DISCLOSURE IN CLOSE EGALITARIAN

RELATIONSHIPS

DURING EMERGING ADULTHOOD

_____

A Thesis

presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

at the University of Missouri-Columbia

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

_____

by

SONIA GIRON

Dr. Nicole Campione-Barr, Thesis Supervisor

JULY 2015

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled

DISCLOSURE IN CLOSE EGALITARIAN RELATIONSHIPS

DURING EMERGING ADULTHOOD

presented by Sonia Giron,

a candidate for the degree of master of arts,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Nicole Campione-Barr

Professor Amanda Rose

Professor Sarah Killoren

Professor Debora Bell

DEDICATION

Thank you to my parents, brothers, sister, and friends for all their support during the completion of this thesis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all those who have helped me with my academic research. I would like to thank my advisor, Professor Nicole Campione-Barr, for all her guidance throughout this writing process. I would also like to thank my fellow lab member, Anna Lindell, for her support and answers to my many questions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

The transition to college during emerging adulthood is a time filled with instability. The provisions gained from relationships with siblings, friends, and romantic partners during this time period can help when coping with the stress of college life. Specifically, disclosure within these close egalitarian relationships is a process by which emerging adults can gain these provisions. The present study examines the specific patterns of disclosure within and across emerging adults' relationships, as well as associations between the sibling relationship and peer relationships. These patterns were examined using social domain theory (Smetana, 2013; Turiel, 2002) to distinguish between the various types of information being disclosed. First-born and second-born emerging adult college students ($N = 232$, M age = 18.5 years, 62.9% female) reported their frequency of disclosure to their closest in age sibling, same-sex best friend, and, when applicable, their opposite-sex romantic partner ($n = 85$). Results show that patterns of disclosure within sibling, best friend, and romantic relationships differ based on the domain of the issue that is being disclosed. Also, peers instead of siblings, are chosen most often to be recipients of disclosure depending on the sex of the individual disclosing. And the association between sibling disclosure and peer disclosure is impacted by the sibling sex composition and appears to show a compensatory relationship for individuals from mixed-sex compositions. Taken together, the findings of the present study highlight the unique role each of these relationships plays in emerging adulthood. Limitations and future directions are also discussed in terms of the impact these findings can have on adjustment during the transition to college.

Introduction

Emerging adulthood can be a time of instability (Arnett, 2000), loneliness (Berman & Spirling, 1991), and depression (Wolf, Scurria, & Webster, 1998). However, the social support that comes from close relationships can improve mental health (Azmitia, Syed, & Radmacher, 2013). An important aspect of close relationships is disclosure (i.e. the revealing of personal thoughts, feelings, and information; Altman & Taylor, 1973; Cozby, 1973) among relationship partners (Reis & Shaver, 1988). Better understanding of this relationship process might help emerging adults maintain stronger relationships, which in turn, could possibly enhance well-being. As this developmental period unfolds, emerging adults become less reliant on parents, and their peers (i.e. best friends, romantic partners) begin to fill roles that were previously solely exclusive to the family (Collins & Laursen, 2004). Thus, disclosure within sibling, best friend, and romantic relationships is the focus of the present study.

Emerging Adulthood

Emerging adulthood (typically 18-25 year olds; Arnett, 2000) is marked by transitions and life changes that include starting college and new jobs, getting married, etc. This stage of development is distinct from adolescence because emerging adulthood is not characterized by the normative experiences of adolescence such as puberty or living under the supervision of parents as are most individuals between the ages of 11-17 years (Arnett, 2000). Emerging adulthood is also not the same as young adulthood because emerging adults are usually involved in obtaining education or training for a future long-term occupation, whereas young adults are typically involved in a stable occupational path (Arnett, 2000). In addition to different life experiences, emerging

adulthood is characterized as being a time of identity exploration, instability, self-focused thought and behavior, feeling in-between, and a time filled with many possibilities (Arnett, 2004), all of which make emerging adulthood a sensitive developmental period. While emerging adulthood encompasses a wide range of individuals (e.g. individuals attending college, the military, in the workforce), the present study focuses on emerging adults enrolled in college. College attendance amongst emerging adults has steadily increased over the past decade, increasing from 35.5% in 2000 to 41% in 2012 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2014). As the number of emerging adults attending college continues to rise, investigations into the myriad of experiences this population is confronted with will be crucial to better understanding this developmental period.

Due to the instability within relationships, life experiences, and identity development that occurs in emerging adulthood, the relationships that are formed and maintained during this time period are essential to healthy development. This is evident in previous findings that emerging adult college students who have greater social support experience an improvement in mental health, while individuals without social support experience a decline in mental health (Azmitia et al., 2013). Additionally, emerging adults who experience an improvement in mental health over a year also show improvement in the development of their identity, demonstrating the importance of relationships during this transitional time period. This is especially relevant for college students, whom often experience loneliness (up to 75%; Berman & Spirling, 1991; Cutrona, 1982) and depression (up to 27%; Bayram & Bilgel, 2008; Wolf et al., 1998) at some level during this time. Investigations into the processes that help to build and maintain relationships in emerging adulthood, such as disclosure, can provide beneficial

information for improving mental health. Specifically, understanding who college students are disclosing to, and what they are disclosing about, can potentially provide insight into how different relationships provide different provisions to emerging adults during these turbulent years. Thus, the present study investigates the types of disclosure within various close egalitarian relationships during emerging adulthood.

Varying Close Relationship Structures

Whether an emerging adult's relationships are open-field (i.e. relationships that are easily formed, changed, and ended) like friendships and romantic relationships, or closed-field (i.e. those that cannot be dissolved due to the legal and kinship bond) like sibling relationships (Collins & Laursen, 1992), each of these develop as the result of accumulated experiences and interactions (Hinde, 1979). Each of these relationships, and the interactions within them, differ based on the role structure within the relationship, which is determined by the level of power held by each member. Differences in power, dominance, and control can result in either egalitarian, characterized by equal power between members such as in romantic relationships and friendships (Collins, Welsh, & Furman, 2009), or hierarchical relationships, characterized by an rank and an imbalance of power between members such as in parent-child relationships, (Fiske, 1992). However, these features can change within relationships throughout the lifespan. For example sibling relationships go from a hierarchical structure in childhood, with the older sibling often possessing more power and control over the younger sibling, to egalitarian (Buhrmester, & Furman, 1990) due to the need to resolve imbalances in power within the relationship by emerging adulthood (Shortt & Gottman, 1997). Egalitarian relationships (i.e. siblings, best friendships, & romantic relationships) are the focus of the present study

3

due to the important role each of these plays in the social development of individuals during emerging adulthood. In addition to the changes in structure of these relationships, each of these relationships is undergoing various changes in relationship processes due to the changing nature and social context of the relationship during the emerging adulthood period (social relational model; Laursen & Collins, 1994). Relationship dimensions (e.g. intimacy) and processes (e.g. conflict, disclosure) will occur at varying levels within different relationships at a given time instead of fluctuating drastically with age over time. For example, conflicts in closed-field relationships often have less equitable resolutions because the relationship cannot be dissolved; meaning that regardless of how unfair the resolution is, the relationship will remain intact. However, conflicts in open-field relationships typically have more equitable resolutions because of the possibility that the relationship will dissolve if both parties are not satisfied with the resolution (Collins & Laursen, 2000). In regards to disclosure, frequency and topic of disclosure are expected to differ across the close egalitarian relationships because of the potential reactions and ramifications that can result from disclosing specific information to a specific relationship partner.

Developmental Changes in Close Relationships in Emerging Adulthood

During the transition from adolescence to emerging adulthood, relationships are constantly evolving due to the dynamic and unstable nature of this developmental period. These changes provide the opportunity for functional transformations in the relationships (Collins & Van Dulmen, 2006). The sibling relationship experiences an increase in intimacy during emerging adulthood when first-born siblings leave the home (Whiteman, McHale, & Crouter, 2011), as well as when emerging adult siblings still reside at home

during this period (Scharf, Shulman, & Avigad-Spitz, 2005). This pattern might be due, in part, to the physical distance that siblings gain from each other during this time period (i.e., one or both moving out of the natal home) or due to a maturing sense of self. Conversely, during the transition from high school to college, satisfaction within best friend relationships typically declines (Oswald & Clark, 2003). However, this negative change is less severe when high levels of communication are maintained (Oswald & Clark, 2003). Finally, romantic relationships become more supportive in emerging adulthood than they were during adolescence (Furman & Buhrmester, 1992). Whereas romantic relationships in adolescence are viewed as being companionate and characterized as primarily involving social activities, romantic relationships in emerging adulthood are described as being mature, emotionally close, and trusting (Shulman & Kipnis, 2001).

In contrast, other research has found that not many differences are present between emerging adults' and adolescents' motives, concerns, and expectations concerning their close peer relationships (i.e., friendships, romantic relationships; Collins & Van Dulmen, 2006). While previous findings might not be consistent, it is clear that the relational needs within emerging adulthood are different than in adolescence due to changing roles, maturity, and responsibilities. This, in turn, alters close egalitarian relationships during this time period, suggesting that changes in disclosure within these relationships during emerging adulthood may also be expected.

Disclosure Within Close Egalitarian Relationships in Emerging Adulthood

According to Altman & Taylor (1973) and Cozby (1973), "personal disclosure includes a person revealing his or her important thoughts, self-evaluations, intense

feelings, or significant past experiences" (as cited in Rotenberg, 1995, p. 1). The type of feedback that is being sought-out will determine the person to whom an adolescent or emerging adult will choose to disclose (Buhrmester & Prager, 1995). Thus, it is important to examine similarities and differences in disclosure across multiple close relationship partners.

Whether disclosure occurs with parents, siblings, or peers, choosing to disclose information involves balancing the need to build and maintain intimacy (Reis & Shaver, 1988), while also preserving autonomy and privacy (Petronio, 2002). Disclosure is also used by individuals to gain input and provisions from relationship partners in order to help cope with problems they are confronted with throughout their daily lives (Buhrmester & Prager, 1995). The provisions that are gained include a reliable alliance, enhancement of worth, instrumental help, companionship, affection, and intimacy (Furman & Buhrmester, 1985) and, according to social provision theory, individuals look for each of these social provisions from their close relationships (Weiss, 1974). However, the provisions gained from a relationship might also vary depending on the sex of the individual and differences in relationship processes. Females' relationships are characterized by emotional intimacy and self-disclosure (Buhrmester & Furman, 1987). This is most likely due to the enabling and facilitative style of interaction that is normal amongst female groups which allows these intimate interactions to begin and then continue (Maccoby, 1990). Males, however, are less likely to engage in intimate discussions and express their intimacy in different formats instead, such as through shared interests and activities, instead (Berndt, 1982; Berndt & Perry, 1990; Savin-Williams & Berndt, 1990). This is likely the case because males are concerned more with

not showing weakness to other males, causing a more restrictive interaction style which would disrupt intimate interactions and end them instead (Maccoby, 1990). These norms and interaction patterns will impact provisions and processes in different ways. In addition, an emerging adult's close egalitarian relationships (i.e. siblings, friendships, and romantic relationships) provide the individual with distinct provisions that facilitate the disclosure of experiences, thoughts, and feelings to one person versus another. For example, older siblings might provide emerging adults with instrumental help to decide which college classes to take, a best friend might be an important source of companionship during years that seem to cause high amounts of stress and loneliness, and romantic partners might provide the intimacy that helps an individual feel cared for during this unstable time. In addition to gaining provisions, disclosing various types of information to various relationship partners has also been linked to a decrease in externalizing behaviors such as delinquency (i.e., disclosure to parents; Smetana, 2008) and lower levels of internalizing behaviors such as depressed mood and anxiety (i.e. disclosure to friends and parents; Kahn & Garrison, 2009; Kerr & Stattin, 2000; Mahon, 1982; Smetana, Villalobos, Tasopoulos-Chan, Gettman, & Campione-Barr et al., 2009). These findings further highlight the importance of disclosure to individual adjustment.

The importance of disclosure within various relationships is also underscored by numerous theories that attempt to explain this process. Communication scholars have posited theories as to why disclosure occurs within relationships including communication privacy management theory and relational dialectics theory. The communication privacy management theory (Petronio, 2002) explains disclosure as dialectic, and that individuals make active decisions about what information to reveal to

7

others and what to keep concealed, and that individuals have ownership and control over if and when their private information can be accessed. Relatedly, relational dialectics theory (Baxter, 2011) suggests that multiple discourses are in competition when an individual chooses whether or not to disclose to a relationship partner. Some of these discourses include the balancing of autonomy and connectedness, openness and closedness, and certainty and uncertainty within a relationship. Both of these theories, as well as the social relational model, suggest that disclosure is likely to vary across egalitarian relationships. However, while this is largely assumed within close relationships research, previous studies examining disclosure across multiple relationships is limited. What is understood about disclosure within sibling, friendship, and romantic relationships is largely through investigations of each individual relationship.

Disclosure within sibling relationships. Siblings are unique egalitarian relationship partners because they are closely connected with parents who have higher status and authority. Thus, careful considerations might be taken into account before an individual discloses information to their sibling. The sibling relationship includes reciprocal (i.e. similar interactions between individuals, such as play behaviors) and complementary exchanges (i.e. hierarchical interactions that are different, but that complements the other individual, such as care-taking behaviors), which make disclosure likely to occur (Dunn, 2002; Howe, Aquan-Assee, & Bukowski, 1995). Higher levels of warmth and instrumental aid are associated with higher levels of disclosure between early adolescent siblings (Howe, Aquan-Assee, Bukowski, Lehoux, & Rinaldi, 2001). Individuals also report disclosing to siblings for various reasons depending on birth order

(Dolgin & Lindsay, 1999). For example, older siblings often disclose in order to teach lessons to their younger siblings, and younger siblings often disclose in order to seek advice from older siblings. Gender also plays a role in disclosure. Sisters in emerging adulthood tend to disclose because they are seeking emotional support more so than brothers (Dolgin & Lindsay, 1999).

The majority of individuals engage in disclosure with their siblings, and disclosure between siblings in early adolescence occurs more frequently than with friends or parents (Howe et al., 1995; Howe, Aquan-Assee, Bukowski, Rinaldi, & Lehoux, 2000). However, for topics about issues with family, friends, and academics, no differences were found in the frequency that these are disclosed to siblings (Howe et al., 2000). Perhaps this lack of differences is due to the ad hoc manner used to categorize the specific issues adolescents indicated disclosing. Recent work has investigated specific experiences that siblings in middle adolescence disclose, such as dating and sexuality (Killoren & Roach, 2014). When disclosing about dating and sexuality, younger sisters often serve as confidants and sources of support, and older sisters serve as mentors, in addition to serving as confidants and sources of support (Killoren & Roach, 2014). Disclosure between siblings in emerging adulthood is high, and siblings most often disclose about topics related to parents, significant successes, and movies (Dolgin & Lindsay, 1999). Additional topics of frequent conversation between siblings include extracurricular activities (e.g. team sports, hobbies) and media (e.g. music, TV, computer games; Tucker & Winzeler, 2007). Topics that are disclosed about the least to siblings include the individual's sex life and major lifestyle changes. However, rates of disclosure are impacted by the age of the sibling to whom an individual is disclosing. Fewer topics

were disclosed to the youngest siblings than with siblings who are closer in age (Tucker & Winzeler, 2007).

Disclosure within friendships. Unlike individuals' siblings, friends do not have the direct connection with figures of authority (i.e. parents), and they are open-field relationships that develop out of mutual liking rather than through biological or parental ties, so disclosure patterns should differ. In early adolescence, disclosing about aversive experiences with peers (e.g., being teased, hit, excluded, threatened with violence) is a protective factor, with adolescents who choose to disclose about these events experiencing lower levels of loneliness (Vernberg, Ewell, Beery, Freeman, & Abwender, 1995). While the majority of early adolescent boys and girls do not disclose these experiences to anyone, when they do decide to disclose they overwhelmingly do so with a friend instead of a sibling (Vernberg et al., 1995). In middle adolescence there is a difference in rates of disclosure by gender, with girls reporting greater levels of disclosure to friends than boys (Pagano & Hirsch, 2007).

Emerging adulthood introduces new experiences, including an expanding social network of friends. Same-sex emerging adults who have a strong focus on building intimacy within their friendships disclose to their close friends at high levels and prefer that their friend also disclose to them at high levels (Sanderson, Rahm, & Beigbeder, 2005). Individuals are more likely to divulge information about their personal problems with a same-sex close friend rather than with an opposite-sex friend or a casual friend (Cramer, 1990). However, male undergraduates prefer to disclose to female friends on topics of work, studying, personality and body issues more so than to male friends (Komarovsky, 1974). Each of these topics are more sensitive in nature, depending on the

specific details of the issue within each topic and there may be other topics that males are more likely to choose to disclose to same-sex friends instead.

   Disclosure within romantic relationships. Romantic relationships become more important in emerging adulthood as focus shifts from forming friendships to forming more intimate companionships. In middle adolescence, levels of disclosure to romantic partners vary depending on individuals' gender and race (Pagano & Hirsch, 2007). White males indicate higher levels of disclosure to romantic partners than white females, and black females report higher levels of self-disclosure in romantic relationships than black males (Pagano & Hirsch, 2007). In emerging adulthood affective and emotional self-disclosure (disclosure related to emotions or affective states such as happiness, fear, etc.) were significantly related to relationship satisfaction as reported by both men and women, with affective self-disclosure being the stronger predictor of relationship satisfaction (Vera & Betz, 1992). Female students also reported higher levels of emotional self-disclosure than male students (Vera & Betz, 1992).

   While some late adolescents and emerging adults are involved in new romantic relationships at their universities, others are involved in long-distance-relationships that originate somewhere outside the immediate university community. Disclosure of factual information (i.e. descriptive self-disclosure) is common in some romantic relationships, especially those that are non-long-distance (Van horn et al., 1997). Over time, romantic relationships that were terminated were found to be significantly lower in intimate self-disclosure (revealing personal and private information) than intact relationships (Van horn et al., 1997). These findings further illustrate the importance of both disclosure

11

about activities, as well as disclosure about intimate thoughts and feelings, in romantic relationships during emerging adulthood.

Valuable research on some specific topics that emerging adults disclose about have been examined across each egalitarian relationship. However, more research needs to be conducted on the specific activities, experiences, thoughts, and feelings they disclose to one another. Furthermore, research needs to be conducted on the content of disclosure within the context of established theories and, in the case of the present study, its importance to emerging adulthood.

Comparisons of disclosure across multiple relationships. Comparing close relationships will provide a more comprehensive understanding of why individuals may disclose specific pieces of information to specific relationship partners during emerging adulthood. Notably, however, little work examined disclosure across multiple relationships. Of the work that has been done, middle adolescent females were found to disclose at greater levels to same-sex best friends than opposite-sex romantic partners (Pagano & Hirsch, 2007). However, middle adolescent males and emerging adult males and females disclosed more to romantic partners than best friends (Kito, 2005; Pagano & Hirsch, 2007). These findings imply that romantic relationships increase in importance during emerging adulthood. Additionally, these findings reveal the different roles that friendships and romantic relationships play for each gender.

Disclosure amongst siblings in early adolescence has been found to occur more frequently than between friends (Howe et al., 2000). However, this might only be the case because early adolescents spend more out-of-school hours with siblings than friends (McHale & Crouter, 1996). Also, this finding was limited to disclosures about family,

12

school, or friend issues, and differences in the topics that were disclosed about between siblings were not found. However, research investigating the disclosure of risky behaviors in emerging adulthood to siblings, peers, and parents found no significant difference in an emerging adult's willingness to disclose, nor actual disclosure of these behaviors to either siblings or peers (Aldeis & Afifi, 2013).

No work has examined the differences in disclosure patterns between sibling, friend, and romantic relationships. Examining the way that each of an emerging adult's egalitarian close relationship partners serve as the recipient for disclosure will provide a more complete understanding of the provisions gained from each of these relationships during this transitional period. While the same overall patterns of disclosure might remain into emerging adulthood, the increased importance of romantic relationships might result in a change to this pattern depending on the topic that is being disclosed.

Conceptualizing Disclosure

Thus far, some of the differences in content of disclosure have been examined in terms of *emotional* (verbally revealing information about one's affective states), *affective* (revealing emotional self-disclosures to relationship partners), *descriptive* (disclosure of factual information), and *intimate* self-disclosure (revealing personal and private information to others) (Van horn, 2007; Vera & Betz, 1992). Differences in disclosure have also been conceptualized as either *self-disclosure*, referring to the disclosure of thoughts and feelings that cannot be learned from anyone beside the individual disclosing them or *routine disclosure*, referring to disclosure about daily activities which can be learned from outside sources (e.g., people outside of the dyadic relationship; Tilton-Weaver, Marshall, & Darling, 2013).

Each of these differentiations in disclosure suggest that the content or the kind of information that is being discussed is important to consider. However, these previous conceptualizations do not categorize the content of disclosure in theoretically informed ways. The social domain perspective may provide an alternative approach to differentiating types of disclosure across a variety of close relationships and developmental periods (Smetana, 2013; Turiel, 2002). Social domain theory posits that people make sense of their social worlds by categorizing their interactions into different domains of social knowledge. These domains are moral (relating to the fairness, justice, rights; e.g. stealing from a store), conventional (relating to expectations agreed upon by a society; e.g. saying please and thank you), personal (information about the private aspects of one's life, outside of regulation by others; e.g. leisure time activities), and prudential (information regarding behaviors that pose a risk to an individual's own self; e.g. smoking cigarettes; Smetana, 2013; Turiel, 2002). Multifaceted issues consist of interactions that can span across more than one of the previously mentioned domains because they are judged to be in different domains by different parties within a relationship (e.g. keeping a bedroom clean; personal to adolescent, but conventional to parent; Smetana, 2011). With regards to disclosure, the topic or type of information that is being disclosed between relationship partners can be categorized into each of these domains. Social domain theory allows for the examination of disclosure across multiple relationships because it is based on the development of our social knowledge which is gained through many interactions with a variety of close relationships. Thus far, however, social domain theory has only been used to investigate adolescent disclosure to parents.

The focus of the present study is on issues that fall within the personal and prudential domain, as well as issues that overlap these two domains (i.e., multifaceted issues). Due to the greater autonomy emerging adults who are attending college experience, they might consider more of their experiences as being in the personal domain. However, emerging adults are also faced with more opportunities to engage in risky behaviors such as consuming alcohol and drugs (i.e. experiences within the prudential domain). Thus, these three classifications are the most pertinent to this age group. The moral and conventional domains are not examined because these domains are primarily sanctioned by laws and social convention throughout development, thus there might not be much variability in experiences related to these domains. The use of social domain theory allows for comparing and contrasting the domain of disclosure across sibling, best/close friend, and romantic relationships. Disclosure can also be examined across various developmental periods, including emerging adulthood, with this theoretical framework, while keeping the metric for examining disclosure constant. Finally, social domain theory provides a better conceptualization of the type of information individuals disclose about beyond the previously mentioned descriptions of disclosure. Due to the complex nature of social interactions, using social domain theory allows for a more accurate portrayal of the context in which disclosure is occurring. It is expected that an individual would believe that different types of information or topics need to be disclosed to different relationship partners for different reasons (Smetana, 2008).

Present Study

Examining disclosure patterns within and between close egalitarian relationships is a first step in gaining the necessary background information to further understand the impacts of relationships on emerging adult development, such as the impact on mental health (Azmitia, Syed, & Radmacher, 2013). Thus, the present study examines the frequency and domain of disclosure within and between close egalitarian relationships (i.e. best friendships, romantic relationships, and sibling relationships) during emerging adulthood. The present study had three research aims. The first aim was to investigate the types or domains of disclosure that occur within each relationship. The second aim compares the pattern of disclosure across the three relationships. The third aim examines similarities in disclosure between sibling relationships and peer relationships (i.e. friendships, romantic relationships) based on the sex composition of the relationship.

To address the first aim, differences by topic domain of disclosure within each relationship were investigated. Within sibling relationships, we expected that emerging adults would disclose the most about multifaceted topics, followed by personal topics, and least about prudential topics because previous research has found that emerging adults disclose most about parents, significant successes, and what movies they have watched to their siblings (Dolgin & Lindsay, 1999), which can be best categorized as personal or on the boundary of the personal domain (i.e., multifaceted). This pattern of disclosure was thought to most likely occur because multifaceted issues are those issues that are interpreted differently by each individual. In the case of the present study, these issues might fall within the personal or prudential domain, and due to the advice seeking nature of sibling relationships, individuals might prefer to disclose this ambiguous information to their sibling. Prudential items would be disclosed about the least to

16

siblings because of the possibility that the potentially damaging information might be revealed to their parents. Older siblings were thought to disclose more about personal topics to younger siblings, than multifaceted or prudential topics because older siblings often disclose in order to teach younger siblings (Dolgin & Lindsay, 1999). Younger siblings would most likely disclose more about multifaceted topics with older siblings, than about personal or prudential topics because previous research has found that younger siblings often disclose in order to get advice or emotional support from older siblings (Dolgin & Lindsay, 1999). Females were expected to disclose about personal topics the most, followed by multifaceted, then prudential topics to their siblings because sisters most often disclose in order to seek emotional support which might include topics within the personal and multifaceted domains (Dolgin & Lindsay, 1999). Males would disclose about multifaceted and prudential topics more than personal topics to their siblings because siblings are more likely to discuss and disclose about multifaceted topics (e.g. media, academics) with their siblings (Howe et al., 1995; Howe et al., 2000; Tucker & Winzeler, 2007) and males are not as likely to disclose in order to seek emotional advice as sisters which might include topics of a personal nature (Dolgin & Lindsay, 1999).

Males and females were expected to have very different patterns of disclosure to same-sex best friends, thus we expect that emerging adults, overall, will disclose about personal topics and prudential topics at similar rates, followed by multifaceted topics. However, there will be a difference in this pattern when disclosure within same-sex best friendships is examined by gender. Females were expected to disclose the most about personal topics with their same-sex best friends, followed by multifaceted, then prudential topics because previous work that included a sample of primarily females

found that emerging adults prefer to disclose about personal problems to same-sex close friends rather than opposite-sex friends (Cramer, 1990). Males were expected to disclose the most about prudential topics with their best friends, followed by multifaceted and personal topics because the risk of receiving criticism or ridicule for disclosing personal topics to same-sex friends might be too high that stems from their avoidance of intimate interactions (Komarovsky, 1974; Maccoby, 1990), thus maintaining intimacy within this relationship might require the disclosure of prudential topics.

Emerging adults were expected to disclose the most about personal topics with their romantic relationship partners, followed by multifaceted and prudential topics because the importance of emotional disclosures to relationship satisfaction and maintenance has previously been found (Van horn et al., 1997; Vera & Betz, 1992). Females and males were both expected to display this same pattern of disclosure with their respective romantic partners, consistent with previous research findings.

To address the second aim, we investigated disclosure patterns across all three relationships. Consistent with previous research comparing disclosure within romantic relationships and friendships in an emerging adult sample, we expected that overall, emerging adults would disclose the most to romantic partners, second most to best friends, and least to siblings (Kito, 2005). However, prior research has shown that both females and males disclose more to their female relationship partners (Pagano & Hirsch, 2007), thus we expected that females would disclose more to their same-sex best friends, followed by their opposite-sex romantic partners, and the least to their siblings, and that males would disclose the most to their opposite-sex romantic partners, followed by their same-sex best friends, and the least to siblings.

We also expected that the frequency of disclosure to relationship partners would depend on the topic that emerging adults are disclosing about. Previous research has shown that individuals are more likely to disclose about negative or aversive events to friends (Vernberg et al., 1995), and perhaps this same pattern will also be found for prudential topics (i.e., risky behaviors). Thus, we expected that emerging adults would disclose more about prudential topics to their same-sex best friends, followed by romantic partners, then siblings. Personal topics were expected to be disclosed about the most to romantic partners, followed closely by same-sex best friends, then siblings because previous work has found that females disclose more about personal topics to romantic partners (Van horn et al., 1997), and that males disclose more about personal and multifaceted topics to female friends than their male friends (Komarovsky, 1974), and this pattern might continue on to opposite-sex romantic relationships. Following similar logic as previously discussed for personal topics, multifaceted topics, which include aspects of both the personal and prudential domain, are hypothesized to be disclosed the most to romantic partners, followed by same-sex best friends, and then siblings because the personal aspects of the information being disclosed might have a greater risk for criticism than the prudential aspects (Komarovsky, 1974).

Our final aim was to investigate how disclosure within same-sex sibling relationships and mixed-sex sibling relationships compare to same-sex best friendships and mixed-sex romantic relationships. Siblings are one of the most enduring relationships that an individual will have during their lifespan (Dunn, 2002). Sibling relationships also have a profound impact on other relationships later in life. For example, higher levels of warmth within sibling relationships is significantly related to more positive relationships

with peers (Lockwood, Kitzmann, & Cohen, 2001). This finding might indicate that there are processes occurring early within sibling relationships that are beneficial to later relationships with peers. Higher levels of romantic intimacy have also been reported by individuals from mixed-sex sibling constellations than same-sex sibling dyads (Doughty, McHale, & Feinberg, 2013). A driving force of this higher intimacy might be attributed to the disclosure patterns within these relationships. Thus, we expected that disclosure within same-sex sibling relationships would be more similar to disclosure within same-sex best friend relationships, than to mixed-sex romantic relationships. We also expected that disclosure within mixed-sex sibling relationships would be more similar to disclosure within mixed-sex romantic relationships, than to same-sex best friend relationships.

From this study we hope to gain information about whom emerging adults choose to reveal specific types of information. Given the instability of the emerging adult time period, learning whom emerging adults prefer to confide in can help us to better understand how emerging adults use their social networks during college. Emerging adults disclose about a variety of information to their peers and siblings, and each relationship partner can offer different provisions that will help them to cope with challenging experiences they encounter.

Methods

Participants

As part of a larger study, undergraduate students in either the fall or spring semester of their first-year of studies were recruited through a departmental undergraduate data pool. Students completed an online battery of questions that included a variety of inclusion criteria for various data collection efforts within the department.

The specific criteria for inclusion in the larger study were: the individual had to be in their first year of college (either first or second semester), was either the first- or second-born child in their family, and was not a twin. First-born individuals were also required to have a younger sibling of at least high school age. First-year students who met these criteria were e-mailed and invited to participate in the larger study. Of the 727 students initially contacted, 260 agreed to participate (35.76%). The final sample used in the present study ($N = 232$) included individuals who reported on disclosure to a sibling and a same-sex best friend. Those who reported being in a romantic relationship were included if they indicated having an opposite-sex romantic partner. Only the 85 individuals who indicated they were involved in a romantic relationship during the time of data collection were included in the final sample. Participants with a romantic partner were not found to differ from individuals without romantic partners on any demographic variables and only one of the six primary study variables that do not focus on romantic relationships (individuals in romantic relationships differ from individuals not in romantic relationships on levels of disclosure to siblings about prudential topics, $t(199.72) = 2.02, p < .05$). Due to these lack of differences, we felt it appropriate to use the entire sample for all possible analyses. The subset of those in a romantic relationship were only used when necessary.

The final sample included 86 males and 146 females. There were 129 first-born and 103 second-born first-year students averaging 18.53 years in age (SD=0.90). Sibling compositions included 118 mixed-sex dyads and 114 same-sex dyads. Younger siblings of first-born participants were an average age of 15.61 years (SD=1.77) and the older siblings of second-born participants were an average age of 21.61 years (SD=1.85). The

best friends of the participants were an average age of 18.52 years (*SD*=1.55). The

romantic partners were an average age of 18.88 years (*SD*=1.89).

The majority of the sample was European American (87.5%), with the remainder

of the sample reporting African American (6.5%), Asian (3.0%), or Hispanic ethnicity

(2.6%). The majority of the sample consisted of intact families (73.7%), few parents were

divorced (17.7), and the remaining were single (either never married or widowed, 8.6%).

The median annual income of the participants' families was $85,000-$99,999 (15.5%).

The families were of middle to high socioeconomic status with the majority of students

reporting their mothers had a Bachelor's degree or higher (69.0%).

Measure

Self-disclosure. A 27-item measure that was developed as part of the larger study

and based on previous work assessing parent-adolescent disclosure (Smetana, Metzger,

Gettman, & Campione-Barr, 2006) was used to assess an individual's frequency of self-

disclosure toward their sibling, best friend, and romantic partner (see Appendix A for

measure) across three domains of social knowledge derived from social domain theory

(Smetana, 2013; Turiel, 2002): personal (12 items), prudential (6 items), and multifaceted

(9 items). The measure was previously used by asking adolescents to rate their frequency

of each disclosure topic to their parents, but in the present measure individuals rated their

frequency of each disclosure item toward their sibling, best friend, and romantic partner

from 1 (never tell) to 5 (always tell), in addition to their mother and father (which will not

be analyzed in the present study). An option was also included that allowed participants

to indicate that they had never done the activity or had a thought about the issue stated in

each item. Several items were also modified to better reflect the experiences of emerging

adults (e.g., "Whether I join any clubs, groups or sport teams") rather than the experiences of adolescents (e.g., "Whether I go out for after school sports or clubs"). Sample items include "What I talk about on the phone," "Whether I felt unhappy during the day" (personal domain), "Whether I use marijuana or other illegal drugs," "Whether I skip class or school" (prudential domain), and "Whether I have sex or am considering having sex," "Whether I stay out late" (multifaceted domain). Mean scores for each domain within each relationship were calculated for use in final analyses. When participants indicated that they never did/felt that way about an item, only those items that were rated as a 1 through 5 were included in the mean scores. Cronbach's alphas for disclosure about personal items to each relationship partner were: 0.94 (to siblings), 0.91 (to best friends), and 0.91 (to romantic partners). Cronbach's alphas for disclosure about prudential items to each relationship partner were: 0.86 (to siblings), 0.83 (to best friends), and 0.87 (to romantic partners). Cronbach's alphas for disclosure about multifaceted items to each relationship partner were: 0.86 (to siblings), 0.84 (to best friends), and 0.89 (to romantic partners). Very little missing data relevant to the variables of interest was present (0.4%), therefore, expectation maximization (EM) was utilized to retain use of all data (Schafer, 1997).

Procedure

Individuals that were eligible and agreed to participate were sent an individualized link to an online questionnaire that could be completed in the privacy of their home. The students gave their consent on the questionnaire, and answered demographic questions and questions about their self-disclosure patterns as described

above. For participating, students received credit toward their introductory psychology class.

Results

Differences in Disclosure Within Sibling, Best Friend, and Romantic Relationships (Aim 1)

To examine specific patterns of disclosure within each egalitarian relationship, three separate 2 (Gender) X 2 (Birth Order) X 3 (Domain) Analysis of Variance (ANOVAs) with Domain as a repeated measure were conducted (one for each recipient of disclosure (i.e. sibling, best friend, romantic partner)) and Disclosure within the relationship as the dependent variable. Significant main effects, interactions, and post hoc tests are reported. When necessary for post hoc mean comparisons, the Bonferroni correction was utilized. Independent and paired samples t-tests were used to probe interactions. All means and standard deviations can be found in Table 1.

Sibling disclosure. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated ($\chi^2(2) = 53.72$, p < .001), therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Huynh-Feldt estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = 0.84$). There was a significant main effect of Gender on Sibling Disclosure, $F(1, 228) = 14.02$, $p < .001$, such that females disclosed more to siblings than males. There was also a significant main effect of Domain on Sibling Disclosure, $F(1.68, 384.03) = 20.47$, $p < .001$. This significant effect was qualified by a significant Domain x Birth Order interaction, $F(1.68, 384.03) = 4.30$, $p < .05$, indicating that second-borns disclosed most about prudential topics, followed by personal, and least about multifaceted topics ($t(102) = 2.79 – 5.25$, p values of all comparisons < .01), while first-borns disclosed about personal topics more than

24

multifaceted (t (128) = 5.67, $p < .001$). Second-borns also disclosed more about prudential topics than first-borns (t(230) = 2.31, $p < .05$).

Best friend disclosure. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated (χ^2(2) = 30.53, p < .001), therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Huynh-Feldt estimates of sphericity (ε = 0.91). There was a significant main effect of Gender on Best Friend Disclosure, F(1, 229) = 24.030, $p < .001$. There was also a significant main effect of Domain on Best Friend Disclosure, F(1.81, 97.61) = 37.37, $p < .001$. However, these main effects were qualified by a significant Gender x Domain interaction, F(1.81, 413.36) = 6.47, $p < .01$. Post hoc analyses indicated that males disclosed to best friends about prudential topics more than multifaceted and personal topics (p values of all significant comparisons < .001), and females disclosed more about prudential and personal topics than multifaceted topics (p values of all significant comparisons < .01).

Romantic partner disclosure. Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated (χ^2(2) = 30.10, p < .001), therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Huynh-Feldt estimates of sphericity (ε = 0.80). There was a significant main effect of Birth Order, F(1, 81) = 5.43, $p < .05$, such that first-borns disclosed more to their romantic partners than second-borns ($p < .05$). There was also a significant main effect of Domain, F(1.60, 129.86) = 13.57, $p < .001$. Post hoc comparisons indicated that emerging adults disclosed about prudential and personal topics more than multifaceted topics to their romantic partners (p values of all significant comparisons < .001).

Differences in Disclosure Between Sibling, Best Friend, and Romantic Relationship (Aim 2)

To examine patterns across all recipients of disclosure and domains a 2 (Gender) X 2 (Birth Order) X 3 (Relationship Partner) X 3 (Domain) Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was utilized with Domain and Relationship Partner as repeated measures and Overall Disclosure as the dependent variable. Significant main effects, interactions, and post hoc tests are reported. When necessary for post hoc mean comparisons, the Bonferroni correction was utilized. Independent and paired samples t-tests were used to probe interactions. All means and standard deviations can be found in Table 1.

Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated ($\chi^2(2)$ = 9.77, p < .01), therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Huynh-Feldt estimates of sphericity (ε = 0.95). There was a significant main effect of Gender, $F(1, 81)$ = 7.01, $p < .01$, which was qualified by a significant Gender x Birth Order interaction, $F(1, 81) = 5.27, p < .05$. There was also a significant main effect of Domain, $F(1.90, 153.89) = 6.68, p < .01$. These effects were further qualified by a significant Gender X Birth Order X Domain, $F(1.90, 153.88) = 3.26, p < .05$, 3-way interaction. Post-hoc analyses indicated that for first-borns, females disclose more than males on personal $(t(127) = -4.61, p < .001)$, prudential $(t(127) = -4.58, p < .001)$, and multifaceted topics $(t(127) = -2.85, p < .01)$. For second-borns, females disclose more than males on personal $(t(101) = -2.89, p < .01)$ and multifaceted topics $(t(101) = -2.57, p < .01)$, but not prudential topics $(t(101) = -2.00, p = n.s.)$. There was also a significant main effect of Relationship Partner, $F(2, 162) = 100.43, p < .001$. This effect was qualified by a significant Relationship Partner x Domain interaction, $F(3.67, 297.40) = 4.92, p < .01$. However, this 2-way interaction was further qualified by a marginally significant Gender X Relationship Partner X Domain 3-way interaction, $F(3.67, 297.40) = 2.13, p < .10$.

Post hoc comparisons indicated that males disclosed about personal topics the most to romantic partners, followed by best friends, and least to siblings (t(29-85) = -4.53 - -7.20, $p < .001$). This pattern also held for males' disclosure of prudential topics (t(29-85) = -2.83 - -9.04, $p < .01$) and multifaceted topics (t(29-85) = -3.33 - -9.59, $p < .01$). Females disclosed about personal topics to best friends and romantic partners more than to siblings (t(54-145) = -2.14 - -11.66, $p < .001$). The same pattern held for disclosure about prudential (t(54-145) = -2.56 - -10.83, $p < .001$) and multifaceted topics (t(54-145) = -1.31 - -13.03, $p < .001$).

Summary of Aims 1 and 2

The pattern of findings suggests that within sibling relationships and best friendships, females disclose more to their relationship partners than males. Within sibling relationships, prudential topics are disclosed about the most, and this is primarily true for second-borns. Within best friendships, prudential topics are also disclosed about the most and this is primarily true for males. Within romantic relationships, first-borns disclose the most. Individuals disclose the most about personal and prudential topics to their romantic partners.

Across all three domains, males disclose to romantic partners the most, followed by best friends, and least to siblings. Females disclose about personal, prudential, and multifaceted topics the most to romantic partners and best friends, and least to siblings.

Associations Between Disclosure Within Same-Sex and Mixed-Sex Relationship Partners (Aim 3)

Hierarchical linear regressions were conducted to investigate the association between the disclosure within specific sex compositions of sibling relationships (i.e.

same-sex siblings, mixed-sex siblings) to the disclosure within best friendships and romantic relationships with either disclosure to the best friend disclosure or romantic partner disclosure as the dependent variable. Additional demographic variables (i.e., ethnicity, SES, birth order) were initially investigated as potential control variables, however, there were no significant associations between these variables and the variables of interest to the study. Thus, to save degrees of freedom in the analyses, they were not included as controls. To examine the association between disclosure within same-sex and mixed-sex siblings, and disclosure within same-sex best friendships Best Friend Disclosure was entered as the dependent variable with Gender, Sibling Composition (i.e. same-sex or mixed-sex), and Gender X Sibling Composition in the 1st step, Sibling Disclosure was entered in the 2nd step, Gender X Sibling Disclosure and Sibling Composition X Sibling Disclosure were entered in the 3rd step, and Gender X Sibling Composition X Sibling Disclosure was entered in the 4th step. The aforementioned analysis was conducted three times; once for each domain of disclosure (i.e. personal, prudential, multifaceted). The same steps and analyses within each domain were repeated for the association between disclosure within same-sex and mixed-sex siblings, and disclosure within mixed-sex romantic relationships, and Romantic Partner Disclosure was entered as the dependent variable. Significant interactions were probed using simple slopes analyses (Aiken & West, 1991).

Association between sibling and best friend disclosure. All betas and significance levels can be found in Table 2. Due to non-significant results in the 3rd and 4th steps for the personal disclosure analysis, these were dropped from the model. A significant main effect of Gender emerged, indicating that females reported more

disclosure to best friends about personal topics than males. There was also a significant main effect of Sibling Composition, indicating that individuals from a mixed-sex sibling composition reported more disclosure of personal topics to same-sex best friends than individuals from same-sex sibling compositions. A significant main effect of Sibling Disclosure about personal topics also emerged, such that the more emerging adults disclosed to siblings about personal topics (regardless of sibling composition), the more they also disclosed to same-sex best friends about personal topics.

In the analysis of prudential disclosure, all 4 steps were significant, thus all steps were retained. There was a significant main effect of Sibling Disclosure. This main effect was qualified by a significant interaction of Sibling Composition x Sibling Disclosure, which was further qualified by a significant 3-way interaction of Gender x Sibling Composition x Sibling Disclosure. Probing of this interaction revealed that the more individuals disclosed to their siblings about prudential topics, the more they also disclosed to their best friends about these topics and this association was stronger for males and females with brothers (males: $t(224) = 5.60$, $p < .001$; females: $t(224) = 5.10$, $p < .001$) than for males and females with sisters (males: $t(224) = 2.60$, $p < .05$; females: $t(224) = 3.25$, $p < .01$).

In the analysis for multifaceted disclosure, steps 3 and 4 were dropped due to non-significant findings. There was a significant main effect of Sibling Composition indicating that, for multifaceted topics, emerging adults from mixed-sex compositions reported more disclosure of multifaceted topics to same-sex best friends than individuals from same-sex compositions. A significant main effect of Sibling Disclosure also emerged, indicating that the more emerging adults disclosed to siblings about

multifaceted topics (regardless of gender composition), the more they disclosed to same-sex best friends about multifaceted topics.

Association between sibling and romantic partner disclosure. All betas and significance levels can be found in Table 3. Due to non-significant findings in steps 3 and 4, these steps were dropped from the analysis for personal disclosure. There was a significant main effect of Sibling Disclosure indicating that the more individuals disclosed to siblings about personal topics, the more they also disclosed to opposite-sex romantic partners about personal topics.

In the analysis for prudential disclosure, steps 3 and 4 were found to be non-significant, thus they were dropped from the model. A significant main effect of Sibling Disclosure for prudential disclosure was found, indicating that the more emerging adults disclosed about prudential topics to siblings, the more they also disclosed about prudential topics to opposite-sex romantic partners.

In the analysis for multifaceted disclosure, step 4 was dropped from the model due to non-significant results. A significant main effect of Sibling Disclosure emerged. This main effect was qualified by a marginally significant Gender x Sibling Disclosure interaction. Simple slope analysis indicated that the more individuals disclosed to their siblings about multifaceted topics, the more they disclosed to their opposite-sex romantic partners about these topics and this association was stronger for males ($t(81) = 5.14$, $p < .001$) than females ($t(81) = 4.01$, $p < .001$).

Summary of Aim 3

For personal topics, disclosure to siblings was positively associated with disclosure to best friends, as well as romantic partners. Females reported more disclosure

to best friends and individuals from mixed-sex sibling compositions reported more disclosure to best friends.

For prudential topics, sibling disclosure was positively associated with disclosure to best friends and this was more so true for males and females with brothers. However, simply disclosing to siblings was positively associated with disclosing to romantic partners.

For multifaceted topics, individuals from mixed-sex sibling compositions and disclosure to siblings were associated with more disclosure to best friends. Sibling disclosure was positively associated with disclosure to romantic partners, and this was more so for males than females.

Discussion

The present study sought to examine various patterns of disclosure within close egalitarian relationships during emerging adulthood. Previous studies have investigated disclosure within one or two of these relationships, however none have examined these three specific egalitarian relationships simultaneously, but these three relationships frequently co-occur in emerging adults' lives. Although some processes and provisions will be similar given the egalitarian nature of these relationships, some processes and provisions will vary. Expanding the examination of these relationship processes to a wider range of relationships will help to better understand the complexities of these relationship networks. Investigating the link between disclosure within sibling relationships and disclosure within peer relationships will also provide further insight into the how the family might socialize individuals. This is important to study in order to be aware of the types of disclosure and interaction styles that might be expected to arise.

Thus, the present study investigated disclosure within and across sibling, best friend, and romantic relationships, and associations between these relationships. This examination provides a more thorough understanding of the many relationships individuals are involved in during emerging adulthood, which can help to inform future work about how each of these might uniquely contribute to an individual's adjustment during this time period. The present investigation also utilized the tenets of social domain theory (Smetana, 2013; Turiel, 2002) to distinguish between the various types of information being disclosed, providing a theoretically supported categorization of the type of information individuals disclose to one another. Examining disclosure with this theoretical framework provides a more comprehensive understanding of what individuals disclose to each other that can be compared across relationship and across various developmental periods.

The first aim of the present study was to examine differences between domains of disclosure topics to siblings, best friends, and romantic relationships. Each of these relationships provides a different context where individuals can learn and develop their disclosing skills. One of these unique situations is the changing structure of sibling relationships from hierarchical to egalitarian during this developmental period. Older siblings were expected to disclose to their younger siblings the most about personal topics because older siblings tend to disclose in order to teach their younger siblings (Dolgin & Lindsay, 1999) and some of the information that is discussed might be of an intimate or sensitive nature like most personal information is. However, younger siblings were expected to disclose to older siblings about multifaceted topics the most because of their tendency to disclose in order to seek advice (Dolgin & Lindsay, 1999). This was

also expected because multifaceted topics are more complex than topics in other domains due to their possibility of belonging in multiple domains depending on the individual's interpretation of the information. This type of information has the potential to cause problems in other relationships (e.g. the parent-child relationship) due to differing opinions, so perhaps advice would be needed for these topics in order to determine the best way to handle the events or actions. These hypotheses were partially supported in the present study. Older siblings reported disclosing more about personal topics than multifaceted topics to their younger siblings. However, younger siblings disclosed most about prudential topics, followed by personal, and least about multifaceted topics. Perhaps emerging adult younger siblings trust their older siblings enough to disclose about such potentially harmful behaviors as a means to seek advice over such activities. While not originally hypothesized, females disclosed more to their siblings than males, aligning with previous research indicating that females' relationships are characterized by disclosure (Buhrmester & Furman, 1987). Second-borns disclosed more about prudential topics than first-borns which was also not originally hypothesized about. Perhaps this was the case because while information that is disclosed to a sibling has the potential of then being told to a parent, possibly resulting in punishments, the insight that an older sibling can provide might outweigh the possibility of these negative consequences (e.g. getting in trouble) incurred, particularly in the case of a close, trusting relationship.

While individuals often claim their best friend is "like a sibling" these are two distinct relationships due to the open-field nature of friendships (i.e., easily dissolved; Collins & Laursen, 1992). Thus, different patterns of disclosure were expected. Within best friend relationships, we expected that females would disclose the most about

personal topics, then multifaceted, then prudential topics to their same-sex best friends because previous work has found that individuals choose to disclose about personal problems to their same-sex close friends instead of to opposite-sex friends (Cramer, 1990). This hypothesis was not supported. Instead, females disclosed about prudential and personal topics more than multifaceted topics to best friends. Perhaps both of these domains were primarily disclosed about because they involve actions/thoughts/feelings that are salient to their friends and that can be discussed in depth. Multifaceted issues typically become encompassed by the personal domain over time, so individuals might gain autonomy over these issues later in life, but through discussion and interactions with parents, and not friends. Males were expected to disclose the most about prudential topics, then multifaceted topics, then personal topics because disclosing about topics that are personal might be too intimate for most males to disclose and the risk of receiving ridicule might be too high (Komarovsky, 1974). This hypothesis was partially supported. Males did disclose to best friends about prudential topics the most, however, multifaceted and personal topics were both disclosed about the least. For males, personal, as well as multifaceted topics, contained information that might have been considered as being too intimate or sensitive to disclose to other males/same-sex best friends, thus prudential topics were the focus of their disclosures to friends. Due to the fluidity of friendships, the ramifications of certain types of disclosures on the friendship might be more important to consider when choosing whether or not to disclose, which might explain some of our findings.

Romantic relationships, at least those not yet reaching the status of marriage or legal commitment, are also open-field relationships and have the possibility of being

easily terminated, potentially impacting patterns of disclosure. Within romantic relationships, we expected that females and males would disclose about personal topics the most, followed by multifaceted, then prudential topics to their opposite-sex romantic partners due to previous findings indicating that disclosing about emotions was important to relationship satisfaction maintenance (Van horn et al., 1997; Vera & Betz, 1992). This hypothesis was partially supported. Emerging adults did disclose about personal topics to romantic partners more than multifaceted, however, they also disclosed about prudential topics more than multifaceted. Perhaps individuals chose to disclose about personal and prudential topics more than multifaceted because they have not gained full autonomy over the multifaceted issues and so they prefer not to disclose this information. For example, individuals who stay out late might consider this issue to be personal, but other individuals might consider it to be an issue that poses a risk to the self and own health (i.e. prudential). During this emerging adult period, individuals might be trying to make their own decisions in regard to this issue but still be seeking advice from outside sources, and thus they have not gained full autonomy. Thus, this information might be better to disclose to a parent who can guide the emerging adult as they continue to mature and gain autonomy. Romantic relationships in emerging adulthood are typically stepping stones to marriages that occur in later adulthood, thus the type of information that is disclosed might be more carefully considered before actually disclosing.

While knowing the patterns within each relationship provides insight into the individual characteristics and processes of each relationship, for many emerging adults, these relationships typically occur simultaneously. Thus, investigating how these three relationships compare to one another is important for better understanding what emerging

adults gain from each of these relationships. The second aim of the present study was to compare patterns of disclosure across each of the three close egalitarian relationships (i.e. sibling, best friend, and romantic). We expected that emerging adult males would disclose to romantic partners the most, followed by best friends, then siblings. We also expected that females would disclose most to best friends, followed by romantic partners, and least to siblings. These patterns were expected because previous research has found that individuals tend to disclose most to their female relationship partners (Pagano & Hirsch, 2007). We also expected that emerging adults would disclose about personal and multifaceted the most to romantic partners, followed by best friends, then siblings because previous work has shown that females and males disclose most to opposite-sex relationship partners about these types of topics (Van horn et al., 1997; Komarovsky, 1974). However, prudential topics were expected to be disclosed most to best friends, followed by romantic partners, then siblings because previous research has shown that individuals tend to disclose about negative events to friends (Vernberg et al., 1995) and perhaps these events would be comparable to behaviors that cause harm to the self (i.e. prudential topics). These hypotheses were partially supported. Males disclosed about all topics the most to romantic partners, followed by best friends, and least to siblings. However, females tended to disclose about all topics to their best friends and romantic partners at equal rates, and least to siblings. Perhaps males are more comfortable disclosing to their opposite sex romantic partners because the females encourage or solicit them to disclose information. Females, however, are typically more invested in relationships and disclose similarly to close relationship partners regardless of gender, similar to what previous research has found. By simultaneously investigating these three

close egalitarian relationships during emerging adulthood, we are better able to understand how an individual's social network provides support during this developmental period. When comparing disclosure between each of these relationships, the domain of the topics being disclosed doesn't appear to play an important role. Perhaps this is the case because the social provisions that are gained from disclosing about any type of information to specific relationship partners outweighs the need to differentiate the type of information that is disclosed.

The third aim of the present study was to investigate the associations between disclosure in same-sex and mixed-sex sibling relationships, and disclosure within same-sex best friendships and mixed-sex romantic relationships. Previous research has shown that relationship qualities such as intimacy and conflict between siblings impacts relationship quality in friend (Lockwood et al., 2001) and romantic relationships (Doughty et al., 2013) later in life because the sibling relationship serves as a social training ground for other relationships. This socialization and the associations between relationships can be either beneficial or harmful to relationships formed outside the family later in life. In order to gain a better understanding of what is happening, investigating the origins is crucial. Thus, we expected that there would be an influential link between these relationships in regards to patterns of disclosure. However, we expected that gender would play a large role in these associations. We expected that disclosure within same-sex sibling dyads would be more associated with same-sex best friend disclosure than mixed-sex romantic partner disclosure. However, this hypothesis was not supported. For personal and multifaceted topics, individuals from mixed-sex compositions reported more disclosure to same-sex best friends. For prudential topics,

males and females with brothers reported more disclosure to best friends as the result of more disclosure to their siblings. In this case, it seems as though the same-sex best friend relationship is playing a compensatory role instead of a complementary one. That is, perhaps because individuals from mixed-sex sibling dyads do not receive necessary social provisions from their opposite sex sibling, so they must go to a relationship partner outside that dyad, in this case their same-sex best friend, to fulfill these needs (East & Rook, 1992).

We also expected that mixed-sex sibling disclosure would be more associated with mixed-sex romantic partner disclosure than same-sex best friend disclosure. This hypothesis was not supported. Sibling sex composition did not play a role in the association between sibling and romantic partner disclosure; instead, gender was the contributing factor. Specifically, for multifaceted topics, the more individuals disclosed to their sibling, the more they also disclosed to their opposite-sex romantic partner and this was more so true for males than females. This might indicate that while females naturally disclose to all relationship partners, males might take the skills they learn and practice with siblings, and apply them to their romantic relationships.

Limitations and Future Directions

Despite the advances in knowledge regarding disclosure among egalitarian relationships in emerging adulthood from the present study, it is not without limitations. Due to the location where data were collected and recruitment though introductory psychology college classes, the sample investigated was primarily European-American and middle class. Future work should take care to investigate a more diverse sample in

order to distinguish the differences in disclosure within various races, ethnicities, and cultures. This type of investigation will provide nuanced information about how disclosure occurs in different groups and will allow for this type of research to inform further work that can be generalized to a broader population. The cultural traditions of Asian and Latin Americans in providing family assistance, support and respect have been highlighted as possibly impacting these individuals in a distinct manner during emerging adulthood (Fuligni, 2007) and perhaps these traditions would impact disclosure to individuals outside the family unit differently from those inside. Our sample also consisted solely of emerging adults attending college, which presents another limitation to the study. Emerging adults take part in many different life experiences such as going straight to work out of high school, trade school, starting families, or enlisting in the military. All of these life courses can present different circumstances that can affect patterns of disclosure and are important to consider in future research on this age group. We were also only able to include same-sex best friend relationships. Mixed-sex friendships are also very likely to occur as individuals move into co-ed residence halls. Patterns of disclosure within these relationships can possibly help to inform work done on mixed-sex romantic relationships and marriages in later adulthood and satisfaction with these relationships. Similarly, our investigation also focused on mixed-sex romantic relationships. Including individuals from same-sex romantic relationships would allow us to understand how sibling relationships affect individuals within the LGBTQ community and also inform work on how their close relationships are beneficial during this stressful developmental period. The duration of the friend and romantic relationships were also not accounted for in the present study. Including this information can provide a more precise

picture of how the nature of long-term sibling relationship impacts and compares to the relatively short-term nature of peer relationships.

Conclusions

The present study provides insight into the patterns of disclosure within and across multiple close egalitarian relationships and how disclosure within these relationships are associated with each other. Overall, it seems that emerging adults are using their romantic relationships as the primary recipients for their disclosures. This is consistent with previous theorizing that individuals begin to recognize the importance of romantic relationships with increasing age and begin to realize the possibility of commitment to others (Brown, 1999). The present study also indicates that disclosure within sibling relationships is associated with disclosure in friendships and romantic relationships depending on which domain the disclosure falls within. It seems that individuals' relationships serve compensatory roles possibly by making up for what is lacking in one relationship. Knowing that a relationship can compensate for what is missing in a different relationship can be helpful for individuals to understand that importance of nurturing their various relationships in order to receive necessary provisions.

This investigation allows for researchers to further understand how to better help emerging adults adjust to the college transition. Greater social support is related to better mental health during emerging adulthood (Azmitia, Syed, & Radmacher, 2013), therefore ensuring that individuals are satisfied in their relationships and are able to maintain their

relationships through disclosure can help them to cope with stress during these years. This will in turn lead to more positive outcomes during these years.

Understanding how emerging adults juggle each of their close relationships can also provide information on how these relationships might or might not be becoming enmeshed. Enmeshment can lead to negative mental health outcomes (Boscoe, Davies, & Cummings, 2012), thus learning how this process is occurring and how to prevent it will benefit this population, as well as those working with this population. Especially during a time when romantic relationships are becoming especially important, emphasizing how to maintain relationship satisfaction will be beneficial to future marital satisfaction. Additionally, these findings highlight the need for university resources for romantic partners such as couples counseling and support for dating/intimate partner violence. Specifically, future work can investigate how disclosure to romantic partners can alleviate stress brought on from outside the relationship, such as from work or school. Extensions of this research can also examine how disclosing and being the recipient of disclosures can work to simultaneously strengthen relationships and improve mental health during the stressful transition to college. Overall these findings indicate that while emerging adulthood and the transition to college can be a stressful time, the network of relationships available can provide various outlets for relieving some of this stress and promoting positive wellbeing.

References

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Aldeis, D., & Afifi, T. D. (2013). College students' willingness to reveal risky behaviors: The influence of relationship and message type. *Journal of Family Communication, 13*, 92-113. doi: 10.1080/15267431.2013.768246

Altman, I., & Taylor, D. A. (1973). *Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships.* New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist, 55,* 469-480. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469

Arnett, J. J. (2004). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Azmitia, M., Syed, M., & Radmacher, K (2013). Finding your niche: Identity and emotional support in emerging adults' adjustment to the transition to college. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 23*, 744-761. doi: 10.1111/jora.12037

Baxter, L. A. (2011). *Voicing relationships: A dialogic perspective.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Bayram, N., & Bilgel, N. (2008). The prevalence and socio-demographic correlations of depression, anxiety and stress among a group of university students. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, *43*, 667– 672. doi: 10.1007/s00127-008–0345-x

Berman, W. H., & Sperling, M. B. (1991). Parental attachment and emotional distress in the transition to college. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 20,* 427–440. doi: 10.1007/BF01537184

Berndt, T. J. (1982). The features and effects of friendship in early adolescence. *Child Development, 53,* 1447-1460. doi: 10.2307/1130071

Berndt, T. J., & Perry, T. B. (1990). Distinctive features and effects of early adolescent friendships. In R. Montemayor, G. R. Adams, & T.P. Gullota (Eds.), *From childhood to adolescence: A transitional period?* (pp. 269-290). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Boscoe, S. M., Davies, P. T., & Cummings, E. M. (2012). Beyond warmth and conflict: The developmental utility of a boundary conceptualization of sibling relationship

processes. *Child Development, 83,* 2121-2138. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01817.x

Brown, B. B. (1999). "You're going out with who?": Peer group influences on adolescent romantic relationships. In W. Furman, B. B. Brown, & C. Feirig (Eds.), *The development of romantic relationships in adolescence* (pp. 291-329). New York, NY, US: Cambridge   University Press.

Buhrmester, D., & Furman, W. (1987). The development of companionship and intimacy. *Child Development, 58,* 1101-1113. doi: 10.2307/1130550

Buhrmester, D., & Furman, W. (1990). Perceptions of sibling relationships during middle childhood and adolescence. *Child Development, 61,* 1387-1398. doi: 10.2307/1130750

Buhrmester, D., & Prager, K. (1995). Patterns and functions of self-disclosure during childhood and adolescence. In K. J. Rotenberg (Ed.), *Disclosure processes in children and adolescents* (pp. 10–56). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511527746.002

Collins, W. A., & Laursen, B. (1992). Conflict and relationships during adolescence. In C. U. Shantz & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *Conflict in child and adolescent development.* (pp. 216-241). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press

Collins, W. A., & Laursen, B. (2000). Adolescent relationships: The art of fugue. In C. Hendrick & S. S. Hendrick (Eds.), *Close relationships: A sourcebook.* (pp. 59-69). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Collins, W. A., & Laursen, B. (2004). Changing relationships, changing youth: Interpersonal contexts of adolescent development. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 24,* 55-62. doi: 10.1177/0272431603260882

Collins, W. A., & Van Dulmen, M. (2006). Friendships and romance in emerging adulthood: Assessing distinctiveness in close relationships. In J. J. Arnett & J. L. Tanner (Eds.), *Emerging adults in America: Coming of age in the 21st century* (pp. 219-234). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association. doi: 10.1037/11381-009

Collins, W. A., Welsh, D. P., & Furman, W. (2009). Adolescent romantic relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*, 631-652. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163459

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

Cramer, D. (1990). Disclosure of personal problems, self-esteem, and the facilitativeness of friends and lovers. *British Journal of Guidance and Counseling, 18,* 186-196. doi: 10.1080/03069889000760171

Cutrona, C. E. (1982). Transition to college: Loneliness and the process of social adjustment. In L. A. Peplau & D. Perlman (Eds.), Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research, and therapy. (pp. 291–309). New York: Wiley Interscience

Dolgin, K. G. & Lindsay, K. R. (1999). Disclosure between college students and their siblings. *Journal of Family Psychology, 13*, 393-400. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.13.3.393

Doughty, S. E., McHale, S. M., & Feinberg, M. E. (2013). Sibling experiences as predictors of romantic relationship qualities in adolescence. *Journal of Family Issues*, *X*(X), 1-20. doi: 10.1177/0192513X13495397

Dunn, J. (2002). Sibling relationships. In P. K. Smith & C. H. Hart (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of childhood social development* (pp. 223-237). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

East, P. L. & Rook, K. S. (1992). Compensatory patterns of support among children's peer relationships: A test using school friends, nonschool friends, and siblings. *Developmental Psychology, 28,* 163-172. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.28.1.163

Fiske, A. P. (1992). The four elementary forms of sociality: Framework for a unified theory of social relations. *Psychological Review, 99*, 689-723. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.99.4.689

Fuligni, A. (2007). Family obligation, college enrollment, and emerging adulthood in Asian and Latin American families. *Child Development Perspectives, 1,* 96-100. doi: 10.1111/j.1750-8606.2007.00022.x

Furman, W. & Buhrmester, D. (1985). Children's perceptions of the personal relationships in their social networks. *Developmental Psychology, 21*, 1016-1024. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.21.6.1016

Furman, W. & Buhrmester, D. (1992). Age and sex differences in perceptions of networks of personal relationships. *Child Development, 63,* 103-115. doi: 10.2307/1130905

Hinde, R. A. (1979). Towards understanding relationships. London; Academic Press Inc.

Howe, N, Aquan-Assee, J. & Bukowski, W. M. (1995). Self-disclosure and the sibling relationship: what did Romulus tell Remus? In K. J. Rotenberg (Ed.), *Disclosure processes in children and adolescents* (pp. 78-99). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511527746.004

Howe, N., Aquan-Assee, J., Bukowski, W. M., Lehoux, P. M., & Rinaldi, C. M. (2001). Sibling as confidants: Emotional understanding, relationship warmth, and sibling self-disclosure. *Social Development, 10*, 439-454. doi: 10.1111/1467-9507.00174

Howe, N., Aquan-Assee, J., Bukowski, W. M., Rinaldi, C. M., & Lehoux, P. M. (2000). Sibling self-disclosure in early adolescence. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 46,* 653-671.

Kahn, J. H., & Garrison, A. M. (2009). Emotional self-disclosure and emotional avoidance: Relations with symptoms of depression and anxiety. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56*, 573-584. doi: 10.1037/a0016574

Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2000). What parents know, how they know it, and several forms of adolescent adjustment: Further support for a reinterpretation of monitoring. *Developmental Psychology, 36*, 366-380. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.36.3.366

Killoren, S. E., & Roach, A. L. (2014). Sibling conversations about dating and sexuality: Sisters as confidants, sources of support, and mentors. *Family Relations, 63,* 232-243. doi: 10.1111/fare.12057

Kito, M. (2005). Self-disclosure in romantic relationships and friendships among American and Japanese college students. *Journal of Social Psychology, 145*, 127-140. doi: 10.3200/SOCP.145.2.127-140

Komarovsky, M. (1974). Patterns of self-disclosure of male undergraduates. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 36,* 677-686. doi: 10.2307/350349

Laursen, B., & Collins, W. A. (1994). Interpersonal conflict during adolescence. *Psychological Bulletin, 115*, 197-209. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.115.2.197

Lockwood, R. L., Kitzmann, K. M., & Cohen, R. (2001). The impact of sibling warmth and conflict on children's social competence with peers. *Child Study journal, 31,* 47-69.

Maccoby, E. E. (1990). Gender and relationships: A developmental account. *American Psychologist, 45,* 513-520. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.45.4.513

McHale, S. M., & Crouter, A. C. (1996). The family contexts of children's sibling relationships. In G. H. Brody (Ed.), *Sibling relationships: Their causes and consequences* (pp. 173–195). Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

National Center for Education Statistics (2013). *Fast facts: Back to school statistics.* Retrieved April 18, 2015, from http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=372

Oswald, D. L., & Clark, E. M. (2003). Best friends forever?: High school best friendships and the transition to college. *Personal Relationships, 10,* 187-196. doi: 10.1111/1475-6811.00045

Pagano, M. E. & Hirsch, B. J. (2007). Friendships and romantic relationships of black and white adolescents. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 16,* 347-357. doi: 10.1007/s10826-0069090-5

Petronio, S. S. (2002). *Boundaries of privacy: Dialectics of disclosure.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Reis, H. T., & Shaver, P. (1988). Intimacy as an interpersonal process. In S. Duck, D. F. Hay, S. E. Hobfoll, W. Ickes, B. M. Montgomery (Eds.), *Handbook of personal relationships: Theory, research, and interventions* (pp. 367-389). Oxford, England: John Wiley & Sons

Rotenberg, K. J. (1995). Disclosure processes: An introduction. In K. J. Rotenberg (Ed.), *Disclosure processes in children and adolescents* (pp. 1-9). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sanderson, C. A., Rahm, K. B., & Beigbeder, S. A. (2005). The link between the pursuit of intimacy goals and satisfaction in close same-sex friendships: An examination of the underlying processes. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22*, 75-98. doi: 10.1177/0265407505049322

Savin-Williams, R. C., & Berndt, T. J. (1990). Friendship and peer relations. In S. S. Feldman & G.R. Elliot (Eds.), *At the threshold: The developing adolescent* (pp. 277-307). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schafer, J. L. (1997). *Analysis of incomplete multivariate data.* London, England: Chapman & Hall.

Scharf, M., Shulman, S., & Avigad-Spitz, L. (2005). Sibling relationships in emerging adulthood and in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 20*, 64-90. doi: 10.1177/0743558404271133

Shortt, J. W., & Gottman, J. M. (1997). Closeness in young adult sibling relationships: Affective and physiological processes. *Social Development, 6*, 142-164. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.1997.tb00099.x

Shulman, S., & Kipnis, O. (2001). Adolescent romantic relationships: a look from the future. *Journal of Adolescence, 24,* 337-351. doi: 10.1006/jado.2001.0409

Smetana, J. G. (2008). "It's 10 o'clock: Do you know where your children are?" Recent advances in understanding parental monitoring and adolescents' information management. *Child Development Perspectives, 2*, 19-25. doi: 10.1111/j.1750

8606.2008.00036.x

Smetana, J.G. (2011). *Adolescents, families, and social development: How teens construct their worlds.* West Sussex, England: Wiley-Blackwell, Inc.

Smetana, J. G. (2013). Moral development: The social domain theory view. In P.D. Zelazo (Ed.), *The oxford handbook of developmental psychology* (832-863). Oxford: Oxford University Press

Smetana, J. G., Metzger, A., Gettman, D. C., & Campione-Barr, N. (2006). Disclosure and secrecy in adolescent-parent relationships. *Child Development, 77*, 201-217. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00865.x

Smetana, J. G., Villalobos, M., Tasopoulos-Chan, M., Gettman, D. C., & Campione-Barr, N. (2009). Early and middle adolescents' disclosure to parents about activities in different domains. *Journal of Adolescence, 32,* 693-713. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.06.010

Tilton-Weaver, L. C., Marshall S. K., & Darling, N. (2013). What's in a name? Distinguishing between routine disclosure and self-disclosure. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. doi: 10.1111/jora.12090

Tucker, C. J., & Winzeler, A. (2007). Adolescent siblings' daily discussions: Connections to perceived academic, athletic, and peer competency. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 17,* 145-152. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-7795.2007.00515.x

Turiel, E. (2002). *The culture of morality: Social development, context, and conflict.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Vera, E. M. & Betz, N. E. (1992). Relationships of self-regard and affective self-disclosure to relationship satisfaction in college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 33,* 422-430.

Van horn, K. R., Arnone, A., Nesbitt, K., Desilets, L., Sears, T., Giffin, M., & Brudi, R. (1997). Physical distance and interpersonal characteristics in college students' romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships, 4*, 25-34. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.1997.tb00128.x

Vernberg, E. M., Ewell, K. K., Beery, S. H., Freeman, C. M., & Abwender, D. A. (1995). Aversive exchanges with peers and adjustment during early adolescence: Is disclosure helpful? *Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 26*, 43-59. doi: 10.1007/BF02353229

Weiss, R. S. (1974). The provisions of social relationships. In Z. Rubin (Ed.), *Doing unto others.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Whiteman, S. D., McHale, S. M., & Crouter, A. C. (2011). Family relationships from adolescence to early adulthood: Changes in the family system following firstborns' leaving home. *Journal of Research on Adolsecence, 21*, 461-474. doi: 10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00683.x

Wolf, T. M., Scurria, P. L., & Webster, M. G. (1998). A four-year study of anxiety, depression, loneliness, social support, and perceived mistreatment in medical students. *Journal of Health Psychology, 3,* 125−136. doi: 10.1177/135910539800300110

Tables

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Participant Disclosure

	First-born		Second-born		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
	M (SD)	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*
Personal Disclosure					
Sibling	2.24 (.91)	2.83 (.89)	2.46 (.86)	2.82 (.99)	2.64 (.94)
Best Friend	3.04 (.85)	3.65 (.76)	2.92 (.90)	3.64 (.80)	3.40 (.87)
Romantic Partner	4.12 (.62)	4.05 (.60)	3.42 (1.31)	3.84 (.84)	3.92 (.82)
Total	2.77 (.81)	3.38 (.66)	2.83 (.76)	3.28 (.77)	
Prudential Disclosure					
Sibling	2.24 (.99)	2.68 (1.14)	2.61 (1.05)	3.02 (1.17)	2.67 (1.13)
Best Friend	3.42 (.94)	3.74 (.98)	3.43 (1.13)	3.82 (.94)	3.64 (1.00)
Romantic Partner	4.22 (.80)	4.09 (.83)	3.25 (1.53)	4.10 (.93)	3.99 (1.02)
Total	2.96 (.80)	3.38 (.81)	3.11 (1.00)	3.49 (.91)	
Multifaceted Disclosure					
Sibling	1.99 (.74)	2.59 (.89)	2.28 (.76)	2.61 (.95)	2.42 (.89)
Best Friend	2.94 (.80)	3.51 (.78)	2.95 (.91)	3.55 (.92)	3.31 (.89)
Romantic Partner	3.65 (.82)	3.87 (.77)	3.11 (1.26)	3.62 (.93)	3.65 (.93)
Total	2.58 (.72)	3.17 (.70)	2.70 (.79)	3.12 (.83)	
Total					
Sibling	2.16 (.82)	2.73 (.87)	2.42 (.81)	2.78 (.95)	2.58 (.90)
Best Friend	3.09 (.78)	3.62 (.72)	3.02 (.86)	3.64 (.82)	3.42 (.83)
Romantic Partner	3.98 (.66)	4.00 (.63)	3.32 (1.28)	3.81 (.84)	3.85 (.83)

Table 2

Summary of Hierarchical Linear Regression Analysis for Variables Associated with Best Friend Disclosure

Predictor Variables	Personal			Prudential			Multifaceted		
	$R^2\Delta$	FΔ	β	$R^2\Delta$	FΔ	β	$R^2\Delta$	FΔ	β
Step 1	.14	**11.85*****		.03	2.25[+]		.11	**9.04*****	
Gender			**.21****			.06			.12
Sib. C.			**-.19***			-.18[+]			**-.26****
Gender x Sib. C.			.01			.11			.09
Step 2	.27	**100.75*****		.22	**65.39*****		.28	**103.26*****	
Sib. D.			**.57*****			**.42***			**.57*****
Step 3	--	--		.01	1.37		--	--	
Gender x Sib. D.			--			.07			--
Sib. C. x Sib. D.						**.30***			
Step 4	--	--		.02	**5.12***		--	--	
Gender x Sib. C. x Sib. D.			--			**-.34***			--

Note. [+]$p \le .10$. *$p \le .05$. **$p \le .01$. ***$p \le .001$. Sib. C. = Sibling Composition. Sib. D. = Sibling Disclosure. Gender: 0 = male, 1 = female. Sibling Composition: 0 = mixed-sex, 1 = same-sex.

Table 3

Summary of Hierarchical Linear Regression Analysis for Variables Associated with Romantic Partner Disclosure

Predictor Variables	Personal			Prudential			Multifaceted		
	$R^2\Delta$	FΔ	β	$R^2\Delta$	FΔ	β	$R^2\Delta$	FΔ	β
Step 1	.04	1.24		.03	.92		.05	1.52	
Gender			-.08			.02			.05
Sib. C.			-.23			-.25			-.11
Gender x Sib. C.			.16			.15			.02
Step 2	.20	**21.38*****		.17	**17.35****		.28	**33.37*****	
Sib. D.			**.51*****			**.44*****			**.81*****
Step 3	--	--		--	--		.06	**3.53***	
Gender x Sib. D.			--			--			**-.40***
Sib. C. x Sib. D.									.17
Step 4	--	--		--	--		--	--	
Gender x Sib. C. x Sib. D.			--			--			--

Note. $^{+}p\leq.10$. *$p\leq.05$. **$p\leq.01$. ***$p\leq.001$. Sib. C. = Sibling Composition. Sib. D. = Sibling Disclosure. Gender: 0 = male, 1 = female. Sibling Composition: 0 = mixed-sex, 1 = same-sex.

Appendix A
Disclosure Measure

What I Talk About with My Family Members, Best Friend and Romantic Partner...

Look at the situations below and select the number that best describes HOW OFTEN you usually tell your MOTHER (without her asking you), FATHER (without him asking you), BROTHER or SISTER (without him/her asking you), BEST FRIEND and ROMANTIC PARTNER (if you currently have one) about the following items. Mark an answer from 1 (Never tell) to 5 (Always tell). If you never do these things or feel this way please mark that item with an X.

1 (Never tell)   2 (Very infrequently)   3 (Some of the time)   4 (Most of the time)
5 (Always tell)   X (I never do/feel this way)

1) What I talk about on the phone (Personal Domain)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

2) The websites I visit on the Internet (Multifaceted)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Father (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Brother/Sister (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Best Friend (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Romantic Partner (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

3) How I feel about my school work or grades (Personal Domain)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Father (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Brother/Sister (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Best Friend (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Romantic Partner (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

4) What I write in emails, letters, or journals (Personal Domain)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

5) If I spend time with someone my parents don't like (Multifaceted)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

6) Whether I finish my homework or assignments (Multifaceted)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

7) How I spend my free time (Personal Domain)

	I (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

8) Whether I smoke cigarettes (Prudential Domain)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

9) How I am doing in different classes at school (Prudential Domain)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

10) How I spend my own money (Personal Domain)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Father (2)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Brother/Sister (3)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Best Friend (4)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Romantic Partner (5)	O	O	O	O	O	O

11) Whether I use marijuana or other illegal drugs (Prudential Domain)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Father (2)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Brother/Sister (3)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Best Friend (4)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Romantic Partner (5)	O	O	O	O	O	O

12) If or who I am dating (Multifaceted)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

13) If I pass notes, text, use Facebook, or don't listen in class (Multifaceted)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

14) Where I hang out or who I hang out with when I'm away from family (Multifaceted)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Father (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Brother/Sister (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Best Friend (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Romantic Partner (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

15) Whether I felt happy, excited, or enthusiastic during the day (Personal Domain)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Father (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Brother/Sister (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Best Friend (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Romantic Partner (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

16) Whether I have sex or am considering having sex (Multifaceted)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

17) What I write in Texts/Instant Messages/Chats (Multifaceted)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

18) Whether I drink beer, wine or other alcoholic drinks (Prudential Domain)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Father (2)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Brother/Sister (3)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Best Friend (4)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Romantic Partner (5)	O	O	O	O	O	O

19) What I talk about with my friends on the phone (Personal Domain)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Father (2)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Brother/Sister (3)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Best Friend (4)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Romantic Partner (5)	O	O	O	O	O	O

20) Whether I join any clubs, groups or sports teams (Personal Domain)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

21) Whether I felt unhappy, bored, or depressed during the day (Personal Domain)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

22) Whether I stay out late (Multifaceted)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

23) My feelings towards my boy- or girl-friend (Personal Domain)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

24) Whether I am going to get or have gotten a tattoo or piercing (Multifaceted)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

25) Which friends I spend time with (Personal Domain)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

26) Whether I go to parties where alcohol is served (Prudential Domain)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○

27) Whether I skip class or school (Prudential Domain)

	1 (never tell) (1)	2 (very infrequently) (2)	3 (some of the time) (3)	4 (most of the time) (4)	5 (always tell) (5)	X (I never do/feel this way) (6)
Mother (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Father (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Brother/Sister (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Best Friend (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○
Romantic Partner (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○