Self-disclosure as an Episode in Everyday Talk: A Descriptive Study

Shashi Surana

Assistant Professor- Business Communication

Narsee Monjee College of Commerce & Economics

Mumbai (India)

Abstract

The Communicate Bond Belong (CBB) theory states that much everyday talk occurs in episodes. CBB theory specifies qualifying criteria for an episode. Frequently undertaking communication episodes is seen as realizing relational satisfaction. Self-disclosure is a type of episode, and literature specifies content of a particular nature that realizes liking. This study investigates the extent to which everyday talk occurs in episodes, and the extent to which self-disclosure is an episode of social interaction. The study is conducted using mixed methods. Data collection adopts diary record as the tool. Data analysis is based on frequencies and interpretation. Findings suggest that appropriate content is related to relational satisfaction from self-disclosure.

Keywords: Appropriate content; liking;

Self-disclosure as an Episode in Everyday Talk—A Descriptive Study

Person-A gifts Rs. 100 to person-B on his birthday. This is investment of resource on the part of person-A. Person-B uses this amount for setting-up a pop-corn stall. Person-A recommends the pop-corn stall to his friend who is the principal at a school in the neighbourhood. The school holds talks with person-B for setting-up a pop-corn counter on campus. This meeting allows person-B to connect and interact-- bond within the social network of person-A. The school officially appoints person-B to sell pop-corn on campus. Person-B is able to make a living. Person-B proposes partnership in the pop-corn business to person-A. Person-A instead asks for the commitment that Person-B take care of him during old age.

The amount of Rs. 100 given by person-A is an investment. It is a finite resource. Person-B being able to start a pop-corn stall with the amount is a benefit for person-B. Person-B offering an equal share in the business is an act of reciprocity, and if accepted is a benefit for person-A. The amount likely to realize from the reciprocity is many times more than the investment that is the reciprocation is inequitable albeit a positive one. Also, the partnership is reciprocation in kind as against the investment which is in cash. Person-B reciprocating with Rs. 100 would make their relation an exchange relation. After repaying the amount, persons A and B could terminate their relation. Person-B offering a partnership is an instance of seeking to make the relationship stable. Person-B is aware first, of person-A's network of individuals from whom he can source more business; and second, person-B's recognition of his own strength of converting person-A's social network into a profitable enterprise. Both the social network and

the ability to run an enterprise are resources; but, the benefit realizing from the resources is larger than the sum of parts. Also, the resource of person-A makes him valued. Putting-in a word within his social network by person-A is an action that is, it employs physical behaviours e.g. speech and/or mental behaviours e.g. persuasion. An action is a striving behaviour because it can open-up opportunities for person-B which cannot realize without person-A's act of recommendation. The social network and the entrepreneurial ability together are an instance of individuation or mutual recognition. Person-B choosing to commit to care during old age would be an instance of action based on attention to the need of person-A. If person-B does take-on care of person-A, then they would be in a relation that satiates person-A's need to belong. This relation would be a need satiating behaviour. A need satiating behaviour is immediately linked to belonging, as against a striving behaviour that is remotely linked to belonging. A variety of striving behaviours can realize the same relation of care for person-A; but, it is only a relation of care that will satiate the need for belonging. Stability, interdependence, and individuation are characteristics of a relationship. A relationship that has any/all of these characteristics is a communal relation. Investment of resources in a communal relation is founded on addressing the need of the other, and not on expectation of reciprocity. Investments made in communal relations tend to lead one/both relational partners to survive, flourish, procreate, and/or protect—to well-being. This is why a communal relation tends to be a need satiating behaviour. The fundamental human need for belonging is a need for forging communal relations that are a means to well-being. CBB theory holds that social interaction is a striving behaviour—a means for unleashing relationships that satiate the need for belonging.

The Communicate Bond Belong (CBB) theory looks at the relation of human communication and the human need to belong. The current paper focuses on describing communication episode; the paper does not investigate the efficacy of communication episode to the formation of relation, the exchange of resources, and so on. Similarly, explanation and/or analysis of outcomes of communication episode is beyond the scope of the current study. The paper is organized as follows--
Section-1 introduces the principles and propositions of CBB theory.
Section-2 reviews literature and defines the concepts of episode, striving behaviour, and self-disclosure.
Section-3 straddles the research questions, design, and findings of the study. This blurring of the boundaries between research design and analysis is aimed-at minimizing repetition and thereby easing comprehension of the study's design and findings.
Section-4 presents the discussion.

Section-1. Introduction

Belonging is a fundamental need of humans (Hall & Davis, 2017). Belonging is realized through the formation and maintenance of close relations. Relations are formed through reciprocity that is the exchange of resources. An individual invests more or invests fewer resources in another based on the value that he/she sees as possible to realize in a given relation. Relations can be either exchange or communal in nature. The need to belong prompts individuals to form close relations. A close relation tends to be communal in nature. In a close that is a communal relation, the basis of investment of resources is the other individual's need as against balance of resources. The focus of CBB theory is on studying the role that human communication plays in the development and/or maintenance of communal relation that gratifies the need to belong.

Facilitating the formation and/or development of a relation into a communal relation is the role an episode plays in realizing belonging. An episode is a definite type of interpersonal communication. For it to facilitate relationship, an episode must be a striving behaviour. (Hall & Davis, 2017)list four propositions (3A-D) for an episode to be a striving behaviour--
An episode must yield physiological and/or psychological benefits for communication actors (3A);
The episode must lead to long-term relational bonding between communication actors (3B);
A reduction in undertaking striving behaviours that is, fewer instances of undertaking communication episodes purely for psychological and/or physiological benefits is a sign of the need to belong been satiated (3C); and
When an episode is seen to function as a striving behaviour that is when an episode is seen as realizing benefits that satiate the need to belong, the communication actor reduces experimenting with alternate episodes (3D). I interpret 3D as incidence of a recurring pattern of a specific episode in interactions. Given the emphasis on the role of episode as a striving behaviour, the next section reviews the concepts of episode, striving behaviour, and of self-disclosure as an episode.

Section-2. Theoretical Framework and Review of Literature

2.1. Episode

The need for belonging prompts everyday talk (Hall & Davis, 2017). But even as everyday talk is directly prompted by the need for belonging, everyday talk does not directly satiate the need for belonging. Instead, everyday talk responds to the prompt from the need for belonging with action that leads to bonding and/or relationship formation or development.

The actions within everyday talk are assortments of physical and/or mental behaviours that communication actors choose to undertake together on incumbent information. The result of this interaction of information and action is the nature of content that realizes. CBB theory categorizes this nature of information into supragenre. The superficial, informal, task or instrumental, deep, and relational are the five broad categories or the supragenre of everyday talk. A supragenre classifies everyday talk by the nature of content. A supragenre may be created within two or more episodes, but a particular episode tends to carry content only of the specific nature. The supragenre specifies the nature of content, and an episode is the type of interaction that realizes this nature of content; that is, an episode sees content of interaction to be of a certain and not some other nature, and the realization of this nature of content tends to be contingent upon application of some and not some other actions. This leads me to operationalizing the episode.
An episode is content of a certain nature realized from action/s undertaken on information by communication actors. This nature of information is co-created for a purpose within daily social interaction. Greater the frequency of such episodes, greater the relational satisfaction for communication actors. Bonding is a form that relational satisfaction takes. Developing a social network, and interaction with persons within this network are measures of bonding.

2.2. Striving Behaviour

Everyday talk realizes bonding which episode leads to, as well; episode yields physiological and/or psychological benefit which striving behaviour does, too; but striving behaviour leads to relationship which neither everyday talk nor episode can. And only relationship realizes belonging (Hall & Davis, 2017). Having said this, incidence of a physiological and/or psychological benefit is important because it is antecedent to the formation of a relationship. If the benefit/s realized is formative for exchange relations, then the specific episode may not evolve into a striving behaviour, because communal rather than exchange relations are capable of realizing belonging. And, the focus of CBB theory is on looking at the efficacy of communication for realizing belonging.

A striving behaviour is an action (Hall & Davis, 2017). An action is the application of a mental behaviour, a physical behaviour, or a combination of mental and physical behaviours in a communication situation. Action may realize benefits that go on to forging exchange relations. The feature of action as striving behaviour is that it realizes something that strengthens the relation. This strength of a relation is measured through the very characteristics of a relation--
1. Stability
2. Interdependence and/or
3. Individuation that is mutual recognition.
When any/all of these characteristics come to describe a relation, the relation becomes a communal relation. A measure of communal relation is that here investments in the relational partner are made on the basis of his need and not on the potential of reciprocity. This makes the striving behaviour valued. This strengthening of relation is the role of striving behaviour in indirectly realizing belonging. CBB theory sees social interaction as a striving behaviour that feeds relationships which in turn satiate the need to belong. Not all social interaction is striving behaviour. This brings me to identifying measures of episode that is a striving behaviour. A striving behaviour--
1. Is an action (application of mental and/or physical behaviours)
2. Yields benefit (other than physiological / psychological)
3. Realizes bonding between interaction partners over a long period of time
4. Occurs in a recurring pattern through particular episode/s.

2.3. Self-disclosure

(Hall & Davis, 2017) sites studies that identify self-disclosure as an episode. Self-disclosure is found to lead to development of an existing relationship, is essential to friendship intimacy, and is positively related to liking. I see liking as a psychological benefit from self-disclosure. I proceed to reviewing literature for arriving at the definition of self-disclosure.

I define self-disclosure as the public or private sharing of information about self that is descriptive (behaviours), evaluative (opinion/emotions), deep (intimate), or any combination of the three which is aimed-at been seen as appropriate by the hearer for it to generate familiarity-based liking towards self for the goal of social-attraction. This definition is culled from review of literature presented below.

(Ruoyun & Utza, 2017) cites literature which states that broadcasting any form of self-information either descriptive e.g. actions or evaluative e.g. feelings about something can be treated as self-disclosure. Prior research assesses self-disclosure along dimensions of amount and level or depth of disclosure. Descriptive, evaluative, and depth are measures of nature of content. Intimate content of self-disclosure is considered fit for sharing in face-to-face interactions. The two together constitute appropriateness which I see as a subjective construct. Studies find appropriateness to increase interpersonal attraction. So, appropriateness of content is determined by setting. This has been established in case of intimate content and face-to-face setting for self-disclosure. This may be because here self-disclosure may be directed to a single person and this can increase effect/s of self-disclosure on the relation. Because shared as part of a one-on-one interaction, this information elicits attention of the hearer. So, setting influences appropriateness of content; and appropriateness of content is positively associated with liking which is a latent measure of psychological benefit. Amount of self-disclosure is the quantitative variable of content, and is measured in terms of frequency. Frequency is related to familiarity, closeness, and social-attraction. 1. Familiarity is what the hearer knows about the speaker and gets accustomed to. This familiarity depends on amount or exposure of self-information. Frequency (amount) of exposure influences familiarity. So, high frequency (amount) of self-disclosure should lead to high familiarity. 2. Closeness is the emotional component of the hearer's response towards the disclosing individual that is, liking for the discloser. This emotional response is influenced by the hearer's perception of appropriateness of content of self-disclosure. When content of self-disclosure is seen as appropriate, increases in amount of self-disclosure leads to increases in closeness that is liking for the discloser. It has earlier been noted that perceived appropriateness of content is related to setting. Face-to-face that is private setting makes for appropriateness of intimate self-information. So, increases in sharing of intimate content in private setting should lead to increase in liking which is a latent measure of closeness. Increases in frequency of self-disclosure is positively related to familiarity; so, increase in frequency of intimate content in private setting should increase closeness. This set of circumstances is the analysis of familiarity-based liking. 3. Social-attraction is operationalized as observable behaviour/s of the hearer as expression of closeness towards the disclosing individual e.g. wanting to spend time with. Social-attraction results from and increases with familiarity-based liking. Here, frequency or amount of exposure reduces uncertainty about the interaction partner which contributes to likability.

but, increased familiarity can decrease liking, as well. This is because continued liking is determined by the interaction partner's belief about consistency and appropriateness of content disclosed. This belief is a result of perceived appropriateness of content as discussed above, and on the perceived similarity of content that is consistency of incumbent information with pre-existing information of self-disclosure. Belief is positively associated with appropriateness and with similarity of self-information. Appropriateness and similarity influence belief. Belief is positively associated with closeness. Belief influences closeness. A negative relation between self-information and social-attraction is a measure of negative belief; and, a positive association between self-information and social-attraction is a measure of positive belief.

Literature cautions against superficial disclosures. Specifically, a large amount of superficial disclosures from an existing interactional partner reduces likeability. Superficiality has not been operationalized in the literature reviewed. I draw on intimate information for operationalizing superficial content. Superficiality is the opposite of depth or that superficial content is everything that deep intimate content is not. So, superficiality may be described as and measured through content that is descriptive and/or evaluative but not intimate shared in private settings; and not necessarily consistent with prior information.

Section-3. Research Design, Data Analysis, and Findings

As stated earlier, this work is part of a larger study of communication episodes in everyday talk. For comparing findings from each of these episodes, it is important that there be methodological consistency. The design decisions presented below are similar to those presented in (Surana, 2020B)and (Surana, Gossip as an Episode in Everyday Talk-- A Descriptive Study (Unpublished), 2020C).

Social anthropology studies evolution of social groups in the broadest sense; ethnography studies smaller groups and/or communities; gossip is the sharing of cultural norms and knowledge. Given the similarities, it is logical to choose from methods for data collection that have been successfully used by social anthropology and ethnography. (Foster, 2004) Participant observation was used by the early researchers. These researchers used field notes as the tool for collecting data. Field notes is where the researcher is in close proximity to the time and place of where the events occur; he immerses himself in the culture of the study group for observing and recording events. This combination of method and tool yields rich primary data but is time consuming. An alternative is video and audio recordings of subjects. While it eases the task of recording events, (Eder & Enke, 1991; Planalp, 1993) (Mettetal, 1982)the challenge of time remains. Additionally, it has been found to even if marginally make subjects less natural in their conversations. The researcher must invest the time needed for becoming accepted within the group to be studied. (Nicolopoulou, 1997)Eavesdropping is an alternate method used by researchers to preserve the spontaneity of conversations and of interpersonal relationships. (Levin & Arluke, 1987) (Dunbar, Marriott, & Duncan, 1997) (McCormick & McCormick, 1992)eavesdropped on Emails for studying incidence of gossip. While eavesdropping does preserve authenticity of data, it clearly poses ethical questions.

Participant observation as method for data collection is efficacious, but eavesdropping and video-audio recording of conversations are not. Diary records is thought to be a suitable alternative for gathering qualitative data of social interactions. (Duke, 2012) It makes the participant a co-researcher in that the participant himself creates the diary record of his social interactions. An advantage of the diary record is that it addresses the challenge of time commitment that the researcher needs to make for gathering data. The diary record maintained by the diarist is the simultaneous gathering of rich data as events unfold, which is to say that there is minimization of loss of richness of data because the subject is the observer and knows what aspect of data must not be missed for this data to be meaningful. (Duke, 2012)has proved useful in confirming the issues I have anticipated and/or encountered in enrolling participants for the study. In adopting participant observation and diary record, I acknowledge the challenge of the study's need for records of social interactions that are not restricted to the work context.

The need to note incidence of content of a certain nature and of frequency lead me to adopting the quantitative technique to data collection and analysis. The survey questionnaire as a data collection tool assumes the respondent to be adequately aware of his use of information as driven by interest in the phenomenon as such, or by something about the person/s within the phenomenon. Interview as tool for collection of data assumes recall. It has to be one-on-one and conducted by the researcher. The costs of time and effort out-weigh the quality of data that is expected to be generated because these interviews would require the respondent to share details of their conversations; a face-to-face situation like interview can cause respondents to withhold details. Diary record has its weaknesses but has been an established tool for collecting conversation data, particularly over an extended period of time. Tracking frequency of interactions implies data collected over an extended period of time. For these reasons, I adopt diary record as the tool for data collection.

I established contact with persons within my professional network to see if they would consent to being respondents for the study. I provided prospective respondents with a brief of the study, assured confidentiality, shared a specimen diary entry, and even solicited suggestions on preferred alternatives to a physical diary entry. But, enrolling respondents was a failed attempt. In the meantime, I started maintaining a diary record of my own conversations. At this stage, there are no empirical works known to the researcher that provide a ready research design to adopt. The series of current papers will show the efficacy of the design decisions made for future work to carry forward and/or to modify. Data in the form of diary records has a low success rate, and to collect such data at this stage could lead to the data getting wasted if data analysis shows-up flaw/s at any stage of the study's design. The current paper is based on the twelve conversations that formed the diary entries over a seven days' period. A key weakness of the study because of the small data-set is that findings from the study will not be robust enough for arriving at conclusions. So, I will end this study with discussion of findings and scope for future research.

I define episode as content of a certain nature realized from action/s undertaken on information by communication actors. This nature of information is co-created for a purpose within daily social interaction. Greater the frequency of such episodes, greater the relational satisfaction for communication actors. In this definition of episode, I see emphasis on the evolution of information into content of a certain nature, and the contingence of relational satisfaction on the very act of transforming information into content. Therefore, the first task is to trace incidence of information, action, and nature of content. The efficacy of nature of content depends upon specifying its difference/s from information; and, demonstrating the role of action in this change. These tasks dictate adoption of the pre-and-post test as method for the study. Action including physical and/or mental behaviours that are performed on incumbent information is the intervention. I look at text of conversation both before and after action acts on it. Nature of content, action, and relational satisfaction are variables under study. The categories of nature of content are drawn from literature on self-disclosure. CBB theory describes action as physical and/or mental behaviours; no additional specification of action is found in literature on self-disclosure. So, data will be generated from coding text of conversations occurring within communication episodes. CBB theory states that communication episodes lead to relational satisfaction. Self-disclosure specifies liking to be a concrete form of outcome of communication episode that I see as constituting relational satisfaction. While for deriving liking, text of conversations has to be coded for nature of content and settings in which these communication episodes are undertaken, CBB theory sees frequency as the measure of relational satisfaction. So, the list of variables and associated measures is as follows--

Variable	Measure
Nature of Content	
	Descriptive
	Evaluative
	Intimate
Action	
	Physical behaviour
	Mental behaviour
Relational Satisfaction	
	Frequency
Setting	
	Private (face-to-face)
	Public (mass)

3.1. The Data

Frequencies for each criterion is presented first. These frequencies are bases for subsequent analyses and interpretations.

data Cbb episode and self-disclosure.	SD QT NI D-A	SD QT NI E-A	SD QT NI I-A	SB QT A PB	SB QT A MB	SD QT NI D+A	SD QT NI E+A	SD QT NI I+A	E QT C CC	E QT
Code	descriptive	EVALUATIVE	INTIMATE	PHYSICAL BEHAVIOUR	MENTAL BEHAVIOUR	descriptive	EVALUATIVE	INTIMATE	COCREATE	DAILY INTE
Frequency	12	3	2	12	5	8	7	3	6	10
%	100	25	16.66667	100	41.66667	66.66667	58.33333	25	50	83.3
Frequency (1A 2A 3B 5A 5B)	5	1	2	5	4	3	3	1	3	5
%	100	20	40	100	80	60	60	20	60	100

3.2. Nature of Content and Action

CBB theory identifies self-disclosure to be an episode. Literature on self-disclosure specifies the nature of information as being descriptive which is a documentation of behaviours and/or actions; evaluative which is an expression of feelings on the subject of conversation; and intimate which is details about self and/or the subject that tend to be shared with some and not many others. CBB theory states that the nature of information changes based on action/s applied on information by the communication actors. RQ-A. What is the nature of content of communication episodes? RQ-A1. To what extent is content descriptive, evaluative, and intimate before action is applied on information? RQ-A2. What changes in nature of content realize after action is applied on information?
RQ-A3. What is the relation between nature of content and behaviours constituting action?

These research questions point towards looking at information both before and after action/s has been applied by communication actors. So, I code conversations in the data-set for the three types of information both before and after communication actors' application of action/s. This analysis of data yields findings that answer research questions A1 and A2.

Data shows the following movement in nature of incumbent information to nature of content realized from application of action. 1. Descriptive content moves from constituting twelve (12) 100.00 per cent of the conversations to constituting eight (8) 66.66 per cent of the conversations after action is applied on information 2. Evaluative content moves from constituting three (3) 25.00 per cent of the conversations to constituting seven (7) 58.33 per cent of the conversations and 3. Intimate content moves from constituting two (2) 16.66 per cent to constituting three (3) 25.00 per cent of the conversations.

	3A SD QT NI D descriptive	3B SD QT NI E EVALUATIVE	3C SD QT NI I INTIMATE	2A SB QT A PB PHYSICAL BEHAVIOUR	2B SB QT A MB MENTAL BEHAVIOUR	3A SD QT NI D descriptive	3B SD QT NI E EVALUATIVE	3C SD QT NI I INTIMATE
1A	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
1B	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
2A	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
3A	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
3B	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
5A	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
5B	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
5C	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
5D	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
6A	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
7A	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
7B	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
	12	3	2	12	5	8	7	3
	100	25	16.6666666667	100	41.6666666667	66.6666666667	58.3333333333	25

Theory expects application of action to effect changes in the nature of content realized. This is research question A3. Data shows--

1. Physical behaviours are applied in twelve (12) 100.00 per cent of the cases.
2. Mental behaviours are applied along with the physical behaviours in five (5) 41.66 per cent cases. Where mental behaviours are applied along with physical behaviours, the share of nature of content changes as follows--
2.1. Descriptive content moves from constituting all the five (5) 100.00 per cent of the conversations to constituting four (4) 80.00 per cent of the conversations.
2.2. Evaluative content moves from constituting zero (0) 00.00 per cent to constituting four (4) 80.00 per cent of the conversations.
2.3. Intimate content constitutes one (1) 20.00 per cent of the conversations both before and after application of action. Only physical action is applied in seven (7) 58.33 per cent of the cases. The change in nature of content is as follows--
1.1. Descriptive content moves from incidence of seven (7) 100.00 per cent to four (4) 57.14 per cent;
1.2. Evaluative content remains constant with an incidence of three (3) 42.85 per cent both before and after application of physical action; and, 1.3. Intimate content moves from incidence of one (1) 14.28 per cent to two (2) 28.57 per cent.

	3A SD QTD descriptive	3B SD QTE EVALUATIVE	3C SD NII INTIMATE	2A SB QTPB PHYSICAL BEHAVIOUR	2B SB QTMB MENTAL BEHAVIOUR	3A SD QTD descriptive	3B SD QTE EVALUATIVE	3C SD NII INTIMATE	COCREATE	DAILY SOCIAL INTERACTION	PURPOSEFUL	PUBLIC	PRIVATE	NETWORK DEVT	INTERACTION IN NETWORK
1A	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	01	1	1	0	1	0	0
3B	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	00	1	1	0	1	0	0
7A	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	01	1	0	1	0	0	1
2A	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	01	1	0	0	1	0	1
5B	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	01	1	1	0	1	0	1
5D	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	00	0	1	0	1	0	0
1B	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	00	0	1	1	0	0	0
5A	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	00	1	0	0	1	0	1
7B	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	01	1	0	0	1	0	1
5C	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	00	1	1	0	1	1	0
6A	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	00	1	1	0	1	0	0
3A	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	01	1	1	0	1	1	0
	12	3	2	12	5	8	7	3	06	10	8	2	10	2	5

3.3. Relational Satisfaction

My interpretation of CBB theory is that frequent co-creation of content for a purpose within daily social interaction is an observable measure of relational satisfaction. Self-disclosure states that the purpose of sharing content is to realize social-attraction towards self. While CBB theory emphasizes frequency for relational satisfaction, self-disclosure literature specifies that frequency is a measure of interpersonal liking. So where there is interpersonal liking between communication actors, there is relational satisfaction. Content has a role in realizing liking and therefore relational satisfaction. Self-disclosure states that content of interaction which is perceived to be appropriate tends to increase liking for the sharer. Appropriate content has been operationalized as intimate content disseminated in face-to-face setting. RQ-B1. To what extent are relational satisfaction, liking, and appropriate content positively related?

I look both at information before application of action and at content after action is applied on it for incidence of intimate content that is also shared in a face-to-face setting. Data shows the following—

1. Before action is applied, two (2) 16.66 per cent of the conversations carried information that is characteristically intimate, and is shared in a face-to-face setting.

2. After application of action, three (3) 25.00 per cent of the conversations carried intimate content in a face-to-face setting.

	3C SD QT NI I INTIMATE	2A SB QT A PB PHYSICAL BEHAVIOUR	2B SB QT A MB MENTAL BEHAVIOUR	3C SD QT NI I INTIMATE	PRIVATE
2A	0	1	1	1	1
7B	0	1	0	1	1
3A	0	1	0	1	1
1A	1	1	1	0	1
5A	1	1	0	0	1
3B	0	1	1	0	1
5B	0	1	1	0	1
5D	0	1	0	0	1
5C	0	1	0	0	1
6A	0	1	0	0	1
7A	0	1	1	0	0
1B	0	1	0	0	0

To make meaning of data on the relation between appropriate content and frequency for its implication for liking and relational satisfaction, I look at evaluative content shared in face-to-face setting both before and after application of action. Data shows the following--

1. Before action is applied on information, two (2) 16.66 per cent of the conversations carried evaluative content, and were shared in face-to-face settings.

2. After application of action, five (5) 41.66 per cent of the conversations carried evaluative content and where shared in a face-to-face setting.

	PRIVATE	3B SD QT NI E EVALUATIVE
5D	1	1
5A	1	1
1A	1	0
2A	1	0
7B	1	0
3B	1	0
3A	1	0
5B	1	0
5C	1	0
6A	1	0
1B	0	1
7A	0	0

3B
SD QT NI E

	EVALUATIVE	PRIVATE
5D	1	1
1A	1	1
2A	1	1
7B	1	1
3B	1	1
1B	1	0
7A	1	0
5A	0	1
3A	0	1
5B	0	1
5C	0	1
6A	0	1

CBB theory qualifies relational satisfaction as frequent interaction with the same interaction partner; self-disclosure literature states that liking which I see as the latent variable of frequency is contingent on perceived appropriateness of content which is intimate and is shared in private. Data shows the following-- 1. Five (5) of the twelve (12) 41.66 per cent conversations in the data-set are shared between the diarist and a particular interaction partner (IP2). 2. Each of the remaining seven (7) conversations is shared with a different interaction partner. So, these five conversations with the same interaction partner fulfill the frequency condition for relational satisfaction as posit by CBB theory. But, self-disclosure sees frequency as a measure of liking; and appropriateness of content is a variable for liking. Here, data shows the following-- 1. Before application of action, two (2) 40.00 per cent of the conversations fulfill the appropriate content condition; two (2) 100.00 per cent of these conversations are with the same interaction partner (IP2). 2. After application of action, each of the three (3) conversations fulfilling the appropriateness criterion are had with a different interaction partner. One (1) 33.33 per cent of the conversations is had with IP2. 3. Before application of action, two (2) conversations share evaluative content in face-to-face setting. One (1) 50.00 per cent of these conversations is with iP2. 4. After application of action, five (5) conversations share evaluative content in face-to-face settings; three (3) 60.00 per cent of these are with the same interaction partner (IP2).

3.4. Co-create

I look at the criterion of co-creation of content of episode. Six (6) 50.00 per cent of the conversations are co-created by communication actors. Of these, three (3) 50.00 per cent of the conversations are with the same interaction partner (IP2). This finding further corroborates the frequency criterion.

3.5. Purposeful

Social interaction with a purpose is a condition for it to be an episode. Data shows the following-- 1. Eight (8) 66.66 per cent of the interactions are undertaken with a purpose. 2. In the sub-set of data, three (3) 60.00 of the five (5) conversations are undertaken with a purpose.

3.6. Daily Social Interaction Ten (10) 83.33 per cent of all conversations occur within daily social interaction of communication actors.

2. Three (3) 60.00 per cent of the five (5) conversations in the sub-set occur within daily social interactions.

Data is largely consistent with criteria of purpose, co-construction, and occurrence within daily social interaction set-out by CBB theory; and with the information as distinct from the nature of content condition as set-out in my definition of episode for a conversation to be considered an episode. Data is consistent also with the criteria of action, and of relational satisfaction. In the fourth and final section, I present the discussion of analysis and final remarks.

Section-4. Discussion

Before action is applied on information, the share of intimate content is 40.00 per cent in case of conversations with the same communication actor (IP2). 100.00 per cent of the conversations with IP2 are held in face-to-face settings. The conversations with IP2 are 41.66 per cent of all conversations that the diarist has had. Going by self-disclosure literature, data confirms the factor of appropriate content, which is a measure of liking. The frequency of interaction is a large enough percentage of the total amount of interaction. This leads me to seeing social-attraction between the communication actors; and, I interpret relational satisfaction between the communication actors as theorized by CBB theory. So while self-disclosure is not the dominant episode in the overall portfolio of everyday talk, it is the dominant episode in the portfolio of conversations with a specific communication actor.

But, the nature of content changes after action has been applied on information. The share of intimate content drops from 40.00 per cent to 20.00 per cent; this is closely aligned with the 25.00 per cent share that intimate content has in the overall portfolio of conversations. What happens to intimate content through application of action? Evaluative content holds the answer. From a share of 20.00 per cent before acting on information, evaluative content acquires a share of 60.00 per cent after action is applied on information. The mix of nature of content after application of action is--

Descriptive	Evaluative	Intimate
60	60	20

Descriptive content is 66.66 per cent in case of the overall data-set as compared to 60.00 per cent in case of the sub-set of data; evaluative content has a share of 58.33 per cent in the overall data-set as compared to 60.00 per cent in the sub-set of data; and, intimate content has a share of 25.00 per cent in the overall data-set as compared to 20.00 per cent in the sub-set of data. I compare the nature of content in the overall data-set both before and after action is applied and find the following-- The share of descriptive content reduces; the share of evaluative content increases; and, the share of intimate content increases.

	Descriptive
Before Action	100
After Action	66.66

It is evident that evaluative content plays the role of taming excesses both of descriptive and intimate content. Mental behaviours in particular are used for this purpose, specifically in case of the sub-set of five (5) conversations. Mental behaviours are applied in four (4) 80.00 per cent of the five (5) conversations, and this corresponds with the decrease in share of intimate content with a simultaneous increase in the share of evaluative content.

	Descriptive	Evaluative	Intimate	Physical Action	Mental Action	Descriptive	Evaluative	Intimate
Frequency (1A 2A 3B 5A 5B)	5	1	2	5	4	3	3	1
	100	20	40	100	80	60	60	20

I interpret this change as a need for moving the conversation from an exchange largely of intimate content to a conversation that is more balanced in the nature of content and is characteristically evaluative of incumbent information. Can this reduction of intimate content and therefore the pruning of the share of appropriate content be interpreted as weakening of liking between communication actors? The high frequencies of face-to-face setting and the frequency of interaction do not support drawing this interpretation. What episode realizes from the combination of characteristics that data has thrown-up is specified by neither CBB theory nor self-disclosure literature. This is a research gap for future studies to look at.

I now move from the fine grain view to a coarse grain discussion of data. Descriptive content is basis for social interaction. Intimate content is like salt; its share in the overall composition of social interaction remains low. Evaluative content fights for share in social interaction; when mental behaviours are applied in combination with physical behaviours, evaluative content takes away the lion's share of content. A broad ratio of the share of descriptive and evaluative content is 60:40, with intimate content making way into conversation off-and-on. Conversations almost always occur within daily social interaction; tend to be purposeful in two out of every three instances; and, tend to be co-created one in every two cases. Going by CBB theory's view of frequency of interaction, there is relational satisfaction between communication actors in the sub-set; but given the small incidence of intimate content, it is evident that liking as defined by self-disclosure is not the purpose of social interaction. This combination of content, action, frequency, setting, and communication actor leads me to visualizing social interaction as follows-- communication actors frequently share descriptive content in face-to-face settings of daily social interaction; habitually evaluate descriptive content to co-create meaning of it for an identified purpose that underlies relational satisfaction; and, occasionally share intimate content that regularly generates liking which may accentuate relational satisfaction.

Findings of the study confirm CBB theory's conceptualization of episode as a form of everyday talk. The current study sought to describe conversation data along tenets of self-disclosure. Findings from the data-set are not consistent with the definition of self-disclosure; But, findings from the sub-set of data of the five conversations between particular communication actors are consistent with the operationalization of liking. Future research may look at episode/s that foreground evaluative content shared in face-to-face settings and apply a combination of physical and mental behaviours on this content. The study highlights the influence of action that is a combination of physical and mental behaviours on appropriate content.

References

Duke, J. (2012). Joining the dots: Piloting the work diary as a data collection tool. *Issues in Educational Research, 22*(2). Retrieved May 2020

Dunbar, R., Marriott, A., & Duncan. (1997). Human conversational behavior. *Human Nature, 8*, 231-46. Retrieved May 2020

Eder, D., & Enke, J. (1991). The structure of gossip: Opportunities and constraints on collective expression among adolescents. *American Sociological Review, 56*, 494-56. Retrieved May 2020

Foster, E. K. (2004). Research on Gossip: Taxonomy, Methods, and Future Directions. *Review of General Psychology, 8*(2), 78-99. Retrieved May 2020

Hall, J. A., & Davis, D. A. (2017). Proposing the Communicate Bond Belong Theory: Evolutionary Intersections with Episodic Interpersonal Communication. Retrieved Oct. 2019

Levin, J., & Arluke, A. (1987). In J. Levin, & A. Arluke, *Gossip: The inside scoop.* New York: Clenum.

McCormick, N. B., & McCormick, J. W. (1992). Computer friends and foes: Content of undergraduates' electronic mail. *Computers and Human Behaviour, 8*, 379-405. Retrieved May 2020

Mettetal, G. W. (1982). The conversations of female friends at three ages: The importance of fantasy, gossip, and self-disclosure. Urbana, USA: University of Illinois. Retrieved May 2020

Nicolopoulou, A. (1997). *Worldmaking and identity formation in children's narrative play-acting.* (C. Lightfoot, & B. Cox, Eds.) NJ: Hillsdale. Retrieved May 2020

Planalp, S. (1993). Friends' and acquaintances' conversations II: Coded differences. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 10*, 339-50. Retrieved May 2020

Ruoyun, L., & Utza, S. (2017). Self-disclosure on SNS: Do disclosure intimacy and narrativity influence interpersonal closeness and Social Attraction? *Computers in Human Behaviour, 70*, 426-36. Retrieved Apr. 2020

Surana, S. (2020B). Social Curiosity as an Episode in Everyday Talk-- A Descriptive Study (Unpublished).

Surana, S. (2020C). Gossip as an Episode in Everyday Talk-- A Descriptive Study (Unpublished).