

# Self-disclosure in the Work Environment: Quantitative and Qualitative Individual Differences

Drs. A.M. de Meij

Free University, Department of Work and Organizational Psychology, Van der  
Boechorststraat 1, 1081 BT Amsterdam, [AM.de.Meij@psy.vu.nl](mailto:AM.de.Meij@psy.vu.nl)

Dr. H. Kelderman

Free University, Department of Work and Organizational Psychology, Van der  
Boechorststraat 1, 1081 BT Amsterdam, [H.Kelderman@psy.vu.nl](mailto:H.Kelderman@psy.vu.nl)

Prof. dr. H. van der Flier

Free University, Department of Work and Organizational Psychology, Van der  
Boechorststraat 1, 1081 BT Amsterdam, [H.van.der.Flier@psy.vu.nl](mailto:H.van.der.Flier@psy.vu.nl)

**Keywords:** Latent-trait latent-class analysis, Self-disclosure, Mixture Measurement Models

## Abstract

This abstract provides an outline of the research determining quantitative and qualitative differences in self-disclosure between subjects. The manifest variables used in the analyses were four variables measuring exposure towards different groups of people (employee, colleague, superior and customer), and extraversion, used as a collateral variable. Responding differently on the exposure variables would indicate selectivity in the choice to whom one will self-disclose. Latent-trait latent-class analysis (Rost, 1988; Kelderman & Macready, 2000; Vermunt, 1997) is used to determine the patterns in the scores. The quantitative latent variable describes the degree of self-disclosure and the qualitative latent variable describes groups of people with different patterns in their self-disclosure. All analyses were performed with the program LEM (Vermunt, 1997). The results show that a model with one quantitative latent variable and one qualitative latent variable with three categories, fits best to the data. There was a non-decreasing association between measured self-disclosure and the quantitative latent variable. Each category is characterized by its scoring-patterns. It is concluded that there are subgroups of subjects that differ in their pattern of self-disclosure, which could be interpreted in terms of selectivity in self-disclosure. The relations between extraversion and both latent variables, were significant.

## References

- Kelderman, H., & Macready, G.B. (1990). The use of loglinear models for assessing differential item functioning across manifest and latent examinee groups. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 27, 307-327.
- Rost, J. (1988). Test theory with qualitative and quantitative latent variables. In R. Langeheine & J. Rost (Ed.), *Latent Trait and Latent Class Models* (pp.147-171). New York: Plenum.
- Vermunt, J.K. (1997). *LEM: a general program for the analysis of categorical data [Computer program]*. Tilburg: Tilburg University}.