

A study of self-disclosure of graduate students in Vellore district

¹ N Sathiyavani, ² Dr. AC Lal Kumar

¹ MEd IInd Year, G.E.T. College of Education, Vidyasankara Puram Village, Paradarami Post, Gudiyattam Taluk, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India

² Assistant Professor for M.Ed., G.E.T. College of Education, Vidyasankara Puram Village, Paradarami Post, Gudiyattam Taluk, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract

The study is conducted with aim of find out the significance of graduate students towards self-disclosure. In this study, descriptive survey method and simple random technique was used among 300 graduate students in the Vellore district. For that, tool on K.M. Roma Pal, was developed and administrated among graduate students. 't' test and F test were used to test the hypotheses. Result shows that there is no significant difference between the following samples such as gender, locality of college, mode of management, group of study, religion, parental occupation, UG degree and year of study toward self-disclosure of graduate students.

Keywords: self-disclosure, descriptive survey method, Vellore district

Introduction

Self-Disclosure

Although distinctive theorists have taken strong positions on self-disclosure; from Sigmund Freud's psychodynamic stance in which he suggested remaining a "blank slate", to Carl Roger's Person centred theory, which advocated greater transcendence (Kahn, 1997), regarding more recent studies on self-disclosure (St. Aubyn, Murphy, O'Neill, 2009) [6] a picture has emerged of self-disclosure being a grey area for psychologists as opposed to, for example, issues around confidentiality, which are strongly regulated by the agency the individual psychologist is working for. As many contemporary psychologists work integratively, it could be suggested that self-disclosure is not mediated by one particular theoretical orientation but is rather based on experience, personality, the particular client group worked with and subjective decisions in the moment of therapy as to whether or not to disclose.

The self-disclosure would seem to be the antithesis of the impersonal world of electronic communication devoid of nearly all cues used to infer feelings from others. Self-disclosure is an act of revealing personal information about oneself to others. Self-disclosure means letting go of anxiety and apprehension of losing someone due to knowing someone more intimately; when relationships reach this stage they become more intimate. When people meet someone in a face-to-face setting, they are usually very cautious about revealing too much about themselves. At the beginning of a face-to-face relationship, they spend time telling the other what they like to do, what they do for a living and how they like to spend their leisure time. Only after establishing a measure of trust do people then start to reveal more about themselves including their deepest inner feelings.

Statement of the Problem

The problem chosen for the study may be stated as "A Study of self-disclosure of graduate students in Vellore District.

Method

Normative survey method was adopted for the study.

Population and Sample

All the samples living in Vellore are the population of the present and the sample of 160 female and 140 male were selected for this study by adopting simple random sampling technique.

Statistical Techniques Used

The investigator used the statistical techniques, Mean, SD and "t" test and F test to accept or reject hypotheses.

Operational Definition of Key Term Used

Self-disclosure as making ourselves "transparent" to others through our communication by reflecting them the unique aspects of ourselves.

Tool Used In the Present Study

Self-Disclosure Scale constructed and standardized by K.M. Roma Pal, Research Scholar (Psychology) Agra College, Pune

Description of the Tool

The self-disclosure consist of 40 statements with Likert type scale. The responses were "disclose everything," "disclose almost everything," "disclose something's," "disclose a few things," "disclose nothing," recoded 0 through 4, respectively. In all eight scales the mean value for each variable was substituted for any missing values on that variable. Individual items contributing to each scale were randomly presented in the survey instrument.

Objectives of the Study

To find out if there exists any significant difference between following sub samples of graduate students with respect to their self-disclosure.

- Gender : Male/Female

- Locality of College : Rural/Urban
- Mode of Management : Government/Aided private
- Group of Study : Science/Arts
- Religion : Hindu/Muslim/Christian
- Parental Occupation : Employed/Unemployed
- UG Degree : BSc/BA/BCom
- Year of Study : 1st/2nd/3rd

of mode of management of graduate students towards self-disclosure.

- There is no significant difference between Arts and Science group graduate students with respect to their self-disclosure.
- There is no significant difference between the sub samples of religion of graduate students towards self-disclosure.
- There is no significant difference between Employed and Unemployed graduate students with respect to their self-disclosure.
- There is no significant difference between the sub samples of UG Degree of graduate students towards self-disclosure.
- There is no significant difference between the sub samples of year of study of graduate students towards self-disclosure.

Hypotheses of the Study

- There is no significant difference between Male and Female graduate students with respect to their self-disclosure.
- There is no significant difference between Rural and Urban graduate students with respect to their self-disclosure.
- There is no significant difference between the sub samples

Differential Analysis for Self-Disclosure Scores of Graduate Students Gender and Self-Disclosure

Table 1: ‘T’ – Values Between Male and Female Graduate Students with Respect in Their Self-Disclosure.

| Gender | N | Mean | SD | ‘t’ Value | Level of Significance |
|--------|-----|--------|-------|-----------|-----------------------|
| Male | 160 | 123.21 | 31.91 | 1.566 | No Significant |
| Female | 140 | 117.02 | 36.49 | | |

It is evident from Table 1, the calculated ‘t’ value is 1.566, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis number (1) was accepted and research hypothesis

is rejected. It is inferred that there is a no significant difference found between male and female graduate students with respect to their self-disclosure.

Locality of Institution and Self-Disclosure

Table 2: ‘t’ Values between Rural and Urban Graduate Students with Respect In Their Self -Disclosure

| Locality of Institution | N | Mean | SD | ‘t’ Value | Level of Significance |
|-------------------------|-----|--------|-------|-----------|-----------------------|
| Rural | 146 | 121.28 | 33.95 | 0.473 | No Significant |
| Urban | 154 | 119.41 | 34.53 | | |

It is evident from Table 2, the calculated ‘t’ value is 0.473, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis number (2) was accepted and research hypothesis

is rejected. It is inferred that there is a no significant difference found between rural and urban graduate students with respect to their self-disclosure.

Mode of Management and Self-Disclosure

Table 3: ‘F’ test among the Sub- samples of Mode of Management with Respect To Their Self Disclosure

| Mode of Management | Sum of Squares | Mean Squares | df | ‘F’ Value | Level of Significance |
|--------------------|----------------|--------------|-----|-----------|-----------------------|
| Between Groups | 61.453 | 30.726 | 2 | 0.026 | No Significant |
| Within Groups | 349890.534 | 1178.083 | 297 | | |
| Total | 349951.987 | | 298 | | |

It is evident from the Table 3, the calculated ‘F’ value is 0.026, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis number (3) is accepted and research

hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference among sub samples of nature of school with respect to their self-disclosure of graduate students.

Group of study and Self-Disclosure

Table 4: ‘T’ Values between Groups of Study Graduate Students with Respect in Their Self -Disclosure

| Group of Study | N | Mean | SD | ‘t’ Value | Level of Significance |
|----------------|-----|--------|-------|-----------|-----------------------|
| Arts | 142 | 118.05 | 35.05 | 0.090 | No Significant |
| Science | 158 | 122.36 | 33.09 | | |

It is evident from Table 4, the calculated ‘t’ value 0.090, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis number (4) was accepted and research hypothesis

is rejected. It is inferred that there is a no significant difference found between Arts and Science graduate students with respect to their self-disclosure

Religion and Self-Disclosure

Table 5: ‘F’ Test among the Sub- Samples Of Religion With Respect To Their Self Disclosure

| Religion | Sum of Squares | Mean Squares | df | ‘F’ Value | Level of Significance |
|----------------|----------------|--------------|-----|-----------|-----------------------|
| Between Groups | 1034.780 | 517.390 | 2 | 0.440 | No Significant |
| Within Groups | 348917.207 | 1174.805 | 297 | | |
| Total | 349951.987 | | 299 | | |

It is evident from the Table 5, the calculated ‘F’ value is 0.440, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis number (5) is accepted and research

hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference among sub samples of nature of school with respect to their self-disclosure of graduate students.

Parental Occupation and Self Disclosure

Table 6: ‘t’ Values between Employed and Unemployed With Respect In Their Self-Disclosure

| Parental Occupation | N | Mean | SD | ‘t’ Value | Level of Significance |
|---------------------|-----|--------|-------|-----------|-----------------------|
| Employed | 138 | 119.01 | 34.12 | 0.613 | No Significant |
| Unemployed | 162 | 121.44 | 34.35 | | |

It is evident from Table 6, the calculated ‘t’ value 0.613, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis number (6) was accepted and research hypothesis

is rejected. It is inferred that there is no a significant difference found between parental occupation employed and unemployed with respect to their self-disclosure.

UG Degree and Self Disclosure

Table 7: ‘F’ test among the Sub- samples of UG Degree with Respect To Their Self Disclosure

| UG Degree | Sum of Squares | Mean Squares | df | ‘F’ Value | Level of Significance |
|----------------|----------------|--------------|-----|-----------|-----------------------|
| Between Groups | 1782.851 | 891.425 | 8 | 0.760 | No Significant |
| Within Groups | 348169.135 | 1172.287 | 297 | | |
| Total | 349951.987 | | 299 | | |

It is evident from the Table 7, the calculated ‘F’ value is 0.760, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis number (7) is accepted and research

hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference among sub samples of nature of school with respect to their self-disclosure of graduate students.

Year of Study and Self Disclosure

Table 8: ‘F’ test among the Sub- samples of Year of study with Respect To Their Self Disclosure

| Year of Study | Sum of Squares | Mean Squares | df | ‘F’ Value | Level of Significance |
|----------------|----------------|--------------|-----|-----------|-----------------------|
| Between Groups | 2083.822 | 1041.911 | 2 | 0.890 | No Significant |
| Within Groups | 347868.164 | 1171.273 | 297 | | |
| Total | 349951.987 | | 299 | | |

It is evident from the Table 8, the calculated ‘F’ value is 0.890, which is not significant at 0.05 level. Hence, the framed null hypothesis number (8) is accepted and research hypothesis is rejected. It is inferred that there is no significant difference among sub samples of nature of school with respect to their self-disclosure of graduate students.

5. It is inferred that there is a no significant difference found between sub samples of religion of graduate students with respect to their self-disclosure.
6. It is inferred that there is a no significant difference found between Employed and Unemployed graduate students with respect to their self-disclosure.
7. It is inferred that there is a no significant difference found between sub samples of UG degree of graduate students with respect to their self-disclosure.
8. It is inferred that there is a no significant difference found between sub samples of no of siblings of graduate students with respect to their self-disclosure.

Major Findings of the Study

1. It is inferred that there is no significant difference found between male and female graduate students with respect to their self-disclosure.
2. It is inferred that there is a no significant difference found between rural and urban graduate students with respect to their self-disclosure.
3. It is inferred that there is a no significant difference found between the sub samples of mode of management of graduate students towards self-disclosure.
4. It is inferred that there is a no significant difference found between Arts and Science group graduate students with respect to their self-disclosure.

Significance of the Study

With globalization adolescents with characterised as relative immaturity, heightened emotionality and eagerness to become independent may take them on a wrong path and lead to overwhelming consequences, such as cybercrimes, drug addiction, juvenile delinquency and sexual harassment. In this reference the finding of the present study implicated by

drawing the attention of parents that favourable home environment would be beneficial for adolescents to develop environment and self-disclosure behaviour which lead them in right direction. The study may point out the importance of widely accepted psychological field in adolescents rehabilitation centre as this study highlights the importance of environment and self-disclosure behaviour of adolescents.

References

1. Best John W, Khan, James V. Research in Education, Tenth Edition, New Delhi. Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd. 2008.
2. Garrett, Henry, Wood Worth RS. Statistics in Psychology and Education, Surjeet Publications Ltd, New Delhi. 2008.
3. Guilford JP. "Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education" New York, Mc Graw Hill Book Company Inc. 1956.
4. Kahn M. between Therapist and Client, the new relationship. (Rev. Ed.). New York: Owl Books, (chapter 4 and 5), 2001.
5. Lokesh Koul Methodology of Educational Research (2nd Ed) New Delhi, Vikas Publishing house Pvt. Ltd. 1990
6. Aubyn StH, Murphy H, O'Neill MH, Therapists' attitudes towards self-disclosure. Poster presentation at the BPS student conference. Brighton, United Kingdom, 2009.