4-16-2018

Driving Forces in Disclosure: Self-Disclosure Goals and Intimacy at the Podium

Layne Paubel
lpqk3@mail.umsl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://irl.umsl.edu/thesis

Part of the Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons, Other Communication Commons, and the Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons

Driving Forces in Disclosure: Self-Disclosure Goals and Intimacy at the Podium

Layne T. Paubel
B.A. in Communication, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2016
A.S., Southwestern Illinois College at Belleville, 2014
A.A., Southwestern Illinois College at Belleville, 2014

A Thesis Submitted to The Graduate School at the University of Missouri-St. Louis
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Master of Arts in Communication

May
2018

Advisory Committee

Stephanie Van Stee, Ph.D.
Chairperson

Yan Tian, Ph.D.

Suahn Cho, Ph.D.

Driving Forces in Disclosure: Self-Disclosure Goals and Intimacy at the Podium

Layne T. Paubel

University of Missouri – St. Louis

Abstract

This study examined six underlying motivations (expression, self-clarification, social validation, relationship development, social control, and information sharing) for self-disclosure in a public speaking setting and a dyadic relationship setting. Five of these goals come from Derlega and Grzelak's (1979) functional approach to self-disclosure and one is an additional goal examined by Bazarova and Choi (2014). This study found that the relative salience of self-disclosure goals in the public speaking classroom was identity clarification, information sharing, self-expression/relief of distress, social validation, relationship development, and social control. Findings indicate that the relative salience of goals in the dyadic relationship setting was self-expression/relief of distress, identity clarification, information sharing, social validation, relationship development, and social control. The relative salience of most of these self-disclosure goals varied across settings (identity clarification, relationship development, social validation, social control, and self-expression/relief of distress). One goal, information sharing, did not differ between the settings. Two key findings show that participants reported a higher salience of relationship development and social validation goals for the dyadic relationship setting compared to the public speaking setting. Self-disclosure in dyadic relationships occurred at higher levels of intimacy than self-disclosure at the podium. Analyses in both settings showed no significant correlations between the salience of relationship development goals and the levels of intimacy.

Keywords: disclosure, self-disclosure, functional theory of self-disclosure, goals, intimacy, public speaking, dyadic relationships

Driving Forces in Disclosure: Self-Disclosure Goals and Intimacy at the Podium

"I tried to kill myself three times."

"I stopped smiling the day my dad died. It took me years to get my smile back."

"My parents' divorce left me devastated."

"My grandmother was killed in a drunk driving accident."

Our minds might automatically picture these statements as told in a hushed tone, whispers of a shared secret. But let us drastically change the scene to examine these intimate secrets as told in front of an audience. The environment of a public speaking classroom provides an opportunity for self-disclosures, no matter how intimate, to be made public. Public speaking classes inherently allow students to divulge personal information about their lives to their peers and to their instructor, that might not otherwise be known in a typical classroom setting. With public speaking being a core requirement for students to take at numerous universities and colleges across the U.S. (Morreale, Worley, & Hugenberg, 2010), it is a wonder that researchers have not fully investigated self-disclosure in this setting. Few studies have examined the role of self-disclosure in public speaking (Littlefield & Sellnow, 1987; Sellnow & Golish, 2000), let alone in the college classroom (Himelstein & Kimbrough, 1963; Hurley & Hurley, 1969). Furthermore, these studies have not examined the underlying motivations for self-disclosing in this setting, nor have they addressed the levels of intimacy in self-disclosure at the podium. Knowing the underlying motivations of these self-disclosures and their relationship to the levels of intimacy can help instructors better understand their students and their goals as individuals. Moreover, examining these goals may bring a new angle to

the body of research in Derlega and Grzelak's (1979) functional approach to self-disclosure.

This research study examines the underlying motivations for self-disclosure in the public speaking classroom using Derlega and Grzelak's (1979) functional approach to self-disclosure, as well as an additional goal that was examined by Bazarova and Choi (2014). What drives people to divulge information – particularly sensitive information – in a public setting with people they might not know well? This study will examine a specific motivation, relationship development, and its connection to revealing sensitive or intimate information in the public speaking classroom to help researchers understand this perplexing phenomenon. To further understand the motivations that are, perhaps, specifically tied to a public speaking setting, motivations for revealing information in a dyadic relationship will also be examined to compare and contrast the goals between settings (dyadic relationships vs. public speaking).

Literature Review

Ever since Sydney Jourard (1971) coined the term "self-disclosure," or "the act of revealing personal information to others," this concept has been studied from a variety of angles (p. 2). For the purposes of this study, the literature review incorporates information on self-disclosure in dyadic relationships, larger groups, and at the classroom podium. Interestingly, as the audience size changes, it appears that underlying motivations also change. This review also incorporates an overview of self-disclosure intimacy, the goals that people seek in self-disclosure, and finally, the functional theory of self-disclosure.

Self-Disclosure in Dyadic Relationships

  Self-disclosure in dyadic relationships has been closely studied (Solano &

Dunnam, 1985; for a review, see Cozby, 1973). For example, researchers have found that

self-disclosure is beneficial in multiple ways (for a review, see Collins & Miller, 1994;

for a review, see Cozby, 1973; Pennebaker & O'Heeron, 1984). In fact, some studies

indicate that it is correlated with (for a review, see Cozby, 1973) or even leads to greater

liking toward another individual (for a review, see Collins & Miller, 1994). In a study by

Pennebaker and O'Heeron (1984), a negative correlation was found between health

problems and how much the participants "discussed their spouse's death with friends" (p.

473). The researchers purport that "[c]onfiding appears to play a central role in the

coping and health process" (p. 476).

  Most applicable to this study, researchers are interested in the type of dyadic

relationship and its impact on self-disclosure (see for example, Chaikin & Derlega, 1974;

Morton, 1978; Murdoch et al., 1969, as cited in Cozby, 1973). For instance, in an

experimental study conducted by Chaikin and Derlega (1974), they looked at three

different dyadic relationships – a relationship with a stranger, with an acquaintance, and

with a friend. They examined people's perceptions of self-disclosure appropriateness in

the presence of these various targets. The results showed that people believed it was less

appropriate to disclose intimate information to a stranger or an acquaintance than it was

to disclose it to a friend. In partial conjunction with this finding, Morton (1978)

conducted a study that looked at strangers and married couples, and she found that

"[s]pouses, relative to strangers, communicated with more descriptive intimacy (i.e.,

private facts), but not more evaluative intimacy (i.e., personal feelings or opinions) …"

(p. 72). Interestingly, in regards to self-disclosure reciprocity, Murdoch et al. (1969) have found that people "disclosed more to the confederate with whom there was no possibility of future interactions" (as cited in Cozby, 1973, p. 82). With this research, it becomes increasingly puzzling as to why someone in a classroom would disclose sensitive information about their lives, since they generally will not know all of their classmates, and it is also expected of them to have future interactions with those classmates.

Self-Disclosure in Larger Groups

Research on self-disclosure has not been confined to dyadic relationships. Researchers have also devoted time to understanding audiences larger than one person, to which one self-discloses (for a review, see Cozby, 1973; see for example, Cravens, 1975; Solano & Dunnam, 1985). Self-disclosure in these new settings provides intriguing information in the realm of self-disclosure. Several findings suggest that some people do not feel as comfortable self-disclosing in groups larger than two (see for example, Drag, 1969 as cited in Cozby, 1973; Solano & Dunnam, 1985). For instance, according to Drag's (1969) dissertation research, groups of fewer people (two or four) self-disclosed more than groups of eight (as cited in Cozby, 1973). It was hypothesized that if the researcher participated in self-disclosure, it would increase each group's self-disclosure at the same rate. Interestingly, this was not the case for each group. Although the four-person group increased their self-disclosure to be "similar to disclosure scores in the two-person group…," the groups of two and eight participants did not increase their self-disclosure. Cozby (1973) states that "it would seem to indicate that in the eight-person group, experimenter disclosure (or probably disclosure by any group member) is not

sufficient to overcome the inhibiting effects of the large group" (p. 8). These findings seem to suggest that people are uncomfortable with self-disclosing in larger groups.

However, research also indicates that there are people who desire a large audience (Cravens, 1975). Cravens conducted an experiment with the belief that the number of targets would change one's self-disclosure, depending on the person's need for social approval. This experiment was based on the assumption that people with a high need for approval would, obviously, crave the social approval of a public setting, whereas those who did not have a high need for social approval would be intimidated by a public self-disclosure. Cravens examined both private and public settings, to which participants were randomly assigned. In the private setting, with the experimenter present, participants exchanged pieces of information with a confederate. In the public setting, the participants were asked if their information could potentially become public information (e.g., lectures, published research) at a later date. The researcher found that people with a high need for approval in the public setting self-disclosed on a more intimate level than those with a high need for approval in the private setting. In the public setting, they self-disclosed more intimately than those with moderate and low needs for approval. In the private setting, participants self-disclosed less intimately than those with the moderate and the low needs for approval. Results also showed that people with a high need for approval in a public setting self-disclosed more than those with a high need for approval in a private setting. Furthermore, the researcher found that people with a low need for approval self-disclosed on a more intimate level in the private setting than those with a low need for approval in the public setting. While it is important to note that this study

had a small sample that consisted of all women, the findings bring light to the compelling desire that some people have to achieve social approval through self-disclosure.

Social Media

Self-disclosure is prominent in social media (see for example, Bazarova & Choi, 2014; Chen, 2015; Choi & Bazarova, 2015; Lee, Im, & Taylor, 2008). Social media has amplified the number of audience members of the self-discloser. For instance, the Pew Research Center (2013) looked at adult Facebook users, providing data on the large number of audience members that are in one's social network. In an interpretation of this survey data by Smith (2014), a staff member at the Pew Research Center, he writes that on average, people have 338 Facebook friends. Fifteen percent of the respondents even said that they have over 500 Facebook friends (Pew Research Center, 2013). Social media creates an environment where people can inherently self-disclose to large audiences. Research on self-disclosure in social media provides us with another angle to help us understand the dynamics of self-disclosure in public settings.

There are several interesting results that can be examined from this angle. For instance, Bazarova and Choi (2014) have found that media affordances, which is media utility (e.g., visibility in this study), impact self-disclosure goals, which then impact the outcomes of self-disclosure in terms of intimacy. Thus, self-disclosure goals are found to be a mediating variable. Interestingly, but not surprisingly, the researchers found that when the participants were communicating with larger audiences through status updates, they were doing so as a means of social validation. When connecting individually through private messages, or with an intended audience in mind through a direct wall post, the goal shifted to relationship maintenance. As self-disclosure becomes

increasingly public (private messaging to direct wall posts to status updates), social validation becomes increasingly important to the discloser. This research shows that as the target audience(s) change, so will self-disclosure behavior. However, Choi and Bazarova (2015), when examining self-disclosure on Facebook and Twitter, found that the network properties might influence self-disclosures more than the network size. The researchers suggest that "people may feel more comfortable pursing relational goals in channels with more clearly defined boundaries than those with loosely defined boundaries and potentially unbounded audiences" (p. 495).

As another example of self-disclosure being studied in social media, Lee et al. (2008) were intrigued by the dynamic of self-disclosing online in blogging, as the self-disclosure habits did not tie in with literature on self-disclosure. From their literature review, they knew that people self-disclosed as part of the norm of reciprocity, that people are reluctant to self-disclose, people self-disclose within social norms, people self-disclose with more confidence in a closed boundary, and that group size impacts self-disclosure. However, it appeared that these rules and findings were overtly ignored in the realm of online blogging. For instance, in their puzzled mindset, they stated that "[t]here does not appear to be any evidence supporting the idea that group size influences self-disclosure over personal Web space" (p. 696). With this conflict between the literature review and blogging practices, the researchers began asking why people would write an open diary for the world to see. These same confusions can easily be applied to the public speaking classroom. Overall, the researchers found that the underlying motives for self-disclosure on blogging included the following: "self-presentation, relationship management, keeping up with trends, storing information, sharing information,

entertainment, and showing off" (Lee et al., 2008, p. 697). They also investigated the consequences of self-disclosure, finding that there were positive and negative aspects, including "relationship management, psychological well-being, and engaging in habitual behavior" (p. 697). Out of these three, habitual behavior was considered the negative aspect, since participants felt chained to their blogging activities.

Overall, it seems that the number of targets, along with the setting, alters self-disclosure behavior and intentions. Self-disclosure behavior and intentions might be changed with the presence of more individuals or the possibility of self-disclosing to more individuals. The setting, such as private vs. public, could also play a role. In sum, it appears that the setting and the number of people in the target audience interact in a unique way with self-disclosure.

Self-Disclosure in the Classroom and in Public Speaking Classrooms

A few researchers have used the classroom as their setting to examine self-disclosure (Himelstein & Kimbrough, 1963; Hurley & Hurley, 1969). As an example, Himelstein and Kimbrough (1963) examined self-disclosure in classroom self-introductions of graduate education students. The authors suggest that "situation and social variables" play a key role in predicting self-disclosure, discrediting the use of Jourard's self-disclosure measure to predict self-disclosure amount and time (p. 439). In fact, they discovered that as the introductions continued, the participants began to self-disclose more information and for a longer period of time. In other words, order of appearance was correlated to self-disclosure behavior. As another example, Hurley and Hurley (1969) examined self-disclosure in the classroom. However, during their study, they split the classes up into groups, and the self-disclosure was examined in those

groups. Furthermore, their research focus was not on the groups, but rather, the comparison of multiple self-disclosure measures. They purport that the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (JSDQ) is not a decent measure to use, since their findings showed that it did not correlate significantly with other independent self-disclosure measures.

Although self-disclosure has been studied in larger groups, including the classroom, self-disclosure of students in a public speaking classroom has largely been overlooked. However, there are a few select cases in which researchers have investigated this topic (Littlefield & Sellnow, 1987; Sellnow & Golish, 2000). In Sellnow and Golish's (2000) study, they examined self-disclosure and public speaking to see if any gender biases emerged between males and females. Using a large sample size, the researchers conducted both quantitative and qualitative analyses, finding both gender differences and gender similarities. They examined comfort levels, and found no gender differences, in that the genders were each "comfortable self-disclosing personal information in a public speech" (p. 51). From these findings, the researchers added to the body of research that says that self-disclosure can be used as a means to "warm the communication climate and reduce perceived anxiety levels experienced by student speakers later in the term" (p. 51). Furthermore, they examined "perceived anxiety levels experienced when presenting a required self-disclosure speech," where the researchers found no gender differences (p. 52). However, the researchers also looked into the speech topics and "thematic content," and differences were found (p. 53). For example, the authors found that the males tended to self-disclose about objects, while the females tended to self-disclose about people. The authors suggest, from this last finding, that it is

key for public speaking instructors to allow students the freedom in selecting a topic to help eliminate any gender biases that might be present in public speaking.

In Littlefield and Sellnow's (1987) research, they conducted an experiment in which they examined groups of students who gave a speech that inherently required self-disclosure to groups of students who gave a speech that did not inherently require self-disclosure. They hoped to see that self-disclosure would reduce public speaking anxiety. However, their results did not support their hypothesis. A different finding in the study, however, was that there was "a significant reduction in speech anxiety over the entire semester" (p. 63). While both of these studies contribute information on self-disclosure in the setting of a public speaking classroom, neither of these studies address self-disclosure intimacy or the goals for the participants' self-disclosures.

As previously stated, public speaking is a required course in many colleges and universities across the U.S. (Morreale, Worley, & Hugenberg, 2010). Because this setting allows students to self-disclose publicly – sometimes with overtly sensitive information – it is important for researchers and instructors to understand the underlying goals for why students share what they do. Are they crying out for help? Are they vying for control? Are they simply wanting validation? Are they seeking a friend? Are they using self-disclosure as an attention-getter? Are they trying to earn a better grade? Again, while public speaking has been studied alongside self-disclosure in a few ways, it does not address the underlying goals for self-disclosure, nor does it investigate the self-disclosure intimacy.

Intimacy of Self-Disclosure

In Cozby's (1973) literature review, he says that disclosure is labeled as having three basic dimensions. The first is its **breadth**, which is essentially the amount of information shared. The second is its **duration**, meaning how long the disclosure takes place. The third is known as **depth**, which is how sensitive or personal the information is. Another name for this is *intimacy*.

Intimacy is a concept that is commonly examined in self-disclosure (see for example, Altman & Haythorn, 1965; Altman & Taylor, 1973; Bazarova & Choi, 2014; Choi & Bazarova, 2015; Howell & Conway, 2001; Morton, 1978). Social penetration theory shows that as time goes on, self-disclosures become more intimate in a relationship (Altman & Taylor, 1973; Morton, 1978). Furthermore, Altman and Taylor (1973) purport that people do not generally provide sensitive information when they do not know the other person that well. They describe the process of learning more intimate information about someone as systematic and gradual. In fact, it is more common for people to communicate nonintimate information than intimate information (Taylor & Altman, 1975). Interestingly, but not surprisingly, research shows that the level of intimacy will change as the group size changes (Solano & Dunnam, 1985). Groups of two people yield a higher level of intimacy than groups of three or four. Furthermore, research shows that self-disclosure intimacy changes as the situation changes (Altman & Haythorn, 1965). Altman and Haythorn studied self-disclosure using a sample of men from a Naval base. They compared nine groups of dyads that were completely isolated to nine groups of dyads that had some access to the Naval base. The results showed that people in the isolation setting disclosed more intimately than those in the control group. Indeed, the isolation participants "reached levels of intimacy or exchange of depth

equivalent to that reached with close friends" (p. 423). Furthermore, the research showed that the self-disclosures in the control group were superficial, with intimacy levels "even less than that achieved with the average man in boot camp" (p. 422). As another example, Bazarova and Choi (2014) found that in Facebook, "disclosures via private messages were more intimate than disclosures either via status updates … or via wall posts…" (p. 647).

Overall, the above findings would suggest that people in a public speaking setting would *not* share highly intimate information in front of a public audience of their classmates and their instructor, whom they might not know well. However, this does present a puzzling scenario for when students in public speaking settings do, in fact, break the norm and disclose at intimate levels. One possible answer can be found in Taylor and Altman's (1975) research. Their research shows that the knowledge of the length of a relationship has also been found to impact the intimacy of self-disclosure. In positive interactions, with the knowledge that one will need to have a long-term relationship (six months) with someone, self-disclosure intimacy is found at higher levels. In similar accord, with the knowledge that one will have a short-term relationship (one week) with someone, intimacy is found at lower levels. Perhaps if students know they will be having continued interactions with their classmates, they might feel a need to get to know these people at a deeper level.

However, Bazarova and Choi (2014) and Choi and Bazarova (2015) present a compelling case that can help explain the puzzling phenomenon of students self-disclosing at high levels of intimacy. The key rests in the **self-disclosure motivation**. As mentioned previously, Bazarova and Choi (2014) found that the relationship between

media affordances and self-disclosure intimacy is mediated by the goal of self-disclosure. Thus, their results support the idea that disclosure goals will precede intimacy. Furthermore, an interesting finding revealed that self-disclosures tend to be more intimate when the underlying motivation is relational maintenance, and not social control or validation. This finding was validated the next year by Choi and Bazarova (2015), who again found that self-disclosure goals were related to intimacy levels. Their study on self-disclosure on Facebook and Twitter found that participants with higher levels of intimate self-disclosures were those who had disclosed because of a relationship maintenance goal (compared to those with social validation goals).

Motivations for Self-Disclosure

Collins and Miller (1994) reported in their meta-analytic review that little research has been done on goals in self-disclosure. Since then, however, researchers have continued to examine self-disclosure goals in various settings. One area of interest has been in people who are diagnosed with HIV (see for example, Derlega, Winstead, Greene, Serovich, & Elwood, 2002; Derlega, Winstead, Greene, Serovich, & Elwood, 2004). Researchers have suggested that people with HIV self-disclose due to "catharsis … duty to inform/educate … testing the other person's reactions … close/supportive relationship … [and] similarity …" (Derlega et al., 2002, p. 420 & 422; Derlega et al., 2004). Researchers have further investigated these topics to find that three of them had the utmost importance, including "catharsis, duty/educate, and close/supportive relationship" (Derlega et al., 2004, p. 761).

Another key area of interest has been social media (see for example, Chen, 2015; Lee et al., 2008). For instance, Lee et al. (2008) found that participants self-disclosed

with several goals in mind, as mentioned previously. These goals include the following: "self-presentation, relationship management, keeping up with trends, storing information, sharing information, entertainment, and showing off" (p. 697). Another researcher, Chen (2015), studied women and their reasons for using social media, while also examining the participants' need to self-disclose. The author wrote that "… needs for affiliation and self-disclosure also play a role in motivations for social media use" (p. 36). Chen found that the need to self-disclose was related to two motivations for using social media, which included engagement and information motivations.

Researchers have also looked at the other side of the coin, investigating reasons as to why people *do not* self-disclose (see for example, Derlega et al., 2002; Derlega et al., 2004). In investigating HIV, researchers asked questions as to why people avoid self-disclosure, including categories such as "privacy … self-blame/self-concept difficulties … communication difficulties … fear of rejection … protecting the other … [and a] superficial relationship …" (Derlega et al., 2002, p. 422; Derlega et al., 2004). One study says that of utmost importance are "privacy, self-blame, fear of rejection… and protecting the other" (Derlega et al., 2004, p. 758).

Other researchers have compiled or examined disclosure decision-making models (see for example, Altman & Taylor, 1973; Derlega et al., 2004). For instance, Altman and Taylor (1973) created a model that highlights the importance of costs and rewards in self-disclosure decisions. Derlega et al. (2004) tested a model that was specifically tied to looking at disclosure decisions of people who have HIV.

Overall, although multiple researchers have examined goals, they have not done so in the context of the public speaking classroom. Specific circumstances, such as

people with HIV or women bloggers, have been studied to discover self-disclosure goals. However, self-disclosure goals in public speaking have not been examined. What key goals would emerge in a public speaking classroom? Would they overlap with any of the goals listed in this section?

Derlega and Grzelak's (1979) Functional Theory

In 1979, Derlega and Grzelak wrote on the appropriateness of self-disclosure, looking at when people deem it appropriate to disclose or not disclose, saying it could be studied from two angles. These include norms/culture, and of prime interest in the current study, "goal satisfaction" (p. 152). Out of this work, they composed a functional theory of self-disclosure. This theory looks at "the expressive value and/or the instrumental effectiveness [achieved goals] of self-disclosure as perceived by the discloser and the recipient" (p. 153). The authors say that they look at "… one type of appropriateness called self-disclosure effectiveness, which refers to the subjective reasons people have for self-disclosing in terms of goal accomplishment" (p. 154). Essentially, this theory purports that people self-disclose with underlying motivations/values/goals. Self-disclosure is seen as an agent to achieve these goals. The goals include the following: expression, self-clarification, social validation, relationship development, and finally, social control.

Each goal for self-disclosure is defined by Bazarova and Choi (2014). Self-expression/relief of distress means to "[e]xpress feelings and thoughts; release pent-up feelings" (p. 645). Identity/self-clarification means "[t]o increase personal clarification and convey one's personal identity" (p. 645). Social validation is defined as the "[v]alidation of one's self-concept; seeking approval and support from others" (p. 645).

Relationship development means "[t]o manage or maintain a relationship" (p. 645).

Social control means "to control social outcomes" (p. 645).

Other researchers have used this theory in order to construct disclosure decision-making models (see for example, Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010; Greene, Derlega, and Matthews, 2006; Omarzu, 2000). For instance, Omarzu (2000) expands on the functional theory by creating a disclosure decision model. This model aids in explaining why people self-disclose, as well as predicts what types of information people will self-disclose. The model shows that situational cues and individual differences influence possible goals. From here, the model is divided into three stages: (**1**) salience of a goal (**2**) target and disclosure appropriateness (**3**) subjective utility, which determines disclosure breadth and duration; and subjective risk, which determines disclosure depth. Omarzu states that the model is "… best suited to predicting initial disclosures, disclosures in new relationships, or disclosure in highly strategic situations" (p. 183). Greene et al. (2006) created a disclosure decision making model that builds on the work of Omarzu (2000). Their model incorporates reasons and situational factors in self-disclosure. However, the factors involved in their model are composed of broader reasons for self-disclosure, which includes "self, other, and relationship-linked reasons for and against self-disclosure" as a means to broadly organize more specific goals (p. 7). Furthermore, Chaudoir and Fisher (2010) also built a model of self-disclosure that incorporated Derlega and Grzelak's (1979) theory. Their model is called the Disclosure Processes Model, and its purpose is to better understand the process of self-disclosure in people with stigmatized identities. In this model, they purport that "… antecedent goals … moderate the effect of disclosure on numerous individual, dyadic, and social contextual outcomes and that these effects are

mediated by three distinct processes: (1) alleviation of inhibition, (2) social support, and (3) changes in social information" (p. 1). However, these researchers believed that the key goals involved in this model were approach vs. avoidance goals. While these models are interesting and shed more light on the multiple variables involved in self-disclosure, the multiple factors and components are outside the scope of this early research in examining self-disclosure in public speaking.

As discussed in the previous section, other researchers have also examined goals in self-disclosure, but these goals that have been studied tend to be tied to a specific scenario (e.g., people with HIV, social media platforms). Researchers have even used Derlega and Grzelak's (1979) work, but they looked at specific factors that they believed might have an impact on self-disclosure, such as anonymity (Ma, Hancock, & Naaman, 2016). The goals listed by Derlega and Grzelak (1979) provide a general framework that can be applied in multiple scenarios. Although some of the examples provided and inferences made in their original work are from dyadic relationships, this theory has also been studied in a public setting, which is social media (Bazarova & Choi, 2014; Choi & Bazarova, 2015).

Bazarova and Choi (2014) extended the research on the functional theory by examining self-disclosure on Facebook. As stated previously, they found that people who disclosed for relational goals produced more intimate levels of self-disclosures than those who disclosed for social validation goals. The next year, Choi and Bazarova (2015) continued their work with this theory and confirmed their previous results on goals and intimacy. Bazarova and Choi (2014) also found that self-disclosure goals were a mediating variable between media affordances and self-disclosure intimacy. Interestingly,

but not surprisingly, results indicated that when the participants were communicating with larger audiences through status updates, they were doing so as a means of social validation. When connecting through private messages individually, or with an intended audience in mind through a direct wall post, the goal shifted to relationship maintenance. Essentially, as self-disclosure becomes increasingly public (private messaging to direct wall posts to status updates), social validation becomes increasingly important to the discloser. This research shows that as the target audience(s) change, so will self-disclosure behavior. However, as previously mentioned, Choi and Bazarova (2015), when examining self-disclosure on Facebook and Twitter, found that the network properties might influence self-disclosures more than the network size. The researchers suggested that "people may feel more comfortable pursing relational goals in channels with more clearly defined boundaries than those with loosely defined boundaries and potentially unbounded audiences" (p. 495).

Beyond social media, Derlega and Grzelak's (1979) goals were addressed in a commentary by Archer (1993). In this commentary, Archer says that these goals are similar to the goals that are found in the work of Archer and Earle (1983). However, he distinguishes a difference, explaining that Derlega and Grzelak's (1979) goals are "organized into classes" (p. 332). This provides a more general, rather than specific, approach to looking at self-disclosure goals.

Overall, Derlega and Grzelak's (1979) functional approach is relevant for this study. This present study examined self-disclosure goals in two settings (dyadic and public). Derlega and Grzelak's (1979) functional approach, in its generality and current applications, is appropriate to utilize in both scenarios.

Overwhelming Gap

There is a substantial gap in the literature that begs to be filled. As previously mentioned, self-disclosure in the public speaking classroom has not been researched thoroughly. In fact, as explained, only a few studies have examined self-disclosure in this particular setting. Self-disclosure intimacy has not been investigated in the public speaking classroom. As previously demonstrated, research on Derlega and Grzelak's (1979) functional approach has largely been studied in social media and as a means to create self-disclosure decision models. Thus, the functional theory has not been examined in public speaking situations either. These gaps gave rise to a research question and multiple hypotheses to further examine this topic.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Since the literature is lacking information on the motivations for self-disclosure in a public speaking setting, the following research question was posed:

RQ1: What is the relative salience of self-disclosure goals at the podium?

The literature indicates that there are differences for self-disclosure in dyadic settings and larger settings. Furthermore, Bazarova and Choi's (2014) study, which examined self-disclosure on Facebook, suggests that different audience sizes are related to different self-disclosure goals. A small target audience was connected to relationship development goals, and a large target audience was connected to social validation goals. As such, the following hypotheses were posed:

H1: The relative salience of each self-disclosure goal will differ across contexts.

H2: Relationship development goals will be reported as more salient for self-disclosure in a dyadic relationship than for self-disclosure at the podium.

H3: Social validation goals will be reported as more salient for self-disclosure at

the podium than for self-disclosure in a dyadic relationship.

The literature suggests that intimacy will change based on how well the target

audience is known (e.g., Altman & Taylor, 1973). It also suggests that intimacy levels

will change based on the audience size, with smaller audiences eliciting higher levels of

intimacy (Solano & Dunnam, 1985). Based on this information, the following prediction

was made:

H4: Self-disclosure in dyadic relationships will be more intimate than self-

disclosure at the podium.

Research suggests that self-disclosure goals will precede and be tied to intimacy

levels (Bazarova & Choi, 2014). In comparison to other goals, when the underlying

motivation is relational maintenance, self-disclosures tend to be more intimate (Bazarova

& Choi, 2014; Choi & Bazarova, 2015). As such, the last hypothesis was posed:

H5: In either context, as relationship development goals become more salient, the

levels of intimacy will increase.

Method

Sample

In the spring semester of 2018, this study recruited participants from several

undergraduate classes (using participants who were at least 18 years of age). The sample

was composed of students in Introduction to Public Speaking (COMM 1040) classes at

the University of Missouri – St. Louis (UMSL), as well as several Public Speaking

classes (SPCH 131) and Public & Private Communication classes (SPCH 145) at Lewis

and Clark Community College (L&C). Students were asked to verify in the consent form

that they had completed their Self-Introduction Speech, which is a speech that inherently requires some level of self-disclosure. These speeches were performed during the first and second month of the semester.

In order to obtain this sample, e-mails were sent to instructors to invite them to present this research opportunity to their classes. The e-mails asked instructors to provide study information (i.e., link and consent form) to their students so that those who were willing to be a part of the research could do so. All instructors offered extra credit to their class sections, which was the recommended incentive. Furthermore, after being granted instructor permission, a visit was made to each class by the researcher to give students an overview of the research, and to invite them to participate. A video was created to invite an online section to participate in the research study. The online survey was open from January 19th, 2018 to February 25th, 2018. As such, the survey was open for about five and a half weeks. This allowed time for the various speech/communication classes to give most of their Self-Introduction Speeches, and students who completed their speeches after the survey closed were provided with an equal opportunity to earn extra credit.

Measures

This study followed a cross-sectional design. Students accessed the Qualtrics survey online via a provided link. As such, the location of the data collection was determined by the participant. After filling out a consent form (see Appendix A) that verified each participant's age and completion of a Self-Introduction Speech, participants were asked to fill out the self-report questionnaire (online survey). This asked students about self-disclosures in their public speeches, the intimacy levels of their self-disclosures, and the salience of various goals of self-disclosure. Students were also asked

about self-disclosures in a relationship with a close friend, the intimacy levels of their

self-disclosures, and the salience of various goals of self-disclosure. At the end of the

survey, they were also asked several demographic questions.

Self-disclosure. As previously noted, *self-disclosure* is defined in this study as

"the act of revealing personal information to others" (Jourard, 1971, p. 2). As several

other researchers have pointed out, or found it important to use themselves, it is also

essential to limit this definition to *verbal* self-disclosure (e.g., Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010;

Choi & Bazarova, 2015; Cozby 1973; Derlega & Grzelak, 1979). Furthermore, this study

specifically looked at *oral* self-disclosures. These specifications are essential to point out

in the research of public speaking. To measure this, students were provided with general

instructions and a definition of self-disclosure. They were asked to give a self-report with

this prompt: "Please think of a recent situation in which you presented a Self-Introduction

Speech in a Public Speaking Class or a related class. Once you can think of such a

situation, list and describe each piece of information you disclosed about yourself during

the speech. Please do not include any information that was not provided in your speech"

(see Appendix B). Students were also asked about a dyadic relationship: "Please think of

a recent conversation with a close friend in which you disclosed something about

yourself. Once you can think of such a situation, list and describe each piece of

information you disclosed about yourself to the friend. Please do not include any

information that was not provided in this conversation" (see Appendix B).

Intimacy. *Intimacy*, which is also known as depth, is conceptually defined as the

degree of sensitive or personal information in the self-disclosure (Altman, 1973). To

operationally measure intimacy, this study adopted Bazarova and Choi's (2014) method.

Based off the work of Bazarova (2012), the researchers used semantic differential scales to measure the intimacy of self-disclosures, which they found to be reliable ($\alpha = .78$). This included measuring items as "'non-intimate-intimate,' 'impersonal-personal,' and 'public-private,'" using a 7-point scale (p. 643; see Appendix C). This study used a self-report measure because individuals are the only ones who can tell you whether or not the information they shared was sensitive information. This is in accordance with Derlega and Grzelak (1979), who state that "… the concept of intimacy is always based on subjective evaluation and cannot be objectively defined" (p. 152). For each setting, participants were given these scales and asked to mark what applied to them, based on their *overall* self-disclosure (see Appendix C). Scale reliability for both intimacy in the public speaking setting ($\alpha = .77$) and the dyadic relationship setting ($\alpha = .85$) was found to be reliable.

Goals. Each goal for self-disclosure is defined by Bazarova and Choi (2014). Identity/self-clarification means "[t]o increase personal clarification and convey one's personal identity" (p. 645). Relationship development means "[t]o manage or maintain a relationship" (p. 645). Social validation is defined as the "[v]alidation of one's self-concept; seeking approval and support from others" (p. 645). Social control means "to control social outcomes" (p. 645). Self-expression/relief of distress means to "[e]xpress feelings and thoughts; release pent-up feelings" (p. 645). The researchers also found it important to include a goal of "information sharing to benefit others," which was based on their literature review (p. 645). This goal was also used in this present study, and it means "[t]o benefit other(s) by sharing information or a personal experience" (p. 645).

This study adapted coding categories from Bazarova and Choi's (2014) content analysis, which is tied closely to the functional theory and its goals, to create scale items. Fourteen statements were provided that relate to each goal, and each item was measured using a 7-point, Likert-type scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." Students were asked to complete these scales for both settings. Cronbach's alpha values were acceptable for motivations for each setting. In the public speaking setting, Cronbach's alpha values were as follows: identity clarification ($\alpha = .67$), relationship development ($\alpha = .89$), social validation ($\alpha = .83$), social control ($\alpha = .87$), self-expression and relief of distress ($\alpha = .68$), and information sharing ($\alpha = .76$). In the dyadic relationship setting, Cronbach's alpha values were as follows: identity clarification ($\alpha = .60$), relationship development ($\alpha = .92$), social validation ($\alpha = .77$), social control ($\alpha = .90$), self-expression and relief of distress ($\alpha = .78$), and information sharing ($\alpha = .94$). Due to the large number of scale items, an additional question was asked twice (once for each context), and it said, "Please select 'Strongly Agree,'" to check participants' attention.

To examine the public speaking setting, participants received a prompt that read: "Think back to your Self-Introduction Speech and the information that you self-disclosed. With the *overall* self-disclosure in mind, please answer each statement by selecting the option that best represents you." To examine the dyadic relationship setting, participants also received a prompt that read: "Think back to the conversation you described earlier in the survey. With the *overall* self-disclosure in mind, please answer each statement by selecting the option that best represents you." To make this questionnaire exhaustive, a final, open-ended question was asked for each setting. For the public speaking setting,

participants were asked: "Are there any other reasons that you provided the information that you did in your speech?" For the dyadic relationship setting, participants were asked, "Are there any other reasons that you provided the information that you did in your most recent conversation with your close friend?" (see Appendix D for the full list of these questions).

Demographics. Finally, eight demographic questions were employed using multiple choice and open-ended questions. These included asking for (**1**) the participant's biological sex, (**2**) the participant's ethnicity, (**3**) the participant's age, (**4**) the participant's income, (**5**) the participant's academic status based on their college credits, (**6**) an estimate of how many people were present when he/she gave their Self-Introduction Speech, (**7**) the course number/instructor, and (**8**) their name if their instructor was giving extra credit for participating in the research (see Appendix E).

Results

The survey collected 78 electronic responses. Participants who did not complete a majority of the survey, as well as those who did not answer correctly for the two attention checks, were removed prior to data analysis. The final sample for analysis was 61 participants.

Demographics

Several demographics were gathered in this study, including sex, ethnicity, age, average yearly income, academic status (based on college credit hours accumulated), and the number of people present (excluding the participant) when the Self-Introduction Speech was given. In terms of **sex**, 37.70% of the respondents were males, and 62.30% of the respondents were females. For **ethnicity**, a majority of the participants (66.70%)

identified themselves as Caucasian/White. 15% identified themselves as Asian

American/Asian, 8.30% identified themselves as African American/Black, 6.70%

identified themselves as Hispanic/Latino, 1.70% identified themselves as Hawaiian

Native/Pacific Islander, and 1.70% identified themselves as Multiracial. The average **age**

of the participants was about 21 years old, and the average **income** for participants was

$10,593.13. For **academic status**, 45% of the participants identified themselves as

Sophomores, 41.70% said they were Freshmen, 6.70% said they were Juniors, and 6.70%

said they were Seniors. The average number of **audience members** that were present

during the participants' speeches was about 20 people. See Table 1 for demographic

information.

Table 1: Demographics

Variable	n	M	SD	%
Sex				
Male	23	-	-	37.70
Female	38	-	-	62.30
Ethnicity				
Caucasian/White	40	-	-	66.70
African American/Black	5	-	-	8.30
Asian American/Asian	9	-	-	15.00
Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander	1	-	-	1.70
Hispanic/Latino	4	-	-	6.70
Multiracial	1	-	-	1.70
Age	61	21.28	4.69	-
Income	46	$10,593.13	$9,704.53	-
Audience Number	60	20.02	7.09	-
Academic Status				
Freshmen	25	-	-	41.70
Sophomore	27	-	-	45.00
Junior	4	-	-	6.70
Senior	4	-	-	6.70

M = mean, SD = standard deviation

Research Question 1 asked, "What is the relative salience of self-disclosure goals at the podium?" Means were examined to answer this research question. In the public speaking setting (see Table 2), the relative salience of goals was as follows: identity clarification ($M = 5.22$, $SD = 1.26$), information sharing ($M = 4.93$, $SD = 1.51$), and self-expression/relief of distress ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 1.30$). Social validation ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 1.61$) and relationship development ($M = 3.17$, $SD = 1.60$) were less salient in the public speaking setting, and social control was the least salient goal in this setting ($M = 2.82$, $SD = 1.65$).

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Goals in the Public Speaking Setting

Goal	n	M	SD
Identity Clarification	61	5.22	1.26
Relationship Development	60	3.17	1.60
Social Validation	61	3.44	1.61
Social Control	60	2.82	1.65
Self-Expression/Relief of Distress	61	4.42	1.30
Information Sharing	61	4.93	1.51

M = mean, SD = standard deviation

Hypothesis 1 stated that the relative salience of each self-disclosure goal would differ across contexts. In addition to the previously reported findings for goals in a public speaking setting, the relative salience of self-disclosure goals was also examined in dyadic settings by looking at the means (see Table 3). The relative salience of goals was

the same as in the public speaking setting, although the ordering differed. In dyadic

relationships, the highest means were found for self-expression/relief of distress (M =

5.70, SD = 1.31), identity clarification (M = 4.80, SD = 1.42), and information sharing (M

= 4.50, SD = 1.90). In accordance with the public speaking setting, the next highest mean

score in the dyadic setting was for social validation (M = 4.30, SD = 1.54), followed

closely by relationship development (M = 4.23, SD = 1.74). Similar to the public

speaking setting, the lowest mean score in the dyadic setting was for social control (M =

3.40, SD = 1.82).

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Goals in the Dyadic Relationship Setting

Goal	n	M	SD
Identity Clarification	61	4.80	1.42
Relationship Development	59	4.23	1.74
Social Validation	61	4.29	1.54
Social Control	61	3.40	1.82
Self-Expression/Relief of Distress	61	5.70	1.31
Information Sharing	60	4.50	1.90

M = mean, SD = standard deviation

A paired samples t-test revealed a significant difference between participants'

mean scores for **identity clarification** goals between the dyadic setting and the public

speaking setting, $t(60)$ = 2.22, $p < .05$. Generally, in a dyadic relationship setting,

participants scored lower (*M* = 4.80, *SD* = 1.42) compared to a public speaking setting (*M* = 5.22, *SD* = 1.26). These results are reported in Table 4.

Table 4: Identity Clarification in Different Settings

Setting	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*t*
Public Speaking	61	5.22	1.26	
				2.22[*]
Dyadic Relationship	61	4.80	1.42	

M = mean, *SD* = standard deviation
p < .05. **p* < .01. ***p* < .001

Paired samples t-tests were also run for relationship maintenance goals, as well as social validation goals. The differences between the mean scores in a dyadic vs. public speaking setting for **relationship maintenance** goals can be found under the results for hypothesis 2. The differences for **social validation** goals can be found under the results for hypothesis 3.

Next, a paired samples t-test also revealed a significant difference between participants' mean scores for **social control** goals between the dyadic setting and the podium setting, $t(59) = -2.66$, $p < .05$. In general, in a dyadic relationship setting, participants scored higher (*M* = 3.38, *SD* = 1.82) compared to a public speaking setting (*M* = 2.82, *SD* = 1.65). These results are reported in Table 5.

Table 5: Social Control in Different Settings

Setting	n	M	SD	t
Public Speaking	60	2.82	1.65	
				-2.66[*]
Dyadic Relationship	60	3.38	1.82	

M = mean, SD = standard deviation
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Furthermore, a paired samples t-test revealed a significant difference between participants' mean scores for **self-expression/relief of distress** goals between the dyadic setting and the public speaking setting, $t(60) = -7.14$, $p < .001$. Generally, when in a dyadic relationship setting, participants scored higher ($M = 5.70$, $SD = 1.31$) compared to a public speaking setting ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 1.30$). These results are reported in Table 6.

Table 6: Self-Expression/Relief of Distress in Different Settings

Setting	n	M	SD	t
Public Speaking	61	4.42	1.30	
				-7.14[***]
Dyadic Relationship	61	5.70	1.31	

M = mean, SD = standard deviation
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Finally, another paired samples t-test was run. However, this test did not reveal a significant difference between participants' mean scores for **information sharing** goals between the dyadic setting ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 1.90$) and the public speaking setting ($M = 4.89$, $SD = 1.50$), $t(59) = 1.42$, $p > .05$. These results are reported in Table 7.

Table 7: Information Sharing in Different Settings

Setting	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*t*
Public Speaking	60	4.89	1.50	
				1.42
Dyadic Relationship	60	4.50	1.90	

M = mean, SD = standard deviation
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Overall, hypothesis 1 was partially supported. The relative salience of various goals across the two settings were similar, when just looking at the overall means. However, the relative salience of most of the goals (identity clarification, relationship development, social validation, social control, and self-expression/relief of distress) significantly differed between a dyadic setting and a public speaking setting. The salience of one goal (information sharing) did not significantly differ between the two settings.

Hypothesis 2 stated that **relationship development** goals would be reported as more salient for self-disclosure in a dyadic relationship than for self-disclosure in the public speaking context. A paired samples t-test revealed a significant difference between participants' reports of the salience of relationship maintenance goals between the dyadic

setting and the public speaking setting, $t(57) = -4.66$, $p < .001$. In general, when in a

dyadic relationship setting, participants reported greater salience of relationship

maintenance goals ($M = 4.26$, $SD = 1.74$) compared to a public speaking setting ($M =$

3.11, $SD = 1.54$). Hypothesis 2 was supported. These results are reported in Table 8.

Table 8: Relationship Development in Different Settings

Setting	n	M	SD	t
Public Speaking	58	3.11	1.54	
				-4.66[***]
Dyadic Relationship	58	4.26	1.74	

M = mean, SD = standard deviation
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Hypothesis 3 stated that **social validation** goals would be reported as more

salient for self-disclosure in the public speaking setting than for self-disclosure in a

dyadic relationship. A paired samples t-test revealed a significant difference between

participants' mean scores for social validation goals in the dyadic setting and in the

public speaking setting, $t(60) = -4.10$, $p < .001$. In general, in a public speaking setting,

participants scored lower ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 1.61$) than in a dyadic relationship setting ($M =$

4.30, $SD = 1.54$). Hypothesis 3 was not supported. Instead, a significant difference was

found in the opposite direction than predicted. These results are reported in Table 9.

Table 9: Social Validation in Different Settings

Setting	n	M	SD	t
Public Speaking	61	3.44	1.61	
				-4.10^{***}
Dyadic Relationship	61	4.29	1.54	

M = mean, SD = standard deviation
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Hypothesis 4 stated that self-disclosure in dyadic relationships would be more

intimate than self-disclosure in the public speaking setting. A paired samples t-test

revealed a significant difference between participants' mean intimacy scores for dyadic

relationships and public speaking settings, $t(56) = -6.29$, $p < .001$. In general, for dyadic

relationships, people reported higher intimacy levels ($M = 5.33$, $SD = 1.78$) compared to

a public speaking setting ($M = 3.87$, $SD = 1.45$). Hypothesis 4 was supported. These

results are reported in Table 10.

Table 10: Intimacy in Different Settings

Setting	n	M	SD	t
Public Speaking	57	3.87	1.45	
				-6.29^{***}
Dyadic Relationship	57	5.33	1.78	

M = mean, SD = standard deviation
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Hypothesis 5 said that in either context, as **relationship development goals** became more salient, the **levels of intimacy** would increase. Correlations were run for both settings. For the public speaking setting (see Table 11), the correlation between the salience of relationship development goals and intimacy levels ($r = .18$) was positive and small, according to Cohen (1988). This indicates that as the salience of relationship development goals increases, so does one's intimacy levels. While this correlation is in the predicted direction, it was not significant, $p > .05$.

Table 11: Correlations between Relationship Development Goals and Intimacy Levels in Public Speaking Settings

Variable	1	2
1. Relationship Development Goals [a]	---	.18
2. Intimacy [a]	.18	---

n [a] $= 56$
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

The dyadic relationship setting (see Table 12) was also examined with a correlation between the salience of relationship development goals and intimacy levels ($r = -.07$). The correlation was negative and trivial, according to Cohen (1988). This indicates that as the salience of the relationship development goals increases, intimacy levels decrease. This was not in the direction that was predicted. However, this correlation was also not significant, $p > .05$.

Table 12: Correlations between Relationship Development Goals and Intimacy Levels
in Dyadic Settings

Variable	1	2
1. Relationship Development Goals [b]	---	-.07
2. Intimacy [b]	-.07	---

$n^b = 57$
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Overall, hypothesis 5 was not supported. For the public speaking setting, as the salience of relationship development goals increased, intimacy levels also increased. For the dyadic relationship setting, a negative relationship was found. However, both correlations were not statistically significant.

Discussion

This study examined six underlying motivations and intimacy levels for self-disclosure in a dyadic relationship setting and a public speaking setting. Several of the hypotheses were supported. One hypothesis was only partially supported, and others were not supported.

The research question sought to determine the relative salience of self-disclosure goals at the podium. Since research on self-disclosure goals and public speaking has not previously been conducted, the anticipated results for this research question were largely unknown. It seemed logical, however, to ascertain that several goals would emerge as more salient than others. Indeed, other researchers have found multiple goals that surfaced in their research (for example, see Lee et al., 2008). The current study found that the relative salience of goals in the public speaking classroom was (**1**) identity

clarification, (**2**) information sharing, (**3**) self-expression/relief of distress, (**4**) social

validation, (**5**) relationship development, and (**6**) social control.

The present study first hypothesized that the relative salience of each self-

disclosure goal would differ across contexts. The three highest mean scores in the dyadic

setting were the same as in the public speaking setting (identity clarification, information

sharing, and self-expression/relief of distress). However, they were ranked differently. In

dyadic relationships, the highest means were found in (**1**) self-expression/relief of

distress, (**2**) identity clarification, and finally, (**3**) information sharing. Similar to the

public speaking setting, next came (**4**) social validation, (**5**) relationship development,

and then (**6**) social control. Furthermore, statistical analyses also revealed differences

across the settings. Generally, as it relates to a dyadic relationship setting, participants

indicated lower salience of **identity clarification** goals when compared to a public

speaking setting. The specific findings for the differences between the settings for

relationship maintenance and **social validation** goals can be found later in the

discussion. In terms of **social control**, generally, when in a dyadic relationship setting,

participants indicated higher salience of this goal compared to a public speaking setting.

For a dyadic relationship setting, participants generally indicated greater salience of **self-**

expression/relief of distress goals than for a public speaking setting. Interestingly, there

was not a significant difference between salience of **information sharing** goals in the

dyadic setting and the public speaking setting. Because self-disclosure is defined in this

study as "the act of revealing personal *information* to others [emphasis added]," it makes

sense that participants would list this as a goal in both settings (Jourard, 1971, p. 2).

Overall, this first hypothesis was partially supported. Salience for most of the self-disclosure goals (identity clarification, relationship development, social validation, social control, and self-expression/relief of distress) differed between a dyadic setting and a public speaking setting. Salience of only one goal (information sharing) did not differ between the two settings.

These results, which indicate that there are multiple differences in the salience of goals between settings, are consistent with previous research, which overall showed that different target audiences and situations will alter the goals for self-disclosing. In more detail, self-disclosure models take into account multiple variables, and some include the setting (e.g., Omarzu's 2000 model that incorporates situational cues). With some researchers looking at different components (e.g., HIV), it follows that the various settings will call for different goals. Furthermore, Himelstein and Kimbrough (1963) suggested that "situation and social variables" play a key role in predicting self-disclosure (p. 439). More specifically, Bazarova and Choi's (2014) study, which examined self-disclosure on Facebook, suggests that different audience sizes are related to different self-disclosure goals. A small target audience (direct messaging and wall posts) was connected to relationship development goals, and a large target audience (status updates) was connected to social validation goals. The study also found that self-expression/relief and social validation were the primary goals of those disclosing to a large target audience. It makes sense that other goals would differ across settings as well.

In the present study, relationship maintenance goals were hypothesized to be reported as more salient for self-disclosure in a dyadic relationship than for self-disclosure at the podium. Consistent with the literature review, Bazarova and Choi (2014)

determined that when specific audiences were addressed in social media, the goal was relationship maintenance. Choi and Bazarova (2015) also examined network characteristics. When examining self-disclosure on Facebook and Twitter, they found that the network properties might influence self-disclosures more than the network size. The researchers suggested that "people may feel more comfortable pursing relational goals in channels with more clearly defined boundaries than those with loosely defined boundaries and potentially unbounded audiences" (p. 495). Together, these results show that with a smaller audience and the more defined boundaries that are found in dyadic relationships, it can be assumed that relational goals will be sought after more so than in a public speaking atmosphere.

It was also predicted that social validation goals would be more salient for self-disclosure at the podium than for self-disclosure in a dyadic relationship. However, this hypothesis was not supported. Instead, it was found that students reported social validation goals as more salient in a dyadic relationship, not a public speaking setting.

This result is inconsistent with previous research. For example, Craven's (1975) work lends support to people self-disclosing in public settings because of their need for social approval. Furthermore, Bazarova and Choi (2014) determined that when larger audiences were in mind in social media, the goal for self-disclosure was social validation. Their research showed that as self-disclosure becomes increasingly public (private messaging to direct wall posts to status updates), social validation becomes increasingly important to the discloser.

There is a likely explanation as to why this hypothesis was not supported. It could be that the classroom settings that the participants found themselves in, during the current

study, were not large enough settings to elicit the students to search for social validation

goals. After all, the average number of audience members was about 20 people.

According to an interpretation of Pew Research survey data, on average, people have 338

Facebook friends (Smith, 2014). Fifteen percent of the respondents even said that they

have over a whopping 500 Facebook friends (Pew Research Center, 2013)! According to

Lenhart (2015), in a statistical write-up for the Pew Research Center, a survey of

teenagers found that Instagram users have about 150 followers, and that Twitter users

have about 95 followers. With the contrast in these numbers, it is reasonable to assume

that goals will differ based on the size of the audience (i.e., a different setting), as

previously discussed. Perhaps people who address larger audiences, such as candidates at

campaign rallies, will be more likely to seek social validation goals than a student in a

small classroom setting.

Another likely explanation as to why participants reported social validation goals

as more salient in a dyadic relationship can be explained through social support. In a

study on social support on Facebook, researchers Blight, Jagiello, and Ruppel (2015)

asked participants to provide them with a recent status update, in which the participants

were seeking social support, along with "the most supportive response" (p. 368). The

researchers found that most participants reported that Facebook comments from a "close

other" were the most supportive that they received recently (p. 370). These did not come

from their acquaintances, although some participants did report Facebook comments

from acquaintances as the most supportive. In the present study, it appears that people

seek social validation, or "[v]alidation of one's self-concept; seeking approval and

support from others," from their friends, but not classmates (Bazarova & Choi, 2014, p.

645). Perhaps people value their friends' thoughts and opinions over classmates. Classmates might not be considered friends, but rather, acquaintances. Furthermore, as Blight, Jagiello, and Ruppel (2015) found that most people receive the most support from friends, it stands to reason that if people know they can receive support from their friends, perhaps they are more likely to go to their friends for validation instead of a room full of classmates.

The present study also hypothesized that self-disclosure in dyadic relationships would be more intimate compared to self-disclosure at the podium, and this prediction was supported. This result of higher intimacy levels for self-disclosure in dyadic relationships is consistent with the work of multiple researchers and studies. For instance, research indicates that groups of two people will yield a higher level of intimacy than larger groups (Solano & Dunnam, 1985). Furthermore, Bazarova and Choi (2014) found that media affordances impact self-disclosure goals, which then impact the outcomes of self-disclosure in terms of intimacy. Perhaps the differences between dyadic and public speaking settings can be seen as "affordances," which in turn might alter self-disclosure goals and, ultimately, intimacy. Bazarova and Choi (2014) further found that in Facebook, "disclosures via private messages were more intimate than disclosures either via status updates … or via wall posts" (p. 647). Also, situations can lead to different levels of intimacy, and research shows that isolated groups self-disclose more intimately than non-isolated groups (Altman & Haythorn, 1965). Isolation was created by having dyads who "worked and lived in a small room for ten days, with no outside contact" (p. 411). Those in the non-isolated groups were allowed to leave their room, and they had outside contact with others, although the dyads were still required to spend most of their

time together. Perhaps people in friendships sense an "isolation," as compared to larger settings where they "come and go" to class.

Furthermore, when looking at the other side of the coin, this result of lower intimacy levels for self-disclosure in public speaking settings is also consistent with previous literature. For example, research shows that people are not as comfortable self-disclosing, in general, in large groups (see for example, Drag, 1969 as cited in Cozby, 1973; Solano & Dunnam, 1985). Chaikin and Derlega (1974) found that people deemed it inappropriate to self-disclose intimate information to a stranger, which was partially confirmed by Morton (1978). Morton found that "[s]pouses, relative to strangers, communicated with more descriptive intimacy (i.e., private facts), but not more evaluative intimacy (i.e., personal feelings or opinions) …" (p. 72). With this social norm, it makes sense that students would not want to self-disclose in-depth to their peers at the beginning of the semester. Furthermore, social penetration theory shows that as time goes on, self-disclosures become more intimate in a relationship (Altman & Taylor, 1973), which means that people will not generally provide sensitive information when they do not know each other well. This finding, again, is concurrent with this study's results, which showed that students in a public speaking setting self-disclosed less intimately to a group of people that they, perhaps, did not know very well.

The last hypothesis was not supported, showing that in both settings, intimacy levels did not change alongside the degree of salience of relationship development goals. For the public speaking setting, as the salience of relationship development goals increases, intimacy levels also increase. However, this correlation was not statistically significant. For the dyadic relationship setting, a negative relationship between the

salience of relationship development goals and intimacy levels was found. However, this correlation was not statistically significant.

This finding is inconsistent with previous research. As previously mentioned, Bazarova and Choi (2014) found that media affordances impact self-disclosure goals, which then impact the outcomes of self-disclosure in terms of intimacy. This lends support to the supposition that disclosure goals will precede and be tied to intimacy. Bazarova and Choi found that self-disclosures tend to be more intimate when the underlying motivation is relational maintenance, which was compared to other goals. Choi and Bazarova (2015) validated this finding in a later study.

There are other explanations for why intimacy levels might not increase alongside the salience of relationship development goals, which are based on other predictors of intimacy levels. For instance, Cozby's (1973) literature review suggests that the **norm of reciprocity** impacts self-disclosure intimacy, meaning that people return intimate self-disclosures with the same level of intimacy. However, this does not continue at the same rate as intimacy levels increase. Cozby states that "[r]eciprocity appears to become less powerful as a determinant of subjects' responses at high levels of intimacy" (p. 82). In the current study, it could be that the norm of reciprocity is driving self-disclosure intimacy more than the self-disclosure goals.

Another example can be found in the work of Kelly and McKillop (1996), researchers who created a model to help determine when people should or should not reveal secrets. It is important to note, however, that the researchers make a case in their literature review that secret keeping is a vastly different concept than self-disclosure, and within this, they reference the factor analyses of Larson and Chastain (1990). For the

purposes of this study, however, the model is still a good explanation because it examines

whether or not people should reveal secrets, which are essentially pieces of personal

information. The model suggests that the secret keeper must answer "yes" to both of

these questions in order to share their secret with another person: (**1**) "Is the secret

troubling?" and (**2**) "Is an appropriate confidant available?" (Kelly & McKillop, 1996, p.

457). For the first question, "troubling" might mean physical (e.g., headaches) or

psychological (e.g., ruminations) symptoms. For the second question, an appropriate

confidant should be "(a) discreet and can be trusted not to reveal a secret, (b) perceived as

nonjudgmental, and (c) able to offer the secret keeper new insights into the secret…" (p.

458). This model is a possible explanation for underlying predictors of self-disclosure. In

the current study, how participants perceive the person they are disclosing to could

impact their self-disclosure intimacy. If they know the person they are disclosing to is

untrustworthy, is perceived as judgmental, and/or someone who does not have new

information for them, then the participant is not likely to disclose an intimate piece of

information, even if they consider the person a friend.

An interesting, and more recent, predictor of observer-rated, self-disclosure

intimacy is laughter (Gray, Parkinson, & Dunbar, 2015). However, when the intimacy

levels were self-rated, the same results did not occur. In the current study, it could be that

there are other variables, such as the level of laughter, within the dyadic conversations

that are interacting with self-disclosure goals.

Implications

There is a substantial gap in the literature that has been begging to be filled. As

previously mentioned, self-disclosure in the public speaking classroom has not been

researched thoroughly. Only a few studies have examined self-disclosure in this particular setting (Littlefield & Sellnow, 1987; Sellnow & Golish, 2000). Furthermore, as previously demonstrated, research on Derlega and Grzelak's (1979) functional approach has largely been studied in social media and as a means to create self-disclosure decision models. Thus, prior to this study, public speaking has not been studied in conjunction with the functional theory. In addition to this, self-disclosure intimacy had yet to be examined in public speaking settings until this study.

This study not only aids in building on the current research, but it provides societal implications. In regards to building on current research, this study may help researchers better understand self-disclosure in public speaking and in dyadic settings. More specifically, it can help researchers understand self-disclosure intimacy in these settings. This research also adds to the work of Derlega and Grzelak's (1979) functional theory, which has largely been studied in the form of disclosure decision-making models and social media. In terms of societal implications, this research can help instructors make assumptions as to why their students are self-disclosing in the classroom, or even outside of the classroom. This could help instructors determine when important courses of action need to be taken (e.g., referring a student to a counselor) in comparison to trivial matters (e.g., getting a student connected on campus). With the knowledge from this study, we can even begin to hypothesize about underlying motivations and goals in other public speaking environments. These might include important societal settings, such as pastoral podiums, political campaigns, and business/industry leaders' oral discourses.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study that need to be addressed. A **convenience sample** was used in this study, meaning that the results are not necessarily generalizable to all college students. There was also a **small sample size**. The sample had a **higher proportion of women** than men, which means that men were not fully represented in this study. If more men were added to this study, it could be that the results would change. In fact, according to a literature review by Cozby (1973), there are multiple instances where researchers have noted sex differences in the amount of self-disclosure. There may also be sex differences in other aspects of self-disclosure, such as goals (see for example, Bazarova & Choi, 2014).

Another factor to mention is that this survey used a **self-report measure**. While observer ratings cannot be used in determining underlying self-disclosure goals, they could be used in measuring intimacy. As such, using a self-report measure especially presents some issues when looking at the intimacy of self-disclosure. According to Morton (1978) "The intimacy of a disclosure may be judged by the discloser, the target of communication, or an outside observer, and these judges may not invariable concur" (p. 73). For example, suppose one student decided to disclose about his/her parents' divorce. To this student, this information might not be as much of an intimate piece of information as much as it is just a fact about her life. To another student, or to another observer, this information could seem highly personal. If people can judge intimacy differently, then different measures (i.e., self-reports vs. observer ratings) might yield different results. However, the current study used Derlega and Grzelak's (1979) logic, when they stated that "… the concept of intimacy is always based on subjective evaluation and cannot be

objectively defined" (p. 152). It stands to reason that if a person owns the information that they are sharing, they also "own" the level of intimacy of that information.

Along with the self-report measure, **memory recall** is also a concern, especially with some time gaps between completing the speech and completing the survey. However, this study was conducted over a relatively short period of time (about five weeks), which should have helped limit the recall bias. Furthermore, for the classes at UMSL, there was a due date for the survey that was a few weeks earlier than the full five-week period, meaning that students had about a three-week timespan between completing their speech and the online survey. It is estimated that students at L&C had no more than about a two-and-a-half-week time span between completing their speech and participating in the online survey, and other students had a shorter time span.

There are some concerns about portions of the survey's **reliability**. Cronbach's alpha values were low for identity clarification in the public speaking setting ($\alpha = .67$) and in the dyadic relationship setting ($\alpha = .60$). The Cronbach's alpha value was also low for self-expression and relief of distress in the public speaking setting ($\alpha = .68$), but not in the dyadic relationship setting ($\alpha = .78$). However, these scale items for goals were developed from Bazarova and Choi's (2014) coding scheme, which means they are new scales. As such, these numbers, although not the best, were considered acceptable in the present study.

Furthermore, while this study only looked at Self-Introduction Speeches in order to keep conditions as similar as possible, the sample was collected from **different classes and different instructors**, meaning that the assignment requirements were not exactly the same. Classes that had assignment requirements that were too dissimilar from a

traditional Self-Introduction Speech were excluded from the study. One of the classes in the sample was even an online class, and although they still met in person for their Self-Introductions, the conditions and relationships formed would most likely be different than those in a face-to-face class. Yet, only two participants indicated that they were from the online class. With this online class, the class "visit" was made via **video**, which was different than the in-person visits made to the other class sections. Regardless, all classes received a class visit, whether online or in-person, inviting them to participate in the research. Furthermore, each class visit was made by the same researcher, which helped keep the conditions similar.

Finally, due to time constraints, some class sections had not completed their Self-Introductions prior to the class visit. As such, they were informed that they could take the survey **once they completed their Self-Introduction assignment**. Knowledge of this information could potentially change the information they provided in their speeches.

Future Research

After conducting this study, there are several ideas that surfaced for future research. This study only looked at public speaking settings in the classroom. Investigating public speaking settings in other situations (e.g., broadcasts, pageantry, civic proceedings) would provide further understanding of what motivations people use when self-disclosing in public. Examining levels of self-disclosure intimacy across these different settings might also provide interesting results. Future researchers should also specifically examine the size of the audience (from a classroom, to an auditorium, and to a broadcast) to see how incrementally increasing the size of the audience will change goals and intimacy levels. In the current study, due to a small variance in the audience

size across classrooms, this aspect was unable to be examined in terms of intimacy. In addition, future research should investigate the speaker's relationship to the audience members. Some students might be speaking to a classroom with many friends, and others might be speaking to strangers. How does this dynamic change self-disclosure goals and intimacy levels? Furthermore, potential models for self-disclosure in public speaking settings should be proposed and tested in order to examine both the variables and the processes used in self-disclosure decision-making.

Conclusion

This study examined six underlying motivations for self-disclosure in a public speaking setting and a dyadic relationship setting. This study found that the relative salience of goals in the public speaking setting was identity clarification, information sharing, self-expression/relief of distress, social validation, relationship development, and social control. The relative salience of goals in the dyadic relationship setting was self-expression/relief of distress, identity clarification, information sharing, social validation, relationship development, and social control. Most of the self-disclosure goals, except for one, varied across settings in terms of their relative salience. Two key findings showed that for the dyadic relationship setting, participants reported a higher salience of relationship development and social validation goals compared to the public speaking setting. Self-disclosure in dyadic relationships occurred at higher levels of intimacy than self-disclosure in a public speaking setting. Analyses in both settings showed no significant correlations between the salience of relationship development goals and the levels of intimacy. Overall, these findings build on Derlega and Grzelak's (1979) functional approach to self-disclosure by examining self-disclosure goals in a public

speaking setting. The results can help people understand underlying motivations for sharing information in different contexts. Future research should examine self-disclosure goals and intimacy for other public speaking settings, increased audience sizes, relationship to the audience members, and disclosure decision-making models for public speaking settings.

References

Altman, I., & Haythorn, W. W. (1965). Interpersonal exchange in isolation. *Sociometry,*
28(4), 411-426. doi:10.2307/2785992

Altman, I., & Taylor, D. A. (1973). Assumptions about personality structure. In *Social*
penetration (pp. 15-24). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Altman, I., & Taylor, D. A. (1973). The course of development of interpersonal
relationships. In *Social penetration* (pp. 27-58). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and
Winston.

Archer, R. L. (1993). Commentary: Self-disclosure, a very useful behavior. In V. J.
Derlega, S. Metts, S. Petronio, & S. T., Margulis (Eds.). *Self-disclosure* (pp. 329-
342). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Bazarova, N. N., & Choi, Y. H. (2014). Self-disclosure in social media: Extending the
functional approach to disclosure motivations and characteristics on social
network sites. *Journal of Communication, 64*(4), 635-657.
doi:10.1111/jcom.12106

Blight, M. G., Jagiello, K., & Ruppel, E. K. (2015). "Same stuff different day:" A mixed-
method study of support seeking on Facebook. *Computers in Human*
Behavior, 53, 366-373. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.07.029

Chaikin, A. L., & Derlega, V. J. (1974). Variables affecting the appropriateness of self-
disclosure. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *42*(4), 588-593.
doi:10.1037/h0036614

Chaudoir, S. R., & Fisher, J. D. (2010). The disclosure processes model: Understanding
disclosure decision making and postdisclosure outcomes among people living

with a concealable stigmatized identity. *Psychological Bulletin, 136*(2), 236-256. doi:10.1037/a0018193

Chen, G. (2015). Why do women bloggers use social media? Recreation and information motivations outweigh engagement motivations. *New Media & Society, 17*(1), 24-40. doi:10.1177/1461444813504269

Choi, Y. H., & Bazarova, N. N. (2015). Self-disclosure characteristics and motivations in social media: Extending the functional model to multiple social network sites. *Human Communication Research, 41*(4), 480-500. doi:10.1111/hcre.12053

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Collins, N. L., & Miller, L. C. (1994). Self-disclosure and liking: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *116*(3), 457-475. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.116.3.457

Cozby, P. C. (1973). Self-disclosure: A literature review. *Psychological Bulletin, 79*(2), 73-91. doi:10.1037/h0033950

Cravens, R. W. (1975). The need for approval and the private versus public disclosure of self. *Journal of Personality*, *43*(3), 503-514. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.ep8970348

Derlega, V. J., & Grzelak, J. (1979). Appropriateness of self-disclosure. In G. J. Chelune (Ed.), *Self-disclosure: Origins, patterns, and implications of openness in interpersonal relationships* (pp. 151-176). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Derlega, V. J., Winstead, B. A., Greene, K., Serovich, J., & Elwood, W. N. (2002). Perceived HIV-related stigma and HIV disclosure to relationship partners after

finding out about the seropositive diagnosis. *Journal of Health Psychology, 7*(4), 415-432. doi:10.1177/1359105302007004330

Derlega, V. J., Winstead, B. A., Greene, K., Serovich, J., & Elwood, W. N. (2004). Reasons for HIV disclosure/nondisclosure in close relationships: Testing a model of HIV–Disclosure decision making. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 23*(6), 747-767. doi:10.1521/jscp.23.6.747.54804

Gray, A. W., Parkinson, B., & Dunbar, R. I. (2015). Laughter's influence on the intimacy of self-disclosure. *Human Nature: An Interdisciplinary Biosocial Perspective, 26*(1), 28-43. doi:10.1007/s12110-015-9225-8

Greene, K., Derlega, V. J., & Mathews, A. (2006). Self-disclosure in personal relationships. In A. L. Vangelisti, & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 409-427). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://login.ezproxy.umsl.edu/login?url=http:// search.credoreference.com/content/entry/cuppr/ self_disclosure_in_personal_relationships/0?institutionId=4388

Himelstein, P., & Kimbrough, W. W., Jr. (1963). A study of self-disclosure in the classroom. *Journal of Psychology, 55*, 437-440.

Hurley, J. R., & Hurley, S. J. (1969). Toward authenticity in measuring self-disclosure. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *16*(3), 271-274. doi:10.1037/h0027390

Jourard, S. M. (1971). Part I: Studies with self-disclosure questionnaires. In *Self-disclosure: An experimental analysis of the transparent self* (pp. 1-2). Toronto, Canada: John Wiley & Sons.

Kelly, A. E., & McKillop, K. J. (1996). Consequences of revealing personal secrets. *Psychological Bulletin, 120*(3), 450-465. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.120.3.450

Lee, D., Im, S., & Taylor, C. R. (2008). Voluntary self-disclosure of information on the internet: A multimethod study of the motivations and consequences of disclosing information on blogs. *Psychology and Marketing, 25*(7), 692-710. doi:10.1002/mar.20232

Lenhart, A. (2015). *Teens, social media, & technology overview*. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/04/09/mobile-access-shifts-social-media-use-and-other-online-activities/

Littlefield, R. S., & Sellnow, T. L. (1987). The use of self-disclosure as a means for reducing stage fright in beginning speakers. *Communication Education, 36*(1), 62-64. doi:10.1080/03634528709378643

Ma, X., Hancock, J., & Naaman, M. (2016). Anonymity, intimacy and self-disclosure in social media. *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI 2016), USA,* 3857-3869. doi:10.1145/2858036.2858414

Morreale, S. P., Worley, D. W., & Hugenberg, B. (2010). The basic communication course at two- and four-year U.S. colleges and universities: Study VIII - The 40th anniversary. *Communication Education, 59*(4), 405-430. doi:10.1080/03634521003637124

Morton, T. L. (1978). Intimacy and reciprocity of exchange: A comparison of spouses and strangers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *36*(1), 72-81. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.36.1.72

Omarzu, J. (2000). A disclosure decision model: Determining how and when individuals will self-disclose. *Personality & Social Psychology Review*, *4*(2), 174-185. doi:10.1207/S15327957PSPR0402_05

Pennebaker, J. W., & O'Heeron, R. C. (1984). Confiding in others and illness rate among spouses of suicide and accidental-death victims. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *93*(4), 473-476. doi:10.1037/0021-843X.93.4.473

Pew Research Center. (2013). *Survey questions_Facebook*. Retrieved from http://assets.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/12/2014/01/Survey-Questions_Facebook.pdf

Sellnow, D., & Golish, T. (2000). The relationship between a required self-disclosure speech and public speaking anxiety: Considering gender equity. *Basic Communication Course Annual, 12*(6), 28-59. Retrieved from http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol12/iss1/6/

Smith, A. (2014). *6 new facts about Facebook*. Retrieved from http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/02/03/6-new-facts-about-facebook/

Solano, C. H., & Dunnam, M. (1985). Two's company: Self-disclosure and reciprocity in triads versus dyads. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 48*(2), 183-187. doi:10.2307/3033613

Taylor, D. S., & Altman, I. (1975). Self-disclosure as a function of reward-cost outcomes. *Sociometry, 38*(1), 18-31. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.umsl.edu/stable/2786231?pq-origsite=summon&seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents

Appendix A

Consent Form

Hello,

You are invited to participate in a research study investigating people's self-disclosure in public and private settings. **To qualify to participate in this study, you must be at least 18 years of age, and you must have completed a Self-Introduction Speech in a public speaking or related course this semester**. The study is being conducted by Layne Paubel and Dr. Stephanie Van Stee in the Department of Communication & Media at the University of Missouri - St. Louis. We would be grateful if you could spend less than 20 minutes to fill out the questionnaire.

Possible Risks: It is expected that participation in this study will provide you with no more than minimal risk or discomfort, which means that you should not experience anything that is any more troubling than your normal daily life. Although there are no direct benefits to participating, your response will help us to better understand the research topic.

The study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Missouri-St. Louis and the Lewis & Clark Community College Institutional Review Board. While filling out the questionnaire, you may skip questions that you do not feel comfortable answering. Your answers will be kept confidential. We will analyze all participants' answers with summarized statistics and no names will be used in reporting of the data. If you are taking this survey to receive extra credit for a course, your instructor will <u>not</u> be able to see your answers. If you have any questions about your

rights or treatment as a research participant, please feel free to contact Brenda Stutte from the Office of Research Administration at UMSL at (314) 516-5897, or the Lewis & Clark Community College Institutional Review Board at (618) 468-4310. If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact us at lpqk3@mail.umsl.edu or vanstees@umsl.edu. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Layne Paubel and Dr. Stephanie Van Stee

Consent: I understand that my participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that I may refuse to participate or may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. I have read this entire form and I understand it completely. By clicking "Yes" below, I am agreeing to participate in the study, and I also meet the qualifications that were listed above.

☐ Yes

Appendix B

Self-Disclosure

Public Speaking Setting:

<u>**Q1**</u> – Please answer the following question to the best of your ability, providing as much detail as possible. Thank you.

A "disclosure" is defined as the verbal/oral act of **revealing personal information to others**.

Please think of a recent situation in which you presented a Self-Introduction Speech in a Public Speaking Class or a related class. Once you can think of such a situation, list and describe each piece of information you disclosed about yourself during the speech. Please do not include any information that was not provided in your speech.

<u>**Q5**</u> – **Dyadic Relationship Setting:**

Please answer the following question to the best of your ability, providing as much detail as possible. Thank you.

A "disclosure" is defined as the verbal/oral act of **revealing personal information to others**.

Please think of a recent, face-to-face conversation with a close friend in which you disclosed something about yourself. Once you can think of such a situation, list and describe each piece of information you disclosed about yourself to the friend. Please do not include any information that was not provided in this conversation.

Appendix C

Intimacy

[NOTE TO READERS: Participants answered questions on this scale twice: once for their self-disclosures in their Self-Introduction Speech, and once for their self-disclosures in their conversation with a close friend.]

Q2 & **Q6** – Based on the *overall* self-disclosure that you just provided, would you say that the information is…

_1 Non-intimate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Intimate

_2 Impersonal 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Personal

_3 Public 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Private

Appendix D

Functional Theory Measure

[NOTE TO READERS: Participants answered questions on this scale twice: once for their self-disclosures in their Self-Introduction Speech, and once for their self-disclosures in their conversation with a close friend.]

Q3 – **Instructions for the Public Speaking Setting:** Think back to your Self-Introduction Speech and the information that you self-disclosed. With the *overall* self-disclosure in mind, please answer each statement by selecting the option that best represents your reasons for disclosing.

Q7 – **Instructions for the Dyadic Setting:** Think back to the face-to-face conversation you described earlier in the survey. With the *overall* self-disclosure in mind, please answer each statement by selecting the option that best represents your reasons for disclosing.

Coding: "Strongly Disagree" marked as "1" and "Strongly Agree" marked as 7.

Identity Clarification:

_1 I provided this information to increase personal clarification.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐

Somewhat Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

_2 I provided this information to convey my personal identity.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐

Somewhat Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

Relational Development:

_3 I provided this information to manage a relationship.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐

Somewhat Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

_4 I provided this information to maintain a relationship.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐

Somewhat Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

Social Validation:

_5 I provided this information to validate my self-concept.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

_6 I provided this information to seek approval.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

_7 I provided this information to receive support from others.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

Social Control:

_8 I provided this information to control social outcomes.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

_9 I provided this information to manipulate social outcomes.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐

Somewhat Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

Attention Check:

_10   Please select "Strongly Agree."

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐

Somewhat Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

Self-Expression and Relief of Distress:

_11   I provided this information to express feelings.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐

Somewhat Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

_12   I provided this information to express thoughts.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐

Somewhat Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

_13 I provided this information to release pent-up feelings.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

Information Sharing to Benefit Others:

_14 I provided this information to benefit other(s) by sharing it.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

_15 I provided this information to benefit other(s) by sharing a personal experience.

☐ Strongly Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree ☐ Somewhat Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Strongly Agree

Q4 – **Public Speaking Setting:** Are there any other reasons that you provided the information that you did in your speech?

Q8 – **Dyadic Relationship Setting:** Are there any other reasons that you provided the information that you did in your most recent, face-to-face conversation with your close friend?

Appendix E

Demographics

Q9 – What is your biological sex?

☐ Male

☐ Female

☐ Intersex

Q10 – What is your ethnicity?

☐ Caucasian/White

☐ African American/Black

☐ Asian American/Asian

☐ Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander

☐ Native American/Alaskan native

☐ Hispanic/Latino

☐ Multiracial

☐ Other_____(type in)

Q11 – What is your age (in years)?

_____(type in)

Q12 – What is your average income before taxes?

_____(type in)

Q13 – What is your academic status? Please select the answer based on the amount of college credits that you have earned.

☐ Freshmen

☐ Sophomore

☐ Junior

☐ Senior

☐ Other

Q14 – Please estimate how many people were present when you gave your Self-Introduction Speech (not including yourself).

_____(type in)

Q15 – What is the *name* **and** the *section number* of the course in which you gave your Self-Introduction Speech?

☐ COMM1040-001 – Introduction to Public Speaking (Elanora Nappier)

☐ COMM1040-002 – Introduction to Public Speaking (Elanora Nappier)

☐ COMM1040-004 – Introduction to Public Speaking (Donna Higgins)

☐ COMM1040-005 – Introduction to Public Speaking (Donna Higgins)

☐ COMM1040-E01 – Introduction to Public Speaking (Milton Clayborn)

☐ SPCH 131-03 – Public Speaking (Elizabeth Grant)

☐ SPCH 131-90N – Public Speaking (Elizabeth Grant)

☐ SPCH 131-N1 – Public Speaking (Elizabeth Grant)

☐ SPCH 145-07 – Public & Private Communication (Elizabeth Grant)

☐ SPCH 145-08 – Public & Private Communication (Elizabeth Grant)

☐ SPCH 145-N1 – Public & Private Communication (Elizabeth Grant)

☐ Other_____(type in)

Q16 – Name

If your instructor is providing extra credit for participating in this survey, please provide your name. Your answers will be kept confidential, and will not be shared with your instructor. Please note that you can only receive extra credit for one course, which will be the one that you selected in the previous question.

_____(type in)