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The current study was designed to replicate previous findings that people like each other more online (Bargh et al., 2002; McKenna et al., 2002) and that they self-disclose more online (Joinson, 2001; Tidwell & Walther, 2002). In addition, the degree to which self-disclosure is positively associated with liking online and face-to-face was investigated. Unacquainted participants \((N = 122)\) were assigned to dyads \((N = 61)\) that met online or in-person, and discussed questions expected to elicit high or low disclosure. Following the 30 minute meeting, measures of self and perceived disclosure and liking were assessed. Results did not replicate previous findings. Differences in liking and disclosure did not emerge between participants online or in-person, but additional analyses revealed differences in the relationship between self-disclosure and liking online and in-person. Liking between face-to-face participants was associated primarily with the amount of disclosure they perceived from their partners’, while liking for online participants was more related to their own self-disclosure.
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Self-Disclosure and Liking Online and Face-to-Face

The rapid expansion of Internet technology in the last thirty years has been accompanied by a surge in the amount of literature dedicated to the nature of computer-mediated communication and the causes and consequences of Internet use. However, despite a great deal of theoretical interest in the subject, there is relatively little empirical research that addresses how social bonds develop online. In online interactions, many of the factors thought to be involved in initial attraction, such as physical attractiveness and proximity (Berscheid & Reis, 1998; Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986), are absent. One might expect, then, that people who meet online would be less likely to like each other. Two studies suggest that the opposite is true, that people who meet online like each other more than people who meet face-to-face (McKenna, Green, & Gleason, 2002; Bargh, McKenna, & Fitzsimons, 2002).

If it is the case that people like each other more online, at least initially, there must be an explanation for this somewhat counterintuitive finding. One clue might come from research by Tidwell and Walther (2002; also Joinson, 2001), who found that people self-disclose more online than they do face-to-face. A great deal of research has already shown that self-disclosure leads to liking, and vice versa (Collins & Miller, 1994), but this relationship has not been tested in computer-mediated communication.

Because the claim that there might be greater liking online is based on only two studies (McKenna, Green, & Gleason, 2002; Bargh, McKenna, & Fitzsimons, 2002), which were similar in several regards, one aim of the current study was to replicate this
finding. This study also tested whether liking is related to self-disclosure in online interactions. In other words, it is possible that heightened self-disclosure leads to greater liking online, which would explain why people like each other more even in the absence of factors traditionally thought to be at the heart of interpersonal attraction.

Current Study

In this study, participants chatted either online or face-to-face and then provided self-reports of liking and self-disclosure, as well as several other measures. There were two primary aims for this research. The first was to replicate the previous findings that people like each other more online (Bargh et al., 2002; McKenna et al., 2002) and that they self-disclose more online (Joinson, 2001; Tidwell & Walther, 2002).

H1: Self-disclosure between interaction partners will be greater online than face-to-face.

H2: Liking will be greater between interaction partners online than face-to-face.

The second aim of the research was to test whether self-disclosure is positively associated with liking online in the same way as it is face-to-face, which would help explain why there is greater liking in a medium that lacks many of the social cues available face-to-face. Specifically, in online interactions, people should like their partners more when they feel that their partners are self-disclosing.

H3: Self-disclosure and liking will be positively associated online.
The dependent measures used in this study also allowed a test of whether partners reciprocated each other’s liking and self-disclosure. The test of reciprocity was whether each partner within a dyad reported that they liked and self-disclosed to the other the same amount and whether there were any differences between the two mediums (online or face-to-face). Additionally, a test of accuracy was conducted of whether people online and face-to-face could accurately judge how much their partners reported liking them and how much their partners reported self-disclosing. The reciprocity and accuracy tests were exploratory, so specific hypotheses were not made about these analyses.

Method

Participants

One hundred twenty-two volunteers (55 male, 67 female; $M_{age} = 19.80$ years, $SD = 2.83$) were recruited from a large undergraduate psychology course at Rutgers University. The volunteers participated in exchange for partial credit toward fulfilling a psychology course requirement. Same and mixed gender dyads were formed from the sample and assigned to one of four experimental conditions created from a 2 (Discussion topic: low closeness and high closeness) x 2 (Interaction Environment: Face-to-face and online) factorial design; face-to-face-low closeness (n=30; 15 dyads), face-to-face-high closeness (n=30; 15 dyads), online-low closeness (n=32; 16 dyads), and online-high closeness (n=30; 15 dyads). There were 40 same gender dyads (24 female, 16 male) and 21 mixed-gender dyads.
\textit{Dependent Measures}

\textit{Closeness}. Closeness was used to gauge the effectiveness of discussion questions designed to elicit self-disclosure. Felt closeness was measured using a composite measure (Aron, et al., 1997) of Berscheid, Snyder, and Omoto’s (1989) Subjective Closeness Index (SCI) (Appendix C) and Aron, et al.’s (1992) Inclusion of the Other In the Self (IOS). The IOS consists of two items rated on a 7-point scale: a comparison of the current relationship with all of one's other relationships, and a comparison of the relationship to what subjects know about the closeness of other people's relationship. The SCI includes seven pairs of circles that are labeled self and partner that create a 7-point interval scale. “Partner” will be used in place of “Other” for the purposes of this study. Both measures have been highly correlated in previous studies, allowing for the creation of a composite closeness measure consisting of the averaged z-score equivalents of both measures ($\alpha=.85$).

\textit{Self-Disclosure, Liking, and Perceived Partner Disclosure and Perceived Liking}. Participant liking for their partner and the degree of self-disclosure were assessed with a series of items (Appendix B) rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1= not at all/none to 7 = a great deal) that were designed to measure the degree to which participants liked and shared personal information with their partner (Reno & Kenny, 1992). The degree to which participants felt their partner’s liked and shared personal information with them was measured using a similar series of statements.

\textit{Trust and perceived partner trust}. Trust may be an important aspect related to an individual’s willingness to disclose information about the self. Trust was measured with
the statement “I trusted my partner with my opinion and thoughts”. An estimate of perceived partner trust was also measured with a similar statement. Both statements were also rated on 7-point scales.

Self-esteem. Self-esteem was measured with the 10-item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (SES; Rosenberg, 1965), rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strong Agree). The scale has been used successfully in the past to provide an estimation of a component of the self-concept, a summation of an individual’s thoughts and feelings with reference to himself as an object.

Procedure

Dyads were randomly assigned to one of four experimental conditions involving an interaction with an unacquainted partner lasting 30 minutes.

Participants assigned to the two in-person conditions were greeted by an experimenter at the same location and seated in an experimental room in chairs facing each other. Participants assigned to the in-person-low closeness condition were given explicit instructions to become acquainted with their interaction partner by taking turns verbally asking and answering a set of 30 questions expected to create a low level of closeness. The participants in the in-person-high closeness condition were given similar instructions, but were given a different set of questions expected to create a significantly higher level of closeness. Both sets of questions were adopted from Aron (1997) and have been used in the past to create significantly different levels of closeness between unacquainted individuals.
Participants assigned to either of the two online conditions met at a different location than their discussion partner to maintain visual anonymity. Participants never saw each other. Each participant was seated in an experimental room at a desktop computer loaded with a text-based chat program that was already logged in and linked to their partner’s chat program. Each participant was identified in the chat by a standard screen name created for the study. In a similar fashion to the two in-person conditions, participants were instructed to take turns asking and answering one of two sets of discussions questions designed to create significantly different levels of closeness. Unlike the in-person conditions participants in the online-low closeness and online-high closeness conditions asked and answered questions textually rather than verbally. Following the interaction, participants in all four conditions completed the dependent measures and were then debriefed.

Results

An ANOVA of environment (online and in-person) x discussion question type (low closeness and high closeness) was conducted for each dependent measure. Preliminary analyses were conducted to investigate the possibility of gender effects due to the mixed nature of the dyads. Analyses comparing males and females individually, as well as analyses comparing mixed gender and same gender pairs, did not reveal any significant main effects or interactions for any dependent measures. Adequate power was not attained to conduct analyses on mixed gender and same gender pairs.

Closeness
Closeness is an important component related to self-disclosure and can be viewed as a proxy for degree of disclosure. It can be manipulated experimentally by varying topics of conversation of discussion partners (Aron, 1997). Participants were expected to report more felt closeness to their interaction partners when discussing personal questions (high closeness) than small-talk questions (low closeness). Closeness (Appendix C) was calculated as the average of three-items and attained adequately reliability ($\alpha=.90$; See Table 3 for means). An unexpected significant main effect of environment was found for closeness, $F(3,118)= 8.36, p =.005$, instead of for the discussion question type, $F(3,118)= .61$, ns. Participant feelings of closeness were higher when interacting face-to-face than online, regardless of the type of questions discussed within a communication medium.

**Disclosure**

Significant main effects and interactions were not found (all $Fs < 2.14$, ns) in any condition for disclosure-to-partner. Participants did not report any differences in the amount of personal information disclosed to their partners in any condition. Significant main effects and interactions were also not found for perceived partner disclosure (all $Fs < 1.36$, ns). Regardless of the questions discussed and interaction environment, the degree of disclosure perceived from partners remained the same. Disclosure-to-partner and perceived partner disclosure were highly related ($r=.70$) and averaged to create overall disclosure (see Table 3 for means). Overall disclosure did not yield any significant main effects or interactions (all $Fs < 1.55$, ns).
To investigate a possible relationship between disclosure to partner and self-esteem (r=.19), an ANCOVA was run. Environment and discussion question type were entered as categorical predictors while self-esteem was entered as a continuous predictor. All main effects, 2-way interactions, and the 3-way interaction involving environment, discussion question type, and self-esteem were assessed. The 3-way interaction of environment x discussion question type x self-esteem and all of the 2-way interactions were not significant (all $F$s < 2.69, ns). A significant main effect of self-esteem was found, $F(3,117) = 5.39, p = .02$. Greater levels of self-esteem led to more self-reported disclosures to partner.

$Liking$

An analysis of the effect of environment x question type on liking for partner revealed no significant main effect for interaction environment ($F(3,118) = .789$, ns) nor discussion question type ($F(3,118) = 1.82$, ns). Regardless of the communication medium or type of questions discussed, participants did not differ in reported liking for partner. However, an environment x discussion question type interaction emerged ($F(3,118) = 4.98, p = .03$) for liking for partner. Participants who discussed personal questions (high closeness) in person liked their partners more than in any other condition. A significant main effect was not found for perceived partner liking ($F(3,118) = .257$, ns). Participants did not think their partners’ liked them any more or less in any condition. Liking-for-partner and perceived-partner-liking were highly correlated ($r = .56, p < .01$; see Table 3 for means). Overall liking, the combination of liking for partner and
perceived partner liking, revealed no significant main effects or interactions (all Fs < .46, ns).

These findings do not support the hypotheses that participants would demonstrate more liking and disclose more personal information online than in-person (McKenna, Green, & Gleason, 2002).

*Relationship between Self-Disclosure and Liking*

Correlational analyses were conducted to investigate associations between disclosure and liking.

Significant tests were adjusted by modifying the effective sample size to account for the non-independence of the present data (Griffin and Gonzalez, 1995). Online, disclosure-to-partner and perceived partner-disclosure were both correlated with liking-for-partner (r = .36 and r = .35, both p < .01). Face-to-face disclosure-to-partner and perceived-partner-disclosure were also positively associated with liking-for-partner (r = .40 and r = .44, both p < .01). These findings suggest initial support for the relationship between liking and how much participants disclosed and how much perceived disclosure from partners in both online and in-person contexts.

Partial correlations were computed for disclosure-to-partner and perceived partner-disclosure because of their high correlation (r = .70, p < .01). Perceived partner disclosure remained significantly correlated with liking in face-to-face interactions (r = .26, p < .05) after controlling for disclosure to partner, but not online (r = .11, ns). After
controlling for perceived partner disclosure, the relationship between disclosure to
partner and liking was significant online ($r = .28, p < .05$) but not face-to-face ($r = .17,$
ns). In addition, the within-dyad correlation between liking-for-partner and how much
their partner reported they self-disclosed was marginally significant face-to-face ($r = .21,$
p $< .10$) but not online ($r = .07$, ns).

These results indicate that there were differences processes occurring in each
environment. Liking between face-to-face participants was associated primarily with the
amount of disclosure they perceived from their partners’, while liking for online
participants was more related to their own self-disclosure.

Reciprocity

Reciprocity of disclosure indicates whether both members of a dyad reported the
same amount of self-disclosure. Analyses revealed that participants only seemed to
reciprocate each other’s disclosure online ($r = .364, p < .01$) and not face-to-face ($r =
.186, ns$). Reciprocity of liking demonstrates that if partner A likes partner B, partner B
also likes partner A. Participants who interacted face-to-face showed reciprocity on liking
face-to-face ($r = .421, p < .01$) but not online ($r = .117, ns$). Reciprocity of trust would
indicate whether participants communicating with each other felt the same amount of
trust. A pattern emerged similar to liking; participants reciprocated trust face-to-face ($r =
.461, p < .01$) but not online ($r = .174, ns$).

Accuracy
Participants in face-to-face and online interactions were both able to accurately judge their partners’ disclosure ($r = .361, p < .01; r = .274, p < .05$). Face-to-face participants, were better judges of liking ($r = .305, p < .01$) and trust ($r = .283, p < .05$) than their counterparts in online interactions ($r = .093$ and $r = .087$, both ns, respectively).

**Trust**

Trust is an essential component of relationships, and may develop differently online than it does face-to-face (See Table 3 for means). Trust develops slower in computer-mediated interactions than in face-to-face interactions (Naquin & Paulson, 2003). The availability of non-verbal information (e.g. body language, eye contact) in face-to-face interactions may help to accelerate the rate at which trust develops, which may in turn impact the degree of disclosure and liking that emerges between partners.

A significant main effect of environment on trust for partner was significant, $F(3,118)=5.67, p = .019$. Participants trusted their partners more when interacting face-to-face than online. Perceived partner trust also followed a similar pattern, reaching a marginally significant main effect of environment, $F(3,118= 3.54, p =.06)$. Participants reported that their partner’s trusted them more when interacting face-to-face than online. Trust for partner and perceived partner trust were highly correlated ($r = .668$). Overall trust was the average of the trust for partner item and perceived partner trust item ($\alpha = .799$) for each participant. A significant main effect of interaction environment was found for overall trust ($F(3,118) = 5.52, p =.02$). Overall trust was higher when participants interacted face-to-face than electronically, regardless of the discussion question type.
Discussion

The primary goal of the current study was to duplicate previous research that found that self-disclosure and liking occurred more readily between unacquainted interaction partners in online contexts than they do in face-to-face settings (McKenna, Green, & Gleason, 2002). The obtained results do not support either hypothesis. Specifically, participants meeting for the first time online did not share more personal information with each other than participants who met initially in person, nor did online participants like each other more than participants who interacted face-to-face. Participants reported no differences in the amount they shared with their interaction partners, and only liked each other more when discussing personal questions face-to-face. Additional tests confirmed the relationship between self-disclosure and liking online and offline. Liking was positively associated with how much participants self-disclosed and how much their partners self-disclosed in face-to-face dyads, but only participants’ own disclosure was linked to liking online. Trust between participants was also greater face-to-face than online.

Additional analyses revealed differences in reciprocity and accuracy. Participants in the face-to-face condition reciprocated liking and trust, but not self-disclosure. The opposite was true of participants online; participants reciprocated self-disclosure but not liking or trust. While face-to-face participants were able to accurately judge how much their partners reported liking and trusting them, and how much they reported self-
disclosing, online participants were only able to accurately judge how much their partner’s reported self-disclosure. They could not accurately predict how much their partners liked or trusted them.

This pattern of findings may be explained by the fact that fewer types of information are transmitted in computer-mediated-communication, and so, by extension, interactions online can be interpreted as less personal and less fulfilling (Sproull & Kiesler, 1986; Kiesler, et al., 1984; Walther, 1996). Liking and trust are not transmitted in computer-mediated communication as easily as when face-to-face. Liking is often indicated by facial expressions, physical closeness or touching, and body language (and dislike can be signaled by the opposite cues), which are not communicated online. Without that information, trust will not be able to develop.

Research has shown that there is less trust in computer-mediated interactions than in face-to-face interactions (Naquin & Paulson, 2003). There is also evidence that people actually are somewhat less honest online (Whitty & Gavin, 2001). That could explain why partners’ self-disclosure did not lead to liking among the online participants. Participants may not have been sure of the truthfulness of the disclosures.

Additional research should explore whether there is more self-disclosure and more liking online compared to face-to-face. The current research suggests that there is not. Although it is unwise to draw too many conclusions about computer-mediated relationships at this time, the current research suggests that the norms and nature of computer-mediated communication have been shifting in the last several years. Internet
users may be disclosing less online. Drawing from the concerns raised in the 1980s about
deindividuation and anonymity leading people to behave online in ways they would not
face-to-face (e.g. Kiesler et al., 1984; Sproull & Kiesler, 1986), it is possible that when
people first started to use email and chat in their relationships, they had strong feelings of
anonymity or unaccountability because of the novelty of the technology. This could have
led people to disclose more online than they would disclose face-to-face. Over time,
however, the tendency to self-disclose online might have declined as the fun and novelty
of the technology wore off and people started to learn that the things that are said online
are still part of the “real world” and often have real-world consequences.

References
reconsidered: Interacting via the Internet. *Journal of Computer-Mediated
Communication, 11*(3), 825-834.

at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*(3), 387-
395.


structure of interpersonal closeness. *Journal of Personality and Social
Psychology, 63*, 596-596.


Tables

Table 1
Reciprocity of Self-Disclosure, Liking, and Trust Online and Face-to-Face

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Face-to-Face</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.364*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.421*</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.461*</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * indicates the similarity between a participant’s self-ratings and his or her partner’s self-ratings on the same dimension, within a particular environment. *p < .01.

Table 2

Accuracy of Self-Disclosure, Liking, and Trust Online and Face-to-Face

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Face-to-Face</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Disclosure</td>
<td>.361**</td>
<td>.274*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.283*</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * indicates the agreement (i.e. agreement) of one member of a dyad’s self-rating and the other member’s estimate of the partner’s rating, within a particular environment. *p < .05. **p < .01.
Table 3

*Means and Standard Deviations of Dependent Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Face-to-Face</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure-to-Partner</td>
<td>5.19 (1.20)</td>
<td>4.85 (1.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Partner Disclosure</td>
<td>5.12 (1.23)</td>
<td>4.91 (1.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>4.19 (1.05)</td>
<td>3.57 (1.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>5.93 (1.31)</td>
<td>5.24 (1.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Partner Trust</td>
<td>5.38 (1.26)</td>
<td>4.89 (1.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>6.10 (1.04)</td>
<td>6.00 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Partner Liking</td>
<td>5.50 (1.23)</td>
<td>5.39 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Standard Deviations shown in parentheses.
Appendix A: Discussion Questions (Aron, et al., 1997)

Instructions

This is a study of relationships, and your task is simply to get close to your partner. We believe that the best way for you to get close to your partner is for you to share with them and for them to share with you. Of course, when we advise you about getting close to your partner, we are giving advice regarding your behavior in this demonstration only, we are not advising you about your behavior outside of this demonstration.

In order to help you get close we've arranged for the two of you to engage in a kind of sharing game. You're sharing time will be for about 30 minutes, after which time we ask you to fill out a questionnaire concerning your experience of getting close to your partner.

You have been given a list of questions. As soon as you both finish reading these instructions, you should begin with the first question. One of you should read aloud the first question and then BOTH do what it asks, starting with the person who read the question aloud. When you are both done, go on to the second question-one of you reading it aloud and both doing what it asks. And so forth.

As you go through the questions, one at a time, please don't skip any; do each in order. If it asks you a question, share your answer with your partner. Then let him or her share their answer to the same question with you. Alternate who reads aloud (and thus goes first) with each new question.

It is not important to finish all the questions in within the time allotted. You may begin!

Closeness-Generating Procedure Questions

1. Given the choice of anyone in the world, whom would you want as a dinner guest?
2. Would you like to be famous? In what way?
3. Before making a telephone call, do you ever rehearse what you are going to say? Why?
4. What would constitute a "perfect" day for you?
5. When did you last sing to yourself? To someone else?
6. If you were able to live to the age of 90 and retain either the mind or body of a 30-year-old for the last 60 years of your life, which would you want? Why?
7. What is the best restaurant you've been to in the last month that your partner hasn't been to? Tell your partner about it.
8. If you could invent a new flavor of ice cream, what would it be?
9. For what in your life do you feel most grateful?
10. If you could wake up tomorrow having gained any one quality or ability, what would it be?
11. If a crystal ball could tell you the truth about yourself, your life, the future, or anything else, what would you want to know?
12. Is there something that you’ve dreamed of doing for a long time? Why haven’t you done it?
13. What is the greatest accomplishment of your life?
14. What do you value most in a friendship?
15. What is your most treasured memory?
16. If you knew that in one year you would die suddenly, would you change anything about the way you are now living? Why?
17. What does friendship mean to you?
18. What roles do love and affection play in your life?
19. Alternate sharing something you consider a positive characteristic of your partner. Share a total of 5 items.
20. How close and warm is your family? Do you feel your childhood was happier than most other people’s?
21. If you could change anything about the way you were raised, what would it be?
22. Complete this sentence: “I wish I had someone with whom I could share…”
23. If you were going to become a close friend with your partner, please share what would be important for him or her to know.
24. Share with your partner an embarrassing moment in your life.
25. When did you last cry in front of another person? By yourself?
26. Tell your partner something that you like about them already.
27. What, if anything, is too serious to be joked about?
28. Your house, containing everything you own, catches fire. After saving your loved ones and pets, you have time to safely make a final dash to save any one item. What would it be? Why?
29. Tell your partner what you like about them; be very honest this time saying things that you might not say to someone you’ve just met.
30. Share a personal problem and ask your partner’s advice on how he or she might handle it. Also, ask your partner to reflect back to you how you seem to be feeling about the problem you have chosen.

Small-Talk Condition Questions

1. When was the last time you walked for more than an hour? Describe where you went and what you saw.
2. What was the best gift you ever received and why?
3. If you had to move from New Jersey where would you go, and what would you miss the most about New Jersey?
4. How did you celebrate last Halloween?
5. Do you read a newspaper often and which do you prefer? Why?
6. What is a good number of people to have in a student household and why?
7. What is the best restaurant you’ve been to in the last month that your partner hasn’t been to? Yell your partner about it.
8. Describe the last pet you owned.
9. What is your favorite holiday? Why?
10. What gifts did you receive on your last birthday?
11. Describe the last time you went to the zoo.
12. One of you say a word, the next say a word that starts with the last letter of the word just said. Do this until you have said 25 words. Any words will do – you aren’t making a sentence.
13. Do you like to get up early or stay up late? Is there anything funny that has resulted from this?
14. Where are you from? Name all of the places you’ve lived.
15. What is your favorite class at Rutgers so far? Why?
16. What did you do this summer?
17. Who is your favorite actor of your own gender? Describe a favorite scene in which this person has acted.
18. What was your impression of Rutgers the first time you ever came here?
19. What is the best TV show you’ve seen in the last month that your partner hasn’t seen? Tell your partner about it?
20. What is your favorite holiday? Why?
21. Where did you go to high school? What was your high school life?
22. What is the best book you’ve read in the last three months that your partner hasn’t read? Tell your partner about it.
23. What foreign country would you most like to visit? What attracts you to this place?
24. Do you prefer digital watches and clocks or the kind with hands? Why?
25. Describe your mother’s best friend.
26. What are the advantages and disadvantages of artificial Christmas trees?
27. How often do you get your hair cut? Where do you go? Have you ever had a really bad haircut experience?
28. Did you have a class pet when you were in elementary school? Do you remember the pet’s name?
29. Do you think left-handed people are more creative than right-handed people?
30. What is the last concert you saw? How many of that band’s albums do you own? Had you seen them before? Where?
Appendix B: Self-Disclosure, Liking, and Trust (Reno & Kenny, 1992)

**Self-Disclosure**

1. I was open.
2. I discussed private topics.
3. I conveyed personal information.

**Perceived Disclosure**

1. My partner was open.
2. My partner discussed private topics.
3. My partner conveyed personal information.

**Liking**

1. I found my partner likeable.

**Perceived Liking**

1. My partner found me likeable.

**Trust**

1. I trusted my partner with my opinion and thoughts.

**Perceived Trust**

1. My partner trusted me with his/her opinion and thoughts.