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I sometimes hold it half a sin
To put in words the grief I feel;
For words, like Nature, half reveal
And half conceal the Soul within.

Tennyson — IN MEMORIAM A.H.H.
Chapter I

SELF-DISCLOSURE: RESEARCH AND THEORY

The present paper is an attempt to integrate some of the theoretical writings and research of Carl Rogers and Sidney Jourard. Both writers have developed theories of personality (Rogers, 1959, 1961; Jourard, 1958) and psychotherapy (Rogers, 1942, 1951, 1959, 1961; Jourard, 1964) which have some overlap, but no explicit relationship to one another. This chapter will present a consideration of parts of their theories along with some of the research involved in the development of their respective positions. Jourard's work on self-disclosure will be placed in the context of Rogers' larger system, and a review of other self-disclosure research will be included. In addition, the author will present in this chapter a discussion of the concept of self-disclosure which will include the rudiments of a new theory as well as some questions to be answered by a study of self-disclosure in an interview setting.

Chapter two is concerned with the methods and hypotheses of this study, while chapters three, four and five present the results, discussion and summary.
The Client-Centered Approach

Rogers (1942, 1951) developed a theory of psychotherapy and later broadened it to include a theory of personality and interpersonal relationships (1959). He suggested that it is the attitudes the therapist holds for his clients, and his communication of them, that determine the success or failure of psychotherapy (1957). He also articulated the specific therapist and patient conditions which he saw as essential to successful psychotherapy, and has proposed that we look at certain feelings, attitudes, and perceptions which the therapist and patient experience for one another and towards themselves. He summarized these conditions as follows:

The client must experience himself as being fully received. There is implied in this term the concept of being understood empathetically and the concept of acceptance. It is also well to point out that it is the client's experience of this condition which makes it optimal, not merely the fact of its existence in the therapist. (1961, p. 131)

The therapist, though still responding in the interview, must recognize that his deliberate technique is not so important as his attitudes toward the patient and the patient's perception of these attitudes.

Rogers, therefore, is in a highly paradoxical position in contemporary psychology. He has suggested that an ability to communicate warm, accepting attitudes towards the patient is the cornerstone of successful psychotherapy and, for this reason, has been considered a major proponent of the existential-phenomenological school of psychotherapy (Ford and Urban, 1964). In apparent contrast to this, he formalized his theoretical position to make it as clear as possible, and has attempted to evaluate it with several research programs.
The first of these programs was the group of studies which he published with Rosalind Dymond (1954). In a later publication, Rogers (1958) stated that he wanted to change the direction of his research program. He reasoned that psychotherapy is not a static entity and cannot be evaluated by the static measures which he had been using. Since psychotherapy is a continuing process, he decided to turn to ongoing behaviors which could be studied during live interviews rather than only at the conclusion of psychotherapy. Since these behaviors consisted of changes in the patients' style of talking, as well as the content of their communication, his scale had to be sensitive to the language style, voice quality, and other cues which would reflect changes in the patient during the interview. The Process Scale (Rogers, 1958; Walker et al., 1960) was his attempt to subsume the style and content of patient behavior and put it on a continuum from rigidity to changingness. Rating scales similar to Rogers' which place style as well as content on a continuum of change, have, by convention, been called process scales.

Rogers' scale consists of seven continua, or "strands," along which seven distinctive stages are identified. The seven strands are summarized below:

1. Feelings and Personal Meanings (FPM)
2. The Manner of Experiencing (EXP)
3. The Degree of Incongruence (INC)
4. The Communication of Self (SEL)
5. The Manner in which Experience is Construed (PC)
6. The Relationship to Problems (PRB)
7. Manner of Relating (REL)

Each of these strands was scored separately on a seven-point scale which, in Rogers' words,
represents a continuum of psychological activity which commences at one end with a rigid, static, undifferentiated, and impersonal type of psychological functioning and, at the other, is characterized by changingness, fluidity, and rich and immediate experiencing of personal feelings which are felt as deeply owned and accepted. (1958, p. 2)

Rogers and his students hoped that this scale would function as an operational measure to evaluate the processes occurring in counseling and psychotherapy. As Rogers developed his theory, and his methods for evaluating it, other authors developed minor systems within the client-centered framework.

Gendlin (1962) has elaborated upon the part of Rogers' work which deals with the immediate experiencing of the patient. Truax (1962) modified Rogers' theory and has done some work with rating scales for therapist, as well as patient characteristics. Truax is particularly concerned with intrapersonal exploration on the part of the patient, and has suggested that if Rogers' (1957) conditions for therapeutic change are met, it is then possible for the patient to feel accepted enough to engage in self-exploration. Self-exploration, in Truax's system, is an intermediary construct, which mediates the patient's experience of acceptance and the personal growth which follows it.

Self-Report Techniques in the Study of Self-Disclosure

The work of Sidney Jourard and his colleagues, although not explicitly in the client-centered framework, can be seen as an extension of Rogers' writings on the importance of the relationship between the patient and his therapist. Rogers' statement that the patient must perceive himself as accepted by the therapist, carries with it the
implication that the therapist must communicate his accepting attitudes to the patient. This will require verbal and non-verbal expressions on the therapist's part so that "the counselor or physician or administrator who is warmly emotional and expressive, respectful of the individuality of himself and of the other, and who exhibits a non-possessive caring, probably facilitates self realization...with these attitudes" (1958, p. 97). It is important to Rogers' theory of psychotherapy that the therapist give of himself during his contacts with the patient. It is to this point that Jourard and his colleagues have addressed their research.

Jourard (1964) suggested that the study of self-disclosure can be an extremely pertinent means of assessing human relationships. This statement is congruent with a concept implied in Rogers' model. It is possible that a continuous process of patient and/or therapist self-disclosure is necessary for therapeutic change. Perhaps the specific personal experiences which the patient relates to the therapist are not as important as the fact that he has included these experiences in the therapeutic interview. The degree of self-disclosing behavior which occurs in therapy might serve as an index of the trust which the patient has for the therapist, and therefore as an assay of the quality of their relationship during that interview. This trust is especially valuable as an indication of therapeutic success if one views psychopathology as the result of extreme degrees of punishment applied to the individual for disapproved behavior. For Rogers, this punishment occurs along with rejection of the individual so that his behavior, or his perceptions surrounding it, are altered. Therapy, then, can be viewed as a situation in which the individual may feel accepted enough to begin to discuss
the perceptions surrounding the punished behavior. It can be seen as successful or unsuccessful to the extent that the patient is able to discuss his most intimate thoughts, feelings, and actions with the therapist.

Although there are few studies dealing with communication of personal material, many research possibilities have been made available by Jourard and his colleagues. Jourard and Lasakow (1958) presented a scale for the measurement of an individual's report of his self-disclosures towards several "target persons." Their thesis was that there are several important content areas or "aspects" of an individual's life that he will be inclined to reveal to a greater or lesser degree, depending on who is the recipient of this information. Jourard's review of the literature (1964) considered issues of self-disclosure in kinship behavior, religious behavior, and cross-cultural patterns of personal communication. He also presented an interesting interpretation of his data by suggesting that self-disclosure can be an indication of a subject's relationship with some specific target person. Since each person can be scored for self-disclosure across various aspects of his life, a "base rate" can be obtained for him. Also, since subjects' self-disclosures are made vis-a-vis selected target people, those scores can be interpreted as assays of the quality of those relationships.

Quinn (1965), using a somewhat altered version of Jourard's scale, studied the interaction between self-disclosure and the relationship which exists between the subject and three possible target persons. He asked his subjects to report whether or not they would disclose information to target persons in three different relationships to them, and found that his subjects revealed most to a close friend, moderately
to a complete stranger, and least to an acquaintance. He reasoned that subjects disclose differentially to varying target persons because of the potential power in the information which the subject gives to the target person. This power poses a threat for the subject depending on his perception of the target person as someone who can or will use this power. An item of personal information in the hands of a person the subject knows he will never see again would be less of a threat than the same piece of information disclosed to someone the subject knows fairly well, but not well enough to have developed a trusting relationship toward him.

Barker (1965) hypothesized that self-disclosure takes place in an interpersonal setting and that there is an interaction between the specific item of information to be disclosed and the subject's perception of the target person as someone to whom it is safe to disclose the information. The relationship between these variables is diagrammed below:

![Diagram of self-disclosure and trust](image)

"Trust" (Perception of the target person as a "safe" recipient)

Self-disclosure as related to S's perception of "riskiness" of information and "trust" in target person. (From Barker, 1965)
The diagonal line across the diagram represents the hypothetical course which successful therapy must follow with regard to the particular aspect of the patient's life under consideration. The therapist must maintain a balance between the importance of the information as seen by the subject and the therapeutic assessment of the subject's perception of him as "safe" or not for the receipt of the information. If the therapist moves too quickly into deeply personal material without the subject's trust, disclosure will not occur. If, on the other hand, the information is not personal and the therapist is seen as a safe person for self-disclosure, then there will be self-disclosure but there will not be movement into disclosure of significant content areas.

It might be interesting to explore the concept of the therapist as a safe target person with regard to the operating procedures of the various schools of psychotherapy. It is possible that there are several ways in which the therapist can become a safe target person to the patient and that different schools of psychotherapy teach their students different procedures for becoming safe target persons. Perhaps the orthodox Freudian becomes a safe target person by providing the patient with an opportunity to disclose to an all-of, anonymous stranger who will certainly not use professionally disclosed information against him, while the client-centered therapist attempts to become something like a trusted friend to the patient. If this were the case, and if we accept patient self-disclosure as an index of the success of therapy, we would expect that both therapists could be successful with a large variety of patients. Analysis of self-disclosure might provide promising methods of assessing psychotherapeutic procedures as well as providing clues about patients'
perceptions of their therapists. Although there is a limited amount of research in which self-disclosure has been measured with regard to interpersonal settings, several preliminary investigations have been undertaken and are reviewed below.

Self-Disclosure: Ohio State University Studies

Greene (1964) presented a sentence completion blank (SDSB) which is scored for self-disclosure. Subjects respond by completing a series of twenty sentence stems which are then rated for self-disclosure by judges using the scoring manual. He reported interjudge reliabilities of .83, .84, and .91 for three pairs of judges. The development of the SDSB was described in the framework of a theory of self-disclosure which treats it as a concept similar to defensiveness. Greene suggested that high self-disclosers are reacting with openness rather than defensiveness in the particular situations he studied. Greene also presented several examples from theories of optimal personality adjustment (Jourard, 1958; Maslow, 1962; Rogers, 1961) indicating that these theories implicitly include some concept of personal expressiveness as a characteristic of the healthy personality. In a group of studies designed to demonstrate the validity of his scale, Greene showed that a group of subjects who were mildly threatened (i.e., were told that their psychology instructors might be shown their protocols) disclosed less than a non-threatened control group. His results indicated that the judges could accurately score the sentences and that the SDSB was sensitive to the differences in responses between the two groups. In another study, Greene demonstrated a significant correlation ($r = .64$, $p < .01$) between therapists' ratings of the patients on the dimension of self-disclosure, and the patients' SDSB
scores. Both of these studies, although interpreted by Greene in a slightly different context, have relevance for the theory of self-disclosure presented above.

Greene's subjects in these two studies were responding to instructions to "express your real feelings." It is important to note the setting in which these instructions were given. In the first of the two studies, Greene's subjects were introductory psychology students. Those subjects in Greene's "non-threatened" group were responding to the instructions on the test blank and to the experimenter who simply informed them that he was attempting to develop a test and that their responses would be held in confidence. Thus the non-threat Ss were responding vis à vis a stranger whom they could assume would not use any of the information against them. The threatened Ss, however, were responding to a person who might very well use their self-disclosures against them, and they disclosed the least. It is interesting to note that Greene, in developing his two treatment groups, intuitively chose instructions which would satisfy the theory of self-disclosure presented above. In the language of this theory, these subjects are responding to conditions in which they differentially evaluate the experimenter as someone to whom it is safe to disclose the information suggested to them by the sentence stems.

Barker's (1965) theory can provide a means of conceptualizing the difference between the threat and non-threat groups more explicitly than by Greene's single construct: "defensiveness." The interpersonal process is broken down to include the subjects' perception of the experimenter and the risk involved in the disclosing of information. Although
Greene did not deal with the risk involved in self-disclosure explicitly, his scoring manual quite frequently makes implicit reference to this concept. For example,

In all instances, the scorer is admonished to accept subject responses at face value, and to score each response as it is written, for its closeness to what are the core issues in a person's personal life (p. 47).

and

Level Two:...Distance from the core theme may be along a dimension of person, place, time, intensity, or frequency (p. 50).

He explains to his judges that when an item of information is distant from the core themes or core issues of a person's life, "the content does not play as major a role over as wide an area of the person's life" as does a disclosure which is closer to the subject's core issues (p. 50).

We can see from these examples that Greene has included in his scoring system an intuitive notion of the "risk" involved in a piece of information which the subject might disclose to the experimenter.

Carpenter (1966) also presented a rating scale which has relevance for research in self-disclosure. He was concerned with the construct Personal-Impersonal, and his scale deals with the manner in which a subject describes a specific target person. Subjects are asked to describe a target person in twenty sentences and their descriptions are rated at five points on a continuum from personal to impersonal, by judges using the manual. Descriptions are scored according to the following criteria for a personal statement:
1. The person described is shown to be a particular locus of experience.
2. He is shown to be a particular locus of construction of the world.
3. He is shown to be a particular locus of decision and activity.
4. He is shown to be a particular locus of history or time.
5. He is shown to be a particular locus of values.
6. He is shown to be one pole of a significant personal relationship with the viewer. (p. 36)

Further on, Carpenter offered the following as his "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. (p. 111)

The subject's description, then, is scored by judges using Carpenter's manual for each sentence. Subsequently, a Personal-Impersonal quotient, or PI Q, is tabulated according to the following formula:

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

(p. 116)

Carpenter presented several studies in which he used the P-I scale. Two of his conclusions are presented below:

Persons who occupy a position of great intimacy in an individual's world tend to be viewed in a more personal way than other individuals who are either less well known or less positively valued and
The level of self disclosure (on Greene's SDSB) typical of a person tends to be positively related to the degree to which other persons view him in a personal manner. (p. 89)

Carpenter, then, has provided some data which indicate that, in close relationships, people tend to view the other more personally. The data also indicate that people who disclose more tend to be seen more personally. Although these are merely exploratory data, some tentative conclusions may be drawn. Perhaps subjects who communicate personal information are treated quite differently from persons who do not disclose such information. It is quite possible that a person's world may be somewhat different as a result of his ability to respond with personal information when dealing with others. If, as Carpenter has suggested, people tend to see someone personally as a function of their involvement with him, perhaps the high discloser has more close relationships than the low discloser.

It seems likely that since Carpenter's subjects responded more personally to the high disclosers, these high disclosers are treated differently by many of the people with whom they have come in contact, even when they have not entered into a highly involved relationship.

Another contribution arising from Carpenter's definition of the construct personal-impersonal is the P-I technique itself. By rating subjects' descriptions of target persons on a personal-impersonal continuum, we have begun to explore those social perceptions which define meaningful human relationships. In the language of Barker's (1965) model for the study of self-disclosure, the P-I technique might be useful as an operational definition of the subject's perception of the target person as safe or not for the disclosure of a specific piece of information. It might be possible, then, to use Carpenter's scale to measure an
independent variable and predict self-disclosure scores for a specific aspect of a subject's life. In this vein, it would also be possible to reverse predictor and criterion, and predict a subject's perception of the target person from his self-disclosure scores. Jourard (1964) explored this latter possibility in his review of the literature. He offered the suggestion that self-disclosure scores could serve as a means of evaluating a subject's relationship to the designated target person. It has been the point of view of the present author, however, that self-disclosure scores must be viewed in the context in which they occur, and that the information disclosed, as well as the subject's perception of the target person, must be taken into consideration.

It seems likely that somewhere along the way, the reader may have questioned the wisdom of grouping self-disclosure scales with self-report inventories concerned with subjects' perceptions of their self-disclosures. Until Greene developed the SDSB there was no measuring instrument specifically developed for studying self-disclosure. Jourard's work in this area, which preceded Greene's, was concerned with subjects' reports of their self-disclosures.

A study by Haggerty (1964) lends some support to the validity of the use of self-reports as measures of self-disclosure. In a large correlational study of the concept of self-disclosure, Haggerty found that subjects who rated themselves as high self-disclosers on Jourard's scale were, in turn, rated as being high disclosers by close friends. Although this portion of Haggerty's study was concerned only with one target person (the subject's friend), it does lend some credence to the possibility that subjects do, in fact, disclose the information they say
they do. Two supporting sources of information can be found in Haggerty's thesis. The first is in the low but significant correlation ($r = .15; p < .05$) she obtained between Jourard's scale and Greene's SDSB. This is at least an indication that subjects who, on Jourard's scale, score high across the various target persons, for several aspects of their lives, tend to be more disclosing of themselves when they are faced with the problem of responding to the stems of Greene's incomplete sentences.

A second, albeit somewhat tenuous, piece of supporting information for the hypothesis that self-report scores for self-disclosure actually represent self-disclosure scores, comes from Haggerty's finding that self-report scores for self-disclosure do not correlate with Marlowe-Crowne (1961) social desirability scores ($r = 0.00$). Those findings indicate that we can, for now, accept Jourard's (1964) self-disclosure scores as more than simple dissimulation. It can also be seen that Greene's technique represents an additional instrument in the study of self-disclosure.

Suchman (1965) presented an additional tool for the study of self-disclosure which he called the REV Scale. This scale was designed for use with samples of spoken rather than written behavior, and therefore has a different focus of convenience from Greene's. The REV Scale was constructed to be sensitive to fluctuations in subjects' language style and voice quality as well as the degree to which the subject is communicating personal or impersonal content to the listener. Inter-judge reliabilities ranging from .53 to .72 were found for a large pool of judges. By adding the dimensions of voice quality and language style to his scale, Suchman was working with a process conception of self-disclosure which he labeled "revealingness." Haggerty (1964) and
McLaughlin (1966) demonstrated low but significant positive correlations of .42 (p < .01) and .48 (p < .05) between the REV Scale and the SDSB, indicating that they may be measuring somewhat different aspects of the same process.

"Revealingness," then, is a construct which has some overlap with self-disclosure but is applicable with data drawn from samples of spoken behavior. This reconstruing of self-disclosure is more global and inclusive than Greene's. It is also less precise, often resulting in lower reliability coefficients.

Perhaps at this point a brief recapitulation would be useful. At the outset of the introduction it was indicated that the study of self-disclosure follows naturally from Rogers' (1959) theory of psychotherapy, personality, and interpersonal relations. It was then suggested that Jourard's work on self-disclosure could be seen as a minor system within the client-centered framework, and some of the literature in the area of self-disclosure and personal communication was reviewed. Finally, some of the different research methods in this area were considered. The REV Scale can be seen as a method derived from Rogers' own approach to clinical research (1958) and theoretically related to the work of Gendlin (1962) and Jourard (1964).

In a previous study (Suchman, 1965) the validity of the REV Scale was tested. A group of subjects were asked to speak with an interviewer "about college life" for a half hour. During this half-hour period the interviewer used two interview styles, roughly described as "personal" and "impersonal," for fifteen minutes each. Conditions were counterbalanced for order so that each subject received both interview
styles, with one half of the Ss receiving the personal interview first and the other half receiving the impersonal interview first. As predicted, a group of judges using the REV Scale were able to differentiate between the subjects in the two conditions ($p < .01$). An unhypothetical finding in this study was that REV Scale scores for those subjects who received the personal interview condition first, never dropped as low as those for the subjects who received the impersonal condition first. This order effect was small but significant ($p < .05$), and holds true for the impersonal-personal order also. The implications of the latter finding, which go beyond the validation of the scale, touch upon Barker's (1965) self-disclosure theory. Perhaps the subjects who receive the personal condition first develop a perception of the interviewer as a person whom they can trust with their disclosures, while those subjects who receive the impersonal condition first do not. This suggests that the perceptions of the target person as "safe" or "unsafe" to reveal oneself to are developed early, and tend to color future interactions with this target person. The present study can be seen as an extension of the previous experiment and is described below.

Purpose

The purpose of the present study is to examine in a more controlled manner the effects of the personal and impersonal interview styles examined earlier. In addition, several other variables of presumed importance are included. First, the author would like to study the effect which the two interview conditions will have on subjects who have been selected specifically as high or low disclosers. In the present study, subjects were chosen not at random, but on the basis of
their scores on Quinn's (1965) self-disclosure scale. The method of selection is discussed in the next chapter.

In addition to including the Quinn scale as a screening technique, the present study utilized several dependent variable measures. Those dependent variable measures are rating scales of the interviewer which the interviewees completed after each interview condition.

Since, as was indicated earlier, the mainsprings of this work can be traced to Rogers' theory, the present experiment may pose an interesting challenge to this theory. For example, in discussing his necessary and sufficient conditions for therapeutic change, Rogers suggests that these will hold at all times for all patients. Specifically, he states:

The element which will be most surprising to conventional therapists is that the same conditions are regarded as sufficient for therapy, regardless of the particular characteristics of the client. It has been our experience to date that although the therapeutic relationship is used differently by different clients, it is not necessary nor helpful to manipulate the relationship in specific ways for specific kinds of clients. To do this damages, it seems to us, the most helpful and significant aspect of the experience, that it is a genuine relationship between two persons, each of whom is endeavoring, to the best of his ability, to be himself in the interaction. (1959, pp. 213-214)

Rogers has, no doubt, altered his position since then, but the fact still remains that he has presented us with a picture of interpersonal factors so potent that they overpower the differences between people.

Rogers' theory would predict that high self-disclosing subjects in a personal interview condition would be most revealing, and that low self-disclosing subjects in an impersonal interview condition would
receive the lowest revealingness scores. The challenge for Rogers' theory lies in the possibility that generally low-disclosing subjects might actually be more comfortable and score higher when faced with an impersonal interview. If this turns out to be the case, then we can no longer assert, as Rogers did, that there is a linear relationship between the degree of "conditions" offered and the "openness" which will occur in the client.

Specific hypotheses will be offered in the next chapter, but at this point it seems worthwhile to note that the present study asks the following questions:

1. What are the effects of personal and impersonal interviews on subjects who tend to report little or a great deal of self-disclosure?

2. What are the effects of alternating the two types of interviews on these two groups of subjects?

3. What will be the relationship between the REV Scale scores and the subjects' ratings of the interviewer after each condition?
Chapter II

METHODS AND HYPOTHESES

The subjects were twenty-eight male and female students selected from a large population of introductory psychology students. They were selected on the basis of their scores on Quinn's self-disclosure scale (Appendix I). This scale asks the subject if he would reveal the information contained in the items to a target person described in the instructions. The subject, then, imagines himself in an interview setting with the target person and responds yes or no to each of twenty items. Subjects scoring between nineteen and seventeen are considered "high disclosers," and subjects scoring between one and three are considered "low disclosers."

Procedure

Each subject was asked to speak with the author for approximately one hour. As each subject arrived he was informed that he was to participate in an experiment on human communication, and that the interviewer would like to begin by talking about college life with him for an hour. (See Appendix II for Instructions to Subjects.)

During the experimental period the subjects received first one, then the other, of the two interview conditions for thirty minutes each. Half received Condition A (personal) followed by Condition B (impersonal), while the other half received Condition B followed by Condition A. Subjects were assigned to these two orders of treatment conditions randomly,
by a research associate. The author did not know the subject's self-disclosure score at the time of the interview.

At the end of the first thirty minutes the subjects were asked to fill out several rating scales which are described in a later section. After the rating scales had been completed and turned in to a secretary, the subjects were asked to talk with the interviewer for another half hour. Again, after thirty minutes, the subjects were asked to rate the interviewer and turn their ratings in to a secretary.

The impersonal interview can be characterized as an interview oriented towards the assessment of the subjects' descriptions of their environment. Topics covered included their course schedules, the ways in which they spent their leisure time, etc. The personal interview was concerned with the subjects' descriptions of their feelings and perceptions of significant events. Topics covered in the personal interview included the subjects' descriptions of embarrassing moments, situations in which they felt happy, sad, etc. (See Appendix VII for Instructions to the Interviewer.)

**REV scale scoring**

Each of the interviews was tape-recorded and two three-minute segments were sampled (the 15th-17th and the 45th-47th minutes) so that there was a Condition A sample for each subject and a Condition B sample for each subject. Those samples, then, were rated by a group of judges using the REV scale (Appendix III).

Both judges were naive regarding self-disclosure research and neither had prior to the beginning of their training seen the REV scale. At first they were trained by listening to previously rated tapes and
making ratings of them, using the REV scale manual as a guide. The judges were not informed of the nature of the study until they had made their final ratings. Since the recordings were made on a stereo tape-recorder with one microphone for the subject and one for the interviewer, there was no contamination effect of having the interviewer and subject behavior judged from the same sample.

Other measuring instruments

At the end of each interview condition, the subjects were asked to rate the interviewer on several scales. These scales are described below:

1. P-I scale (Carpenter, 1966): The subjects were asked to write brief descriptions of the interviewer. These descriptions were rated by a group of judges using Carpenter's manual. (See Appendix IV.)

2. The Relationship Inventory (Barrett-Lennard, 1959): This scale has been used to rate therapists on Rogers' (1957) conditions for successful psychotherapy. The form used in the present study is taken from Peirce (1965) and is applicable to brief encounters between interviewer and subject. (See Appendix V.)

3. General interviewer rating scale: This scale was developed by the author for this study. It is, in effect, a structured form of a post-experimental inquiry. In this scale the subject is to rate the interviewer on several dimensions, including whether or not he liked him; whether or not he thought the interviewer was a competent person, etc. In addition, the subjects were asked whether or not they noticed any difference between the first half hour and the second, what they were, etc. (See Appendix VI.)
Hypotheses

Since there are three variables under consideration, there will be three major hypotheses which will apply to the four instruments.

1. Subjects who score high on the Quinn scale and are considered high self-disclosers will score highest on the REV scale. These subjects will also tend to rate the interviewer higher on the P-I scale, the Relationship Inventory, and the general rating scale. Those Ss who score low on Quinn's scale and are considered low self-disclosers will score lowest on the REV scale and will tend to rate the interviewer lower on the other measurements also.

2. There will be an effect of order of presentation of the two interview conditions so that those subjects who receive the impersonal condition first will score lower in the personal condition than those Ss who receive the personal condition first. Those Ss who received the personal condition first will score higher in the personal condition than the Ss who received the impersonal condition first. This relationship will hold true across all subjects regardless of whether or not they are high or low self-disclosers, and for all four measuring instruments.

3. All subjects will receive their highest REV scale scores in the personal interview condition and will tend to rate the interviewer higher in this condition on the three rating scales. Similarly, all Ss will receive their lowest REV scale scores in the impersonal interview condition and will tend to rate the interviewer lower in this condition.
Analysis of the data

The data were analyzed according to the procedures specified by Winer (1962) for the analysis of variance of a three factor experiment with repeated measures on one factor and an equal number of subjects per cell. In order to comply with the requirements of this analysis, several subjects were eliminated from the analysis. The reasons for their elimination from the experiment, and the means by which they were eliminated will be noted in the report of the results. Newman-Keuls sequential range tests were used for the analysis of the interactions.

For the present experiment, findings occurring with a probability of $p \leq 0.05$ will be accepted as meaningful and will be considered in the discussion section.
Chapter III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Since there were four measures of the subjects' responses to the two interview styles, results will first be presented for each of the four measures separately. A consideration of the results with respect to the hypotheses will follow and the discussion of these latter results will conclude the chapter.

Dependent Variable Measures

**REV scale**

Although the reliability of the REV scale has been previously demonstrated (Suchman, 1965), reliability with respect to the present judges must be ascertained before the REV scale scores can be considered. In the present study, the product-moment correlation between the judgments made by the two REV scale judges was .87. This figure is higher than any of the correlations obtained in previous REV scale research (Suchman, 1965; Haggerty, 1964; Mollers, 1965; McLaughlin, 1965; Carpenter, 1966). Since previous correlations ranged from .53 to .76, the present figure was considered adequate.

The analysis of variance of the REV scale scores for twenty subjects is presented in Table 1. Eight subjects were eliminated, at random, to comply with the procedures specified by Winer (1962) for the analysis of variance of a three-factor experiment with repeated measures on one factor and an equal number of subjects per cell. The elimination of these
subjects was made necessary by a lack of available subjects in one of the cells. Subjects were eliminated from the remaining three cells to conform to the number in the smallest cell.

TABLE 1

Analysis of Variance of REV Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (Self-Disclosure)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Order)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects w/in Groups [error(between)]</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Treatments)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.95</td>
<td>69.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C x Subjects w/in Groups [error(within)]</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P ≤ .05(1, 16) = 4.49
P ≤ .001 (20, 16) = 5.33
**P ≤ .01 (20, 16) = 3.26
***P ≤ .001 (1, 16) = 16.12
Of the three factors studied, the two treatments (interview styles) were significantly effective ($p < .001$), while the order of presentation of the treatments and the initially determined self-disclosure scores of the Ss were not. The personal interview was associated with higher REV scale scores while the impersonal interview was associated with lower REV scale scores. Neither the order of presentation of the two treatments nor the Ss' scores on the Quinn self-disclosure scale, then, were significant as main effects.

**Relationship inventory**

Table 2 presents the summary table for the analysis of variance for the Relationship Inventory scores of sixteen subjects. Twelve Ss were eliminated from the analysis; eleven of those to simplify statistical procedures, as described above, and one because of his failure to complete a portion of the inventory after one of the interviews.

As Table 2 indicates, the two interview styles were once again highly effective ($p < .001$). There were also two interactions which occurred between the treatment factor and each of the other two experimental factors. The AC interaction was significant at $p < .001$ while the BC interaction was significant at $p < .05$. The Newman-Keuls analyses of the AC and BC interactions are presented in Table 3 and Table 4 respectively.
TABLE 2

Analysis of Variance of Relationship Inventory Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</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 (Self-Disclosure)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Order)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,740.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>231.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects w/in Groups [error(between)]</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3,203.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Treatments)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,701.13</td>
<td>22.58***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,591.99</td>
<td>21.66***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,081.12</td>
<td>9.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>242.01</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C x Subjects w/in Groups [error(within)]</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>119.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05(1,12) = 4.75
** p ≤ .01(16,12) = 3.88
*** p ≤ .001(1,12) = 18.64
TABLE 3

Newman-Kouls Sequential Range Tests of the AC Interaction on the Relationship Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>((a_{1c_2}))</th>
<th>((a_{2c_2}))</th>
<th>((a_{2c_1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Disclosing-Personal ((a_{1c_1}) = 87.50)</td>
<td>36.37**</td>
<td>19.00**</td>
<td>18.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Disclosing-Personal ((a_{2c_1}) = 68.88)</td>
<td>17.75*</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Disclosing-Impersonal ((a_{2c_2}) = 68.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Disclosing-Impersonal ((a_{1c_2}) = 51.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \(p < .05\)  
** \(p < .01\)
**TABLE 4**

Newman-Keuls Sequential Range Tests of the BC Interaction on the Relationship Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>((b_{1c2}))</th>
<th>((b_{2c2}))</th>
<th>((b_{1c1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I to P - Personal ((b_{2c1})) = 91.38</td>
<td>13.13**</td>
<td>30.00**</td>
<td>26.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P to I - Personal ((b_{1c1})) = 65.00</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I to P - Impersonal ((b_{2c2})) = 61.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P to I - Impersonal ((b_{1c2})) = 58.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**\(p < .01\)**
It can be seen from Table 3 that three of the six differences between group means are significant at \( p < .01 \) while two are different at \( p < .05 \). The high disclosing - personal interview group was significantly higher than any of the other three groups (\( p < .01 \)). The high disclosing - impersonal interview group was lower than the low disclosing - impersonal interview group (\( p < .05 \)), the low disclosing - personal interview group (\( p < .05 \)), and the high disclosing - personal interview group (\( p < .01 \)).

Table 4 indicates that the order by interview interaction reflects the fact that the mean of the scores for the group in which the order of treatment was impersonal to personal and the treatment was a personal interview was greater than the mean of the scores of any of the other three groups (\( p < .01 \)), and that there was no significant difference between the means of those other groups.

**Personal-impersonal scale**

The reliability of the judge in the present study was determined by a product-moment correlation between her scores and a criterion group specified by Carpentor (1966) on a group of standardized descriptions. This correlation was .87 and was considered adequate for the present study. Table 5 presents the summary of the analysis of variance for the Personal-Impersonal scale. This analysis was based on data obtained from twelve subjects. Sixteen Ss were eliminated from the analysis because their descriptions of the interviewer contained less than eight sentences. Carpentor (1966) has suggested that descriptions containing less than eight sentences be eliminated from research with his scale because they are not large enough samples of the subjects' behavior to use as the
### TABLE 5

Analysis of Variance of P-I Scale Transformed Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</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 (Self-Disclosure)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,768.03</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Order)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,262.03</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,048.38</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects w/in Groups [error(between)]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,843.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Treatments)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,276.03</td>
<td>5.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,420.05</td>
<td>10.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57.05</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>759.37</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C x Subjects w/in Groups [error(within)]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>228.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p \leq .05(1,8) = 5.32$

$P \leq .01(1,18) = 11.26$
TABLE 6

Nowman-Kouls Sequential Range Tests of the AC Interaction on the P-I Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( (a_2c_2) )</th>
<th>( (a_2c_1) )</th>
<th>( (a_1c_1) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Disclosing-Impersonal ( (a_1c_2) ) = 117.67</td>
<td>53.67**</td>
<td>19.00**</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Disclosing-Personal ( (a_1c_1) ) = 112.17</td>
<td>48.17**</td>
<td>13.50**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Disclosing-Personal ( (a_2c_1) ) = 98.67</td>
<td>34.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Disclosing-Impersonal ( (a_2c_2) ) = 64.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[** p < .01\]
base of a proportion. The analysis of variance is presented for personal-impersonal scores (proportions) which have been transformed to radians to ensure normal distribution (Carpenter, 1966; Manor, 1962).

It can be seen from Table 5 that once again the two interview conditions have had a significant effect on the Ss' behavior in the post-interview ratings. For the personal-impersonal scale, however, this effect is significant at p < .05. Similarly, there is an AC interaction which is also significant at p < .05. Table 6 presents the Newman-Kouls tests of the difference between the means of the individual groups in the AC interaction.

Table 6 indicates that the means of the high disclosing - personal interview group and the high disclosing - impersonal group are not significantly different from one another, but are higher than either of the other two groups. The low disclosing - impersonal interview group is the lowest of the four and is different from the low disclosing - personal group at p < .05.

Table 6 also reveals that four of the six differences are significant at p < .01. The low disclosing - personal interview group and the low disclosing - impersonal interview group differ at p < .05. The high disclosing - personal interview group is not different from the high disclosing - impersonal interview group at p < .05.
General questionnaire

The summary for the analysis of variance for the General Questionnaire is presented in Table 7. This analysis is based on data obtained from twenty subjects. Eight subjects were eliminated, at random, to comply with the requirements of the analysis as noted above for the REV scale.

Although the effects of the two interview styles and the order of presentation of those two interview styles achieved the $p < 0.10$ level, their difference was not accepted as significant. In addition, there are no main effects which are different at $p \leq 0.05$, and no interactions between any of the three variables under consideration which are different at $p \leq 0.05$. 
### TABLE 7

Analysis of Variance: General Questionnaire Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (Self-Disclosure)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Order)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.04</td>
<td>3.29+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects w/in Groups</td>
<td>error(between)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Within Subjects     |     |        |       |
| C (Treatments)      | 1   | 42.04  | 3.37+ |
| AC                  | 1   | 3.01   | 0.24  |
| BC                  | 1   | 0.61   | 0.05  |
| ABC                 | 1   | 13.24  | 1.06  |
| C x Subjects w/in Groups error(within) | 16 | 12.48 |       |

* + p ≤ .010(1, 16) = 3.05
  
  p ≤ .05(1, 16) = 4.49
Hypotheses

To simplify the presentation of the data relevant to the three hypotheses, each hypothesis will be stated and will then be followed by the data which are relevant to it.

Hypothesis 1

Subjects who score high on the Quinn scale and are considered high self-disclosers will score highest on the REV scale. These Ss will also tend to rate the interviewer higher on the P-I scale, the Relationship Inventory, and the General Rating Scale. Those Ss who score low on the Quinn scale and are considered low self-disclosers will score lowest on the REV scale and will tend to rate the interviewer lower on the other measures also.

The data relevant to this hypothesis consist of the analysis of the main effects of factor A (high vs. low self-disclosing Ss) on all four measures. It can be seen from Tables 1, 2, 5 and 7 that there was no difference between the high and low self-disclosing groups as a main effect at \( p \leq .05 \) for the REV scale, the Relationship Inventory, or the General Questionnaire, respectively. The hypothesis, therefore, is not supported. There were interactions between the pre-tested self-disclosure scoros and the two interview stylos which will be considered under the results for Hypothesis 3.

Hypothesis 2

There will be an effect of order of presentation of the two interview conditions so that those Ss who receive the impersonal condition first will score lower in the personal condition than those Ss who receive the personal condition first. Those Ss who receive the personal condition first will score higher in the personal condition than those Ss who receive the impersonal condition first. This relationship will hold true across all Ss, regardless of whether or not they are high or low self-disclosers, and for all four of the measuring instruments.
Hypothesis 2 is tested by the analysis of the interaction between factor B (order of presentation of the two interview conditions and factor C (treatments, or the two interview conditions). Tables 1, 2, 5 and 7 indicate that there was no difference between the personal to impersonal order group at \( p \leq .05 \) for the REV scale, the Relationship Inventory, the P-I scale, and the General Questionnaire.

There was, however, an interaction between the order of presentation of the two interview conditions and the interview conditions themselves on the Relationship Inventory \( (p < .05) \). Table 4 suggests that this interaction reflects the fact that the mean of the scores in which the order of presentation was impersonal to personal and the treatment was a personal interview, was significantly higher than the mean of any of the other three groups. This finding clearly fails to support Hypothesis 2.

**Hypothesis 3**

All subjects will receive their highest REV scale scores in the personal interview condition and will tend to rate the interviewer higher in this condition on the three rating scales. Similarly, all Ss will receive their lowest REV scale scores in the impersonal interview condition and will tend to rate the interviewer lower in this condition on the three rating scales.

The data relevant to Hypothesis 3 can be found in the analysis of the effects of factor C (the two treatments). It can be seen from Table 1 that the Ss did receive their highest REV scale scores in the personal interview condition \( (p < .001) \). Table 2 shows that the mean of the Ss' scores in the personal interview condition is greater than the mean of the Ss' scores in the impersonal condition on the Relationship Inventory \( (p < .001) \). Table 5 reveals that the same finding holds true
for the P-I scale but at the .05 level. This finding also appeared on
the General Questionnaire at $p < .10$, which is not considered an accept-
able level of significance for the present study. To recapitulate, the
mean of the Ss' scores in the personal interview condition was higher
than the mean of their scores in the impersonal interview condition.
This finding occurred at $p < .001$ for the REV scale and the Relationship
Inventory, at $p < .05$ for the P-I scale, and at $p < .10$ for the General
Questionnaire.

A significant interaction was found between the subjects' pro-
tested self-disclosure scores and the two treatments. This finding
occurred on the Relationship Inventory ($p < .001$) and the P-I scale
($p < .05$), but the pattern of these interactions was not consistent for
either of the two measures. For this reason, no general interpretation
of this interaction is possible, and the reader is referred to the
previous section in which these interactions were noted as they appeared
on the three measures.

Discussion

Hypothesis 1

Since there was no acceptable difference between the high and
low self-disclosing groups on any of the four measures, Hypothesis 1 is
clearly not supported by the data. It is possible, however, that the
failure to find differences between high and low self-disclosing groups
may reflect failure in the technique employed in obtaining those groups,
rather than failure of high and low self-disclosing groups to perform
differently. The reader may recall that these groups were selected on
the basis of their scores on Quinn's revision of Jourard's self-disclosure
Although Quinn did generate some validity data using his scale (1965), it is important to note that he never validated it against an external criterion. Jourard, on the other hand, has demonstrated the usefulness of his scale in predicting hypothesized relationships with several external criteria (1964). Perhaps the appealing simplicity of Quinn's technique (twenty questions scored yes or no), as opposed to Jourard's (sixty questions scored 0, 1 or 2), created the problem in predicting the performance of the high and low self-disclosers. In addition, a limitation on the amount of time available for administration of a self-disclosure questionnaire was imposed on the author, making Quinn's technique seem even more appealing.

Since failure in the screening procedure for selecting the high and low self-disclosers is a reasonable possibility, at least, it seems better at present to adopt a conservative strategy and not interpret the data for the individual groups. This would be safer in view of the lack of information about the pre-test measure and the fact that there is no consistent pattern of AC interactions between the four post-interview measures.

**Hypothesis 2**

The fact that there were no acceptable differences between the personal to impersonal order group and the impersonal to personal order group indicates that Hypothesis 2 is not supported. This can be explained by the fact that the experimental procedures employed in this study have confounded the effects of order of presentation of the two treatments with error. Since the procedure made use of two separate interviews, with the end of the first interview clearly distinguished from the
beginning of the second interview by a set of instructions and the half-
hour rating period, it would have been difficult to interpret the effects
of the two orders of presentation had they appeared significant in the
analysis of variance.

Hypothesis 3

Findings on all of the four measures support Hypothesis 3. For
each of the measuring instruments, the means of the Ss’ scores in the
personal interview condition were higher than the means of their scores
in the impersonal interview condition. These data, then, support Rogers’
(1959) assertion that the conditions which he has specified for success-
ful psychotherapy will operate independently of the personality character-
istics of the person with whom the therapist is interacting. To the
extent that the personal interview in the present study is analogous to
Rogers’ "conditions," the present study supports Rogers’ assertion.

The interactions which were found for the pre-tested self-disclosure scores and the treatments can not be meaningfully interpreted
since, as noted above, there is no consistent pattern of group means.
The interaction between the order of treatments and the interview condi-
tions, which was found on the Relationship Inventory, can be explained
in view of the possibility that subjects in the group in which the order
was impersonal to personal and the treatment was a personal interview may
have seen the impersonal interview as the experimental treatment and the
personal interview as a post-experimental "conversation." This explana-
tion, however, does not account for the fact that this finding did not
occur for all of the Ss in impersonal to personal order groups. Since
this finding occurred only on the Relationship Inventory and occurred at a
minimal level of significance, it will not be given further attention.
Chapter IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The major finding of this research was the consistently significant effect of the two treatments on the subjects' responses to the dependent variable measures. This finding was at $p < .001$ for the REV scale and the Relationship Inventory, at $p < .05$ on the P-I scale, and at $p < .10$ (not accepted as significant) on the General Questionnaire. In view of the instruments and procedures employed, it seems safe to suggest that the two interviews were effective in determining the Ss' responses to the interviewer both within the interview (REV scale) and in the post-interview rating period (Relationship Inventory, P-I scale, General Questionnaire).

One might also conclude that the variation in the data between the scales reflects the power of the instruments employed. It appears, then, that the REV scale and the Relationship Inventory were particularly appropriate to the present study, as indicated by the results obtained from them. The results based on the P-I scale must be regarded as tenuous because of the possibility that the subjects may have been biased in their use of the scale as a result of their having received the P-I scale after having completed two rating scales. This may have created an evaluative "set" in the subjects and could have been responsible for lower P-I scale scores than would have occurred otherwise, since Carpenter's criteria for scoring a sentence as impersonal include sentences in
which the subject evaluates the target or includes him in a large class of individuals rather than considering the target person's own perceptions, feelings, etc. (Carpenter, 1966; p. 113) The P-I scale, then, was clearly employed in a setting which prevented adequate use of it. Future research with this instrument, in conjunction with other rating techniques, should employ the P-I scale before the other techniques are given.

In effect, it seems that the present study has demonstrated that the REV scale and the Relationship Inventory are valid measuring instruments for use with half-hour interviews of the type employed in this research and specified in Appendix VII. This finding adds support to the earlier demonstration of the validity of the REV scale in similar interviews of fifteen minutes' duration. This is of particular importance since in developing the REV scale it was suggested (Suchman, 1965) that such a scale should be more useful than previous process scales in situations similar to the present study, in which a subject's "level of experiencing" (Gendlin, 1962) would be expected to be quite low.

The Relationship Inventory was designed for use in rating someone with whom the rater has had a more extended relationship and, in fact, was validated in various studies of personal counseling and teaching (Barrott-Lennard, 1959). The present study indicates that a subject's total score on the Relationship Inventory does reflect his impression of an interviewer he has seen for no more than a half-hour. This finding might be valuable to researchers concerned with the nature of interpersonal relationships, who might be interested in a means of evaluating relationships of brief duration.
The failure of the General Questionnaire to reflect differences between subjects in any of the treatment groups might be explained on the basis of the brief and unstudied history of this instrument. Little attention has been directed toward the possibility that Ss might evaluate E more favorably when considering their relationship with him (as on the R. I.) or his feeling (as on the R. I. or the P-I scale), but might evaluate him less favorably when asked to assess E's efficiency or competence as an interviewer. The author would suggest, then, that this be undertaken in the context of a separate study or series of studies in which the effectiveness of the interviewer or therapist is the main focus of attention rather than an incidental interest to a study on interviewer-interviewee relationship.

The Two Interviews

Since differences in the effects of the two interviews were found on all four of the dependent variable measures, particularly the RSV scale and the Relationship Inventory, it can be concluded that the two treatments were, in fact, different. A question might arise, however, concerning the nature of the difference between the two treatments. Appendix VII contains descriptions of the two interviews, and the author would argue that he did, in fact, present the two interviews as described.

This is suggested by the fact that all but two of the twenty-eight subjects who participated in the study were able to correctly specify differences in E's interview behavior in a post-experiment debriefing session. Examples of their comments consisted of such statements as: "You were more interested in my feelings," and indications that they felt the author was "being more personal," etc. These informal
"data" seem to indicate that the Ss serving in the experiment responded to the two treatments as "personal" and "impersonal" interviews. The problem of specifying the relationship between interviewer and interviewee behavior could be better explored in a study which would make use of rating scales for interviewer as well as interviewee behavior. Truax (1962, 1965) has made some attempts in this direction, with results which seem to be relevant for the content as well as the methodology of the present study.

**Recommendations**

In addition to the methodological improvements noted in the previous section, the author would like to offer some recommendations for further research. These will include several additional methodological improvements, as well as an experimental approach to the problem of the content of subject self-disclosures.

Generally, authors who have used process scales evaluate their reliability on the basis of correlation coefficients computed from the ratings of two or more judges who have listened to a sample of spoken behavior. An important modification of this procedure would be to obtain ratings from a group of judges and have them rate the same sample of spoken behavior after some time had elapsed. In this way, authors could present a form of test-retest reliability as well as the usual inter-judge reliability. Consideration of the problem of reliability is particularly important for authors of process research since these rating techniques do not seem to be independent of the theories which they are employed to evaluate. Since there is "surplus meaning" inherent in the technique, it is necessary to make it clear that researchers who share
this meaning can do so when a period of time has elapsed since their previous rating. This focus on the reliability of the scales suggests methodological improvements which would make these scales more useful to researchers who would choose to use them independently of the theories which they are evaluating. First, it would be a simple matter to have the judges make their ratings in different places or at different times. This would tend to eliminate the possibility of any influence of one rater upon another. Another possibility would be to use naive judges trained by someone who is not familiar with the research being undertaken. This would help to further separate the rating techniques from the theories and hypotheses which are being tested.

The problem of process scale validity is also worthy of consideration. The term "process scale" has been used to include a number of rating techniques which consider the subject's expressed affect (i.e., "process" or "style"), as well as the content which he communicates, in a sample of spoken behavior. These techniques, although highly innovative when first undertaken (Rogers, 1958; Walker et al., 1960), have never been given careful methodological treatment. It is most important to explore what we are studying when we use these scales. A study will soon be undertaken which will compare the REV scale with another self-disclosure rating scale. This latter scale will require judges to rate a subject's voice quality, language style, and content, independently. From these three subscales a total score will be obtained which can be compared to the REV scale score. The three subscales represent the three dimensions which are treated as a group in REV scale ratings. It will be interesting to see how they are treated by judges using them independently.
An additional possibility might be to compare judges' ratings of affect, which is expressed in a subject's voice quality, to the same ratings made from an oscilographic picture of the subject's spoken behavior. We will then be able to ascertain the amount of information contributed to our analysis of the subject's communication by the rating scale, its three subscales, and the oscilographic recording. These scores will be compared to the REV scale scores of the same material so that we can see what we are adding by studying the sources of the total REV scale score.

The problem of the content of self-disclosures has been treated by Jourard (1964) for the six aspects which he sees as significant to a person's life. The author would like to attack the same problem from a somewhat different approach. Kelly (1955) has offered a definition of "self" in terms of his personal construct theory. Briefly, his definition of "self" consists of a group of personal constructs which Kelly has labeled "core constructs." These can be obtained from the subject by means of Kelly's Role Construct Repertory Test (Kelly, 1955). The author intends to study the content of Ss' self-disclosures by finding the "core constructs" which appear in samples of communicative behavior in various settings. This would present a promising alternative to Jourard's a priori definition of the six significant aspects of self.
Chapter V

SUMMARY

The present study was concerned with the personality theory (1959) and methodology (1958) of Carl Rogers and the self-disclosure theory of Sidney Jourard (1964). Twenty-eight male and female Ss were interviewed for two half-hour periods by a single E following a procedure employed earlier by Suchman (1965). These Ss were selected on the basis of their scores on a previously administered self-report inventory for self-disclosure (Quinn, 1965), so that half were high self-disclosers and half low self-disclosers. The two interviews were characterized as "personal" and "impersonal" (Appendix VII).

Three hypotheses were tested concerning the effects of the two interviews, and the order of their presentation, on the high and low self-disclosing Ss. Independent variable measures consisted of three rating scales which the subjects used to rate the interviewer after each half-hour interview, and a scale for rating the Ss' response during the interview (Appendixes IV, V, VI, and VII).

Results across all four measures indicated that the subjects did respond to the two treatments, but that their responses were independent of the order of presentation of the treatments. It was also found that the Ss' responses to the two treatments were independent of their inclusion in the high or low self-disclosing groups. These latter results were explained in terms of the fact that the validity of the self-disclosure questionnaire may be in question. The former results
were interpreted in view of the fact that the design of the present study confounded the effects of order of presentation with error in producing two distinctive treatments.

Methodological problems inherent in process scale research were offered along with suggestions for further research into the problem of the content of subject self-disclosure.
APPENDIX I

We would like to know what kind of personal information you would reveal if you were being interviewed. We would like you to imagine yourself being interviewed by a psychology graduate student as part of his Ph.D. research. He greets you, asks you to come to a plain looking room to talk to him for an hour and promises to keep everything you tell him in strict confidence.

This questionnaire contains a series of statements about experiences and feelings which people have. The question we're asking is whether you would be willing to share these experiences with the grad student in the situation described above (grad. student who you will probably never see again and who promises he'll keep the information confidential).

Please circle "Yes" if you would be willing to tell the student about the particular experience or feeling mentioned in the statement, circle "No" if you would not tell him about it.

1. Would you be willing to tell this person about sexual Yes No
   fantasies you have had, their form and frequency, the
   persons involved in the fantasies, and your feelings
   about the fantasies?

2. Would you be willing to tell this person about your most Yes No
   painful and threatening feelings of inadequacy as a
   person, including your greatest fear concerning your-
   self?

3. Would you be willing to tell this person what specific Yes No
   aspects about the opposite sex gets you most sexually
   aroused? What you do about this when they're present?

4. Would you be willing to tell this person about times Yes No
   you make a fool of yourself in a social situation,
   how you cover up for it, illustrating with examples?

5. Would you be willing to tell this person what your Yes No
   reaction would be if a close friend of yours told
   you he was a homosexual, what you would think, what
   you would do?

6. Would you be willing to tell this person about the Yes No
   most sexually exciting experience you ever had?
7. Would you be willing to tell this person what action in your past life you feel most guilty about, what exactly you did about it then? Yes No

8. Would you be willing to tell this person what about your body physically you feel most self-conscious about? How you cope with it? How you cover up? Yes No

9. Would you be willing to tell this person about the time when you hurt someone most, who the person involved was, what your relationship was, what exactly you did, and why you did it? Yes No

10. Would you be willing to tell this person about the thing you have felt most ashamed of in life, your feelings concerning it, etc? Yes No

11. Would you be willing to tell this person what you feel is your strong point with the opposite sex and how you use this to your advantage? Yes No

12. Would you be willing to tell this person in what specific ways you find yourself using people, and how you feel about doing this when you do it? Yes No

13. Would you be willing to tell this person about times when you feel inferior to other people, in what particular way you feel inferior, what the feeling is like, and how you react to it? Yes No

14. Would you be willing to tell this person about the most humiliating experience in your life, the circumstances, your feelings, etc. Yes No

15. Would you be willing to tell this person about times when you feel superior to other people, in what particular way you feel superior, what your feeling is like, and how you justify feeling that way? Yes No

16. Would you be willing to tell this person what, other than the physical presence of the opposite sex, gets you aroused sexually (pictures, images, thoughts, etc.), and what you do to relieve your sexual tension? Yes No

17. Would you be willing to tell this person what characteristic about you you feel the opposite sex most dislikes, how you feel about it, and what you do about it?
18. Would you be willing to tell this person what aspect about your personality you feel most self-conscious about? How you cope with it? How you cover up?  
Yes  No

19. Would you be willing to tell this person in what specific kinds of situations you feel your ego threatened, what the feeling is like, why you feel as you do, and how you react?  
Yes  No

20. Would you be willing to tell this person about your sexual development, your earliest sexual feelings, experiences, and conflicts, what you did to resolve them, and how you presently feel about sex?  
Yes  No
APPENDIX II

INSTRUCTIONS TO SUBJECTS

First Half-hour

This is a study of personal communication and interviewing. What I would like to do, is to talk with you for a half-hour. At the end of the half-hour, I'll ask you to rate me on a group of rating scales which I'll give to you. When you are finished with the rating scales, I'd like to talk with you for another half-hour. Then, after we have finished our second conversation, I'll ask you to fill out another series of rating scales. The rating scales will show how I appeared to you in each of the two half-hour sessions. These sessions will be tape-recorded but the only people who will listen to the tapes will be a small group of graduate students in psychology. They won't know your name because I have assigned a number to you (show subject the number on the tape box). You'll use this number on the rating scales also so that no one, including myself, will know who you are when they are scoring your ratings. You'll be completely anonymous from now on. Do you have any questions? O.K. then, let's begin.

Second Half-hour

Now that you've finished the ratings, I'd like to talk with you again. We'll talk for another half-hour and then I'll ask you to fill out another group of rating scales. When you're through with them, I have a few brief questions I'd like to ask you, and then I'll answer any questions that you have about my experiment. Do you have any questions? O.K. then, let's begin.
Debriefing Session

Now that we have finished the experiment, I would like to ask you some questions. The questions are concerned with your perceptions of the experiment. I would like to know what it was like for the subjects who participated and so there are no right or wrong answers. This will take about five minutes and when we've finished, I'll answer any questions you have.
APPENDIX III

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?
THE SCORING LEVELS

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 clichés 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:
I. 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.

II. 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.
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 as 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 1, 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 tries
to 'buy' that with a lot of favors." Arrow 2 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. (I-sentences are excluded from the calculation.) The PI-Q is then reached with the formula:

\[
\text{PI-Q} = \frac{\text{Sum P}}{\text{Sum P + Sum I}} \quad (100)
\]
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 self-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-reference.

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, "privato" "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."
Sum $P = 10$

Sum $I = 2$

$$PI = \frac{\text{Sum } P}{\text{Sum } P + \text{Sum } I} \cdot (100) = \frac{100}{10 + 2} \cdot (100) = 83 \text{ (rounded to second decimal place)}$$

**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 tries 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.

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

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 loader. (13) She heads many school and church activities.

(14) She is very lively and gay. (15) She dances 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 reference.

2. I. Same as No. 1.

3. I. Same as No. 1.

4. I. Refers to other persons, and makes no 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. 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.

\[
\text{Sum } P = 1 \\
\text{Sum } I = 18 \\
\text{PI } Q = \frac{1}{19} \times (100) = 5
\]

**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 offer her solution. (7) She likes to have fun but can be very serious at times.

**Judgment of Sentences.**


\[
\text{Sum } P = 7 \\
\text{Sum } I = 0 \\
\text{PI } Q = \frac{7}{7} \times (100) = 100
\]

**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

PI Q = 6/8 • (100) = 75
APPENDIX V

Number________________

Date:________________

Time:________________

RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY -- FORM OS-M-64

Below are listed a variety of ways that one person may feel or behave in relation to another person.

Please consider each statement with reference to your present relationship with the interviewer.

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

+3: Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.  -1: No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.

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

+1: Yes, I feel that it is probably true.  -3: No, I strongly feel that it is or more true than untrue.

1. He respects me as a person.
2. He wants to understand how I see things.
3. His interest in me depends on the things I say or do.
4. He is comfortable and at ease in our relationship.
5. He feels a true liking for me.
6. He may understand my words but he does not see the way I feel.
7. Whether I am feeling happy or unhappy with myself makes no real difference to the way he feels about me.
8. I feel that he puts on a role or front with me.
9. He is impatient with me.
10. He nearly always knows exactly what I mean.
11. Depending on my behavior, he has a better opinion of me sometimes than he has at other times.
12. I feel that he is real and genuine with me.
13. I feel appreciated by him.
14. He looks at what I do from his own point of view.
15. His feeling toward me doesn't depend on how I feel toward him.
16. It makes him uneasy when I ask or talk about certain things.
17. He is indifferent to me.
18. He usually senses or realizes what I am feeling.
19. He wants me to be a particular kind of person.
20. I nearly always feel that what he says expresses exactly what he is feeling and thinking as he says it.
21. He finds me rather dull and uninteresting.
22. His own attitudes toward some of the things I do or say prevent him from understanding me.
23. I can (or could) be openly critical or appreciative of him without really making him feel any differently about me.
24. He wants me to think that he likes me or understands me more than he really does.
25. He cares for me.
26. Sometimes he thinks that I feel a certain way, because that's the way he feels.
27. He likes certain things about me, and there are other things he does not like.
28. He does not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.
29. I feel that he disapproves of me.
30. He realizes what I mean even when I have difficulty in saying it.
31. His attitude toward me stays the same: he is not pleased with me sometimes and critical or disappointed at other times.
32. Sometimes he is not at all comfortable but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.
33. He just tolerates me.
34. He usually understands the whole of what I mean.

35. If I show that I am angry with him he becomes hurt or angry with me, too.

36. He expresses his true impressions and feelings with me.

37. He is friendly and warm with me.

38. He just takes no notice of some things that I think or feel.

39. How much he likes or dislikes me is not altered by anything that I tell him about myself.

40. At times I sense that he is not aware of what he is really feeling with me.

41. I feel that he really values me.

42. He appreciates exactly how the things I experience feel to me.

43. He approves of some things I do, and plainly disapproves of others.

44. He is willing to express whatever is actually in his mind with me, including any feelings about himself or about me.

45. He doesn't like me for myself.

46. At times he thinks that I feel a lot more strongly about a particular thing than I really do.

47. Whether I am in good spirits or feeling upset does not make him feel any more or less appreciative of me.

48. He is openly himself in our relationship.

49. I seem to irritate and bother him.

50. He does not realize how sensitive I am about some of the things we discuss.

51. Whether the ideas and feelings I express are "good" or "bad" seems to make no difference to his feeling toward me.

52. There are times when I feel that his outward response to me is quite different from the way he feels underneath.

53. At times he feels contempt for me.

54. He understands me.
55. Sometimes I am more worthwhile in his eyes than I am at other times.

56. I have not felt that he tries to hide anything from himself that he feels with me.

57. He is truly interested in me.

58. His response to me is usually so fixed and automatic that I don't really get through to him.

59. I don't think that anything I say or do really changes the way he feels toward me.

60. What he says to me often gives a wrong impression of his whole thought or feeling at the time.

61. He feels deep affection for me.

62. When I am hurt or upset he can recognise my feelings exactly, without becoming upset himself.

63. What other people think of me does (or would, if he knew) affect the way he feels toward me.

64. I believe that he has feelings he does not tell me about that are causing difficulty in our relationship.
APPENDIX VI

General Interview Rating Scale

Below are listed a variety of ways that one person may feel or behave in relation to another person. Please consider each statement with regard to the interviewer.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how strongly you feel that it is true, or not true, in your relationship with the interviewer.

Please mark every one. Write in +3, +2, +1, or -1, -2, -3, to stand for the following answers:

+3: I strongly agree.
+2: I agree.
+1: I agree slightly.
-1: I disagree slightly.
-2: I disagree.
-3: I strongly disagree.

1. The interviewer seemed to be competent in his gathering of interview information.
2. I felt comfortable.
3. The interviewer did not ask intelligent or pertinent questions.
4. I liked the interviewer.
5. He did not seem very efficient.
APPENDIX VII

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE INTERVIEWER

Subjects will come to talk with you for two half-hour periods. You are to conduct a different type of interview in each of the two periods. One of these interviews will be a "personal" interview and the other will be an "impersonal" interview. The descriptions of these interviews are described below.

Impersonal Interview

The purpose of this interview is to obtain the subject's description of his environment and history. You are to try to find out as much about this as you can. The interview will focus on biographical data about the subject and your style must be objective and impersonal. Similarly, you are to find out as much as you can about the way the subject spends his time. You should discover his course schedule and how he spends his time between class hours. In the same context, you will try to discover the way the subject spends his social hours and this will necessitate inquiries into the types of leisure activities in which he engages.

It is important to note that in answering both of these questions you will avoid, but not actively discourage, references which the subject might make as to his likes, dislikes, attitudes, feelings, etc. Your role is that of a "fact-finder" so that it would be poor technique for you to do anything but question the subject carefully so that you get as much information as you can. In short, although you are in a
face-to-face situation with these students, you are not to approximate a personal interview.

**Personal Interview**

In this condition you are to try to set the situation so that the subjects feel that they can trust you in an unguarded manner. The subject should not feel that he has to interact with you in a socially acceptable fashion and, if possible, he should be put at ease so that he will react to you personally rather than as an "experimenter". You are to concern yourself with the subjects' descriptions of their feeling in certain situations and you are to try to help them to express these feelings to you honestly. The specific situations which are to be considered will be the subject's most embarrassing moment, a sad experience, and a happy experience. If you think that it would aid the subjects to feel more comfortable with you, you may engage them personally, and give them information about you and your experiences. As a general principle, try to find out the subject's likes, dislikes, attitudes, feelings, etc., for any topic which he brings up. You are to avoid, but not actively discourage, statements which the subject might make which are not concerned with his personal life.

As an interviewer you are to gain an empathic understanding of the student you are with and, although you will only see these subjects for a half-hour, you are to try to make the interview as personal as possible.
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