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CHAPTER I

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

On Writing This Report

Know the world by heart
Or never know it!
Let the pedant stand apart --
Nothing he can name will show it!
Also him of intellectual art.
None know it
Till they know the world by heart.

Take heart then, poet!

Archibald MacLeish, "Theory of Poetry"

All real living is meeting.

Martin Buber, I and Thou:

This study has to do with the issues of self-disclosure and confirmation. It is an exploratory study. Of course, every study which is not a simple replication is exploratory, in the sense that a fresh question is asked of nature, but this study is exploratory in other ways as well. It has not only asked new questions, but also, in its small way, has been an inquiry into how best to ask questions about persons and their commerce with each other. When considering most psychological research, it may be unnecessary or
even undesirable to raise such questions, but it seems unavoidable if one wishes to investigate phenomena of the kind denoted by terms like "self-disclosure" and "confirmation." This is because such terms are self-contradictory and meaningless when viewed from an impersonal frame of reference.

The Psychologist as the Man in the One-Way Glass Suit

There would seem to be little doubt that the assumptional frame of reference adopted by American experimental psychology is an impersonal one. By this I mean that persons are studied by an approach which considers them not as active and experiencing centers of orientation in a personal world, but as interchangeable instances of some "objectively" defined class. The fact that the frame of reference is less often seen discussed per se anymore (at least inside the "mainstream"), but is used tacitly in solving problems, may make its impersonal character less obvious but no less the case. This may become obvious again only when it is used to approach an irreducibly personal set of problems, as in the present case. The difficulties created by this situation can scarcely be dealt with completely and systematically here; but they may at least be alluded to.
The impersonal working assumptions and concomitant strategies of scientific psychology can be glimpsed "between the lines" of reports published in the more highly reputed journals of the field, and occasionally in more explicit form by editors articulating their principles of selecting reports for publication, or by prominent psychologists who have taken it upon themselves to spell out guidelines for the scientific endeavor. One particularly influential instance of the latter was John B. Watson's paper *Psychology as the Behaviorist Views It* (1913). This was a vigorous effort to rid the science of psychology of introspectionism and a philosophical "surplus meaning" of terms. Observable behavior was settled upon as the proper object of study. This simple working principle was altered and elaborated subsequently, but the reluctance to construe the psychological subject in terms of his own experience continued. A later work, written by S. S. Stevens and published in 1939, set forth a working version of "Operationism" which was to have widespread influence. Stevens listed seven characteristics, or principles, for operationism. In these principles it seems clear that he advocated, for the sake of rigor and parsimony, to adopt a stance of the "other one" toward the psychological subject; and even toward the experimenter himself when he is in the role of providing data rather than observing it. This seems historically important, inasmuch as this
kind of objectivity has become hardened, in many quarters, into a virtue. It generally seems the case, in fact, among behavioristically inclined psychologists that they view their subjects not only as the "other one" but, as David Bakan has pointed out, as a stranger. He writes (1967):

The behaviorist fashions himself a language which is modeled after the language among strangers. What do we mean? It is characteristic of conversation among strangers that they should talk of the most "public" things. Thus, strangers on a train, say, might talk of the weather, the characteristics of different cities, and the World Series. The language which is used among strangers is generally of the kind which would be accepted by the philosopher of science who calls himself a "physicalist."

Referring to a difficulty which prompted me to this discussion, Bakan goes on to say:

Thus, the kind of language which is held up to us as an ideal language, that is, a physicalistic language, is one which, in its essence, is not very good for the kind of intimate coparticipation of the kind suggested by (Carl) Rogers and other clinical psychologists. (p. 83)

It must be said, that while behavioristic rigor seems still almost universally esteemed, its application has in many cases "loosened up" considerably. Observations are almost always taken as referring beyond themselves to some "intervening variable" or "nomothetic construct." Yet, this extra-behavioral reference is almost always still an impersonal one, not involving the active assumption that the other is an existentially unique locus of
experience and activity. Even in cases in which the higher-order constructs have experiential connotations (as in, for example, "anxiety," or "self-concept"), these are almost always considered secondary to their formal functioning inside the impersonal abstractive system which is providing the rationale for the study involved.

It may be that an impersonal frame of reference was the inevitable choice for anyone who wanted to become a scientific observer of other persons. The aim of such observation, after all, is the establishment of abstract, replicable laws generalizable across people or classes of people. The Scottish philosopher John Macmurray gives an account of this "depersonalization," or process of abstraction from the total man, in the service of scientific utility (1956). As he has it, it would seem that physical science, operating primarily under the vision of Newton, had developed a set of methods suitable for dealing with the objects-in-space of a Newtonian world. The activities of these objects are behavior pure and simple, it should be noted, since it is presumed that falling stones and such have no experience, no intentions, no meanings of their own. The procedures adopted proved more and more useful in gaining control over the physical environment. If science could do this, the question arose, why not apply the approach as well to the even more troublesome and unpredictable human environment? So
with procrustean sweeps of the ax, various attempts were made to fit the subject-matter to the model. The major models of sub-personal science, as defined by Macmurray, were the object and the organism. Both models "fit" important parts of human experience. The "object" fits ones experience of falling downstairs, for example, for there one is entirely subject to Newtonian laws, and no intervention of his own is possible. Habitual activity fits the "organism" model, as being due to "stimulus-response bonds." Of course, there are some important aspects of human life not covered by these, such as the kind of activity-governed-by-intention that constitutes the scientific endeavor itself. But both "sub-personal" models could, within their limits, fit many of the facts. There is another side to the story as well; for along with this "abstraction from" the total person went a continuous tendency to reify the models or constructs so obtained and treat them as if they were the full and complete account of reality. It is as if the conscious, intentional psychologist, intending to be scientific, turned to the conscious and intentional persons about him and, inasmuch as they were to provide scientific data, drew a kind of magic circle around them wherein only the generalizable and behavioral aspects of their existences could be discerned; that is, their individuality, consciousness and intentionality were systematically partialed out as irrelevant, and
even as "unobservable" -- as indeed they were, given the impersonal observation-base adopted. Yet, the magic, for all its utility, may be somewhat dangerous if in some cases it has charmed its user as well. For what sort of result comes from taking the abstracted behavioristic datum not as a partial view held for some purpose, but as constitutive or definitive of how the world "really is?"

Most psychologists seem to be more concerned with problems than with assumptions, and the fact that their language presupposes the absence of personal reality for their observations is often not explicitly acknowledged. At the same, to complicate matters, the problems with which many of these psychologists seem to want to deal are not really appropriate for the kind of impersonal science which their language implies. This incongruity fairly screams from the pages of those journals at all concerned with "clinical" or "interpersonal" issues. It becomes intolerable, I think, when constructs like the ones focussed upon here are involved.

I will have more to say below about why I think this problem exists and why its solution is a pressing issue. First, let me sketch some of the concepts with which this study is concerned. Then, perhaps, these issues will be more clear.
The Ontological Dimension of Human Communication

If research done by human beings about other human beings is ever based primarily upon a coherent theory, or drawn simply from previous studies, this study is not an instance of it. It hatched out of a congeries of concerns which are as resistive to summarization now as they have been insistent upon commingling previously. The notions which are described below seem to me to represent themes with which a number of writers are concerned, and which have occupied me, both in my personal life and in my fledgling hopes as a scientist of persons.

Reflecting upon that mixed family of concerns, I have an image of a scene. A mother and her daughter are talking. The daughter is younger than the ones to be discussed below, about eight or nine years old. They are standing, facing each other, the mother looking down. Details are few and vague, and save for the dim outlines of a room, the two are surrounded by a silent absence of background. They are caught in the scene in a moment of contact, held as if by a stopped movie frame. Thus caught, there is a poignancy to the scene, although one senses that it is part of an unbroken stream of events, a momentary intersection of two busy and separate, but reciprocally orbiting lives. The picture focusses
upon, balances around, the daughter, around and upon something held in her hand perhaps, just found and engaging, or upon some words, half-formed, held just behind her tongue and about to be uttered. The girl, involved with her experience, has taken her awareness to her mother for sharing. The mother is poised to listen in some fashion and respond in some fashion, and the girl in turn is set to receive that response. In some sense she will keep it, as a part of herself. Then the movie reel unsticks, the action flows on, and gone.

This small scene seems to contain many of the issues which are of concern here. There is a drama to it, although its full significance would be easy to miss to the casual observer. A transaction of experience is about to take place. A self-revelation of some form and quality is in the offing, and a response of some sort will immediately attend it and qualify it. One senses that the stakes are high in this exchange; high certainly for the little girl, perhaps high as well, although less obviously so, for the mother. The stakes are those discussed by ontologists, stakes of being and becoming. The matter seems worth attending to, certainly. But how can one approach it as an empiricist? It seems plain that the significance of the scene would evaporate instantly if it was understood impersonally. To "catch it" at all would seem to require a
personalistic starting point, a model of man which would not omit the existential dimension of the scene at the same moment that it provided a conceptual bridge to it. Two characteristics in particular seem required of such a model. They are, first, that a person is an active and experiencing center of orientation in the world; and second, that a person lives out his life largely in active, dramatic inter-relations with other persons.

Harold McCurdy, in his Personality and Science (1965), has developed a construction of personality as comprised of a self in active, ongoing relation with a personal world. The self, as he uses the term, is not a reified ego, or a "self-concept," but rather:

. . . that which is capable of asserting "I am." It is an active power which thinks, wills, and perceives, and expresses itself in form and motion. I regard it as a real being, though not in its essence perceptible or measurable, and as always mentally active, though with varying degrees of consciousness. (p. 11)

He borrows Whitehead's term "prehension" to signify the relations self has with its objects.

Prehension is a very broad term . . . It has the special merit of implying . . . the activity of reaching out and grasping. This activity both "reproduces in itself the general characteristics of an actual entity" and "is referent to an external world." For example, seeing (one variety of prehension) both reveals the capacity of the person to see and refers to the actuality of the thing seen; and fearing (another variety of prehension) both manifests the prehending person's fearfulness and asserts the presence of something external which the fearing, so to speak, catches and holds. (p. 32)
Along with the assumption that each person is existentially unique (is a prehending nexus of the world) is another, that each person lives out life largely in relation to other persons. Thus, many of the important objects of one's prehended world are themselves persons who are themselves centers of orientation in a prehended world. It is this multiplicity of personal worlds which gives us the problem of communication; and in that the problematic of the articulation and elaboration of personal being in the arena of others' awarenesses.

That there is from the earliest age a desire to communicate seems little in doubt. In fact, it may be, as Macmurray has argued (1961), a distinguishing characteristic of the human infant as opposed to all other species that it comes into the world, and only manages to exist in it, as a communicator.

Long before the child learns to speak he is able to communicate, meaningfully and intentionally, with his mother. In learning language, he is acquiring a more effective and more elaborate means of doing something which he can already do in a more crude and primitive fashion . . . In the human infant -- and this is the heart of the matter -- the impulse to communicate is his sole adaptation to the world into which he is born. Implicit and unconscious it may be, yet it is sufficient to constitute the mother-child relation as the basic form of human existence, as a personal mutuality, as a "You and I" with a common life. (p. 60)

Macmurray goes on to argue that this condition sets the stage for the essentially interpersonal quality of human life, such
that human experience is, in principle, shared experience. Yet, as he goes on to say, the ideal condition of mutual understanding often goes awry.

The weight of the drama in the little scene of the mother and daughter comes principally from two choice points, two contingencies, which arise in it. To the girl is given the issue of whether or not, or to what extent, or just how, to express herself. The need to do so, originally at least, is probably strong. Yet she may choose, perhaps from fear or confusion, to leave her prehensions unsaid; or even, indeed, to cast them into "nonbeing," to deny them to her own awareness. This choice represents the issue of self-disclosure. The other contingency is not in the girl's control, but rests irrecoverably outside of it, in the mother's choice. The latter may hear and understand, and in that let the girl's separate prehensions be as they are, while in the same moment according them interpersonal validity. Or she may miss them, render them lonely, and invalidate them. This is the issue of confirmation. These are reciprocal concepts, each depending for intelligibility upon the other. They refer to reciprocal phenomena, to what McCurdy has called "bipolar process." As he describes it (1968, p. 328)
Both poles must be recognized even when attention is concentrated on one. To put it succinctly in an example: "She is growing beautiful" must not be dissociated from "I see that she is growing beautiful," or even "Because I look at her as I do, she is growing beautiful." "She is growing beautiful" can be as factual as "The rocket is accelerating," but the experiment is different. To be sure, the acceleration of a rocket also depends upon some human preconditions. But in the case of "She is growing beautiful" the bipolarity of observer and observed is peculiarly essential. To report the fact accurately we must include ourselves in the description and admit that if our manner of looking has changed her, her manner of change affects in turn our manner of looking. We must describe, that is, a whole relational universe.

The two poles of bipolar process have been emphasized differentially by different writers, so they will be discussed below under separate headings (although even then they will blur together); and after that will be outlined some constructs regarding personality characteristics which have been held to be relevant to these paired issues of disclosure and confirmation.

**Self-disclosure vs. Self-concealment**

Sidney Jourard begins his discussion of self-disclosure by calling it the "portal to man's soul" (1964). He writes (p. 9):

Man's self, as near as we now know, can never be known to any save the experiencing individual unless the individual man unequivocally cooperates and makes his self known. In short, man must consent; if we would know his self, he must want to tell us. If he doesn't wish to tell us of his self, we can torture him, browbeat him, tempt him, even make incisive psychoanalytic guesses; but unless he wishes to make his self known, we will of course never know it.
However shrewd our guesses might be about a man's self, when we guess about a man's self, we never know whether we are correct until he says, and means it, "You're right." Moreover, we don't know for a certainty whether he means it.

He goes on to posit that one's own knowledge of himself is also involved in disclosure:

Through my self-disclosure, I let others know my soul . . . . In fact, I am beginning to suspect that I can't even know my own soul except as I disclose it. I suspect that I will know myself "for real" at the exact moment that I have succeeded in making it known through my disclosure to another person.

The issue of self-disclosure vs. self-concealment may be said to arise originally from the fact that each of us is existentially unique, inhabiting a personal world which orbits about his own self and no one else's. As Jourard says, to be known we must choose to make ourselves known, to express ourselves. Yet, we might ask, why would one ever choose to not be known, or to be known falsely? It may be that in each human life the issue is originally encountered not as a choice but as a given. Some aspects of the self may be experienced, even by the self, as "bad" or even as "not me."

However that may be, it seems that in every personality some prehensions are more problematical than others. The self not onlyprehends its objects, but takes different stances toward
those prehensions. Some are self-acknowledged, publicly avowed, and returned to again and again in building up a stable "self-concept." Others are only dimly articulated and cautiously acknowledged, while still others seem to be willed out of being altogether. This capacity for self-negation which human beings have seems central to this discussion. The existentialists, particularly Sarte (1956) and Heidegger (1962) have dealt with this characteristic of human nature. I am not up to the task of presenting their ideas adequately; but, as treated by Lefebre (1963), the subject can at least be mentioned.

In Heidegger's ontology "dividedness" is shown to be a constituent of human being. I am always already away from myself -- involved in activities -- before I start coming to myself. That "away from myself" precedes "myself" need not surprise us. A related phenomenon can be observed in ontogeny. The child discovers himself -- the "I" -- after he has become aware of the world he is in -- after the "you." Heidegger has developed a conceptualization which captures the constitutive dividedness of human being. Man is seen as analogous to an outrigger canoe, as the being that is always divided, part of which is always away from itself. (Animals are incapable of being away from themselves.)

Heidegger's conceptualization makes it possible to think of logically opposite aspects of human being as co-existing ones. Thus it is of crucial importance for the conceptualization of the phenomena which we encounter in the practice of psychotherapy. For our patients experience certain manifestations of their being as "this is not myself," and "not myself" is a specific form of "away from myself." It is a very important one because "human being is the only kind of being which is not only capable of being what it is but also
of being what it is not." (Meinertz, 1952) Not being myself is a privilege only the human being has. Therefore the "not myself" aspect of human being must be given equal status epistemologically, with the "myself" aspect.

In a more psychological vein, Freud's (1960) concepts of regression, resistance and superego all are pertinent here, as are Horney's (1937) accounts of the development of the "false self" and the "neurotic character."

Many writers agree that being in or out of touch with one's own prehensions and being willing or unwilling to express them to others are intimately entwined issues. Jourard, putting the stress on the willingness to express, posits that the extent and quality of a person's self-disclosure to at least one other person have important consequences for psychological health. People who disclose too little, or whose disclosures are too dishonest, become self-alienated and even mentally ill. Optimal levels of disclosure, on the other hand, open the doors to a "positively healthy" (as opposed to merely normal) way of life. The benefits of the way of life, according to Jourard, may range widely, including longevity, a fulfilling marital life, literary creativity, and being a good teacher.

Carl Rogers, in much the same vein, but reversing the direction of causality, wrote (1961, p. 330):

The whole task of psychotherapy is the task of dealing with a failure in communication. The emotionally maladjusted person, the "neurotic," is in difficulty first, because communication within himself has broken down, and second because
as a result of this, his communication with others has been damaged. In the "neurotic" individual, parts of himself which have been termed unconscious, or repressed, or denied to awareness, become blocked off so that they no longer communicate themselves to the conscious or managing part of himself. As long as this is true there are distortions in the way he communicates himself to others, and so he suffers both within himself, and in his interpersonal relations. The task of psychotherapy is to help the person achieve, through a special relation with a therapist, good communication within himself. Once this is achieved he can communicate more freely and more effectively with others. We may say then that psychotherapy is good communication, within and between men. We may also turn that statement around and it will still be true. Good communication, free communication, within or between men, is always therapeutic.

Rogers and others in his school have discussed at length the process of self-disclosure. For them more than for Jourard it is closely entwined with the issues of the understanding and responsiveness of the person to whom the disclosure is being offered. They have emphasized in particular the personal growth, the becoming, which may attend such disclosure. Thus Eugene Gendlin, focussing on the effect of the process on the discloser's relation to his own experience, has said that it is the interpersonal relationship with the therapist itself which is responsible for therapeutic change.

This is what really changes him, for alone he can think about the same things, yet he remains as he is . . . . There are differences in his manner of experiencing in different relationships . . . . My sense of you, the listener, effects my experiencing as I speak, and your response
partly determines my experiencing a moment later . . . . Thus it is not the case that I tell you about me and then we figure out how I should change, and then somehow I do it. Rather, I am changing as I talk and think and feel, for your responses are every moment part of my experiencing, and partly affect, produce, symbolize, and interact with it. And only by this experiencing process (and the difference you make in its character) do I change. (1962, p. 38).

Rogers thinks that the growth-producing effects of a therapeutic (disclosure-producing) relationship run both broad and deep. He says (1961, p. 36):

It is my hypothesis that in such a relationship the individual will recognize himself at both the conscious and deeper levels of his personality in such a manner as to cope with life more constructively, more intelligently, and in a more socialized as well as a more satisfying way . . . . He changes his perception of himself, becoming more realistic in his views of self. He becomes more like the person he wishes to be. He values himself more highly. He is more self-confident and self-directing. He has a better understanding of himself, becomes more open to his experience, denies or represses less of his experience. He becomes more accepting in his attitudes toward others, seeing others as more similar to himself.

In his behavior he shows similar changes. He is less frustrated by stress, and recovers from stress more quickly. He becomes more mature in his everyday behavior as this is observed by friends. He is less defensive, more adaptive, more able to meet situations creatively.

The issue of what factors produce, or elicit, self-disclosure has attracted the attention of a number of writers. Barker (1965) has speculated that the likelihood of disclosure occurring depends upon the interaction of two factors: the "riskiness" of the item of information which is to be disclosed, and the perception of the
other person (to whom one will or will not disclose) as being trustworthy or not. Thus, someone who is not perceived as being very trustworthy will tend to be given only very "safe" and "impersonal" items -- the "name, rank and serial number" of the prisoner of war. On the other hand, very intimate and risky prehensions may be shared with someone perceived as very trustworthy. And, in this process, something more than sharing may be produced. Self-disclosure merges into "self-exploration" (see Carkhuff, 1967), and thence into the unfolding of personal being; the movement of the "not me" into the "me" (Sullivan, 1953).

Rogers and his colleagues have devoted considerable attention to factors which might be expected to elicit self-disclosure and self-exploration, but they have focussed upon the encompassing interpersonal relationship and its "atmosphere" as these are determined by the attitudes of the one doing the listening. This raises the issue of confirmation.

**Confirmation vs. Disconfirmation**

Martin Buber has written eloquently and articulately about this matter. I quote him below at some length (1965, pp. 79-81).

The chief presupposition for the rise of genuine dialogue is that each should regard his partner as the very one he is. I become aware of him, aware that he is different,
essentially different from myself, in the definite, unique way which is peculiar to him, and I accept whom I thus see, so that in full earnestness I can direct what I say to him as the person he is. Perhaps from time to time I must offer strict opposition to his view about the subject of our conversation. But I accept this person, the personal bearer of a conviction, in his definite being out of which his conviction has grown -- even though I must try to show, bit by bit, the wrongness of this very conviction. I affirm the person I struggle with: I struggle with him as his partner, I confirm him as creature and creation, I confirm him who is opposed to me as him who is over against me. It is true that it now depends on the other whether genuine dialogue, mutuality in speech arises between us. But if I thus give to the other who confronts me his legitimate standing as a man with whom I am ready to enter into dialogue, then I may trust him and suppose him to be also ready to deal with me as his partner.

Confirmation entails appreciating the other person as he is to himself, and trying to approach and understand him in just this way.

One cannot do this, however, by "observation."

To be aware of a man, therefore, means in particular to perceive his wholeness as a person determined by the spirit; it means to perceive the dynamic centre which stamps his every utterance, action, and attitude with the recognizable stamp of uniqueness. Such an awareness is impossible, however, if and so long as the other is the separated object of my contemplation or observation. It is only possible when I step into an elemental relation with the other, that is, when he becomes present to me. Hence I designate awareness in this special sense as 'personal making present'... (This is carried out by) 'imagining the real', for in its essential being this gift is not a looking at the other, but a bold swinging -- demanding the most intensive stirring of one's being -- into the life of the other. This is the nature of all genuine imagining, only that here the realm of my action is not the all-possible, but the particular real person who confronts me, whom I can attempt to make present to myself just in this way, and not otherwise, in his wholeness,
unity, and uniqueness, and with his dynamic centre which realizes all these things ever anew.

This "making present" is only one person's side of the matter, however. A truly fruitful relationship requires a mutuality of confirmation and response. It is ontologically complete only when the other recognizes that he is "made present" by me, accepts that, and reciprocates by "making me present" for himself. This mutuality of "making present" is the basic condition for personal becoming, he writes, not any kind of relation to oneself, as is often argued.

He goes on to say that man needs confirmation essentially in order to be human. An animal is itself without question.

It is different with man: Sent forth from the natural domain of species into the hazard of the solitary category, surrounded by the air of a chaos which came into being with him, secretly and bashfully he watches for a Yes which allows him to be and which can come to him only from one human person to another. It is from one man to another that the heavenly bread of self-being is passed.

It seems clear that Rogers is talking about something rather like a confirmatory stance when he describes the three attitudinal "threads" which a therapist tries to communicate to his client (1957). He thinks that these three "threads" are spoken of in some form by most of the important theorists of "helping relationships." They are warmth (or positive regard), genuineness and accurate empathy. Although these elements have been separated with some success for
empirical study, it seems clear that they are understood primarily as functioning together, in a total gestalt. In a summary statement, Rogers says (1958, p. 143):

I assume a constant and optimal set of conditions for facilitating (therapeutic) change . . . . I assume that the client experiences himself as being fully received. By this I mean that whatever his feelings -- fear, despair, insecurity, anger, whatever his mode of expression -- silence, gestures, tears, or words; whatever he finds himself being in this moment, he senses that he is psychologically received, just as he is, by the therapist. There is implied in this term the concept of being understood, empathically, and the concept of acceptance.

It should be noted that Rogers' terms "acceptance" and "receiving" are different in some respects from "confirmation" as used by Buber. The differences are made plain by a transcribed "dialogue" between the two (Buber, 1965). The differences are sharpest when considering the attempt to form relationship with, or confirm, someone who is "problematical:" i.e. divided against himself. To "accept" someone "totally" who does not "accept" himself, is a confusing idea, and in fact would seem necessarily a disconfirming process since the other's own frame of reference would be necessarily passed over by it. Buber, adopting what would seem to be the more adequate tack, characterizes confirmation as involving an active stand in regard to the conflicted polarities of the other's life, and wills outcomes of those conflicts perhaps undreamed of by the other. The differences between Rogers and
Buber seem largely due to the fact that the latter is articulating from a larger perspective an issue which Rogers leaves at the level of an apparent paradox -- that of a "person changer" (therapist) who "only accepts." It should be noted that in the development of a scale to measure confirmation Buber's treatment of the concept was primarily relied upon.

R. D. Laing (1961; 1964) in his treatment of this issue, has focussed attention on the "disconfirmation" pole of the construct, particularly as he finds it descriptive of the communicational patterns of families containing a schizophrenic member. As he writes (1961, p. 90):

In those families of schizophrenics that have been studied in detail, a consistent finding appears to be that there is minimal genuine confirmation of the parents by each other and of the child by each parent, separately or together, but there may not be obvious disconfirmation. One finds, rather, interactions marked by pseudo-confirmation, by acts which masquerade as confirming actions but are counterfeit . . . . The characteristic family pattern . . . does not so much involve a child who is subject to outright neglect or even to obvious trauma, but a child whose authenticity has been subjected to subtle but persistent mutilation, usually quite unwittingly. Moreover, it seems that if for many years lack of genuine confirmation takes the form of actively confirming the child's false self, he comes to be placed in such a false position that he feels guilt or shame at being honest or genuine about his "real" feelings.

The forms which such disconfirmation or pseudo-confirmation may take seem almost endless. Two of Laing's examples will
suffice here (ibid., pp. 92-93):

1. During direct observation of the relationship between a six-month-old child and its mother, the occasions in which smiling occurred were noted. It was observed, first of all, that infant and mother smiled at each other not infrequently. It was then further observed that the mother, during the periods of observation, never once responded with a smile to the infant's initial smile at her. She, however, evoked smiling in the infant by smiling herself, by tickling and playing with the infant. When she was the evoker of the infant's smiles, she in turn smiled back, but she responded with a flat, dull look if the infant took the initiative.

It appears that we have here an example of confirmation or endorsement given to compliant responses in the infant, and a total, in this one instance, failure to respond in a confirmatory manner to smiling initiated by the infant.

2. A little boy of five runs to his mother holding a big fat worm in his hand, and says, 'Mummy, look what a big fat worm I have got'. She says, 'You are filthy -- away and clean yourself immediately.' The mother's response is an example of what Ruesch (1958) has called a tangential response. In terms of the boy's feeling, the mother's response is at a tangent, as it were. She does not say, 'Oh yes, what a lovely worm.' She does not say, 'What a filthy worm -- you mustn't touch worms like that; throw it away.' She does not express pleasure or horror, approval or disapproval of the worm, but she responds by focussing on something which he has not considered and which has no immediate importance to him, namely whether he is clean or dirty.

Numerous theorists have related the issue of confirmation, or rather the absence of it, to the development of schizophrenic "illness." Imperviousness was held by Fromm-Reichmann (1948) to be one of the prime characteristics of the "schizophrenogenic mother," who does not listen to what her child "really" says, nor
to what he genuinely needs, but instead behaves toward him on the basis of her own needs. Several other theoretical formulations have been offered (e.g. Brodey, 1958; Wynne et al., 1958; Bowen, 1960) which seem to have as a common element an assertion that "schizophrenogenic" families are characterized by a lack of recognition of the other's presence, an indifference to his intentions and feelings.

The malignant effect of disconfirmation seems to lie primarily in its power to "mystify" the other person, so that he does not know himself with any certainty what his experience really is (Laing, 1965; 1967). Moreover, one may come to feel that he does in fact feel as he is told he does; that is, he acquiesces, without being aware of doing so, in the process of pseudo-confirmation. Any stirring of what he really feels (his actual prehension) may then be experienced with great alarm, as the encroachment of something dangerous and foreign, of the "not-me."

This mystification, or loss of experience, is in marked contrast to the active discovery of experience described by Gendlin as resulting from relating with a highly confirmatory therapist (1964, p. 136):

Personality change is the difference made by your responses in carrying forward my concrete experiencing. To be myself I need your responses, to the extent to which
my own responses fail to carry my feelings forward. At first, in these respects, I am "really myself" only when I am with you.

For a time, the individual can have this fuller self-process only in just this relationship. (Italics in original, denoting theoretical terms previously defined)

Psychotherapy of the kind described by Gendlin proceeds on the assumption that the client's process of active contact with, and articulation of, his felt experience has become frozen (i.e. his "experiencing" is not being "carried forward"). The therapist, by focussing attention on the client's felt experience (his "direct referent") sets the latter's own process of contact and articulation in motion.

Although the above discussion has moved with broad strokes, it can be seen that a number of writers have shared a concern in the ontological dimension of human communication. The issue of how much one makes known of himself to another is held to be related to the realness and immediacy with which he can grasp his own experiential being. And that realness in turn is held to be related to the kind of stance, whether confirming or disconfirming, held by the one to whom he would speak.

**Self-Actualization**

If the dark road to self-alienation and madness leads, as Laing and the other suggest, by way of self-concealment and
disconfirmation, then the way to a genuine and actualized life may lead the opposite direction. The statements already quoted by Jourard, Buber and Rogers suggest that they think this is the case. A person whose life, at least at some moments with some important person, is characterized by genuine self-disclosure, and who is received confirmingly by the other, should have a more clear, less conflict-ridden and less self-deceived relation to his own experiential world, than one who is never so disclosing and so confirmed.

Maslow, using a psychological language of motivations, traits and types, has audaciously written about the authentic life, as he conceives it (1962, p. 23):

Healthy people have sufficiently gratified their basic needs for safety, belongingness, love, respect and self-esteem so that they are motivated primarily by trends to self-actualization (defined as ongoing actualization of potentials, capacities and talent . . . .) as a fuller knowledge of, and acceptance of the person's own intrinsic nature, as an unceasing trend toward unity, integration or synergy within the person.

According to Maslow, a healthy or "self-actualizing" person differs from persons who are "deficiency-motivated" in several ways, one of which is his manner of perceiving and relating to other persons.

In essence, the deficit-motivated man is far more dependent upon other people than is the man who is predominantly growth-motivated. He is more "interested," more needful, more attached, more desirous.
This dependency colors and limits interpersonal relations. To see people primarily as need-gratifiers or as sources of supply is an abstractive act. They are not seen as wholes, as complicated unique individuals, but rather from the point of view of usefulness. What in them is not related to the perceiver's needs is either overlooked, or else bores, irritates and threatens. . . . Disinterested . . . perception of the other as unique, as independent, as end-in-himself -- in other words, as a person rather than a tool -- is the more difficult, the more hungry the perceiver is for deficit satisfaction.

Healthy, self-actualizing people are capable of an intensely rewarding, affirmatory, yet non-possessive stance toward important other persons which Maslow calls "being-love." Among other characteristics of "B-lovers" he states that:

B-lovers are more independent of each other, more autonomous, less jealous or threatened, less needful, more individual, more disinterested, but also simultaneously more eager to help the other toward self-actualization. . . . B-love . . . creates the partner. It gives him a self-image, it gives him self-acceptance, a feeling of love-worthiness and respect-worthiness, all of which permit him to grow. It is a real question whether the full development of the human being is possible without it. (ibid, p. 72)

It seems, from this description, that self-actualizing persons may be expected to be more confirming persons, more ready to approach other persons with a stance of "letting be." This leads to the final two concepts to be discussed.

Trust

For a person to disclose or to confirm would seem to
require trust, and it may be that persons who are relatively more prone to do these things are, in general, more trusting. In fact, a willingness to disclose would seem to require some trust that the other will respond confirmingly; and a willingness to confirm might presuppose a trust that the other will respond honestly in his self-expressions. In these senses of "trusting," at least, Maslow's "self-actualizing" person would be expected to show more trust than someone less self-actualizing.

**Personal Approach**

It would seem likely that the more "self-actualizing" a person is, the more he will tend, at least in personal situations, to approach others with a personalistic frame of reference. In an earlier effort to work operationally with these issues, I defined a personal view as (Carpenter, 1966):

... personal to the extent that it makes reference to (the other) person's "internal," experiential frame of reference. The view is impersonal to the degree that it lacks such reference. Another way of putting this is to say that a personal view definitely implies that the other person is a living, experiencing center of a personal world. That is, that he feels, knows, thinks, experiences, chooses, values, decides to act, etc. An impersonal view lacks this implication.

As defined, a personal approach toward a person would seem to be a necessary (but not a sufficient) condition for an act of
confirming; and similarly, a personalistic stance toward oneself would seem to be a prerequisite to disclosing oneself genuinely to someone else.

**The One-Way Glass Revisited**

It is these issues of self-disclosure, confirmation, and their attending concepts that I wish to approach in this study.

This is not the first psychological study aimed at irreducibly personal issues. The others seem to have proceeded, by and large, by an unspoken procedure of leaving impersonal working assumptions unarticulated and unreflectively mixed with the personal problems they would approach. Sometimes this seems to have worked out well, as in the case of the research of Truax and the other Rogerians studying "process variables." Yet it would seem that what success they achieved was in spite of their "official" operational frame of reference, not because of it.

Sometimes the result seems less fortunate. A recently published study of "self-disclosure" used as subjects men who were ordered to participate (Navy enlisted men). The subjects were given a deck of six cards each containing a "self-disclosure" previously scaled by elegant psychometric methods, and were told to "communicate" by selecting a card and reading it into a microphone
to "another sailor" who was ostensibly in a nearby room. They were "fed-back" "responses" automatically by a programmed tape-recorder with a small repertoire of general statements. Thus the men were told to disclose themselves by selecting a statement which was not their own and telling it to someone who did not exist. They were told to reveal themselves, but not about themselves, and to no one. I mention this research not to demean it. In many respects it seemed exemplary. It does, however, illustrate the kinds of pitfalls which threaten when one mixes impersonal methods with personalistic problems. The study was conceived and presented as a rigorous investigation of self-disclosure. Yet what may its results be said to mean?

It would surely be preferable to be consistently impersonal throughout. Matarazzo has studied the interactional phenomena of psychotherapy in this way, by rendering discussion into the purely objective data of sound and silence (1962; with Weitman and Saslow, 1963; with Wiens and Saslow, 1965). He has studied such things as length of speech, rate of exchanging utterances, durations of silence. His results, whatever else one might say of them, are cogent.

The variables dealt with in this study are of quite a different sort. They have to do with stances toward experience, and the
shifts in those stances. Self-disclosure vs. self-concealment has to do with the stance one takes toward his own experience, at least as he presents it to someone else. Self-disclosure is that stance in which I present myself to you as I actually experience myself to be, and in that, will an understanding on your part of me as I actually know myself. Self-concealment is a stance in which I present myself as something other than how I feel myself to be. I may lie about what I feel, or, more commonly perhaps, I may leave the "direct referent" (Gendlin, 1964) of feeling altogether and present myself as an embodiment of some current and easily recognizable stereotype (e.g. a "liberal," a "man," a "psychologist"). In this stance I will not your understanding, but something else, such as agreement or approval.

Confirmation vs. disconfirmation has to do with the stance one takes toward the experience of the other person. In confirmation I attend to how you experience yourself to be, and will an understanding of you in your own "frame of reference." In disconfirmation I focus on you as an instance of some class, and will an "objective" understanding of you, as you function as an item in some structure in my own (or some abstract) frame of reference.

Psychologists have typically adopted for their scientific endeavors a stance toward themselves which is self-concealing, and
a stance toward their subjects which is disconfirming. McCurdy (1968) has discussed the first matter in describing the psychologist's efforts to be an "objective observer" who does not effect what he observes. Yet, judging from the work of R. Rosenthal (1963) and others, even observing is not a neutral stance but actually exerts interpersonal effects. One attempted way out of this dilemma has been the deliberate adoption, by the observer, of the role of "anyone." As Floyd Allport has said (1967, p. 3):

> It seems as though we ought to remove the observer altogether, but still have the record. This of course is impossible. The observer must also be left there as a part of the world under observation. The problem is to adopt some criterion to assure us that what he is doing in this capacity is, in kind, just like what everything else in nature is doing. His act of observing and recording should present no "special case." He should be a participant but not a disturbing participant.

In practice, one finds experimenters reading pre-written instructions to subjects, "expressing" pre-rehearsed "emotional reactions" to them, etc. It seems clear that this is a stance of self-concealment, adopted by methodological fiat.

The stance typically adopted toward the subject is a disconfirmatory one, inasmuch as certain dimensions of his behavior are abstracted out and measured, and construed in some frame of reference not (almost certainly) the subject's own.
I do not mean to be raising a fatuous, sentimental complaint that such conduct is "not nice." I am disclosing a problem which I have experientially encountered, and am inviting the reader's understanding. The problem is how to study a pair of opposing stances from a frame of reference defined by only one of them -- how to study self-disclosure vs. self-concealment from a stance of self-concealment -- how to study confirmation vs. disconfirmation from a stance of disconfirmation. As an analogy, suppose an art critic wished to compare two periods of an artist's work: one in which he painted with vivid colors, and one in which he used only black, white and shades of grey; and suppose too that he gathered "data" for his inquiry by way of black-and-white photographs. The contrast he wished to study would disappear the moment he so approached it. The analogy may be filled out in a rather chilling way. Suppose it had been discovered by some Rogerian art critic that paintings construed as monochromatic actually lost hue and came to look that way. A later generation of art critics, coming upon the black-and-white paintings handed on to them might well conclude that the earlier concern about color had been merely "sentimental" or "philosophical."

It seems necessary, to me, to adopt an overarching person-alistic frame of reference within which our impersonal knowledge-
gathering can be subsumed and given perspective. This seems logically required by the fact that an impersonal point of view can be subsumed and used intelligibly within a personal point of view, but the opposite is not the case. This is a special example of the gestalt principle that the whole is more than the sum of its parts.

Science is itself more than the impersonal body of knowledge which it produces. It is first, if the reasoning of Polanyi (1958; 1964) is sound, a personal enterprise -- the enterprise of personal knowing. The fact that science is a personal activity finds special significance in psychology which is, at least from one point of view, the science of persons. So long as the focus is on aspects of persons which are sub-personal, the problem may escape crucial proportions. But when the "politics of experience" (to use Laing's phrase) are involved, the issue becomes inescapable.

This problem does not seem easily solved. George Kelly (1955) may have been on the way to a solution when he built the beginnings of a scientific psychology based on the assumption that all men were scientists and psychologists. He argued for a seamless bond between our nomothetic and impersonal construction of persons and our personal construction of them -- our construction of their construction systems. However we do it, it seems clear that we need a way of clearly articulating our psychological
activities at both the encompassing personal, and the subsidiary impersonal, levels of abstraction.
CHAPTER II

RESEARCH BACKGROUND

Preliminary Statement of Problem

The intent behind the present study was the investigation of self-disclosure and confirmation in the communication of mothers and college-age daughters. Both these variables were to be studied in various ways. Their relationship to certain situational factors was to be examined, as was their possibly reciprocating effect on each other. Their relation to other variables: self-actualization, interpersonal trust, and personal approach was also to be studied. No research could be found which was directly pertinent to these questions. However, a large number of studies are certainly related to it, and those which seemed most closely related are reviewed briefly here.

Self-Disclosures

1. Self-report Measures

A self-report questionnaire for the measurement of self-disclosure was developed by Jourard and Lzsakow (1958). Their
Self-Disclosure Inventory (SDI) consisted of 60 items, ten in each of six general categories of information about the self. The subject is asked to rate how much he has disclosed of the area represented by each item to each of five "target persons." Scored in different ways, this questionnaire has been used to study differential tendencies to disclose about different areas of experience, or to different target persons; and when given a total score for each subject, used to compare groups of subjects in their general "tendency to disclose." In the initial study on college students it was found that, in terms of subject variables, females reported more disclosures than males, and whites more than negroes. In terms of target persons, for unmarried subjects mothers were reported as receiving the highest level of disclosures, other persons less. Married subjects reported less disclosures to parents and friends than did single subjects, and most to the spouse. In terms of areas, more disclosures were reported in the areas of "Tastes and Interests," "Attitudes and Opinions" and "Work," and less in the areas of "Money," "Personality" and "Body." There was also a significant correlation found between reported liking for parents and reported disclosures to them.

In a later study, Jourard (1961) found considerable cross-cultural similarity in the pattern of findings just mentioned when his
American students were compared with British, Lebanese and Puerto Rican samples. The validity of the instrument received some test in a study by Jourard (1962), in which a significant correlation was found between the self-disclosure scores of nursing students and the ratings they were given a year later of "their ability to establish and maintain a communicative relationship with patients." Evidence for convergent and discriminant validity of the SDI was reported by Pedersen and Higbee (1968). They administered two forms of the scale along with the Social Accessibility Scale, (SAS), and in a multi-trait, multi-method analysis, concluded that the two disclosure scales performed similarly, but both measured a variable different from that measured by the SAS. Other studies attempting to test the validity of the SDI have produced negative results. Lubin and Harrison (1964) compared SDI scores of persons who participated in a 20-hour "group process training" session to ratings of their self-disclosure behavior in the interaction, and no relation was found. Another investigation (Himmelstein and Kimbrough, 1963) found no significant correlation between SDI scores and the number of discrete items of information about the self disclosed by graduate students making personal introductions in the classroom. Using the peer-nomination technique for assessing validity, Himmelstein and Lubin (1965) found no
correlations between the SDI and judgments by peers of the extent to which the individual was likely to confide in others, or to be confided in by them. Weigel and Warmath (1968) found no change in SDI after the subjects had participated in small-group therapy, even though behavioral increases in disclosures were noted. These authors concluded that the scale was not sensitive to such changes.

Haggerty (1964), in a construct-validity study, found a small but significant correlation between the Jourard test and a more behavioral measure of disclosure, the Self-Disclosure Sentence Blank (discussed below), but none with verbal disclosure in an interview situation, as measured by the Revealingness Scale (also discussed below).

The construct-validity of the SDI, in terms of its correlation with measures of "actual disclosure," has also been studied by Petersen and Breglio (1968). Written disclosures were elicited and measured on a 3-point scale (the exact use of which, unfortunately, was vaguely reported). These measures, totaled across several areas of experience, correlated significantly with total scores of the full-size SDI, but not quite significantly with a smaller (25 item) version of it.

Quinn (1965), using a somewhat altered form of Jourard's test, found that his subjects reported most disclosures to a close
friend, less to a complete stranger, who would never be seen again, and least to an acquaintance. He had predicted this result, and explained it as the result of an interaction between perceived power-to-hurt (or risk) and trust. Disclosure is risked to a permanent resident of one's life only if he is trusted; but for the evanescent "stranger on a train" the issue of trust is not raised.

Also using a self-report index of disclosure, a cluster of studies by Taylor and his colleagues (Frankfurt, 1965; Taylor, 1964; Taylor, Altman and Sorrentino, 1968) has shown a relationship between positive interpersonal experiences (high levels of "reward-cost evaluation") and higher disclosures. In a study on college roommates (Taylor, 1968) a relationship was found between reported self-disclosures and measure of information exchange and perceptual accuracy regarding the roommate's attitudes and values. Another set of studies (Taylor and Oberlander, 1969) dealt with perceptual-motivational variables in tasks stressing "people-oriented perception" in relation to reported self-disclosures. A greater ability for the recognition and discrimination of incomplete faces was found for high disclosers. High disclosers were also found to have lower recognition thresholds on the selection of tachistoscopically presented faces distributed among inanimate objects below recognition threshold. Further study showed that this effect obtained for human
vs. animal figures as well as for human vs. inanimate ones, suggesting that higher disclosers are highly "sensitized" to human objects.

Taylor and Altman (1966) have also provided for use in future research, a set of areas of self-disclosures scaled for "intimacy level" by use of self-reported willingness to disclose in the various areas.

It should be noted that all of the above research suffers from the difficulties of interpretation posed by the self-report mode of measurement. In the present case, it seems to take a particular form. Asking someone whether or not he discloses himself is about the same as asking him if he tells the truth. Whatever his answer, paradoxical difficulties of interpretation arise; for if he says he does tell the truth, he may be lying in saying so; and if he says he doesn't tell the truth, then how can he be believed?

2. **Written Self-Disclosure**

Greene (1964) developed a sentence completion blank technique for the direct, "behavioral" assessment of the subject's level of disclosures in completing sentence stems with instruction to "express your real feelings . . . about matters which are important to you." His rater's manual aims at the assessment of to
what extent the person's response purposively permits the reader to know him. Rating seems to be made primarily in terms of two variables; how personally important, or "core" the information given is, and how "private" or risky, or potentially socially undesirable it is. Greene reported results of three studies pertinent to the validity of his scale as follows: (1) Subjects role-playing a high-disclosing person were significantly higher on self-disclosure than subjects role-playing a non-self-disclosing person; (2) Subjects scored higher on self-disclosure under low-threat than under moderate-threat conditions; (3) Therapists' independent ratings of their patients' willingness to self-disclose correlated significantly with the patients' SDSB scores. Pedersen and Breglio (as mentioned above) also devised a measure for assessing the actual self-disclosures of written material, and found a relation to the SDI (1968a). They also (1968b) examined the relationship of this measure with various personality characteristics. No differences on the measures were found for females, although females were more disclosing than males in all areas but "money." For males, there was some evidence that higher measures of emotional instability were associated with higher levels of disclosure in the areas of "personality," "health" and "personal appearance."
3. **Verbal Self-Disclosures**

 Constructs closely related to self-disclosure, as it occurs in a face-to-face verbal exchange, are "Self-Exploration" and "Experiencing." Both measures stemmed from Rogers (1963) theories about personal growth in a therapeutic relationship and represent attempts to gain access to that intrapersonal growth process and study its development and its relation to other variables.

 Antecedents to these constructs, in their present form, come from research aimed at discriminating more and less successful psychotherapy cases. Peres (1947) found clients made a higher number of references to personal problems in successful than in unsuccessful cases, and her findings received corroboration by others (Steele, 1948, Wolfson, 1949, Seeman, 1949, Blan, 1953).

 Tomlinson and Hart (1962) used the Process Scale developed by Rogers, Walker and Rablen (1960), which is a global measure of the quality of the client's self-expression in terms of the degree of self-exploration, rigidity of constructs and degree of immediate experiencing. More successful cases scored higher on the Process Scale. Similar findings relating Process scores to outcome were reported by Wagstaff, Rice and Butler (1960); and in research on therapy with schizophrenics, Truax and Carkhuff (1964) found a positive relation between outcome measures (e.g. MMPI, Rorschach,
length of time hospitalized) and score on the Depth of Intrapersonal Exploration Scale. The last mentioned scale has also been studied in relation to the "therapist variables" discussed below (Rogers and Truax, 1962), and positive associations were found. Using self-exploration as the dependent variable in a Youden Square design, they found that both therapists and patients contributed to the levels of self-exploration obtained; that is, both an "eliciting" and a "dispositional" effect was found. Other studies have extended the use of these variables into the group therapy situation (Truax, Wargo and Carkhuff, 1966; Truax and Wargo, 1966). The Ebel intraclass reliability estimates of the Depth of Self-Exploration Scales which were found in a number of studies are reviewed in Truax and Carkhuff, 1967) and found to range from .68 to .88.

Gendlin (1962; 1964) has argued that personality growth in psychotherapy occurs as a result of the changes in quality of experiencing which attend the client's self-disclosures. A scale for rating this was devised by him and Tomlinson and revised by Mathieu and Klein (1963; 1967). In a study dealing with psychotherapy with schizophrenic patients (Rogers, Gendlin, Kiesler, and Truax, 1967) rated levels of experiencing were found to relate both to the level of accurate empathy offered by the therapist, and to the relative successfulness of the therapy, as assessed by outcome
measures (such e.g. length of time out of the hospital, decrease in indicants of pathology on MMPI scales, etc.).

Both the "Depth of Self-Exploration" and the "Experiencing" scales were designed for use with verbal interaction in psychotherapy. The Revealingness Scale (Rev Scale) was developed by Suchman (1965) to provide a means of discriminating among more everyday kinds of interactions, "when personal communication is not very deep." It is modeled after the Experiencing Scale, but is intended as an elaboration of its two lowest levels into more finely discriminated steps. Revealingness ratings are made on both content and stylistic considerations. This scale, in slightly altered form, is used in the current study, and will be described in detail in Chapter IV. Interjudge reliabilities (Pearson r's) were reported by Suchman to range between .53 to .72 for a large pool of judges. Testing the validity of his scale, Suchman role played two types of interviewers in half hour interviews with college undergraduates. His styles of interviewing were characterized as "personal" and "impersonal." In the first he tried to elicit a feeling of trust, and in the second he aimed at a "rational understanding" in a "crisp, objective, impersonal" manner. Revealingness (Rev) levels were elicited differentially by the two manners of interviewing. This effect was later replicated (Suchman, 1966), and Rev. scores were found to be
related to the P. I. Scale (a measure of personal approach discussed below) but not to scores on a self-report disclosure measure. A higher inter-rater reliability coefficient ($r = .87$) was found in this later study. In the construct validity studies mentioned above as having tested the relationship of the Rev scale and the Self-Disclosure Sentence Blank, reliability coefficients for the Rev scale in one (Haggerty, 1964) ranged from .36 to .86, and in the other (McLaughlin, 1966) ranged from .39 to .86.

In summary, it can be seen that the issue of self-disclosure has been approached by three main routes: written self-report, written self-expression and verbal self-expression. In the first approach the subject's own assessment provides a score, in the other two an outside judgement of the subject's behavior is made by a trained rater.

Research directed to the assessment of the validity of the self-report techniques have drawn mixed results; however, the self-report method has obvious advantages in terms both of the ease and rapidity with which scores can be collected, and of the absence of time-consuming and only partially reliable rating procedures upon which the other two methods must rely.

It would appear, for the present at least, that studies of self-disclosure should employ situations and methods of
measurement requiring the least possible operational "leap" from the problem area under investigation. Since the proposed research was to focus on the verbal communication of family members, measures which could directly treat such communication seemed preferable.

The original Process scale, and its more refined descendants, the "Experiencing" and "Depth of Self-Exploration" scales, have been used profitably, but for the most part research with them has centered on the atypical kinds of discussion found in intensive verbal psychotherapy. Suchman's Rev scale, with its differentiation of more everyday kinds of communication would seem to provide the best entry-point available for approaching the kinds of interaction of interest here. Even so, its use to date has solely been with interactions occurring in the context of very brief and artificial relationships. Its relevance to the communications of persons so differently related as mother to daughter is yet to be examined.

**Confirmation**

An original scale for the operationalization of the confirmation construct was built for this study, so no existing research may be cited concerning it. This scale is discussed in Chapter IV. In general, however, several investigators have used different
measures conceptually quite closely related to confirmation, and some of their work will be noted. Confirmation is taken here to refer to the position one person (A) takes toward another person's (B's) experience, as expressed by his responses to the self-expressions of B. In a confirmatory stance A clearly perceives and acknowledges B's self-expressions, and shows an interest in it for its own sake. A disconfirmatory stance is marked by misperception and distortion of B's intentions in his self-expressions, and an obvious desire to "find" only certain elements in his experience. A confirmatory stance implies an existential validity of the other person's point of view (as discussed in Chapter I), a disconfirmatory one does not.

Suchman's studies (1965, 1966) seemed to employ relatively confirming and disconfirming styles of interviewing in the "personal and impersonal" conditions presented, but the nature of these conditions is only generally described and they are not objectively measured.

The cluster of studies on "therapist attitudes" as elicitors of therapeutic process, which has stemmed from Rogers' (1961) theories, represents attempt to make objective measurement of constructs closely related to confirmation. Most of the work has focused on communication in psychotherapy. Accurate empathy,
positive regard (or warmth) and congruence have each been studied by the use of rating scales similar to the ones already described. The conceptual relation between confirmation as used here and the gestalt comprised of these three attitudinal variables was noted in Chapter I. Relationships which were found between these variables and the variables of experiencing and self-exploration, were mentioned above. With various groups of clients, relationships have also been found between these variables and various measures of positive outcome, or enhanced adjustment and functioning (summarized by Truax and Carkhuff, 1967).

Although there are no reported studies of family interaction in terms of these variables, as would be most pertinent here, there are a few dealing with relationships other than psychotherapy. Working with preschool children and their teachers, Truax and Tatum (1966) found that changes in the children's preschool performance and social adjustment were related to the degree of warmth and empathy given them by their teachers. Genuineness was not found to be related.

Christensen (1960) found that rated warmth given to students was related to the latter's achievement levels on measures of vocabulary and arithmetic, while Duskin (1956) found that teachers higher in accurate empathy were better able to maintain harmonious
interpersonal relations in the classroom. Aspy (1965), in a neatly
designed study controlling for sex, IQ and initial levels of achieve-
ment, found that the gains in reading achievement of 3rd grade stu-
dents varied as a function of the level of the (combined) conditions
of empathy, regard and genuineness which were shown them by
their teachers. In fact, in this study, the effect of high vs. low
conditions was as great as that of high vs. low levels of intelli-
genence. These findings were corroborated in a study by Aspy and
Hadlock (1966), and high vs. low levels of conditions were found to
relate to rate of truancy as well.

A scale developed by Mishler and Waxler (1968) as a rating
of "Responsiveness," the Acknowledgement Code, was used more
than any other as a basis for the development of the Confirmation
Scale used in this study. It was developed for the study of family
communications and was used in the research reported to compare
communicational styles of families having a schizophrenic child
from those having only normal children. Schizophrenic families
were further broken down into those with a child who was "poor"
on the Phillips (1953) Scale of Premorbid Adjustment, and those
with one who was "good" on the scale. Their rating procedure
treats each block of speech (bounded before and after by someone
else's speech) both as a "stimulus" for the speech to follow, and as
a "response" to the statement which preceded it. By these means, they intended to "measure the degree to which the intent and content of a particular statement are acknowledged, or taken into account, by the following speaker." (p. 33). Specific coding rules were set for rating responses to various classes of stimuli (e.g., fragments, statements, questions). The rationale for the codes came from Ruesch's (1957) discussion of modes of acknowledgment, and devious acknowledgment, as well as from the examples of "fragmented communication" given by Wynne and Singer (1963). As conceived, the scale discriminated four levels of acknowledgment: none, low, moderate and high. Coding reliability for the complete scale could not, however, be brought to an acceptable level. As used, the scale was collapsed to a binary distinction, between responses with no acknowledgment and those with some. A person's score in an interaction was a ratio of the number of acts containing some acknowledgment to the total number of codable acts. Used in this way, coding reliability was sufficiently accurate. Differences in rate of acknowledgment were found across all three groups of families (normal, "good" schizophrenic and "poor" schizophrenic) with the normals being most acknowledging, "goods" less, and "poors" least.
In summary it seems that this general issue of confirmation in verbal communication is empirically workable and potentially important. The present research departs from these precedents in at least two respects, however. First, the kinds of differentiations focussed on in the previous research probably have little negotiability in the interactions to be studied here. The highly confirmatory responses of the psychotherapist, like the highly disconfirmatory ones of the schizophrenic's mother, are probably rare in "normal" communications. The second departure is the focus here on family communication. Many of the relationships studied by the Rogerians were intense and intimate ones but none were familial. While the Mishler and Waxler study was on the communication of families, no attempt was made to differentiate among various kinds of "normal" communication.

Self-Actualization

Maslow (1950) reported a non-experimental, impressionistic investigation of a number of persons, both contemporary and historical, who he perceived as being highly self-actualized or psychologically healthy. His "findings" consisted of the "development of a global or holistic impression of the sort that we form of our friends and acquaintances." (p. 164)
He felt that his impressions of these people fell into several clusters of characteristics which set them off from less-healthy, "normal" people. Examples of the title he gave such clusters were "more efficient perception of reality and more comfortable relations with it," "acceptance of self, others and nature," and "spontaneity." Along with the "acceptance" cluster, three other descriptions seem particularly pertinent to the issues of disclosure and confirmation. These are "spontaneity," "Gemeinschaftsgefühl" or fellow-feeling as described by Adler, and a capacity for very profound interpersonal relations. In a later paper, Maslow (1967) argued specifically for the application of the self-actualization concept not as a static typology characterizing only a few extraordinary people, but as a process (self-actualizing) which characterizes any human life more or less, and is effectable by choice, self-discipline, and by "helping-relationships" characterized by a "taoistic uncovering and then helping," by (although Maslow does not use the term) confirmation.

Shostrom (1965) developed a questionnaire technique for the measurement of self-actualization, the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). The theories of Maslow (1954; 1962) were used in generating the items, as were the statements of Reisman et al (1950) regarding inner and other directedness and May's et al (1958) and
Perls (1947; 1951) concept of time orientation. Items and item factors were established on the basis of face validity. The scale yields scores on 12 scales all held to be pertinent to self-actualization. Shostrom indicates that two of them however, Time- Competence (TC) and Inner Direction (I) are considered to provide the best estimates of overall level of self-actualization.

Evidence for the validity of the scale has been found in several studies. Shostrom (1964) found that the test significantly discriminated between groups nominated by clinical psychologists as "relatively self-actualized and relatively non-self-actualized." Evidence for concurrent validity of the scale was found in a study of Shostrom and Knapp, (1966) in which all 12 POI scales significantly discriminated therapy clients who were just beginning treatment from those well along in treatment. Similarly, Fox (1965) found higher POI scores for normals and nominated "self actualized" persons than for psychiatric patients. The finding was replicated by Fox, Knapp, and Michax (1968). Other studies (Zaccaria and Weir, 1966; Galele and Weir 1968; and Murray, 1966) found the POI useful in discriminating alcoholics from non-alcoholics, alcoholics receiving therapy from others not receiving therapy, and teachers who were rated by their students as having high levels of "concern for students" from teachers not so rated. Similarly, Fisher (1968)
found that POI scores of a group of psychopathic felons were significantly lower than scores of normals, and significantly higher than scores of psychiatric inpatients. Equivocal or invalidating studies with the measure have also been reported. Culbert, Clark and Babele (1968) found a predicted increase of POI scores from beginning to end of a sensitivity training experience for one group, but not for another. Vance (1967) found no significant correlation between the POI and a questionnaire measure of adjustment, the Mental Health Analysis. Klavetter and Mogar (1967) reported an analysis of the POI in term of stability and internal consistency of the test. An examination of stability coefficients and intercorrelations indicated that 3 of the 12 scales (I, TC, and Self-actualizing Value) accounted for almost all the variance. They concluded that performance on the test could be more accurately and parsimoniously expressed on fewer than the twelve postulated dimensions. In general, it would seem that the POI has some utility for distinguishing groups already diagnosed as in some way "pathological" from others not so diagnosed, but its value for distinguishing among degrees of self-actualization among normals may be in some doubt. It was chosen for use in this study even so, because other measures of self-actualization which have been reported upon (e.g. McKinney, 1968) are of even more dubious validity.
Interpersonal Trust

Rotter (1967) has developed a scale to measure the generalized expectancy that the oral or written statements of other people can be relied upon. The scale is constructed to be free of response-bias due to social desirability and yea-saying and has high internal consistency and test-retest reliability. An assessment of construct and discriminant validity was done using sociometric ratings of groups (2 sororities and 2 fraternities) who had had a long acquaintance for mutual observations. Trust as measured was significantly associated with ratings of trust.

It was negatively related to dependency, not related to gullibility and positively related to humor, friendship, popularity, and especially trustworthiness. Rotter points out that the concept of trust, as he is using it, should be pertinent to the development of adequate family relationships and of healthy personalities of children, as well as a prerequisite for successful psychotherapy. He speculates that it may be an important variable in human learning in general. He says (p. 651):

Much of the formal and informal learning that human beings acquire is based on the verbal and written statements of others, and what they learn must be significantly affected by the degree to which they believe their informants without independent evidence.
Personal-Approach

Carpenter (1966) developed a rating procedure for measuring the extent to which one person's description of another was personal; that is, construed in terms of the other's own frame of reference, needs, feelings, etc. Descriptions were always elicited with instructions to "write as well as you can what he or she is really like as a person. That is, write the few most important things you can think of regarding what he or she is really like." Acceptable rating reliability for these Personal-Impersonal (P-I) scores was achieved, and several studies using the instrument were conducted. College students were found to write more personal descriptions of persons in their own lives when those persons were both well-liked and well-known than when they were either liked but not well-known or well-known but disliked. An experimental manipulation of attention-set of the perceiver (whether they were asked to listen as a potential employer or a potential friend) and self-disclosure level of the target person was carried out with groups of subjects listening to a tape recording of people talking. Results indicated that both variables effected the personal-ness of the resultant understanding reported. In another study the scale was used as a personality measure by scoring the understanding subjects reported of the most important male and female persons in their lives. These scores were correlated with certain
measures, and predicted relationships were found with the California F Scale, the Self-Disclosure Sentence Blank, and the dimensions of "thinking-feeling" and "sensation-intuition" on the Myers Briggs Type Indicator.

McLaughlin (1966; also in Carpenter, 1966) studied the interaction of high- and low-revealing interviewers and high- and low-revealing interviewees. Accounts were written of the interviewers by the interviewees after a 30-minute session. Level of personalness was found to vary as a function of the disclosure-level of the target person, but not of that of the writer.

Suchman in the study mentioned above, (1966), interviewed his subjects in "personal" and "impersonal" ways. Accounts written by the subjects about the interviewer were found to receive higher P-I scores after the "personal" interview than after the "impersonal" one. The P-I scores were also found to relate positively to the amount of revealingness which the subjects had produced during the interview.

Otten (1967) compared freshman and graduate students of different fields in a developmental study of self-determination and personal approach. Self-determination was measured by Rotter's Internal-External Scale and Ezekiel's Personal Future Test made up of 4 sub-tests. Personal approach was assessed by a P-I measure
of accounts of the most important male and female in the subjects' life, and by Greene's Self-Disclosures Sentence Blank. P-I scores were higher for the graduate students than for the freshmen, which was taken by Otten to indicate a difference in development of interpersonal adjustment. Some evidence was produced for convergent and discriminant validity of the scale when considering the graduate student data. The P-I correlated significantly with the SDSB, but not with any of the other scales. No such effect was found for the freshmen data where, in fact, none of the measures correlated significantly with any of the others.

**Family Communication**

It seems a curious phenomenon that two of the most stimulating areas of relatively new research to develop in the last few years -- that of disclosure and responsiveness on the one hand, and of family interaction on the other -- seem to have produced very little cross-fertilization. Whatever the reasons, there is virtually no work in the imaginative and burgeoning area of family communication that deals directly with the issues of disclosure and confirmation, save for the work on "Responsiveness" by Mishler and Waxler (1968) mentioned above. A great deal of work has some relevance to the current study, though, and some of it is mentioned briefly.
Most of the thinking and research in the area has focused on the family as an aid to understanding and explaining the development of psychopathology in a family member. Following the interpersonal elaborations of psychoanalytic theory by such writers as Sullivan (1953) and Eriksen (1950), attention became more centered on the family as an important agent in the development of mental illness. Fromm-Reichman conception of the "schizophrenogenic mother" (1945) was an important stimulant to research focusing on family etiology of mental illness. Rabkin (1965) has characterized the research of the 1940's and 1950's dealing with these problems as largely "trait studies" -- attempts to correlate specific parental attitudes (e.g. overprotectiveness, rejection) with specific traits or clusters of response-tendencies in the child (e.g. aggression and autism). A large number of such studies is summarized by Spiegel and Bell (1959). Much subsequent work has focused on family interaction, in an effort to identify and describe pathological patterns of interaction relevant to the development of individual psychopathology. Haley (1962) Handel (1965), and Fontana (1966) point out that family interaction studies are fraught with difficult and often unique methodological problems, but assert that these are not insurmountable.

A number of theorists (Bateson et al., 1956; Haley, 1959; Jackson, 1965; Lidz et al., 1957; Lidz et. al., 1965; Wynne et. al., 1958)
have offered heuristic theoretical positions regarding the etiological significances of family interaction in the development of schizophrenia in particular. All of these conceptions involve, to some extent, the assertion that relatively poor communication characterizes pathological relationships.

A number of researchers have addressed themselves to the quality of communication in pathological relationships. The quality of communication would seem to involve the ability and willingness of one person to make his experiences understood by another, and to understand in return. Well-controlled studies by Alkire (1966), Fisher et. al (1959), Lennard et. al. (1965), Stabenan et. al. (1965), Morris and Wynne (1965), Lerner (1964, 1965), Ferreira and Winter (1968a, 1968b), and Reiss (1967a, 1967b, 1968) all demonstrate the relationship of the level of mental disturbance or health of the family member to the quality of communication in his family. Vagueness, ambiguity, disruption, distortion, paucity of content, and indirection in dealing with disagreements, have all been found to be characteristic of the family communication patterns of more severely disturbed families. Such communication, as Ruesch (1957), and Laing (1964), have pointed out (using slightly different terminologies) are neither truly disclosing nor truly confirming. A study by Laing (1966) brought the issues of pathological communication and
disclosure-confirmation more directly to bear upon each other than previous ones had, but his research instrument (the Interpersonal Perception Method) seems confounded with all the problems of interpretation which have been discussed by Chronback (1956) as characteristic of dyadic levels of analysis, so interpretation of his results seems unclear.

Overview

A sizable body of research can be found which has pertinence to the main constructs in this study -- self-disclosure and confirmation -- as well as to those of lesser interest -- self-actualization, personal-approach and interpersonal trust. Direct and specific precedents, however, are not to be found. This study is intended as an investigation of the communications of normal family members. Research on both disclosure and confirmation has focussed primarily on unusual and extreme forms of communication, often by abnormal groups of persons, in the context of non-familial relationships. Personal approach has been related to the disclosure of normal persons but not in familial interaction; and it has not been studied in relation to confirmation. Self-actualization and interpersonal trust have not been studied in relation to disclosure or confirmation at all, nor in regard to any dimension of familial interaction.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN AND EXPECTATIONS

Purpose of the Investigation

The constructs of self-disclosure and confirmation are assumed to represent important variables in interpersonal communication.

This study is intended to be an exploratory investigation of the variables in term of their relations to each other and their relations to the following other factors.

1. Relationship-type. The kind of interpersonal relationship in which the interaction is occurring presumably has some effect on the levels of the variables under study. More intimate relationships, interactions produced by the girls with their own mothers are compared to interactions with a stranger.

2. Disposition. Much of the literature dealing with these concepts assumes that a person's proneness toward revealing or concealing himself, and toward confirming or disconfirming others, may be understood in dispositional terms; that is, that persons are characterized by relatively stable "baselines" or dispositional
tendencies to reveal or confirm. In the proposed study, the strength of the subjects' dispositions for revealing and confirming are estimated by the levels of these things produced in brief standardized interview situations in which, hopefully, important situational and interpersonal variables are held constant. The girl's disclosure level in the interview with an experimenter is used as a "base-line" measure of disclosure, and hence as a measure of her "disposition" or tendency to disclose. Similar "base-line" and dispositional scores on each mother's confirmingness will be taken from her confirmation level when interviewing the co-ed confederate.

3. Intimacy-level of the area of inquiry. Taylor and Altman (1966a, 1966b) have constructed a set of "intimacy-scaled stimuli for use in studies of interpersonal relationships." A pool of 671 topics (e.g. "my feelings about blind dates," "the amount of money I spend buying sports equipment") were rated by 180 sailors who had just completed recruit training. Each item was placed on an 11 point continuum as to its degree of intimacy. The items were then scaled using the method of equal-appearing intervals. Unfortunately, the scale values obtained are presumably valid only for a population of subjects similar to the ones that made the original ratings. Another problem was presented by the fact that the topics were all so delimited that they would not normally yield the amount
of discussion desired. I attempted to make an approximation of appropriate topic areas by grouping several related items together into clusters which seemed likely to have relatively high or low intimacy values for the college girls to be tested here, and which seemed general enough to produce sufficient discussion. This method of operationalization was admittedly informal, but it seemed about the best sort of approximation that could be obtained. Levels of disclosure and confirmation produced when discussing a relatively "high-intimacy" area are compared to scores from a relatively "low-intimacy" area.

4. **Intra-familial "style," or level of personalness.** Confirmation and disclosure may be influenced by the levels of these qualities which are typical of interaction in the person's "core," or centrally important (usually familial) relationships.

Thus, families may be characterized by relative levels of disclosure and confirmation. It may be that some families typically tolerate, illicit and produce communications low in the "ontological dimension" (i.e., in the terms used here, low in disclosure and confirmation), while other families may be typified by higher levels. If so, then the tendencies of different family members to disclose and confirm might be positively related. Some suggestion that this may be true, at least in extreme cases, is given by the conclusion
of various observers (see Chapter II) that families which contain a schizophrenic member tend to be internally consistent in tendencies toward poor communication.

Thus, family members may tend to resemble one another with respect to the dispositional levels of disclosure and confirmation which they display. This study examines the extent to which the disposition to confirm on the part of the mothers is related to the disposition to disclose shown by their daughters. To test this, the scores obtained in the respective "base-line" situations are correlated.

5. **Reciprocal relationship of confirmation and disclosure.** It seems likely that the level of confirmation of one person in an interaction is related to the level of disclosure of the other, and vice versa. Such an interdependence would be analogous to that ordinarily seen between "giving" and "accepting," for example. In most interactions (e.g. paying a clerk for a purchase) the amount of giving done by one person tends to be matched by the amount of accepting done by the other, if not initially, then rapidly after readjustments which each makes to the perceived intentions of the other. A receptive smile given in response to a tentatively disclosing statement may induce confidence in the other which encourages more disclosure. The presence of such a possible interdependence
is examined by comparing levels of "base-line" confirmation elicited by high and low revealing girls (in terms of prior "dispositional" measures) when being interviewed in the other-mother condition; and also by examining the strength of correlation between self-disclosure and confirmation within each segment of interaction. The relations between Rev and Con scores in each of the mother-daughter conditions are examined.

6. **Three personality variables.** Measures of three personality variables conceptually related to the major constructs were also obtained from subjects, in order to examine possible correlations. The three were "self-actualization," "interpersonal trust" and "personal approach."

The measure adopted for self-actualization is the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) of Shostrom, described in Chapter II. Since three of the twelve scales of the test have been found (Klavetter and Mogar, 1968) to represent factors accounting for almost all the variance among the items, these three (Time-Competence, Inner-Direction, and Self-Actualizing Value) are used as measures of the subject's level of self-actualizing.

The Rotter Impersonal Trust Scale, also described in Chapter II, is adopted as a measure of the subject's generalized expectancy that the verbal or written word of others can be relied upon.
The Carpenter Personal-Impersonal Scale (P-I Scale) also discussed in Chapter II, is adopted as a measure of personal approach. The scale is applied to written descriptions by the girls (not the mothers) of the most central male and female persons of their lives, and estimates the extent to which these centrally important figures are understood in a personal manner. (See appendix IV for the scale's rating manual).

The experimental focus was on a situation in which the girl was interacting with a parent, with the former being asked to reveal herself, while the mother was asked to try to develop a full and accurate understanding of the girl's position. College freshmen girls and their mothers were chosen as subjects. A variety of considerations entered into this choice. College students were more easily solicited as subjects than any other group. Since the child's task would be to disclose herself, girls were preferable to boys since the former have been found, in several studies, to both report and demonstrate wider ranges of self-disclosures; and, also, mothers are generally more easily convinced to participate in such bothersome affairs than fathers. The rate of refusals (no money was available for payment) was expected to be high in any case, and it seemed wise to try to keep it as low as possible. Same-sex
rather than opposite-sex pairs were chosen since the same-sex parent-child relationship is generally assumed to be more critical in the development of the child's personality; and it seemed there that the child would be most likely to learn the "rules" for interpersonal communication which would pattern later relationships. It was hoped, in part, to be able to sample these rules in this study.

The basic situation studied was that of a college girl discussing with someone her feelings and opinions about some issue. Sometimes the girl was talking with an experimenter who was following a somewhat standardized procedure, sometimes with her own mother, and sometimes with another girl's mother who she had never met before. Each mother, for her part "interviewed" her own daughter, another girl who she had never met, and a co-ed confederate who each time told a relatively standardized story. Each subject took part in all three conditions.

Selection and Solicitation of Subjects

Subjects were Ohio State University freshman girls whose parents resided in the Columbus area and their mothers. Since both confirmation and disclosure, as measured, are estimated from verbal behavior, it seemed wise to attempt to eliminate any contaminating effect of verbal intelligence prior to the study proper.
Scores on the American College Test, or ACT were made available by the university. Although no direct measure of verbal ability is produced by this test, two scores, "English" and the "composite score," are assumed to be particularly highly related to such ability. Therefore, only girls whose scores in both these categories did not exceed one standard deviation either direction from the mean were considered further (local norms were used).

Letters were sent to some 500 of the remaining girls requesting their participation in a study on "interpersonal communication." They were asked to indicate their willingness to participate by returning the enclosed form. The form also elicited the following information:

1. Whether or not they were willing to become involved in discussions about their personal feelings and opinions.
2. Whether they were married or single.
3. Whether they were currently living in the parental home or had done so within the last twelve months.
4. Whether or not their mothers would be willing to participate in the study by coming to the university with their daughters for an hour or two of discussion on "family communications." Girls whose replies indicated that they were not willing to engage in personal discussion, were married, had not lived at home for the past twelve months, or whose mothers were unwilling to participate were excluded from further consideration. Others were contacted for appointments.
Thus, subjects were all female freshmen, single, currently or recently living in the paternal home, and of middling verbal ability in terms of local university norms. All indicated a willingness to engage in personal discussion for the research. As it happened, all subjects who appeared were Caucasian; so the variable of racial group may be said to have been controlled as well.

Procedure in the Experimental Session

The Ohio State University Behavioral Science Laboratory provided the facilities for the study. For each session two co-experimenters and two co-ed confederates were present. The co-experimenters (one of whom, myself, was at all sessions) were all advanced graduate students in clinical psychology, and all had had experience in interviewing and psychotherapy. The confederates were undergraduate college girls from the Columbus area, of comparable age and college experience to the subjects, who were paid for their participation. Two mother-daughter pairs were scheduled for each session. The procedure for the session is outlined below. (See Figure I for an overview of the steps each pair of subjects went through)

1. Each co-experimenter greeted one mother-daughter pair and led them and one of the confederates to a pair of adjoining
FIGURE I

STEPS OF EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

Note: the own-mother and other-mother conditions, and the high-intimacy and low-intimacy conditions were given in each order an equal number of times. See Figure 2.
interviewing rooms. The confederate was left in one, and asked to wait. The mother and daughter were then taken into the adjoining room.

2. After brief chatting and answering initial questions, the experimenter read the following instructions:

We are interested in studying certain characteristics of college-age girls. You (to girl) were selected and asked to participate because our records indicate that you are a normal and representative member of your class.

Tonight we have two main goals: the first is to get some idea about how daughters actually communicate with their mothers, and the second is to find out just what you (to girl) are really like as a person.

In regard to the first matter, how daughters communicate with their mothers, we have a lot of theories but not many real facts. We know especially little about how normal people, like yourselves, behave.

As for the second goal, of finding out what you are really like, let me just say that we would like to find out as clearly and completely and richly as possible just how you feel and think about some important areas of your life. It's your experience, how these things look to you, that we are especially interested in finding out about. (to mother) Since you are her mother, and know her as well as you do, we would like you to help us in this by interviewing your daughter and finding out for us just what she really does feel and think about these things. Please use your knowledge of her to help you get a really complete and accurate picture of how she feels. I will give you some areas to ask about. Try to make sure that you know just how she really feels about each of them. Check with her to be sure her answers are clear to you before you go on to the next question.

Of course, all this information will remain private. It will be coded, and your names will not appear on any materials.
Still, after we are through, if you don't want us to include your discussion then we will destroy the records.

I'm sure you noticed as you came in here that some other freshman girls and their mothers are also here? Besides discussion between the two of you about the things I mentioned, we would also like you (M) to talk with another girl as well; and we would like you (D) to also talk with another girl's mother. Okay? If you have any questions about what I've said so far, I'll try to answer them.

Now, each of the two discussions I mentioned just now will take about 20 minutes. Before you get into those, we would like each of you to take part in another interview of about 10 minutes in length. I would like to talk with you (D) briefly, and I would like you (M) to try your hand at the interviewing with a 10 minute session with another girl. After that, we'll get started on the two longer talks. Okay?

3. The experimenter then asked the daughter to wait for him a moment while he took the mother to the adjoining room.

Once there, he introduced the mother and the confederate, and then read the following:

(Introductions . . .) I would like you to try your hand at the kind of interviewing I am asking you to do here tonight. I would like you (M) to try to find out just what ___'s college experience so far has meant to her. What effect it has had on the way she sees herself, on her plans for the future, and in general how her college experiences have changed her and are changing her as a person. I'd like you to talk about this for a few minutes. I'll leave, and come back shortly. Any questions?

The confederate was introduced to the mother simply as a girl with about the same amount of experience with college as her own daughter, and no explicit mention was made of her being a
confederate. No effort was made to hide this, however, and it was expressed openly by the experimenter if he was asked, or by the confederate herself if it became appropriate during the course of their conversation. The confederates were asked not to try to act, but to treat the conversation as an ordinary social meeting in which they were asked to express some of their experiences. They were asked to be honest and to speak in whatever manner was most comfortable for them, so long as their talk was neither superficial nor inappropriately "deep." Mainly, they were asked to tell essentially the same story to each mother by whom they were interviewed, insofar as the idiosyncratic structuring of different mothers permitted it. Since the same pair of confederates assisted in almost all the sessions, their own sense of consistency, it was hoped, would provide a kind of standardization. On five occasions one of the regular confederates could not be present, but her substitute was thoroughly briefed beforehand both by the chief experimenter and by one of the "regulars" as to the kind of approach that was normally adopted.

4. The experimenter then returned to the daughter in the adjoining room and read:

I'd like to talk with you for just a few minutes -- Partly in order to get acquainted, partly to give you some idea of the kind of questions we will be asking later. Everyone knows
that college is an important time for a person, often a time that makes important and lasting changes in one's life. I'd like you to tell me just what your college experiences so far have meant to you. During these few minutes, I would like you to tell me of your feelings as a new college student, so that I can understand what this experience is really like for you, so I can see it as you do, or from your point of view, as much as possible. How has it been for you so far, and what changes do you find it making in your life?

Once the question was posed the experimenter was to conduct a "Rogerian" interview by following the girl's lead and trying to understand clearly and receptively whatever she said to him. In general, he was to convey a friendly interest and to "pick-up on" the more personally important aspect of whatever she said, and thus encourage the girl to express herself as freely and deeply as she might wish. Male experimenters were employed out of expediency, since it was not possible to pay experimenters for their help, and I intended to do one of the two interviews in each session myself. Incidentally, this seemed to present no opportunity for inadvertent "experimenter bias" effects, since the baseline interview was conducted before any other data was collected. Since it seemed preferable to control the variable of sex of the baseline interviewer, only other males were asked for help in that role.

5. After ten minutes of discussion the experimenter led the daughter to either her own mother or the other girl's mother (the "own-family" and "other-family" conditions were each used first for
half of the sessions, randomly chosen). The confederate was asked to leave, and the experimenter read the following to the subjects:

Remember, we are interested in trying to find out as richly and completely as possible just how your daughter (or other girl) actually does feel and think about the two areas mentioned here. (give M card with two question-areas on it). It's her own point of view that we are especially interested in finding out about. Take about 10 minutes with each area. Ask her about the first one, ______, first, and talk with her until you feel she has pretty well said how she feels and thinks about it. Then go on to the other one. Take about 10 minutes with each one. When the clock there is at ______, it will be about time to go on to the next question. I'm not going to specify any certain interviewing procedures for you to follow; just talk with her as you normally would (or as you would talk with your own daughter). Any questions? I'm leaving now. I'll knock and come back in about 20 minutes.

The experimenter then gave the mother a card with two inquiry areas on it (described below) and left the two alone.

6. After twenty minutes had elapsed, the experimenter returned and asked the daughter to accompany him. The two experimenters then "switched" daughters, taking each to be inter-viewed by the mother with whom the other girl had just been talking. The mothers were asked to keep the card, and to use the same inquiry areas. The experimenter then reiterated the instructions to the mother, as follows:

You're asked to proceed as you did just now. Remember, we're interested in getting a complete and full picture of just how _______ really does feel and think about these areas. Again, take about 10 minutes with each area. When
the clock is at ___ it will be about time to go on to the second area. Again, just talk as you normally would (or, as you would to your own daughter). Any questions? Okay, I'm leaving and I'll be back in about twenty minutes.

7. After twenty minutes the experimenter returned. The daughter was taken back to her own mother, if she was not already with her. The experimenter then answered any questions which the two had about the study. He then asked if they were willing to take some questionnaires home, fill them out, and mail them back. If so (all were willing) each subject was given a POI and an IPT scale, and the daughter was given two P-I blanks, one for a description of "the male person she knew best and felt closest to," the other for "the female person she knew best and felt closest to." The experimenter then gave the subjects a return envelope, and thanks, and the session ended.

There were four inquiry areas, two of which were given at a time for use in each twenty minute interview period. The areas were arranged in four sets, as follows:

Set A-1

1. What it takes to make her worried, anxious and afraid; and what makes her happy.

2. How she likes best to spend her leisure time. What social activities she most enjoys. What people she likes doing things with.
Set B-1

1. How she thinks college changes a girl's relationships with her parents, and how she feels about the changes. What she feels about the "generation gap" as she experiences it in her own life.

2. Her feelings, fears and ideals regarding her personal appearance.

Set A-2 comprised the same areas as set A-1, but in reverse order; likewise B-2 was the same as B-1, but in reverse order.

In half the sessions (randomly picked) sets A-1 and B-1 were used, each given to one of the mothers. In the other half of the session sets A-2 and B-2 were used. Sets A-1 and B-1 contain the area assumed to be high in intimacy value first, and the low intimacy item second. Sets A-2 and B-2 began with the low intimacy area.

Each session thus yielded twelve discrete blocks of discussion, each roughly ten minutes long, and each permitting a measure of disclosure (for the daughter) or a measure of confirmation (for the mother) or both. The level of disclosure displayed by the girl in the experimenter-condition was taken as her "base-line" of disclosure; and, similarly the mother's level of confirmation when interviewing the confederate was taken as her "base-line" level of confirmation.
Overview of Design

In all, thirty sessions were planned (although more were carried out, due to loss of data caused by recording difficulties). The first five sessions were pilot testing. These sessions served two functions. First, they permitted the discovery and elimination of various "bugs" (awkward procedures, poorly-worded inquiry areas, mechanical recording problems, etc.); and they also yielded data suitable for use in developing and testing the rating scales for disclosure and confirmation, and also for training raters on those scales. These issues are discussed in Chapter IV.

The twenty-five experimental sessions were to be analyzed in two ways. The first was by analyses of variance treating the disclosure and confirmation scores obtained in the mother-daughter interviews as the dependent variables; and the girl's "baseline" disclosure, the own-mother vs. other-mother condition, and the intimacy level of the inquiry area, all treated as independent variables. Sixteen sessions were required for the experimental design. Sessions differed in terms of pairings of the baseline disclosure levels of the girls. Girls were divided into two groups more-disclosing (MD) and less-disclosing (LD) according to whether their disclosure level in the experimenter interview was above or below the median for scores in that condition. Girls of each level were to be paired
with other girls of each level an equal number of times, and the
effects of order of presentation of the other two variables were to
be controlled by counter balancing. A number of sessions appropri-
ate for this was sixteen, as the schema below shows. (Note that
"N" below refers to the number of sessions.) See Figure II.
(Page 83).

Thus, considering the 32 daughters involved in the 16 ses-
sions, there were two girls in each combination of pairings and
orders. For example, four girls who were MD were paired with
four other girls who were also MD. Two pairs of these girls (two
sessions) spoke with their own mothers first, the others with the
other mother first. One pair of the girls (one session) who talked
with the other-mother first and one pair who talked with the own-
mother first talked about a high intimacy area first in both mother-
daughter interviews; and the other two pairs talked about a low-
intimacy area first. The same pattern was followed for LD girls,
MD with LD and LD with MD.

Since the MD-LD distinction was made from behavior in the
experimenter-interview, and since that was conducted at the same
time as the other conditions, there was no way of knowing what
pairing of girls a particular session represented until it was over,
and then no way to determine the orders of the other variables so
FIGURE II

OVERVIEW OF DESIGN

Pairing          Order of Own vs. Other-Mother Order of Intimacy Level
MD* with MD      own-mother first (N=2)  high first (N=1)
(N=4)            low first (N=1)
other-mother first (N=2)  high first (N=1)
low first (N=1)

own-mother first (N=2)  high first (N=1)
low first (N=1)

other-mother first (N=2)  high first (N=1)
low first (N=1)

own-mother first (N=4)  high first (N=2)
low first (N=2)

other-mother first (N=4)  high first (N=2)
low first (N=2)

* MD = more disclosing; LD = less disclosing
each treatment-and-order-combination could be filled most rapidly. It was assumed that in running twenty-five sessions the sixteen required cases would turn up, with some classes over-filled. If not, more sessions were to be run. The required array was produced by the twenty-five sets run, however, even though two had to be excluded because of recording mishaps which were discovered only after the study was finished. In cases where more than the required number of sessions of a given sort had been collected, "extras" were excluded by random means prior to any examination of the data. An additional reason for collecting extra sessions was the anticipation that some base-line disclosure scores would fall exactly at the median, and thus not be classifiable as MD or LD.

A correlational analysis was also planned for these data. For this, all 23 usable sets were utilized.

**Preparation of Materials for rating**

A three-minute segment was extracted from each of the ten-minute interviewing blocks for rating. The segments were comprised of the fifth through the seventh minute of each block. Occasionally a short block was found, caused by a mother changing inquiry area before the seven minutes had elapsed. In this case, the segment was determined by working backward for the change-of-
area until a three-minute period was obtained. Each segment was assigned a code number which identified it but which gave no hint to raters as to the conditions it represented.

**Rating**

Rating was done by trained and reliable judges. A revision of Suchman's (1965) Revealingness Scale (Rev. Scale) was used as a measure of self-disclosure, and an original Confirmation Scale (Con Scale) was used to rate confirmation.

Rev ratings were made by several sets of three raters each. An average of the three ratings given was used to represent the segment. Con scores were established by a single pair of raters who judged all segments. The use of two instead of three raters was out of expediency. Pressures of time, a paucity of potential volunteers, and lack of funds to pay raters, all made the risk of some loss of reliability due to fewer raters seem a necessary evil.

**Analyses**

Four analyses of variance were carried out. The first two treated the Rev. scores as the dependent variable, the second two (identical to the first two) treated the Con scores. A three-way
design with repeated measures on two factors, (Winer, 1962, p. 338) and a three-way design with repeated measures on one factor (ibid, p. 328), were both used. The independent variables or the first were the "dispositional" grouping of the girls in term of Rev level, the intimacy level of the topic under discussion, and the "relationship" variable (whether discussion was with the own or the other mother). On the second, which used only the "other-mother" conditions, the independent variables were intimacy level, base-line grouping of the girl being interviewed, and base-line Rev grouping of the interviewer's own daughter.

A correlation matrix of Rev scores, Con scores, overall average Rev and Con scores, and scores on the three personality variables was also computed.

One additional set of correlations was also calculated -- between the Rev and Con scores in each segment.

Expectations

Rev scores

1. Disclosure should vary as a function of the base-line disclosure level (D level) of the girl; i.e. MD girls will produce higher Rev scores when talking with the mothers than will LD girls.
2. Disclosure should vary as a function of the type of relationship in which the interaction is occurring; i.e. disclosure should be greater in the own-mother condition than in the other-mother condition.

3. Disclosure should vary as a function of the intimacy-level of the inquiry area, with high intimacy areas yielding higher disclosure and vice versa.

4. Disclosure should vary in reciprocal relationship with confirmation. Thus, the Rev. scores should show a significant positive correlation, within the segment, with Con scores. Separate correlations will be calculated for each mother-daughter condition.

5. The girl's disposition to disclose, as estimated by her baseline Rev. score, should be related to her mother's disposition to confirm, as estimated by her baseline Con score. A significant positive correlation is expected.

6. An additional expectation is tentatively stated. When Rev. scores in the other-mother condition only are examined, a tendency may be found for higher Rev. scores to have been elicited by mothers of MD girls than by mothers of LD girls.
Con Scores

No expectations are stated for Con scores save as mentioned in "4" and "5" above. Analyses parallel to those performed on Rev scores will be carried out purely on an exploratory basis.

Personality Variables

1. POI, IPT and P-I (for girls only) scores of each subject are expected to correlate positively.

2. The POI and IPT scores of each mother and daughter are expected to correlate positively.

3. The POI, IPT and P-I scores of the girls are expected to correlate positively with her Rev scores in the several conditions.

4. The POI and IPT scores of the mothers are expected to correlate positively with her Con scores in the several conditions.
CHAPTER IV

OPERATIONS FOR DISCLOSURE AND CONFIRMATION

It was necessary to develop operations for the major constructs of self-disclosure and confirmation before the constructs could be studied. It proved necessary to revise one scale and totally construct the other.

Revealingness Scale

The measure adopted for self-disclosure was Suchman's Rev Scale. This is a thirteen-point scale, consisting of seven defined levels separated by six undefined half-steps. The scale is designed to measure the extent to which an individual willingly reveals himself through his verbal behavior. The lowest score, zero, is assigned to total silence, a complete absence of verbal or vocal behavior. The highest score, six, is given when the person, through his talking, demonstrates an active "searching for new meanings or fresh expression of feelings." The descriptive labels for the intermediate steps are: 1. Description of externals;
2. "cool attitudes about externals; 3. remote observer of internal experience; 4. internal observer with momentary involvement; 5. internal narrator. For an elaboration of these levels, see Appendix I.

One problem which has been encountered in the use of this scale has been the relatively low inter-rater reliabilities typically obtained. It is obvious that this instrument, like other "process scales," is a scale only in a metaphorical sense. One does not use it like a ruler, or a checklist, to assess the amount of some "stuff." It seems that a large number of complex judgments must be made in using the scale and, as Suchman has acknowledged (1969), the descriptions of scale levels are neither concretely specific nor comprehensive; and some part of a judge's rating is always made by a global "feel" about the rated interaction. Although this intuitive and global quality seems intrinsic to this sort of "measurement," it seemed possible to improve the scale, and increase rating reliability, in two ways. First, it seemed wise to combine the process of training judges with a process of elaborating and explicating the scale, so that we could define consensual rules for ratings pertinent to the particular kind of data to be judged. Several researchers (Suchman, personal communication; Waxler, personal communication; Klein, personal communication) had advised
as much in regard to this scale or similar ones. The effort was made to remain true to the original level-descriptions, but to render them, when possible, more explicit in regard to the kinds of interactions which were anticipated. As for the second effort at improvement, it seemed apparent that there were several discrete dimensions of judgment running through the scale, not one. It seemed that if these were isolated and put into different subscales, to be used jointly with the global scale, clarity and reliability might be enhanced. The following dimensions (which, admittedly, are themselves far from unitary) were extracted by inspection:

1. the Risk-Value of the Content (to what extent does the subject confine herself to information about herself which is socially acceptable?); 2. the Personal Importance of the Content (to what extent is the material given central to the person's life, to what extent is an experiential frame of reference adopted, and is there any active exploration of personal material during the interaction?); 3. Emotional Involvement (does the speaker's voice and manner convey any current, emotional involvement with the interviewer and with ongoing, newly found parts of her own feelings?); 4. Feelings of Rater about the Speaker's Willingness to be Known.

These subscales were defined, revised and re-revised in the course of trying to make the scale more explicit.
Training was begun with prospective judges studying segments, rated previously in a study by McLaughlin (1965). Once a good idea was gained as to how the earlier judges had used the scale, attention was turned to the problems of revising the scale in use with pilot-test data. A one-page "short-form" of the overall scale was devised, for use in conjunction with the subscales. These succinct level-descriptions contained what our raters had found to be the most salient discriminating features of each level.

An additional concern was the shape of the distribution of scores produced by the scale. Some previous research (McLaughlin, personal communication) had been plagued by the fact that most sessions had been given nearly identical ratings, permitting very little variation among scores. This posed a particular problem in this study, due to the fact that the MD-LD distinction could not be made for scores falling on the median -- the place where most scores had fallen in earlier work. A profile of scores obtained in the reliability testing was plotted to see if this problem was portended for these data. Unfortunately, while the distribution was somewhat flatter than that reported earlier, almost 70% of the ratings fell at two scale levels: 2.5 and 3.0, with the latter collecting the larger number. Discussion and examination of subscales suggested that level Three, as defined, could clearly be divided into two
separate stages on the basis of the level of subscale dimension II, "personal importance of content." An additional step (a new level Four) was added to the scale, along with a new undefined half-step, and raters' instructions for both the "short form" (global) and the sub-scales were revised accordingly. After a short while, this 15-point scale seemed workable, and it and the raters were tested on a dozen new segments (rater reliability had already been high on the 13-point scale). Both passed the test. The reliability coefficients of the raters, when their scores were compared to pre-established "criterion" scores, ranged from .587 to .903 with a median value of .776. The reliability of the mean ratings for each item (as estimated by analysis of variances, Winer 1962, p. 126) was .936. The distribution of scores was considerably flatter, with greater spread both direction from the median, than before. Incidentally, all the raters involved with defining the additional step agreed that it permitted differentiation of an important qualitative aspect which the previous version of the scale had left obscured. The final version of the scale, as used in this study, is given in appendix II. The reliabilities of the ratings assigned to the experimental data are discussed in Chapter V.
**Confirmation Scale.**

At first, it was hoped to use the Mishler and Waxler (1968) Acknowledgment Code as a measure of confirmation. The scoring instructions in their book were supplemented by additional advice and samples of scored protocol kindly sent me upon my request. As used by Mishler and Waxler, the scale is essentially a simple binary one, with responses being classified as either "nonacknowledging" or "acknowledging." A more differentiated, four-level, version had been found unworkable due to low inter-rater reliability. The score assigned to an interaction was a ratio of the number of responses scored "acknowledging" to all scorable responses.

Ten segments of pilot data were transcribed and rated on the scale and two problems, virtually insurmountable, were found. The first was the great scarcity of responses scorable as nonacknowledging (only one clear case out of the ten interactions). The scale had been useful in distinguishing the interactions of highly disturbed families from normal ones, but its power to make fine discriminations among the interactions of normals seemed doubtful. This problem was further complicated by the fact that in a three-minute segment mothers often produced very few responses. A scoring error (using a scale of far from perfect rating reliability) could result in a large difference in the resultant ratio when the denominator is quite small.
With these observations, it was decided to construct an original scale for the measurement of confirmation. The new scale was to contain the binary distinction of the Acknowledgment Code in its lower level, but would permit other discriminations as well.

The two persons who were to do all the Con ratings helped in every stage of the development of the scale. Stages were first generally and tentatively defined, then used, then re-defined and elaborated in light what was found, and so on, for several stages of revision.

The final version of the scale, consisting of seven defined levels and six undefined half-steps, requested that the rater attend to all the interviewer's verbalizations primarily in terms of their aspect as responses to what the interviewee has just said. Quoting from the instructions:

The question which the rater must have in mind is, how confirmatory or disconfirmatory, in balance, is that series of responses. It is important to note, from the outset, that "confirmation-disconfirmation" as used here, does not mean the same as "agreement-disagreement."

Various facets of that question can be stated. How explicitly and accurately does the interviewer acknowledge what she is told -- how explicitly does she express a comprehension of the content and an understanding of the intention of the girl's statement? When she changes the subject or expresses her own opinions or feelings do these acts serve to extend the self-disclosures of the girl, connecting with them and inviting their expansion, or do they move away from what the girl says, entirely or in part? In
terms of the general "tone" or "manner" conveyed by the interviewer, how general an interest does she convey about the real thoughts and feelings of the other person? How receptive does she seem to be to whatever the other might wish to say? How much "room" does she give her to really speak her mind?

Two aspects of the interviewer's speech are distinguished below on a general level, and again more specifically in defining each scale step. A third point of focus for the rater, less "objective" than the first two, is also described.

The three "points of focus" for the rater were "response" (most important), "changes of topic and self-expression" and "general impression of the interviewer's manner." Each of the seven defined levels is explicated in terms of these three foci. The "response" focus is defined generally as.

The most important point of focus for the rater. Here, each block of speech of the interviewer is examined in relation to the speech of the girl which preceded it. The question to be asked is, how accurately, receptively and genuinely are the statements of the girl responded to. Is there present an explicit, accurate acknowledgment of the content and intention of the statement? If it is accurate regarding both, does the response focus more on high-revealing aspects of the previous speech, or more on low-revealing aspects, or on neither particularly? If on high-revealing aspects, does it suggest a curiosity about the fact to be conveyed, or a genuine interest in coming to know the other as a person -- the former probably being a more dispassionate and businesslike affair than the latter.

On the one extreme (level 0) this girl does not seem to have been heard at all; on the other her meaning is perceived more clearly than she herself, perhaps, could manage. In between, responses are to be distinguished as being more or less accurate, more or less selective of high or
low possibilities in the other's messages, more or less willing to perceive whatever this girl might find to say irrespective of how much it might be approved of or agreed with. It is important to remember that a response may be argumentative and still be highly confirmatory.

At level O, the aspects of response, change of topic and self-expression, and general impression, are summarized as follows:

A. **Response.** The interviewer responds completely inaccurately, as if she had not heard what the other person had said at all. No apparent cognizance of either the content or intention of the other's statement is shown. Also scored at this level would be complete lack of response -- utter silence -- to whatever the other said.

Example: (girl) No, that doesn't follow.
(woman) We're just trying to find out who you go with.

B. **Change of topic and self-expression.** Such acts are scored 0 when they make no explicit acknowledgment of either the content or intention of the previous statement, and are not prefaced by any acknowledging response, nor by any acknowledgment that the topic is being changed. Thus, there is no apparent connection to what the girl had just said.

Example: (girl) Well since I've met so many people here and I'm going to meet so many more people that it gives me sort of a head start as to what to expect from others.

(woman) Will you use your nurses' training here in the Peace Corps?

C. **General Impression.** Here the woman seems not to want to hear the girl -- and doesn't. She seems not to want the girl to be there at all, so far as expressing herself is concerned.
Definitions of the other scale steps are given in Appendix III. The reader would probably need to examine them in order to learn what the scale actually, operationally means.

Specific examples were found in the pilot data for most of the elements of the scale. The rating instructions and examples are also given in Appendix III.

After the scale was completed and the raters had gone through training, they were tested for reliability with a set of 15 items taken from pilot data. The resulting correlation coefficient of individual ratings (Pearson r) was .75. This was considered adequate, particularly since each segment was to be scored the mean of the two ratings given it, and such average ratings are more reliable than single ones.

The reliability of the ratings of the experimental data is given in the following chapter.
CHAPTER V

RESULTS

This chapter begins with an examination of the inter-rater reliabilities of the Rev and Con scales, and then examines the results of analyses pertinent to the expectations outlined in the last chapter. A number of post-hoc analyses are also presented, and then all results are summarized.

Inter-rater Reliability of Scales

All Con scores were assigned by a single pair of raters. Rev scores were assigned by a total of eleven raters who worked in fourteen trio-combinations, the trios judging different numbers of items. Mean ratings on both scales were used to represent each segment. Ratings were made independently, but (in most cases) with all the group of raters present. All Rev ratings which were judged with the group present were announced immediately after all raters had completed each item. This was done in hopes of discovering any grossly divergent modes of rating, and reaching consensual agreement before proceeding. While this may have been of
some help, it proved to be a tedious and often emotionally wearing process; and it soon appeared that, among already trained raters, boredom and emotional fatigue were more destructive of rating reliability than simple disagreement could ever be. In light of this experience, raters deferred the announcement and discussion of all Con scores until the end of the rating session.

The inter-rater reliability coefficients are given in Table 1. The $r_k$ value represents an estimate of the reliability of the average rating of all raters to a given segment, and it is taken as the appropriate measure of reliability in this case. This value is not a Pearson (Winer 1962, p. 125). The average inter-rater Pearson coefficient, $r_1$, is also given for additional reference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>No. raters</th>
<th>No. Items</th>
<th>$r_k$</th>
<th>$r_1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be seen from Table 1 that the rating of Con scores, done by a single pair of judges, reached an adequate level of reliability. The groups of Rev raters produced mean ratings the \( r_k \) values of which ranged from .948 to .372, with a median value between .873 and .817. It should be noted that the lower values all came from sets of judges which rated relatively few (less than 10) items. Thus, the overall level of reliability of Rev scores is considered adequate.

Distribution of the Rev and Con scores (averaged over raters) are given in appendixes V and VI, respectively.

The PI scale also requires rating by a trained judge. A single rater did each PI form. Her reliability was estimated by comparing her scores on essays in a standardized test booklet (Carpenter, 1966) to the criterion scores. These essays were the same sort as those collected in this study. A Pearson \( r \) of .88 was reached, which was taken as evidence of adequate reliability. Since only one rater judged the experimental essays, no estimate of inter-rater reliability could be obtained. In place of that, the judge re-rated fifteen essays selected randomly two months after the first rating. Here rate-rerate reliability, in the form of a Pearson \( r \) was .85.
Rev Scores

Expectations 1, 2 and 3 - that disclosure level should be found to vary as a function of the girl's baseline disclosure level, the type of relationship in which she is interacting, and the intimacy level of the topic under discussion - were tested by analysis of variance (Winer, 1962, p. 337). The results are summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GIRLS' REV SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (baseline S.D. group)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45.72</td>
<td>8.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. w. groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (own vs. other mothers)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>3.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x subj. w. groups</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (intimacy level of topic)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>7.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C x subj. w. groups</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>3.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC x subj. w. groups</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ***p < .01  
** **p < .05  
* *p < .10
The effects of both the baseline grouping and the intimacy-level of the topic are significant. The differences are in the expected directions. The situational factor of own vs. other-mother reached a suggestive level of significance, as did the three-way interaction. The other interactions were all non-significant. Thus, a strong tendency was found for girls to disclose with the mothers at the same relative level which they had shown with the experimenter. Also, there was a strong tendency for girls to disclose themselves more highly when discussing the high-intimacy topics, and less so when discussing the low-intimacy topics. A weaker tendency was found as well for girls to disclose themselves more highly to their own mothers than to the other mothers with whom they were paired.

The triple interaction can perhaps be most simply construed as a difference in interaction effects of relationship on intimacy-level, depending upon whether the girls were MD or LD. This interaction effect is represented graphically in Figure 1.
FIGURE III

THE INTERACTION OF FACTORS B (RELATIONSHIP) AND C (INTIMACY LEVEL) FOR DIFFERENT LEVELS OF A (MD AND LD GIRLS)
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Thus it appears that for MD girls, the predicted effect of intimacy-level obtained only in the other-mother condition. In the own-mother condition a relatively high level of disclosure was sustained across both levels of intimacy. For the LD girls, on the other hand, the effect of intimacy-level was found only in the own-mother condition. In the other-mother condition a relatively low level of disclosure was maintained across both levels of intimacy.

Thus, expectations 1 and 3 received support, while there is some suggestion that expectation 2 may be valid as well. The meaning of the three-way interaction may be clarified by noting that much of the effect is contributed by the tendency of the MD girls to disclose more highly when talking with the other mothers (a stranger) about a high-intimacy topic, than did the LD girls in the same situation. It should be recalled that the MD-LD distinction was obtained by observing behavior in the "baseline" situations, which also was discussion with a stranger about a high-intimacy question. Thus, it may be that the baseline discrimination represents in part a specific tendency to disclose-to-a-stranger-about-high-intimacy-topic, more than a general "disposition" to disclose.

Expectation 6 suggested that when scores from the other-mother condition were considered, a tendency might be observed for higher Rev scores to be associated with (elicited by)
mothers of MD girls than by mothers of LD girls. This latter possibility is examined below.

Revealingness scores from the other-mother conditions were examined by analysis of variance. The results are given in Table 3.

**TABLE 3**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GIRLS' REV SCORES IN OTHER-MOTHER CONDITION ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (baseline S.D. group of girl)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.63</td>
<td>7.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (baseline S.D. group of interviewer's daughter)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. w. groups</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (intimacy level of topic)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>5.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>4.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C x subj. w. groups</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P < .05**

No effect of the sort anticipated was found. The significant effects observed are the same as those given in Table 2 and already discussed.
Con Scores

Analyses parallel to those just reported were conducted on the confirmation scores as well. It was anticipated that the mothers of MD girls might show higher levels of Con than mothers of LD girls, but the effects, if any, of the other factors were not guessed at. The results of the two analyses of variance are presented in tables 4 and 5.

TABLE 4
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MOTHERS' CON SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between subjects</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>all F's &lt; 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. w. groups</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>549.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within subjects</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x subj. w. groups</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>139.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C x subj. w. groups</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>82.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC x subj. w. groups</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5

**Analysis of Variance of Mothers' Con Scores in Other Mother Condition Only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>375.39</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj. w. groups</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>293.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C x subj. w. groups</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neither any main effects, nor any interactions were significant. The four analyses of variance just discussed used data only from the thirty-two mothers and thirty-two daughters (or sixteen sets of subjects) who comprised the experimental design described above. For the analyses reported below, all usable data, including those not employed in the ANOV's, were included. Forty-six mother-daughter pairs (or 23 sets) were examined in the analyses treating Rev and Con scores. Sessions which had to be omitted from the analyses of variance because of design requirement seemed
legitimately included in other analyses in which the balanced combinations of baseline Rev groupings (described in Figure II in Chapter III.) were not of concern. An additional ten pairs, whose Rev and Con scores were lost due to recording difficulties, are included in the analyses treating only the personality variables.

Dyadic Comparisons

First the relationship between baseline measures of Rev and Con was examined. Expectation 5, that a positive relationship would be found between the "dispositional" measures of the mother-daughter pair was not supported. A Pearson r of the respective baseline scores was -.080. Clearly, the expectation that there would be found an intra-familial covariation of disclosure and confirmation was not borne out. It should be noted that one of the negative findings discussed just above, that Con scores in the experimental situation were not related to the subjects' daughter being MD or LD, also suggests the same absence of the expected relationship.

It was also anticipated that Rev and Con scores would be found to co-vary positively in each interaction. Pearson r's were calculated between the paired variables in each of the four treatment combinations in which all subjects were observed. The correlation coefficients are given in Table 6.
TABLE 6

PEARSON R CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF REV AND CON SCORES WITHIN EACH INTERACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>r (N=46)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own mother -- high intimacy</td>
<td>-.250(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own mother -- low intimacy</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other mother -- high intimacy</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other mother -- low intimacy</td>
<td>.457(^c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - All significance levels are based on two-tailed tests.

\(^a_{P}<.10\)
\(^b_{P}<.05\)
\(^c_{P}<.01\)

A more complex effect than the one expected seems to be suggested. The anticipated positive relationship was found in only one condition: "other M - low intimacy." A negative correlation of marginal significance was found in the "own M - high intimacy" condition. Possible interpretations of this finding are discussed in the next chapter.
**Personality Variables.** Measures of self-actualization (POI), and interpersonal trust (ITS) were collected for mothers; those two plus a measure of personal approach (PI) were collected for daughters. There were three general expectations regarding these variables.

The first held that the variables should be positively correlated with each other for each subject. Table 7 presents the correlations found for the girls, table 8 those for the mothers. Partial support for the expectation was found. First, considering the daughters' matrix, it can be seen that the ITS is found to be positively related to the "self-actualizing value" subtest of the POI. The P-I has no relation to any of the other measures.
TABLE 7

PEARSON R CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
OF PI, ITS AND THREE POI SCORES (I, TC AND SAV) FOR DAUGHTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>ITS</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>SAV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>- .081</td>
<td>- .027</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>- .003</td>
<td>.290b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>.533d</td>
<td>.368c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.566d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAV

* All N's = 50

* Note* All significance levels are based on two-tailed tests.

a. $p < .10$
b. $p < .05$
c. $p < .02$
d. $p < .01$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITS*</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>SAV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>.412&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>.364&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.333&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.503&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All N's = 50

Note - All significance levels are based on two-tailed tests.

\[ a_p < .05 \]
\[ b_p < .02 \]
\[ c_p < .01 \]
\[ d_p < .001 \]

The relationships among the three POI sub-scales are not particularly noteworthy here, since such relationships have been found before, and since two pairs of the subscales (I-SAV and TC-SAV) are not completely independent due to item overlap.

For the mothers, the three POI scales are related as expected, and ITS is found to be related to the I scale of the POI, but is unrelated to the other two.
TABLE 9

PEARSON R CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS AND NUMBER OF PAIRS OF PERSONALITY VARIABLES FOR GIRLS AND THEIR MOTHERS.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures for Mothers</th>
<th>IT$\mathbf{S}$</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>SAV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>.251&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>.267&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures for Daughter I</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.272&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of pairs given below each r value.
Note - All significance levels are based on two-tailed tests.

<sup>a</sup><sub>π < .10</sub>
<sup>b</sup><sub>π < .05</sub>

It can be seen that only 3 of the 20 coefficients are marginally significant at the .10 level. The fact that two of them are on the same pair of measures (ITS and I) may give some added strength
to the possibility that these daughters and mothers are similar in terms of these constructs. A small relationship was found between the mothers' interpersonal trust scores and the girls' scores on personal approach. All in all, however, the support for the general expectation is quite weak.

The third set of expectations held that the personality measures of the daughters and mothers should be positively related to their Rev and Con scores, respectively. See Table 10 for the results for the daughters, and Table 11 for those of the mothers.

**TABLE 10**

**PEARSON R CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN PERSONALITY VARIABLES AND REV SCORES FOR DAUGHTERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rev scores:</th>
<th>PI (n=39)</th>
<th>ITS (n=41)</th>
<th>PO/I (n=40)</th>
<th>TC (n=40)</th>
<th>SAV (n=40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own-high</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own-low</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>0.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-high</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-0.205</td>
<td>-0.335b</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-low</td>
<td>0.315b</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average own</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average other</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>-0.249</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average own and other</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - All significance levels are based on two-tailed tests.
a_p < .10
b_p < .05
TABLE II
PEARSON R CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN PERSONALITY VARIABLES AND CON SCORES FOR MOTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con scores:</th>
<th>ITS (-41)</th>
<th>P01I (n=40)</th>
<th>TC (n=40)</th>
<th>SAV (n=40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>-.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own-high</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-.333b</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own-low</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-high</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-low</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average own</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average other</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average own and other</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - All significance levels are based on two-tailed tests.

Looking first at the findings for the P-I scale in Table 10, it can be seen that the girls level of "personal approach" was related to her level of self-disclosure only in the condition in which she discussed a low-intimacy topic with the other-mother. No significant relations were observed between P-I and Rev scores in the
"baseline" condition, nor in the other three mother-daughter conditions. The ITS bore no significant relation to Rev in any of the conditions; and the same absence of relationship was found for the TC and SAV subscales of the POI.

A negative relationship was found between the I subscale of the POI and Rev scores in the "other mother-high intimacy" condition; but no relation to Rev was found in the other conditions. It seems clear that the expectation of a positive relationship between Rev scores on the one hand and the ITS and the POI on the other received no support. The expectation of a positive relation between PI and Rev scores received partial support.

From Table 11 it can be seen that the expectation that the mother's level of confirmation would be positively related to her ITS and POI scores received no support. Only one significant correlation was found, and it was in the contrary direction.

Additional analyses. Since the Con scale is a new and untested variable, it seemed appropriate to perform such additional analyses as might cast more light on its functioning and on its relation to the Rev scale in these experimental conditions.

One "hunch" behind much of the analysis originally planned for the Con scores was that the dispositional tendencies to disclose
and confirm on the parts of a girl and her mother, respectively, should be positively related. As was seen, no correlation was found between the baseline measures of Rev and Con. Similarly, no substantial relation of the girls' baseline Rev score to her mother's Con scores was found (Table 4). A similar analysis was performed, with correlations computed between the girls' Rev scores and the mothers' Con scores when both were in the other-mother condition; i.e., when they were not talking with each other. Here again, the results did not support the initial expectation. See Table 12.

**TABLE 12**

**PEARSON R CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN DAUGHTER’S REV SCORES AND HER MOTHER’S CON SCORES WHEN BOTH ARE IN THE OTHER-MOTHER SITUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other-high</th>
<th>Other-low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other-high</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-low</td>
<td>-0.221</td>
<td>-0.271a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note - All significance levels are based on two-tailed tests.*

*P < 0.10*
Surprisingly, a negative trend is suggested, with one value reaching a suggestive level of significance. Given all these results, the initial expectation of a positive intra-familial relationship of Rev and Con is in no way supported.

Given this, it would appear that the analyses given in tables 4 and 5, with their treatment of Con scores in groups determined by the daughters' Rev level, were somewhat ill-fated, since the guiding assumption for those analyses was that the disclosure level of the girls would bear a positive, predictive relation to the level of confirmation of their mothers.

In order to check for the consistency in Con scores, irrespective of the daughters' Rev level, correlations were calculated between the mothers' Con scores in each situation. The dispositional stability (or, from another slant, the test-retest reliability) of the variable can thus be assessed. The values are given in Table 13.
TABLE 13
PEARSON R CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE MOTHERS' CON
SCORES IN EACH SITUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Own-high</th>
<th>Own-low</th>
<th>Other-high</th>
<th>Other-low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.245&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.534&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.319&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own-high</td>
<td></td>
<td>.520&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.374&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.393&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own-low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.393&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.390&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.504&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An extension of the Baseline columns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average own</th>
<th>Average other</th>
<th>Average own and other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.487&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.406&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note - All significance levels are based on two-tailed tests.

<sup>a</sup><i>p</i><.10
<sup>b</sup><i>p</i><.05
<sup>c</sup><i>p</i><.02
<sup>d</sup><i>p</i><.01
<sup>e</sup><i>p</i><.001

The relationships are uniformly positive and with two exceptions, of better than marginal significance. Thus, it seems that the mothers in this study showed considerable intra-personal consistency in the levels of confirmation which they exhibited across the various conditions. Examination of Table 13 suggests that the consistency
was strongest across topics with the same girl (r with own daughter
= .520, with other daughter = .504) than across girls. When the
efficacy of the baseline score as a predictor is examined, its rela-
tion to behavior with the other daughter is considerably stronger
than with the own daughter. In particular, the baseline score is
most strongly related to that from the "other-high" condition (the
condition most nearly resembling that from which the baseline
score was drawn). This is reminiscent of the finding for Rev
scores discussed above. A more direct comparison of the effects
for the two scales can be gained from Table 14, which shows
inter-correlations of Rev scores for girls across the various condi-
tions.

Clearly, the subject consistency for Con is stronger than
that for Rev. Although all inter-correlations for Rev are positive,
only three reach significance. For the girls as for the mothers,
baseline scores predicted more strongly to the "other-high" condi-
tion than to any of the others. This finding, of greater intra-
subject consistency for Con than for Rev scores, was unanticipated
and is discussed in the following chapter.

The final set of analyses represented an attempt to further
examine effects of the "dispositions to confirm" of the mothers on
Rev and Con scores produced in the interactions. Mothers'
### TABLE 14
PEARSON R CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE DAUGHTERS' REV SCORES IN EACH SITUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Own-high</th>
<th>Own-low</th>
<th>Other-high</th>
<th>Other-low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.380(^d)</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own-high</td>
<td>0.435(^d)</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own-low</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-high</td>
<td>0.263(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An extension of the Baseline columns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Own</th>
<th>Average other</th>
<th>Average own and other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>0.251(^a)</td>
<td>0.336(^b)</td>
<td>0.365(^c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baseline Con scores were divided at the median into more-confirming (MC) and less-confirming (LC) groups, analogous to the MD-LD groupings used in the ANOV's reported above. It seemed desirable to see how "confirmingness level" would effect Rev and Con scores, both directly and in interaction with the Rev level of the girl with whom the mother is talking. Four unweighted means ANOV's were carried out; one on Rev scores in the "own-mother" condition, one on Rev scores in the "other-mother" condition, one on Con in the "own-mother," and one on Con in the "other-mother."
Dyads were included in which neither partner was at the median in her baseline Rev or Con score. This caused the sacrifice of considerable data, primarily because of the large number of mothers (11) who had to be excluded. Even given the reduced N's and the relatively low power of the analyses, it was felt that they might yield valuable suggestions. Averages of the high and low-intimacy scores in each treatment combination were used as the dependent variables.

The results of the first analysis, on Rev scores in terms of the dispositional levels of the two partners, are given in Table 15; and the results of the other three analyses are presented in Tables 16, 17 and 18.

### TABLE 15

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF REV SCORES FROM OWN-MOTHER CONDITION IN TERMS OF BASELINE LEVELS OF DISCLOSURES AND CONFIRMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (baseline S.D. group of girl)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>739.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (baseline Con group of mother)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8984.70</td>
<td>8.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1056.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01**
TABLE 16
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF REV SCORES FROM OTHER-MOTHER CONDITION IN TERMS OF BASELINE LEVELS OF DISCLOSURE AND CONFIRMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (baseline S.D. group of girls)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4992.51</td>
<td>6.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (baseline Con group of mothers)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1247.64</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>741.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

TABLE 17
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF CON SCORES FROM OWN-MOTHER CONDITION IN TERMS OF BASELINE LEVELS OF DISCLOSURE AND CONFIRMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (baseline S. D. group of girls)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (baseline Con group of mothers)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>819.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3174.01</td>
<td>4.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>700.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
**TABLE 18**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF CON SCORES FROM OTHER-MOTHER CONDITION IN TERMS OF BASELINE LEVELS OF DISCLOSURE AND CONFIRMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (baseline S.D. group of girls)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>586.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (baseline Con group of mothers)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4280.25</td>
<td>8.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>267.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>501.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P < .01**

Variable B (baseline Con groups) was found to directly effect the level of Con scores produced in the other-mother interactions (this effect, in correlational form, has already been mentioned); it interacted with variable A (self-disclosure grouping of girl) for significant effects on Rev scores in the own-mother condition, and on Con scores in the own-mother condition; and it had no effect on Rev scores in the other-mother condition. The two interaction effects (both on data from the own-mother condition) are the only new information given by these analyses, and they are presented graphically in figure 2. Analogous results from the other-mother conditions are given for comparison in Figure 3.
FIGURE IV

INTERACTION EFFECTS AB ON REV AND CON
SCORES IN THE OWN-MOTHER CONDITION

[Bar graph showing interaction effects for different groups of girls and mothers.]

- MD Girls and MC Mothers
- MD Girls and LC Mothers
- LD Girls and MC Mothers
- LD Girls and LC Mothers
FIGURE V

MAIN EFFECTS ON REV AND CON
SCORES IN THE OTHER-MOTHER CONDITION
It can be seen from Figure 2 that in the own-mother condition, Rev scores were higher when MD girls were talking with MC mothers and when LD girls were talking with LC mothers. Thus, girls who were like their mothers in being either high or low on the baseline measures produced higher disclosures with their mothers than did girls who were unlike their mothers on the baseline measures.

The interaction effect on Con scores was of exactly the opposite kind. Con scores were higher when an MC mother was interviewing her LD girl, and when an LC mother was with her MD girl; and were lower when MC were with MD and LC with LD. Since they represent the same set of conversations, these opposing interactions should be viewed together. Viewed so, they seem provocative and puzzling. They will be discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

This study was an attempt to investigate the issues of self-disclosure and confirmation as observed in the discussions of college-age girls and their mothers. Each girl talked with an experimenter, her own mother, and the mother of another girl. Each mother talked with an experimental confederate, her own daughter, and another mother's daughter. In each discussion the girl was asked to adopt the role of interviewee, with the request that she was to make her "real thoughts and feelings" known to her interviewer. The mother was always asked to adopt the role of interviewer, and requested to elicit as "accurate and complete and rich" an account as possible of what the girl "really thinks and feels."

Further, she was asked to develop a complete and accurate understanding of the girl's thoughts and feelings, and to make sure her understanding was a correct one. Thus, the girl was asked to disclose herself, and the mother was asked to elicit and accurately receive the disclosures.
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The study was initially described as an exploratory one. Of the two major scales employed, one was in a revised form never before tested (although the revision, hopefully, did not change the basic functioning of the scale), and the other was a new scale, not used before at all. No really pertinent theoretical rationale was available, from which definite hypotheses could have been drawn. Expectations were labeled simply as expectations. Since this was clearly a pre-theoretical kind of investigation, the term "hypothesis" did not seem warranted.

The study turned on four major issues, each of which will be discussed: the Rev and Con scales themselves, factors relating to disclosure, factors relating to confirmation, and the inter-relation of disclosure and confirmation. Some of the problems associated with the study will be examined as well, and some possible routes for future research will be mentioned.

The Rev and Con Scales

The revision of the Rev scale and the construction of the Con scale were both successful inasmuch as the instruments permitted a fair range of reliable discriminations in these data. The actual distributions of scores, already referred to, are given in Appendices V and VI. The reader should note that for both scales the
ranges of observed scores were rather constricted. This should be kept in mind in thinking about the effects found. The extremes of communicational behavior representing the anchoring poles of the scales are apparently rare "freaks," found perhaps in the more exotic settings of psychotherapy or in the families of the insane, but only faint traces of these extremes are discernable in these data. As seen in figure 4, the observed ranges are considerably shorter than those permitted by the scales, and the bulk of the scores on each fall within a narrow, central band. On both, the four steps 2.0 to 3.5, inclusive, contain the great majority of the
observations (84% for the Con scale, 86% for the Rev scale). The reader is referred to the rating scales in Appendices II and III to sharpen his operational understanding of the sorts and shadings of conduct most frequently being examined here. It should also be noted that the upper tail of the distribution of Rev scores would be shorter, and the whole distribution more nearly normal in shape, if the Rev scores from the "experimenter-daughter" (baseline) condition were excluded. This condition produced a higher mean Rev score and a higher ceiling than any of the mother-daughter conditions.

Disclosure

The effects of factors effecting Rev scores in the mother-daughter interactions were examined. Girls were interviewed first by an experimenter who intentionally took a relatively high confirmatory stance toward her and asked her to discuss what important changes she had found in her life as a result of her new college experiences. The Rev scores in this situation were divided at the median and girls classified as More Disclosing (MD) or Less Disclosing (LD) thereby. This classification was taken as an estimate of the girl's disposition to disclose, and was treated as an independent variable in examining the Rev scores produced by the girls
when talking with the mothers. Two other independent variables were also employed. The first was whether the girl was talking with her own or the other mother. This was termed the "relationship" variable. The last independent variable was the intimacy level of the topic assigned for discussion. Two topics, having to do with personal appearance and the use of leisure time, were designated "Low intimacy" topics. Two others, centering on factors influencing important emotions (such as "worry" and "happiness"), and on the girl's perceived changes in her relationships with her parents upon growing older, were called "High intimacy" topics.

All three variables were expected to influence the levels of disclosure, with the "MD", "own mother" and "high intimacy" sides of the constructs all expected to produce the higher scores. No expectations were framed for interactions.

Two of the three, "disposition" and "intimacy-level," showed clearly significant effects in the expected directions; while the third, "relationship," showed a weaker effect in the expected direction, but only of marginal significance. The three-way interaction also showed a marginally significant effect.

It seems safe to conclude that these girls did consistently disclose themselves more when they belonged to the MD group and when they were asked to discuss more intimate issues. The
likelihood that the "relationship" variable had a real effect is probably increased somewhat by its showing both a main effect and an interaction effect of marginal levels of significance. "Disposition," as operationally defined, was an effective variable. The question as to whether or not the variable is most appropriately termed "disposition" is still unanswered. Several findings seem to offer help in clarifying the issue. The triple interaction, although unanticipated, seems interesting in this respect. It suggests that MD girls disclosed at a relatively high level in three of their four interactions, dropping to a relatively low level only when discussing the low intimacy topic with the other mother. The LD girls, on the other hand, disclosed at a relatively low level in three of their four interactions, jumping to a relatively high level only when discussing a high intimacy topic with their own mothers. Assuming for the moment that the effect is a genuine one, at least two lines of interpretation seem possible in thinking about it. The first would consider the MD-LD distinction as an indication of general disposition and the four combinations of relationship and intimacy as representing different degrees of "demand" to disclose. Girls with a high propensity to disclose would not do so only in a situation with relatively low "demand" (presumably, the "other mother -- low intimacy" situation has the least "demand"). On the other
hand, girls with a low propensity to disclose might disclose highly only in the situation of strongest "demand" (the "own mother - high intimacy" one). Perhaps a more parsimonious approach would be to treat the MD-LD distinction as being less an indicator of general disposition than an index of propensity to disclose in situations similar to the one in which the distinction was made. Much of the interaction effect seems due to the different levels of disclosure of the two groups in the "other mother - high intimacy" situation -- the same sort of situation (discussion of an intimate issue with a stranger) as the one in which the MD-LD distinction was made. Of similar implication was the finding presented in Table 14. There it was seen that, although the Rev scores from the baseline condition were correlated positively to all four of the mother-daughter situations, the association was significant only with the "other mother -- high intimacy" one. Finally, in the pair of analyses reported in Tables 15 and 16 (on admittedly smaller bodies of data) the "disposition" Rev factor was found to have a straightforward main effect when scores from the "other mother" condition (averaged across intimacy levels) were considered, but acted on scores from the "own mother" condition in a more complex way, in the form of an interaction with a similar "dispositional" factor for confirming-ness of the mothers. It would appear that, in spite of there being
some association between them, predispositions to disclose to a stranger and to the own mother seem largely independent of each other. This impression is strengthened by the observation, also from Table 14, that correlations are stronger within the "own -" and "other-mother" situations than across them. The notion of a general "disposition to disclose" does not appear to be the most appropriate one for construing these results. The use of a relatively standardized interview-with-a-stranger to estimate a person's disposition to disclose has been the typical approach in research to date (Suchman, 1965, 1966; McLaughlin, 1965; Haggerty, 1964; Jackson, 1968) and given the typical opportunities and constraints of the academic research setting, it will likely continue to be the method of easiest access to the subject's "disposition." The present findings suggest, however, that caution should be used in interpreting any conclusions regarding such estimates of disposition, until further research has shown more exactly what relation these estimates may have to the various kinds of communication outside the experimental cubicle.

The "intimacy level" variable also showed a clear relation to Rev scores. Girls did elaborate more of their own frame of reference and disclose more material of a personally central, potentially socially undesirable nature (these are the issues most involved in
the range of scores observed) when discussing the "high intimacy" topics. This result does not seem surprising. It should be recalled that these girls were unusual in that they had been willing to participate in a study which had plainly promised to ask them to discuss their personal feelings. Roughly 80% of the persons contacted about the study had declined to answer or had answered in the negative. Had a less cooperative group been commandeered into the same situation, the result might well have been different. Discussion with several Rev scale raters after the completion of all rating, suggested that the "intimacy level" effect may well have been diluted by something of a mistake in picking the "low intimacy" topics. One of them -- "her feelings, fears and ideals regarding her personal appearance" -- was apparently a more crucially personal issue for many girls than this male experimenter had anticipated. It seems clear that future research should rely on some prior scaling procedure to select items of varying levels of intimacy suitable for the specific subjects and procedures to be studied.

The weak main effect of the "relationship" variable on Rev scores perhaps warrants little discussion here. It seems fairly clear, though, that discussing personal matters with their mothers was, for these girls, quite a different business than discussing such things with a stranger (other mother or experimenter). The
importance of type of relationship upon the phenomena of disclosure and confirmation seems worthy of further study, but the simple expectation that family relationships will produce higher levels of disclosure than relationships with strangers may be justified only under certain limiting conditions.

The relationship of the Rev scores to the various personality variables was equivocal at best. The measure of "personal approach," the PI scale, bore a significant relation to disclosure in only one of the conditions, the "other mother - low intimacy" one. The PI scale is here taken as providing an estimate of the extent to which the subject construes persons of central importance in her life in a personalistic ("internal") manner. It appears that this tendency to so construe others relates positively to how personally the girl tends to express herself when discussing a relatively low-intimacy topic with a woman, just met, of her mother's generation. The tendency does not relate, however, to how personally she expresses herself with the same woman in talking of a more intimate topic; nor in talking with her own mother about either topic; nor in talking with the experimenter. It may be that the "other-mother - low intimacy" situation contained the least situational "pull" for high self-disclosure, and that the girl's level of disclosure there was more sensitive to her general tendency to think of
human relations as more or less personal. This tendency seems to have been subordinated to other factors in the other conditions.

There was no relationship found between Rev and the measure of self-actualization (POI). The three subscales of the POI and the Rev scores from the different conditions produced only one significant coefficient, and that in the opposite direction from the expectation. If there is any validity to the assertion that people who are more able and willing to disclose themselves are in some sense more self-actualizing, no evidence to that effect was found here. It should be pointed out, however, that the research so far reported on the POI is far from conclusive in ruling out the possible effects of "social desirability" as a response bias effecting scores. The items were chosen by a face-validity procedure, and many seem quite transparent in their aim. The atmosphere of this particular study was such that it was probably clear to most participants that "authentic communication" and other such "self-actualizing values" were held in esteem. Persons desiring to "look good" in this situation might well have raised their POI scores accordingly. At the same time, verbal conduct which, in the discussions, seemed aimed at "looking good" (whatever the content) was always scored more low in self-disclosure thereby. Thus, it seems that some likelihood of a negative correlation may have
infected this study, and perhaps cancelled out whatever actual positive relationship may have existed. It should also be noted that the Rev scale and the POI are different kinds of measures (in a sense in which Rev and the PI, for example, are not). The Rev measure is made by an independent observer assessing the style of another's conduct, the POI is a self-report. A more "behavioral" measure of self-actualization might yield different results; although no encouragement for such an expectation can be said to be given here.

Rev and the measure of "interpersonal trust" (ITS) were also found to be unrelated. The coefficients are all quite small and are mixed in sign. It may be that there was little reason to expect these variables to have been related in the first place. The ITS was designed to estimate the extent to which a person tends to believe in the truth of what others say to him. This kind of "generalized expectancy" may have utility in the framework of social learning theory (Rotter, 1954) in which it was designed to function, but its relation to the predisposition to disclose oneself is less clear-cut. A different sort of "interpersonal trust" seems at issue as a factor relevant to self-disclosure, and the ITS was probably an inappropriate operation for it.

Since neither the girls' scores on the POI nor on the ITS were found to relate to Rev scores, the relation found between them (r between ITS and SAV = .290; p < .05) is not of concern here.
Confirmation

Neither "intimacy level" nor "relationship" had any direct effect on the levels of confirmation expressed by the mothers. Although mothers showed no tendency to confirm differentially depending upon whether they were talking about a high or low intimacy topic, or whether with their own or the other daughter, they did show a strong tendency toward individual consistency in their relative levels of confirmation. The intra-personal correlation coefficients for the Con variable were considerably stronger than corresponding ones had been for the girls' Rev scores. An individual style in confirmingness seems to be indicated, a style which was maintained across the several different situations. Of course, this apparent stability could be due largely to the fact that the variables of "relationship" and "intimacy-level" had been chosen because of their probable effect on self-disclosure, not on confirmation. It seems likely that, while variations in these dimensions have no differential "pull" for confirmation, others could be imagined which would.

It would not be correct to say, however, that "relationship" and "intimacy-level" had no effect whatever on Con scores. They did have an effect in that they altered the kinds of dyadic relationships observed between Rev and Con within each interaction. This will be discussed below.
Some unplanned analyses were carried out treating the mothers' baseline Con score as a basis for a "dispositional" classification of mothers into two groups, exactly as the baseline Rev scores had been used. Relatively small N's were available for the analyses, but this classification (Less Confirming and More Confirming) did show a significant main effect on Con scores in the "other-mother" condition. This is the same result as the correlational one already reported, indicating an individual stability in Con scores.

No relationship was found between Con and the personality variables of self-actualization and interpersonal trust. The correlation coefficients were almost all quite small and are mixed in sign. The remarks made about the similar absence of relationship with Rev scores seem as applicable here.

Relation between Disclosure and Confirmation

There were two general expectations regarding the possible relations of Rev and Con scores. The first was that girls and their mothers would tend to be similar to one another when they were observed independently of each other. That is, mothers who were relatively high in confirmation when interviewing someone besides
their own daughters, would tend to have daughters who were relatively high in disclosure when talking with someone not their own mother.

The second general expectation was that Rev and Con scores should be positively related within each interaction.

The first expectation was not supported by the findings. Neither baseline nor other-mother measures of the variables showed the expected relationship. The two "dispositions" were, in this group of subjects, quite unrelated to each other. This fact was the downfall of some other analyses, the guiding expectations of which had been built, like a house of cards, upon the assumption of the positive relationship between dispositions. Thus, a grouping of mothers in terms of their daughters' being Less-Disclosing (LD) or More-Disclosing (MD) yielded no effects in terms of the Rev scores produced in the interactions in the other-mother conditions. An effect might have been expected had the groups differed in confirmingness, and if different levels of confirmingness did act to differentially elicit disclosure. A similar grouping of mothers also produced no effect on Con scores in any of the mother-daughter situations. This absence of relation, like any negative finding, poses problems of interpretation. It is clear that the expected simple and direct relationship posited was quite gratuitous. The
general notion that family members share "ontological rules" regarding the expression and reception of personal experience may still have some truth, however. These "girls" were in reality young adult women whose discussions, for the most part, seemed expressive of complex, maturing personalities engaged by and large in a world of persons and issues much larger than the parental home. At this late- or post-adolescent stage of development, individual identity largely independent of parental constraints seemed the rule rather than the exception. Future research might focus more profitably on younger children and their parents.

The second general expectation concerning the relationship between Rev and Con scores -- that they would be positively associated within the interaction -- was not supported in any simple way; but several findings seem to combine to suggest a more complex, but still meaningful, picture.

When the Rev and Con scores for each of the four mother-daughter interactions were correlated, a negative relationship of a marginal level of significance was found in the "own-mother-high-intimacy" condition, and a significant positive relation was found in the "other-mother-low-intimacy" condition. No relationship was found in the other two conditions. More than one line of reasoning could probably be found to account for this pair of effects.
(assuming both are real and would be found again in a new sample), but the following seems most likely to me. The "own-mother" and "other-mother" conditions were quite different in many important ways. The impression of myself and of others who have listened to the verbal interactions were all to the effect that a much more "charged" atmosphere prevailed in the former. The potentiality for more intimate exchange was there, along with other "pressures" (such as a desire to make the relationship seem "normal" or "happy" to the investigators) all of which were much lessened in the interactions with the strangers. The interacting effects of disclosure and confirmation would appear to be different in the two kinds of exchange. It should be noted that of these four treatment-combinations, the "own-high" condition had produced the highest mean level of disclosure, the "other-low" condition the lowest. It would appear that in the latter condition the variables interacted as expected, with the interviewer defining the "rules" for the discussion by the eliciting effect of her level of confirmation, and the interviewees took their "cues" and expressed themselves in an "appropriate" style. The insignificant positive correlation in the "other-high" condition may be due to the fact that there the "cues" establishing the "demand to disclose" were given so definitively by the nature of the high-intimacy question itself plus the strongly
worded instructions to both mothers and girls, that there was less "room" for the differential confirming of the interviewer to have an effect. The "other-low" condition was somewhat more ambiguous in its demand, since the same instructions accompanied a topic which offered greater latitude for either superficial or intimate discussion. Here the effect of the interviewer's confirming, with its implicit "steering" of talk in more or less personal directions, could have been strongest. At least two possible patterns could be involved in the negative relationship found in the "own-high" condition, either or both of which could be occurring. First, in that condition, with much more "to be said" (i.e. already known and held in common between the two), and with disclosure already proceeding at a relatively high level, the mother's level of confirmation may have functioned less as a simple elicitation than as a moderating response. Girls who began to offer relatively high levels of self-disclosure may have been met by some disconfirmation by mothers who wished, by that, to discourage the expression of too personal or potentially undesirable material. That is, mothers may have tended to wish to control disclosure to assure the presentation of a "good" picture of the girl and the family. Another possibility is that some girls, having been asked about a high-intimacy topic by their mothers, and then receiving disconfirmatory responses to their statements, may have reacted with "rebellion;" that is, by
asserting their actual feelings and thoughts even more definitely and strongly. Both processes would seem likely to characterize the kinds of tensions concerning identity-development, independence and separation which must occur in most normal families of this socio-economic group with girls of this age. The "own-low" condition may not have raised the issue of high self-disclosure so inescapably, and so did not arouse the expression of these tensions so sharply. The possibility that issues and tensions may have been aroused in the "own-high" condition that did not operate so strongly elsewhere, may be suggested also by the fact that the "dispositional" baseline scores of Rev and Con had the least predictive value for scores in this condition. If the baseline scores are an index of how the individual typically behaves, the general tendencies would seem to have been overpowered by other factors in the "own-high" condition.

Something should be said here about what seems to be an important difference in the rating processes specified by the Rev and Con scales. The former depends largely upon content (what is said), particularly within the range of scores observed here. The Con scale, on the other hand, was deliberately constructed to make it, so far as possible, "content free." Scores on it are determined for the most part by style of response ("how" rather than "what").
Thus, the following two exchanges would yield identical measures for Con, but different scores for Rev.

1. (girl) I think I'm changing my taste. I like short skirts much better than I did a few months ago.

(mother) Really? I can understand that, since there are so many nice new styles around.

2. (girl) I'm not sure I realized this before, but I just can't stand the way Daddy treats me sometimes in front of my friends.

(mother) Really? Well, I can understand that, seeing how his moods are at times.

Although the Con scores are the same, the mother is clearly "going along with" a much more intimate exchange in the second example than in the first. In an abstract sense the mother in the second example is indeed "more confirming" inasmuch as she is perpetuating a more intimate discussion by her accurate acknowledgment, but operationally the scale is "blind" to this distinction. Thus, although the cell means for Con scores did not differ between the "own-high" and "other-low" conditions, the similar levels of Con were in interaction with quite different levels of Rev. It may well be that the mothers were in some sense more "receptive" in general in the "own-high" than in the "other-low" conditions, but
there met particularly high levels of disclosure with a drop (operationally discriminable) in confirmation. If this reasoning is sound, the two effects characterizing the "own-high" and "other-low" conditions may have mixed in the other two conditions, cancelling each other, and resulting in the non-significant correlations.

Some evidence that the level of confirmation shown the girl does influence her level of disclosure seems suggested by the fact that the experimenters, who deliberately attempted to maintain a relatively highly confirmatory stance toward the girls, elicited a higher mean level of disclosure than was produced by any of the mother-daughter groups. Scoring of a few randomly selected "experimenter-daughter" segments for the experimenter's level of confirmation did suggest that they were, on the average, considerably more confirmatory than the mothers. Complete analysis was not undertaken since the many uncontrolled differences between the experimenters and mothers besides their levels of confirmation would leave any differences found impossible to interpret with any certainty.

A final issue explored was the effects of baseline, "dispositional" groupings of both mothers and daughters on the Rev and Con scores produced by them, both as main effects and in interaction. Dyads were given single scores on each, obtained by averaging across intimacy-levels.
The effects found for the "other-mother" dyads were simple and straightforward. For the Rev scores, the MD-LD grouping of daughters had a significant effect, the MC-LC grouping of mothers had none. For Con scores, the MC-LC grouping had a significant main effect, the MD-LD had none.

For the "own-mother" condition the effects were, once again, less simple. For both Rev scores and Con scores no main effects were significant, but the interaction effects were. The "high-high" and "low-low" conditions received the higher Rev scores, while the "high-low" and "low-high" cells were higher in Con. This opposing pattern of interactions seems interesting but puzzling. The earlier surmise, that the baseline groupings were really inappropriate as predictors for the "own-mother" situations, does not explain why the interaction effects should have been found there. After pondering these effects for some time, I must admit that I can make no simple, straightforward accounting for them. The lines of reasoning I came up with seemed, upon reflection, to be tenuous and over-complicated, more like rationalizations than explanations. Given the small N's, the unexpected nature of the results, and their perplexing form, it seems wisest to simply report them for the time being until future, more adequate research can be directed to the problems they pose.
In summary, the main findings were as follows. These girls disclosed themselves more deeply when they were discussing more intimate topics than they did with less intimate topics. Girls who had disclosed themselves more deeply when talking with the experimenter tended to do so again when talking with their own mother and the other mother by whom she was interviewed. There was also a tendency, less marked, for girls to be more revealing with their own mother than with the other mother. The level of disclosure was also found to be related to the level of confirmation given by the mother in the interaction. The relation was negative and marginally significant when talking with the own-mother about a high-intimacy topic and significantly positive when talking with the other-mother about a low intimacy topic. No significant relationship was found in the two other mother-daughter situations. Girls and their own-mothers did not show any relationship of baseline "dispositional" measures of Rev and Con, respectively; nor were the baseline groups of girls (LD or MD) predictive of the Con scores produced by their mothers when the latter were interviewing other girls. Con scores were also not related to the variables of "relationship" and "intimacy level." A baseline grouping of mothers derived from their discussion with the experimental confederate was found to be predictive of the Con scores they produced when inter-
viewing the other-girls; but not (at least in an analysis of relatively few dyads) of scores produced when interviewing their own-daughters; but a correlational analysis suggested that with more data the "baseline" and "own-daughter" Con scores were related, and that Con scoring tended in general to show considerable intra-individual consistency across the several situations — a greater consistency, in fact, than that found for the girls' Rev scores.

Of the personality measures employed, only the measure of personal approach was found to be related to the girl's level of disclosure, and then in only one situation. The measures of self-actualization and interpersonal trust bore no discernable relationships to Rev and Con scoring, nor to the personal-approach measure.

Problems and Prospects

Several difficulties characterized this study. First, one of the two major variables, the Con scale, was new and had to be used without benefit of any prior validation. Further research aimed precisely at filling this lack would seem desirable. The lack of precise standardization in the baseline interviews also was a problem. This would not seem to be easily corrected, without abandoning the ideal of studying interactions without artificiality,
scripts, etc. The situation might have been improved had only two experimenters and two confederates been used throughout the entire study, and checks made of their discussions such that continuous control of the relevant variables (presumably Con for the experimenters and Rev for the confederates) was assured. It would also seem desirable, in future research on "intimacy level," to establish relative levels of intimacy of topics by prior scaling procedures using a population of subjects similar to the ones to be studied.

Two features of the experimental procedures pose some difficulties in interpretation of these findings as representing natural familial communications. The first is the use of artificial role-assignments, in which one person was designated the "discloser" and the other the "receiver." The other was the ever-present "third party" -- the unseen other person represented by the tape-recorder. The effects of these things cannot be assessed in regard to these data. Future research might profitably employ a more nearly naturalistic mode of data collection, such as that used by Kaswan et. al. (1968). In their procedure, subjects were asked to discuss some matters in the waiting room before the session began. These waiting room discussions, recorded, were themselves used as the experimental data.
The limiting features of this population of subjects must be kept in mind before assuming the probable validity of any generalizations taken from these findings. These girls were all Mid-Western college Freshmen of middling verbal ability. They and their mothers showed what proved to be an unusual willingness to participate in the study at all. These girls had all maintained relatively close ties with their parents, being unmarried and choosing to attend college in their home town. The girls were all young adults, 18 to 20 years of age.

These limiting features provide suggestions for future research. Daughters of different ages and their mothers could be studied. A series of such studies at various age levels could yield developmental hypotheses, which could then be tested by longitudinal research. At the age level studied here, non-college girls, girls already married, or girls with disharmonious relations with their mothers could all be tested with profit. The communications of other family members (fathers and sons, for example, or husbands and wives) could also be examined; as could the communications of families containing a mentally disturbed member.

In general, the complex and fascinating inter-relations of disclosure and confirmation seem barely approached in this study. The processes occurring among family members seem particularly in
need of further exploration. Much of the thinking concerning disclosure and confirmation seems to have stemmed from, and focussed upon, the peculiar non-familial interactions of psychotherapy or the interaction of families containing a highly disturbed member. A systematic, empirically adequate account of these processes in normal families still awaits construction.
THE REVEALINGNESS (REV) SCALE

Purpose:

The present scale is an attempt to measure the degree to which a subject willingly reveals himself through his verbal behavior.

Scoring:

To score the subjects responses the judge assigns a scale value from Zero to Six to each segment that is to be scored. The judge must make himself familiar with the descriptions of behavior which are appropriate for the various scoring levels.

Note:

It is important to keep in mind the question to which this scale is addressed: How well does the subject let the listener get to know him?
Level Zero (No Talking)

No talking at all. The subject presents no verbal or vocal behavior. He makes no expressive sounds such as sighing, laughing, crying, etc. All silences are scored at this level. The listener learns nothing about the subject (except possibly that the subject does not want to be known at all).

Level One (Description of Externals)

The subject does not talk about himself. He talks only about externals. This material is presented with no feeling. S describes external events, gives intellectual ideas or theories but he offers no evaluations or opinions. He says nothing at all which is relevant to his personality.

He says only those things that one would be willing to say to a potentially unfriendly or threatening person, i.e., things which do not leave one open to personal attack.

The listener gains no understanding of the subject's life. He gets the impression that S did not intend to reveal anything about himself.

Level Two ("Cool" Attitudes about Externals)

The subject does not talk about himself. He talks about external events but he is willing to reveal his relationship to these
events. He is willing to reveal the stand that he has taken, (i.e., he gives attitudes, opinions, evaluations of things, etc.) but he does this unemotionally, intellectually, and not very strongly.

He makes no socially undesirable statements.

Although this verbalization may help the listener to know S a little, the listener gets the impression that S was not attempting to make himself known.

**Level Three (Remote Observer of Internal Experience)**

The subject talks about himself but there is no self-involvement in what he says. His style of expression is externalized, intellectualized, mechanical, distant, etc. (e.g., He may say "one," or "people" or "they," instead of using the personal pronoun "I.") He talks like a remote observer of himself. His distance from himself and lack of self-involvement is manifested in his flat voice as well as his externalized style of talking.

He says things that one might say in public to a mere acquaintance. His conversation is casual and social; not private. He uses cliches and stereotyped language. His speech has a contrived or rehearsed quality to it. His voice has a very impersonal ring to it.

You get the impression that he says what he says because it sounds good from a distance but not because it expresses what he really feels.
The listener gets the impression that S is willing to tell something about himself, but also wished to do it without self-involvement as he talks. This verbalization may help the listener to know S better, but only slightly. S consistently keeps his feelings out of his voice.

**Note:**

1. Responses in which there is a discrepancy between feeling and content are scored at this level, e.g., Responses made by a person who is obviously upset who says, in a strained voice, "I'm not bothered at all" or a person who calmly informs someone how much he hates him, would be scored at this level.

2. Levels 1-3 are appropriate for responses which, although differing in degree of importance to the subject, in content, are nevertheless made without any indication of feeling or emotion in S's voice. (If feeling enters into S's communication then level Four or Five would be appropriate depending on how long it is maintained.)

**Level Four (Internal Observer with Momentary Involvement)**

The subject talks about himself in the style of Level Three (i.e., externalized, intellectualized, etc.) but there is a momentary self-involvement in what he says. The style of S's speech or the
quality of his voice indicate to the listener that S, for a short time is "self-involved."

He says things that one might say to someone who seems trustworthy but with whom he has not had a close intimate relationship.

The listener gets the impression that S, while not necessarily desiring to reveal his feelings, is willing to talk about himself. At times his voice betrays some feeling and involvement in what he is saying.

**Note:**

Level Four is essentially Level Three with a momentary addition of the characteristics of Level Five.

**Level Five (Internal Narrator)**

The subject expresses himself with self-involvement and feeling. The feeling in his voice indicates that S is expressing himself rather than just talking about himself.

He reveals himself the way that one would to a trusted friend.

He does not attempt to present himself in a socially favorable manner.
The listener gets the impression that S is being honest and wants to express his present feelings. He gives the listener the impression that he is getting to know S as S feels himself to be. There is no sense that S is evading, or backing away, or disguising himself, etc. The listener feels trusted.

**Level Six (Searching for new meanings or fresh expression of feelings)**

The subject is actively trying to explore his personality and his world even though, at the moment, he might be doing so fearfully and tentatively. He may be discovering new feelings or new aspects of himself. He may be talking about his values, his perceptions of others, his relationships, his fears, or his life choices but, in any case, he is taking the risks involved in self-exploration. He speaks with spontaneity and feeling in his voice. Although this level would be appropriate for those responses in which S becomes "Emotional," it would also apply to segments in which S freely communicates with the listener as he discovers new feelings or new aspects of himself. He talks about himself in a manner which, for most people, would be reserved for a trusted friend. The listener gets the impression that he is getting to know S intimately and deeply and that S is taking the risk of sharing the process of self-discovery with him. The listener has the feeling that S trusts him with his newest, or strongest, or most tentative feelings.
REVEALINGNESS SCALE (IN VolVEMENT SCALE)

REVISED SHORT FORM

0.0 No verbal expression. Unwilling to talk.

1.0 Talks only about external things, no mention of her own relation to them (attitudes toward them, opinions, evaluations, etc)

2.0 Focus on external things, but willing to reveal her relation to them. Content quite safe and minimally personal.

3.0 Person talks about herself, content moderately important, some self-reference. Talks in a style lacking in involvement (defined below) in the moment and with the interviewer. (She may be animated, or emotional, but if not "involved" rates no higher than 4.5)

4.0 Focus is clearly on self, much important content, much self-reference; but, as in "3," lacking in involvement.

5.0 Same as 4, but with moments of involvement. At times, her manner suggests that she is "involved" and not "style-bound." Evidences at least brief "encounter" with the interviewer as a specific other person, not a stereotype; as well as brief "encounter" with areas of her own feelings and thoughts that she does not ordinarily touch in everyday conversations.

6.0 The involvement is sustained beyond brief moments. A real "encounter" is experienced.

7.0 The encounter has the creative momentum of self-discovery for the interviewee.
Subscale I: Risk-Value of Content

QUESTION JUDGE MUST ASK: To what extent does the person confine herself to information about herself which is socially acceptable? To what extent does she allow herself to disclose feelings, opinions or facts which might be disapproved of by others, and in particular by the sort of person with whom she is talking?

Rev Levels

0 Willing to risk no material at all. Silence.

1-2 Willing to talk, but stays only within the confines of obviously socially acceptable material.

3 Almost all material is obviously socially acceptable, with brief exceptions which are only hinted at, or are denied after they are given.

4 Almost all material is obviously socially acceptable, with brief exceptions which are given directly and are not denied.

5 Mostly socially acceptable, some exceptions, not denied.

6-7 Little or no apparent effort to protect self by staying within confines of social acceptability. Obviously intent on "communicating" rather than "looking good." Frequent expectations to s.a. willingly given.
Subscale II: Personal Importance of Content

QUESTIONS JUDGE MUST ASK: (Three separate but related questions are involved) 1. To what extent is the material given trivial and peripheral as opposed to central and important? How much of the person's life, as she experiences it, is touched upon by what she says? 2. Does she talk only about things, external events, and other people, or does she disclose internal, experiential facts (what she feels, values, fears etc.)? 3. Also, does she report only what she knows to be so (substantive) or is she reporting what she is actively discovering in her feelings while the interview is going on?

Rev Levels

0 No information. Silence.

1 Only peripheral or trivial information. No self-reference or "internal" focus. Substantive.

2 Only peripheral material. Mostly other-referent, with exceptions of self-reference. Substantive.

3 Less restricted to purely trivial information. Much other-referent. Substantive.

4-5 Some material is central and important. Much self-reference. Substantive.

6 Much of the material is central and important. Self-reference is more sustained. Substantive, perhaps traces of active.

7 Much of material is central and important. Self-reference is sustained. Active (reporting on what she is currently discovering that she feels).
Subscale III: **Emotional Involvement**

**QUESTION JUDGE MUST ASK:** Does the speaker's voice and manner of speaking convey or not convey some current, emotional involvement with the interviewer and with ongoing, newly found parts of her own feelings? Is she "in" or "knocked out" of her typical style of self-presentation? If some emotional involvement is present, does the content of her speech indicate an attempt to deny the involvement (are the "verbal" and the "nonverbal" messages congruent or incongruent)?

**Rev Levels**

0  Silence. No content or emotion.

1-2  Speech is present, but without any emotional involvement. Voice is flat, chatty, or otherwise non-affective.

3-4  Short moments of involvement may be heard, but if so they are discrepant with content. The voice may be animated or emotional, but not actively involved or "engaged."

5  Short moments of emotional involvement, congruent with content. They are "knocked out" of their typical style for moments.

6-7  More sustained emotional involvement is present. Congruent.
Subscale IV: **Feeling of Judge about the Speaker's Willingness to be Known**

**QUESTION JUDGE MUST ASK:** Assuming that the speaker is talking to me, how trusted do I feel by her? How willing is she to let me get to know her? Is she willing to become "self-involved" and engaged with me?

**Rev levels**

0 Not trusted at all. Silence.

1-2 Listener feels trusted only with very minimal and "safe" material about the speaker -- as if the speaker considered him a potential threat. Listener gains only a picture of a stereotype of a person, not a unique individual.

3 Listener feels that the speaker is venturing some trust by expressions of some personal information about herself. Predominant impression is still that the picture of herself which she has given is how she wants to be seen, and not how she experiences herself. Get to know her only slightly as an individual. No active involvement or engagement is ventured.

4 Listener feels "let in" on central, important, personal information. The understanding gained is more of an individual than a stereotype, but the understanding is an "abstract" one, since no active involvement or engagement is ventured.

5 Listener feels (as in 4) trusted enough to learn about the speaker as an individual person, and feels also that the speaker is willing to become actively engaged or involved with him for brief moments.

6 Listener feels trusted with knowledge and ongoing engagement. A real "encounter" is experienced.

7 Listener feels trusted with ongoing engagement, information about the speaker, as well as with the speaker's most tentative, currently forming ideas and feelings about herself. The "encounter" has the creative momentum of self-discovery for the interviewee.
APPENDIX III
CONFIRMATION SCALE

Rating Manual

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS: This scale is an attempt to define the construct "confirmation-disconfirmation" in such a way as to permit reliable ratings of the speech of one person who is interviewing another. In this particular study, the interviewer will always be a middle-aged woman and the interviewed will be a college girl.

The rater is to listen to the interviewer's side of the interaction, thinking of it in terms of its aspect as a series of responses to what the girl says. The question which the rater must have in mind is, how confirmatory or disconfirmatory, in balance, is that series of responses. It is important to note, from the outset, that "confirmation-disconfirmation" as used here, does not mean the same as "agreement-disagreement."

Various facets of that question can be stated. How explicitly and accurately does the interviewer acknowledge what she is told - how explicitly does she express a comprehension of the content and an understanding of the intention of the girl's statement? When she changes the subject or expresses her own opinions or feelings do these acts serve to extend the self-disclosures of the girl, connecting with them and inviting their expansion, or do they move away from what the girl says, entirely or in part? In terms of the general "tone" or "manner" conveyed by the interviewer, how general an interest does she convey about the real thoughts and feelings of the other person? How receptive does she seem to be to whatever the other might wish to say? How much "room" does she give her to really speak her mind? - Two aspects of the interviewer's speech are distinguished below on a general level, and again more specifically in defining each scale step. A third point of focus for the rater, less "objective" than the first two, is also described.

RESPONSE: This is the most important point of focus for the rater. Here, each block of speech of the interviewer is examined in relation to the speech of the girl which preceded it. The question to be asked is, how accurately, receptively and genuinely are the statements of the girl responded to. Is there present an
explicit, accurate acknowledgement of the content and intention of the statement? If it is accurate regarding both, does the response focus more on high-revealing aspects of the previous speech, or more on low-revealing aspects, or on neither particularly. If on high-revealing aspects, does it suggest a curiosity about the fact to be conveyed, or a genuine interest in coming to know the other as a person, the former probably being a more dispassionate and business-like affair than the latter.

On the one extreme (level 0) this girl does not seem to have been heard at all; on the other her meaning is perceived more clearly than she herself, perhaps, could manage. In between, responses are to be distinguished as being more or less accurate, more or less selective of high or low possibilities in the other's messages, more or less willing to perceive whatever this girl might find to say irrespective of how much it might be approved of or agreed with. It is important to remember that a response may be argumentative and still be highly confirmatory.

CHANGE OF TOPIC AND SELF-EXPRESSIONS. These acts leave the content of the previous statement and focus elsewhere. Still, here it is their function as responses which will be focussed on. They usually can be seen as part of a response or as a substitute for a response. If a response element is present (generally as a preface) the relation of both to the other's previous statement. At the low extreme such acts contain no element of response and do not explicitly acknowledge that fact (as would be done, for example, by saying "I'm changing the subject...."). At this high extreme they serve as an elaboration of a full and accurate response, which acts to invite further unfolding of the other person's point of view.

GENERAL IMPRESSION OF INTERVIEWER'S MANNER. Here the rater is not asked to focus on each block of speech, as above, but rather, after hearing the whole segment, on his own residual impression of the interviewer's general manner. This is the general impression conveyed by the interviewer as to her general attitude toward the interviewer, her intentions regarding her own hearing of the girl, the "rules" which she seems to be setting regarding how and about what the girl should speak.
PREPARATION FOR RATING: If more than a couple of days has elapsed since last rating, the judge should reread the descriptions of each scale step so they are fresh in mind. A good "freshener" would be to then rerate the two segments last rated at the last session, noting any differences in scoring.

RATING PROCEDURE: Two general approaches are used in rating, and both should be used with each segment. First, the rater must listen objectively to the interviewer's speech and have in mind what she says and how she says it. Notes should be kept of anything that seems pertinent to reaching a rating, so that they can be examined afterwards. Then the descriptions of the various scale steps should be examined, and the one selected which best describes the segment heard. Half-steps should be assigned freely, when that seems most appropriate. In addition to this objective procedure, also see what "Feeling" the interviewer gives you as you listen, imagining you were being interviewed with the aim of expressing yourself. How much room do you feel the interviewer gives you for you to express yourself directly and fully, how genuine is the invitation to express, how clearly and accurately does the interviewer seem to be hearing what is said. Decide which scale-step best describes the feeling the interviewer gives you. If the rating reached by these two ways are different, try to reconcile the difference.
SCALE STEPS

ZERO A. **Response.** At this level, the interviewer responds completely inaccurately, as if she had not heard what the other person had said at all. No apparent cognizance of either the content or intention of the other's statement is shown. Also scored at this level would be complete lack of response -- utter silence -- to whatever the other said.

Example: (girl) No, that doesn't follow.
(woman) We're just trying to find out who you go with.

B. **Change of topic and self-expression.** Such acts are scored zero when they make no explicit acknowledgement of either the content or intention of the previous statement, and are not prefaced by any acknowledging response, nor by any acknowledgement that the topic is being changed. Thus, there is no apparent connection to what the girl had just said.

Example: (girl) Well since I've met so many people here and I'm going to meet so many more people that it gives me sort of a head start as to what to expect from others.
(woman) Will you use your nurses' training here in the Peace Corps?

C. **General Impression.** Here the woman seems not to want to hear the girl - and doesn't. She seems not to want the girl to be there at all, so far as expressing herself is concerned.

ONE A. **Response.** The interviewer responds partially accurately, but with considerable distortion of the actual content and/or intention of the other's statements.

Example: (girl) We talk along and all of a sudden it's 2 o'clock in the morning and Wow! 'Our parents are gonna kill us! (laughs) you know (laugh).
(woman) Yeah (laugh) a sophomore in college and your parents are gonna kill you (laugh)

(Note: This contains a distortion of intention while it is accurate as to content. The content for the girl is: "we realize what time it is and say to ourselves "our parents are gonna kill us;"" intention is: "We are startled and anticipate being in trouble." The mother hears the content similarly but acts as if the intention were: "You and your parents interact in strange ways." The laughter, which seems to indicate commonality, actually covers the differences. For the girl, it says roughly: "I suddenly anticipated trouble;" for the mother: "you and your parents treat you strangely."

B. Change of topic and self-expression. In general, these do not totally lack connection with the previous statement, but they distort either its content or intention or otherwise move away from it decisively.

A score of 1 is given for a response which is a change of topic, containing no explicit acknowledgement of the previous statement save for the acknowledgement that the topic is being changed.

Example: (girl) There's really not that much that makes me happy.

(woman) Now - to get back to the "anxious" (previous topic).

Example: (girl) When I wasn't home I heard my father missed me so much, he even cried about it and all, and that surprised me because he's always, I've always thought of him as real strong. But now that I'm home all he does is talk about my sister Ida. And this is really sad. He's not really being inconsistent, but still he is.

(woman) Yes I'm very glad too that my daughter has come home and fitted so nicely into the family.
C. **General Impression.** Here it is as if the mother's principle is "I want to hear only a bit of what you say, I'll add the rest."

**TWO**

A. **Response.** Responds accurately with selection of low revealing aspects of the girl's statements (i.e. relatively low levels of personal importance and risk-value are focussed upon accurately).

**Example:** (girl) I don't think that I'm that smart, scholastically, but I have lots of ideas. I'm always thinking but scholastically I'm not brilliant, I don't think I'm even average, I think I'm below average, I do so poorly sometimes.

(woman) This may not be any lack of ability though. It may be just not getting on quite the same track as the teacher.

B. **Change of topic and self-repression.** In general, these contain, or are prefaced by, some accurate recognition of what was previously said, but they tend to move the conversation toward, or to maintain it on, relatively low levels of importance and potential risk. Thus, they "fit" with what the girl said, but steer clear of higher levels of risk and importance.

Scored here are instances in which a simple recognition ("yes," "I see," etc.) is followed by a change of topic moving away from material which seems potentially personally important.

**Example:** (girl) With my grandparents the generation gap seems tremendous. They seem so stupid sometimes. They talk without thinking and just because they're older it makes them right. But I don't have that kind of trouble with my parents, but with my grandparents I do.

(mother) O.K. (pause) Do you like the feeling of growing up and becoming more independent?
Also scored here are instances in which the change of topic or self-expression are obviously accurately related to the girl's statement, but which move the focus away from the line of expression the girl was developing.

Example: (girl) We'll be sitting there talking and someone will say "let's go over to John's house." And we will, we'll just, you know, play along. It's nice once in a while to just completely relax with your friends.

(woman) Do you ever like to spend time, oh say, just with your best girl friend?

C. General Impressions. Here the interviewer seems willing to hear clearly whatever the girl says, but steers her conversation in a low-revealing direction. It is as if she is saying "Tell me about things, but cool it." The mother is steering or maintaining "high" hurt differ from girl about what she (g) thinks, and is claiming last word about it.

THREE A. Response. Responds accurately with neither high- nor low-revealing aspects focussed upon more than others. Included here would be simple "recognition" responses ("yes," "uh huh," etc.) which are unelaborated, and not connected to a change of topic or self-expression.

Example: (girl) being in plays makes me tremendously happy.

(woman) Did it make you happy helping in Alan's play?

B. Change of topic and self-expression. In general, these acts contain or are prefaced by accurate acknowledgement, and do not serve either to particularly deepen or superficialize the conversation.

Scored here are cases in which a simple recognition is followed by a change of topic or self-expression moving away from material which does not seem high in personal importance.
C. **General Impression.** Here there is a neutral willingness to let the girl speak and be heard, but with no discernable "pull" for either more or less self-disclosure. If there are "pulls" of both kinds, they seem about evenly balanced.

**FOUR A. Response.** Responds accurately with some selection toward high-revealing aspects.

Example: (girl) When you meet people from different environments, like the people who come from the same environment as the rioting, then the rioting makes perfect sense. And the history books can't teach you that.

(woman) Then you mean that you benefit more than you - there's no - it doesn't make you look down on those that come from the different environment from you?

B. **Change of topic and self-expression.** These acts generally function much more as a part of, or elaboration of, an accurate response than at the lower scale levels. Either they are connected to a high-tending accurate response, and serve as an invitation to further high-revealing trite material, and extend the girl's line of thought in a more high-revealing direction.

C. **General Impression.** The woman seems willing to hear whatever the girl says, and steers her talk in a high-revealing direction. She seems to be saying "Show me what's important to you."

**FIVE A. Response.** Responds accurately with definite and genuine emphasis on high-revealing aspects. Responses are not only accurate, they convey a sincere interest in the other as a person.

Example: (girl) If you get out of the kind of environment that molded you and made you what you are it's good. I mean people at 18 or 19 are malleable enough that meeting someone
from a new environment can change them and make them perhaps more tolerant of people which is very important. I think.

(woman) Do you think your life has been enriched by this association?

B. **Change of Topic and self-expression.** These are, as in level 5, almost always an elaboration or extention of an accurate, high-tending, response. These tend to move toward centrally important material, either by elicitation or example.

C. **General Impression.** Here the woman seems to be willing to hear whatever the girl has to say, and conveys a genuine interest in learning about her as a person. She seems to be saying: "show me what you really feel and think. Let me really get to know you."

**SIX**

A. **Response.** As in level 5, but also invites an "encounter" or immediate engagement of the other with her current experiences and with herself (the interviewer) as an immediately present, real person.

B. **Change of topic and self-expression.** These move not only, as in 5, to centrally important material, but also toward more immediacy of engagement or involvement of the girl with her own feelings and thoughts as she is currently experiencing them, as well as toward a less "role-defined" involvement with the interviewer.

C. **General impression.** The interviewer seems willing to hear everything, and to engage in immediate encounter with the girl's most currently forming, tentatively expressed feelings. She seems willing that they be at least momentarily "out of role" with each other. It is as if she is saying "let me share your feelings now."
Special scoring rules established by raters:

1. If mother and daughter are agreeing with each other or "cooperating" with each other to the point of perhaps sounding rehearsed or staged and the responses are all accurate and this involves talk of feelings etc., it can't be scored a 4, because the feeling behind this is that we're not going to have the opportunity to hear if there's anything else besides the mutual agreement. Therefore the feeling is not "show me what's important to you" but "show me the right thing that's important to you" or "show me the right thing and we'll agree." Score this a 3.5 if the content is high (emphasis is toward feeling) and 3.0 if it is less so.

2. In reaching an overall score, don't average in the 3's (individual responses) and dilute the tendencies high or low. Just let them support or add to the amount of highness or the amount of lowness of the entire segment.
PERSONAL-IMPERSONAL RATING SCALE

JUDGES' MANUAL

The Construct

The scale is designed to measure the construct Personal vs. Impersonal. This dimension is intended to describe certain qualities of a person's view of another person.

Theoretical Definition. A view of someone is Personal to the extent that it makes reference to that person's "internal," experiential frame of reference. The view is Impersonal to the degree that it lacks such reference. Another way of putting this is to say that a Personal view definitely implies that the other person is a living, experiencing center of a personal world; that is, that he feels, knows, thinks, experiences, chooses, values, decides to act, etc. An Impersonal view lacks this implication.

Operational Definition. The datum for this scale will be the written report of a subject, giving what he believes to be his most important ideas about what a given person is "really like." Each such report will be analyzed sentence by sentence before a total score for the report is reached.
The judge is to evaluate each sentence as being either Personal, Impersonal, or Ambiguous. The sentence will be called Personal if its meaning is heavily weighted by some reference to the "internal," experiential frame of reference of the one being described. It will be called Impersonal if such reference is absent or treated as unimportant. The class of Ambiguous is to be assigned as seldom as possible, only when it is not possible to say whether the sentence contains an important Personal reference or not.

**Personal Sentences.** In general, such Personal references can usually be said to take one of the following forms.

The person described is explicitly shown to have experiences of his own. For example, "private" or "inner" experiences are attributed to him, as in: "I think I hurt his feelings," "he does a lot of planning before he acts," "he has a lot of fantastic dreams," "children often make him angry."

If the sentence shows the person to have a unique point of view of his own, that is, to have his own perceptions, opinions, attitudes, prejudices, structure of meanings, etc., it is called Personal. For example: "having such poor eyesight must affect his ideas," "he prefers brown suits," "he is very much in favor of urban renewal," "he feels all Italians are crazy."
Another way a sentence may be called Personal is if it makes reference to the person's capacity to choose, decide, have goals and values. For example "he is working extra hard to get a raise," "he decided to leave town rather than stay," "he thinks that honor is more important than money."

The judge will quickly come to spot the "key terms" which distinguish a Personal sentence. In the above, for instance, such phrases as the following were especially important: "his feelings (hurt);" "he does . . . planning;" "He prefers;" "he feels;" "he is . . . working (in order to) get . . . ;" "he decided;" "he thinks."

While hard and fast rules of diction can not be relied on blindly in making a decision, the majority of sentences which contain Personal reference, use phrasing similar to the above.

**Impersonal Sentences.** Any sentence which plainly lacks any important reference to the experiential dimension of the other person, is called Impersonal. The variety of forms an Impersonal statement may take seems endless; but the following cases, if not exhaustive, may be illustrative.

The other person may be presented, not in terms of his own experience, but as an entity in the experience of the describer. For instance, "he always makes me feel good," "he's the person who is most important to me," "he's a sort I cannot tolerate."
The description may be purely behavioral or "objective," as in: "he always hangs around the Union, and bowls most every weekend," "he yells at you every time you turn around," "he has a lot of good times."

The other person may be described as a member of some class or typology: "he's a cheater," "he's just a plain lazy man," "he's a real leader." While such statements may in some sense seem to "get at what he really is," they make no reference to "what he is" in terms of his own experience.

Not being described as one who chooses, aspires, has values, etc., his behavior is accounted for by things "exterior" to his experiential world, as in: "his childhood helped him have such strong character," "he just isn't motivated to learn."

The following simple diagram may make clearer the difference, as defined, between a Personal and an Impersonal view of another person.
Diagram A is intended to represent certain aspects of an Impersonal view. Two objects, the Topic Person, and his Ford automobile, are pictured in the Writer's perceptual field. Two ideas that the Writer has about the T person are represented by the two numbered arrows. Arrow 1, notice, just touches T's circular skin; and if W were to express the idea in words, he might say, "T does a lot of swell things for me," or even, "T is an awfully nice fellow." The fact that the arrow pierces no further indicates, as the words do, that the idea shows no cognizance of T's own frame of reference. The second idea has to do with T's relation with his Ford, and might be stated, "I see T driving his car most every day." The line of relation between T and Ford also just touches T's exterior. This represents the fact that it is a "behavioral" relation which is perceived by W, and not (at least as stated) by T.
Diagram B represents a Personal view of the same two objects, and the arrows, again, two ideas of W about T. Arrow one, this time, has a different focus, inside of T. W might express it, "T feels the need for a lot of friends," or "I think that T wants people to like him, and tried to 'buy' that with a lot of favors." Arrow two again points to the relation between T and his Ford; but the form of the relation perceived is somewhat different. It might be stated, "T really loves that car, it's important to him to have something big and powerful." The line of relation this time originates inside of T, as the words used indicate.

**Ambiguous Sentences.** This category is to be assigned as seldom as possible; only when the judge is unable to decide whether a given sentence is Personal or Impersonal. If a sentence seems ambiguous when standing alone, the judge is to read other sentences preceding and following it. This will generally shed new light which makes a decision possible. The following types of statements often seem to make for difficulty in judging.

Descriptions employing psychological language may often be difficult to assess. While such statements as: "his toilet training led to later problems," and "he has a lot of drive," may appear to have a certain "internal" reference, they are nevertheless to be scored Impersonal in that they make no explicit reference to the experiential dimension.

Descriptive cliches which employ Personal language but are known to be generally used with Impersonal intent, also pose some problem for judgment. Consider, for example, the statement:
"she is suffering from illusions of grandeur." The question is, does the writer intend the word "suffering" to have its original, experiential meaning, or is the term used for its popular (and degenerated) meaning as a non-experiential quasi-explanation of behavior? In this case, examination of surrounding statements make the latter interpretation seem the safer. Other examples of this problem are: "he is a fun-loving guy," "She goes out of her way to be friendly," "he knows how to get around."

In rare cases a sentence may contain two major clauses one of which is Personal and the other Impersonal. If neither seems to outweigh the other in importance for the meaning of the total statement, the statement is scored Ambiguous.

Unscored Sentences. On only two occasions will a sentence be left unscored. The first is when, at the beginning of a report, the writer starts with an introductory sentence obviously outside the body of the essay. For instance, "I am going to write about a friend of mine." The other time a sentence will be left unscored is when it is a simple repeat; that is, when it had been given previously in the report.
Scoring the Report

It seems advisable that the judge first read each report through once or twice before beginning scoring. He then considers each sentence separately, and designates each one as either Personal, (P), Impersonal, (I), or Ambiguous, (?). After this is done, he can proceed to calculating the Personal-Impersonal quotient (or PI-Q) for the whole report.

The judge adds the total number of P-sentences and I-sentences. (?-sentences are excluded from the calculation). The PI-Q is then reached with the formula:

\[ \text{PI-Q} = \frac{\text{Sum P}}{\text{Sum P + Sum I}} \times 100 \]

Judging Examples

The following reports will serve as examples of both judging and scoring. Each sentence in the reports is numbered. The scoring of each sentence, along with some discussion, follows each report. In the discussion, the author of the report will be called "writer" (W), and the one written about will be called "topic person" (T).

First Example. (1) A fellow who is always very friendly. (2) Most frequent meetings being in chemistry lab. (3) He seems to be very happy, content in life. (4) He was willing to help another
but only if he had some hope of future use of that person. (5) He does not allow himself to be drawn in close to a person until he has seen how that person's acquaintance may benefit him. (6) He is very unconcerned about things which do not affect his life directly. (7) He does not let himself be bothered by the troubles of others and "minds his own business." (8) In spite of what may be called this "selfish attitude" he seems to try to make people like him. (9) He appears to feel no real need for anyone as far as his personal happiness goes but when confronted by a problem, such as bad results on an experimental run, he will immediately seek out another, before analyzing his own records in search of error. (10) He seems to base his self-confidence more on "luck" than on real assurance. (11) Basically, I believe, he is an able young man who is interested in educating himself, as shown by his 3.6 accum., and who is concerned with accomplishing the goals he has set before him. (12) He seems to trust in himself and want to succeed, so I believe he probably will.

**Judgment of Sentences.**

1. I. This behavioral description lacks any important Personal reference.

2. I. This simple statement of "objective" fact, makes no experiential reference to T.
3. P. "Happy" and "Content" in this sentence do seem to convey a P-references.

4. P. The reference to T's "willingness" (rather than his behavioral "doing"), along with an allusion to his privately held values, give a P tone here.

5. P. The reasoning here is similar to no. 4.

6. P. Although negative statements which use P-language are often difficult to assess, there seems here to be a considerable P. intent in the words "concern" and "affect."

7. P. The strong reference to self-direction and implied values is important in this judgment.

8. Here the writer seems to be reaching behind an apparent "attitude" to his "trying." This strongly implies experienced values, decision and initiation of action, which makes the sentence a P.

9. P. The other's feeling of "need" is referred to, if only in the negative. Also, the verb "seek" has overtones of the "inner" initiation of action.

10. P. Here the active, "private" "building" of a stable pattern of experience ("self-confidence") is attributed.

11. P. "Is interested" and "is concerned" are phrases which seem to speak "out of" the frame of reference of the other.

12. P. "Trusting" is an experiential, "private," attribution, as is "wanting."

\[ \text{Sum } P = 10 \]

\[ \text{Sum } I = 2 \]

\[ \text{PI O } = \frac{\text{Sum } P}{\text{Sum } P + \text{Sum } I} \times \frac{100}{10 + 2} \]

(100) = 83 (rounded to second decimal place)
Second Example.

(1) As a person he is very sly and tricky. (2) He likes people to know he is around. (3) He doesn't care if he hurts someone's feelings or not. (4) He is a fun-loving guy, but only when it is something he enjoys doing. (5) He is not a mixer. (6) He likes recognition and will stop at no means in obtaining it. (7) He is literally a big mouth and a show off. (8) He also thinks he is Mr. Atlas and sometimes he try to take away his friends' girlfriends to show that he can get any girl he wants. (9) He will do a favor, but sometimes he thinks of what he will get out of it. (10) He has a smooth line that he gives to everyone. (11) People just don't know whether to trust him or not.

Judgment of Sentences.

1. I. The terms "sly" and "tricky" refer only to the other as he is experienced or conceived of by the writer, and have no Personal reference.

2. P. This cliche is hard to judge, and P-judgment is made on a low level of confidence.

3. ? It seems impossible to say whether this refers to some inferred experience of "caring" or is only indirect behavioral description plus evaluation by the writer.

4. P. This judgment, like no. 2, is also made with a low level of confidence.

5. I. This sentence is both a simple classification of the other, and is behavioral, and has no P-side.
6. P. Although this sounds strongly like a "cliche of judgment," the reference to "liking" and indirectly to his values and decision-making, give weak indication of a P.

7. I. Same as no. 5.

8. P. This long sentence gives a mixed impression, but the reference to his thinking, trying, and to his valued ends, seem to balance it slightly to the P side.

9. P. "...sometimes he thinks of..." in the second clause, seems to weight the sentence slightly to the P side.


11. I. This refers to the experience of other persons, and says nothing directly about T at all.

\[
\text{Sum P} = 5 \\
\text{Sum I} = 5 \\
\text{PI Q} = \frac{5}{10} \cdot (100) = 50
\]

**Third Example.**

(1) My closest friend and I have known each other for about seven years. (2) We are always in and out of each other's homes. (3) We both come from about the same background. (4) She was well-liked in high school. (5) Although she is plump she is not sloppy in her appearance. (6) She has excellent taste in clothes. (7) Often we shop together. (8) She is a very pleasant and friendly person.

(9) Mutually we have the same friends. (10) I have never seen her really angry. (11) She always tries to keep a level head.
(12) She is a born leader. (13) She heads many school and church activities.

(14) She is very lively and gay. (15) She dances very well and is light on her feet. (16) She is popular with everyone. (17) She has a great sense of humor. (18) I like her and always will like her. (19) We have had some great times together. (20) She goes out of her way to be friendly and likable.

Judgment of Sentences.

1. I. This statement of objective fact makes no P reference.
2. I. Same as no. 1.
3. I. Same as no. 1.
4. I. Refers to other persons, and makes no P reference about T.
5. I. Same as no. 1.
6. I. This evaluative statement obviously refers to the experienced values of the writer (or assumed "objective" values) and not to T.
7. I. Same as no. 1.
8. I. This is behavioral, not Personal.
9. I. Same.
10. I. Although this hints at something P with the term "angry," the strong implication is behavioral.
11. P. The concept of the other's "trying" shows an element of P.
12. I. Simple categorization.
13. I. Same as no. 1.

14. I. Despite slight hints of P, the impression is strongly "exterior."

15. I. Same as no. 1.

16. I. Same as no. 4.

17. I. Behavioral description.

18. I. Relates the frame of reference of W, not of T.

19. I. Same as no. 1.

20. ? It seems impossible to say whether "her way" which she "goes out of" carries the implication of something perceived by T, or not.

Sum P = 1

Sum I = 18

\[ P/Q = 1/19 \cdot (100) = 5 \]

**Fourth Example.**

(1) She is anxious to "get ahead" of the average person and is willing to work hard toward her goals. (2) She likes to have a lot of friends. (3) She's interested in what others say. (4) She tries to be polite and thinks of the other person as well as herself. (5) She sets high standards and tries to keep them. (6) She is willing to listen to your problems and then to offer her solution. (7) She likes to have fun but can be very serious at times.
Judgment of Sentences.


Sum P = 7
Sum I = 0
PI-Q = 7/7 * (100) = 100

Fifth Example.

(1) She is quite reserved and quiet and likes to have fun, but not fun that hurts other people since people's feelings are important to her. (2) She tries to work hard and she is very conscientious. (3) She is tolerant of other people's shortcomings and expects the same in return. (4) She is quite emotional and becomes depressed easily but this is mainly due to the painful severing of close ties with her family and boyfriend by being down at school. (5) Her ideas of fun include more than the social parties and similar events. (6) She is very content with simple things and can find beauty or enjoyment in them. (7) She comes from a small town and has not been changed by two years exposure to a large city. (8) She is still as warm and friendly as the day she came down here.

Judgment of Sentences.

Sum P = 6

Sum I = 2

\[ \text{PI-QL} = \frac{6}{8} \times (100) = 75 \]
DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE REV SCORES, NUMBER OF RATERS = 3
GROUPED AVERAGE REV SCORES

Number

0.0 0.5 1.0 1.5 2.0 2.5 3.0 3.5 4.0 4.5 5.0 5.5 6.0 6.5 7.0
AVERAGE CON SCORE, NUMBER OF RATERS = 2
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