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ABSTRACT

The first goal of this study is to examine how private and workplace friendships differ in emotional closeness and perceived support. The second goal is to utilize the disclosure decision model (DDM) to determine how relationship context impacts disclosure goals and disclosure characteristics. Data were collected from 117 individuals through snowball sampling. Findings indicated individuals were closer and perceived more support with private friends than with workplace friends. Individuals tended to use relationship development and stress relief disclosure goals with both their private friends and workplace friends than social control, identity clarification, or seeking approval goals. Additionally, the only disclosure goal that predicted disclosure depth was social control. Taken together, these findings indicate individuals use similar goal and disclosure characteristics with both private and workplace friends even though closeness and perceived support levels differ. This study contributes to the understanding of private and workplace friendship and tests the disclosure decision model with a communication perspective.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION & LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

Friendships are one of few relationships that individuals have the freedom to initiate or dissolve at any time. Friendships are developed by choice, as Rawlins (1992) explains, “Friendship cannot be imposed on people; it is an ongoing human association voluntarily developed and privately negotiated” (p. 9). The voluntariness separates friendships from other interpersonal relationships such as parent-child and student-teacher. Friendships also differ from romantic relationships in the lack of “sexual or romantic loving” and “overtones of possessiveness and exclusivity” (Rawlins, 1992, p. 12). Additionally, research has found that friendships tend to develop based on certain factors rather than events, or “turning points,” commonly seen in romantic relationships (Levinger, 1983). Influencing factors derive from both the individuals and context of the relationship, with one such contextual factor being the workplace.

Employees spend much of their days at the office and additional hours commuting to and from work and checking emails after hours. With so much time dedicated to one’s job, developing workplace relationships into friendships that fulfill greater interpersonal needs provide positive benefits for both the individual(s) and organization, including higher job satisfaction, commitment, creativity, information-sharing, decision making influence, and career advancement (Dotan, 2009; Sias, 2009; Sias, 2005). Friendships in the workplace have many of the same benefits as traditional friendships, including support, respect, enjoyment, and self-disclosure opportunities (Cole & Bradac, 1996).
where the individuals come to know and interact with one another beyond their original organizational context. Moreover, workplace friendships have unique benefits, such as watching out for each other’s best interest within the organization (Rawlins, 1992) and serving as buffers between coworkers (P. Sias, 2009). This literature demonstrates that workplace friendships seem to have functions similar to private friendships; however, the fact that they develop within the context of the workplace may alter the nature of the friendship.

With limited research on workplace friendships, one major question remains unanswered: do workplace friendships differ from private friendships? One important distinction is how the relationships differ in self-disclosure. Self-disclosure can be defined as the act of verbally communicating personal information to another individual (Chelune, 1975), including their thoughts feelings and actions (Derlega & Grzelak, 1979). Self-disclosure is necessary to facilitate relationship development (Altman & Taylor, 1973). In private relationships, sharing personal information makes individuals vulnerable, but taking the risk increases intimacy, trust, and closeness. In the workplace, self-disclosure allows individuals to develop friendships with co-workers, but engaging in self-disclosure may entail even more risk than found in private friendships; individuals must not only weigh the personal risks of self-disclosure, but also need to consider institutional vulnerability. Developing a friendship involves getting to know the whole individual; however, workplace friendships have added constraints because they exist as a function of the roles and norms of the workplace (Sias & Cahill, 1998) where one must balance his or her private and public life as well as maintain a positive impression. Individuals fear revealing too much private information could negatively impact their
reputation (Derlega et al., 2008), which may result in undesirable consequences especially in an organizational setting. Individuals must weigh both relational and professional goals and consider who they can disclose to when deciding what and how much to disclose.

The main goal of the study is to examine the disclosure decision model (DDM) and how disclosure characteristics might differ between private friendships and workplace friendships; however, before examining disclosure differences, it must first be determined if the two groups are different in meaningful ways. Two variables that may be distinguishing features are level of closeness and level of impression management. Accordingly, in the following section, I examine each in turn. I then discuss the components of the disclosure decision model.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Relationship Development and Closeness

One factor that is important to relationship development is increasing the degree of closeness, which includes disclosing private information, help and support, and shared interests and activities (Parks & Floyd, 1996). Individuals are spending increasingly more time in the workplace, which also increases the amount of time spent with one’s coworkers. Sias (2009) pointed out, many people spend more time with coworkers than with family and friends. Previous research has shown that workplace friendships are often initiated because the individuals share a similar space (Sias & Cahill, 1998; Sias, Smith, & Avdeyeva, 2003). Such frequent interaction facilitates relationship development
and as the friendships become closer, communication is more intimate and open (Sias & Cahill, 1998).

There have been conflicting research findings regarding the importance of proximity to developing a relationship. In one such study, participants believed physical proximity was less important to their friendship initiation than personality, shared tasks, and perceived similarity (Sias et al., 2012). Interestingly, in the same study, face-to-face communication was the most utilized form of communication (as opposed to mediated communication via the telephone, e-mail, texting, etc.) and rated as the highest quality communication. In other words, while participants did not perceive proximity as having an influential role in their relationship development, without being physically close to one another the most preferred and highest quality communication would not exist.

Despite conflicting research findings on the importance of physical closeness to relationship development, it would be counter-intuitive to say that physical closeness does not have any impact on relationship development. For example, physically close friends defined relationship closeness in terms of amount of self-disclosure and frequency of interaction (Johnson, Haigh, Craig, & Becker, 2008). Based on these findings and on the fact that coworkers typically interact on a regular, if not daily, basis, I then propose the following research question:

RQ1: Is there a difference in closeness between private and workplace friends?

**Importance of Adequate Impression Management**

Another factor that may distinguish private friendships from workplace friendships is the importance in the latter of maintaining a positive impressions in the workplace. Employers may prefer that employees leave their private lives and feelings
“at the door;” however, employees may view their coworkers as friends who are capable of learning about private information. A difficult reality to balance is how much information one can divulge without interfering with their workplace persona.

An early conceptualization of self-disclosure involved a “more is better” approach (Jourard, 1968); however, that conceptualization has been revised and scholars describe disclosure as a balance between openness and closedness (Irwin Altman & Taylor, 1973; Petronio, 2000). Openness can have both positive and negative consequences. Derlega et al., (2008) found individuals most frequently were open about their experiences because they felt they had a close relationship with the other and to seek help or support. In contrast, Communication Privacy Management theory suggests being too open could result in increased vulnerability and loss of personal control of information (Petronio, 2000).

Allowing for increased levels of vulnerability may lead to positive relational outcomes (e.g., building relationships, asking for support); however, it can be more risky to increase vulnerability in some relationships. The private sphere consists of relationships such as significant others, immediate family, and close friends. The public sphere consists of relationships developed in the workplace, church, or other social organizations. Because of the desire for individuals to conform to socially accepted norms, it is more risky to self-disclose to those whose relationships are developed in the public (Bazarova & Choi, 2013). Workplace friendships are unique because they are not completely public nor completely private (Marks, 1994).

Research has shown that the lines between "private and work lives are more diffuse than distinct. It is impossible to separate these areas of activity" (Stohl, 1995, p.
5). In other words, individuals' private lives are becoming increasingly intertwined. One distinction between workplace friendships and private friendships is that workplace friendships must also balance their professional impressions. Workplace friends interact beyond their formal organizational roles and discuss a variety of topics other than work, which leads to greater intimacy, frankness, and depth than between coworkers whose relationship does not extend beyond the workplace (Sias & Cahill, 1998). Allowing for too much private information to become public in the workplace can leave the individual vulnerable to negative reputations in an environment where one is constantly being evaluated by others. Because of the need for impression management, it could be expected that individuals allow workplace friends less access to their intimate lives than their private friends. Therefore, I hypothesize:

H1: Individuals demonstrate more impression management tactics with workplace friends than with private friends.

**Disclosure Decision Model**

To this point, this study focused on the how closeness and impression management may differ in private friendships and workplace friendships. In addition, this study seeks to determine the impact on disclosure goals and disclosure characteristics between these friendships. The disclosure decision model (DDM) proposes that the context of the friendship impacts the disclosure goals, which in turn alters the disclosure breadth and depth. As demonstrated below, this model has been used as background for several studies, but few have directly tested the model’s hypotheses, especially from a communication perspective.
Psychologist Julia Omarzu published her article about the disclosure decision model in 2000. As of January 25, 2014, this article was cited 52 times via a search of Web of Science. Breakdown of these results revealed only nine articles were published in communication journals; whereas, the other 43 articles were published in journals related to psychology, sociology, or interdisciplinary studies. Another search of “disclosure decision model” the Communication and Mass Media Complete (CMMC) database revealed only six related and published articles (Checton & Greene, 2012; Cormier, Gordon, & Magnan, 2004; Greene et al., 2012; Greene, Carpenter, Catona, & Magsamen-Conrad, 2013; Hargie, Dickson, Mallett, & Stringer, 2008; Steuber & Solomon, 2011), none of which tested hypotheses forwarded by Omarzu. Further inspection of the results in the Communication and Mass Media Complete database revealed three of the articles were testing Greene’s disclosure decision-making model (DM-MM; Greene et al., 2012). It should be noted that this model is not the same as the disclosure decision model. Greene specifically states, “the model is grounded in uncertainty…and how people balance potential risks related to different aspects of the disclosure decision” (Greene et al., 2012, p. 357) when deciding whether to reveal health information to a partner. In contrast, the DDM proposes a more general model of disclosure that can be applied to a myriad of situations and relationships and it does not center on the influence of uncertainty, albeit risk is discussed in one part in the DDM (Omarzu, 2000).

The database searches reveal that scholars are citing this model, and notably, scholars outside of the field of communication are also citing the DDM. For example, the DDM is used as a framework for a study on using computer interfaces capable of human-
like interactions. The article forwards propositions based on the DDM, but the propositions were not empirically tested. Specifically, the article states,

DDM posits that the depth (i.e., quality) of the disclosure will be directly and inversely influenced by the perceived risk...Individuals will be more likely to reveal risky information when they feel that the interviewer will not respond adversely or negatively (Omarzu 2000; Afifi & Steuber, 2009; Collins & Miller, 1994). Because of the objective nature of ECAs, interviewee responses should not be influenced by fear of moral judgments or negative reactions. This leads to the following proposition: Proposition 1: ECA interviewers can elicit as much information as, or more information than, human interviewers when asking the same questions (Pickard, Burns, & Moffitt, 2013, p. 167).

This except demonstrates the DDM being utilized as a theoretical framework outside of the field of communication, but the DDM has seldom been empirically tested and examined from a communication standpoint.

The author is only aware of one communication study that specifically used DDM as a framework and empirically tests the model. Bazarova and Choi (2013) tested the hypothesis forward by Omarzu in the context of social networking sites, specifically in public disclosures (Facebook status updates and wall posts) and private disclosures (Facebook private messages). The study found individuals pursue differing goals at varying degrees on intimacy depending on whether they use the public or private outlet. Public disclosures were less intimate and most often aimed at social validation, whereas, private disclosures were more intimate and most often used for relational development. As this study shows, the DDM posits testable hypotheses that extend understanding of the
relationship between context, disclosure goals, and disclosure characteristics. The DDM
does not discuss how specific contexts relate to specific disclosure goals; therefore, this
study seeks to investigate how the contexts of private friendships and workplace
friendships impact disclosure goals and ultimately, disclosure. Next, background of the
DDM is discussed followed by descriptions of each of the three phases proposed by
Omarzu (2000).

The DDM extends Derlega and Gzelak’s (1979) functional theory of self-
disclosure that posits that self-disclosure serves different functions and the discloser must
determine the appropriateness and effectiveness of the chosen function and subsequent
disclosure. Omarzu (2000) built on this idea and developed the disclosure decision
model, which proposes that situational characteristics (contexts) impact disclosure
characteristics such as disclosure breadth, depth, and duration. The disclosure decision
model was developed to describe how individuals decide which disclosure behaviors are
appropriate for their active goals and available target. The model seeks to illustrate how
internal decisions impact disclosure characteristics. Because disclosure has such a variety
of possible characteristics, a general model that allows for organization of disclosure
characteristics is useful to organize both extant and future research. The DDM consists of
three stages of decision-making and disclosure adaptations (see Figure 1), which are
discussed in the following sections.

**Stage One: The Context and Goal(s) of Disclosure**

Stage one of the DDM describes the process through which an individual decides
to enter into a situation and chooses which disclosure goal is most appropriate for the
Figure 1: The Disclosure Decision Model with study variables (italics) added in corresponding boxes.
situation. Individuals select self-disclosures that consist of information that provides social rewards (i.e., improves the chances their goal(s) will achieved) (Omarzu, 2000). The proposed goals in the DDM are based on Derlega & Grzlak’s (1979) functional theory of self-disclosure and include seeking approval, relationship development, stress relief, social control, and identity clarification. Seeking approval disclosures generally aim to improve one’s acceptance and liking and is the default goal if no other goal is immediately salient (Baumeister, 1982). Relationship development disclosures can promote increased relationship closeness between individuals. Stress relief disclosures allow discloser to discuss problems and reveal negative emotions. Social control disclosures strategically share information or resources in an effort to control social outcomes. Identity clarification disclosure is used to convey information about one’s identity, feelings, or beliefs.

Omarzu (2000) posits that depending on the context of the situation, particular disclosure goals will be more salient. Miller and Read (1987) proposed individuals have different goals in public or private dyadic situations with identity clarification being a salient goal in public disclosures and relational development as a primary goal in private disclosures. Extending this idea, since workplace friendships develop from a different context than private friendships, an individual may adjust his or her disclosure goals depending on which friend is present in the interaction. I therefore propose the following hypotheses:

H2: Individuals favor relational maintenance disclosure goals with private friends, whereas individuals favor impression management goals with their workplace friends.
H3: Higher levels of relationship closeness are associated with more relationship development goals; whereas, lower relationship closeness levels are associated with more identity clarification goals.

Stage Two: Choosing a Target

The next stage of the DDM involves the selection of an appropriate target to be the disclosure recipient because as Omarzu (2000) states, “all confidants are not created equal” (p. 179). For the purposes of this study, the participant was prompted to choose targets meeting certain criteria (private friend and workplace friend), which narrowed the selection of acceptable targets. One factor that may make a target seem more appropriate is the level of perceived support available from that person. Perceived support is broadly defined as the level of support available should support be needed (MacGeorge, Feng, & Burleson, 2011). Research has shown that the availability of support is considered a characteristic of closeness. For example, in a study of 137 participants, researchers asked what factors contributed to being close with a friend. Participants indicated “help and support” as one of top factors (Johnson et al., 2008). This research echoes similar findings by Parks and Floyd (1996) who asked 270 college students to define closeness. Self-report measures indicated “help and support” as one of the most commonly used phrases. Consistent with these finding, I hypothesize:

H4: Relational closeness is positively related to level of perceived support.

Because participants were instructed to choose someone to whom they have previously disclosed information, this study cannot directly examine the impact of perceived support as a predictor of an acceptable target; however, the level of perceived support may be one characteristic that influences the decision of who is an appropriate
target. Thus, this study examines the how private friendships and workplace friendships differ on levels of perceived support with the following research question:

RQ2: Is there a difference in availability of social support between private and workplace friends?

**Stage Three: Disclosure Characteristics**

According to DDM, context cues and disclosure goals combined predict disclosure characteristics. Traditionally it is thought that the more intimate a relationship, the greater breadth and depth are seen in disclosures (Jourard, 1968). Breadth is the range of topics discussed including thoughts, feelings, or behaviors. Depth is the level of intimacy and honesty of the disclosure (Vangelisti, 2002). Research has shown that people tailor self-disclosures to the individual and situation (Omarzu, 2000). As discussed above, private friendships and workplace friendships may be likened to private and public communication forums where revealing private information may reflect varying degrees of appropriateness. One study found that intimate disclosures shared in public spheres (Facebook) were viewed as less appropriate than the same disclosure shared privately (Bazarova, 2012). Extending this idea that individuals believe there are certain situations that are more appropriate for more intimate disclosures and also based on hypotheses advanced by the DDM, I hypothesize:

H5: Individuals exhibit more (a) disclosure breadth and (b) disclosure depth with private friends than with workplace friends.

Lastly, the DDM proposes, “As situations change, one or another goal may become more important, or more accessible, and behaviors, including self-disclosure behavior, may change to reflect this” (Omarzu, 2000, p. 178). Literature to support this
relationship can be found in Barzarova and Choi (2013) that looked at disclosure goals and disclosure characteristics in private and public Facebook messages. The study found relationships between the disclosure goals of relational development, social validation, social control, and self-expression and disclosure intimacy. Therefore, there is some empirical evidence to support the existence of the relationships proposed by Omarzu between disclosure goals and disclosure characteristics. While Bazarova and Choi operationalized disclosure characteristics as disclosure intimacy, Omarzu specifically discussed disclosure characteristics in terms of disclosure breadth and depth, which will be the focus in this study. Using this idea and empirical evidence, I hypothesize:

H6: In private friendships, disclosure goals predict (a) disclosure breadth and (b) disclosure depth.

H7: In workplace friendships, disclosure goals predict (a) disclosure breadth and (b) disclosure depth.
CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

Design

The present study used a survey design to assess the impact of relationship context (private and workplace) on disclosure goals, target choice, and disclosure characteristics. Data was collected through snowball sampling using the researcher’s private and professional networks. The target demographics were currently employed professionals.

Procedures

A survey was created in Qualtrics and was distributed electronically through snowball sampling. The first page of the questionnaire was informed consent and described the purpose of the study, risks, and length (approximately 30 minutes). Participants were allowed to freely choose whether to proceed with the survey. The survey explored aspects of participants’ relationships with a close private friend and close workplace friend. Participants were allowed to terminate participation at any time by closing their browser. After the survey was submitted, the website automatically redirected participants to fill out an additional form with their contact information for the prize drawing. A random drawing was held to determine the winners. Winners were contacted via email and requested to claim their prize within two (2) weeks.

Measurement

The questionnaire was divided into two main sections: one regarding a private friendship and another regarding a workplace friendship. Each section contained the same
questionnaires (except demographic information) with respect to each relationship. At the beginning of each section, participants were prompted to choose with whom they have the “closest, deepest, most involved, and most intimate [private/workplace] relationship.” Participants were asked to keep this person in mind for the remainder of the section.

Instructions included:

We would like you to choose the one person with whom you have the closest, deepest, most involved, and most intimate personal relationship and answer the following questions with regard to this particular person.

Participants were asked to enter in the friend’s initials, which was piped through each survey section to remind the participant specifically which friend they are supposed to be keeping in mind. This information was not used in any way other than as a reference for the participant.

**Impression Management.** The Concern for Appropriateness Scale (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984) was used to measure a general level of the participant’s concern for impression management. For example, items include “In social situations, I have the ability to alter my behavior if I feel that something else is called for;” and “I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.” This scale is a 7-point Likert-type scale with anchor points of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) ($M = 5.35$, $SD = .71$, $\alpha = .88$). This scale is also repeated for impression management in the workplace with items altered to reflect the appropriate relationship ($M = 5.36$, $SD = .74$, $\alpha = .87$).

**Emotional Closeness.** Closeness was measured using the Emotional Intimacy Scale (Sinclair & Dowdy, 2005). This scale included items such as, “I can openly share
my deepest thoughts and feelings with this person;” “This person cares deeply for me;”
and “This person would willingly help me in any way.” The scale was anchored by a 5-
point Likert-type scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree); therefore, higher
numbers reflect higher emotional closeness to the participants’ private friends ($M = 4.56,$
$SD = .53, \alpha = .87$) and workplace friends ($M = 3.53, SD = .74, \alpha = .83$).

**Social Support.** To measure perceived social support, the Medical Outcomes
Study (MOS) Social Support Survey (Sherbourne & Stewart, 1991) was used. This 5-
point Likert-type scale ranged from 1 (none of the time) to 5 (all of the time). Instructions
for this scale were as follows:

People sometimes look to others for companionship, assistance, or other types of
support. How often is each of the following kinds of support available to you if
you need it from your close private friend/workplace friend?

This scale explored the participants’ perceptions of support availability. In other words,
do they think their private friend ($M = 3.88, SD = .71, \alpha = .94$) or workplace friend ($M =
2.86, SD = .80, \alpha = .94$) will be there for them when they are in need? Items included,
“Someone you can count on to listen to you when you need to talk;” “Someone to give
you information to help you understand a situation;” “Someone to do things with to help
you get your mind off things;” and “Someone to turn to for suggestions about how to deal
with a personal problem.”

**Self-Disclosure.** Participants were instructed to think about a particular time
when he/she disclosed something important to their selected private friend. Next,
participants were given several open-ended response boxes, each with a different set of
directions.
We are now interested in a self-disclosure you have given to your close friends. Pick an event, behavior, feeling, or strong emotion in your life that you revealed to those around you, specifically to [your close personal friend]. Think about this self-disclosure in as much detail as possible. What happened? How long ago? Who was involved? How did it make you feel? How were you impacted? Now, we would like for you to tell us what specifically you actually revealed to [your close personal friend]. Give as much detail as possible.

Next, participants were asked if they intentionally left anything out of the disclosure, and if so, to explain why. These were open-ended responses so participants did not feel forced to answer within given boundaries.

Because the disclosures were first discussed as open-ended questions, the Revised Self-Disclosure Scale (Wheeless & Grotz, 1976) was used to measure quantifiable data regarding the self-disclosures. Participants were instructed to answer the questions with the previous self-disclosure in mind. Items included, “My self-disclosure was an accurate reflection of who I really am;” “When I revealed my feelings about myself, I consciously intended to do so;” and “My statements of my feelings were brief.” This scale is a 7-point Likert-type scale ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). This scale was presented to all participants for their private friend ($M = 5.33, SD = .64, \alpha = .73$); whereas, the scale was only populated if the participant indicated he or she also disclosed the same topic with his or her workplace friend ($M = 5.01, SD = .75, \alpha = .84$). Several items were removed from both private and workplace disclosure scale composites to achieve scale reliability.
In addition to the Revised Self-Disclosure Scale composite score, several items were grouped together to produce two sub-scales: disclosure breadth and disclosure depth. Grouped items were chosen based on face validity as well as reliability. Both breadth and depth sub-scales produced acceptable reliability (α = .76 and α = .70, respectively). Items included in the breadth sub-scale were “I do not often talk about myself;” “My statements of my feelings were brief;” “The conversation lasted the least time when I discussed myself;” and “Only infrequently do I express my personal beliefs and opinions” (all items recoded so that a higher number indicated more breadth). Items included in the depth sub-scale were “My self-disclosure was an accurate reflection of who I really am;” “I was not honest in my self-disclosure (item recoded);” “I did not feel completely sincere when I revealed my own feelings, emotions, behaviors, or experiences (item recoded);” and “I intimately disclosed who I really am, openly and fully in my disclosure.”

**Disclosure Goals.** The participants were asked about their goals when disclosing to their private and workplace friends. The custom scale began with the definitions of each goal as seen in Omarzu (2000). Next, the participant was given a 7-point Likert-type scale to indicate how important each goal was to their disclosure. Scale anchors ranged from 1 (*not at all important*) to 7 (*extremely important*). Lastly, participants were given an open-ended text box to indicate any additional reasons why they decided to disclose. A composite score was not calculated because there was a single response for each goal; however, a mean score for each goal was calculated (see Table I).
Table I

Disclosure Goals Means and Standard Deviations for Private Friends and Workplace Friends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disclosure Goal</th>
<th>Personal Friends</th>
<th>Workplace Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking approval</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship development</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress relief</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social control</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity clarification</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographics

Participants for this study ($N = 131$) were recruited through snowball sampling using professional contacts and social media. Requirements for participation included being above 18 years of age ($M = 33.9$; $SD = 10.6$) and able to identify their closest private friend and closest workplace friend (either former or current was acceptable). Compensation was offered in the form of chance to win one of two $50 gift cards. The sample consisted of 90 females and 41 males and identified as mostly Caucasian ($n = 117$; 89.3%) with the remainder identifying as African America ($n = 4$; 3.1%), Hispanic ($n = 4$; 3.1%), Asian ($n = 4$; 3.1%), Pacific Islander ($n = 1$; 0.8%), and Other ($n = 1$; 0.8%). Participants typically identified their private friend as a close friend with an average relationship length of 19 years and their workplace friend was most often identified as a co-worker with an average relationship length of 4.4 years. Additionally, most of the participants were employed full-time in a professional position and rated their job satisfaction as very good (see Table II).
Table II

*Participant Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Friend Relationship</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate family</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended family</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close friend</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual friend</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workplace Friend Relationship</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Industry</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry level</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to (1) determine if one’s friendships with a personal friend and workplace friend differ in meaningful ways, and (2) to test the hypotheses of the disclosure decision model. In this chapter, the results of this study are presented.

Preliminary Analyses

A total of 109 participants (81.3%) reported the type of relationship they had with their private friend. The majority of participants categorized their closest, platonic private friend as a close friend, followed by an immediate family member (parent, sibling, or child). Fifty-eight participants reported the type of relationship they had with their closest workplace friend. A majority of participants listed their closest workplace friend as a co-worker, which was, interestingly, followed closely by a boss. Most individuals reported seeing their private friend face-to-face only a couple times a year \( n = 57; 52.3\% \) or once or twice a month \( n = 24; 22.0\% \), whereas, they reported seeing their workplace friend face-to-face mostly several times a day \( n = 24; 31.6\% \) or several times a week \( n = 20; 26.3\% \).

Bivariate correlations were run on all study variables for each private friend (Table III) and workplace friends (Table IV). Comparisons of the two bivariate correlation tables revealed many differences between the tables, with perceived support and emotional closeness the only set of variables significantly related in both. Perceived support and emotional closeness were positively related for both private friends and workplace friends. Impression management was significantly related to emotional
Table III

**Correlations among Study Variables in Private Friendships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V1</th>
<th>V2</th>
<th>V3</th>
<th>V4</th>
<th>V5</th>
<th>V6</th>
<th>V7</th>
<th>V8</th>
<th>V9</th>
<th>V10</th>
<th>V11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1: Self-presentation</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2: Emotional closeness</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3: Perceived support</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4: Self-disclosure</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5: Self-disclosure depth</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6: Self-disclosure breadth</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7: Seeking approval goal</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8: Relationship development goal</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9: Stress relief goal</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10: Social control goal</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11: Identity clarification goal</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < .05, ** p < .01
### Table IV

**Correlations among Study Variables in Workplace Friendships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V1</th>
<th>V2</th>
<th>V3</th>
<th>V4</th>
<th>V5</th>
<th>V6</th>
<th>V7</th>
<th>V8</th>
<th>V9</th>
<th>V10</th>
<th>V11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1: Self-</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2: Emotional</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3: Perceived</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4: Self-disclosure</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5: Self-disclosure depth</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6: Self-disclosure breadth</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7: Seeking</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approval goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8: Relationship development goal</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9: Stress relief goal</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10: Social control goal</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11: Identity clarification goal</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < .05, **p < .01
closeness in private friends, and self-disclosure breadth in workplace friends, but not vice versa for either variable. The stress relief disclosure goal was significantly and positively related to both emotional closeness and perceived support in private friendships, but not in workplace friendships. Lastly, self-disclosure depth was significantly and negatively related to the social control disclosure goal only for private friends.

**Test of Research Questions and Hypotheses**

RQ1 asked if there was a difference in closeness between private and workplace friends. A paired-sample *t*-test was conducted and resulted in a significant difference in the scores for emotional closeness between private friends (*M* = 4.54, *SD* = .52) and workplace friends (*M* = 3.52, *SD* = .74); *t*(1,73) = 11.20, *p* < .001. Overall, these results suggest that individuals are emotionally closer to their private friends than workplace friends.

H1 posited individuals would have a higher amount of impression management with workplace friends than private friends. A paired-sample *t*-test indicated there was no significant difference between impression management in workplace friends (*M* = 5.36, *SD* = .74) and private friends (*M* = 5.38, *SD* = .72); *t*(1,74) = .31, *p* > .05. As a result, H1 was not supported.

H2 predicted (a) individuals would favor relationship development disclosure goals with their private friend, and (b) individuals would favor identity clarification disclosure goals with their workplace friend. First, for private friendships, a one-way repeated measures ANOVA was performed on disclosure goals. Mauchly’s test of sphericity was statistically significant; χ²(9) = 17.85, *p* < .05; therefore, the epsilon values were assessed for the Greenhouse-Geisser (ε = .90) and Huynh-Feldt (ε = .94).
Because each epsilon was greater than .75, the degrees of freedom were corrected using the Huynh-Feldt estimates of sphericity (see Field, 2013). The ANOVA tests and the Huynh-Feldt $F$-test all suggested to reject the null hypothesis and conclude there is a significant difference between disclosure goals; $F(3.77, 297.94) = 49.29, p < .001$. Specifically, a Bonferroni post hoc analysis showed significant differences between the goals of relationship development, stress relief, and social control, but not seeking approval and identity clarification (see Table 5). In other words, while individuals ranked relationship development goals as more important than social control, the relationship development goal was not more important than stress relief, seeking approval, or identity clarification goals. Thus, H2a was partially supported.

Next, for workplace friendships, a one-way repeated measures ANOVA was performed on disclosure goals. Mauchly’s test of sphericity was not statistically significant; $\chi^2(9) = 3.40, p = .95$; therefore, the assumption of sphericity has been met and no further adjustments were needed. The ANOVA tests concludes there is a significant difference between disclosure goals; $F(4, 64) = 7.48, p < .001$. Upon further analysis, however, a Bonferroni post hoc test showed no significant differences between identity clarification and any other disclosure goal, which resulted in H2b not being supported (see Table V). Despite lack of support for H2b, individuals did display significant differences in importance of relationship development goals and social control goals, as well as significant differences between stress relief goals and social control goals.
Table V

*Mean Differences between the Disclosure Goals for Private Friends and Workplace Friends*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disclosure Goals</th>
<th>Private Friends</th>
<th>Workplace Friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking approval</td>
<td>3.38a</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship development</td>
<td>4.13b</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress relief</td>
<td>5.83a,b,c</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social control</td>
<td>2.61a,b,c,d</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity clarification</td>
<td>4.40a,c,d</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Subscripts denote means that are significantly different at p < .05 or less.

H3 posited that (1) higher levels of relationship closeness would be associated with a higher importance on relationship development goals, and (2) lower relationship closeness level would be associated with higher importance of identity clarification goals. Simple linear regressions were used to analyze these relationships. I regressed relationship development goals onto closeness. Closeness did not account for a significant portion importance of relationship development goal in neither private friends, $F(1,78) = .44, R^2 = 0.08, p = 0.51$, nor workplace friends, $F(1,16) = .54, R^2 = 0.04, p = 0.47$. Closeness was also not significantly related to importance of social acceptance goals for private friends, $F(1,78) = .104, R^2 = 0.01, p = 0.31$, or workplace friends, $F(1,16) = 1.48, R^2 = 0.09, p = 0.24$. These results indicate there is no significant relationship between closeness and the disclosure goals of relationship development and identity clarification; therefore, H3 was not supported.

Based on the previously discussed bivariate correlations, emotional closeness was
positively and significantly related to importance of the stress relief goal in private friends; therefore, using linear regression, I regressed the stress relief goal onto emotional closeness. Emotional closeness ($\beta = .58, p < .05$) accounted for a significant portion of the variance in importance of stress relief disclosure goal $F(1, 79) = 4.76, R^2 = .06, p < .05$. This indicates that in established private relationships disclosure may be more often used for stress relief.

H4 predicted closeness would be positively related to level of perceived support. Initial bivariate correlations showed a significant and positive relationship between emotional closeness and perceived support in private friends and workplace friends. Perceived support was then regressed onto closeness for both private and workplace friends. Closeness to a private friend ($\beta = .74, p < .001$) accounted for a significant portion of the variance in perceived support, $F(1, 94) = 39.72, R^2 = .30$. Closeness to a workplace friend ($\beta = .73, p < .001$) accounted for a significant portion of the variance in perceived support, $F(1, 73) = 44.10, R^2 = .38$. Based on these results, this hypothesis was supported for both private friends and workplace friends such that as emotional closeness increases so does the perceived availability of support.

RQ2 asked if there was a difference in perceived availability of support between private and workplace friends. A paired-sample $t$-test indicated there was a significant difference between perceived support from private friends ($M = 3.89, SD = .68$) and workplace friends ($M = 2.83, SD = .77$); $t(1,72)= 9.81, p < .001$. These results show that individuals perceive more support is available from their private friends than workplace friends.

H5 predicted that individuals would exhibit more (a) disclosure breadth, and (b)
disclosure depth with private friends than workplace friends. A paired-sample $t$-test showed there was a significant difference in disclosure breadth between private friends ($M = 4.58, SD = 1.34$) and workplace friends ($M = 3.94, SD = 1.14$); $t(1,16) = 3.05, p < .01$. In contrast, a paired-sample $t$-test did not find a significant difference in disclosure depth between private friends ($M = 6.02, SD = 1.05$) and workplace friends ($M = 5.44, SD = 1.30$); $t(1,15) = 1.54, p > .05$. Thus, H5 was partially supported in that individuals displayed more disclosure breadth with private friends than workplace friends, but did not go into more depth.

H6 posited that disclosure goals predict (a) disclosure breadth and (b) disclosure depth in private friendships. Bivariate correlations among study variables suggested only the social control disclosure goal predicted disclosure depth. To further analyze, disclosure breadth and disclosure depth were independently regressed onto each disclosure goal using simple linear regression (Table VI). Social control accounted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Disclosure Breadth</th>
<th>Disclosure Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeking approval</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship development</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress relief</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social control</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity clarification</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for a significant portion of the variance in disclosure depth, $F(1, 78) = 5.69, R^2 = .07, p < .05$. More specifically, disclosure depth decreased as the importance of using the disclosure to influence the other increased. Several additional disclosure goals approached significance, including identity clarification predating disclosure breadth and relationship development predicting disclosure depth. Thus, H6a was not supported, while H6b was supported when using social control as the predictor.

H7 predicted that disclosure goals predict (a) disclosure breadth and (b) disclosure depth in workplace friendships. Bivariate correlations indicated there were no significant relationships between variables, which simple linear regression also confirmed (Table VII). Therefore, H7a and H7b were not supported.

Table VII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Disclosure Breadth</th>
<th>Disclosure Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeking approval</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship development</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress relief</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social control</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity clarification</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, bivariate correlations showed a positive relationship between disclosure breadth and impression management in workplace friends. Using simple linear regression, disclosure breadth was regressed onto impression management. Impression
management accounted for a significant portion of the variance in disclosure breadth, \( F(1, 15) = 5.18, R^2 = .27, p < .05 \). In other words, more impression management increased disclosure breadth in workplace friends.
CHAPTER FOUR
DISCUSSION

One goal of the study was to determine if friendships developed in the context of the workplace differ from friendships that develop in one’s personal life. Another goal was to explore the disclosure decision model and how disclosure characteristics might differ between private friendships and workplace friendships. Specifically, this study compared individuals’ relationships with their closest private friend and closest workplace friend on levels of closeness and availability of support to see if these friendships differ in meaningful ways. Next, participants were asked a series of questions regarding a disclosure to their private friend and asked if they also disclosed the same information to their workplace friend. If the participant indicated they did disclose the same information to their workplace friend, they were asked to fill out the same questions regarding the disclosure to their workplace friend.

Private and Workplace Friendship Relationship Differences

The first part of this study sought to determine if private friendships differ from workplace friendships on level of closeness (RQ1), availability of support (RQ2), and impression management (H1). Results showed private and workplace friendships differ on levels of closeness and availability of support; however, individuals did not display more impression management with their workplace friends than private friends. Participants were closer and had a higher level of perceived support with their private friends, despite seeing workplace friends face-to-face more often. Sias and Cahill (1998) originally found co-workers perceived their transition from co-worker/acquaintances to
friends as a result of close proximity; however, in the last decade her findings have shifted to reveal workplace friends feel personality, shared tasks, and perceived similarity are more important to friendship development (Sias et al., 2012). Furthermore, this study lends support to research that suggests proximity may not impact relationship development as much as originally thought (see also McEwan & Guerrero, 2012; Oswald & Clark, 2003).

This study found there was no difference in level of impression management between private and workplace friends. Open and honest self-disclosures may lead to an increase level of vulnerability for the discloser. Having similar vulnerability levels with private friends and workplace friends could demonstrate one way in which the lines are blurring between the public and private lives of individuals. Thus, the similarities in impression management could indicate that individuals are being open and honest about their ideas, feelings, beliefs, and experiences regardless of the exact context of the relationship.

**Disclosure Decision Model**

The second part of this study sought to empirically test the disclosure decision model and test the hypotheses forward by Omarzu (2000) by comparing private and workplace friendships disclosure goals (H2 and H3), selection of target (H4), and disclosure characteristics (H5, H6, and H7). Generally speaking, the DDM consists of three stages: Stage 1 discusses the context and choice of disclosure goals; Stage 2 examines the selection of an appropriate target; and Stage 3 explores the impact of context and disclosure goals on disclosure characteristics, such as breadth and depth. Hypothesis based on those forwarded by the DDM resulted in varying levels of support.
**Stage One: Goals.** Stage one of the DDM focuses on how the relationship context may impact choice of disclosure goals. Disclosure goals did appear to vary between private friends and workplace friends, albeit not in the predicted ways. As predicted, relationship development goals were important in private friendships, but surprisingly, not more than stress relief and identity clarification. A possible explanation is there could be a point in a friendship where individuals disclose, not to develop the friendship, but to maintain it. This could indicate that different disclosure goals are more important during various stages of the friendship lifespan. Because this study asked participants to choose their closest private friend, the relationship development goal may have no longer been the most important disclosure goal. Thus, future research could explore not only the impact of the relationship context, but also the impact of the relationship stage on disclosure goals to more fully understand the how relationship characteristics predict disclosure goals.

In the context of workplace friends, identity clarification goals were expected to be favored; however, participants did not indicate a preference for identify clarification goals over any other goal. Miller and Read (1987) proposed identity clarification would be a salient goal in public disclosures, which the results of this study do not support. Additionally, participants indicated relationship development and stress relief were important disclosure goals with both their private and workplace friends. Taken with the results that participants did not regulate their impression management more with workplace friends than private friends, these findings continue to support the notion that public and private friendships may have similar characteristics and developmental patterns.
**Stage Two: Target and Perceived Support.** The second stage of the DDM discusses the discloser’s choice of an appropriate target. Because participants were prompted to choose their closest private and workplace friends, this study cannot speak to how the choice is made; however, it can discuss the relationship characteristics of individuals chosen. Results showed that as both private and workplace friends get closer, they perceive more availability of support. This result is consistent with several studies on support (Fehr, 2004; Johnson et al., 2008). Fehr (2004) found that friends develop intimacy through many ways of relating (self-disclosure, shared activities, goal achievement), as well as when they can count of a friend for “comfort and cheering up” and “practical help” (Fehr, 2004, p. 279). Additionally, results showed individuals believed their private friends would provide more support than their workplace friends. Considering a large percentage of participants did not disclose the same topic to their workplace friend, these finding may indicate that perceived support could impact the likelihood of choosing someone as a disclosure target.

**Stage Three: Disclosure Breadth and Depth.** The last stage of the DDM discusses the impact of the relationship and disclosure goal on disclosure characteristics, namely breadth and depth. This study found that participants exhibited more breadth, but not depth, with private friends than with workplace friends. In other words, they disclosed a larger range of their thoughts, feelings, or behaviors with private friends. Considering there was no difference in depth, it could be said that individuals were similarly open and honest with both their private and workplace friends.

Interestingly, only one disclosure goal predicted disclosure depth; in private friends, the higher the importance of social control the less depth the discloser allowed. In
other words, when individuals want to influence their private friend, they are less open and honest in their disclosure. This seems counter-intuitive as one might think when trying to persuade someone, more details would be more persuasive. One possible explanation for the negative relationship between desire to influence and disclosure depth is the need for the discloser to maintain positive face. Perhaps being too open and providing too much information could result in revealing unfavorable details. The discloser might err on the side of caution and choose to disclose the minimum amount of information that sufficiently persuades the target. Future research could explore the impact of face threats, and more generally, secondary goals, on disclosures with a primary goal of social control.

**Study Significance and Implications**

This study contributes to the body of knowledge about how friendship characteristics may vary as well as empirically testing the disclosure decision model. First, friends are important part of individuals’ lives and it is important to understand processes that influence these relationships. It can be easy to argue the significance of romantic and familial relationships in one’s life, as these relationships can become sources of long-term stability and support. Friends, too, can become sources of stability and support, but their roles can be harder to realize. Individuals usually have numerous friends spanning from acquaintances to intimate friends; whereas, individuals typically only have one significant other, two parents, and a few siblings. Individuals may have many close friends and just a few acquaintances or countless acquaintances and very few close friends. This variety in relationship types makes friendships difficult to study;
however, it also highlights the importance of understanding the nuances found in friendships.

This study discussed the differences in friendships by directly comparing levels of closeness and perceived support for a private and workplace friend of the participant. Participants were asked to choose their closest friend in each context. This revealed that “closeness” is a relative term, and while the two friendships may be one’s “closest,” this does not necessarily mean “equal.” Closeness could be one way in which friendships are distinguished from each other.

Despite the differences in closeness and perceived support between private and workplace friends, disclosure breadth and depth were not found to be notably different between the friendship types. In other words, even though the workplace friend was not as close as the private friend, the disclosures were similar in amount discussed and honesty. These findings beg the question: Why are individuals being as vulnerable with friends who are less close?

One possible explanation could stem from the participants’ disclosure goals. For private and workplace friends, the disclosure goal of stress relief as reason for disclosing was rated highest in importance. Similarly, when comparing relationship type and reason for disclosing, participants cited catharsis (i.e., stress relief) more often with same-sex friends than with any other relationship (Derlega et al., 2008). Harboring stress has also been shown to negatively impact health and well-being (Cohen, Doyle, Turner, Alper, & Skoner, 2003; McEwen, 2002). Thus, when individuals seek to reduce their stress, the positive outcome of relief may outweigh the risk of disclosing to someone who they might not normally choose as an appropriate target, in this case, their workplace friend.
Workplace friends may also become a more appropriate target because of the frequency of interactions; they happen to be “at the right place at the right time” when an individual desires to disclose in order to feel better. It could be surmised that relationship characteristics and disclosure goals work both influence who is deemed an appropriate target and not just one or the other.

On a general level, this study explored the disclosure decision model. Since the model was forwarded in 2000, researchers have begun to use it as a framework for studies in various disciplines (e.g., Greenland, Scourfield, Maxwell, Prior, & Scourfield, 2009; Hargie et al., 2008); however, more studies are needed to empirically test the hypotheses of the model. Furthermore, there are few empirical studies that examine the DDM from a communication perspective. This study looked at the three stages of the DDM and attempted to evaluate them separately with varying degrees of success. Despite the lack of support for some of the forwarded hypotheses, this study is an important step in the process of testing and revising models that are used as a basis for understanding disclosure processes.

**Limitations and Future Research**

The present study did have some limitations. The first limitation is the lack of participant responses for workplace friends. While the overall sample size was acceptable at 134 responses, only 17 responses were captured regarding the disclosures with workplace friends. Participants were asked to think about any disclosure they revealed to their private friend, and then they were asked if they revealed the same topic to their workplace friend. The majority of participants indicated they did not disclose the same topic to their workplace friend. Future research could encourage participants to choose a
disclosure that they revealed to both their private and workplace friends. Furthermore, a longitudinal study with diary entries could allow researchers access to more recent disclosures and allow the participant to record what topics they disclosed to each group.

The second limitation of this study was related to the length of the questionnaire. As mentioned, the number of workplace responses was low, which could have also been a result of the amount of time required to complete the questionnaire. By attempting to touch on each of the three stages in the DDM, nuances within and between the stages may have been overshadowed. Future research on the DDM could look at each stage individually or in comparison with only one other stage. Also, as seen by the results of this study, there were some differences between private and workplace friends; however, maybe those differences were not great enough to elicit a difference in disclosure goals and disclosure characteristics. Future studies on the DDM could seek out a number of relationship types to compare.

The third limitation of this study was the measure used in capturing disclosure goals. This measure was created for the purposes of this study and only had one question per disclosure goal. While this measure had face validity, because each dimension had only one question, internal validity could not be calculated. Future studies should include a more robust goal measure and possibly pilot testing if the measure has not been previously validated.

Conclusion

This study examined differences between private and workplace friendships on relationship characteristics and disclosure processes using the disclosure decision model as a framework. Private friendships had a higher amount of closeness and perceived
support than workplace friendships, revealing the need to treat these friendships as distinct. Moreover, predictions forwarded by the disclosure decision model regarding the differences in disclosure goals and disclosure characteristics between private and workplace friends garnered some support. This study was an important step in empirically testing the disclosure decision model using a communication perspective as well as exploring how friendships can vary as a result of their context. Thus, this study extends previous communication research on disclosure and provides a foundation for understanding relational and disclosure differences between personal and workplace friendships.
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APPENDIX A Participant Email

Researchers at the Wake Forest University Department of Communication are conducting a research study about disclosure characteristics between you and your friends (IRB00021571). Participants 18 years or older and who can identify both a personal friend and a professional friend are eligible to participate.

The purpose of the study is to find out how individuals disclose a personal story to both a personal and professional friend. Study involves completion of a one-time online survey of approximately 30 minutes in length. Study participants will be entered in a random drawing for one (1) of two (2) $50 VISA gift cards that will occur on or before April 1, 2014.

If you would like more details, please contact Loren Bailey at baillc12@wfu.edu.

If you are interested in participating in this study, click the link below to be directed to the informed consent and survey. Please forward this [email/post] to anyone you think might also be interested in this study.

[web link to Qualtrics survey]

Thank you for your time.
APPENDIX B Informed Consent

Self-Disclosures to a Personal Friend and Professional Friend

You are invited to participate in a research study to explore how you disclose personal information to both a close personal friend and professional friend. In this study we will ask you to complete a series of questionnaires that asks a variety of questions regarding yourself, your relationship with a personal friend and professional friend, and how you have disclosed personal information to each of those individuals.

To be eligible for this study you must be at least 18 years of age and able to identify a personal friend and professional friend both of whom you have disclosed some type of personal information. This can be any type of disclosure as long as it is regarding something that is not available through sources (social media, resume, etc).

Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You may decline to participate or discontinue your participation at any time without penalty by closing your browser window. Any responses entered to that point will be deleted. You may also choose not to answer any question(s) you do not wish to answer for any reason.

Completing this survey will take approximately 30 minutes. Individuals who complete the study will be included in a random drawing for a chance at one (1) of two (2) $50 VISA gift cards. Winners will be notified via email and must claim prize within two (2) weeks of notification.

We do not anticipate any risk in your participating. Please note that we will be asking for you to discuss a potentially personal story, which may make some people feel uncomfortable. However, you choose what story to disclose and write about it in your own words.

While we cannot promise you will receive any direct benefit from your participation in this study, we hope this information may help us better understand how individuals discuss sensitive topics to important individuals in their lives.

To protect the confidentiality of your identity, your responses will be submitted to the study team with no identifying information. After completion of the survey, you will be automatically redirected to another form to fill out your contact information for the drawing. This information will be stored in a separate file from your survey responses. Please note, however, that while in transmission on the internet, your responses may not be entirely secure.

If you have any questions or concerns about the study please contact Loren Bailey at baillc12@wfu.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, contact the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at 336-758-5888.
We encourage you to print or save a copy of this page for your records (or future reference).

By clicking "I agree", you indicate that you are at least 18 years old and that you agree to participate in this research project. You will advance to the survey. If you do not wish to participate, please close your browser window.

____I agree
APPENDIX C Participant Demographic Information

Thank you for choosing to participate in this study. Below is a series of questionnaires about a variety of topics regarding you and the friendships you have with both a personal friend and professional friend.

Please answer each question as honestly as possible. There are no right or wrong answers. You may answer questions on a page in any order; however, you will be unable to return to a previous page once you click the “Submit” button. Length to complete study is approximately 30 minutes.

1. What is your sex?
   Male
   Female

2. What is your age in years?  _____

3. What is your ethnicity?
   White/Caucasian
   African American
   Hispanic
   Asian
   Native American
   Pacific Islander
   Other

4. What is your relationship status?
   Married
   Widowed
   Divorced
   Separated
   Monogamous dating relationship
   Non-exclusive dating relationship
   Single
APPENDIX D General Impression Management Scale

People constantly manage the impressions of themselves and those around them. Below are statements that explore various ways in which you may customize your impressions. Using the 7-point scale, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement in your general, everyday life.

7-point scale:
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

1. In social situations, I have the ability to alter my behavior if I feel that something else is called for.
2. I am often able to read people’s true emotions correctly through their eyes.
3. I have the ability to control the way I come across to people, depending on the impression I wish to give them.
4. In conversations, I am sensitive to even the slightest change in the facial expression of the person I’m conversing with.
5. My powers of intuition are quite good when it comes to understanding others’ emotions and motives.
6. I can usually tell when others consider a joke to be in bad taste, even though they may laugh convincingly.
7. When I feel that the image I am portraying isn’t working, I can readily change it to something that does.
8. I can usually tell when I’ve said something inappropriate by reading it in the listener’s eyes.
9. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.*
10. I have found that I can adjust my behavior to meet the requirements of any situation I find myself in.
11. If someone is lying to me, I usually know it at once from that person’s manner of expression.
12. Even when it might be to my advantage, I have difficulty putting up a good front.*
13. Once I know what the situation calls for, it’s easy for me to regulate my actions accordingly.

* item recoded
APPENDIX E Private Friend Demographic Information

We are investigating the nature of interpersonal relationships. As part of this study, we would like you to answer the following questions about your relationship with another person with whom you have a platonic, personal relationship (i.e., someone you do NOT have a romantic relationship with and who you do NOT associate with on a professional basis such as a co-worker, supervisor, subordinate, or colleague). Specifically, we would like you to choose the one person with whom you have the closest, deepest, most involved, and most intimate personal relationship and answer the following questions with regard to this particular person.

This person may be a close, personal friend, family member, or companion. It makes no difference exactly who this person is as long as she or he is the one person with whom you have the closest, deepest, most involved, and most intimate platonic relationship. Please select this person carefully since this decision will affect the rest of this section.

With this platonic, personal friend in mind, please respond to the following questions:

Who is this person? (initials only) ____

1. What is this person's age? ______
2. What is this person's sex?
   Male
   Female
3. Which one of the following best describes your relationship with this person?
   (Check only one)
   Immediate family (parent, sibling, child)
   Extended family (grandparent, aunt, uncle, cousin)
   Close friend (non-romantic)
   Casual friend (non-romantic)
   Other
4. How long have you known this person in years?
5. How frequently do you see this person face-to-face?
   Not at all
   A couple times a year
   Once or twice a month
   About once a week
   Several times a week
   Every day
   Several times a day
APPENDIX F Emotional Intimacy Scale

Please indicate your level of agreement to each statement below regarding your close [personal/workplace] friend.

5-point scale:
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neither agree or disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

1. This person completely accepts me as I am.
2. I can openly share my deepest thoughts and feelings with this person.
3. This person cares deeply for me.
4. This person would willingly help me in any way.
5. My thoughts and feelings are understood and affirmed by this person.
APPENDIX G MOS Social Support Survey

People sometimes look to others for companionship, assistance, or other types of support. How often is each of the following kinds of support available to you if you need it from your close [personal/workplace] friend?

5- point scale:
   None of the time
   Rarely
   Sometimes
   Often
   All of the time

1. Someone to help you if you were confined to bed
2. Someone you can count on to listen to you when you need to talk
3. Someone to give you good advice about a crisis
4. Someone to take you to the doctor if you needed it
5. Someone who shows you love and affection
6. Someone to have a good time with
7. Someone to give you information to help you understand a situation
8. Someone to confide in or talk to about yourself or your problems
9. Someone who hugs you
10. Someone to get together with for relaxation
11. Someone to prepare your meals if you were unable to do it yourself
12. Someone whose advice you really want
13. Someone to do things with to help you get your mind off things
14. Someone to help with daily chores if you were sick
15. Someone to share your most private worries and fears with
16. Someone to turn to for suggestions about how to deal with a personal problem
17. Someone to do something enjoyable with
18. Someone who understands your problems
19. Someone to love and make you feel wanted
APPENDIX H Self-Disclosure to Private Friend

A self-disclosure is when you intentionally reveal something about yourself to another person that is generally unavailable from other sources (e.g., social media, your resume). This could be a particularly important event, behavior, feeling, or strong emotion you experienced.

We are now interested in a self-disclosure you have given to your close friends. Pick an event, behavior, feeling, or strong emotion in your life that you revealed to those around you, specifically to your private friend. Think about this self-disclosure in as much detail as possible. What happened? How long ago? Who was involved? How did it make you feel? How were you impacted?

Now, we would like for you to tell us what specifically you actually revealed to your private friend. Give as much detail as possible.

Was there anything that you intentionally omitted from telling your private friend? ___No ___Yes, please explain.
APPENDIX I Revised Self-Disclosure Scale

Still keeping in mind this self-disclosure to your close personal friend, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement for each statement regarding how you disclosed to this friend.

7-point scale:
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree or disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

1. My self-disclosure was an accurate reflection of who I really am.
2. When I expressed my personal feelings, I was aware of what I was doing and saying.
3. When I revealed my feelings about myself, I consciously intended to do so.
4. I do not often talk about myself*
5. My statements of my feelings were brief.*
6. The conversation lasted the least time when I discussed myself.*
7. Only infrequently do I express my personal beliefs and opinions.*
8. I usually disclose positive things about myself.
9. My disclosure about myself was more negative than positive.*
10. I did not reveal myself because I do not know myself thoroughly enough.*
11. I was not confident that my expression of my own feelings, emotions, and experiences were true reflections of myself.*
12. I was not honest in my self-disclosure.*
13. I did not feel completely sincere when I revealed my own feelings, emotions, behaviors, or experiences.*
14. I intimately disclosed who I really am, openly and fully in my disclosure.
15. Once I got started, my self-disclosure lasted a long time.
16. I revealed information about myself without intending to.*
18. My disclosure of personal beliefs and opinions was directly related to the conversation.

* item recoded
APPENDIX J Self-Disclosure Goal Scale

People often have different reasons for disclosing information to others including the following:

- **Seeking approval**: trying to get others to like you and accept you.
- **Relationship development**: using disclosure to develop your relationship with the person.
- **Stress relief**: talking about the event/emotion reduced your stress or negative emotions.
- **Social control**: disclosing to influence the other person.
- **Identity clarification**: disclosing so that you can convey accurate information or help to define ideas about yourself.

Based on those definitions, how important was each reason to you when you disclosed to your personal friend?

7-point scale
- Not at all important
- Low importance
- Slightly important
- Neutral
- Moderately important
- Very important
- Extremely important

1. Seeking approval
2. Relationship development
3. Stress relief
4. Social control
5. Identity clarification

Did you have other reasons for wanting to disclose to your personal friend? Please explain? _____
APPENDIX K Workplace Demographic Information

For many adults, much of their time is spent at work. For the following sections, we would like you to focus on your professional environment and relationships with co-workers or other colleagues.

1. What is your current employment status?
   - Employed, full-time
   - Employed, part-time
   - Student, currently holding an internship
   - Unemployed

2. What type of industry are you in?
   - Professional
   - Retail
   - Service
   - Non-profit
   - Social Work
   - Self-employed
   - Other

3. How long have you been at your current company in years? ____

4. What is your job level?
   - Entry-level
   - Intermediate
   - Experienced
   - Expert
   - Management
   - Executive

5. What is your average income per year?
   - Less than $10,000
   - $10,000 to $20,000
   - $20,001 to $30,000
   - $30,001 to $40,000
   - $40,001 to $60,000
   - $60,001 to $100,000
   - $100,001 to $200,000
   - Over $200,001

6. What is your overall job satisfaction?
   - Poor
   - Fair
   - Good
   - Very Good
   - Excellent

7. Approximately how many people work in your organization?
   - 2-10
   - 11-20
   - 21-100
101-250
251-500
501-1000
1000+

8. Approximately how many co-workers do you interact with on a daily basis?
   _____ (insert number)
APPENDIX L Workplace Impression Management Scale

In the below statements about impressions, please think about them in the context of your workplace and indicate your level of agreement or disagreement.

7-point scale:
   Strongly disagree
   Disagree
   Somewhat disagree
   Neither agree or disagree
   Somewhat agree
   Agree
   Strongly agree

1. In social situations with co-workers, I have the ability to alter my behavior if I feel that something else is called for.
2. I am often able to read co-workers’ true emotions correctly through their eyes.
3. I have the ability to control the way I come across to co-workers, depending on the impression I wish to give them.
4. In conversations, I am sensitive to even the slightest change in the facial expression of the co-worker I'm conversing with.
5. My powers of intuition are quite good when it comes to understanding co-workers' emotions and motives.
6. I can usually tell when co-workers consider a joke to be in bad taste, even though they may laugh convincingly.
7. When I feel that the image I am portraying isn't working, I can readily change it to something that does.
8. I can usually tell when I've said something inappropriate by reading it in my co-worker’s eyes.
9. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different co-workers and different situations.*
10. I have found that I can adjust my behavior to meet the requirements of any work situation I find myself in.
11. If someone is lying to me, I usually know it at once from that co-worker’s manner of expression.
12. Even when it might be to my advantage, I have difficulty putting up a good front.*
13. Once I know what the work situation calls for, it's easy for me to regulate my actions accordingly.

* item recoded
APPENDIX M Workplace Friend Demographic Information

For this part of this study, we would like you to answer the following questions about your relationship with a close friend from your professional network, such as a co-worker, supervisor, subordinate, or colleague. As you did previously, choose the one person with whom you have the closest, deepest, most involved, and most intimate professional relationship and answer the following questions with regard to this particular person. Please select this person carefully since this decision will affect the rest of this section.

With this person in mind, please respond to the following questions:

1. Who is this person? (initial of first name only) ____
2. What is this person's age? ______
3. What is this person's sex?
   Male
   Female
4. Which one of the following best describes your relationship with this person? (Check only one)
   a co-worker
   a boss/supervisor
   a subordinate
   a colleague (i.e., someone who you work with professionally, but who is not in your organization)
5. How long have you known this person in years?
6. How frequently do you see this person face-to-face in your professional environment?
   Not at all
   A couple times a year
   Once or twice a month
   About once a week
   Several times a week
   Every day
   Several times a day
APPENDIX N Workplace Friend Disclosure

Did you disclose the same topic to your workplace friend that you did to your personal friend?
___ No  ___ Yes

If yes, we would like for you to tell us what specifically you actually revealed to your workplace friend? This may be the same or different from your disclosure to your personal friend. _____

Was there anything that you intentionally omitted from telling your workplace friend?
___ No  ___ Yes, please explain.

Did you have other reasons for wanting to disclose to your workplace friend?
___ No  ___ Yes, please explain.
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