reason of attitude similarity; second, for "A" to be rewarded for his
disclosure of significant, non-public attitudes, there must be some
confirming reaction to "A"'s disclosure such that "A" can reasonably
infer that "B" holds the same or a similar attitude.

Quite apart from the strictly interactional rewards, Jourard
(1964, p. 27) has suggested that we only come to know ourselves fully
(which would presumably include our significant attitudes) through
the process of disclosing ourselves to another person. In North
American culture, it would seem to be reasonable to suggest that self-
knowledge has some reward value. In fact, such self-knowledge could
well be the "meaningful" part of the relationship between "A" and "B".

In a "meaningful relationship" between "A" and "B", then, self-
disclosure is an integral and necessary act or set of actions. "A",
the discloser, runs the risk of disapproval from "B" but gains some
increase in self-knowledge and, with some confirming reaction on the
part of "B", the social reward of being attractive and attracted to
"B", though he would presumably not disclose significant attitudes,
or any other personal information, to someone whom he initially disliked. "B" is rewarded for listening to "A's" disclosures by gaining some power to influence "A" through possible disapproval. In addition, "B" may gain the rewards of interpersonal attraction for himself by reacting to "A's" disclosures in such a way that "A" can reasonably infer attitude similarity. Following the disclosures of "A", of course, "B" is already aware of the degree of similarity of attitudes and may well reap some of the benefits of attraction to "A" without giving any reaction whatsoever. It seems likely, however, that "B" would react to "A's" disclosures in that such reaction would, if it implies attitude similarity, enhance "A's" attraction to "B".

It is apparent that reaction to disclosure is, in itself, a kind of disclosure and should also be similarly related to interpersonal attraction as has been suggested for self-disclosure. The reaction of the target person could well, however, be much less explicit, in terms of disclosure, than the original disclosure. Given the natural situation, it would probably obtain, however, that both "A" and "B" would both react and disclose in alternating sequence.

With self-disclosure of non-public information, it seems likely that the quality of the information disclosed would be of some importance to the quality of any interpersonal relationship resulting therefrom. The studies by Byrne and his co-workers referred to previously (p. 7), seem to indicate that significant attitudes are more influential than are trivial attitudes. It seems only reasonable, indeed, that we would react more favorably, given no other information,
to someone who agreed with our racial attitudes than to someone who, for instance, preferred the same brand of cigarettes. The one implies a relatively lengthy set of possible actions or reactions, while the other is quite limited.

In this regard, the assumption is here made that disclosure of acts or thoughts may have the same weight in influencing interpersonal attraction as direct disclosure of attitudes, inasmuch as many of us routinely infer attitudes from expressed actions or thoughts of others, and actions are often used as the test of sincerity of expressed attitudes.

The "significance" of expressed or implied attitudes could be approached in a variety of ways, from popular "social" significance to some sort of ultimate existential importance. Since we are dealing here with interpersonal matters, however, it seems appropriate to approach the question as an interpersonal one. We would all very likely disclose a great deal of information about ourselves to almost anyone, such as preferences for slip-on versus tied shoes, or whether we prefer to write with a pen or a pencil. However, we would probably restrict to only our closest friends information regarding our sexual experiences or our personal evaluation of ourselves. If we regard as a scale of significance the readiness with which we would disclose personal information to strangers, acquaintances, and friends, we can refer to "significance" as a measure of ease of disclosure. For the purposes of this dissertation, the relative ease of disclosure
of specific material to strangers versus very close friends will be referred to as a scale of intimacy, on which the material disclosed may be rated. Certainly, disclosure of intimate personal information seems subjectively to involve more risk of disapproval; approval of, or agreement with, highly intimate attitudes and actions also would seem to involve greater rewards.
Chapter II
Review of the Literature

Previous studies of self-disclosure (cf., Jourard, 1971, for a review of his own and his colleagues work) have generally treated the variable after-the-fact as an already accomplished process. Such studies have, however, provided some evidence that self-disclosure is greater if the discloser holds positive feelings toward the person to whom he is disclosing (Jourard & Lasakow, 1958). As was suggested in Chapter I, it would seem necessary that the discloser hold some positive feelings toward the target person before any disclosure would take place; the Jourard and Lasakow study suggests that this is not only a necessary condition, but also that attraction may be related to disclosure on a quantitative basis. If liking for the target person is related to quantity of personal information disclosed to that person, it may also hold that disclosure of personal information to another person influences the liking for that person. A study by Worthy, Gary, and Kahn (1969) suggests exactly that relationship; self-disclosure was found to have a significant positive effect on the rated liking of the discloser for the target person of his disclosures, even after initial ratings of liking were partialed out. Similarly, a study by one of Jourard's students (Drag, 1968) found that positive affect toward the target of disclosure increased from beginning to end of a period of mutual self-disclosure.
In the study by Drag, it was also found that the intimacy of the information disclosed increased from the beginning to the end of the disclosure process, which suggests that intimacy of information disclosed may also be related to the resultant interpersonal attraction. A somewhat more recent study (Lefkowitz, 1970) found that individuals may be predisposed to feel greater interpersonal attraction toward a stranger if they believe that the stranger, upon their meeting, will be willing to make "meaningful" self-disclosure statements. In this particular study, "meaningful" statements included such categories as attitudes toward sex, religion, and drugs, while "trivial" statements included such information as food preferences and favorite athletes. The "meaningful -- trivial" dimension used by Lefkowitz appears to correspond quite closely to the "intimacy" dimension employed in the present study.

An earlier study (Taylor, 1965) investigated the self-disclosure of college roommates who were initially strangers to each other. It was found that amount of self-disclosure increased over time up to an asymptote at approximately nine weeks. It was also noted, however, that different pairs of roommates reached asymptote at quite different levels of intimacy of information disclosed. This finding was noted, but no explanatory hypotheses were proposed to account for it. Similarly, the Worthy, Gary and Kahn (1969) study, mentioned above, found large differences in the average intimacy level of disclosures. The differences were not related to other measures used in the study,
and no explanatory hypotheses were offered.

Tuckman (1966) investigated the role of personality variables in self-disclosure and found that reported self-disclosure among peers was positively related to measures of cognitive complexity. He did not, however, find that the intimacy of information disclosed was related to the same or other personality measures. Halverson and Shore (1969) also investigated the relationships between personality measures and self-disclosure; they found that quantity of self-disclosure was negatively related to authoritarianism as measured by the California F-scale (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950). Since, however, these investigators did not establish or use a quantitative measure of the intimacy of disclosed information, their study can offer no information about the possible relationship between intimacy of information disclosed and personality characteristics.

The experimental work cited thus far would generally seem to indicate that dyadic (two-person, mutual) self-disclosure tends to facilitate or increase interpersonal attraction, and that self-disclosure increases according to the chronological length of the interaction up to an asymptotic value. Additionally, the level of intimacy of the information disclosed seems to increase conjointly with the increase in interpersonal attraction and the time spent in the interchange. On the basis of these findings, it seems likely that self-disclosure can be considered as an interpersonal outcome which has some reward value and tends to enhance or extend the
relationship. The relationship of the intimacy of the information disclosed to the reward value of self-disclosure is, however, not clear. The asymptotic intimacy level of disclosure may be related to personality characteristics, but this notion is not supported by the research of Tuckman (1966). The studies of Drag (1968) and Lefkowitz (1970) suggest, respectively, that an increase in the intimacy level of the information disclosed is related to an increase in interpersonal attraction and to a predisposition for greater attraction. It is here suggested that the intimacy of the information disclosed is, as is self-disclosure, a quantifiable outcome of interpersonal interaction and that, generally, the more intimate is the information that is disclosed the greater is the reward value of this particular interpersonal outcome.

While several studies (e.g. Taylor, 1965; Worthy, Gary, & Kahn, 1969) have noted striking differences in the intimacy of information disclosed between one dyad and another, the source of the differences in the intimacy levels has yet to be clarified. In this regard, it may be noted that two of Byrne's colleagues have conducted a study (Aronson & Worchel, 1966) in which it was found that attitude similarity or dissimilarity was not as important in determining interpersonal attraction as was availability to the subjects of the reactions of their partner subjects when they had participated in an interaction process with their partners during the experimental procedure. The findings of this study suggest a possibility that availability of
reaction to disclosure may be related to intimacy of information disclosed, inasmuch as other studies (e.g. Lefkowitz, 1970) seem to indicate that intimacy of disclosed information covaries with interpersonal attraction -- which the Aronson and Worchel (1966) study relates to availability of reaction to disclosure of attitudinal information.

Some additional support for the notion that one of the key factors in the varying intimacy levels developed in the dyadic self-disclosure process may be the return disclosure of reaction to previous disclosures of personal information can be found in the subjective descriptions of what may be termed "intensive group experiences."
The term "feedback" is often very important in descriptions of such groups; this term is used to describe an interaction process in which one participant openly reveals his immediate and continuing reactions to another participant. Rogers (1967) describes the process and result as follows:

It is the public self which members tend to reveal to one another, and only gradually, fearfully, and ambivalently do they take steps to reveal something of their inner world (p. 264). ...Gently at times, almost savagely at others, the group demands that the individual be himself, that his current feelings not be hidden, that he remove the mask of ordinary social intercourse (p. 268). ...One member, trying to sort out his experiences immediately after a workshop, speaks of the "commitment to relationship" which often developed on the part of two individuals ... (p. 271) ... very positive, warm, and loving feelings can develop between members of the encounter group (p. 273).
Rogers' remarks seem to suggest that not only is self-disclosure involved in such groups, and positive relationships developed, but also that one of the major variables involved is the availability of reaction of one member of the group to another member of the group. Similarly, Bradford, Gibb, and Benne (1964) suggest that one of the major responsibilities of group members is to give explicit reactions to other members of the group in order that each participant "learns ... of the reactions he produces in others as he interacts with them" (p. 2).

As it has been previously proposed that greater intimacy of disclosures has greater reward value in a developing interpersonal relationship, it is here also proposed that the availability to individuals of reactions to their disclosures also has reward value as payoffs as described by Homans (1950, 1961) and Thibaut and Kelley (1959).

The idea of availability of reaction of target persons to disclosures as an important variable influencing the development of relationship seems to have occurred to Worthy, et. al. (1969) in that they allowed eye contact for half of their subject groups and prevented it for the other half in "the belief that facial cues offer a discloser information about the other person's reaction to his disclosure (p. 60)." However, no specific instructions were given with regard to providing reaction to disclosure and no effects were found for the experimental manipulation used.
Considering, however, that the subjects in the Worthy, et. al. study were initially strangers, it may well be that many of them deliberately concealed their reactions to other's disclosures (insofar as possible). Goffman (1959) has noted this typical concealment of reaction in normal social contacts (p. 9):

...each participant is expected to suppress his immediate heartfelt feelings, conveying a view of the situation which he feels the others will be able to find at least temporarily acceptable. The maintenance of this surface of agreement, this veneer of consensus, is facilitated by each participant concealing his own wants behind statements which assert values to which everyone present feels obliged to give lip service.

In order to avoid the subjectively felt necessity of "this veneer of consensus" for the present study, explicit verbal reactions either were required for each disclosure or the subjects were specifically instructed not to react at all. Eye contact was prohibited for all subjects in order to provide the maximal difference between the two reaction conditions, i.e., it was assumed that there would be a greater difference between verbal reaction versus no verbal reaction than between eye contact plus verbal reaction versus eye contact alone.
Chapter III

HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis 1: General Statement: Quantity of information exchanged being held constant, the more intimate the personal information disclosed in a dyadic situation, the stronger will be the feelings of positive regard developed by the participants in the disclosure situation, given that the participants are initially strangers.

Rationale: It has been suggested (e.g., Homans, 1961) that the social interaction between strangers meeting for the first time can be characterized in terms of "payoffs" and that self-disclosure can be quantified as such a payoff (Worthy, Gary & Kahn, 1969, p. 59). Jourard and Lasakow (1958) found that more self-disclosure was directed toward persons toward whom the discloser felt greater positive regard; additionally Drag (1968) and Worthy, et. al. (1969) found increased feelings of positive regard after a period of dyadic self-disclosure between strangers. Further, Drag found greater intimacy from beginning to end of the disclosure process and Worthy, et. al., found that average intimacy of disclosure was highly correlated with average intimacy of all disclosures received.
It is here suggested that intimacy of information disclosed between strangers is another quantifiable outcome of the interaction process, and that it is correlated with reward value in the interaction.

**Specific Statement:** For the present study, it was expected that subjects disclosing intimate personal information would yield scores on the dependent measures measuring interpersonal attraction indicating the strongest feelings of positive regard for each other, while subjects disclosing non-personal information would yield scores indicating the least feelings of positive regard. The scores of subjects disclosing personal non-intimate information were expected to fall between those of the other two groups.

**Hypothesis 2:**

**General Statement:** Given self-disclosure between strangers at any level of intimacy, the more available to the discloser is the reaction of the target person to his disclosure, the greater will be the feelings of positive regard developed by the discloser toward the target person.

**Rationale:** It is suggested here that reaction to self-disclosure, as well as self-disclosure itself, functions as an outcome with reward value in an interaction process between strangers. This idea is based on the findings of Aronson and Worchel (1966) that
availability of reaction when subjects have participated in an interaction process is more important in determining interpersonal attraction than is attitude similarity. Further, the statements by Rogers (1967) and by Bradford, Gibb, and Benne (1964), discussed earlier (p. 16), suggest that availability of reaction to self-disclosures is an important variable in determining interpersonal attraction. By the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960), the person who is a target for a disclosure would be expected to provide an interpersonal payoff with similar reward value; such a payoff could well be the target person's reaction to the disclosure. It is, therefore, expected that greater interpersonal attraction will be associated with greater availability to the discloser of the target person's reaction to the disclosures, as greater interpersonal attraction is associated with greater rewards (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959, pp. 33-37).

**Specific Statement:** In the present study, it was expected that subject dyads providing reaction to each other's disclosures would yield scores on the dependent measures measuring interpersonal attraction indicating greater feelings of positive regard toward each other than would subject dyads in which reaction to disclosures was not available.
Chapter IV

**METHOD**

**Design:** The general design of the study was a two-by-three factorial design, with two different conditions for each of three levels of intimacy of information disclosed. The two treatments were designated "information only" (IO) and "information plus reaction" (IR); in the IO condition, subjects were instructed simply to disclose to each other the designated information; in the IR condition, subjects were additionally instructed to give an explicit verbal reaction to each item of information disclosed by their dyad partner.

The three different levels of intimacy of information disclosed were designated "personal intimate" (PI), "personal non-intimate" (PN) and "non-personal" (NP). Information disclosed in the NP category was a list of general informational items supplied to the subjects by the experimenter. Information disclosed in the PN category dealt with personal information rated as relatively non-intimate by peers of the subjects; information in the PI category consisted of areas of personal information rated as relatively intimate by the same group of peers.

The general plan of the study can be seen in the following table (Table 1).
Table 1
Design of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of Reaction</th>
<th>Information Only</th>
<th>Information + Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy of Information</td>
<td>Personal Intimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosed</td>
<td>Non-Personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjects: Subjects for the study were female undergraduate students enrolled in introductory psychology courses at the University of British Columbia. Females only were used as subjects due to indications in previous studies (e.g., Jourard & Lasakow, 1958) that females disclose more material more readily than do comparable males. Dyad partners were assigned without any matching criteria except for the following:

1. Dyad partners must have been available for the study at the same hour of the day.

2. Dyad partners could not have been previously acquainted.

Due to the unmonitored dyadic situation, the varying intimacy levels of information to be disclosed, and the complications of sex relationships in our culture, interaction of the experimental conditions with sex of the subjects could reasonably have been expected. An ideal design would have included male-male, female-female, and male-female dyads, but such an extensive design would have been beyond the feasibility limits of the present study. Hence, the female-female pairing was selected for the present study, on the basis of such studies as that of Jourard and Lasakow. Limited generalizability was accepted as a reasonable consequence and the interactions with the sex pairing of the subjects was left for future studies.
(3) No more than three (3) years difference in the ages of the dyad partners was allowed.

All subjects were contacted by telephone and assigned a participation time suiting their class schedule; the first contacted stranger subject available at the same time was assigned as a dyad partner.

Subject dyads were assigned in non-selected sequence to the PI-IO, PI-IR, PN-IO, and PN-IR cells until all four cells were filled. Due to the possibility of limited numbers of subjects, the NP-IO and NP-IR cells were filled, in that alternating sequence, after the PI-IO, PI-IR, PN-IO and PN-ir cells were filled, since these four cells were most crucial to the design. However, the whole design was completed within one month's time, suggesting reasonable comparability on that basis. Ten dyads were assigned to each cell, a total of 120 subjects for the whole design.

For all subjects, the age range was from 17 to 24 years with a mean age of 18.7.

Materials: The items of personal information disclosed by the dyad partners (categories PN and PI) were drawn from the Personal Information Inventory (PII), an instrument adapted by the present author from the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire of Jourard and Lasakow (1958). The PII consists of six items in each of seven areas of personal information and is designed primarily for use with college student populations (see Appendix 1). The items were rated for degree of intimacy by peers of the subjects, i.e., 65 female undergraduate students at Simon Fraser University enrolled in introductory psychology and
English courses. The items were arranged randomly and presented to
the peer group for rating on a five-point scale from 1 (non-intimate)
to 5 (very intimate). "Intimacy" was operationally defined for the
raters by linking each rating point (1-5) in the instructions with a
stated friendship level. (See Appendix 2, p. 58). Items with a mean
rating of 2.5 or less were designated as non-intimate items, while
items with a mean rating of 3.5 or more were designated as intimate
items. Four items from each so designated group of items were selected
by the present author for disclosure by the subjects in the experimental
situation. An additional two items were selected from the non-
intimate group of items and were used as introductory items, i.e.,
disclosure of these items preceded both the non-intimate and intimate
set of items in the experimental procedure. The introductory items
were those with the lowest mean intimacy ratings.

The two introductory items were:

(1.) My likes and dislikes in music; my favorite songs and
musical performers. (mean rating: 1.29)

(2.) My favorite TV shows, and those I don't like.
(mean rating: 1.31)

The range of item mean ratings for intimacy was from a low of 1.29 to
a high of 4.53. The items used as non-intimate experimental items
and their ratings were:

(1.) My favorite foods, the way I like food prepared, and my
food dislikes. (mean rating: 1.42)

(2.) The kind of movie I like to see, and the sort of movie I
avoid seeing. (mean rating: 1.45)
(3.) My personal views on human nature; whether I generally like or dislike people, whether I think people are essentially good or bad, or neither. (mean rating: 1.90)

(4.) My feelings about illegal drug use (other than alcohol); whether or not I have ever used or ever would use drugs illegally (marijuana, methedrine, etc.) (mean rating: 1.94)

The items used as intimate items in the experimental situation, and their intimacy ratings were:

(1.) What it takes to hurt my feelings deeply, or what it takes to make me really depressed or blue. (mean rating: 3.74)

(2.) Whether I do now engage, ever have or ever would consider engaging in premarital or extramarital sexual intercourse; if so, with whom and my present feelings about the person or persons. (mean rating: 4.20)

(3.) My feelings about my adequacy in sexual behavior - whether or not I feel able to perform adequately in sexual relationships. (mean rating: 4.53)

(4.) That which I would least like my parents to know about me. (mean rating: 4.22)

It should be noted that the order of intimacy of the items, both for the personal intimate and personal non-intimate sets of items, was arranged in ascending steps. This procedure was altered for the last two of the items in the personal intimate set in order that the two sexual-content items, which are obviously related to each other, might be contiguous. This arrangement was also suggested by the subjective impressions of pilot study subjects. A small number of pilot study subjects (six) all disclosed their previous sexual behavior when discussing their feelings in regard to their own sexual adequacy. Each of them felt that the sexual behavior item was superfluous once they had discussed the sexual adequacy item.
Material for the NP category consisted of two parallel series of six statements each. The statements were selected by the present author as subjectively interesting and informative, but impersonal, statements about a variety of topics. As it was expected that actual disclosures of personal information in the other two categories would differ somewhat for each of the two dyad partners, even when responding the same item, the two parallel series of statements were devised, each statement in one series being matched for content with a statement in the second series. Each of the dyad partners was given one of the series to read to her partner. (See Appendix 3).

Procedure: Instructions to the subjects were in three phases; an initial introduction to the study and request for confidentiality, specific instructions according to the particular condition and category of information to be discussed, and instructions regarding the dependent measures. All subjects were paid $2.00 for their participation, and it was determined immediately upon their arrival whether or not they had been previously acquainted (only one dyad had, and they were re-scheduled with different partners). Following the ascertaining of no previous acquaintance, the following instructions were read to the PN and PI subjects.

Please sit down, one of you on each side of the table, and I'll read the instructions to you.

This is a study about how people come to know about each other. I'll ask each of you to talk about yourself to some extent and also to listen to your partner talk. After you have talked to each other, I'll ask for some information about your reactions to each other.
Since you will be exchanging information about yourselves, I'll also ask that you agree that any personal information exchanged, and the details of the study, be kept confidential. I'll be tape recording what you say, but the recording will be kept both confidential and anonymous. Your partner and the tape recorder, by the way, will be your only audience; once you begin, I'll leave the room and I won't be able to hear what you're saying.

These sheets (handing them out) have on them a list of items of personal information; this is the material you will be working with. I want each of you to tell the other the information about yourself listed on that sheet.

Now, you are not required to participate in this study, and you may refuse to do so if you wish; you'll be paid the $2.00 in either case. If you are willing to continue, and to maintain confidentiality, please say so now. (Pause for agreement)

All right, you'll have a total of 30 minutes for both of you to go through all six items, so, ideally, each of you would spend 2½ minutes on each item. Please try to spend about that amount on each item, though some will take less and others slightly more time. I'll knock on the door once every five minutes to let you know about the time remaining.

So that the recording can be anonymous, please call each other "A" and "B" -- and would you (pointing to one subject) be "A" please, and you "B" (pointing to the other subject). "A" you will start. I suggest you go through the list item-by-item, each of you talking about the same numbered item in turn. Say your letter and the number of the item you are talking about when you begin each item.

Two things are quite important for you to remember; first, it is very important that you both talk about all six items, and, second, please just listen while your partner is talking without giving any reaction that she can hear or see.* I'll ask you later about your total reactions to each other.
Do you have any questions? (Pause--with questions answered ad lib.) All right, I'll turn on the tape recorder now and leave.

At the point of the asterisk in the above instructions, the following instructions were added for the PN and PI subjects under the IR condition only:

When your partner finishes talking about each item, I want you to tell her your reaction to what she has just said, but very briefly. Your reaction can be positive, something like, "I like what you said," or "I approve." Or your reaction can be neutral, something like, "I have no particular reaction to what you said," or, "I can't decide what my reaction is." Or your reaction can be negative, which would be something like, "I disapprove," or, "I don't like what you said." Please don't be any more detailed or lengthy than that in giving your reactions. If you want, you might use the words, "My reaction is ..." and then whatever it is, positive, negative, or neutral.

The subjects in the NP category received similar, but slightly different instructions, as follows:

Please sit down, one of you on each side of the table, and I'll read the instructions to you.

This is a study in how people come to know about each other. I'll ask each of you to talk about some things and also listen to your partner talk. After you have talked to each other, I'll ask you for some information about your reactions to each other.

I'll also ask that you agree to keep the details of the study confidential. I'll be tape recording what you say, but the recording will be kept both confidential and anonymous. Your partner and the tape recorder, by the way, will be your only audience; once you begin, I'll leave the room and I won't be able to hear what you're saying.
Now, you are not required to participate in this study, and you may refuse to do so if you wish; you'll be paid the $2.00 in either case. If you are willing to continue, and to maintain confidentiality, please say so now. (Pause for agreement).2

All right. The purpose of this part of the study is to find out what impressions people gain of each other during a neutral interaction. I want each of you to read to the other the items listed on these sheets (handing out the sheets). I suggest you go through the list one at a time, each of you reading the same-numbered item in turn. One of you has items with the letter "a" after each number, and you will begin. The other of you has "b" statements. Say the number and letter of each statement before you read it.

Now, it is quite important that you do not react either to what you are reading or what your partner is reading in any way that your partner can see or hear. Please just read the statements on your list or just listen to what your partner is reading.* When you finish, I'll ask you about your reactions to each other.

Do you have any questions? (Pause--with any questions answered ad lib). All right; I'll turn on the tape recorder and leave. Knock on the door when you are finished.

At the asterisk in the above instructions, the following additional instructions were added for the NP category subjects under the IR condition:

2. No subjects refused to participate, and only one of the 120 subjects stated on the dependent measures that her experience was "unenjoyable, harmful, or frightening" to her. Several subjects wished to refuse the $2.00 paid for their participation, but were convinced that their accepting payment was a necessary part of the experimental design.
When your partner finishes reading each statement, I want you to tell her your reaction to what she has just read, but very briefly. Your reaction can be positive, something like, "I like what you read," or, "I approve." Or your reaction can be neutral, like, "I have no particular reaction to what you read," or, "I can't decide what my reaction is." Or your reaction can be negative, something like, "I disapprove," or, "I don't like what you read." Please don't be any more detailed or lengthy than that in giving your reactions. If you want, you might use the words, "My reaction is ..." and then whatever it is, positive, negative, or neutral.

Following the experimental interaction, all subjects were asked to complete the dependent measures, with specific instructions printed on each of the measures. Additionally, each subject in the PN and PI categories was asked to give her own personal rating of the intimacy level of each of the items disclosed, using the same rating scale as that used by the peer group in the initial selection of items to be disclosed.

**Measures:** The primary measure of relationship for the study was a series of 28 statements concerning the dyad partner to which each subject was instructed to indicate degrees of agreement or disagreement. This instrument was adapted by the present author from the "Level of Regard", "Unconditionality of Regard" and "Congruence" scales of the Relationship Inventory developed by Barrett-Lennard (1962) (See Appendix 3).
"Level of Regard" is explained by Barrett-Lennard as follows (p. 4):

Regard refers here to the affective aspect of one person's response to another. This may include various qualities and strengths of 'positive' and 'negative' feeling. Positive feelings include respect, liking, appreciation, affection, and any other affectively adient response. ... Level of regard is the general tendency (at a given time) of the various affective reactions in relation to another. More specifically, it may be considered the composite 'loading' of all the distinguishable feeling reactions of one person toward another, positive and negative, on a single abstract dimension.

"Unconditionality of Regard" is explained as "the degree of constancy of regard felt by one person for another who communicates self-experience to the first" (p. 5).

"Congruence" is explained as:

The degree to which one person is functionally integrated in the context of his relationship with another, such that there is absence of conflict or inconsistency between his total experience, his awareness, and his overt communication, is his congruence in this relationship. ... In other words, the highly congruent individual is completely honest, direct, and sincere in what he conveys, but he does not feel any compulsion to communicate his perceptions, or any need to withhold them for emotionally self-protective reasons. (pp. 5, 6)

Since the instrument used in the present study made use of some, but not all, items from each of the above scales, it is probable that the specificity described by Barrett-Lennard is simply not obtainable in this case. However, it seems highly likely that some of the construct content is retained, at least enough to warrant describing the instrument as a measure of interpersonal relationship - probably measuring interpersonal attraction.
A second measure of relationship was a series of ten questions devised by the present author offering a number of hypothetical behavior and reaction choices to the subjects. Generally, the choices deal with the possibility of further interaction with the dyad partner; choices indicating a desire for further interaction are scored numerically higher than those indicating little desire for further interaction (see Appendix 4).

Further, all subjects in the PN and PI dyads were asked to indicate the quality of their disclosures on yet another instrument developed by the present author from the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire of Jourard and Lasakow (1958) (See Appendix 4).

**Apparatus:** The study was conducted in a mobile research trailer, which appeared essentially the same as a house trailer of similar size, but without windows. The inside dimensions of the experimental room were eight feet by twelve feet. At the entrance to this room and the room into which the subjects initially entered, was a small ante-room with dimensions eight feet by four feet. Connecting the two rooms was a door upon which the experimenter knocked as indicated in the instructions to the subjects. Also connecting the two rooms was a large window which was covered with completely opaque material throughout the study.

Within the experimental room, the subjects were seated on either side of a table measuring three feet by five feet. Down the center of the table was placed a 24 inch high plywood barrier, barring the subjects' sight of each other. This sight barrier was placed to
insure that non-verbal cues could not be used under the IO condition.

Behind the table at which the subjects were seated, and barred from their sight by plywood barriers, was an identical table upon which the tape recorder was placed (Ampex, Model 1100). Each subject was provided with an ashtray and, of course, a microphone leading to one track of the stereophonic tape recorder.

The overall placement of the apparatus was approximately in the center of the experimental room, which placed the subjects somewhat toward the anteroom.

In the anteroom, with the connecting door closed, it was possible to hear the voices of most subjects, but the words could not be distinguished.
Chapter V

RESULTS

Two separate measures of interpersonal attraction toward the dyad partner were obtained; one of the measures, devised by the present author, was a series of ten hypothetical questions concerning possible future contact with the dyad partner. The other measure of interpersonal attraction was derived from the Relationship Inventory of Barrett-Lennard (1962). The ten hypothetical questions were scored on a three point scale indicating no desire for any future contact (scored 0), undecided (scored 1), or some desire for future contact with the dyad partner (scored 2). The measure of interpersonal attraction derived from the Relationship Inventory was a series of twenty-eight statements indicating affective and interactional reactions to the dyad partner. The subjects indicated degrees of agreement (scored +1 to +3) and disagreement (scored -1 to -3) with each statement.

Scoring and Treatment of the Data: The ten hypothetical questions were scored as indicated above and in Appendix 4, with a single score for each subject derived by summation over all ten questions. The means and standard deviations for each level of intimacy of information disclosed and availability of reaction are presented in Table 2.
Table 2
Hypothetical Questions
*Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of Reaction</th>
<th>Information Only</th>
<th>Information + Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy of Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Intimate</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Non-Intimate</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Intimate</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The possible range of scores was from 0 to 19, with higher scores indicating greater desire for future contact with the dyad partner.

Analysis of variance (Edwards, 1968) did not reveal any significant differences between the various experimental groups for the scores on the hypothetical questions (see Appendix 5).

The series of twenty-eight statements concerning affective and interactional reactions toward the dyad partner was treated as a single score for each subject, derived by summation of the ratings of all twenty-eight statements with appropriate reversals of algebraic values depending on the directionality of the particular item (items phrased positively were alternated with items phrased negatively in an AB pattern). The means, standard deviations, and ranges for each level of intimacy of disclosure and availability are presented in Table 3.
Table 3
Relationship Inventory Measure
Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of Reaction</th>
<th>Information Only</th>
<th>Information + Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Intimate</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>23.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Non-Intimate</td>
<td>29.95</td>
<td>24.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personal</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>20.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The possible range of scores was from -84 to +84, with higher positive scores indicating greater interpersonal attraction toward the dyad partner; higher negative scores would indicate greater dislike for the dyad partner.

Analysis of variance on these data revealed significant effects for both the level of intimacy of the information disclosed and the availability of reaction to the disclosures. There was no effect for order of disclosure (i.e., which of the two dyad partners began disclosing first), and no significant interactions were revealed by the analysis. The source table for this analysis is presented in Table 4.
Table 4
Source Table for Analysis of Variance for Relationship Inventory Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56083.467</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy Level (L)</td>
<td>4666.117</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2333.058</td>
<td>*5.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction Availability (R)</td>
<td>5044.033</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5044.033</td>
<td>*12.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of Disclosure (O)</td>
<td>30.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.000</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L \times R)</td>
<td>654.617</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>327.308</td>
<td>0.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L \times O)</td>
<td>420.350</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>210.175</td>
<td>0.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R \times O)</td>
<td>9.634</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.634</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L \times R \times O)</td>
<td>858.316</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>429.158</td>
<td>1.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>44400.516</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>411.116</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .01 \)

As a means of determining specific effects of the level of intimacy of information disclosed, orthogonal comparisons (Edwards, 1968) of the data resulting from the varying levels of intimacy of information disclosed were computed. These results are present in Table 5. The orthogonal comparisons reveal differences at the .01 level of significance between the personal intimate disclosures versus the combined scores for personal non-intimate and non-personal disclosures.
Differences between the personal non-intimate disclosures and non-personal disclosures, however, resulted in a significance level of only .10.

Table 5
Orthogonal Comparisons of Relationship Inventory Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intimacy of Information Disclosed</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>PN</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficients</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01  a: Error term of 411.116 (from table 4) used to calculate F values; df = 1 and 108.

As there were only two availability of reaction groups, no additional statistical manipulations were performed to compare these means for specific effects. Simple inspection reveals that the higher mean scores were obtained from the subjects for whom reactions of the dyad partner were most available.

A questionnaire on which the subjects were asked to indicate the completeness, or lack thereof, of each of their disclosures was administered after the subjects had completed the two measures already discussed. The quality of disclosure questionnaire was scored as a five point rating scale, with the highest score (4) representing the most complete disclosure the subjects could manage in the time allowed. The means and standard deviations for this measure are
presented in Table 6 for the personal intimate and personal non-intimate groups under both conditions of availability of reaction from the dyad partner. The questionnaire was not, of course, administered to the subjects in the dyads revealing standarized non-personal information since the experimental conditions allowed no variation in the quality of disclosure.

Table 6

Quality of Disclosure Questionnaire

*Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of Reaction</th>
<th>Information Only</th>
<th>Information + Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy of Information Disclosed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Intimate</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Non-Intimate</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The possible range of scores was from 0 to 24, with higher scores representing more complete disclosure of information.

Analysis of variance of these data revealed no significant differences or interactions between or among the various experimental groups.

After completing the other measures, all subjects except those disclosing standardized non-personal information were asked to rate
the intimacy of the items of information they had disclosed. The averaged ratings of intimacy of disclosure items are presented in Table 7, along with the previous peer ratings of the same items. Mean ratings are presented for the personal intimate and personal non-intimate groups as a whole, as well as the mean ratings for each of the availability of reaction groups in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disclosure Groups</th>
<th>PI,IO</th>
<th>PI,IR</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>PN</th>
<th>PN,IO</th>
<th>PN,IR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>*1.29</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>*1.31</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Introductory Items, common to all disclosures groups. The possible range of ratings was from 1 to 5, with higher scores indicating greater intimacy. PI = "personal intimate"; PN = "personal non-intimate"; IO = "information only"; IR = "information + reaction".
Chapter VI
Discussion of Results

As was stated in Chapter V (p. 34), the ten hypothetical questions concerning future contact with the dyad partner did not show any significant differences between groups either for intimacy of information disclosed or for availability of the reactions of the dyad partner to information disclosures. This is a somewhat puzzling finding inasmuch as the measure derived from the Relationship Inventory did reveal such differences (see below). Perhaps one explanation that might be considered is that the content of the hypothetical questions was different from the content of the Relationship Inventory measure. The hypothetical questions were primarily concerned with additional or continuing interaction with the dyad partner, while the other measure asked primarily for the quality of affective reactions to the dyad partner. It may also be possible that, while self-disclosure and reaction to self-disclosure may affect interpersonal attraction, there is no concomitant effect on statements of behavioral intentions regarding future interactions with the person one has effected disclosure with and heard disclosure from. While such an explanation may be plausible, it seems somewhat unlikely; interpersonal attraction, for reward value alone, probably does influence interpersonal interactions, though possibly not statements of plans for interaction.

Another possibility is that the ten hypothetical questions,
devised by the author and used for the first time in the present study, were not a good measure of interpersonal attraction. All scores, for all subjects, were positive. The maximum score was 19, of which several were obtained, and the minimum obtained score was 9, of which only one occurred. The means, as shown in Table 2 (p. 35), are all rather high and the standard deviations are relatively small. It may well be that this measure simply did not discriminate very well between highly interpersonally attracted dyads and those less attracted.

The twenty-eight statement measure adapted from Barrett-Lennard's Relationship Inventory was probably a better measure of the interpersonal attraction within the dyads. The items for this measure were well researched by Barrett-Lennard and were selected for discriminatory power. Also, there was allowed greater range in the strength of rated agreement or disagreement. The obtained range of scores on this measure was quite wide, including some negative scores (-33 to +74 from a possible -84 to +84). At a different level, subjective comments of some of the subjects, occasionally written in margins or verbalized to the author, were generally in accord with the obtained scores for those subjects. Split-half reliability coefficients (Bruning & Kintz, 1968) were obtained for this measure for each experimental group and are presented in Table 8. As can be seen, the coefficients are generally fairly high, around .70, with the lowest being .41. This low correlation, additionally, was for the group in which the subjects read standardized statements to each other and were instructed not to react to the statements either they
or their partners read; it seems likely that what was measured for this particular group was a somewhat diffuse stereotype rather than reactions toward a specific other person.

Table 8
Split-Half Reliability Coefficients for Relationship Inventory Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of Reaction</th>
<th>Information Only</th>
<th>Information + Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy of Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Intimate</td>
<td>.6929</td>
<td>.7231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Non-Intimate</td>
<td>.7592</td>
<td>.6791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personal</td>
<td>.4113</td>
<td>.6853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On this measure, analysis of variance revealed differences between groups on both hypothesized factors.

The effect of experimental instructions allowing reactions to disclosures is apparent from the analysis of variance -- there is greater interpersonal positive affect if reactions are allowed. However, the effect of varying the intimacy level of the information disclosed is not quite so clear. The orthogonal comparisons do reveal statistically significant differences between the effects of disclosure of personal intimate information versus disclosure of personal non-intimate information and the reading of non-personal
standarized information, but the differences between the effects of disclosure of personal non-intimate information and the reading of non-personal standarized information may have been obtained by chance. (The probability that the obtained differences were not due to chance is only .90 rather the usually accepted .95). Given, however, the limited number of subjects (20) in each cell of the design and the reaching of the .10 level of significance for the difference between the personal non-intimate and non-personal subject groups, it seems quite possible that replication of the task with larger groups of subjects might well reveal differences between the groups at the more conventionally accepted .05 level of significance. It should also be noted that the magnitude of the mean scores on the Relationship Inventory measure for each group is in the hypothesized order (see Table 3, p. 36).

All experimental subjects were asked to rate the intimacy of the items of information they disclosed after they had completed their disclosures, and the mean ratings are shown in Table 7 (p.40). While the ratings of the experimental subjects are, thus, not comparable to the ratings of their peers, on the basis of which the items were selected for disclosure, inspection of Table 7 clearly indicates that the experimental subjects did perceive a difference between those disclosure items selected as being intimate versus those selected as being non-intimate. While Table 7 also indicates that the experimental subjects rated the intimate items of disclosure as
less intimate than did their peers, and also rated the non-intimate items as more intimate than did their peers, it could well be that their ratings of intimacy were heavily influenced by their already having disclosed the information called for by the items. Perhaps, however, their ratings of intimacy reflected the subjective quality of their disclosures in the experimental situation more than the previously rated intimacy value of the disclosure items in a non-experimental situation. If that effect did obtain, it could be considered that the intimate/non-intimate difference was not as great as had been planned. The notion is, however, not supported by the scores on the quality of disclosure questionnaire administered immediately after the Relationship Inventory measure. The quality of disclosure questionnaire, analysed for all six items disclosed and for the four experimental items only (i.e., excluding the two introductory items common to all personal disclosure groups), showed no differences between either the personal intimate versus personal non-intimate disclosure subjects or between the subjects in the two availability of reaction groups. The highest possible score on the quality of disclosure questionnaire, considering all six items, was 24 and the mean scores for all personal disclosure groups were near or above 17. This would seem to suggest that all personal disclosure subjects revealed in a relatively complete fashion the information called for by the disclosure items.

The use of the tape recorder during the experimental sessions was intended primarily as a strategy for coercing the subjects into
following the experimental instructions as given rather than having a girl-to-girl chat with the disclosure material serving as a convenient starting point. In fact, the tape recorder was defective and operated (or did not operate) rather erratically; this was not, however, known to the subjects (or, initially, to the experimenter!). Due to the unpredictable performance of the tape recorder, complete tapes of all experimental sessions were not available. However, at least four complete tapes were available for each experimental group, and the first four complete tapes for each group were systematically monitored by the author. Each monitored tape was scored for whether or not the called for information was actually disclosed and whether or not any additional information was disclosed as well. If additional information was disclosed, it was rated as to whether or not it was of greater intimacy value than that of the information called for. Further, each monitored tape was scored for reactions given and the quality of any reactions (positive, neutral, or negative).

Of the four tapes monitored from each group, only the dyads giving non-personal information and the dyads disclosing personal intimate information without reaction followed the disclosure instructions exactly. One subject in the personal intimate/information plus reaction group disclosed personal birth control information, which was scored as less intimate than the information called for in any case. In the personal non-intimate dyads, two subjects in the information only category and three subjects in the information plus reaction category introduced additional information; in four cases the additional information was
related to drug use and the other subject related a history of obesity. All of this additional information was scored as more intimate than the information called for.

All subjects monitored followed the reaction instructions, though all but one used such terms as "I agree," or "I like that too," rather than the verbalizations suggested. One subject, in the personal non-intimate/information plus reaction group gave five specifically negative reactions and one neutral reaction; her partner gave only two negative reactions and one neutral reaction. Other than the exceptions mentioned, all reactions given were scored as positive. No dyads instructed to not react gave specific reactions. In addition to the specific reactions given, all personal disclosure dyads in both availability of reaction categories gave occasional verbal encouragement sounds such as "Hmmm", "uh-huh," and "yeah"; these were not scored as reactions but were noticeably not present in the dyads giving non-personal information.

Due to an experimental design oversight on the part of the author, the experimental tapes were truly anonymous and it was not possible to connect a specific tape to a specific dyad's scores. However, the tapes available do provide some slight, and quite equivocal, evidence that the personal non-intimate dyads may have gone somewhat beyond the experimental instructions and introduced information closer to that called for in the personal intimate dyads.
Chapter VII
Discussion and Conclusions

Of the two measures of interpersonal attraction used, the data from one of them indicates no effects from the experimental manipulations of the self-disclosure interactions. The other measure yielded data which were predicted quite well by the two experimental hypotheses (pp. 18-20). The content of the measure showing no effects was primarily hypothetical future or continuing interactions with the dyad partner, while the Relationship Inventory measure was aimed primarily at current affective reactions to and evaluations of the dyad partner. Of the two measures, the content of the Relationship Inventory measure would seem to be more appropriate to the content of the experimental hypotheses. Other possible reasons for preferring the Relationship Inventory measure have already been discussed in Chapter VI (p. 41). In any case, it seems reasonable to confine the present discussion to the content of the Relationship Inventory measure and to suggest that behavioral interactions of the sort with which the ten hypothetical questions were concerned may have been quite unaffected by the various experimental manipulations.

One of the more obvious limitations of the present study is its severely limited generalizability; all subjects were young female undergraduate students enrolled in a single Canadian University. Additionally, the subjects interacted only with females. While University students are very probably not representative of the
general population, the present study is even further limited in the firm conclusions that can be drawn from it in that only one sex of university students were used as subjects and they interacted with only one sex. An ideal design would have included both sexes interacting with both sexes. However, due to the varying intimacy levels of the information disclosed and the complicated patterns of sexual interaction in our culture, such an ideal design would have been beyond the feasibility limits of the present study. It is hoped that future studies can include more of the requirements for generalization to larger populations.

Another limitation of the present study is the specific self-disclosure interaction. All interactions were mutual, with both partners disclosing the same or similar information and either both partners reacting to each disclosure of their partner or neither of them reacting at all. It is possible that quite different results may have been obtained if only one dyad partner had been disclosing, or only one partner reacting to disclosures. The interaction used does, however, seem to be the sort of interaction that probably most often occurs in natural interactions between young females.

Perhaps, the most striking finding of this study is the strong differences in the affective reactions established between young female strangers when they are or, alternatively, are not instructed to provide specific verbal reactions to each other's self-disclosures in a dyadic situation. The giving of personal reactions, even to the
reading of completely impersonal quotations, apparently resulted in markedly more positive feelings towards each other on the part of the dyad partners than the feelings generated in the dyads for which no such reactions were available. This finding seems to lend strong support to the idea that the target person's reactions to self-disclosures enhances the development of feelings of positive regard for the target person. It should, however, be noted that the reactions actually given were generally positive or favorable (see p. 47).

It may well be, and should probably be investigated in future studies, that positive reactions lead to positive feelings and negative feelings result from negative reactions to disclosures. In this respect, there was considerable variation in the scores of the Relationship Inventory measure, with some subjects indicating negative feelings toward the dyad partner. All of the negative scores, however, occurred in the dyads for which reactions were not available. Such data suggest that the quality of reactions to disclosures may not be as important to the quality of the affective reactions developed as is the simple availability of reactions to self-disclosure whatever the quality of such reactions may be. Since, however, most of the reactions actually given were apparently positive or favorable, the data available from the present study are not definitive.

While the importance of the target person's reactions to self-disclosures in a dyadic situation is fairly clear from the data obtained, the importance of the relative intimacy of the information
disclosed to the development of positive interpersonal affect is not quite so clear. Though the data are as predicted by the first experimental hypothesis (p. 19), the specific effects analyses of the data seem to indicate that the major differences in the interpersonal affect developed may lie in the differences between delivering standardized and impersonal information versus disclosing personal information of any quality. However, "intimacy" was defined in the present study as the relative ease or difficulty of disclosure to strangers versus friends. Surely, it is easier to deliver impersonal information to strangers than to disclose any sort of personal information. Thus, it may be reasonably argued that intimacy, as defined here, has an important influence on interpersonal affective reactions developed in a dyadic self-disclosure situation.

Given the results of the present study, it would seem to be of some importance to find out whether or not the affective reactions developed have behavioral concommitants. This is not indicated by the subjects' reactions to the ten hypothetical questions concerning future interactions with the dyad partner, but it should be remembered that the scores on the hypothetical questions generally indicated a willingness or desire for further interaction no matter what the scores on the Relationship Inventory measure. It seems likely that the subjects would be more prone to engage in or avoid some forms of interactions according to the quality of affective reactions to each other, but the nature of such discriminating interactions is presently unknown. In any case, the nature of such interactions may well vary
according to age, sex, or other variables which were not investigated in the present study.

Even though the present study is of limited generalizability, it would appear to suggest that, within the population of which the subjects were representative, people tend generally to like each other better the more they know about each other. Just possibly, the same effect would hold for other populations. Such an intriguing possibility seems well worth further research.
Chapter VIII

REFERENCES


Byrne, D., Clore, G. L. Jr., & Griffitt, W. Response discrepancy versus attitude similarity-dissimilarity as determinants of attraction. Psychonomic Science, 1967, 7, 397-398.


Chapter IX
Appendices
Appendix 1

PERSONAL INFORMATION INVENTORY

I. Tastes and Interests
1. My favorite foods, the way I like food prepared, and my food dislikes.
2. My likes and dislikes in music; my favorite songs and musical performers.
3. The kinds of movies I like to see, and the sort of movie I avoid seeing.
4. My favorite TV shows, and those I don't like.
5. The kinds of clothes I feel most comfortable wearing.
6. The kind of party or social gathering that I like best, and the sort that would bore me, or that I wouldn't enjoy.

II. Morals and Values
1. What I think and feel about religion; my personal religious views, and my attitudes toward religious groups other than my own, e.g., Catholics, Jews, Protestants, atheists, etc.
2. My feelings about illegal drug use (other than alcohol); whether or not I have ever used or ever would use drugs illegally (marijuana, methedrine, etc.)
3. The things I regard as desirable for a man to be, and that which I regard as desirable for a woman to be -- what I look for in a man, and in a woman.
4. My personal views on sexual morality -- how I feel that I and others ought to act in sexual matters.
5. My personal views on human nature; whether I generally like or dislike people, whether I think people are essentially good or bad, or neither.
6. My views on the present government--the Prime Minister (or Premier), government policies, etc., and the political party I am most in sympathy with.

III. Body and Physical Appearance

1. My present physical measurements; height, weight, waist, etc.

2. Problems and/or worries I have had with my physical appearance in the past.

3. Whether or not I now have any health problems, e.g., trouble with sleep or digestion, female complaints, allergies, headaches, piles, etc.

4. Those things about my physical appearance that I like and think others like.

5. Those things about my physical appearance that I dislike and think others dislike

6. How I wish I looked and my feelings about how I do look; my ideals for overall appearance and how closely I think I match them.

IV. Guilt

1. That which I feel most ashamed of in my past.

2. The most embarrassing situation I have ever been in.

3. My worst failure or unkept commitment.

4. That which I would least like my friends to know about me.

5. The most serious lie I have ever told.

6. That which I would least like my parents to know about me.

V. Academic Life and Career

1. How I really feel about other people in my classes.

2. How I feel about the choice of classes or major I have made -- how satisfied I am, other choices I seriously considered.

3. My ambitions and goals for my education.
4. What I feel are my special strong points and qualifications for my particular classes or major.

5. What I feel are my shortcomings and handicaps that prevent me from working as I'd like to, or that prevent me from getting ahead as I'd like to.

6. What I find to be the worst pressures and strains of academic life.

VI. Sex

1. Whether I do now or have ever practiced masturbation; if so, how often and how I feel about doing so.

2. Those of my features or characteristics which I feel are most attractive to the opposite sex.

3. Those of my features or characteristics which I feel are least attractive to the opposite sex.

4. Whether I do now engage, ever have or ever would consider engaging in premarital or extramarital sexual intercourse; if so, with whom and my present feelings about the person or persons.

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

6. Whether I do now engage, ever have or ever would consider engaging in homosexual activities; if so, with whom and my present feelings about the person or persons.

VII. Personality and Feelings

1. The kinds of things that make me really angry.

2. The subject of my most frequent daydreams and the kind of daydreams I have about that subject.

3. Those aspects of my personality that I am pleased with -- that I am glad to have as part of my personality.

4. What it takes to hurt my feelings deeply, or what it takes to make me really depressed or blue.

5. Those aspects of my personality that I dislike or worry about -- that I regard as a handicap to me.

6. The sort of things that make me really worried, anxious and afraid.
Appendix 2

Intimacy Rating Scale Instructions

For experimental purposes, please rate each of the items below according to the degree to which you, personally, feel the item is or is not intimate. Using the scale below, choose one of the five statements and write the number of the statement, in the space provided, by the item you are rating.

Also please indicate your sex and age. Your co-operation is appreciated.

Age: ___________  Sex: ___________

5.: Very intimate - I would give this information to very few people.

4.: Intimate - I would give this information only to my close friends.

3.: Personal - I wouldn't give this information to just anybody, but I wouldn't mind telling any of my friends.

2.: Not intimate - I would give this information to most people if they were interested.

1.: Not at all intimate - I wouldn't mind telling this information to anybody.
Appendix 3

Non-Personal Disclosure Items

1a. We are said to be a society dedicated, among other things, to the pursuit of truth. Yet, disclosure of the truth, the truth of one's being, is often penalized. Impossible concepts of how man ought to be ... make man so ashamed of his true being that he feels obliged to seem different, if for no other reason than to protect his job. S. Jourard

1b. Probably the "tyranny of the should" is a factor which keeps man from making himself known as he is. Yet, when a man does not acknowledge to himself, who, what and how he is, he is out of touch with reality and he will sicken and die; and no one can help him without access to the facts. S. Jourard

2a. The widely held fears that pot and LSD would create a mass-withdrawal from society and reality have proven groundless. The vast majority of psychedelic users haven't dropped out and gone to live among the trees and most of those who actually did have come back. Those who fear change would better spend their time trying to stamp out television and education and travel ... J. L. Simmons

2b. Marijuana isn't a poison and it isn't a magic elixir. It's an intoxicant. As an intoxicant, pot seems preferable from a medical and social standpoint; no hangovers, little or no physical damage even with excessive use, far less befuddling of perceptions and actions. But it is an intoxicant. J. L. Simmons

3a. We have an excellent vocabulary for technical subjects ...; almost every man can name the parts of an automobile engine clearly and definitely. But when it comes to meaningful interpersonal relations, our language is lost; we stumble, and are practically as isolated as deaf and dumb people who can only communicate in sign language. R. May

3b. I believe it could be shown in researches ... that when a culture is in its historical phase of growing toward unity, its language reflects the unity and power whereas when a culture is in the process of change, dispersal and disintegration, the language likewise loses its power. R. May
4a. Man's being can be seen from different points of view and one or other aspect can be made the focus of study. In particular, man can be seen as person or thing. Now, even the same thing, seen from different points of view, gives rise to two entirely different descriptions, and the descriptions give rise to two entirely different theories, and the theories result in two entirely different sets of action. R. D. Laing

4b. Now, if you are sitting opposite me, I can see you as another person like myself; without you changing or doing anything differently, I can see you now as a complex physical-chemical system, perhaps with its own idiosyncrasies, but chemical none the less for that; seen in this way, you are no longer a person but an organism. R. D. Laing

5a. Every society is conservative. Change in the social order is resisted, often with brute force by those with the most privilege and freedom. ... The entire institutional structure of society is devoted to training people to conform to those ways that will keep the economic and political system in its present form. S. Jourard

5b. The family begins a socialization process, shaping children to the habits, values, and beliefs that will make the child "fit". The school system, far from educating, is actually an additional training institution, directing people in the ways in which they must go, else they will not reach minimally privileged status. S. Jourard

6a. A curious thing has happened. Unlike the majority of their predecessors for the century and a half, most of our contemporary social scientists are not interested in fundamental social change. To them, we have apparently reached the summit of institutional progress, and it only remains for the sociologists and applied-anthropologists to mop up the corners and iron out the kinks. P. Goodman

6b. Our social scientists have become so accustomed to the highly organized and by-and-large smoothly running society that they think that "social animal" means "harmoniously belonging." They do not like to think that fighting and dissenting are proper social functions, nor that rebelling or initiating fundamental change is a social function. Rather, if something does not run smoothly, they say it has been improperly socialized; there has been a failure in communication. P. Goodman
Appendix 4

Dependent Measures

In answering the following questions, please be sure to check only one answer to each question and to answer every question. Your answers will be considered confidential and will not be shown to your partner.

1. In sorting out your own reactions to this experiment, would you prefer to

   ____ think about it by yourself?
   ____ talk it over with your partner?
   ____ talk it over with the experimenter?

2. If you both had the time and your partner was interested in doing so, would you like to continue the experimental dialogue further?

   ____ yes
   ____ undecided
   ____ no

3. In thinking of things about yourself you would not want to tell your partner, do you find there are

   ____ very few?
   ____ some, but not too many?
   ____ quite a few?

4. Do you feel that your experience in this experiment was

   ____ boring or worthless to you?
   ____ interesting, worthwhile or enjoyable?
   ____ unenjoyable, frightening or harmful to you?
5. Would it be a disagreeable surprise to meet your partner at a party some time after this experiment?

______ yes

______ no

______ don't know

6. If you were to meet your partner on campus some time after this experiment, would you feel embarrassed if she began discussing with you the things you have said during this experiment?

______ yes

______ maybe

______ no

7. If you both had the time, would you like to discuss this experiment with your partner right now?

______ yes

______ no

______ don't care either way

8. Do you think you would enjoy talking to your partner over a cup of coffee from time to time?

______ yes

______ perhaps

______ no

9. Another experiment similar to this one is planned for later this year; would you be willing to participate in it?

______ yes

______ undecided

______ no
63.

If your answer is "yes," please indicate below the times you would be able to participate. (1 hour of time required).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please also indicate whether you would prefer to be paired with the same or different partner.

______ same partner

______ different partner
Below are listed a variety of ways that one person may feel or react in relation to another person.

Please consider each statement with reference to your present relationship with your partner in this experiment.

Mark each statement in the left margin, according to how strongly you feel that it is true or not true in this relationship. Please mark every one. Write in +3, +2, +1, or -1, -2, -3 to stand for the following answers:

+3: Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.

-1: No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.

+2: Yes, I feel that it is true

-2: No, I feel it is not true.

+1: Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.

-3: No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

1. I respect her as a person.

2. I am inclined to put on a role or front with her.

3. I really like her.

4. It bothers me when she tries to talk about certain things.

5. I appreciate her as a person.

6. I would really prefer her to think I like her even though I don't.

7. I feel friendly and warm toward her.

8. There are times when what I actually say to her is quite different from what I am thinking underneath.

9. I am truly interested in her.

10. What I say to her often would give a wrong impression of my full thought at the time.

11. I feel at ease with her.
12. I find her rather dull and uninteresting.
13. I feel that I am a real and genuine person with her.
15. I am able to be sincere and straightforward with her in whatever I express.
16. I don't like her as a person.
17. I feel comfortable to express whatever is in my mind with her.
18. Somehow, she irritates me.
19. I can be quite openly myself in our relationship.
20. At times I feel contempt for her.
21. My feeling toward her stays about the same; I am not in sympathy with her at one time and then displeased with her at another time.
22. The interest I feel in her depends on the things she says.
23. My liking or disliking of her is not altered by anything she says about herself.
24. I like her in some ways, while there are other things about her I do not like.
25. Whether she is expressing "good" thoughts and feelings or "bad" ones does not affect my reaction to her.
26. Sometimes she seems to me a more worthwhile person than she does at other times.
27. I don't think anything she says really alters the way I feel towards her.
28. I feel quite pleased with some things she says, and then she disappoints me at other times.
The purpose of this part of the experiment is to ask you about the kind of information you revealed to your partner in this experiment. Below these instructions you will find numbers for each item of information you revealed and several columns of blank spaces. For each item of personal information you revealed, please indicate the kind of information you gave your partner by checking the appropriate column, according to the explanation below of the column headings. Please make only one check mark for each item and be sure to check every item. This information will not be given to your partner, and you will not be asked to explain any further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>I+D</th>
<th>I-T</th>
<th>I-I</th>
<th>T-I</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I+D: All the important things plus most of the details.
I-T: Most of the important things minus some of the more trivial details.
I-I: Some of the important things, but not all of them.
T-I: Mostly trivial details without any really important information.
M: Mainly a misrepresentation.
Appendix 5
Source Table for Analysis of Variance for the Ten Hypothetical Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>*F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>669.7917</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy Level (L)</td>
<td>9.5167</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7584</td>
<td>1.4806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction Availability (R)</td>
<td>3.6750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6750</td>
<td>0.5717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of Disclosure (O)</td>
<td>0.0084</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0084</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L x R</td>
<td>2.1500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0750</td>
<td>0.1672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L x O</td>
<td>12.7166</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3583</td>
<td>0.9892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R x O</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8750</td>
<td>0.2917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L x R x O</td>
<td>16.3500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.1750</td>
<td>1.2718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>623.5000</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>6.4278</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All F values non-significant