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ABSTRACT

UNDER PRESSURE? THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RECIPROCITY, INTIMACY, AND OBLIGATION IN SELF-DISCLOSURE

Name: Prosser, Julie Lanette
University of Dayton

Advisor: Dr. Erin O’Mara

Studies of self-disclosure conducted in the lab show that individuals report greater liking for those who disclose highly intimate information, whereas field studies show that individuals report greater liking for those who disclose information of lower intimacy. One possible explanation for such inconsistent findings is that laboratory studies typically create a scenario where the recipient of self-disclosed information is expected and obligated to reciprocate by self-disclosing in return. Field studies, however, remove the obligation for the participant to reciprocate, thus creating an unbiased evaluation of liking for the discloser. The current study examined the effects of self-disclosure on liking when level of intimacy and participants’ roles were manipulated in a lab setting (participants were expected to respond or not). Participants evaluated an individual based on a vignette of low or high intimate content. The interactive effects of participant role and intimacy level on reports of interpersonal liking as well as the role of perceived similarity with the disclosing target were examined. Results indicated only a main effect of intimacy, such that participants evaluated the target person with higher levels of liking when the vignette
was of high intimacy rather than low intimacy, regardless of expected role. Additionally,
although similarity did not mediate the association between intimacy and liking,
participants in the high intimacy group felt significantly less similar to the target than
participants in the low intimacy group and liked the target significantly more when they
perceived him or her to be similar to themselves.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Interpersonal relationships are formed as two people get to know one another, often through disclosing information about the self. In fact, the likelihood of forming a meaningful bond between two people increases as the amount of shared intimate information increases as well (Barrell & Jourard, 1976; Collins & Miller, 1994; Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991; Norton, Frost, & Ariely, 2007; Sprecher, Treger, & Wondra, 2012; Sprecher, Treger, Wondra, Hilaire, & Wallpe, 2013; Taylor & Hinds, 1985; Worthy, Gary, & Kahn, 1969). Given the important role that self-disclosure, or the process of a discloser revealing personal information to a receiver, plays in the formation and maintenance of relationships, it is important to know how disclosing personal information will impact the relationship (Barrell & Jourard, 1976; Leman & Tenenbaum, 2011).

Research regarding the association between self-disclosure and liking is inconsistent. Much of existing research shows a strong, positive association between self-disclosure and liking, especially when the self-disclosure becomes increasingly intimate with time (Collins & Miller, 1994; Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991; Sprecher et al., 2012; Taylor & Hinds, 1985; Worthy et al., 1969). Yet, the positive association between intimate self-disclosure and liking is often only found when participants complete the study in a laboratory setting when they are expected/obligated to respond to the
disclosing target. In field studies, however, participants are often required to simply observe other individuals interacting, which eliminates any feeling of obligation the participants may experience when expected to respond. In these situations, reports of liking are often higher for those disclosing information of low intimacy rather than high intimacy (Chaiken & Derlega, 1974; Collins & Miller, 1994; Weisel & King, 2007). Lab and field studies therefore examine the effect of intimate information on liking in drastically different experimental contexts, thus creating discrepant findings regarding the true effects of self-disclosure on liking.

Thus far, experimenters have not directly tested the effect of self-disclosure on interpersonal liking when intimacy level (low vs. high) and participants' role (expected to respond vs. not) are manipulated in the same experimental setting. Additionally, research has not examined whether individuals will differentially choose to become involved (reciprocate) in conversations high or low in intimacy when they are not obligated to do so. The current study experimentally tests whether role (involved, uninvolved, or given the choice to respond) and degree of intimacy (high, low) interact to predict liking for the discloser.

Why We Self-Disclose

Self-disclosing to another person is a way for him or her to get to know the person disclosing, and to create a strong interpersonal bond between the two individuals. In order to create that lasting bond with another person, it is necessary to form a successful first impression from which a mutual bond of trust and liking can form (Barrell & Jourard, 1976). One can even make assumptions about the status of a relationship by the amount of self-disclosure that is mutually passed between two individuals (Collins &
Miller, 1994; Derlega, Walmer, & Furman, 1973; Sprecher et al., 2012). Increasing the amount of information shared between two people makes it easier to form and identify similarities, which are needed for simple social interactions to turn into close friendships, especially as information becomes more intimate over time (Barrell & Jourard, 1976; Collins & Miller, 1994; Norton et al., 2007; Sprecher et al., 2013).

There are also many mental health benefits associated with disclosing personal information to other individuals. Clinically, the effectiveness of therapy can be in part determined by how well the client is able to self-disclose (Rogers, Griffin, Wykle, & Fitzpatrick, 2009). The therapist cannot effectively do his or her job if the client does not feel comfortable sharing details about his or her life and troubles. The more a client shares with a therapist, the closer and more comfortable the professional relationship becomes. Thus, as the client-therapist relationship strengthens, reports of liking also increase within the dyad (Rogers et al., 2009).

There are numerous physical health benefits to self-disclosure as well. Pennebaker and Seagal (1999) followed students throughout college and tracked the number of times each individual visited the doctor following an experiment in which participants were instructed to write a passage based on a specific prompt. Those who were instructed to write about a traumatic event and their feelings associated with said event visited the doctor significantly fewer times when compared with the control group who wrote about non-emotional events. In addition to making fewer trips to the doctor, participants engaging in self-disclosure studies generally report feeling happier long-term when compared to the control participants of the same studies (Pennebaker & Seagal, 1999).
Factors Influencing the Effect of Self-Disclosure on Liking

Generally, research suggests that the more information an individual knows about another, the more likely it is that the two will find common ground for which mutual liking can develop (Sprecher et al., 2012). However, disclosing too much information to another person can result in lower levels of liking, which may lead to the recipient feeling unwilling to respond (Chaikin & Derlega, 1974; Collins & Miller, 1994; Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991). Such contradictory findings suggest that additional factors that influence the association between degree of intimacy in self-disclosure and liking need to be examined. Some of the factors that have been directly examined include valence (positive vs. negative content), intimacy level (low vs. high), and the status of relationship closeness between the two individuals (stranger vs. close friend or partner; Collins & Miller, 1994; Rogers et al., 2009). An additional factor that has not been empirically tested is the experimental context in which the study is conducted. As mentioned previously, lab studies yield different results regarding the effect of self-disclosure on liking compared to field studies. Research has not directly combined the characteristics of both contexts in a single study.

Valence. When disclosing to another person, it is important that the overall tone, or valence, is more positive than negative. Regardless of intimacy level, individuals tend to associate shared information with the discloser's personality and attitude, thus either increasing or decreasing liking (Collins & Miller, 1994). For example, sharing mostly positive information will likely generate a positive evaluation of the discloser, as well as lead the recipient to associate thoughts of that person with initial perceptions of high positivity and honesty (Lannutti & Strauman, 2006). Likewise, if an individual only
discloses negative information, the recipient will form a negative impression associated with the attitudes of the discloser (Collins & Miller, 1994). The current study uses vignettes that were pilot tested to ensure that the content does not significantly vary by positivity or negativity; the valence is held constant.

**Intimacy and relationship closeness.** In addition to sharing mainly positive information, the level of intimacy and the degree of relationship closeness are also important factors in studying the effects of self-disclosure on liking. The degree to which intimate information is positively received depends upon the relationship closeness of the individuals involved in the disclosure exchange (Barrell & Jourard, 1976; Chaikin & Derlega, 1974; Collins & Miller, 1994). As one factor depends on the other, it is beneficial to discuss the two factors together as one category.

As relationships grow, there is often an expectation for the content of disclosure to increase in intimacy, which drives increased liking in numerous situations (Barrell & Jourard, 1976; Collins & Miller, 1994; Derlega et al., 1973; Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991; Sprecher et al., 2012; Taylor & Hinds, 1985; Worthy et al., 1969). Receiving intimate information from another person generally makes the receiver feel special, as if he or she has been specifically chosen to hear the intimate information (Jones & Archer, 1976; Rubin, 1975). The recipient views being singled out as socially rewarding, thus leading to higher levels of reported liking for the discloser, which facilitates a growing interpersonal bond (Collins & Miller, 1994).

While it is beneficial to increase intimacy as time passes in a relationship, intimately disclosing to a stranger can often be viewed as socially unacceptable behavior, and the discloser is often thought of as inappropriate, maladjusted, and unusual (Collins
& Miller, 1994; Cozby, 1972). Such circumstances could provoke anxiety and elicit embarrassment for the receiver if expected to respond with the same level of intimacy, thus leading to less liking for the discloser (Chaikin & Derlega, 1974; Collins & Miller, 1994; Cozby, 1972; Jones & Archer, 1976). In some extreme cases, individuals report that the highly intimate discloser is less intelligent, less honest, less discreet, and more anxious when compared to a lower intimacy level discloser (Cozby, 1972). In these situations, it is possible, and perhaps more comfortable, for the receiver to respond in a less-intimate manner than the discloser. However, responding with lower levels of intimacy violates the norm of reciprocity (which is applied as a social norm for communication; see section below for further details) and can lead to lower levels of liking (Berg & Archer, 1980; Chaikin & Derlega, 1974; Gouldner, 1960). The receiver also has the option of simply not responding at all to the discloser. However, not reciprocating disclosure in even the slightest form causes reports of liking to decrease even more than when responding in a less-intimate manner (Chaikin & Derlega, 1974; Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991; Moon, 2000).

As it is important to determine which relationship status elicits the highest reports of liking for the optimum amount of intimate disclosure, the current study uses vignettes that only vary in intimacy, which was determined by a pilot study prior to data collection. Relationship closeness is held constant, as participants do not know their "partner."

**Experimental context.** Experimenters have different avenues for which they can study self-disclosure, and each yield different results for the effect of self-disclosure on liking. Some experimenters conduct studies in the lab, whereas others choose to conduct field studies, where participants are removed from any interaction with the individuals
who are disclosing. Thus far, experimenters have not directly studied the difference between results yielded from the lab and results yielded in the field. The current study addresses this gap in the literature by conducting the study in the lab, but manipulating participants' role, using the role conditions to recreate the degree of obligation felt by participants in both types of experimental contexts (lab and field) to respond to the original discloser.

In most laboratory settings, participants are obligated and expected to respond to an initial discloser. In these studies, participants who receive disclosure initially like those who share highly intimate information, thus leading to higher reciprocity (i.e., responding with the same intimacy level; Collins & Miller, 1994; Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991; Moon, 2000; Sprecher et al., 2013; Taylor & Hinds, 1985). For example, if Person X discloses something intimate to Person Y, Person Y will initially like Person X and want to disclose intimate information in return. A reciprocal exchange of intimate disclosure leads both the discloser and receiver to report higher levels of liking for each other (Sprecher et al., 2013).

Field studies often require participants to simply observe two people interact, rather than interacting themselves. In such cases, participants tend to report greater liking for people who disclose information low in intimacy (Chaikin & Derlega, 1974; Collins & Miller, 1994; Weisel & King, 2007). Even in cases in which there is an equal exchange of disclosure observed between the dyad (thus upholding the norm of reciprocity), reports of liking are lower when the dyad equally exchanges information of high intimacy (Chaikin & Derlega, 1974).
As each experimental context generates different conclusions regarding the effect of self-disclosure on liking, the current study holds the experimental context constant, while manipulating participants' role. The study is conducted in a laboratory setting; however, the participants' roles simulate that of both previous lab studies as well as field studies by asking some participants to reciprocate disclosure and others to simply receive the information and evaluate their fellow "participant."

**Theoretical Explanations**

Several theoretical explanations can account for when intimate self-disclosure leads individuals to report higher or lower liking for a discloser. Two theories that are particularly relevant for the current study are the familiarity-attraction link (Sprecher et al., 2012), and the social norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960).

**Familiarity-attraction link.** The more an individual knows about another, the more likely it is that the two individuals can find common ground to which they can both relate (otherwise known as perceived similarity; Sprecher et al., 2012). This common ground, or similarity, is the key element in the “familiarity-attraction link” or “information-based familiarity” and has been shown to mediate the association between self-disclosure and liking (Sprecher et al., 2012; Sprecher et al., 2013). In other words, we tend to like those who are similar to us, and we are able to determine who is similar from the information the other person chooses to reveal. Higher amounts of disclosure lead to an increased sense of similarity, therefore driving higher levels of liking felt toward the discloser (Sprecher et al., 2012; Sprecher et al., 2013).

**Reciprocity.** Reciprocity is an even exchange of benefits between two individuals (Gouldner, 1960). The norm of reciprocity was originally derived from the idea of moral
reciprocity, which dictates that an individual is obligated to repay any benefit of equal value received from another person (Gouldner, 1960). In the case of self-disclosure, two people must offer information of similar value (topic, valence, and intimacy) to one another in order to keep a balanced exchange of disclosure, which creates a situation in which liking will continue to grow between the two individuals (Berg & Archer, 1980; Chaikin & Derlega, 1974; Gouldner, 1960; Sermat & Smyth, 1973; Worthy et al., 1969). However, if the conversation is one-sided (reciprocal disclosure is not present) the imbalance can have a detrimental effect on the interpersonal relationship, leading to lower levels of liking (Chaikin & Derlega, 1974; Moon, 2000).

The theory of reciprocity explains why, in situations where mutual disclosure occurs, highly intimate disclosure yields a higher increase in liking than does disclosure of lower intimacy (Chaikin & Derlega, 1974; Collins & Miller, 1994; Gouldner, 1960; Jones & Archer, 1976; Miller, Berg, & Archer, 1983; Moon, 2000; Rubin, 1975; Sprecher et al., 2013). Person X discloses information to Person Y in order to offer a piece of him or herself. Person Y feels an initial amount of liking for Person X, and is then obligated to return the information of similar intimacy. With the reciprocation of disclosure, a bond of trust is formed within the dyad because the balance of disclosure is maintained, increasing intimacy, as well as liking (Chaikin & Derlega, 1974; Gouldner, 1960; Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991; Moon, 2000). Participants usually report higher levels of liking when the disclosure is reciprocated in terms of intimacy level, and the more one person likes another, the more information he or she will continue to share (Collins & Miller, 1994). When reciprocity is broken, either by lack of matching intimacy, or lack of information returned at all, the trust is broken and liking decreases.
It is possible that the norm of reciprocity conveys a certain obligation for individuals to respond with equal intimacy. Perhaps that obligation to respond leads to greater reported liking as a way to justify disclosing something of intimate value to another person. In other words, if a stranger discloses something to another person, it would simply be rude to not respond in a similar manner. Thus, as a means of justification, the receiver convinces himself he likes the discloser enough to share information in return. The current study manipulates participants' role expectations, therefore removing the response obligation to examine whether individuals will openly choose to respond, and how that removed sense of obligation changes reports of liking.

**Current Study**

Existing research presents a complicated account of when highly intimate disclosure creates meaningful and appropriate interpersonal relationships. In contexts where participants are expected to respond, individuals report greater liking for those who disclose information high in intimacy and they are very willing to disclose in return (i.e. reciprocate; Collins & Miller, 1994; Derlega et al., 1973; Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991; Miller et al., 1983; Moon, 2000; Sermat & Smyth, 1973; Sprecher et al., 2013; Taylor & Hinds, 1985), whereas in contexts in which participants are removed from an interactive role, individuals report greater liking of those who disclose information low in intimacy (Chaikin & Derlega, 1974; Collins & Miller, 1994; Cozby, 1972; Weisel & King, 2007). However, these results occur in separate studies either conducted in the lab or in the field and have not yet been directly compared in the same study. Placing
participants in different experimental contexts creates opposing obligations and roles in
which participants are expected to fulfill. As of yet, experimenters have not addressed the
influence of participants' role and obligation to respond or not in a single study. It is
therefore difficult to determine whether or not true liking leads to reciprocity, or if
participants reciprocate because they feel obligated to do so. The current study addresses
this gap in the literature by manipulating the participants’ role (involved, uninvolved, or
given a choice about their role in the disclosure exchange) in which individuals may find
themselves when interacting with others while holding the experimental context constant.
This study fully crosses participants’ role with degree of disclosed intimacy to determine
under which conditions highly intimate information is best received by others
(demonstrated by reports of higher liking for the discloser).

The theory of reciprocity can have important implications for the social guidelines
governing self-disclosure. When participants feel obligated to respond, adhering to the
theory of reciprocity should elicit higher levels of liking for the discloser. The current
study attempts to show that when the obligation to respond is removed, highly intimate
information should actually elicit lower levels of liking for the discloser in stranger
dyads. Disclosing intimate information to a stranger is seen as a violation of social norms
(Collins & Miller, 1994), and when the participants no longer feel obligated to uphold the
balance that the theory of reciprocity suggests, high intimacy should lead to lower levels
of liking.

Based on empirical research, (H1) self-reported liking for the discloser (referred
to as “person A”) will vary based on the intimacy level of the vignette and the expected
role of the participant. Specifically, (H2) when participants are expected to respond to
person A (involved role condition), levels of liking will be significantly higher in the high intimacy condition when compared to the low intimacy condition. (H3) When participants are given the option to choose to respond or not (choice role condition), they will rate higher levels of liking in the low intimacy condition when compared to the high intimacy condition. (H4) Participants in the uninvolved role condition are also expected to report higher levels of liking in the low intimacy condition when compared with those in the high intimacy condition. Additionally, (H5) for those given the choice to respond, individuals will be significantly more willing to respond in the low intimacy condition than those in the high intimacy condition. Lastly, based on the familiarity-attraction link, regardless of participants’ role, (H6) perceived similarity will mediate the association between intimacy and liking, such that high intimacy will lead to increased similarity, thus leading to higher reported liking for the discloser.
CHAPTER 2
METHOD

Participants

One hundred and eighteen undergraduate students were recruited from introduction to psychology classes at a Midwestern Catholic university to participate in this study in exchange for partial course credit. Several students were excluded because they did not follow directions (N = 4) or exhibited language barriers (N = 2). One student was excluded because she correctly guessed the purpose of the study, and one was excluded because her friend told her about the study before completing the session. After excluding these participants, 110 participants remained. Participants were 18.93 years of age on average (SD = 1.02), of which 89.1% were Non-Hispanic White and 85.5% were women.

Procedure

This study was a 3 (role: involved, uninvolved, choice) x 2 (intimacy: low, high) between-subjects design. All participants were told the aim of the study was to better understand how two people get to know one another for the first time and how people form impressions of others. First, participants were asked to fill out general questionnaires, supposedly while person A wrote the initial “get-to-know-you” message. These questionnaires included a measure of attachment, self-disclosure tendencies, and mood.
After a few minutes, a message appeared on the computer screen alerting the participant that person A had finished his or her (manipulated to match participant’s sex) initial message and was ready to be viewed. At this point, the experimenter came into the room to give the participant further instructions based on one of three conditions to which they were randomly assigned (involved, uninvolved, or choice role). Participants in the involved role condition were told that they were expected to type a message in response to person A, and participants in the uninvolved role condition were told they would only be expected to observe the other participant’s initial disclosure without a response. Those in the choice role condition were told they would have the choice to respond to person A at the end of the study. The experimenter explained to the participants in the choice role condition that person A was aware of the possibility that no response would be provided at the end of the experiment, and many students actually chose not to respond. The purpose of this section was to eliminate any feeling of obligation that the participant may have felt regarding sending a message in response to person A. After the experimenter explained the directions, participants read person A’s message, which was actually a pre-written vignette of either high or low intimacy determined by the condition in which participants were randomly assigned.

After reading the vignette, participants completed measures of social attraction and likability toward person A, and additional items evaluating the content of the vignette. Together, these measures assessed self-reported liking for the discloser, perceived similarity to the discloser, and intimacy of the information disclosed. Also, participants in the choice role condition answered an additional question that indicated how willing they were to respond to person A. After the measures were completed,
participants answered a demographic survey, as well as suspicion questions and were immediately debriefed by the experimenter.

Materials

Vignettes. Fourteen vignettes were pilot tested for the purpose of this study. All vignettes were written from a student’s perspective, reflecting on his or her early experiences regarding time spent at the same university that the participants attended, including opinions on classes and professors, as well as friends. Seven vignettes represented the low intimacy condition, for which the information was vague with very general details, whereas the other seven represented the high intimacy condition, for which the information was much more detailed and personal.

Nineteen participants (78.9% women), who were, on average, 23.63 years of age (SD = 3.23) completed the study on a volunteer basis. Participants read each vignette in a random order and answered questions regarding perceived intimacy, positivity, and negativity (see questions 1, 2, and 5 in Appendix A).

A one-factor univariate repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated that vignettes 1 and 11 significantly differed in perceived intimacy, such that vignette 11 (M = 3.53, SD = 1.26) was significantly more intimate when compared to vignette 1 (M = 2.37, SD = 1.01), F(1,18) = 15.02, p = .001. In addition, a one-factor univariate repeated measures ANOVA indicated that vignette 1 (M = 3.53, SD = .96) and vignette 11 (M = 3.84, SD = 1.01) did not significantly differ in positivity, F(1,18) = 2.11, p = .16. Lastly, a one-factor univariate repeated measures ANOVA indicated that vignettes 1 (M = 2.74, SD = .87) and 11 (M = 2.68, SD = .88) did not significantly differ in negativity, F(1,18) = .04, p = .84, thus concluding that vignette 1 would represent the
low intimacy condition and vignette 11 would represent the high intimacy condition (see Appendix B).

**Attachment.** Individuals with an anxious attachment style differ in their preferences for receiving self-disclosure compared to individuals with an anxious/ambivalent or secure attachment style (Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991). To measure attachment, participants completed the Experiences in Close Relationships – Relationship Structures Scale (ECR-RS; Fraley, Heffernan, Vicary, & Brumbaugh, 2011; see Appendix C) for five target persons (mother, father, dating partner, best friend, and close relationships in general). The ECR-RS is a 9-item measure assessed by a 7-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 7 = Strongly Agree) in which the first six items assess avoidant attachment (i.e., “I don’t feel comfortable opening up to others”), and the last three items assess anxious attachment (i.e., “I’m afraid that other people may abandon me”). Higher scores indicate higher avoidance and higher anxiousness, respectively. Given the structure of the study, attachments to close friends and relationships in general were the only two styles that would have influenced an assessment of person A. Attachments to mothers, fathers, and dating partners were irrelevant to the outcomes of this study. Therefore, the measures indicating attachment to best friends and close relationships in general were the only two scales used for analyses. Cronbach’s alphas for the avoidant friend, anxious/ambivalent friend, avoidant relationships, and anxious/ambivalent relationships subscales were .81, .93, .84, and .93, respectively.

**Self-disclosure.** To assess the impact that individual differences have on the decision to respond, participants completed the Self-Disclosure Index (SDI; Miller et al., 1983; see Appendix D). The SDI is a 10-item measure ($\alpha = .82$) assessed by a 5-point
scale (0 = Discuss not at all; 4 = Discuss fully and completely). The index was originally created so the stem of each question could be modified based on the research question at hand regarding target of disclosure. For the current study, the stem of each question referred to someone to whom they had recently been acquainted. Example items include how much participants tell others about their “deepest feelings,” “personal habits,” or their “worst fears.”

Positive and negative affect schedule (PANAS). Current mood was assessed to examine whether a positive or negative mood influenced the self-reported liking for others and/or willingness to disclose. To assess mood, participants completed the PANAS: a 20-item measure on a 5-point scale (1 = Very slightly or not at all; 5 = Extremely; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Participants rated how they were currently feeling at the time of the study, including items such as “excited,” “proud,” “afraid,” or “jittery.” Ten items assess positive affect (α = .85), and ten items assess negative affect (α = .75; see Appendix E).

Liking. To assess levels of overall liking toward the discloser (person A), participants completed two measures. The first measure was the Social Attraction subscale from the Measurement of Interpersonal Attraction (McCroskey & McCain, 1974; see Appendix F). The Social Attraction Scale contains six statements rated on a 5-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree), including, “It would be difficult to meet and talk with him/her,” and “He/She would be pleasant to be with.” This subscale was highly reliable (α = .73).

Participants also completed Reysen’s Likability Scale (2005) to assess liking on a 7-point scale (1 = Very Strongly Disagree, 7 = Very Strongly Agree; see Appendix G),
with the exclusion of two questions: “This person is physically attractive” and “This person is knowledgeable.” These two questions were excluded because participants did not view any pictures or judge physical attractiveness of person A, and person A’s disclosure did not contain any specific topic knowledge. Items such as “This person is friendly,” and “I would like to be friends with this person” were included (\(\alpha = .84\)). Items from Reysen's (2005) Likability Scale pertaining to similarity were not included in the liking measure (see Primary Analyses for details). Cronbach's alpha remained high (\(\alpha = .85\)).

**Perceived similarity.** Perceived similarity was expected to mediate the effect of intimacy level on liking, such that reading the highly intimate vignette would lead to higher perceived similarity, thus resulting in higher levels of liking, regardless of the participant's role (Collins & Miller, 1994; Heine & Renshaw, 2002; Sprecher et al., 2012; Sprecher et al., 2013). Two items assessed perceived similarity. The first item was taken from Reysen's Likability Scale: “This person is similar to me” (Reysen, 2005; see item 1 in Appendix G) and is measured on a 7-point scale (1 = Very Strongly Disagree; 7 = Very Strongly Agree). The second item was taken from the Manipulation and Vignette questions created by the experimenters for the purpose of this study: "How similar is person A to you?" Answers for this question are on a 7-point scale (1 = Not at all; 7 = Very similar; see item 4 in Appendix A). Cronbach's alpha for these two items was .83.

**Manipulation and vignette questions.** Participants also completed a measure consisting of various questions that served as a manipulation check for perceived intimacy, positivity, and negativity. Other questions referenced similarity to person A and other general questions regarding likability (see Appendix A for the full list of questions).
**Willingness to respond.** Participants in the choice role condition indicated at the end of the experiment how willing they were to respond to person A. However, these participants were not actually given the opportunity to respond. Their willingness to respond was assessed by a single item, “How willing are you to respond to your fellow participant?” Responses were measured on a 5-point scale (1 = Extremely Unwilling; 5 = Extremely Willing). As discussed in the procedure, participants in the choice role condition were told that person A was aware that they may not receive a response so as to alleviate any obligation for the participants.
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

The means, standard deviations, and ranges for all measures are presented in Table 1. Correlations between the primary dependent variables are presented in Table 2.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Continuous Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECR-RS Avoidance/Friend</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-RS Anxious/Friend</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-RS Avoidance/Relationships</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR-RS Anxious/Relationships</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure Index</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Attraction</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likability</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likability (items 2-9)</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Liking</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Respond</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Overall Liking = computed using standardized items from the Likability (items 2-9) Scale and the Social Attraction Scale.
Table 2

Correlations between Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Likability^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social Attraction^a</td>
<td>.67****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overall Liking^a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Similarity^a</td>
<td>.42****</td>
<td>.48****</td>
<td>.48****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Willingness^b</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Overall liking = Mean(Likability, Social Attraction); the correlation of these items is therefore not reported, as they would be artificially high.

^a n = 110. ^b n = 35. ****p < .0001

A preliminary analysis served as a manipulation check to further demonstrate that the vignettes varied significantly by intimacy. A one-way ANOVA revealed that the vignettes significantly varied by intimacy condition, such that the low intimacy vignette (M = 2.28, SD = 1.11) was rated significantly less intimate when compared to the high intimacy vignette (M = 3.15, SD = .98), F(1,108) = 18.67, p < .0001. Furthermore, two one-way ANOVAs indicated that the low intimacy (M = 4.25, SD = 1.12) and high intimacy (M = 4.55, SD = .99) vignettes did not differ by positivity, F(1,108) = 2.21, p = .13, nor did the low intimacy vignettes (M = 2.33, SD = 1.38) differ from the high intimacy vignettes (M = 2.32, SD = 1.37) in negativity, F(1,108) = .002, p = .96.

Primary Analyses

To measure liking, participants completed McCroskey and McCain's (1974) Social Attraction Scale and Reysen's Likability Scale (2005). All items from the Social Attraction Scale were used to assess liking, whereas only eight items were used from the Likability Scale (item 1 regarding perceived similarity was used in the measure of similarity, therefore it was not included in the measure of liking). The Social Attraction
Scale and the eight-item Likability Scale were significantly correlated, $r = .67, p < .0001$; therefore all included items from these two scales were standardized and averaged to compute an overall liking score for each participant ($\alpha = .88$).

It was predicted that intimacy level and participants’ expected role would interact to predict liking (H1). Specifically, those in the involved role condition were expected to report higher liking for the target after reading the high intimacy vignette compared to those reading the low intimacy vignette (H2). Participants in the choice role condition (H3) and the uninvolved role condition (H4) were expected to report higher liking for the target after reading the low intimacy vignette compared to those reading the high intimacy vignette.

As mentioned previously, three measures of liking were used for analyses (the Social Attraction Scale, the 8-item Likability Scale, and the standardized average of both measures). Consistent across each measure of liking, three two-way ANOVAs indicated a main effect for intimacy on liking, such that individuals reported higher liking for those in the high intimacy condition, regardless of expected role, $F(1,104)_{8\text{-item likability scale}} = 10.39, p = .002$, $F(1,104)_{social attraction scale} = 4.05, p = .04$, $F(1,104)_{average of both measures} = 8.78, p = .004$. See Table 3 for relevant means across intimacy conditions.

Consistent across each measure of liking was a non-significant main effect for participants' role on liking, such that individuals' reports of liking did not vary by expected role, regardless of intimacy, $F(1,104)_{8\text{-item likability scale}} = .12, p = .88$, $F(1,104)_{social attraction scale} = .84, p = .43$, $F(1,104)_{average of both measures} = .38, p = .68$. These main effects were not qualified by the interaction. Consistent across each measure of liking, three two-way ANOVAs indicated that liking did not significantly vary by intimacy level and role,
\( F(2,104)_{\text{likability scale}} = .91, p = .40, F(2,104)_{\text{social attraction scale}} = 2.44, p = .09, \)

\( F(2,104)_{\text{average of both measures}} = 1.29, p = .27. \) See Table 4 for relevant means and standard deviations of liking across all conditions. Given that the interaction was not significant, hypotheses 1-4 were not supported.

Table 3

*Means and Standard Deviations for Low and High Intimacy Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Low intimacy</th>
<th>High intimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likability (8-item)</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Attraction</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Liking</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

*Means and Standard Deviations for Liking across All Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Involved role</th>
<th>Uninvolved role</th>
<th>Choice role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low intimacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likability (8-item)</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Attraction</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Liking</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High intimacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likability (8-item)</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Attraction</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Liking</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 5 predicted that those in the choice role condition would be significantly more willing to respond to the target in the low intimacy condition when compared to those in the high intimacy condition. A one-way ANOVA revealed that willingness to respond in the low intimacy condition (\( M = 4.33, SD = 1.28 \)) did not differ
from the high intimacy condition ($M = 4.53$, $SD = 1.37$), $F(1,33) = .19$, $p = .66$.

Hypothesis 5 was not supported.

Hypothesis 6 stated that participants' perceived similarity to person A would mediate the association between intimacy level and liking. Given the consistency of effects across all three measures of liking, this analysis was conducted using only the overall liking measure. Before testing for mediation, a one-way ANOVA was used to assess whether similarity varied by intimacy condition. The main effect for condition was trending towards significance, $F(1,108) = 3.58$, $p = .06$, such that similarity was higher among participants in the low intimacy condition ($M = 4.56$, $SD = 1.20$) than in the high intimacy condition ($M = 4.15$, $SD = 1.05$). This analysis was followed up with a test of the proposed hypothesis by using the PROCESS Macro for SPSS to conduct the bootstrapping method (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Intimacy was dummy coded with the low-intimacy condition as the reference group. It was predicted that receiving high intimacy would lead to greater perceived similarity, which would then lead to greater liking for the target.

Perceived similarity did significantly mediate the association between intimacy and liking, using 5000 bootstrap samples and a 95% bias-corrected CI = [−.2705, −.0038]. However, the bias-corrected confidence interval is a more liberal estimation of mediation (see Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Therefore, the percentile confidence interval is the recommended confidence interval to report. When testing for mediation using 5000 bootstrap samples and a 95% percentile CI [−.2606, .0063] the results are no longer consistent with mediation (see Figure 1 for betas and $p$ values).
Given the inconsistency in the results based on confidence interval, the pattern of results of the mediation analysis are interpreted below but they are merely suggestive of a pattern of effects that might explain the associations between the constructs. Participants in the high intimacy condition reported feeling significantly less similar to person A compared to participants in the low intimacy condition. However, similarity was positively associated with liking. In other words, participants will like other individuals even if they do not feel similar to them, as long as the information is detailed and personal. However, the more similar they feel to the target, the more liking participants report.

**Figure 1.** Mediation model of intimacy and liking.

*^p = .06, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001, ****p < .0001*

**Secondary Analysis**

All analyses were conducted before and after controlling for attachment style for best friends and current relationships in general, self-disclosure tendencies, and participants' current mood. Only two attachment styles were used (best friends and close
relationships in general) because research suggests using a relationship-specific attachment that is most relevant to the hypothesis in question (Fraley et al., 2011). The current study did not present the disclosing target as a family member or romantic partner; the disclosing target was presented as a peer, which could be related to friendships or relationships as a more global target. The findings were consistent regardless of controlling for each variable, therefore all results are reported without covariates.
CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION

Given the importance of self-disclosure in relationships, it’s critical to understand the effect that revealing intimate information about oneself will have on the relationship. Researchers in the past have reported many trends regarding the effect of self-disclosure on liking, but not all are consistent. In some situations, disclosing personal information to other people is seen as an offering of oneself to another, and is received as a token of trust from which a meaningful relationship can grow (Barrell & Jourard, 1976; Collins & Miller, 1994). In other situations, disclosing intimate information to a stranger is associated with lower levels of liking, especially when that information is overwhelmingly negative (Collins & Miller, 1994; Cozby, 1972). Experimenters have placed participants in various expected roles, in several experimental settings, and have manipulated the intimacy level of disclosure, all to examine the effect of self-disclosure on liking. Unfortunately, many studies which manipulate intimacy level also unintentionally alter the overall valence (i.e., highly intimate information is often more negative in nature; Chaikin & Derlega, 1974), which creates a confounding variable in predicting liking. Thus far, no study has manipulated participants’ role and intimacy level while holding the experimental context and valence constant, as the current study attempted to accomplish.
The first hypothesis predicted that liking would vary as a function of both role and intimacy level. This hypothesis was not supported. However, there was a main effect of intimacy for all outcomes of liking, regardless of role. This suggests that intimacy is a primary determinant of whether the disclosure recipient likes the person sharing information, such that participants report higher liking after receiving information of high intimacy compared to receiving information of low intimacy. These results are consistent with findings from previous lab studies, despite attempting to simultaneously mimic the characteristics of both lab and field experimental contexts.

There are many possible explanations for why participants' role did not influence interpersonal liking for the disclosing target in the current study. One possibility is the expectations that the participants bring to the experiment. The title of the study itself suggested that participants would be interacting with another student over the course of the experiment. After participants entered the lab, they then received the manipulation instructions, which attempted to remove that expectation depending on the condition in which participants were assigned. Perhaps participants still expected to interact even after gaining the knowledge that they would not in fact be interacting with anyone. The instructions may not have been enough to remove what expectations participants had before even coming in to the experiment. Another possible explanation is that the involvement (and the choice thereof) was not adequately manipulated in the uninvolved and choice roles. Participants believed that another student was involved in the experiment and was given the same set of instructions; however, person A had to send a message no matter what. Therefore, it is possible that participants still felt an obligation to give something back to person A because they both had to go through the trouble of
completing the experiment, and perhaps that was expressed through higher levels of reported liking for person A. The act of being in a laboratory room for a fixed amount of time, believing that another student was down the hall, and ostensibly interacting with that student in real-time through a computer may have been enough to override whatever role manipulation the experimenters tried to enforce.

The fifth hypothesis predicted that those in the low intimacy condition would be significantly more willing to respond to person A compared to those in the high intimacy condition. This hypothesis was not supported, such that participants were equally willing to respond across intimacy conditions. Based on empirical research, disclosing intimate information to a stranger is inappropriate and should cause participants to feel anxious or uncomfortable when expected to respond with the same level of intimacy (if participants were to uphold the norm of reciprocity; Collins & Miller, 1994; Mikulincer & Nachshon, 1991). An explanation for why intimacy level did not influence willingness to respond may reside in our conceptual definition of “intimacy.” In this case, we refer to intimacy as more detailed information about a person’s life. Too many times in the literature, intimacy is described interchangeably with positivity or negativity. In numerous studies, the high intimacy condition contains extremely negative content (i.e., Chaikin & Derlega, 1974), thus making it unclear if reports of liking are due to receiving a significant amount of information, or simply receiving negative information. For the current study, the intimate information provided in the vignette would not normally make someone uncomfortable if expected to reciprocate equally, thus not influencing how willing participants were to send a message in response.
Another explanation for why participants were equally willing to respond is that the experimental setting may have been more influential over reported willingness than that of intimacy level. To elaborate, the experiment was posted for a 30-minute session in the lab that participants completed in exchange for course credit, whether the session lasted the full 30 minutes or not. By giving the participants a choice to respond to the disclosing target, they were basically given the option of leaving the session early, or staying for the full session to type a message in response. Some participants took longer to complete the questionnaires than others, in which case their session would have taken longer than 30 minutes had they actually responded. It is possible that participants simply were not willing to respond because they wanted to leave the session, which may not have been influenced at all by the intimacy level of the original message, or the amount of reported liking for person A.

The final hypothesis predicted that perceived similarity would mediate the effect of intimacy predicting levels of liking. When using the percentile corrected confidence interval, this hypothesis was not supported. Based on previous research, high intimacy is usually associated with higher levels of perceived similarity, the rationale being that with more information available to make judgments, the higher the possibility of finding common ground on which to relate (Sprecher et al., 2012; Sprecher et al., 2013). The results indicated that high intimacy was actually associated with lower similarity, even though higher similarity was associated with higher liking. The mediation model was not supported.

A possible explanation for why increasing the intimacy level of the vignette decreased perceived similarity is again related to our conceptual definition of intimacy.
The low intimacy vignette contained very vague, general information, which revealed that person A was a student at the University of Dayton, who enjoyed the classes and liked spending time with friends on campus. This general information could have been from any given student at the university and is very common among college-aged individuals. Adding details regarding the student's specific major, specific places in which to spend time with friends, as well as academic information regarding grades, makes it difficult for others to find similarities to the target. The information isn't necessarily too much to disclose to another person, but it decreases the chances to form common ground with the participants because there are a variety of majors available and some students may enjoy drastically different types of classes.

The interesting result from the mediation model, however, is that even though high intimacy predicted lower similarity, the overall mediation model still suggested a positive association between intimacy and liking through perceived similarity. In other words, we like individuals who are willing to disclose intimate details of their lives, even though they may not be similar to us; we still appreciate that the other person offered that piece of him- or herself. This is consistent with the literature which suggests that receiving disclosure in an experiment leads to more liking than that reported by the discloser for their partner (Sprecher et al., 2012). People often feel special and singled out when receiving personal information from another individual (Collins & Miller, 1994; Jones & Archer, 1976; Rubin, 1975). Collins and Miller (1994) also reported that people have more positive beliefs about those who are willing to disclose personal information to others compared to those who are not willing to disclose the same information, regardless if that person is similar or dissimilar to the receiver.
To help further explain why individuals may like those who disclose information even though they are not similar to them, Hornsey, Wellauer, McIntyre, and Barlow's (2015) recent findings suggest that both men and women prefer nonconforming others. Their series of studies found that individuals prefer nonconformist characteristics in others, they find nonconforming others to be more romantically attractive, and overall, individuals rate nonconformists more positively than conformists. Hornsey et al. (2015) also found that nonconformists experience higher romantic achievement and overall satisfaction than those who conform to group norms and expectations. Combining these results with the findings of the current study suggests that individuals may actually like other individuals more who are different from themselves and different from others because they stand out from the otherwise homogenous crowd, and are willing to share a piece of themselves with others.

Limitations

While this study held the experimental context constant (all individuals completed this study in the same laboratory setting), it is possible that the participants' manipulated role was not made sufficiently salient to them to influence their perceptions of person A and the study itself. As mentioned above, the title of the study for which participants signed up indicated that they would be interacting with another participant. After the participants began the study, experimenters administered the directions verbally by a simple paragraph of instructions. However, many students ignore instructions or pretend to know what is expected of them, even if told otherwise. As a result, many participants in the uninvolved role and choice role conditions may have still expected that they would be interacting with the other student, perhaps just at a later point in the experiment. With
that possibility in mind, it is difficult to know if participants still felt as if they would disclose reciprocally, and furthermore, whether that expectation influenced their levels of self-reported liking.

Another limitation to the current study is the experimental context. Although we tried to imitate characteristics of both field and lab studies, the setting in which participants were placed may have not been successful in completely removing them from an interactive role. For example, when experimenters conducted field studies in the past, they have participants watch an interaction or listen in on two people having a conversation, thus making it very clear that the participant is not involved in the self-disclosure exchange at all, nor should they expect to be at any point during the study. This is evident because there are already two people engaging in a conversation; there would be no need for the participant to interact with the dyad. Furthermore, the participants would not expect that the dyad is aware of their presence at all. In the current study, this is not the case. Participants thought that the other person was just down the hall from them with another experimenter, but they were also under the impression that person A was directly messaging them; there was no other student present to respond to person A. Therefore, it is difficult to know if the participants actually understood their role in the uninvolved and choice role conditions, as some still anticipated writing a message at the end of the session.

**Future Directions**

There are many opportunities for research to expand as a result of this study. In the future, it would be beneficial to better manipulate participants' role. First, the instructions paragraph would need to match for each condition. For example, in the
choice role condition for the current study, the experimenters explain to the participants that person A is aware that a response message is not guaranteed, and person A was made aware of this as part of their instructions before writing the message. However, for the involved and uninvolved roles, participants were not aware of person A's expectations. In the future, those in the involved role condition should know from the beginning that person A expects a response, and they were informed that a message would be received by the end of the study. In the uninvolved role condition, participants would be informed that person A was aware that they would definitely not receive any type of response at the conclusion of the study. Making these expectations known to the participants would aid in making their role more salient, as well as understanding what led person A to say certain things, or add specific intimate details in his or her disclosure.

In addition, it is possible that participants in the choice condition decided to not respond to person A because it provided an opportunity to end the study early. It is important that if participants choose to not respond to person A, it is indicative of their feelings toward the disclosing target rather than because they want to leave early. In the future, it would be wise to inform the participants that there is another task to complete after the message, or perhaps in place of writing a message if they choose not to, so as to remove the temptation to leave the session earlier than the posted time.

Another future direction for this study is to have a similar situation set up in the lab, but to frame the study as an online-dating experience. Framing the study in this way would provide a more generalizable method to study the way people receive self-disclosure in the real world when trying to get to know one another. In the realm of online dating, individuals may want to send a message to another person, but are unsure
of how much information is appropriate to reveal in the initial greeting. This scenario would match up perfectly with the choice role condition of the current study: person A sends a message to someone, not knowing if it will merit a response. It would be beneficial to experimentally test how much self-disclosure is initially acceptable in the context of romantic dating, where self-disclosure is extremely important.

Finally, a future direction for this study would be to provide participants with an opportunity to actually respond to person A. Researchers could then code those messages for content, intimacy level, and for elements of matching between the initial vignette and the response message. Experimenters could ask participants to complete questionnaires for initial levels of liking directly after reading person A's message and have them write their response. After sending the message, participants could fill out another liking measure to further replicate previous findings which suggest that liking increases after episodes of equal reciprocity (Berg & Archer, 1980; Chaikin & Derlega, 1974; Moon, 2000; Sprecher et al., 2013).

In conclusion, the current study shows that intimacy level has a significant impact on how much someone likes another. Intimacy level affects perceived similarity, and the more similar two people are, the more liking is present. However, if two people are dissimilar, self-reported liking may still be high because one person is willing to share specific details of his or her life with the other. Self-disclosing to another person is a beneficial tactic for which to start a relationship of any kind. Further research needs to isolate the role of obligation in self-disclosure and reciprocity, and to critically examine why we still like those who are dissimilar to us.
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APPENDIX A

MANIPULATION AND VIGNETTE QUESTIONS

1. How intimate or personal were the things Person A told you?

1 2 3 4 5 6

Very Low in Intimacy   Very High in Intimacy

2. How positive were the things Person A told you?

1 2 3 4 5 6

Not Very Positive   Very Positive

3. How nice would you evaluate Person A?

1 2 3 4 5 6

Not At All Nice   Very Nice

4. How similar is Person A to you?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at allSimilar   Very Similar

5. How negative were the things that Person A told you?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not Very Negative   Very Negative

6. Do you think Person A shared too much personal information?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all   Very Much So
7. Would you feel comfortable sharing about yourself the kind of information shared by person A?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Not at all  Very Much So

8. Could you see yourself sharing the same type of information shared by person A?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Not at all  Very Much So

9. What do you think is person A’s sex?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Definitely Male
Definitely Female
APPENDIX B
VIGNETTES

Low Intimacy Vignette

Hi, I attend the University of Dayton. Living here is a lot different from what I am used to, but I think I have adjusted pretty well. My parents are fine with me being here because they like the atmosphere. The professors are cool for the most part and I’ve made some friends. My grades are mostly stable and I like what I am learning. I will probably like it even better when I get done with the general classes. I study with my friends and hang out a lot when we have free time. We just do normal things, I guess. We do whatever typical college students are expected to do, and we try to stay out of trouble. People sometimes come visit me from high school, and I make the trip home to see them when I can, too. It is cool that we are all still in contact with each other. I like going to UD, but I’m ready to get out of school, just like anyone else. I want to move out of Ohio and see what I can do with my degree in the real world.

High Intimacy Vignette

Hi, I’m a sophomore at the University of Dayton. I grew up in South Carolina, and it was weird leaving. All my childhood memories are from SC, and Dayton is a lot different. It gets really cold here. My parents were pretty happy when I got accepted. They knew I would enjoy UD and make a lot of new friends. I like my professors, but my math professor is my favorite (even though the class has nothing to do with my
business major). Once I get into the accounting classes, it will probably be even easier. So far, I’ve been getting A’s and B’s in all my other classes, too. I live really close to all my friends on campus. My group gets together about once a week to study, but then we all go hang out at the Greene. Once a month, my friends from SC visit me and they like it here too. As much as I like going to UD, I am ready to graduate and start my career. I want to move to New York and be part of the city life, and corporate business world.
APPENDIX C

EXPERIENCES IN CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS – RELATIONSHIP STRUCTURES

QUESTIONNAIRES – Same scale, once for each relationship

Experiences in Close Relationships – Relationship Structures Questionnaire: A
method for assessing attachment orientations across relationships.

_Psychological Assessment, 23_, 615-625. doi: 10.1037/a0022898

This questionnaire is designed to assess the way in which you mentally represent
important people in your life. You'll be asked to answer questions about your parents,
your romantic partners, and your friends. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or
disagree with each statement by clicking along the scale below.

1) Please answer the following questions about your mother or a mother-like figure

2) Please answer the following questions about your father or a father-like figure

3) Please answer the following questions about your dating or marital partner.

   _Note: If you are not currently in a dating or marital relationship with someone, answer
   these questions with respect to a former partner or a relationship that you would like to
   have with someone._

4) Please answer the following questions about your best friend
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It helps to turn to this person in times of need.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I talk things over with this person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I find it easy to depend on this person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I don't feel comfortable opening up to this person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I prefer not to show this person how I feel deep down.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I often worry that this person doesn't really care for me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I'm afraid that this person may abandon me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I worry that this person won't care about me as much as I care about him or her.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ECR-RS – General Attachment Measure

Please read each of the following statements and rate the extent to which you believe each statement best describes your feelings about close relationships in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It helps to turn to people in times of need.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I talk things over with people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I find it easy to depend on others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I don't feel comfortable opening up to others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I prefer not to show others how I feel deep down.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I often worry that other people do not really care for me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I'm afraid that other people may abandon me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I worry that others won't care about me as much as I care about them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
SELF-DISCLOSURE INDEX


How much do you discuss the following topics with people whom you’ve recently become acquainted?

0 = Discuss not at all  4 = Discuss fully and completely

1. My personal habits
2. Things I have done which I feel guilty about
3. Things I wouldn't do in public
4. My deepest feelings
5. What I like and dislike about myself
6. What is important to me in life
7. What makes me the person I am
8. My worst fears
9. Things I have done which I am proud of
10. My close relationships with other people
APPENDIX E

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE AFFECT SCHEDULE


This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you feel this way right now, that is, at the present moment. Use the following scale to record your answers.

1          2            3   4     5
very slightly      a little         moderately            quite a bit          extremely
or not at all

__ interested       __ irritable
__ distressed       __ alert
__ excited       __ ashamed
__ upset       __ inspired
__ strong       __ nervous
__ guilty       __ determined
__ scared       __ attentive
__hostile
__enthusiastic
__proud

__jittery
__active
__afraid
APPENDIX F

MEASURE OF INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION


**Directions:** The scales below are designed to indicate how attractive you find another person to be. Please indicate your perceptions of the attractiveness of "[Person A].” Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you:

Strongly Disagree = 1; Disagree = 2; Neutral = 3; Agree = 4; Strongly Agree = 5

**Social Attraction**

_____ 1. I think he (she) could be a friend of mine.
_____ 2. I would like to have a friendly chat with her/him.
_____ 3. It would be difficult to meet and talk with him (her).
_____ 4. He (she) just wouldn't fit into my circle of friends.
_____ 5. We could never establish a personal friendship with each other.
_____ 6. He/she would be pleasant to be with.
APPENDIX G
REYSEN’S LIKABILITY SCALE


Instructions: Circle how strongly you agree with each statement.

1. This person is similar to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>very strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. This person is friendly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>very strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. This person is likeable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>very strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. This person is warm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>very strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. This person is approachable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>very strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I would ask this person for advice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>very strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. I would like this person as a coworker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. I would like this person as a roommate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. I would like to be friends with this person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>