



University of Tennessee, Knoxville

TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange

Doctoral Dissertations

Graduate School

8-2014

Site Supervisor Self-disclosure: A Shared Experience

Jeffrey R. Sweeney

University of Tennessee - Knoxville, jsweene1@utk.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss



Part of the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sweeney, Jeffrey R., "Site Supervisor Self-disclosure: A Shared Experience. " PhD diss., University of Tennessee, 2014.

https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/2865

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Jeffrey R. Sweeney entitled "Site Supervisor Self-disclosure: A Shared Experience." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Counselor Education.

Marianne Woodside, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Joel Diambra, Norma Mertz, Tricia McClam

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

Site Supervisor Self-disclosure: A Shared Experience

A Dissertation Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Jeffrey R. Sweeney

August 2014

Copyright © 2014 by Jeffrey R. Sweeney
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To my wife, Kelley, you gave me the unwavering love and faith to assure me that nothing but a successful result was even possible;

To my parents, Gail and Tommy, and my mother-in-law and father-in-law, Diane and Walter, you gave me the support and encouragement that provided daily motivation;

To my mentors Coach Marvin Martin, Dr. Dick Pelley, and Dr. Marianne Woodside, you gave me the tools to become a life-long learner and a conscientious professional;

To my dissertation committee, Dr. Woodside, Dr. Tricia McClam, Dr. Joel Diambra, and Dr. Norma Mertz, you gave me your ideas for this work and your commitment to see it through;

To the counselor education faculty, Dr. Woodside, Dr. McClam, Dr. Diambra, Dr. Robert Kronick, Dr. Melinda Gibbons, former faculty Dr. Marla Peterson, and the late Dr. Charles Thompson, you gave me the opportunity to pursue and the inspiration to finish;

And, to the countless other family, friends, and teachers who have influenced my educational and professional journey;

Thank you.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to the memory of my late grandparents, R.W. Sweeney, Jr. and Mary Elizabeth “Betty” Sweeney. The love, care, and time they devoted to me during my youth shaped my character to this day. The encouragement and interest they provided throughout my early adulthood provided motivation through the most difficult and stressful circumstances of my journey. My grandma cemented the importance of education in my mind from my earliest experiences. I miss them both every day and consider myself among the most fortunate to have so many memories of shared experience with them.

ABSTRACT

This study examined supervisor and supervisee perceptions of the purpose for using supervisor self-disclosure as an intervention in the counseling supervision process while also looking at supervisor and supervisee perceptions of the effects these disclosures have on the supervisee. The participants in this study were school counseling site supervisors and their supervisees enrolled in internship in school counseling at a CACREP accredited land-grant university in the southeastern United States. This study employed a collective case study design using multiple cases as sources for investigating the perspectives of both members of the supervisory dyad regarding the shared experience of a supervisor self-disclosure statement. Qualitative data analysis procedures provided a means for understanding participants' perspectives. Relevant findings from the research included a common description of self-disclosure among participants and congruent perspectives between supervisors and supervisees sharing the same supervisor self-disclosure (SRSD) experience regarding the intended purpose and perceived effect of the SRSD. The researcher discussed implications for counselor education and for future research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter Introduction	1
Theoretical Framework	3
Research on Self-disclosure and Supervision	5
Statement of the Problem	9
Purpose of the Study	9
Research Questions	9
Definition of Terms	10
Delimitations	11
Limitations	12
Significance of the Study	12
Organization of the Study	13
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	14
Chapter Introduction	14
Working Alliance	15
Self-disclosure	36
Paired Perceptions in Counseling and Supervision	48
Site Supervision for School Counseling Supervisees	58
Chapter Summary	62
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	67
Chapter Introduction	67
Qualitative Methods	68

Participants.....	78
Data Collection	79
Data Analysis	86
Chapter Summary	94
CHAPTER 4: DATA PRESENTATION	96
Chapter Introduction	96
Case-By-Case Analysis.....	96
Cross-Case Analysis	171
Chapter Summary	182
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	184
Chapter Introduction	184
Summary of the Study	185
Limitations	185
Discussion of Research Questions and Supervisory Working Alliance ..	186
Researcher Reflections.....	210
Implications for Counselor Education	213
Considerations for Future Research.....	216
Chapter Summary	218
REFERENCES	219
APPENDICES	239
Appendix A: Open-ended Survey on Participant Perceptions	246
Appendix B: Supervisee Demographic Questionnaire	248
Appendix C: Supervisor Demographic Questionnaire	249

VITA.....	250
-----------	-----

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Case One Summary	115
Table 2: Case Two Summary.....	134
Table 3: Case Three Summary.....	151
Table 4: Case Four Summary	170
Table 5: Cross-case Summary	182
Table A1: Summary of Research Using Supervisory Working Alliance Assessment Instruments.....	240
Table A2: Analysis of Partial Transcript and Survey Data.....	241
Table A3: Descriptive Categories for Case One Survey Responses.....	242
Table A4: Descriptive Categories for Case Two Survey Responses	243
Table A5: Descriptive Categories for Case Three Survey Responses	244
Table A6: Descriptive Categories for Case Four Survey Responses.....	245

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Chapter Introduction

Clinical supervision is a counselor training process used to enhance the development of attitudes and skills conducive to the practice of counseling (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). An essential feature of the clinical supervision process (henceforth referred to as supervision) is the relationship between the supervisee and the supervisor commonly referred to as the supervisory relationship (Campbell, 2006). Supervisors may use a variety of techniques to build an effective supervisory relationship including self-disclosure (Haynes, Corey, & Moulton, 2003). This study focuses on supervisor self-disclosure within the context of the supervisory relationship. This chapter introduces the concept of self-disclosure along with its context in counseling and supervision, provides a theoretical framework for understanding current research on self-disclosure, describes the related literature on the topic, highlights significant needs for additional research, and outlines the purpose and significance of the current study.

Chaikin and Derlega (1974) succinctly defined self-disclosure as the revelation of personal information about one's self. Though not always verbal and not always overt, Goffman (1959) described self-disclosure as a component of basic human interaction. To explain the basic need for self-disclosure, Jourard (1971) suggested an optimal level of self-disclosure as necessary for healthy psychological adjustment and the development of intimate relationships; highlighting the premise that the process of disclosing allows one to better know the self and to be known by others.

In a therapeutic context, self-disclosure by a client to a therapist satisfies Jourard's hypothesis of encouraging healthy psychological adjustment. In addition, self-

disclosure provides the counselor information about the client and his or her perspective on context, issues, and challenges within a therapeutic setting (Corey & Corey, 2011). A counselor's understanding of the client's perspective facilitates the counseling process (Cochran & Cochran, 2011).

Likewise, a parallel exists in the context of counseling supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). Self-disclosure by a supervisee to a supervisor appears necessary for the supervisee to reflect on the self as a developing professional counselor including issues, challenges, and perspectives faced when dealing with clients (Farber, 2006). Farber also explained that this self-disclosure by the supervisee, in addition to supervisor observations, provides the supervisor with information about the supervisee and his or her clients for the purposes of evaluation. A supervisor's understanding of the supervisee's conceptualization of client issues facilitates the supervision process (Borders & Brown, 2005).

As research on the topic expands, the term self-disclosure represents a multifaceted type of communication within the context of counseling and counseling supervision (Farber, 2003). In the *therapeutic relationship*, both clients and counselors self-disclose. Clients disclose thoughts, feelings, and behaviors to their therapists for the purpose of gaining new perspectives and achieving personal growth (Farber, 2003). Therapists self-disclose to clients as an intervention, in part, to normalize client experience and model the behavior of self-disclosure (Edwards & Murdock, 1994; Hill, Mahalik & Thompson, 1989; Knox, Hess, Petersen, & Hill, 1997). In the *supervisory relationship*, the use of self-disclosure appears isomorphic to the counseling relationship (Farber, 2006). Supervisees, like clients, self-disclose to their supervisors in an effort to

gain insight into their work with clients and to grow as a therapist (Duan & Roehlke, 2001; Yourman, 2003). Supervisors, like therapists, self-disclose to supervisees as an intervention, in part, to normalize supervisee experience, encourage supervisees to disclose, and strengthen the emotional bond between supervisor and supervisee known to be part of the supervisory working alliance (Knox, Burkard, Edwards, Smith, & Schlosser, 2008; Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999). The roles within the therapeutic and supervisory relationships provide a variety of perspectives for exploring the dynamic of self-disclosure.

Theoretical Framework

In an effort to explain how the cohesion develops between client and therapist or supervisee and supervisor, Bordin used a therapeutic working alliance model to outline how therapists and clients work together for change (1979) and then adapted the model to explain how supervisors and supervisees work together for change (1983). Bordin suggested three components comprise the supervisory relationship: agreement on goals of supervision; agreement on tasks of supervision; and an emotional bond between supervisee and supervisor (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009).

Agreement on goals of supervision refers to goals for expected change on part of the supervisee. The level of mutual understanding between the supervisor and the supervisee regarding some combination of thought, feeling, and/or behavior change that may enhance supervisee development can determine the strength of the working alliance (Bordin, 1983). In supervision, goals could be set for supervisee development and the supervision experience. For example, a supervisor and school counseling supervisee agree to set a goal for the supervisee to use knowledge of learning styles to positively

influence school performance of students (Studer, 2006). Agreement to demonstrate developmentally appropriate levels of motivation and responsibility for the work of supervision that leads to learning and growth exemplifies another potential goal established between the supervisor and supervisee (Woodside & McClam, 2006). Clear, direct communication about the goals related to the supervision experience allows the supervisee to understand objectives that lead to success (Campbell, 2006).

Agreement on *tasks of supervision* refers to a component of the working alliance that also must incorporate some level of mutual understanding between the supervisor and supervisee (Bordin, 1983). Specifically, these *tasks* include activities and exercises for the personal development and awareness of the supervisee, practice with specific interventions related to a theoretical perspective, or demonstration of interpersonal skills necessary to facilitate positive relationships with clients (Borders & Brown, 2005).

Continuing the examples described in the previous paragraph, an agreed upon task for the goal of using knowledge of learning styles to positively influence school performance could be to administer and interpret a learning styles inventory (Studer, 2006). In the other example, the supervisor and supervisee agree to complete the task of writing a contract describing expectations for the schedule and format of individual or group supervision (Woodside & McClam, 2006). For agreement to exist, the supervisee must understand the connection of the tasks to the likelihood of achieving the goals.

Additionally, the supervisor must identify tasks the supervisee has the capacity to perform in order for the tasks of supervision to enhance the working alliance (Bordin, 1983).

The *emotional bond between supervisee and supervisor* “will center around the feelings of liking, caring, and trusting that the participants share” (Bordin, 1983, p. 36). These relational bonds develop from efforts to achieve a common goal or the occurrence of sharing an emotional experience (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). Campbell 2006 highlighted the importance of the supervisor’s relationship skills to communicate understanding and respect as integral to building the necessary level of trust. Campbell also described the benefits of this trust to include supervisee openness to feedback and willingness to take risks with developing new behaviors. These characteristics of the supervisory relationship correlate with effective supervision (Muse-Burke, Ladany, & Deck, 2001).

Research on Self- Disclosure and Supervision

Through the past two decades, research focused exclusively on supervisor self-disclosure (SRSD) as an intervention received some attention (Ladany & Walker, 2003). Ladany and Lehrman-waterman (1999) found that supervisors who self-disclose more frequently strengthen the emotional bond, one component of the supervisory working alliance (Bordin, 1979), between the supervisee and supervisor. They also posited that increased SRSD may lead to reciprocal disclosures on the part of the supervisees. Ladany, Walker, and Melincoff (2001) likewise reported that SRSD was a method for expressing a supervisor’s emotional openness to a supervisee. In such a supervisory relationship, the supervisor may self-disclose in an effort to normalize a supervisee’s experience or share process comments and immediate reactions to the supervisee’s performance. Knox et al. (2008) found that enhancing the relationship and modeling self-disclosure represented two reasons that supervisors engaged in SRSD with supervisees.

These research results highlight the uses of SRSD as a technique for improving the supervision experience.

Research on SRSD focuses on the content and frequency of SRSD (Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999), the relationship among supervisory style, supervisory working alliance, and SRSD (Ladany et al., 2001), and the effects of SRSD on supervisees (Knox et al., 2008). These studies serve to define SRSD in the professional literature and provide a basis from which new research on the topic may serve to inform counselor educators and counseling supervisors about the use of SRSD as an intervention in supervision.

Researchers studying SRSD collected data on the perceptions of one member of the supervisory dyad by asking either the supervisees or supervisors to respond with their perceptions regarding SRSD and the supervisory relationship. Although these studies examined the frequency, content, and purpose of SRSD, they do not examine these perceptions from the perspective of a supervisor and supervisee as members of the same supervisory relationship, sharing the same experiences. One study by Hill et al. (1989) explored the perceptions of a client and a therapist as members of the same therapeutic relationship. In this instance, the participants in counseling relationships used brief therapy with anxious or depressed clients. Hill et al. (1989) found positive effects of therapist self-disclosure reported by both the therapist and the client, although the therapist used self-disclosure infrequently. This research by Hill et al. (1989) highlights the potential relevance of investigating perspectives of both members of a dyadic relationship.

Although these studies suggest some congruence in their findings, several aspects of SRSD merit further exploration. First, the current literature reports findings from either the perspective of the supervisee (Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999) *or* the supervisor (Knox et al., 2008; Ladany et al., 2001). However, no attempt assessed the experience of SRSD from the perspectives of both members (supervisor and supervisee) of the same supervisory relationship. Hill et al. (1989) completed a study on therapist self-disclosure in which both members of a therapeutic relationship provided responses related to the perceived level of the client's involvement in therapy and the helpfulness of specific therapist self-disclosures. This study did not explore self-disclosure as a supervisory intervention. The absence of an attempt to explore the common and or discrepant perceptions of both members of a supervisory relationship regarding a shared experience of a SRSD represents a significant limitation in the literature. Research exploring feedback on specific SRSDs from the perspectives of both members of the supervision dyad could provide some indication of the effectiveness of the technique in a supervisory setting (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009).

Second, the data gathering procedures in these studies (Knox et al., 2008; Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999; Ladany et al., 2001) also merit additional consideration. Specifically, the post hoc designs of these three studies asked participants to reflect on memorable experiences of SRSD within current or recent supervision relationships as long as two years past. Unlike the studies on self-disclosure in counseling supervision that depend upon long-term participant recall, the Hill et al. (1989) study used a procedure involving video tape review in an attempt to gather feedback on the experiences of specific therapist self-disclosures that shared by both members of the

therapeutic relationship within a current therapeutic context. Video tape review is a common strategy for enhancing reflective thinking in counselor education (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Haynes et al., 2003; Griffith & Frieden, 2000). By providing “maximum cues for reliving the experience,” (Kagan, Krathwohl, & Miller, 1963, p. 237) participants using this procedure may better recall specific reactions to events in recent therapy or supervision interactions. Researchers may enhance the accuracy of reporting reactions to SRSD by both members of the supervision relationship by using techniques for enhanced recall of recent supervision sessions within current supervision dynamics (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009).

Third, while the participant groups in these studies (Knox et al., 2008; Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999; Ladany et al., 2001) potentially included some master’s level supervisees and some master’s level supervisors, researchers made no effort to distinguish any results characteristic of these particular subgroups of supervisees and supervisors. In fact, most supervisor participants included licensed psychologists and other doctoral level clinicians with advanced training and experience in counseling supervision (Knox et al., 2008; Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999; Ladany et al., 2001). In the literature on self-disclosure, few studies focus on any particular characteristic of supervisors or supervisees. Exceptions include a study by Duan and Roehlke (2001) that explored self-disclosure in supervision based on cross-racial supervisory relationships, investigating the impact of race and ethnicity on relationship dynamics in supervision. In addition, studies of therapist self-disclosure focused on characteristics of client perceptions related to the therapeutic contexts of brief (Hill et al., 1989) and long-term therapy (Knox et al., 1997). Supervisors formally trained at the

master's level, like school counseling site supervisors, may understand and initiate the use of an intervention like SRSD in a qualitatively different way than licensed psychologists or other PhD level supervisors (Studer, 2006).

Statement of the Problem

Due to the minimal attention given to SRSD over the last decade, a paucity of research exists specific to the use of SRSD as an intervention in supervision conducted by specific populations of supervisors with limited training in supervision, such as school counseling site supervisors. Additionally, the procedures used to solicit data on SRSD lack the immediacy that would enhance accuracy of recall and provide an opportunity to gain insight from both members of the supervisory dyad reflecting upon the same supervisory experience.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to explore and describe perceptions of a SRSD experience shared between a counseling supervisor and supervisee within the context of school counseling site supervision. Furthermore, this study explores characteristics of SRSD specific to supervisory relationships in which the supervisor lacks doctoral level training as a clinician or supervisor. In addition, the qualitative research design, methods, and data collection procedures outlined in this study expand the use of case study to explore the specific phenomenon of SRSD in the context of school counseling supervision.

Research Questions

The research questions focus on exploring the congruence between supervisor and supervisee regarding specific aspects of the experience of SRSD.

1. How do the school counseling site supervisor and the school counseling supervisee conceptualize and describe self-disclosure?
2. How do the school counseling site supervisor and the school counseling supervisee describe the intended purpose of a shared SRSD experience?
3. How do the school counseling site supervisor and the school counseling supervisee describe the perceived effect(s) of a shared SRSD experience?

Definition of Terms

Supervisor self-disclosure requires a role (supervisor or supervisee), process (supervision), and specific action (self-disclosure). Beyond the basic understanding of these concepts, this study necessitates some explanation for their application in the common settings of school counseling. This section defines several key terms related to the context of the study.

Self-disclosure – the revelation of personal information about one’s self (Chaikin & Derlega, 1974).

Supervision – a process whereby a senior member of the profession observes and evaluates a less experienced member of the profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009).

Supervisor – a trained and experienced professional possessing the competence to facilitate professional development (Haynes et al., 2003).

School Counseling Site Supervisor – the school based supervisor required to be a practicing school counselor with professional credentials and a minimum of 2 years of experience as a school counselor. Accreditation guidelines require individual training in supervision (CACREP, 2009).

Supervisee – a counseling student enrolled in a required practicum or internship course designed to incorporate formal education into practical experience (Studer, 2006).

Supervisory relationship – the dynamic of two people engaged in the process of supervision modified by the demands of various contexts and personal attributes (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009).

Supervisory working alliance – a collaborative, developing relationship between a supervisor and supervisee related to their agreement on the goals necessary for change, the tasks assigned in supervision necessary for goal attainment, and shared feelings of liking, caring, and trust (Bordin, 1983).

Participant congruence – the degree to which the responses reflect common descriptive categories for the individual participant across the survey questions (Prout & Wadkins, 2014).

Dyad congruence – the degree to which the responses reflect common descriptive categories among the supervision dyad members across the survey questions (Retrum, Nowels, & Bekelman, 2013).

Supervisor self-disclosure (SRSD) – information disclosed by a supervisor to a supervisee regarding the supervisor's own successes or struggles, similar or dissimilar training experiences, and/or in the moment reactions to clients or supervisees (Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999).

Delimitations

The delimitations inherent in this study include the select group of participants chosen and the concept under investigation. School counseling site supervisors paired with internship students from a Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related

Educational Programs accredited land-grant university in the southeastern United States serve as participants in this study. While the focus of the study remains on SRSD, the research excludes any examination of client disclosure or supervisee disclosure as well as the phenomenon of non-disclosure (Farber, 2006).

Limitations

The current study incurs limitations inherent in the nature of qualitative research design. In this type of research, the detailed examination of specific cases prevents generalization of the results to larger populations (Yin, 2003). In addition, the researcher must analyze and interpret qualitative data collected from open-ended surveys. This process introduces the possibility for personal bias at various points in the research, potentially increasing the likelihood of skewed results and erroneous conclusions (Merriam, 1998).

To combat these limitations, however, the researcher uses several strategies to increase the trustworthiness of the findings in this study. The collective case study design allows for the collection and triangulation of multiple sets of data from multiple participants (Yin, 2003). Data collected from transcripts and open-ended self-report surveys enables the rich, thick description expected of qualitative research (Creswell, 2009). Finally, member checking permits the reporting of results and conclusions in a manner consistent with participant voice and understanding (Creswell, 2009).

Significance of the Study

An exploration of the SRSDs used by school counseling site supervisors provides information about the purpose and intention of site supervisors using the intervention and the perceived impact of the intervention on counseling supervisees. This study also

provides information to assist counselor educators in the CACREP required training of site supervisors. Additionally, counselor educators may be able to better prepare counselors-in-training for the experience of site supervision.

Organization of the Study

The present study follows a five-chapter format. Chapter One contains a complete overview of the study. Chapter Two includes a review of the relevant literature related to self-disclosure, SRSD, counseling supervision, the supervisory relationship, and school counseling site supervision. Chapter Three discusses the methodological considerations inherent in the case study design presented here, as well as considerations for open-ended surveys and online data submission practices. At this point, the discussion also elaborates on the data analysis procedures used to make sense of the information collected from participants. Chapter Four presents the findings from the study. Finally, Chapter Five relates the findings to the existing body of literature on self-disclosure and counseling supervision. Additionally, Chapter Five outlines the implications of this research for counselor training and future research.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter Introduction

In 2006, the American Psychological Association defined *evidence-based practice* as “the integration of the best available research with clinical experience in the context of patient characteristics, culture, and preferences” (p. 282). The group concluded:

Many strategies for working with patients have emerged and been refined through the kinds of trial and error and clinical hypothesis generation and testing that constitute the most scientific aspect of clinical practice. Yet clinical hypothesis testing has its limits, hence the need to integrate clinical expertise with the best available research. (p.282)

Though many theoretical models of counseling and psychotherapy produce positive results in clients (Pope & Wedding, 2008), other factors related to therapeutic interaction also account for a portion of the beneficial changes experienced by clients (Barlow, 2004). According to Norcross (2002), in an effort to account for a greater portion of the variance, researchers devoted a significant amount of time and effort to the study of the interpersonal dynamics between the client and therapist. As a result, Bordin (1979) developed a model for the therapeutic relationship known as the *therapeutic working alliance*.

Research focused on the supervision process parallels the empirical study of the therapeutic process. Overlaps between therapeutic counseling and supervision include theoretical models (Campbell, 2006), therapeutic interventions (Borders & Brown, 2005), and relationship dynamics (Doehrman, 1976). Bordin (1983) applied his concept of the

therapeutic working alliance to supervision. The *supervisory working alliance* addresses, in part, the relational aspects of the supervisor and supervisee interaction. In addition, the examination of the therapeutic intervention of therapist self-disclosure parallels research in supervision (Farber, 2006). Supervisor self-disclosure (SRSD) as an intervention in supervision maintains a discernible influence on the supervisory working alliance (Ladany et al., 2001; Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999). Self-disclosure, as one aspect of the supervisory relationship, is the focus of this study and this review of the literature.

This chapter reviews the literature relevant to the use of self-disclosure by a supervisor in the process of supervision and the relationship these SRSDs may have to the supervisory working alliance. Four sections comprise this chapter. The initial section introduces the concept of the working alliance and its application to therapy before focusing on a significant aspect of the relationship between the supervisor and supervisee, known as the supervisory working alliance. The second section introduces the concept of self-disclosure and briefly describes research related to therapist self-disclosure before presenting details from the research related to the use of self-disclosure in counseling supervision with an emphasis on its use by the supervisor. The third section highlights research attempting to capture perceptions of shared events in therapy and supervision. The final section describes the specific context of this research, school counseling site supervision.

Working Alliance

The concept of a working alliance, like many other psychological constructs, originated in the analytic perspective of psychotherapy (Greenson, 1967). Knowledge of the origin, context, and components of the working alliance contribute to a clearer

understanding of this concept. Early discussions of the working alliance (Dubin & Rabin, 1969) described the concept synonymously with rapport, working relationships, and positive transference. Dubin and Rabin (1969) clearly distinguished the working alliance from positive transference. “The working alliance consists of cooperative, progressive, observing, rational, synthesizing, and communicative activities” (p. 696). While transference reactions are always inappropriate, the term *positive* refers to direction. Positive transference reactions “draw the patient toward the therapist” (p. 697). Greenson (1967) made another important distinction between the working alliance and transference. While transference reactions between a therapist and client can influence the working alliance, they originate from a completely separate relationship. The working alliance originates from the realistic and appropriate relationship between patient and therapist (Dubin & Rabin, 1969).

With a working alliance concept developing around the notion of rapport, integration, and mutually agreed upon goals, practitioners still question how much of themselves to reveal to the client. Martin Buber (1958) used the therapeutic relationship as an example of one that cannot develop full mutuality. He suggested the therapist limit the revelation of personal information if the client-counselor relationship is to retain the characteristics of an *I-Thou* relationship. In summary, the notion of the working alliance expanded the therapeutic relationship beyond the concepts of rapport, transference, and countertransference.

Therapeutic Working Alliance

As counselors and therapists looked beyond the ideas of rapport and transference to consider the impact of the therapist-client relationship, new models describing the

therapeutic relationship emerged in the literature. After identifying working alliances in a variety of relationships (student-teacher, parent-child, and therapist-client), Bordin (1979) synthesized the work of several contributors to the psychoanalytic literature (Sterba, 1934; Menninger, 1958; Zetzel, 1956; Greenson, 1967) in his conceptualization of a *therapeutic working alliance*. He highlighted the unique factors of the working alliance in therapy. According to Bordin, the therapeutic working alliance encompasses three dynamic features of the interactions between therapist and client: agreement on goals of therapy, selection of tasks necessary to pursue these goals, and the development of relational bonds between the counselor and the client.

Goals. As outlined by Bordin (1979), the views of therapeutic treatment, no matter the theoretical orientation, assume the client somehow contributes to his or her own unhappiness. Therefore, an imperative exists for an agreement on goals for therapy that result in reducing the client's own contribution to that unhappiness. The specific goals vary greatly depending on the theoretical orientation of the therapist and the individual needs of the client.

Tasks. All therapeutic endeavors attempt to bring about change in the thoughts, feelings, or behaviors of clients (Corsini, 2008). As presented by Bordin (1979), the accomplishment of specific tasks required for change relate directly to the theoretical orientation of the therapist. Collaboration related to tasks requires a level of agreement between the therapist and the client about the tasks necessary in therapy and how the accomplishment of those tasks leads to change or goal attainment.

Bonds. Bordin's (1979) description of the relational bond feature of the therapeutic working alliance used terms such as liking, trust, and attachment. These

bonds vary significantly according to the theoretical approach used in therapy. For example, an analytic therapy relationship requires a deep trust developed over weeks or even years of sharing the client's innermost experiences.

Strain. Finally, Bordin (1994) emphasized his concept of strain in the therapeutic working alliance. A strain (break or rupture) in the working alliance represents a "significant deviation in the patient's commitment to the working alliance, whether it is with regard to goals, tasks, or bonds" (p. 18). These strains often parallel the client's difficulties outside of the relationship. Therefore, the rupture and repair cycle of the therapeutic working alliance present opportunities for the therapist to facilitate change by connecting self-defeating character in the alliance with the change goal (Safran & Muran, 2000).

In summary, Bordin (1979, 1983, & 1994) constructed a theoretical model of the working alliance around the concepts of goals, tasks, and bonds. This relationship model distinguished the client-therapist relationship from basic analysis of rapport building, transference, and countertransference. The working alliance model refined how this relationship contributed to therapeutic outcomes. Considering the potential of the working alliance to affect therapeutic endeavors, researchers and practitioners explored ways to assess and quantify this construct.

Working Alliance Inventory

Horvath and Greenberg (1989) attempted to quantify the therapeutic working alliance with the development of the Working Alliance Inventory (WAI). The WAI instrument collects self-reported responses designed to gather the counselor's and the client's perceptions regarding the therapeutic working alliance during counseling

(Horvath & Greenberg, 1989). The WAI contains parallel forms for both counselors and clients and consists of three scales (goals, tasks, and bonds), each with twelve items designed to reflect the level of congruence between the counselor and the client (Al-Darmaki & Kivlighan, 1993).

Kokotovic and Tracey (1990) established reliability estimates for the WAI between .88 and .93 for all three scales across both versions of the instrument. To establish validity for the measure, WAI ratings correlated with counseling outcome (Horvath & Greenberg, 1989), client characteristics (Kokotovic & Tracey, 1990), counselor technical activity (Kivlighan, 1990; Kivlighan & Schmitz, 1992), and client-counselor expectations for relationship (Al-Darmaki & Kivlighan, 1993). The working alliance originated in the context of therapeutic counseling. As stated earlier, the concept of the therapeutic working alliance quickly found a parallel in the supervisory relationship.

Supervisory Working Alliance

The next step in the evolution of the working alliance concept became its application to counseling supervision (Bordin, 1983). The aspects of the *supervisory working alliance* reflect the same aspects considered in the therapeutic working alliance. The strength of the alliance depends on the mutual agreement of the supervisor and supervisee on *goals* necessary for change, growth, and development. According to Bordin, the supervisor and supervisee must also share a common understanding of the *tasks* assigned in supervision necessary for goal attainment. Additionally, the mutual feelings of liking, caring, and trusting that develop in “a collaborative enterprise for change” establish the relational *bonds* between the supervisor and supervisee. Bordin

(1983) identified the three major components of the working alliance (goals, tasks, and bonds) when adapting the framework to the relationship between a supervisor and supervisee. The author omitted any specific discussion on *strain*. However, Bordin discussed a set of supervision goals addressing difficulties in the client-supervisee dynamic that parallel personal obstacles for the supervisee. Additionally, in the evaluation of supervision, Bordin mentioned reviewing “our sense of accomplishment, our identifications of how we worked together, our satisfactions, dissatisfactions and identifications of any obstacles in our alliance that we could not overcome.” (p. 40).

The remainder of this section includes a review of the development of instrumentation for measuring the supervisory working alliance, use of this instrumentation to assess the supervisory working alliance’s correlation to other phenomena, and finally, use of this instrumentation in assessing the supervisory working alliance’s correlation with SRSD. For a summary view, please see Table A1.

Development of Supervisory Working Alliance Instrumentation

With the concept of the working alliance applied to counseling supervision, researchers turned their attention to the development of quantitative instruments for assessing the supervisory working alliance. Efstation et al. (1990), Bahrnick (1989), and Baker (1990) all attempted to establish a reliable, valid measure of the supervisory working alliance. These researchers constructed their instruments based on the work of Horvath and Greenberg (1989). Horvath and Greenberg developed the WAI to assess the therapeutic working alliance from the perspectives of both the therapist and the client.

Efstation et al. (1990) created an assessment with the understanding that the supervisory working alliance “consists of a set of identifiable activities or tasks

performed by each participant in the relationship” (p. 323). To confirm these ideas, the researchers asked 10 experienced supervisors to list activities for both supervisors and supervisees in the supervision process. Efstation et al. (1990) coupled the supervisor’s ideas with additional ideas of their research team to create 30 supervisor items and 30 supervisee items on a seven point Likert-type format ranging from *almost never* (1) to *almost always* (7).

In their primary study developing the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI), Efstation et al. (1990) collected data from 185 supervisors and 178 supervisees. The data collected consisted of supervisor and supervisee responses to the SWAI and the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI; Friedlander & Ward, 1984). Supervisees also responded to the Self-Efficacy Inventory (SEI; Friedlander & Snyder, 1983) as a measure of supervision outcome. Factor analysis of the responses loaded three factors (Client Focus, Rapport, and Identification) for the supervisor version and two factors (Client Focus and Rapport) for the supervisee version. Reliability coefficients for each of the supervisor scales ranged from .71 to .77 and from .77 to .90 for the supervisee scales. While perceptions of supervisors and supervisees about what goes on in supervision may differ significantly, similarities existed in regard to a client focus and rapport. Additionally, supervisors’ perceptions further distinguished a dimension of Identification (supervisors’ perceptions of the supervisees’ identification with the supervisor). Efstation et al. (1990) concluded that additional exploratory and confirmatory analysis is necessary with a new sample of supervisors and supervisees with a specific focus on collecting responses from supervisees at various stages of counselor training.

While Ladany, Ellis, and Friedlander (1999) pointed out that the SWAI (Efstation et al., 1990) does not correspond with the three factors of Bordin's (1983) supervisory working alliance model, Bahrack (1989) completed a dissertation study which included the construction of another supervisory working alliance assessment. Similar to the Efstation et al. (SWAI; 1990) measure, Bahrack (1989) adapted the Horvath and Greenberg (1989) WAI instrument used for the therapeutic working alliance. In this instance, the author created parallel forms for the supervisor and supervisee by replacing references to "therapist" and "client" with "supervisor" and "supervisee". Another adaptation included replacing references to "client problems" with "supervisee issues". This resulted in 36 items, 12 for each of the three scales (goals, tasks, and bonds). Seven raters, who were advanced doctoral students or PhDs in counseling psychology, reviewed this draft of the instrument. The researcher obtained 98% agreement from the raters on items representing the bonding aspect but only 60% and 64% for goals and tasks, respectively. Bahrack (1989) reported two factors for the instrument: bonding and goals/tasks. However, unlike Efstation et al. (1990), Bahrack's instrument used the same terminology, scales, and format of the Horvath and Greenberg (1989) model.

The research by Bahrack (1989) focused on the effect of role induction procedures on the supervisory working alliance. The subjects included 17 counseling psychology supervisees in their first, second, or third quarter of a supervised practicum and 10 supervisors (nine advanced graduate students with formal, systematic training in supervision and one university faculty member). Of the 10 supervisors, six supervised only one supervisee. Each supervisor/supervisee pair completed a series of three self-report instruments during the third week of supervision, the fifth week of supervision,

and at the conclusion of supervision. The Working Alliance Inventory for Supervision (Bahrnick, 1989) assessed the strength of the supervisory working alliance. A semantic differential (Osgood, 1952) assessed the supervisee's evaluation of supervision.

Researchers administered the Supervisor Emphasis Rating Form (Lanning, 1986) to assess the areas of counselor development supervisors emphasized with supervisees.

Conclusions from the study indicated that role induction has a brief impact on the levels of congruence between supervisor and supervisee related to semantic differential, global working alliance, working alliance-tasks, and working alliance-goals. Even though role induction led to more congruence in the supervisory dyad, it failed to correlate with higher scores on the Goal and Task subscales of the Working Alliance instrument or a more positive evaluation of supervision. Interestingly, the control group (no role induction procedure administered) displayed more congruence in the amount of bonding taking place and reported higher ratings in overall satisfaction with supervision. The author concluded "a more positive evaluation of supervision is related more to congruence on the bond scale of the Working Alliance (an affective component) than it is to congruence on Tasks and Goals (cognitive components)" (Bahrnick, 1989, p.75).

Baker (1990) also created a supervisory working alliance assessment in a dissertation study focused on the relationship among the supervisory working alliance, narcissism, gender, and theoretical orientation. Since Baker used the working alliance model developed by Bordin (1979), the author revised the WAI originally created by Horvath and Greenberg (1986). Like the work of Bahrnick (1989), the adaptations for this instrument included replacing references to therapist, client, and therapeutic relationship with supervisor, supervisee, and supervisory relationship, respectively. The instrument

retains its original structure with 36 total items, 12 for each of the three scales (goals, tasks, and bonds). Again, the researcher developed parallel forms for supervisor and supervisee. Item analysis confirmed the reliability of this revised WAI.

Baker's (1990) research examined the relationship of the supervisory working alliance to supervisor and supervisee narcissism, gender, and theoretical orientation. The participants included 66 supervisors and 71 doctoral level interns in counseling or clinical psychology. The researchers administered either the supervisor or supervisee version of the Working Alliance Inventory and the Narcissistic Personality Inventory to each of the participants (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979).

Results indicated no significant relationship among supervisors' and supervisees' total scores on the NPI and WAI. However, researchers identified negative correlations between supervisors' and supervisees' total NPI score and the WAI Bond scale. Researchers also described findings related to gender pairing in the supervisory dyads. Female supervisors reported higher working alliance scores when working with male supervisees as compared to those paired with female supervisees or male supervisors working with male or female supervisees. Other findings related to gender included female supervisees who reported much lower working alliance scores when paired with male supervisors as compared to females working with female supervisors or male supervisees working with either male or female supervisors.

In summary, this section reviewed the research incorporating the development of three instruments designed to measure the strength of the supervisory working alliance. The next section reviews additional research using these instruments to add validity to these measures and explore correlations among related variables.

Research Using the SWAI, WAI-S, and WAI-T

The studies reviewed in this section highlight the use of the SWAI (Efstation et al., 1990), WAI-T (Bahrnick, 1989), WAI-S (Bahrnick, 1989), WAI-T (Baker, 1990), and WAI-S (Baker, 1990). Of these instruments, the WAI-T (Bahrnick, 1989) appears most commonly in the literature on the supervisory working alliance. Table A1 presents a summary of the following research including instrumentation, participants, and significant findings.

After developing the SWAI (Efstation et al., 1990), Patton and Kivlighan (1997) conducted a follow-up study on the working alliance in supervision using the SWAI (Efstation et al., 1990). Their research outlined the premise that the intention of supervision is to positively affect all aspects of the therapeutic process. The authors explained that supervisees who experience difficulty establishing a working alliance with the therapy client will mirror those same difficulties establishing a working alliance with the supervisor in supervision. According to the researchers, as the supervisor works to effect the supervisory working alliance, the supervisee may incorporate some of the “conceptual understandings, interactional style, and technical activities of the supervisor to address the alliance difficulties in the counseling relationship” (Patton & Kivlighan, 1997, p.109).

To test this hypothesis, researchers administered the SWAI (Efstation et al., 1990) to 75 counseling supervisees receiving supervision from 25 supervisors and administered the WAI (Horvath & Greenberg, 1989) to the 75 individual clients of those 75 supervisees. Each supervisee used time-limited dynamic psychotherapy (TLDP) during these brief therapeutic interactions (four sessions). Researchers also compared data on the

supervisory working alliance and the supervisee's technical skill to determine if the working alliance in supervision had a more significant relationship to the relational aspects of the therapeutic working alliance or supervisee technical skill. Raters completed the Vanderbilt Therapeutic Strategies Scale (VTSS; Butler, Henry, & Strupp, 1992) as an evaluation of supervisee's ability to adhere to the TDLP methods.

In the Patton and Kivlighan (1997) study, data analysis resulted in two significant findings. Results indicated significant relationships between the supervisee's perception of the supervisory working alliance and the client's perception of the therapeutic working alliance. No relationship existed between the supervisory working alliance and the Interviewing Styles scale of the VTSS. The authors concluded that the supervisory working alliance has a stronger influence on relational aspects of the supervisee in therapeutic interactions than on the technical activity of the supervisee in therapeutic interactions.

Ladany and Friedlander (1995) studied the working alliance in connection with counseling supervision, while adding validity to the instrument developed by Bahrnick (1989). In their investigation, participants responded to both the Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee version (WAI-T; Bahrnick, 1989) and the Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (Olk & Friedlander, 1992). The participant sample included 123 counseling supervisees of which 90% were in either counseling or clinical psychology programs and 67.5% were involved in doctoral studies. Researchers found the working alliance inversely related to role conflict and role ambiguity. A stronger emotional bond experienced between the supervisor and supervisee correlated with less experience of role conflict. If the emotional bond was weaker, reported experience of role conflict by the

supervisees was higher. Additionally, grouping the agreement on the goals and tasks of supervision together produced another inverse relationship. Supervisees experiencing more role conflict agreed with supervisors less on the goals and tasks for supervision. With regards to role ambiguity, researchers identified only one significant relationship. Supervisees experienced less role ambiguity when clear expectations existed regarding the goals and tasks necessary for supervision. These findings demonstrated the salience of the working alliance to counseling supervision and provided empirical support for the validity of the WAI-T (Bahrlick, 1989).

Additional research conducted by Ladany, Brittan-Powell, and Pannu (1997) using the WAI-T (Bahrlick, 1989) examined the interactions of supervisory racial identity and supervisor working alliance. The researchers administered a series of instruments assessing racial identity development [Cultural Identity Attitude Scale (CIAS; Helms & Carter, 1990a), White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS; Helms & Carter, 1990b), and Perceptions of Supervisor Racial Identity (PSRI)], multicultural competence [Cross Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised (CCCI-R; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991)], and the supervisory working alliance (WAI-T) to 105 counseling supervisee participants.

Findings from Ladany et al. (1997) revealed a connection between racial identity development and all aspects of the supervisory working alliance. Specifically, supervisors and supervisees who shared a high degree of racial identity development experienced stronger agreements on the goals and tasks of supervision as well as a stronger emotional bond. This result supported the rationale that people with common belief systems, in this case regarding racial awareness, readily develop mutual trust and liking. Furthermore, in

supervisory relationships where the supervisor has a higher degree of racial identity development than the supervisee, a significant agreement with respect to the goals, tasks, and strength of bond, though weaker, still existed. This type of relationship relied on an informed supervisor who is sensitive to the racial identity status of the supervisee. Data on racial matching revealed no significant prediction for the supervisory working alliance. The authors suggested no causal direction for this relationship. They indicated a strong working alliance could likely create a setting where the discussion of racial issues leads to greater racial identity development.

Ladany, Lehrman-waterman, Molinaro, and Wolgast (1999) also used the WAI-T (Bahrnick, 1989) to assess the effects of supervisor behavior on the supervisory working alliance. Specifically, to test the relationship of supervisor ethical behavioral practices to the strength of the supervisory working alliance, researchers administered the WAI-T, the Supervisor Ethical Practices Questionnaire, and the Supervisor Ethical Behavior Scale to 151 supervisees. The authors hypothesized that unethical behaviors on the part of the supervisor would damage the supervisory working alliance. Data collected from the participants showed that 51% of the supervisees reported unethical behaviors on the part of their supervisors. Of those supervisees that reported unethical behaviors, 35% openly discussed those incidents with the supervisor. As expected, higher frequencies of reported unethical behavior correlated with lower scores on all three scales (Goals, Tasks, and Bonds) of the WAI-T. Likewise, greater adherence to ethical behaviors on the part of the supervisor led to a stronger supervisory working alliance. Thus, supervisor ethical behavior influenced the supervisory relationship.

Additional research by Ladany, Ellis, et al. (1999) explored the relationships among the supervisory working alliance, supervisee self-efficacy, and supervisee satisfaction. The authors expected supervisees to report higher satisfaction when experiencing a strong supervisory working alliance. Specifically, when experiencing a strong emotional bond, the supervisees likely become more “comfortable with the supervisor and view the personal qualities and attitude of the supervisor favorably” (p. 448). Likewise, when close agreement on the goals and tasks of supervision exists “collaboration in supervision is expected to be facilitated and the supervisees comfort with the supervisor and with self-evaluation will be enhanced” (p. 448).

In an effort to test these hypotheses, the researchers (Ladany, Ellis, et al., 1999) assessed the supervisory working alliance (WAI-T; Bahrnick, 1989), supervisee self-efficacy [Self-Efficacy Inventory (S-EI; Friedlander & Snyder, 1983)], and supervisee satisfaction with supervision [Trainee Personal Reaction Scale-Revised (TPRS-R; Holloway & Wampold, 1984)] in 107 counseling supervisees. Each participant completed the series of three instruments between the third and fifth weeks of supervision and between the eleventh and sixteenth weeks of supervision. Analysis of the collected data revealed a relationship between the Bond scale of the supervisory working alliance and supervisee satisfaction. Increases in the Bond factor of the supervisory working alliance corresponded with greater supervisee satisfaction while decreases in the Bond factor related to less supervisee satisfaction. The authors described two other significant conclusions from the data. Though changes in the supervisory working alliance failed to correspond to changes in supervisee self-efficacy, supervisee self-efficacy increased significantly over time. In addition, the supervisory working alliance appeared somewhat

stable as no significant changes occurred in any of the three factors of the WAI-T between the first and second administration. This research supported the claims by Bordin (1983) addressing the critical nature of establishing a strong supervisory working alliance early in the supervisory process (between the third and fifth sessions) for positive supervision outcomes.

In another study by Lehrman-waterman and Ladany (2001), researchers examined potential relationships between the evaluation process within supervision, supervisor influence on supervisee self-efficacy, the supervisory working alliance, and supervisee satisfaction with supervision. The 274 counseling supervisee participants in this study responded to three self-report instruments and a demographic questionnaire. The Evaluation Process within Supervision Inventory (EPSI), designed specifically for this study, assessed both the goal setting and feedback aspects used to characterize evaluation in supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Freeman, 1985). Participants also completed the Supervisee Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ; Ladany, Ellis, et al., 1999; Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999) and a demographic questionnaire. Half of the participants completed the WAI-T (Bahrnick, 1989) while the other half completed the Self-Efficacy Inventory (S-EI; Friedlander & Snyder, 1983; Ladany, Ellis, et al., 1999).

Statistical analysis indicated significant relationships among several of the variables in the study. The findings relevant to this literature review described the link between the evaluation process (goal setting and feedback) and the supervisory working alliance. Participants who rated the experience of supervision evaluation more positively also reported a stronger supervisory working alliance. The authors (Lehrman-waterman & Ladany, 2001) noted the logical nature of this finding pointing out that both concepts

included an aspect dealing with supervision goals. The evaluation process uses both goal setting and feedback while the supervisory working alliance includes agreement on goals, agreement on tasks, and strength of emotional bond. Lehrman-waterman & Ladany (2001) concluded that the evaluation process (i.e. goal setting) should be used early in supervision to establish the foundation for a healthy working alliance. Additionally, “supervisors who sense their relationship with their trainees as troubled may seek to engage in more goal setting and feedback as a reparative effort” (p. 174).

Ramos-Sanchez et al. (2002) studied the impact of negative supervision events on supervision satisfaction and the supervisory working alliance. The participant sample included 126 supervisees. Each participant completed the Relationship Questionnaire (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), the WAI-T (Baker, 1990), and the SLQ-R (McNeill, Stoltenberg, & Romans, 1992). Findings from this research indicated supervisees reporting negative events in supervision experienced a weaker supervisory alliance and lower levels of satisfaction with supervision.

In summary, the seven studies mentioned in this section along with the three studies reviewed in the previous section establish the use of quantitative measures to assess the supervisory working alliance. The next section reviews the application of these measures to researching the concept of SRSD.

Supervisory Working Alliance Instrumentation and Supervisor Self-disclosure

This section reviews three studies correlating a quantitative measure of the supervisory working alliance with various phenomena related to counseling supervision specifically including SRSD. To start, Ladany and Lehrman-waterman (1999) investigated connections among the supervisory working alliance, supervisory style, and

SRSD. The authors agreed with an assertion by Norcross and Halgin (1997) that supervisors who disclose information to their supervisees about their own personal counseling experiences might help foster a sense of trust in the supervisory relationship.

The researchers constructed two instruments designed to assess the content and frequency of SRSDs. The Supervisor Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (SSDQ), validated by the researchers in a pilot study, provided a definition of self-disclosure, and listed and defined six types of disclosures potentially offered by supervisors. Supervisees responded to the items on the SSDQ by listing up to two examples of observed SRSDs from their supervision experience for each of the six categories. Additionally, researchers administered the Supervisor Self-Disclosure Index (SSDI), a nine item self-report inventory rating the types of SRSDs on a one (*not at all*) to five (*often*) scale, to gauge the frequency with which supervisors self-disclose in supervision. While providing this baseline information, the 105 counseling supervisee participants also completed self-report measures assessing their perception of the supervisory working alliance (WAI-T; Bahrnick, 1989) and their supervisors approach to supervisees known as supervisory style [Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI; Friedlander & Ward, 1984)].

The data analysis and findings supported conclusions with regards to SRSD and the supervisory working alliance. First, more frequent self-disclosures on the part of the supervisor corresponded with greater agreement between the supervisor and supervisee on the goals and tasks of supervision and a higher level of the emotional bond. Second, sharing counseling struggles influenced the emotional bond between supervisor and supervisee. Though the authors made no causal inference, they implied that SRSD,

particularly the disclosure of counseling struggles, used as an intervention in supervision may improve the supervisory working alliance.

As a follow up to the Ladany and Lehrman-waterman (1999) study, Ladany et al. (2001) again completed research investigating the relationships among the supervisory working alliance, supervisory styles, and SRSD. In this study, the participants included 137 counseling supervisors. Each participant completed the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI; Friedlander & Ward, 1984), the Working Alliance Inventory – Supervisor Version (WAI-S; Baker, 1990), and the Supervisor Self-Disclosure Index (SSDI; Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999). Researchers analyzed data from these instruments for significant relationships between the three supervisory styles (attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task-oriented), the three elements of the supervisory working alliance (agreement on goals, agreement on tasks, and strength of the emotional bond), and the frequency of SRSD.

Results from the data analysis revealed significant interactions between supervisory style and the supervisory working alliance as well as supervisory style and frequency of SRSD. Supervisors who perceived themselves as using a more attractive style reported higher scores on all three factors of the working alliance. A more attractive supervisory style related to greater agreement on the goals and tasks of supervision as well as a stronger emotional bond. Supervisors who perceived they are more interpersonally sensitive reported greater agreement on the tasks of supervision. A task oriented style significantly related to greater perceived agreement on the tasks of supervision. For the relationships between supervisory style and SRSD, supervisors with a more attractive style of supervision perceived a greater frequency of their own self-

disclosures. Likewise, the more interpersonally sensitive that supervisors perceived themselves to be, the more frequently they perceived themselves to self-disclose. No relationship existed between the frequency of SRSDs and the task oriented supervisory style. Considering these findings, the authors concluded that it would be beneficial for supervisors to attend to how their choice of interactional style and frequency of self-disclosure may impact the supervisory working alliance.

In 2008, Matazzoni completed dissertation research examining relationships between supervisee developmental level, supervisory working alliance, and SRSD. Participants completed separate instruments designed to assess each of the areas under investigation. The WAI-T (Bahrack, 1989) assessed the supervisory working alliance. The Supervisor Levels Questionnaire – Revised (SLQ-R; McNeill, Stoltenberg, & Romans, 1992) evaluated the supervisees perceived level of development. Additionally, the researcher administered the Supervisor Self-Disclosure Index (SSDI; Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999; Ladany et al., 2001) to assess the content and frequency of SRSDs.

Analysis of the data collected from participants revealed many significant findings. Overall, supervisees failed to report frequent disclosures by their supervisors. Though the frequency of SRSDs minimally influenced the bond component of the supervisory working alliance (Bond scale of WAI-T), the content of the disclosures showed a strong correlation to the Bond component. More frequent experiential disclosures (defined as disclosures related to the supervisors past experiences) correlated with a greater bond while more frequent extraneous disclosures (defined as disclosures that were not relevant to training) related to less bonding. Supervisees at a higher level of

training reported more SRSDs. Based on results from the SLQ-R, supervisees who rated as more dependent on their supervisor also reported more frequent bonding. In addition, supervisees who reported a higher awareness of self and others showed a correlation to SRSD. If the SRSDs included content of the experiential nature, the working alliance bond tended to be stronger. If the SRSDs included content of an extraneous nature, the working alliance bond tended to be weaker; although, more months in supervision eliminated the negative impact of extraneous disclosures on the strength of the supervision bond. Based on these findings, the author concluded that supervisors should attend to the content of their self-disclosures recognizing that they could impact the supervisory working alliance in a positive or negative fashion. However, several mitigating factors affect how these SRSDs impacted the relationship including the experience of the supervisee, the number of months the supervisee has spent in current supervision, and developmental level of the supervisee.

This section summarized studies by Ladany and Lehrman-waterman (1999), Ladany et al. (2001), and Matazzoni (2008). This research provides empirical connections between the supervisory working alliance and SRSD.

Summary of Research Related to the Supervisory Working Alliance

As conceptualized by Bordin (1983), the supervisory working alliance appears most frequently in the literature quantified by instruments adapted from the WAI (Horvath & Greenberg, 1989). Results from studies using these instruments (Bahrnick, 1989; Baker, 1990) correlated the supervisory working alliance to role induction (Bahrnick, 1989), supervisee narcissism (Baker, 1990), role conflict and role ambiguity (Ladany & Friedlander, 1995), racial identity development (Ladany et al., 1997),

supervisor ethical behavior (Ladany, Lehrman-waterman, et al., 1999), supervisee self-efficacy and satisfaction (Ladany, Ellis, et al., 1999), SRSD and supervisory style (Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999; Ladany et al., 2001), the evaluation process in supervision (Lehrman-waterman & Ladany, 2001), negative events in supervision (Ramos-Sanchez et al., 2002), and supervisee development and SRSD (Matazzoni, 2008). (See Table A1 for a summary of research related to supervisory working alliance assessments.) These findings support the validity of the supervisory working alliance while also highlighting the connection to specific relationship and outcome variable associated with counseling supervision. The next section of this review focuses on the relationship variable of self-disclosure in supervision.

Self-disclosure

Self-disclosure appeared as a major topic of interest across multiple disciplines for the past several decades (Goffman, 1959; Jourard, 1964; Cozby, 1973; Derlega & Berg, 1987; Watkins, 1990; Farber, 2006; Henretty & Levitt, 2010). Goffman (1959), in *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, described the roles and mechanisms necessary for communicating and shaping impressions in social interactions. Jourard studied self-disclosure in connection with mental well-being (1964), age (1961a), religious denomination (1961b), nationality (1961c), and profession (1962). Cozby (1972) explored a relational perspective relating self-disclosure to the concepts of reciprocity and liking. Cozby's 1973 review of the literature on self-disclosure outlined three parameters for self-disclosure research including amount of information, level of intimacy of information, and time spent disclosing.

In 1987, Derlega and Berg organized the themes of self-disclosure research into three categories: personality, relationships, and counseling. The theme of personality referenced the correlations of an individual's personal characteristics to self-disclosure patterns oftentimes with formalized instruments (Jourard, 1958). Many of these characteristics summarized by Archer (1979) include gender, race, and birth order to name a few. Relationships, as a theme in self-disclosure research, referenced the study of liking for and trust in the discloser (Cozby, 1972; Pederson & Higbee, 1969), social exchange theory related to the type of information shared (intimate/non-intimate, positive/negative, etc.), reciprocity and modeling involving an observer's reaction to the disclosing behavior, and social penetration theory (Altman & Taylor, 1973). The final theme introduced by Derlega and Berg (1987) covered research and theory surrounding counseling and psychotherapy. These topics included psychological maladjustment related to self-disclosure, psychotherapy's emphasis on client self-disclosure as a key feature in most treatment modalities, and the discussions concerning counselor self-disclosure (Watkins, 1990). In fact, the comprehensive reviews of self-disclosure by Watkins (1990), Farber (2006), Bloomgarden and Mennuti (2009), and Henretty and Levitt (2010) all focused on the topic of counseling and psychotherapy.

As a result of this broad interest in the concept of self-disclosure, research across various disciplines and contexts produced an array of characteristics, descriptions, and definitions. McCarthy and Betz (1978) highlighted many of these distinctions when attempting to contrast self-disclosing versus self-involving statements. These authors argued that definitions by Jourard and Jaffe (1970) and Luft (1969) lacked specificity, definitions by Shapiro, Krauss, and Traux (1969) included both verbal and nonverbal

behavior, definitions by Culbert (1968), Dies (1973), and Johnson and Noonan (1972) included information about the individual disclosing as well as here and now reactions of that individual in the present moment. McCarthy and Betz (1978) supported the distinction by Danish, D'Augelli, and Brock (1976) that in-the-moment responses differ as self-involving statements rather than self-disclosing statements. A review of self-disclosure literature by Cozby (1973) defined self-disclosure as a verbalized, personal revelation made by one person to another. Watkins (1990) echoed this description nearly twenty years later labeling the roles of counselor and client in the context of counselor self-disclosure. Simon (1988) and Simone, McCarthy, and Skay (1998) added descriptors like *conscious* and *intentional* to the definition. Though a recognized distinction between self-involving statements and self-disclosing statements persists (Edwards & Murdock, 1994), varied operational definitions of self-disclosure identified in research studies continue to confound efforts to attain a consistent understanding of the concept of self-disclosure in the context of counseling and counseling supervision (Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999).

Over the past five decades, behavioral scientists investigated the concept of self-disclosure. The resulting literature summarized in this section identified a variety of elements for consideration when operationalizing the term. Considering the breadth of research focused on the topic of self-disclosure, additional understanding for this research study required a more narrow emphasis. The next section focuses specifically on research related to therapist disclosure in the context of the therapeutic relationship.

Therapist Self-disclosure

The concept of self-disclosure exists at the very core of the therapeutic interaction. Each participant in the therapeutic relationship can engage in the act of disclosing (Farber, 2006; Hendrick, 1987). Though understanding and interpreting client disclosures in counseling practice and research found a place in Freud's early descriptions of psychodynamic theory (1966), more recently researchers attempted to empirically answer questions regarding therapist self-disclosure (Edwards & Murdock, 1994; Hill & Knox, 2002; Knox, Hess, Petersen, & Hill, 1997; Simon, 1988; Watkins, 1990). Hill and Knox (2002) described therapist self-disclosure as one of the most controversial interventions; some therapists proclaimed the benefits of therapist self-disclosure while others opposed it. Bloomgarden and Mennuti (2009) promoted a more balanced view of therapist self-disclosure "acknowledging its value when done with clinical wisdom and skill" (p.7).

Regardless of one's professional stance regarding the use of therapist disclosure, research results indicate favorable perceptions of therapist self-disclosure (Dowd & Boroto, 1982). In addition to individual perceptions of the disclosing therapist, researchers empirically investigated many other factors including the frequency of therapist disclosure (Hill, Helms, Tichenor, et al., 1988), reasons for therapist self-disclosure (Edwards & Murdock, 1994), effects of therapist disclosure on immediate outcome (Hill, Helms, Tichenor, et al., 1988; Knox et al., 1997), and treatment outcome (Hill, Helms, Tichenor, et al., 1988). Results from this research are not always consistent. However, the majority of studies examined by Hill & Knox (2002) found that therapists used self-disclosure as an intervention to model appropriate behavior. In addition, they

found self-disclosure fostered a therapeutic relationship and normalized client experience. Hill, Helms, Tichenor, et al. (1988) and Knox et al. (1997) both reported therapist self-disclosure as a helpful intervention in the immediate context of therapy, but results of treatment outcome varied to a greater degree.

In describing therapist self-disclosure, Watkins (1990) and Farber (2006) both used many of the same categorizations and dimensions of self-disclosure as Cozby (1973) including amount of information shared, level of intimacy of this information, and time spent disclosing. Likewise, scholars discussed therapist self-disclosure in terms of social theories and models such as the social exchange theory, modeling, reciprocity, reinforcement, and social penetration theory. In fact, the critical distinction of self-disclosure in any context seems to be the specificity of the roles articulated in the definition. This literature defines therapist self-disclosure as a therapist purposefully and consciously sharing private information about herself or himself to a client (Farber, 2006).

Though therapist self-disclosure included many of the same elements from the general description found in the literature, the defined roles of the participants engaging in the behavior distinguished this concept in the research. Further investigation into self-disclosure in counseling and psychotherapy noted a parallel application in the context of counseling supervision.

Supervisor Self-Disclosure

Similar to therapy, the counseling supervision relationship creates opportunities for communication through the use of self-disclosure for both members. In fact, the supervision process highlights the need for supervisees to self-disclose fears, hopes, and

frustrations with clients to their supervisors for consultation and objective feedback (Haynes et al., 2003). The literature also supports the use of SRSD to enhance the supervisory working alliance and model appropriate disclosure for supervisees (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Haynes et al., 2003). While research focused directly on the occurrence of self-disclosure in supervision appears infrequently in the literature, studies that focus specifically on SRSD are even less common (Farber, 2006).

Until Ladany and Lehrman-waterman (1999) directly addressed the topic of SRSD, most research related to the topic consisted of the counselor's self-disclosures in therapy as a parallel event (McCarthy & Betz, 1978; Watkins, 1990), positive or negative experiences in supervision (Gray, Ladany, Walker, & Ancis, 2001; Hutt, Scott, & King, 1983; Worthen & McNeill, 1996), and what supervisors do not disclose in supervision (Ladany & Melincoff, 1999; Yourman & Farber, 1996).

Research by Ladany and Lehrman-waterman (1999) investigated the use of SRSD in the supervisory relationship. Adapting the definition of self-disclosure used by Watkins (1990), the researchers defined SRSD as statements of personal information made by the supervisor to the supervisee such as counseling struggles, training events, or reactions to clients. The participants in the 1999 Ladany and Lehrman-waterman study consisted of 105 counseling supervisees. Each subject completed a series of questionnaires about his or her supervisor's use of self-disclosure in supervision in an effort to determine the various types of SRSDs, how SRSD relates to supervisory style, and the influence of SRSD on the supervisory working alliance. The Supervisor Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (SSDQ) designed by the research team defines SRSD generally and six specific types of SRSDs. The instrument then directs respondents to list up to two

examples of each type of SRSD. The Supervisor Self-Disclosure Index (SSDI) consists of a nine-item inventory asking participants to respond on a five-point scale with the frequency to which their supervisors engaged in various types of SRSDs. The participating supervisees also completed the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI; Friedlander & Ward, 1984) and the Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee Version (WAI-T; Bahrnick, 1989) to assess the relationship of supervisory style and supervisory working alliance to the use of SRSD.

Data analysis from the Ladany and Lehrman-waterman (1999) study identified the following results related to SRSD, supervisory style, and the supervisory working alliance. Supervisees reported an overall SRSD rate of 5.46 during their supervision experience. Findings related an attractive supervisor style to more frequent use of SRSDs. In addition, an interpersonally sensitive supervisor style significantly related to less frequent disclosures of neutral counseling experiences while a task-oriented style related to less frequent disclosures of personal issues or counseling successes. As related to the supervisory working alliance, the more supervisors self-disclosed the greater the agreement on the goals and tasks of supervision and the stronger the emotional bond as perceived by supervisees. Additionally, and more specifically, when supervisors disclosed their own counseling struggles more frequently supervisees perceived an even stronger emotional bond as part of the supervisory working alliance.

The authors discussed at length the frequency of the various types of SRSDs used by supervisors. Participants reported ten types of SRSDs. Each type reported a frequency rating based on the percentage of respondents reporting that particular type of disclosure. Researchers obtained the following results: Supervisors disclosed personal issues to 73%

of respondents, neutral counseling experiences to 55%, counseling struggles to 51%, counseling successes to 25%, non-counseling related professional experiences to 22%, reactions to supervisee clients to 19%, dynamics of the training site to 13%, supervisory relationship to 12%, didactic mentoring to 12%, and experiences as a supervisor to 8%.

In another study, Ladany et al. (2001) investigated SRSDs along with supervisory style and supervisor working alliance. The participants in this study consisted of 137 counseling supervisors who each completed four instruments. Researchers used the SSI (Friedlander & Ward, 1984) to assess supervisor style and the WAI-S (Baker, 1990) to evaluate of the supervisory working alliance. Each participant also completed the SSDI (Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999) in order to assess the frequency with which certain types of SRSDs occurred. The final instrument, a questionnaire, collected demographic data on characteristics of both the supervisors and the supervisees. The researchers provided instructions asking supervisors to consider their experiences with a supervisee whom they supervised for at least two months.

Results from this research revealed relationships between supervisory style and self-disclosure. The more interpersonally sensitive supervisors perceived themselves to be and the more attractive supervisors perceived themselves to be, the more each of the two types perceived themselves to self-disclose. Researchers found no relationship between the task-oriented supervisor style and the frequency of SRSD. Ladany et al. suggested, “It is possible that self-disclosure is one way of demonstrating warm, friendly, and invested styles.” (2001, p.272)

Ladany and Walker (2003) summarized research on the types of SRSD by describing these five types. *Personal material* consists of information about the personal

life of the supervisor indirectly related to the supervisee and often unrelated to supervisory work. *Therapy experiences* include information from the supervisor's work as a therapist often intended to serve as a model for supervisees. *Professional experiences* involve details related to professional responsibilities outside of therapy such as organizational tasks or inter-office relationships. *Reactions to trainee's client* represent those impressions shared about the client or the position the supervisor might take with the client. *Supervision experiences* pertain to self-disclosures about expectations for supervision, previous supervision experiences, or thoughts and feelings about being a supervisor. The authors proposed that these types of SRSDs influence supervision particularly the supervisory relationship, the supervisee's use of self-disclosure, and the supervisee's self-efficacy.

In addition to these categories, Ladany and Walker (2003) described three personalization dimensions that exist on a continuum of greater to lesser personalization. The first dimension, congruence or discordance, described the level of relevance the SRSD expresses in relationship to the supervisee's concern. The second dimension referred to the level of personal intimacy (intimate/non-intimate) for the supervisor. The final dimension, service of the supervisor versus service of the supervisee, addressed the issue of whose needs the supervisor's self-disclosure fulfills. SRSDs with congruence to the supervisee's concern, a significant level of intimacy, and in service to the needs of the supervisee express more personalization than SRSDs exhibiting discordance to the immediate issues in supervision, a lack of intimacy, or serving the needs of the supervisor.

Ladany and Walker (2003) also proposed a set of supervision outcomes related to SRSD. SRSDs affect the supervisory working alliance most notably impacting the emotional bond element of the working alliance. The authors related the impact on this component to the display of trust a supervisor must show in making personalized self-disclosures. Supervisees reciprocate the trust resulting in a strengthened emotional bond. An enhanced sense of trust facilitates self-disclosure on the part of the supervisee.

Knox et al. (2008) completed qualitative interviews with 16 counseling supervisors regarding the use of SRSD. Most of the supervisors reported using self-disclosure judiciously to enhance supervisee development and to normalize supervisee experience. Less than half of the supervisors reported using self-disclosure to strengthen the supervisory relationship, to model self-disclosure, or to increase disclosures of the supervisees. Supervisors most commonly reported self-disclosing about their own clinical experiences, the supervision process, the supervisory relationship, as well as personal biographical information. Lastly, supervisors chose not to disclose if doing so would cross a boundary or serve only to benefit the supervisor.

In the Knox et al. (2008) study, supervisors generally reported positive effects from SRSD for themselves and their supervisees. For supervisors, the self-disclosures seemed helpful and provided a sense of relief. For supervisees, the participants reported positive effects related to increasing supervisee self-disclosure, learning, and a sense of relief on the part of the supervisees.

Matazzoni (2008) completed dissertation research comparing the influence of SRSD on the supervisory working alliance based on the developmental level of the supervisee. Participants were doctoral supervisees. Researchers administered the WAI-T

(Bahrlick, 1989), the SSDI (Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999), and SLQ-R (McNeill et al., 1992) in an effort to assess supervisee's perception of the supervisory working alliance, the frequency of various types of SRSDs, and developmental level. Results of this research confirmed that supervisors used self-disclosure infrequently as an intervention in supervision. In spite of infrequent SRSDs, these disclosures impacted the supervisory working alliance. Supervisees who perceived their supervisors as disclosing past experiences recorded a higher score on the Bond scale of the WAI-T. Supervisees who perceived their supervisors as disclosing more about extraneous topics unrelated to counselor training actually scored lower on the Bond scale. Additionally, supervisees with more experience in graduate training more likely perceived a greater frequency of disclosures from their supervisors.

Knox, Edwards, Hess, and Hill (2011) completed a recent study on SRSD. Participants in this study included 12 supervisees, each with multiple semesters in supervision. In addition to completing a demographic questionnaire, supervisees responded to a semi-structured, interview protocol. Researchers then analyzed the transcript data using consensual qualitative research methods (Hill, Thompson, & Williams, 1997). Results from this research indicated that supervisees had little or no training related to SRSD. However, participants recognized SRSDs of personal or relevant clinical experience. These participants commonly reported an overall positive effect related to SRSD. Participants typically perceived the supervisor's purpose for using self-disclosure to be normalizing supervisee experience. The resulting effect on the supervisee achieved this purpose. More positive outcomes resulted from supervisees who

perceived a stronger relationship with his or her supervisor. When the relationship was more tenuous, participants reported less positive results.

Summary of Research on Supervisor Self-disclosure

Analysis of the peer-reviewed research on SRSD identified commonalities in informational content, purpose, and outcomes of SRSD. Information disclosed by a supervisor regularly related to the topics of clinical experience, supervision experience, and personal material. These disclosures purposed to affect the strength of the supervisory relationship, normalize supervisee experiences, and model appropriate disclosures. The actual impact of this intervention represented across studies included only normalizing supervisee experience and strengthening or weakening the bond between supervisor and supervisee. These relational impacts depended on the frequency and content of the SRSDs.

A more detailed review of these articles highlighted additional features of this body of work including research methods, participant samples, and frequency data. The literature on SRSD published to date employed both quantitative (Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999; Ladany et al. 2001) and qualitative (Knox et al., 2008; Knox et al., 2011) investigative methods. Likewise, the body of literature included participant samples representative of the perspectives of both the supervisor (Ladany et al, 2001; Knox et al., 2008) and supervisee (Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999; Knox et al., 2011). Frequency data from these studies provided evidence to suggest that SRSD serves as a common intervention to the skill set of experienced supervisors. However, with this understanding, supervisors infrequently employed the intervention. Given the research methods, participant samples, and frequency data from the literature on SRSD, the next

section explores available research presenting perceptions of both participants of a working alliance.

Paired Perceptions in Counseling and Supervision

Research reviewed thus far focused on the working alliance and self-disclosure in the contexts of counseling and supervision. Researchers employed research designs that gathered responses from different roles or combinations of roles within therapeutic and supervisory relationships including clients, therapists, clients and therapists, supervisees, supervisors, supervisees and supervisors, and clients, supervisees, and supervisors. The response data gathered included self-report data and or ratings from trained observers. This section of the literature review focuses on research designed to gather responses to therapist or supervisor behavior from both members of the relationship dyad by first examining the client-therapist dyad, then transitioning to research using the client-therapist-supervisor triad, before concluding with a summary of research samples using the supervisory dyad.

Hill, Helms, Tichenor, et al. (1988) investigated therapist response modes in therapy by eliciting responses from both the therapist and the client. The study examined the frequency of various types of responses, immediate and long-term effects of these responses on the client, as well as the therapist's intention in employing selected responses. To accomplish this, researchers chose eight therapist participants and recruited eight clients to complete each dyad. Participants completed a series of self-report assessments following a videotape review of each session. Judges evaluated session transcripts and identified over 16,000 response modes across sessions. While the data collected highlighted the frequency of therapist responses like self-disclosure and the

helpfulness of such responses to the clients, the authors concluded that therapists and clients differ in what they perceive as helpful. Though perspectives from both members of the therapeutic dyad provided information to test the researcher's hypotheses, the researchers aggregated the data according to role.

Likewise, Hill et al. (1989) chose a participant sample of eight therapist-client dyads. Judges evaluated session transcripts for therapist verbal behavior and identified 99 instances of therapist self-disclosure. Both members of the dyad reviewed videotapes of therapy sessions and completed the Helpfulness Scale (Elliott, 1985) in response to therapist interventions. Data analysis reported therapist self-disclosures and helpfulness ratings for therapist interventions in aggregated statistics based on the role represented within the dyad. Reassuring disclosures, defined by Hill et al. (1989) as supportive and reinforcing, rated more helpful to clients and therapists. Therapists rated all categories of self-disclosure as less helpful compared to clients.

Hill and Stephany (1990) conducted research pairing client nonverbal behavior with perceived reactions by client and therapist. Participants included 16 therapist-client dyads each observed for a single session. Judges rated nonverbal behaviors while clients and therapists responded to the Client Reactions System (Hill, Helms, Spiegel, & Tichenor, 1988). Researchers aggregated the results by role and reported in terms of client involvement. Clients self-reported that head movements correspond with involvement in therapy. Data showed therapists misinterpreted speech hesitancy as a nonverbal signal of client involvement in therapy.

Regan and Hill (1992) collected data from members of 24 therapeutic dyads to study things left unsaid in therapy. Counselors and clients reviewed videotapes and

completed self-report questionnaires to determine the frequency, content, and valence of things left unsaid. In addition, researchers determined if counselors were aware of what clients left unsaid and if any detectable benefits existed for this awareness. Analysis of data matched responses of what clients left unsaid with the counselor's guess. Research presented aggregated data of matched results with measures of session satisfaction.

Findings indicate that clients left fewer things unsaid than counselors assumed according to counselor guesses. Additionally, the more counselors could accurately identify what clients left unsaid, the rougher counselors rated the session on the smoothness scale of the SEQ. Likewise, under the same circumstances of counselors correctly identifying things left unsaid by the clients, clients reported less satisfaction on measures for satisfaction with treatment.

Following up on the idea of things left unsaid in counseling, Hill, Thompson, Cogar, & Denman (1993) studied therapist and client reports of covert processes in long-term therapy. For this study, 19 dyads completed a taped review of a counseling session within 24 hours of its completion. Researchers used multiple instruments to collect self-report data from participants. Although 17 clients left something unsaid in a session and therapists identified 17 clients who left something unsaid, researchers analyzing responses determined that only seven examples matched correctly with the therapist guessing which client had left something unsaid. Further analysis showed that therapists rarely have an awareness of how clients react internally or what clients choose not to say. However, when members of the dyad correctly perceive a negative reaction from their partner, the response to that negativity rated with more satisfaction.

This research using data collection protocols eliciting perspectives from both members of the therapeutic dyad focused on the effect of specific in-session events on therapeutic measures including client reaction, client satisfaction and helpfulness (Hill, Helms, Tichenor, et al., 1988; Hill et al., 1993; Hill & Stephany, 1990). Though researchers discussed inferences linking the results to the therapeutic relationship (Regan & Hill, 1992), these studies included no methods for directly correlating the impact of in-session events on changes to the therapeutic relationship. Studies designed to assess the possibilities of parallel process in the therapeutic and supervisory relationships look for variables affecting both types of dyads.

For example, Friedlander, Siegel, and Brenock (1989) employed a case study design to investigate parallel processes in counseling and supervision using three participants: a client, a supervisee, and a supervisor. Data collection consisted of three main categories: person assessment, process indices, and outcome evaluation. Person assessment data included characteristics related to supervisory style, theoretical orientation, and client assessment. Process indices measured communication patterns, supervisor feedback, session evaluations, and counselor rating. Outcome evaluation used participant perception data from the supervisor and supervisee to assess supervision and counselor perception for assessing post-treatment changes for the client. Analysis of the results showed several similarities between the dyads. The client responses rated more favorable to counseling than did the supervisee while the supervisee showed more favorable responses to supervision than did the supervisor. Continued analysis of the results revealed another similarity related to complementary communication patterns. In the supervision dyad, the supervisor predominantly used leading patterns of self-

presentation with the supervisee responding with the cooperative pattern. Likewise, in the therapeutic dyad, the counselor used leading patterns while the client chose cooperative responses. Data specifically related to supervision indicated that this particular relationship (rated positively) included a supervisor with an attractive and interpersonally sensitive style.

Another case study design by Alpher (1991) examined interdependence and parallel process in supervision and short-term therapy. This study included three participants: patient, therapist, and supervisor. Primary results came from data collected on social behavior more specifically social interdependence. Over a course of therapy including 22 sessions, the behavioral analysis consistently revealed parallel changes in perceived interdependence between the members of the therapeutic dyad and members of the supervisory dyad. Alpher concluded support for the understanding of the supervisor as more than a role to be emulated. In this case study, the therapist's perceived interpersonal interactions with the other member of one dyad correlated with changes in the therapist's perception of interpersonal dynamics in the other dyadic relationship.

Research accounting for the perspectives of all members of the client-supervisee-supervisor system placed the supervisee in a critical role of providing a perspective for both dyads. While this type of participation appears critical to research on parallel processes between counseling and supervision, studies investigating specific aspects of the supervisory working alliance or perceived responses to supervisor interventions require the perspective of the counselor-in-training only in the role of supervisee.

For example, a case study by Martin, Goodyear, and Newton (1987) focused only on the supervisory dyad. The authors articulated the research purpose as describing

events during supervision, showing change in the supervisee's in-session behavior, and linking these processes to overall supervision outcome. Data collection procedures occurred for a single supervisory dyad over the 11 weeks of supervision and included both quantitative and qualitative strategies. The most relevant finding from the researchers' final analysis noted the supervisory dyad developed a working relationship during the second session of supervision. This result corresponds with the findings of Rabinowitz et al. (1986), which emphasized the importance to the supervisee for developing a working relationship during the first three sessions. For this supervisory dyad, the rapid development of a working alliance correlated with matching results on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers-Briggs, 1962) for both members. A relative absence of conflict between supervisor and supervisee over the course of supervision also correlated with the rapid development of a supervisory working alliance. This finding contradicts earlier work by Mueller and Kell (1972), which hypothesized the inevitability of conflict in this working relationship.

In addition to the case study method, Bahrack (1989) completed dissertation research on the effects of role induction to the supervisory working alliance. In a quasi-experimental design, the researcher created an experimental group consisting of 10 supervisees along with their supervisors and a control group of seven supervisees paired with their supervisors. After random assignment, the experimental group completed a role induction exercise designed to establish clear and specific understanding for the purpose and expectations of supervision. At three different points throughout the course of the practicum or internship training semester, both supervisors and supervisees

completed assessments for the supervisory working alliance, supervisor areas of emphasis, and a semantic differential.

For the data analysis, the researcher aggregated the data by group (experimental or control), by role (supervisor or supervisee), and by timing of administration (pre-test, post-test, or post-post-test). Results indicated no significant difference in the rating of the supervisory relationship between groups. However, the experimental group showed more congruence among the roles of the supervisory dyad regarding the supervisory working alliance and their evaluative feelings of supervision as measured by the semantic differential at the time of the initial post-test. Another interesting finding indicated that the control group experienced higher agreement on the relational bond subscale of the working alliance measure and that this level of agreement grew through the post-test assessments. This result reflected only the increased agreement between supervisor and supervisee pairs not the development of a stronger bond.

Bahrack (1989) concluded the dissertation research with a couple of important implications. First, the values of the working alliance in supervision remained stable over the course of the study. Since the first measure for the supervisory working alliance occurred between the third and fourth sessions of supervision, this result adds increased credibility for assessing the working alliance at various points in the supervision process beyond the initial introductory stage. Second, the rating of the working alliance failed to correlate with the participants' evaluation of supervision. Thus, Bahrack urged further exploration of the link between the supervisory working alliance and evaluative ratings of a supervision experience.

In another dissertation by Baker (1990), research examined the supervisory working alliance related to factors of supervisee narcissism, gender, and theoretical orientation. The participant sample included 66 supervisors and 71 interns. Although this study sought participant perspectives from both roles in the supervisory dyad, only 43 cases included complete response sets from both members of the same dyad to the assessments for the working alliance, supervisor/supervisee narcissism, and demographics (theoretical orientation included). The remaining 23 supervisors and 28 supervisees represented the only member of their particular dyad completing all research procedures.

Baker (1990) concluded several points from the analysis of data collected. As related to the topic of narcissism, the researcher identified a strong negative correlation between ratings of overall narcissism (both supervisor and supervisee) and ratings of the bond scale of the supervisory working alliance. Additionally, a sense of entitlement on the part of the supervisee correlated negatively to the global working alliance score as well as the scales for tasks and goals. As related to gender, dyads matched based on this factor indicated no significant difference on the supervisory working alliance compared to unmatched dyads. However, female supervisors working with male supervisees reported higher assessments of the working alliance than any other gender combination (female supervisors with female supervisees or male supervisees working with either male or female supervisors). Likewise, female supervisees working with male supervisors rated the supervisory working alliance lower compared to any other gender combination (female supervisors with female supervisees or male supervisees working with either

male or female supervisors). Baker cautioned drawing conclusions based on a lack of statistical significance for these trends.

Beyond the topics of particular interest to this investigation, Baker (1990) also noted some additional findings. A negative relationship between the number of sessions of supervision per week and the overall ratings of the supervisory working alliance existed at a statistically significant level. Similar relationships existed when comparing the number of years of supervision experience or the number of supervisees given individual supervision by the supervisor with the supervisors' reports of the working alliance for supervision. Baker concluded that these results point to the idea of an optimum amount of supervision for both the supervisee and supervisor to maintain a strong working alliance within this dyadic relationship.

Additional insight on paired perceptions in the supervisory dyad came from Ratliff, Wampler, and Morris (2000). These researchers in marriage and family therapy studied lack of consensus in supervision through a qualitative approach. Using conversation analysis techniques on transcripts of supervision sessions for 23 supervisees and six supervisors, investigators identified episodes involving lack of consensus occurring 120 times over 23 hours of supervision. For these 120 episodes revealing a lack of consensus, researchers categorized interactional strategies for supervisors into 10 categories divided along a continuum of confrontation with levels of low, moderate and high confrontation. The authors associated themes of influence and evaluation with these supervisor responses. Likewise, researchers categorized supervisee responses into eight categories divided along a continuum of agreement described as "Yes," "Yes, but," and "Not really." The authors associated themes of cooperation and deference to the

supervisee reactions. Based on their analysis of the results, Ratliff et al. (2000) described supervision in this way: “Supervisors do not really tell supervisees what to do, and supervisees do not promise to do what supervisors say” (p. 381). However, the authors recognized the need for supervisors to strike a balance between supervisee autonomy and competent clinical practice.

Dow’s (2001) dissertation research presented another example of paired perceptions in supervision research with his ex post facto design examining reports of events in supervision sessions. Using an extant database consisting of reports from 86 supervisors and 161 supervisees, Dow examined paired responses as to the most important topic in the supervision session, who initiated the topic, and supervisor’s style during the discussion of the topic. The results provided statistically significant findings for agreement on the most important topic, who initiated the topic, and the supervisor’s style during the discussion of the topic. Likewise, even when the members disagreed on the most important topic, data showed a statistically significant agreement on who initiated the topic and the supervisor’s style during the discussion of the topic. Though this statistical significance existed, Dow concluded no clinical significance based on a majority of responses representing overall disagreement.

Summary of Research on Paired Perceptions in Counseling and Supervision

Supervision research including the perspectives of both members of the supervisory dyad employed a variety of data collection methods and strategies for reporting results. Case study methods (Martin et al., 1987) directly examined the overall experience of supervision using self-report measures and observations. Other qualitative strategies collected data from both members of the dyad (Ratliff et al., 2000). The focus

of the research data centered on transcript analysis rather than self-reported participant perspectives. Dissertation research (Bahrlick, 1989; Baker, 1990; Dow, 2001) focused on the use of self-reporting instrumentation to answer research questions. In reporting results from these studies, authors aggregated the data by role (Bahrlick, 1989; Baker, 1990) in some instances and by agreement among the members of the same dyad (Bahrlick, 1989; Dow, 2001) in other instances. As a result, some of the research identified attempted to represent perspectives on a common experience for both members of the same dyad while others settled on conclusions for the dyad in general based on aggregated information from both perspectives.

For topics in counseling and supervision, research designed to collect data representing the perspectives of both participants in the counseling or supervision interaction appeared infrequently in the literature. The research highlighted in this section represented attempts in the counseling and supervision literature where investigators collected, analyzed, and reported on data from both members of the same dyad. As presented here, the research focused on therapy including both the client and therapist, supervision including both the supervisor and supervisee, or the triadic relationships involving supervisor, supervisee (therapist), and client. The next section of this literature review explores a specific context for supervision where both members of the supervisory dyad bring diverse backgrounds to the relationship and share common influences on the experience.

Site Supervision for School Counselor Supervisees

The supervision of counselors in training exists in multiple contexts. Counselor supervisees balance the demands and expectations of their graduate training program as

well as a field site placement (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). Dodd (1986) noted the differing goals of these entities. Colleges and universities primarily pursue the education and training of their students, while the field site delivers services to clients. While training programs focus their structure around a consistent framework of professional standards and faculty supervisors often have similar credentials (CACREP, 2009), site placements vary to a much greater degree and qualifications of site supervisors vary (Studer, 2005). Individuals interested in field site supervision identify the location of the field setting, the roles and responsibilities of the site supervisor, and the training and qualifications of the site supervisor as factors necessary for understanding the culture and context of field site placements (Studer, 2006). The focus of this section examines the context of site supervision for school counselor supervisees.

Field site placements for school counselors in training present some unique cultural and contextual factors for consideration in supervision (Studer & Diambra, 2010). Studer, Diambra, and Gambrell (2010) detailed the relevance of several physical markers of the school setting including the school counselor's office, organizational charts, assessments, and public relations information. Phillips and Wagner (2003) defined school culture more broadly than socioeconomic status, race, religion, and school size. More generally, the culture includes values, beliefs, and rituals shared by the members of the organization. In a school setting, disciplinary practices and policies, state and federal education initiatives, school improvement goals and philosophies, and the collaborative relationships among stakeholders (school board, administration, teachers, students, parents, etc.) exemplify factors for consideration by school counselors and counselor supervisees in the process of supervision (Kroninger et al., 2010).

In regard to context, Crawford (2010) listed three factors for consideration in understanding a school site placement: the age of the counselees, the time demands on the counselor, and the time availability of the clients. A school site functions to educate children and adolescents. The focus on school age children narrows the developmental issues for consideration with the client population. These issues include concerns with cognitive development, highlighting students with special needs, as well as identity development concerns related to drug use, sex, depression, and suicide (Studer & Diambra, 2010). Additionally, the objectives school counselors address when aligning with the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) National Model for school counseling programs specify necessary tasks and assignments upon which school counselors focus their work responsibilities. The delivery of the guidance curriculum, individual student planning, responsive services, and system support program components include varying amounts of direct clinical contact with students (Gysbers & Henderson, 2000). Finally, based on the accountability pressures of federal education laws like No Child Left Behind (U.S. Department of Education, 2002), many schools place an even greater emphasis on instructional availability. Classroom teachers and school administrators view time in the school counselor's office as missed classroom instruction time. The age and developmental issues of the clients as well as the time constraints of both counselors and clients represent important consideration in understanding the context of the field site placement for school counselor supervisees (Crawford, 2010).

As a field site supervisor, a school counselor assumes the roles and responsibilities of both a professional school counselor and a supervisor. The professional

school counselor must fulfill the roles of a counselor, consultant, and coordinator in direct service to the student clients (Wittmer, 2000). School counselors also serve as program managers and administrators orchestrating the implementation and evaluation of a comprehensive developmental counseling program (Schmidt, 1999). The field site supervisor must fill both the role of administrative supervisor and clinical supervisor. As a clinical supervisor, the site supervisor must fill the roles of teacher, counselor, and consultant (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). As an administrative supervisor, the site supervisor must meet the responsibilities for ensuring adherence to the expectations of the training program, keeping proper documentation of supervisory sessions, and completing supervisee evaluations (Haynes et al., 2003). When a school counselor becomes a site supervisor for a counselor in training, this role adds additional responsibilities for both clinical and administrative supervision.

School counselors typically do not take formal coursework or receive training in supervision (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). Bernard and Goodyear (2009) described the site supervisor as one who enjoys the supervision process and the opportunity to influence supervisees and training programs. Studer (2005) described the field site supervision of school counselors in terms of an exchange. Exchange refers to the supervisor's efforts at helping the supervisee learn counseling skill and case conceptualization in exchange for the supervisee's assistance with an overwhelming caseload. Without adequate training in supervision, school counselors may miss opportunities to provide adequate supervision.

The American Counseling Association (ACA) 2005 Code of Ethics (ACA, 2005) promotes training in supervision prior to adopting the role of counseling supervisor. CACREP (2009), in its 2009 Accreditation Standards, placed this responsibility for

minimum training of site supervisors on the university training program coordinating the site placements. The accreditation standards also set minimum expectations for the qualifications of a site supervisor (Studer, 2006). These requirements include a master's degree and professional credential, two years of professional experience, an understanding of the program's expectations, requirements, and evaluation procedures, and "relevant training in counseling supervision" (CACREP, 2009, Section III.C.4). However, not all school counselor training programs achieve accreditation through CACREP. Therefore, many school counselors may be practicing as site supervisors without meeting these minimum CACREP requirements.

Summary of Research on School Counseling Site Supervision

In summary, site supervision represents a melding of the educational requirements of the counselor training program with the client service expectations of the site placement. For school counseling supervisees, this experience represents not only the requirement for clinical skill development, but also the imperative to understand the general cultural and contextual components related to working in a school setting as well as necessary elements specific to the site placement. For the school counseling site supervisors, this experience adds the responsibilities of both clinical and administrative supervision to the role of professional school counselor. Field site supervision introduces specific challenges for both the counseling supervisor and supervisee.

Chapter Summary

This review of the literature detailed the context for research investigating SRSD in supervision dyads. Major elements explained in this chapter included the working

alliance, self-disclosure, supervisory dyads as participants, and site context for supervision. A brief summary of each concept follows.

Though a relationship exists in any therapeutic endeavor, the working alliance concept developed around the ideas of rapport and mutually agreed upon goals (Dubin & Rabin, 1969). Bordin (1979) conceptualized the therapeutic relationship as a therapeutic working alliance applying the elements of agreement on goals for therapy, agreement on the tasks necessary to achieve those goals, and the development of a relational bond between the therapist and client. In 1983, Bordin applied these same concepts to the relationship between a counseling supervisor and supervisee. The Working Alliance Inventory (WAI), developed by Horvath and Greenberg (1989), attempted to measure a global therapeutic working alliance and its components of agreement on goals, agreement on tasks, and strength of relational bond. Bahrnick (1989) then developed the Working Alliance Inventory for Supervision based directly on the WAI. This instrument appears most frequently in the literature to measure the three components of the supervisory working alliance (goals, tasks, and bond) as well as offer an overall global score for the supervisory working alliance.

The development of instruments capable of providing a valid measure of the supervisory relationship connected this research to findings on SRSD. Cozby (1973) defined self-disclosure as a verbalized, personal revelation made by one person to another. By definition, this made self-disclosure the default client response pattern in a therapeutic relationship. Additionally, researchers studied the impact of this behavior as an intervention used by therapists (Watkins, 1990; Hill & Knox, 2002). As was the case with the working alliance, researchers and practitioners alike applied this behavior to the

roles in the counseling supervision dyad (Farber, 2006). Research findings highlighted frequency data, informational content, supervisor purpose, and supervisee outcomes (Ladany & Walker, 2003). Further analysis of the findings of this research regularly points to a significant impact of SRSD on the degree of bonding in the supervisory relationship. Understanding that SRSD occurs infrequently as an intervention (Matazzoni, 2008), the more often supervisors self-disclose in congruence with supervisee concerns, the stronger the relational bond between supervisor and supervisee (Knox et al., 2011).

Research literature examining the impact of the supervisory working alliance and SRSD frequently included self-report data evaluating the perspective of supervisors (Ladany et al., 2001; Knox et al., 2008) or supervisees (Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999; Knox et al., 2011). Closer examination revealed a consistent pattern of including representation from only half of the supervisory dyad. Investigations documenting perspectives from both sides of a dyadic relationship demonstrated the use of a variety of data collection and presentation strategies (Ratliff et al., 2000; Dow, 2001). Adding multiple perspectives to the collection of research data allowed for matching data among the roles within a dyad (Bahrack, 1989) and looking at rates and levels of agreement between roles within specific dyads (Dow, 2001).

After reviewing literature on the process for and research of supervision, the present investigation requires the placement of supervisory dyads into a specific context. The complexity of school counselor training makes for a unique endeavor. Site supervision requires the formation of supervisory dyads with members juggling multiple roles and responsibilities. The site supervisor must manage the responsibilities of a

school counselor and supervisor simultaneously as well as navigate the expectations of a school system and university training program (Studer, 2005). Likewise, the supervisee must respond to demands from the site placement and university while also balancing the shift from supervisee (practicum) to advanced supervisee (intern) to professional (Studer & Diambra, 2010).

Although the research literature identified congruent findings across roles and variables related to SRSD, several aspects of the topic merit further exploration. First, the current literature reports findings from either the perspective of the supervisee (Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999) *or* the supervisor (Knox et al., 2008; Ladany et al., 2001). However, no attempt assessed the experience of SRSD from the perspectives of both members (supervisor and supervisee) of the same supervisory relationship. Research exploring feedback on specific SRSDs from the perspectives of both members of the supervision dyad could provide some indication of the effectiveness of the technique in a supervisory setting (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009).

Second, the data gathering procedures common to this body of literature (Knox et al., 2008; Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999; Ladany et al., 2001) also merit additional consideration. Specifically, the post hoc designs of these three studies asked participants to reflect on memorable experiences of SRSD within current or recent supervision relationships as long as two years ago. The studies on self-disclosure in counseling supervision depended upon long-term participant recall. Researchers may enhance the accuracy of reporting reactions to SRSD by both members of the supervision relationship by using techniques for enhanced recall of recent supervision sessions within current supervision dynamics (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009).

Third, while the participant groups in these studies (Knox et al., 2008; Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999; Ladany et al., 2001) may include some master's level supervisees and some master's level supervisors, researchers made no effort to distinguish any results characteristic of these particular subgroups of supervisees and supervisors. In fact, most supervisor participants were licensed psychologists and other doctoral level trained clinicians with advanced training and experience in counseling supervision (Knox et al., 2008; Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999; Ladany et al., 2001). In the literature on self-disclosure, few studies focus on any particular characteristic of supervisors or supervisees. Supervisors formally trained at the master's level, like school counseling site supervisors, may understand and initiate the use of an intervention like SRSD in a qualitatively different way than licensed psychologists or other PhD level supervisors (Studer, 2006).

This review of the literature provides the necessary background and focus for exploring the specific phenomenon of SRSD within the context of the supervisory relationship described in the previous paragraph. The next chapter details the use of the case study method for investigating the research questions considered in the present study:

1. How do the school counseling site supervisor and school counseling supervisee conceptualize and describe self-disclosure?
2. How do the school counseling site supervisor and the school counseling supervisee describe the intended purpose of a shared SRSD experience?
3. How do the school counseling site supervisor and the school counseling supervisee describe the perceived effect(s) of a shared SRSD experience?

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Chapter Introduction

This study describes the perceptions of a supervisor self-disclosure (SRSD) experience shared between a counseling supervisor and supervisee within the context of school counseling site supervision. This study collected participant survey data and audio-recorded case examples of supervision interactions between school counseling site placement supervisors and school counselor supervisees in an effort to explore the following research questions:

1. How do the school counseling site supervisor and the school counseling supervisee conceptualize and describe self-disclosure?
2. How do the school counseling site supervisor and the school counseling supervisee describe the intended purpose of a shared SRSD experience?
3. How do the school counseling site supervisor and the school counseling supervisee describe the perceived effect(s) of a shared SRSD experience?

Chapter Three details the method, procedure, and analysis used to conduct this investigation of SRSD. First, related to the methods, a rationale for and description of case study research describes many assumptions and limitations inherent in qualitative research, in exploratory or descriptive case studies, and in the role of the researcher. This section concludes with a discussion of trustworthiness and rigor (Merriam, 2009) for this research. Second, a description of the procedures includes information about the participant sample and techniques for selection including the nature and context of the participants selected for this research. Third, data collection procedures describe the solicitation of participants and two phases of data collection. This section also explains

the context of a pilot study used to assess the feasibility of these procedures and to collect data. Fourth and finally, a description of data analysis procedures facilitates a context of transparency for the results describing the phenomenon of a shared SRSD experience.

Qualitative Methods

The case study represents one example of a qualitative research strategy. The qualitative research paradigm assumes that reality is socially constructed and consists of multiple possibilities and interpretations (Merriam, 2009). Qualitative researchers attempt to provide a thorough description and interpretation of these possibilities within a specified context. Some of the research considerations characteristically employed in qualitative inquiry include a need to understand the uniqueness of the natural setting, to understand the meaning of experience for the participants, and the opportunity to collect data from multiple sources (Merriam, 2009; Creswell, 2009).

Denzin and Lincoln (2005) described qualitative research as “a situated activity that locates the observer in the world” (p.3). Other qualitative researchers (Merriam, 2009; Creswell, 2009) echoed similar descriptions stressing the critical element of collecting data in the field at the site of the issue. Qualitative research protocols commonly use purposeful sampling techniques to identify research sites matching the nature of the research questions (Merriam, 2009). The researchers often choose a context that serves to represent either a typical or atypical example of the phenomenon in question (Abramson, 1992). Qualitative researchers seek to gain an understanding of the uniqueness of a situation by purposefully choosing the context and collecting data directly from the field site.

In addition to the setting, the researcher seeks to discover the meaning of the experience for the participant rather than the researcher (Creswell, 2009). The perspective of the actors in the setting, known as the insider's or emic perspective exists as a key focus for qualitative researchers (Merriam, 2009). Maxwell (2005) described this point of view as more than the events or actions taking place during the course of the phenomena. Qualitative researchers pursue an understanding of how the participants make sense of the phenomena and how this understanding influences participant behavior. The outcome reveals how people interpret events in their lives (Merriam, 2009).

Lastly, qualitative research strategies collect data from multiple sources. Creswell (2009) listed observations, interviews, document analysis, and audio-visual materials as sources from which qualitative data may be collected. Creswell further suggested that researchers include arguments about the strengths and weakness of each type of data collected in the research design. Stake (1995) also described circumstances for multiple sources of data collection to include simply interviewing multiple participants or observing multiple sites. Analyzing and comparing data from a variety of sources allows qualitative researchers to benefit from a process known as triangulation (Fielding & Fielding, 1986). Triangulating data from multiple sources limits the potential for bias from a single data source and adds validity to the researcher's interpretations and conclusions (Maxwell, 2005). Merriam (2009) encouraged the use of excerpts and quotes from multiple data sources to achieve a thick, rich description of the phenomena under investigation. Qualitative research designs characteristically include data collection from a variety of sources.

In summary, qualitative research seeks to understand perspectives of a socially constructed reality. The characteristics of this research approach include a thorough examination of the field site, an interpretation of the meaning of experience for the participant, and an analysis of relevant data from multiple sources. Qualitative research reports result in a thoroughly detailed description of the setting, participants, and phenomena in question. The next section describes case study research as one specific form of qualitative research.

A Rationale for Case Study Research

The basic design employed in this research represents the case study method (Yin, 2003). Merriam (1998) borrowed descriptions from the likes of Stake (1995) and Yin (1994) crafting a definition of case study inclusive of the object of study, the process of research, and the end product of inquiry. The object of the research, or case, refers to a single bounded system or unit where the boundaries between phenomenon and context are often unclear (Yin, 2003; Stake, 1995). The process of research, known as case study research, involves empirical inquiry investigating a contemporary phenomenon (Yin, 2003). The case study researcher investigates both the common and the distinguishing aspects of the case (Stake, 1998). The end product, referred to as a case study, reflects “an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single instance, phenomenon, or social unit” (Merriam, 1998, p.27). Again, Stake (1998) framed the requirements for the case study researcher to account for the background knowledge of the reader when presenting the case. “A new case without commonality cannot be understood. Yet a new case without distinction will not be noticed” (p. 95). Thus, case study research describes

an empirical inquiry of a bounded unit or system resulting in a thick rich description of the object and its context.

The case study method possesses several advantages making it adaptable and appropriate to the research questions presented in this study. First, the topic of research conforms to the definition Yin (2003) offered to describe the case. The shared communication experience of a SRSD exists as a bounded phenomenon that includes a supervisor constructing a self-disclosing statement, communicating that statement to a supervisee, the supervisee hearing the statement, and ascribing a meaning to the disclosure. Second, Yin (2003) proposed the case study method for answering ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions related to “a contemporary set of events, over which the investigator has little or no control” (p. 9). The research questions proposed in this study focus on the reasons a supervisor employs SRSD as an intervention in supervision and how to interpret this intended meaning. Furthermore, the researcher has no control over the use, understanding, or impact of SRSD in the supervision interviews. Third, the case study results in a rich, thick description of a complex phenomenon embedded in its natural context allowing the reader a more detailed understanding of the SRSD process. Case study designs present several advantages for inquiry within the qualitative research paradigm.

Collective case study. As mentioned in the previous section, qualitative research emphasizes the need for collecting data from multiple sources. For case study research, collecting data from multiple sources may come in the form of a multisite or multi-case design (Yin, 2003; Stake, 1995). Stake (1995) labels such research as a collective case study and describes the focus not on the value of a particular case but rather on the

insight the cases can provide on the topic. Yin (2003) frames the need for multiple cases around the notion of enhanced external generalizability. Thus, the collective case study design provides the opportunity for analysis of commonalities and differences among cases and the ability to establish a level of congruence with an existing theoretical framework. As a result, adding additional case examples to the case study design enhances both the confidence a reader can have in the conclusions of the researcher and the breadth of these conclusion for understanding the meaning of the experience.

This collective case study design resembles the multiple-case design with embedded units of analysis as described by Yin (2003). In this study, the *context* refers to a supervision session between a school counseling site supervisor and a school counseling supervisee in an internship placement. The *case* refers to a SRSD experience during a supervision session. The *units of analysis* embedded within each case refer to both the perceptions of the school counseling site supervisor and the school counseling supervisee regarding this shared school counseling site supervisor self-disclosure experience. Huberman and Miles (1994) described the circumstances under which such designs were suitable. “Tighter designs are indicated when the researcher has good prior acquaintance with the setting, has a good bank of applicable, well-delineated concepts, and takes a more explanatory and/or confirmatory stance involving multiple, comparable cases” (p. 431). The multiple cases represent unique SRSD experiences among different site supervisor and school counseling supervisee dyadic relationships.

Limitations. As with all research designs, limitations exist within the multisite case study. These limitations include the researcher as the primary means of data collection, the researcher as the interpreter of meaning, and the overall limited

generalizability of the results. The potential for researcher bias exists at nearly every stage of the research process (Creswell, 2009). Clearly, the researcher chooses the topic under investigation and the design of the study, including the data types collected and sources observed. As the primary means of data collection, the researcher thus relies on a human instrument (Merriam, 1998). While this allows for adjustment and adaptation during the research process, the possibility of variances in sensitivity to critical data, particularly discrepant data, threaten the credibility of the research. Furthermore, the interpretive nature of qualitative research creates another potential for bias. Researchers bear the responsibility of interpreting observational data, inferring a level of importance to the experience, and organizing this understanding into themes or other units of analysis. Merriam (1998) called this “the process of making meaning” (p. 178). Finally, the case study by definition limits generalizability to a specific bounded phenomenon. Creswell (2009) extends the idea for qualitative research by emphasizing the goal of deeper understanding for the particular and the specific associated with the object of study. While Merriam (2009) articulated the possibility of understanding the general by examining the specific, Walker (1980) placed the responsibility of generalization on the reader who seeks to find applicable meaning for the research to his or her experience. The limitations of researcher bias and limited generalizability draw particular attention to the researcher’s attempt to address these issues. Therefore, this type of qualitative presentation requires an examination of the role of the researcher.

Role of the Researcher

The researcher accepts numerous responsibilities when conducting scholarly research. These responsibilities include attaining proper institutional review board (IRB)

approval for studies involving human subjects, following ethical guidelines for research in the associated profession, thoroughly describing and adhering to research design protocol, and explicitly addressing researcher biases. This section describes the steps taken to ensure accountability to the role of the researcher.

Conducting ethical research involving human subjects requires proper approval from the IRB (ACA, 2005; Creswell, 2009). The researcher in this study followed the guidelines for completing the IRB application process and gaining the necessary approval. Additionally, the researcher designed and executed research protocol in compliance with the Code of Ethics for the American Counseling Association (ACA) (2005). The ACA instructions and guidelines offered for research require ethical treatment of subjects including informed consent and confidentiality. The researcher informed all participants of the purpose of the study and any potential risk associated with participation. Furthermore, the identity of all participants remained confidential through the use of coding procedures during data collection and pseudonyms for case descriptions. In summary, according to the ACA Code of Ethics (2005), the principal researcher maintains ultimate responsibility for ethical research practice.

Ethical research also requires a strict adherence to research design protocol. In any research endeavor, a clear, thorough description of the researcher's behavior and interactions with participants provides necessary information for the reader to evaluate both context and quality of the research. As a goal of the empirical process, the researcher publicizes not only the results and implications of the study but also the methods and processes by which the data collection and analysis occur (Anfara, Brown,

& Mangione, 2002). For this study, the researcher provides a detailed description of data collection and analysis procedures in separate sections later in Chapter Three.

Researcher bias. With the researcher as the primary means of data collection and interpretation in qualitative research protocols, the role of the researcher introduces the possibility of researcher bias (Creswell, 2009). Researcher bias exists as the presence of personal issues and values in the strategic, ethical, or interpretive elements of research (Locke et al., 2007). In an effort to address researcher bias in this study, the primary researcher engaged in a process of reflecting through beliefs, assumptions, and experiences related to the research topic.

The researchers reflections on the topic of supervision and self-disclosure included thoughts centered on CACREP accredited school counselor training, the experience of being supervised as a supervisee, the experience of providing site supervision, the experience of serving as a program supervisor, and completing advanced training in supervision as a doctoral student. Self-disclosure existed at all levels of training, counseling, and supervision. SRSDs vary by topic. The proximity of the supervisee to the institution, the temporal nature of the supervision interactions, and the structure applied by the supervisor through planning supervision interventions seem connected to variability in SRSDs. After completing the literature review, the researcher recognized some elements of purpose and frequency correlated with SRSD. As a supervisor, the researcher realized an absence of conscious thought associated with the intentions of and the perceptions for using SRSD. In summary, the researcher reflected on personal experiences as a counselor in training, a professional school counselor, site supervisor, and program supervisor in addition to his counseling preparation and

supervision training. These reflections also included thoughts on site supervisors, programs supervisors, and expectations for research. The researcher referred to these reflections throughout the data analysis for awareness on how these prior experiences impact interpretation of data.

Trustworthiness

According to Anfara et al. (2002), a researcher must employ multiple strategies to account for the quality and rigor of qualitative research. For this type of research, concepts like credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability, replace the common quantitative correlates of internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity (Anfara et al., 2002). This study used multiple sources of evidence, multiple-case studies, member checks, and triangulation of data sources to verify the credibility of the data, trustworthiness of conclusions (Guba & Lincoln, 1982).

This research design uses many strategies for enhancing the trustworthiness of the data collected and thus the conclusions drawn from the data. Yin (2003) described multiple sources of evidence as a factor in creating a good case study. In the data gathering phases, this study specifically describes the use of structured interviews (demographic questionnaire and open-ended survey) and observations (audio recordings). Each source also contains responses from multiple roles within the case (supervisor and supervisee). In addition to the multiple sources of evidence within each case, this study includes the multi-site element highlighted by Merriam (1998) as a way to increase transferability of the results and provide a greater degree of confirmability to the conclusions. To further enhance the credibility of the findings, the researcher incorporated member checking into the data handling procedures. According to Stake

(1995), member checking involves asking participant to review drafts of the findings and offer feedback to the language and interpretation of those findings. Lastly, the researcher included steps to triangulate data sources. Creswell (2002) described triangulation as “the process of corroborating evidence from different individuals, types of data, or methods of data collection” (p.280). Individual case analysis focused on examination of data elements from interviews and observations from multiple roles. Cross-case analysis comparisons focus on the comparing and contrasting elements from the multiple cases. The intentional use of multiple sources of evidence, multiple case examples, member checking, and data triangulation in this research design enhances the trustworthiness of the results. See sections on *Data Collection* and *Data Analysis* for more thorough descriptions of how the research protocol includes these strategies.

As suggested by Merriam (2009), “Investigators need to explain their biases, dispositions, and assumptions regarding the research to be undertaken” (p. 219). Yin (2003) also encouraged the reflection on prior knowledge to achieve a higher quality of data analysis. Following these ideas, the researcher routinely reviewed personal reflections and research protocol at each stage of data analysis and made notes about the influence they may have on an evolving perspective. Creswell (2009) recommended using quotes from participants in reporting results as well as using exact wording for form codes, themes, and categories. The researcher included direct, concrete examples from data to represent the participant’s voice and represent participant perspectives rather than personal biases. Finally, Creswell (2009) stated the importance of considering discrepant data leading to potential contradictions as a way to increase realism and

credibility. Even if findings are surprising, they should resonate with the reader (Yin, 2003).

Participants

This study explores the dynamic of SRSD within the context of a supervision relationship consisting of a school counseling site placement supervisor and school counseling supervisee. According to CACREP (2009), school counseling site placement supervisors must have a master's degree, appropriate certification or license, two years of professional experience, knowledge of the counselor training program, and "relevant training in counseling supervision" (CACREP, 2009, III.C (4), p. 14). CACREP (2009) requires school counseling students to complete a 100-hour supervised practicum and a 600-hour supervised internship. The criterion-based selection technique (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993) required each site supervisor in the study to meet the CACREP requirements associated with his or her role in the school counseling supervision dyad. Likewise, the school counseling supervisee participants consisted of students enrolled in an internship course at the time of data collection. Additionally, all participating dyads engaged in periodic, direct, individual supervision.

Convenience sampling techniques (Merriam, 1998) focused the selection of participants on available school counseling internship site placements at a CACREP accredited land-grant university in the southeastern United States. Sampling considerations also accounted for the length of the supervisory relationship that, for school counselor training, potentially concludes within a single academic semester (Studer, 2006). All sites chosen for participation served as typical cases (Patton, 1990). The sample size totaled four supervisor/supervisee relationship dyads for the collective

case design. Though Lincoln and Guba (1985) recommended adding additional cases until the data reaches a point of saturation or redundancy, this study specified participation by four supervision dyads selected over two separate semesters in an effort to balance the need for comprehensive examination of the common case while managing practical concerns for time and available participants. The goals of this qualitative case study focused on comparing the perceptions of the purpose of the SRSD and the perceptions of the effects of the SRSD. The researcher contacted potential participants after the IRB granted approval for the research.

Data Collection

The data collection procedures for this study included participant solicitation and data gathering. Once the methodology and procedures for the study gained IRB approval, an initial research project piloted both the participant selection and the data collection strategies. This original pilot study served as a research competency requirement for the PhD in Counselor Education. After a brief summary of the pilot study, this section details procedures for participant solicitation and data gathering.

Beginning the Research

The initial participant selection and data collection for this research occurred during the 2010-2011 academic year. This project piloted the participant solicitation and data collection processes. A brief description of the participant solicitation and data collection processes used both in the pilot study follows.

Pilot study. For the pilot study, the initial steps included identifying a participant sample, seeking permission from the university school counseling program coordinator, communicating with the internship instructor, and meeting directly with the potential

supervisee participants. After the IRB university committee granted approval on behalf of the university, the school counseling program coordinator allowed the researcher to pursue further coordination of the project with the internship instructor. After coordinating a visit to the school counseling internship class, the primary researcher solicited participants by presenting the research topic, explaining requirements for participation, describing possible risks involved, declaring provisions for the safety of the participants including the goals of confidentiality and the right to withdraw, and finally suggesting the benefits of the opportunity to participate in the scientific endeavor to learn more about school counseling site supervision. The section on soliciting participants provides more detailed information about this process.

The next steps in the pilot study included collecting informed consent and demographic information from all participants and an audio recording of a supervision interaction from each supervisory dyad. After soliciting participants, supervisees from the school counseling internship class notified the researcher by email of their supervisors' willingness to participate. At that point, the researcher emailed informed consent documents and demographic questionnaires to each individual participant with instructions on how to return those items to the researcher. Once receiving both documents from each member of a supervisory dyad, the researcher emailed instructions for making an audio recording of a supervision session and submitting that recording to the researcher. The section on phase one data collection provides further details for confirming participation and collecting initial data.

The final steps for collecting data in the pilot study included listening to the audio recordings, identifying an SRSD example, creating a partial transcript, sending a survey

to the participants, and collecting responses to the survey. After receiving the audio recording from each supervisory dyad, the researcher listened to the supervision sessions in search of an example of a SRSD as previously defined in Chapter One. After identifying such an example, the researcher prepared a partial transcript including multiple complete segments of conversational interaction by each dyad member preceding the SRSD and the actual SRSD example. The researcher sent this partial transcript followed by three open-ended survey questions (Appendix A) to each participant. Participants received instructions for completing the survey and returning it to the researcher. At that point, participant involvement in the data collection process concluded. The section on phase two data collection provides further details for processing the audio recordings and collecting final data from participants.

As a result of the success of these data collection procedures, the researcher proposed to include the participant data gathered from the pilot study with the data gathered for the dissertation study. Although the researcher previously employed the data collection procedures, the data collected underwent no analysis prior to the dissertation proposal. Therefore, the content of the pilot created no influence on the additional literature review, research design, further data collection, or overall data analysis of this research project. The researcher collected additional data for this study as outlined below.

Extending the Research

The processes used in the pilot study demonstrated the necessary feasibility to expand the study. With the approval of the dissertation committee, data from the pilot study combined with new data collected for the dissertation study completed the data set for the present investigation.

Participant solicitation. The participant sample in this research project includes participants in the researcher's previous research project from the fall term of 2010 and an additional school counseling site supervisor and supervisee participating in the internship course in the school counseling program at a CACREP accredited land-grant university in the southeastern United States during the fall term of 2013. Before identifying additional individuals for participation and after obtaining IRB approval, the researcher contacted the School Counseling Program Coordinator/School Counseling Practicum and Internship Coordinator for approval to solicit participants. After obtaining approval, the researcher collected names of potential participants from the practicum and internship coordinator. At this point, the researcher contacted the internship instructor for permission to attend class, describe the present study, and request participation from students.

During the scheduled internship classroom visit, the researcher took 10 minutes to present the opportunity for participation in this doctoral dissertation research study by introducing himself, distributing information packets, describing the contents of the packets, and responding to questions and concerns. To begin the presentation, the researcher introduced himself as a current doctoral student at the university engaged in dissertation research. Next, the researcher distributed an information packet to each internship student. This packet contained a summary of the research project, a copy of the informed consent document, and a supervisor packet. The supervisor packet also contained a summary of the research project, three copies of the informed consent document for review by the school site supervisor, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. Then, the researcher reviewed and described the content of each packet

including the focus of the research, the need for participants, the terms of informed consent and protection of participants, and procedures for voluntary participation or seeking additional information for supervisees. As explained in the presentation, for supervisees expressing interest in participation, the researcher communicated with the participant's supervisor via email to express the supervisee's interest in research participation. In that same communication with the supervisor, the researcher reviewed the focus of research, described the contents of the supervisor information packet, and explained steps necessary for dyad participation. During the presentation, the researcher shared intentions for a one-week follow up and a subsequent two-week follow up regarding participation in the research study via email. Lastly, opportunities for questions about the study and further explanation of instructions and procedures concluded the presentation.

The researcher followed the participant solicitation protocol outlined in the description of the presentation to supervisees in the preceding paragraph. Supervisors and supervisees confirmed participatory status by signing and returning informed consent documents. Data collection began immediately after receiving consent from both members of a supervisory dyad.

Data collection. The researcher gathered data for this study in two phases. Data collection began after collecting the informed consent for participation from both members of a dyad. Phase one included collecting demographic data and audio recordings of a supervision interaction. Phase two included collecting responses to an open-ended survey.

Phase one: demographic information and audio recording. Once both members of the supervisory dyad returned the informed consent, the researcher sent the supervisees and supervisors instructions, via password-protected email, explaining the next step for continued participation. The email included an attached demographic questionnaire (Appendices B and C) as well as instructions for completing and returning the questionnaire. The password-protected email communication stated the same message to all participants. However, the questionnaires attached to the emails contained participant codes used to identify responses by the individual case and supervisory role of the participant. Supervisors and supervisees returned the demographic questionnaire either as a reply to the password-protected email or uploaded the documents to the password-protected digital dropbox along with the audio recording as described next.

Demographic data collected on the supervisors and supervisees included age, ethnicity, and gender. Additional information specific to site supervisors included years of professional school counseling experience, number of school counseling supervisees previously supervised, hours of specific training in counseling supervision, and type of school (elementary, middle, or high) where the particular placement occurs. Additional information specific to the supervisees included the number of graduate courses completed toward the school counseling degree, number of hours of supervision received during the current term, and stage of training (practicum or internship). The questionnaire included demographic variables identified as significant correlates to supervision and self-disclosure (Baker, 1990; Ladany, Ellis, et al., 1999; Matazzoni, 2008).

The aforementioned email also communicated instructions for audio recording a supervision session. Because supervisees keep audio recording equipment on hand as part

of internship requirements for recording client sessions, research protocol assigned the responsibility of recording the supervision session to the supervisee. The supervisee recorded a supervision interaction lasting approximately 30 minutes, checked the recording for reasonable listening quality, and submitted this recording to the researcher through campus mail or a password-protected digital dropbox. Once participants returned the materials per instructions, the second phase of data collection began.

Phase two: open-ended survey. Upon receiving the recordings, the researcher listened to each supervision session and identified an occurrence of a SRSD. The researcher created a partial transcript including the identified SRSD, several statements by each member of the dyad occurring before the self-disclosing statement, and an open-ended survey consisting of three questions. The precluding statements by each member of the dyad provided contextual information that helps improve recall (Kagan, Krathwohl, & Miller, 1963). Then, the researcher sent the partial transcript including the SRSD example and the open-ended survey to supervisor and supervisee participants via password-protected email.

The researcher instructed the participants to read the SRSD example, respond to the questions, and return the open-ended survey. The open-ended survey served as a structured protocol and focused on participant understandings of the concept of self-disclosure, perceptions of the supervisor's purpose for using self-disclosure, and the perceptions of the effects of the self-disclosure on the supervisee. The open-ended survey questions (Appendix A) include:

1. Please explain your understanding of the concept of self-disclosure.
2. What was your perception of the purpose of using this supervisor self-disclosure?

3. What was your perception of the effect of this supervisor self-disclosure on the supervisee?

At times, researchers criticize the use of open-ended questions in a survey due to an inability to obtain adequate answers (Dillman, 2000), but open-ended questions provide an opportunity to explore unanticipated possible answers. They also allow for the collection of data in the participants' own words (Dillman, 2000; Fowler, Jr., 2002). The researcher asked participants to refrain from consulting or collaborating with the other member of his or her supervisory relationship dyad or anyone else involved with internship.

Data Analysis

After data collection ended, the researcher began the data analysis process. The researcher followed procedures for analyzing qualitative research recommended by Creswell (2009, 2007) and Rossman and Rallis (1998). As suggested by these researchers, the data analysis process moves from the specific to the general emphasizing first direct analysis of text from documents, transcripts, or field notes and then additional analysis of codes, themes, or categories accumulated from the direct analysis. Therefore, this type of analysis also involves multiple steps or stages of data review. Even though the process of analysis appears linear as described below, the various steps interrelate for an integrated approach interpreting the text as a whole, then categorizing into parts, and then interpreting meaning for the whole again. The researcher used the six steps recommended by Creswell (2009, pp. 185-189) for conducting qualitative research analysis:

1. Prepare data – First, transcribe supervision interviews. Second, type field notes. Third, sort data according to type.
2. Read all data collected – Read entire data set to gain an initial understanding of the meanings of the data. Record insights on these reflections.
3. Initiate a thorough analysis and begin the coding process – Separate the data into sections. Group sections into categories. Use codes to distinguish sections (use language of the participants) (Rossman & Rallis, 1998).
4. Describe the setting and the categories – Represent people, places, and events in the account.
5. Describe the categories using the words of the participants.
6. Interpret categories – Describe meanings attributed to the experience. Identify questions for future research.

The remainder of this section details the application of Creswell's (2009) process to the present investigation.

Step One: Prepare Data

To begin, the researcher gathered the raw data (data set) for each case. These data sets included a) demographic information about each participant, b) an audio-recording of an entire supervisory session, c) a partial transcript of a SRSD from the audio-recorded supervisory session, and d) the three question survey each member of the dyad completed after reading the partial transcript. Specifically, the raw data consisted of demographic information for each participant including age, gender, ethnicity, and experience related to education, training, and supervision. The audio recording of the supervision session provided contextual information including length of the session, number or frequency of

supervisor self-disclosures, context (what is happening or the focus of the discussion), and who directs the session. A partial transcript of the supervisory session consisted of the actual self-disclosure event preceded by multiple complete segments of conversational interaction by each dyad member of the supervisory dyad. Finally, the survey questions for the supervisor and the supervisee included the following: a) Please explain your understanding of the concept of self-disclosure. b) What was your perception of the purpose of using this supervisor self-disclosure with the supervisee? and c) What was your perception of the effect of this supervisor self-disclosure on the supervisee? All data remained organized by case (Creswell, 2009).

Step Two: Read All Data Collected

Next, the researcher continued the analysis by reading through each piece of data for basic understanding of the case and its context. These pieces of data consisted of demographic charts, partial transcripts, and survey responses from supervisor and supervisee.

First, the researcher reviewed the demographic chart taking notes in the margins of the chart alongside each participant role to highlight elements found in the literature to be particularly influential in the supervisory relationship such as gender and experience. The researcher then created a narrative description of the demographic information depicting the supervisor and supervisee as well as the supervisory dyad as a whole and the context of the supervision event.

Second, the researcher listened to the audio-recorded supervision session to understand the context surrounding the SRSD example. The researcher made notes related to the following questions: What is happening (case consultation, evaluation,

etc.)? Who is directing the interaction? What role is the supervisor taking (teacher, counselor, or consultant)? What skills does the supervisor demonstrate? At what point does the SRSD example occur? What happens after the SRSD event? What is the tone of the interaction (formal, informal, other)? Do dyad members generally achieve consensus of thought or opinion about issues presented in this session? What elements of the supervisory working alliance (goals, tasks, and bonding) are evident in the session? Are additional examples of SRSD apparent? What else stands out from the transcript?

The researcher listed the questions above on a separate document. Then, while listening to the audio recording, the researcher made notes and drafted answers to these questions. The researcher used these questions and answers as guidelines for understanding the supervision event. The researcher noted ideas about the supervision event that differ from the questions listed above. Based on these ideas and insights, the researcher created a narrative description of the case context positioned within the literature on supervision and the supervisory working alliance. The researcher compared data related to supervisor behavior during the recorded supervision interaction to triangulate with supervisor experience level from the demographic questionnaire. In addition, the researcher triangulated data from the survey responses to questions three with what happens during the supervision session after the SRSD experience. The researcher also noted discrepant data (Maxwell, 2005).

Finally, the researcher reviewed the responses to the open-ended survey including the partial transcript included for enhanced recall. The researcher made notes to highlight the type of SRSD (Ladany, Lehrman-waterman, 1999), level of participant congruence among responses, and level of dyad congruence between responses of supervisory dyad

partners. Participant congruence refers to consistency in a participant's thoughts or feelings (Prout & Wadkins, 2014). Participant congruence is determined by matching response data on a single question to the similarity of response data on other questions and to what happened in the supervision session. The researcher considered the following questions: Does the participant's understanding of self-disclosure (question one) relate to that participants perception of the intention of the SRSD (question two) and to the effect of the SRSD (question three)? Does the participant's understanding of the phenomenon (question one), perception of intention (question two), and perception of the effect (question three) relate to the participant's behavior in the supervision session? The researcher also made notes to highlight the level of dyad congruence. Dyad congruence refers to consistency in perspective (Retrum, Nowels, & Bekelman, 2013). Dyad congruence is determined by matching response data on a particular question to the similarity of the response data of their dyad partner on the same question. For this, the researcher considered the following question: Does the level of congruence between the members of the dyad for corresponding questions on the survey relate directly to the corresponding research questions?

Step two of the data analysis consisted of an initial reading of the entire data set for each case. The researcher repeated the procedures described in this section with each case in this design. With the initial overview of the data complete, the researcher reviewed his personal reflections (described earlier in the section on Role of the Researcher) and made additional notes to address ideas made more salient by the data reviewed for each case as well as ideas not found in the data. The researcher then reviewed data, notes, and narratives from step two in the data analysis to ensure salient

points found support in participant words and to note any new perspectives with which the researcher identifies. After completing this reflective process, the researcher took a second look at the data from the surveys as noted in the next step of the analysis process.

Step Three: Initiate a Thorough Analysis and Begin the Coding Process

Coding data involves a multilayered review process. The researcher followed coding procedures outlined by Tesch (1990) which include the following eight steps:

1. Read the particular data elements carefully for each case.
2. Reread the data elements this time making notes about underlying meanings.
3. List these thoughts and combine ideas under similar topics.
4. Review the data a third time. This time writing codes (abbreviations for the topics) next to the text where these topics appear.
5. Group similar topics into a category. Name the categories using participant words.
6. Decide on a code for each category and create an alphabetized list.
7. Collect the data representing each category into one place. Perform an analysis for a thorough description of the category.
8. Recode the data if necessary to account for refined categorical descriptions.

The researcher applied the coding procedures to the partial transcript and survey responses in order to keep the focus on the SRSD experience, which defines the case in this design. The researcher tracked this process and documented notes in a table similar to Table A2. In this table, the far left column with the heading of *time* represents the particular point of the transcript or survey where the topics appear. The columns labeled *supervisor* and *supervisee* represent the participant that introduced a given topic or

category. The columns labeled *notes* provide space for researcher comments about additional patterns in the data, strong categorical examples, and process notes. As indicated by Tesch (1990), the next part of the process required the researcher to list the topics from the table. For these cases, the researcher kept topics related to the role of supervisor and supervisee separate. The researcher made notes on this list about overlapping topics and descriptive categories in order to track the combination of similar ideas. Once the researcher settled on a preliminary list, he coded the original data elements with the abbreviations representing these topics, refined the categories, and reorganized data according to coded categories.

The researcher repeated this process separately for each case in the design. The research question attempts to answer questions related to a shared experience of SRSD. By aggregating the data at any point, the researcher shifts that focus from the shared experience within a dyad to the general role of a supervisee or supervisor within a supervisory dyad. As the analysis progressed to step four, the researcher continued to organize and describe data, notes, and codes according to case.

Step Four: Describe the Setting and the Categories

The categories identified from the partial transcripts and surveys represent the content for the next stage of analysis. The researcher described the categories associated with the supervisor perspective and linked excerpts from the data to represent specific examples of these categories. Sections of the transcript data or survey responses often represented more than one topic or category. Likewise, the researcher described the categories associated with the supervisee perspective and linked excerpts from the data to represent specific examples of these categories. After describing the categories for each

role within a dyad, the researcher concluded the case description by summarizing categories for the dyad.

With the second overview of the data complete, the researcher again reviewed his personal reflections making notes on ideas made more salient by the data reviewed for each case as well as notes on ideas still not found in the data. The researcher then reviewed data, notes, and narratives from step four in the data analysis to ensure salient points found support in participant words and to note any new perspectives with which the researcher identified. After completing this reflective process, the researcher advanced to the next step of data analysis.

Step Five: Describe the Categories Using the Words of the Participants

At this point, the researcher advanced the analysis to include cross-case comparisons (Yin, 2003). This cross-case analysis included comparing meanings and descriptions from step four and notes and information included from the initial review in step two. The researcher questions: What meanings apply to multiple cases? Are there any overarching categories to these shared experiences? The researcher used case-by-case comparisons for this stage of analysis. In order to focus the attention the study on the shared experience of SRSD between a school counseling site placement supervisor and a school counseling supervisee, the researcher made no attempt to aggregate any data according to supervisor or supervisee role. However, the researcher reviewed data associated with each role for achieving degree of credibility to the findings and identifying potentially discrepant data.

Step Six: Interpret Categories

The final stage of analysis built the content for Chapter Five: the interpretation of the data toward the goal of answering the research questions. The researcher took the analysis from specific cases back the general point of view for a shared SRSD experience. The researcher reflected overall on what was learned by each case and by the collective group of cases. Further, the researcher assessed how well the data gathered and interpreted through this methodological design answered the research questions. The researcher also included a description of how data and conclusions from the present investigation relates to the body of literature and theory on the supervisory working alliance, SRSD, paired perceptions in supervision research, and site supervision for school counselors. Lastly, the researcher addressed with this analysis what questions remain unanswered and how future research can address those queries.

Chapter Summary

This chapter began by introducing the research questions and articulating the applicability of a qualitative research design, specifically the case study. While qualitative research bears the limitations of researcher bias and limited generalizability, the collective case study design provides a successful solution for answering the research questions in this study. With attention to the trustworthiness of the results, design elements specifically addressed credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. The procedures section described the participant sample, methods for selecting participants, and two phases of data collection. Phase one included the demographic information and audio-recorded supervision session. Phase two included the open-ended survey. The final section of this chapter described the application of

Creswell's (2009) qualitative analysis techniques and Tesch's (1990) coding procedures to the data collected in this study.

CHAPTER 4: DATA PRESENTATION

Chapter Introduction

Chapter Four presents the findings from two data analysis approaches. First, findings reflect the case-by-case analysis of the research. Each case description includes a brief summary of the demographic data of the supervisory dyad followed by a more detailed explanation of the supervision experience shared by supervisor and supervisee, including the context of the supervisor self-disclosure. With this context in place, the researcher organizes ideas, topics, and themes present in the participants' responses to the survey questions about the shared experience of a SRSD in the context of school counseling supervision into descriptive categories. Each case study concludes with a summary of the context and ideas illustrated by the case. Second, the findings reflect results of data analysis across cases. The cross-case analysis compares demographic information, contextual information of the supervision interaction, partial transcript information, and survey response data across all cases. This analysis highlights findings that appear consistently across cases.

Case-By-Case Analysis

Case One

The researcher collected Case One data during the fall semester of 2010.

Dyad demographic data. Each member of the Case One dyad completed the demographic questionnaire. For Case One, the supervisor identified as a 27 year-old Caucasian female. She reported two years of experience working as a professional school counselor with no prior training or experience as a counseling supervisor. The supervisee identified as a 30 year-old Caucasian male. He previously completed 10 graduate level

counseling courses. This supervisee planned to complete his first 300-hour internship experience during the semester the researcher gathered the data indicating a part-time on site experience. In summary, Case One dyad consisted of a mixed-gender pairing of similar ethnicity. Also of note in this case, the supervisee was older than the supervisor. The supervision experience for Case One occurred in an elementary school setting.

Audio recorded supervision session. The context of the SRSD provided by the audio recording of the supervision session of the Case One dyad consisted primarily of a formal evaluation. The initial 30 minutes of the 40-minute supervision interview consisted of a supervisor-directed evaluation of the supervisee's development. Specifically, the supervisor and the supervisee reviewed the evaluation form used by the academic program for the mid-term evaluation. While the evaluation followed this formal protocol, the conversation exhibited a friendly, positive, and supportive tone. The following comments made by the supervisor while addressing the supervisee's progress with group counseling work illustrated this style: "I'm really impressed with how the group goes. I've talked to several guys and, they really like it. They like you." Additionally, the supervisor provided feedback on performance with concrete examples from the supervisee's experience. For instance, while evaluating criteria referred to as *supervisee acceptance of positive and constructive feedback*, the supervisor stated, "I remember a conversation with you about Riley and me telling you that a teacher had noticed improvements in his behavior. And, I remember saying to you 'I know I've seen improvement.' And, you responded to me like, 'Oh, no, no.' Now, you are more accepting of positive feedback." The supervisor and supervisee rarely achieved consensus on evaluative categorical scores. The supervisee repeatedly responded with discrepant

self-evaluations when hearing evaluative ratings assigned by the supervisor. For example, “I would agree with that. I just marked myself a little bit higher because...” or “I’m not saying I do a bad job at all. I’m saying that I feel I could do a little bit better as I...” From listening to the audio recording, the discussion of these discrepant viewpoints on supervisee performance never resulted in contentious debate.

In viewing the audio recording from the perspective of the supervisory working alliance, the discussion of the supervisee’s performance within the context of the evaluation form linked specific goals and tasks. For example, the supervisee’s successful use of *multiple and varied intervention strategies with a diverse client base* (task) exemplified for the supervisor the criteria referred to as *considers atypical growth* (goal). In another example, the supervisee received feedback for adapting length of sessions, frequency of breaks, and intervention activities appropriately for students of differing age levels (task) in fulfilling the criteria *shows understanding of developmental stages of school aged youth* (goal). The dyad used the criteria from the evaluation form to establish goals for the supervisee experience. The discussion of activities completed in relation to those criteria illustrated for the dyad the connections between those goals and tasks.

In this audio recording, clear examples of SRSD occurred six times. First, in the seventh minute, the supervisee described a wish for working with more female clients in order to experience handling their “drama.” In relating her own difficulty in similar situations, the supervisor disclosed her own struggles by stating, “It’s not easy for girls!” (laughs). Second, when discussing parent interactions in the 13th minute, the supervisor shared her training experiences stating “I want to encourage you to do one of the things that I did in my internship, in my first year...” Third, moving to the topic of

administrative supervision in the 15th minute of the recorded interaction, the supervisor disclosed feelings about her internship experience stating "...my frustration with my observation..." Fourth, approximately a minute later, the supervisor compared her feelings as a supervisee to the feelings of the current supervisee regarding attendance and punctuality by disclosing, "You hate to miss and I felt the same way." Fifth, in the 19th minute, the supervisor shared a reaction concerning a decision the supervisee made about his own professional development outside the scope of the internship by disclosing, "I think you made the right choice." The sixth and final example of SRSD found in the interaction occurred during the 20th minute, roughly halfway through the 40-minute session, and included a longer, more detailed statement from the supervisor's professional experience about developing an accountability system. This final SRSD serves as Case One because it occurred in the middle of the interaction sufficiently enough to exclude the possibility of casual conversation at the opening or closing of the session and because it consisted of sufficient length and detail to include the defined characteristics of a SRSD. (See section SRSD below for more details). The supervisor engaged in self-disclosure about her counseling struggles, training experiences, and reactions to the supervisee.

Partial transcript. The Case One data set included a partial transcript with 24 lines of dialogue; 19 spoken by the supervisor, five spoken by the supervisee. The first 11 lines of the dialogue (eight spoken by the supervisor, three spoken by the supervisee) served to aid participant recall of contextual information from the interaction. The last 13 lines of the dialogue (11 spoken by the supervisor, two spoken by the supervisee) represented the Case One SRSD addressed in the open-ended survey.

Contextual information pre- SRSD. To establish an understanding of the context, the researcher describes what occurs prior to the SRSD. This description includes the supervisor's dispositions toward the supervisee, the supervisor's expectation of the supervisee, and the supervisee's role in this part of the dialogue.

Regarding the supervisor's disposition toward the supervisee, the researcher identified both support and reassurance displayed by the supervisor toward the supervisee leading up to the experience of SRSD. The statement "You have done great." reflected the supervisor disposition of support. The statements "You've been doing it on your own." and "You've completely developed it." communicated the supervisor disposition of reassurance.

Regarding the supervisor's expectations of the supervisee, the researcher identified work, knowledge, development, and independence from the data. Statements like "You've definitely worked hard at that," "I definitely think you know that," "You've completely developed it," "You've been doing it on your own," and "I'd like to see what you come up with," communicated these expectations, respectively. In addition to these findings, statements related to gender differences ("it's all boys"; "with a girl present") represented an outlying topic.

The analysis of the participant statements for the role of the supervisee included only attending responses indicating acknowledgement of supervisor commands. The supervisee demonstrated an engaged response as the supervisor directed these moments of the interaction.

An example from the partial transcript reads as follows with a note to the reader. The words in italics represent a category specific to the evaluation form. The supervisor

read the category first and then commented on the category related to the supervisee experience.

Supervisor: ...*Expand Knowledge of Resources and Referrals*- I definitely think you know that. *Develop Rapport with Staff*-

Supervisee: Mmhm.

Supervisor: You've definitely worked hard at that. *Develop Accountability System*- The only reason it's down is because I'd like to see what you come up with.

Supervisee: Oh, okay.

The example above reflects the supervisor's disposition toward the supervisee, the supervisor's expectations of the supervisee, and the role of the supervisee from the supervision interaction.

SRSD. The SRSD event included both supervisor and supervisee participation in the dialogue. Analysis of the SRSD led to the identification of data described as professional and therapeutic experience. The supervisee participated with attending responses. The Case One SRSD follows:

Supervisor: Like you know, you know I have my notebook, or whatever. Um but um, the one thing I noticed that was most important and helpful to me is, you know, we had the superintendent come through last year...

Supervisee: Mmhm

Supervisor: ...and uh there was a little girl –he made her cry- there was a little girl crying and I pulled her out and I calmed her down and I brought her back in. And then, he got focused on me. Very often people are not

focused on us. They don't really care what we do. And, you know, sometimes we get the reputation for -I walk around and I drink coffee...

Supervisee: Mmhm

Supervisor: ...and I do whatever -um. So, it was nice for him to walk into my office and for him to say, "Well, you know, what do you do?" And I can open this book and I can say, "This is what I've done all day and this is what I did last week." And for him to actually say, "Wow!" You know?

The professional experiences described in the SRSD related to the concept of professional accountability. The supervisor described artifacts used to create an accountability system. For example, "I have my notebook." and "I can open this book." The supervisor also described accountability to an authority figure when she stated, "He (school system superintendent) got focused on me." Additionally, the supervisor described accountability to the profession by including comments like "very often people are not focused on *us*," "they don't really care what *we* do," and "this is what I've done all day and this is what I did last week." The supervisor also discussed the results of this professional accountability both as sense of satisfaction and recognition. Her statements, "It was nice." and "For him (school system superintendent) to actually say, 'Wow!'" reflected these feelings.

Though the SRSD described professional experiences, the disclosure also included data related to therapeutic interaction. For example, a line from the SRSD stated, "...there was a little girl crying and I pulled her out and I calmed her down and I brought her back in." The phrase "calmed her down" did not directly state a specific therapeutic technique but implied a level of therapeutic intervention.

As with the pre-SRSD phase of the partial transcript, the supervisee offered only attending responses. During the SRSD, the supervisee vocalized his interest by using the sound “Mmhm” on two occasions. These attending responses indicated supervisee engagement in the interaction.

Survey responses. Both members of the supervisory dyad in Case One responded to the three survey questions. The open-ended survey questions allowed for responses in the participants’ own words. See Table A3 for a summary of identified descriptive categories for Case One.

Question one. Question one focused on the participants’ understanding of the concept of self-disclosure by prompting them to “Please explain your understanding of the concept of self-disclosure.”

Supervisor. After analyzing the data from the question one response, the researcher identified five categories representative of the supervisor’s conceptualization of self-disclosure. These descriptive categories included relationship, communication, content, purpose, and harm. Relationship refers to any interaction between two people in general and could include specific dyadic contexts for counselor-client and/or supervisor-supervisee. For relationship, data from the supervisor’s description associated both “a client” and “a counselor” with self-disclosure in a therapeutic context. The supervisor also stated, “At times, self-disclosure can move the counselor client relationship forward.” Communication refers to efforts of revealing, sharing, giving, speaking, or discussing by a participant in the relationship. For communication, the supervisor described the act of self-disclosure as “giving” the client information. Content refers to personal information about the discloser including details, stories, issues, and situations

that are similar to the experiences of the other person and/or related to the discussion topic. For content, data from the supervisor's description of self-disclosure includes "giving personal details," "using personal stories," and "similar situations." Purpose refers to efforts to bring about some type of change. For purpose, the researcher identified three subcategories from the supervisor's response data connected to the purpose of self-disclosure. The first subcategory related to bonding between the two individuals. Bonding refers to general descriptions of improving the relationship. Phrases like "see a deeper side" and "deepen the relationship" directly addressed increasing a sense of intimacy in the relationship. Also in this same subcategory of bonding, additional data addressed the issue of trust (a key element in relationship building) in the relationship: "Self-disclosure can move the counselor-client relationship forward, especially if the client is not quick to trust." The concepts of depth and trust provided consistent support for the subcategory of bonding. The second subcategory of empathizing addressed the idea that self-disclosure communicates a sense that one person understands the experience of the other by sharing similar experiences and feelings. As the supervisor in Case One stated, "It can at times provide the client with a sense that the counselor can empathize with how they feel." As reflected in the data, the concepts of empathizing and bonding appeared distinctive. Though communicating a sense of understanding could improve the relationship, the specificity of empathizing distinguishes it from bonding in the analysis. The third subcategory in the category of purpose for self-disclosure identified from the data related to normalizing the experiences of the client. Normalizing refers to the recognition that one's experiences reflect common experiences in the setting. This recognition often takes place when one hears of others in similar situations. The

supervisor stated, "...because they (counselors) are using personal stories in order to demonstrate an understanding of how they have felt in similar situations." For the fifth category, harm, the researcher included data from the response describing situations where the supervisor judged self-disclosure to be inappropriate. She stated, "Self-disclosure can also harm the relationship." Then, she continued to describe these situations in more detail adding "...when it is used too frequently and/or inappropriately," "use it in order to make a client 'feel better,'" and "when the counselor-client relationship has moved beyond the therapeutic realm." In summary, the data for the supervisor's response to survey question one included data categories identified as relationship, communication, content, purpose, and harm.

Supervisee. After analyzing the data from the question one response, the researcher identified four categories representative of the supervisee's conceptualization of self-disclosure. These descriptive categories included relationship, communication, content, and purpose. For relationship, the data from the supervisee's description referred to "you," "yourself," "another person," "two people," "they," and "one another." The supervisee data outlined the context for this relationship simply as the discloser ("you") and another person stating, "...you are revealing parts of yourself to another person..." For communication, the supervisee described the act of self-disclosure as "revealing" parts of the self. For content, data from the supervisee's description of self-disclosure included "parts of yourself" and "similar experiences." For purpose, the researcher identified three subcategories from the supervisee's response data connected to the purpose of self-disclosure. These subcategories included teaching, bonding between the individuals, and normalizing experience. Teaching refers to efforts to improve

understanding or share insight. In this case, the supervisee data described the purpose of self-disclosure to “explain a point.” The supervisee described the impact of self-disclosure on the relationship as helping “form a bond.” The data also included the idea of normalizing experience with the supervisee stating, “...they can relate to one another through their similar experiences.” In summary, the data for the supervisee’s response to survey question one included data categories identified as relationship, communication, content, and purpose.

Question two. Question two focused on the purpose or purposes the supervisor intended when using the specific SRSD from the partial transcript. The survey asked, “What was your perception of the purpose of using this supervisor self-disclosure with the supervisee?”

Supervisor. After analyzing the question two response, the researcher identified a single category representative of the supervisor’s purpose for using the SRSD. This descriptive category included teaching. For teaching, data from the supervisor’s explanation of purpose included the word *example* two times, indicating that this SRSD details actions to serve as a model for supervisee behavior. Also linked to teaching, the supervisor’s response included statements like, “The supervisee had heard part of this story previously...” and “...the counselor was hoping to remind the supervisee of what we had talked about in previous sessions.” introducing the concepts of review and repetition. The supervisor directly stated, “the purpose...to give the supervisee a concrete example.” adding additional evidence for the category of teaching. The response to question two included significant data related to the subject discussed in the partial transcript. The researcher labeled this data as the topic and included it as a subcategory of

teaching. For Case One the topic consisted of professional accountability and advocacy. Data from the supervisor's explanation of purpose included the description of an artifact, the "accountability notebook." The supervisor described the notebook as the basis for an "accountability system." The supervisor referred to these accountability structures as allowing her "to advocate for herself and for what the counselor's role is" and to explain "the purpose and necessity of the counselor." In summary, the data for the supervisor's response to survey question two included a descriptive category identified as teaching and subcategorized professional accountability and advocacy as the topic.

Supervisee. After analyzing the question two response, the researcher identified a single category that represented the supervisor's purpose for using the SRSD. This descriptive category included teaching. For teaching, data from the supervisee's perception of the purpose included statements like "show me," "show what," "demonstrated how," and "presented how." Within the category of teaching, the researcher identified two subcategories. These subcategories included the topic and its significance. For the topic of professional accountability and advocacy in Case One, data included statements like "show what kind of work you are doing," "be held accountable," and "accountability...how it is useful." The supervisee perception data also included the phrase "advocate for the profession." For significance, data from the supervisee's perception of the purpose included the following phrases: "how important it is," "it was necessary to," and "convey the importance of." These phrases reflected a purpose of communicating a level of significance for the topic. In summary, the data for the supervisee's response to survey question two included a data category identified as teaching with two subcategories referred to as topic and significance.

Question three. Question three focused on the effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. The survey asked, “What was your perception of the effect of this supervisor self-disclosure on the supervisee?”

Supervisor. After analyzing the data from the question three response, the researcher identified one category representative of the supervisor’s perception of the effect this SRSD had on the supervisee. This descriptive category called understanding refers to gaining new insights or new perspectives and included subcategories related to the topic of professional accountability and advocacy as well as connecting theory to practice. For understanding, the supervisor perception data revealed “the supervisee understood the point that the supervisor was making” about professional accountability and advocacy. Beyond the subcategory related to the topic, the supervisor perceived that the supervisee “could connect what his professors teach...to on the job site significance.” This data reflected an emphasis on the subcategory of connecting theory to practice. In summary, the data for the supervisor’s response to survey question three included a single data category identified as understanding.

Supervisee. After analyzing the data from the question three response, the researcher identified two categories representative of the effect this SRSD had on the supervisee. These descriptive categories included understanding and motivation. The researcher also identified a subcategory related to the topic of professional accountability and advocacy present in each category. For understanding, the supervisee made the following statement: “I have a purpose for...” indicating a new perspective on the topic. For motivation, the data included phrases like, “It motivated me...” and “I *really want...*” as references to the sense of encouragement he took from the SRSD toward this topic. In

summary, the data for the supervisee's response to survey question three included data categories identified as understanding and motivation.

Participant congruence. This section discusses the survey responses in regard to participant congruence (Prout & Wadkins, 2014). Participant congruence refers to the degree to which the responses reflect common descriptive categories for the individual participant across the survey questions.

Supervisor congruence. In Case One, supervisor responses to the survey revealed congruence between some questions and a lack of congruence between others.

Congruence between questions one and two. The researcher identified five categories related to the supervisor's conceptualization of self-disclosure in response to question one. Those descriptive categories included relationship, communication, content, purpose, and harm. Within the category purpose, the researcher identified subcategories of bonding and normalizing experience. While the shift to question two required the supervisor's conceptualization of self-disclosure to shift from counselor-client to supervisor-supervisee, the category identified for the purpose of the SRSD in question two included teaching the topic of professional accountability and advocacy. Though not contradictory, the data attributed to the category of purpose showed a lack of complete congruence. The supervisor added the purpose of teaching in question two to explain her self-disclosure. Evidence of congruence existed for the category of content in questions one and two. Data identified in this category consisting of "personal stories" in both questions.

Congruence between questions one and three. With regards to question three, the researcher described a category of understanding ascribed to the supervisor's perception

of the effect on the supervisee. From the category of purpose in the question one response, the supervisor described a purpose of self-disclosure as bonding. In the question three category of understanding, the emphasis remained on the supervisee understanding the supervisor. A lack of congruence existed between questions one and three.

Congruence between questions two and three. In addressing the responses to questions two and three, the supervisor demonstrated some congruence. The data for the question two response indicated teaching the supervisee about accountability and advocacy as the purpose of the SRSD. The response data for question three indicated the perception that the supervisor achieved this purpose. However, additional data indicated a perception that the supervisee also connected a level of understanding from the classroom to the work site.

For the Case One dyad, the supervisor response data lacked complete congruence between questions one and two as well as between questions one and three. The data demonstrated greater congruence between questions two and three.

Supervisee congruence. In Case One, supervisee responses to the survey revealed some congruence between all three questions with outlying descriptive categories preventing complete congruence across all questions.

Congruence between questions one and two. The researcher identified four descriptive categories related to the supervisee's conceptualization of self-disclosure in response to question one. Those categories included relationship, communication, content, and purpose. Within the category of purpose, the researcher identified subcategories of teaching, bonding, and normalizing experience. While the shift to

question two required the supervisee's conceptualization of self-disclosure to shift from the self and another person to supervisor-supervisee, the category identified for the purpose of the SRSD in question two included teaching the topic of professional accountability and advocacy as well as highlighting its significance. The category of teaching in question one and the category of teaching in question two overlapped highlighting a level of congruence. However, the data lacked any other areas of overlap among the descriptive categories of question one and question two.

Congruence between questions one and three. With regards to question three, the researcher described two categories including understanding and motivation to account for the data on the perceived effects of the supervisee. After analyzing responses from questions one and three, the supervisee data demonstrated congruence with a subcategory of teaching in the purpose category of question one and a level of understanding described as an effect of SRSD in question three. However, the effect on motivation appeared unaccounted for based on the question one response data.

Congruence between questions two and three. In addressing the responses to questions two and three, the supervisee demonstrated some congruence. The data included teaching as a purpose of the SRSD from question two. The response data for question three indicated understanding the topic of accountability and advocacy as an effect on the supervisee. However, any connection between the subcategory of significance from question two and the category of motivation discussed in question three remained unclear.

For the Case One dyad, the supervisee response data demonstrated a clear strand of congruence through all three questions. Some outlying descriptive categories existed for each question.

Dyad congruence. This section discusses the survey responses in regard to dyad congruence (Retrum, Nowels, & Bekelman, 2013). Dyad congruence refers to the degree to which the responses reflect common descriptive categories among the supervision dyad members across the survey questions.

Question one congruence. The researcher compared the responses for the supervisor and the supervisee from question one. After analyzing the categories, the Case One dyad response data showed some congruence. Both the supervisor and the supervisee described self-disclosure in terms of a relationship between two people, a communication process, containing information of a personal nature, and serving a purpose as evidenced by the descriptive categories of relationship, communication, content, and purpose. The supervisor and supervisee differed in the way they described this requisite relationship. The supervisor described the relationship for self-disclosure to be that of a counselor and a client while the supervisee described the relationship as the self and another person. Both members of the dyad described self-disclosure as a communication process with the supervisor “giving” and the supervisee “revealing” the content. In the category of informational content, both supervisor and supervisee described self-disclosure as including personal information and shared experiences. For the category of purpose, the supervisor and supervisee described multiple possibilities. Both included the idea of normalizing behaviors or experiences and bonding between the two individuals. The supervisee also added the purpose of teaching. Likewise, the

supervisor added an additional category not included in the supervisee's overall response. The supervisor described a set of characteristics of self-disclosure she judged as harmful. The responses the Case One supervisor and supervisee showed congruence for the majority of the descriptive categories in question one.

Question two congruence. The researcher compared the responses for the supervisor and supervisee from question two. After analyzing the categories, the Case One dyad response data showed a high level of congruence. Both the supervisor and supervisee described the purpose for the SRSD in terms of teaching the topic of professional accountability and advocacy as evidenced by the descriptive categories. The supervisor and supervisee differed in their descriptions of teaching. The supervisor described teaching as using examples to model behavior and repeating information to reinforce ideas. The supervisee described teaching as showing, demonstrating, and conveying ideas. In addressing the information and ideas from the topic of professional accountability and advocacy as a subcategory, both supervisor and supervisee data included these words repeatedly, though the supervisor data included greater depth and detail by introducing artifacts, systems, and validity of work. The supervisee data included an additional subcategory, significance. According to the supervisee, the supervisor intended for the SRSD to emphasize the importance of the topic. The responses of the Case One supervisor and supervisee showed congruence for the majority of the data in question two.

Question three congruence. The researcher compared the responses for the supervisor and the supervisee from question three. After analyzing the categories, the Case One dyad response data showed congruence. The supervisor and supervisee data

represented a category identified as understanding. The supervisee data gives some indication that this level of understanding the topic resonates with the supervisor's implication of connecting theory to practice. The supervisee data included an additional category identified as motivation. The supervisor data contained no information related to supervisee motivation.

Case One summary. In summary, the Case One SRSD occurred during a 40-minute supervision interaction between a female supervisor and a male supervisee at an elementary school. See Table 1 for a summary of Case One. This interaction focused on the academic program's evaluation of the supervisee's performance and experience with the supervisor. The tone of the interaction reflected a positive and supportive disposition by both members of the dyad. SRSD occurred six times during the interaction with one of those SRSD events forming the basis of Case One. The Case One SRSD included both professional and therapeutic experiences. Each member of the Case One dyad completed an open-ended survey consisting of three questions. Responses from both supervisor and supervisee for question one included data related to the relationship between two people, the process of communication, the content of self-disclosure, and the purpose of self-disclosure. The supervisor included comments referring to a potential for harm related to self-disclosure. Supervisor and supervisee also exhibited common responses to question two. The response data from both participants identified teaching as the purpose for the SRSD. The supervisee also perceived the SRSD as highlighting a level of importance for the topic. The response data for question three addressed the effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. The supervisor perceived the supervisee as understanding the topic of professional accountability and advocacy, while the supervisee discussed the effect on his

motivation along with a new understanding of the topic. Refer to Table A3 for a summary of the descriptive categories for Case One. Case One concluded with a discussion of the congruence of responses for each participant and the congruence of responses between participants.

Table 1: Case One Summary

Supervisor- 27 year old Caucasian female with no prior supervision experience		Supervisee- 30 year old Caucasian male in his first internship experience
This session is a formal evaluation. SRSD occurred 6 times.		
Question 1	Self-disclosure described in terms of a relationship between two people, a communication process, containing information of a personal nature, and serving a purpose.	
Question 2	Both the supervisor and supervisee described the purpose for the SRSD in terms of teaching the topic of professional accountability and advocacy.	
Question 3	The supervisor and supervisee described the effect of the SRSD in terms of understanding the topic.	

Case Two

The researcher collected Case Two data during the fall semester of 2010.

Dyad demographic data. Each member of the Case Two dyad completed the demographic questionnaire. For Case Two, the supervisor identified as a 30 year-old Caucasian female. She reported six years of experience working as a professional school counselor with two hours of training and five previous experiences as a counseling supervisor. The supervisee identified as a 26 year-old Caucasian female. She previously completed 13 graduate level counseling courses. This supervisee planned to complete both her first and second 300-hour internship experiences during the semester the researcher collected the data indicating a full-time on site experience. In summary, the

Case Two dyad consisted of a same- gender pairing of similar ethnicity. The supervision experience for Case Two occurred in a middle school setting.

Audio recorded supervision session. The context of the SRSD provided by the audio recording of the supervision session of the Case Two dyad consisted of both case consultations and supervisee skill development. The supervisor structured three segments to the 34-minute session. The first eight minutes of the interaction included consultations focused on two of the supervisee's clients. During this time, the supervisee detailed her interactions with students while the supervisor asked clarifying ("So, she remembered talking about that stuff?") and probing ("How did you feel when she was telling you that she was mad at you?") types of questions. At a point in the eighth minute, the supervisor shifted the line of questioning to a focus on skill development. For example, the supervisor asked about the supervisee's efforts to prepare her clients for terminating the counseling relationships, "Have you been talking to the other kids about 'My time (at the school) is coming to an end'?" And, in the 17th minute, she asked the supervisee about planning and executing group counseling activities, "So the activities you've been doing, do they seem to be things that you would do again?" The supervisee's responses continued to inform the supervisor about specific case details. For example, "I've been tellin' everybody. I told Sam..." and "I think it's hard with it being a lunch group...they're tryin' to eat...you've got to get them from classes..." The final segment in the supervisor's approach began in the 22nd minute. This time the supervisor directed the supervisee to reflect on her experiences with internship and supervision. For example, "Have there been any things, this week, that you've been concerned about with your own

skills?"; "What skills have grown the most?"; and "Is there anything we need to accomplish in the next three weeks?"

In viewing the audio recording from the perspective of the supervisory working alliance, the supervisor engaged in efforts to communicate a sense of liking and trust throughout the supervision interaction. For example, when discussing challenges associated with co-facilitating counseling groups and student interactions earlier in the semester, the supervisor reflected aloud on a situation shared with the supervisee by stating, "I was like, I probably should have let her (the supervisee) talk more." Later in the dialogue, the supervisor shared, "I feel like you came in (to internship) with strong counseling skills." In the final six minutes of the interaction, the supervisor specifically discussed the remaining goals for the internship experience, "Is there anything we need to accomplish in the next three weeks...I didn't know if you wanted to do another classroom guidance?" The supervisee's response, "I could do another one, probably." preceded a discussion about the tasks involved in achieving this goal like choosing a grade level, classroom, topic, and activity suitable for the experience. The discussion concluded with a reference linking the task of classroom guidance during the internship to a broader professional goal stated by the supervisor, "I want you to feel comfortable in a classroom especially if you are going into an elementary school."

In this audio recording, clear examples of SRSD occurred nine times. First, in the 10th minute, the supervisee discussed transitioning some of her clients to another counselor. The supervisor disclosed her reaction to one client by stating, "I don't think I would transition him to her." Second, in the 14th minute as the supervisor and supervisee discussed another student with whom they both worked, the supervisor shared her

counseling struggles by stating, “I can’t figure him out.” Third, in the 17th minute, the supervisor asked about the supervisee’s plans for concluding her counseling group. Her reaction to the supervisee’s response disclosed, “I think you should do something for your last group (serve pizza or cookies).” Fourth, in the 20th minute, the supervisor disclosed her own struggles with co-facilitating student interactions, “I end up taking over...” Fifth, in the 21st minute, the supervisor disclosed another reaction to a supervisee’s client by stating, “I think she would have told you if something was up.” Sixth, in the 26th minute, the supervisor disclosed another personal struggle, this one related to managing her experience with an emotional attachment to her work. She stated, “It took me about a year to not take everything home with me.” Seventh, in the 28th minute, the supervisor and the supervisee discussed activities for classroom guidance lessons. The supervisor disclosed, “I don’t like to get stuff out of books typically.” She immediately clarified for the supervisee that she occasionally borrowed pieces of lessons from published sources. Eighth, in the 29th minute, the supervisor disclosed a reaction to the supervisee by stating, “I feel like you came in with strong counseling skills.” when reflecting on the supervisee’s accomplishments during the internship. The ninth and final example of SRSD found in the interaction occurred in the 32nd minute, near the end of the 34-minute session and includes a statement sharing her counseling experiences with clients in crisis. This final SRSD serves as Case Two because it occurred late enough in the interaction to exclude the possibility of casual conversation at the opening of the session but prior to any closing comments and because it consisted of sufficient length and detail to include the defined characteristics of a SRSD. See section SRSD below for more details. The supervisor engaged in self-disclosure about her reactions to the

supervisee, reactions to the supervisee's clients, her own counseling struggles, her own struggles as a supervisor, and similar training experiences.

Partial transcript. The Case Two data set includes a partial transcript with 33 lines of dialogue; 18 spoken by the supervisor, 15 spoken by the supervisee. The first 28 lines of the dialogue (15 spoken by the supervisor, 13 spoken by the supervisee) serve to aid participant recall of information from the interaction. The last five lines of the dialogue (three spoken by the supervisor, and two spoken by the supervisee) represented the Case Two SRSD addressed in the open-ended survey.

Contextual information pre-SRSD. To establish an understanding of the context, the researcher describes what occurs prior to the SRSD. This description includes the supervisor's attempt to teach the supervisee including ideas described as reflecting on experience, processing actions and outcomes, considering possibilities, and establishing a new frame of reference for decision making. In this dialogue, the discussion encompassed a counselor's obligation to breach the client's expectation for confidentiality in any situation where that breach serves to protect the client's welfare, such as notifying a proper authority. The supervisee faced an ethical decision when making such a breach and again when considering if, how, and when to notify the client.

First, the supervisor made an effort to teach the supervisee a more developed frame of reference by reflecting on previous experience. The supervisor stated, "I'm trying to remember with your DCS calls, did you tell the other kids...or did you not tell them?" Then, the supervisee processed two of her experiences and responded, "No, *we* told the one beforehand. Then the other one, *I* didn't tell her beforehand." Next, the supervisor encouraged the consideration of other possibilities by asking, "Do you feel

like it would have made a difference to be upfront about it?” The supervisee’s response demonstrated consideration of alternate possibilities. For example, “Yeah...So you think- do you think that is something you should tell them?” Lastly, the supervisor encouraged an open consideration of the possibilities for each situation. In this dialogue, the supervisor and supervisee considered two situations. In one situation, the supervisor and supervisee informed the student of the breach of confidentiality before it occurred and the student did not become upset. In the other situation, the supervisee chose not to inform the student of the breach before it occurred and the student became upset afterward. The supervisor reinforced this new frame of reference, “Not in every situation. I just kind of wanted you to...” The supervisee acknowledged a new understanding by stating, “I think it just depends on the...she might have gotten mad...just because.”

SRSD. The SRSD event included both supervisor and supervisee participation in the dialogue. Analysis of the SRSD led to the identification of data described as therapeutic experience. The supervisee participated with attending responses. The Case Two SRSD follows:

Supervisor: The first time I ever told, I had to call ‘em...

Supervisee: Mmhm

Supervisor: ...was “I’m going to kill myself you F ‘n B” I mean it was...So,

Supervisee: Yeah

Supervisor: You can make ‘em mad now or you can make ‘em mad later.

The therapeutic experience described in the SRSD presented an additional situation related to breaching client confidentiality. In this third situation, the counselor told the client about the breach before it occurred and the client became upset. This

additional scenario added support for the supervisor's attempt to encourage the supervisee to consider alternate possibilities when breaching the confidentiality of a client in order to prevent harm to that client. The final statement in the SRSD, "You can make 'em mad now or you can make 'em mad later." highlighted support for the new frame of reference just acquired by the supervisee. The frame of reference indicated earlier when the supervisee reflected, "I think it just depends..."

This SRSD also described an event experienced by the supervisor that is similar to an event described in the audio-recorded supervision session by the supervisee. This therapeutic experience, now identified as common to both members of this dyad, centered on clients who became upset with counselors because of a DCS call.

Unlike the pre-SRSD phase of the partial transcript, the supervisee offered only attending responses at this stage. During the SRSD, the supervisee vocalized her interest by using the sound "Mmhm" on one occasion and the word "Yeah" on another occasion. These attending responses indicated supervisee engagement in the interaction.

Survey responses. Both members of the supervisory dyad in Case Two responded to the three survey questions. The open-ended survey questions allowed for responses in the participants' own words. See Table A4 for a summary of identified descriptive categories for Case Two.

Question one. Question one focused on the participants' understanding of the concept of self-disclosure by prompting them to "Please explain your understanding of the concept of self-disclosure."

Supervisor. After analyzing the data from the question one response, the researcher identified four categories representative of the supervisor's conceptualization

of self-disclosure. The descriptive categories included relationship, communication, content, and purpose. Relationship refers to any interaction between two people in general and could include specific dyadic contexts for counselor-client and/or supervisor-supervisee. For relationship, data from the supervisor's description included "you as a person" and "the person to whom you are speaking." This data outlined the context for this relationship simply as the discloser ("you") and another person ("...the person to whom you are speaking."). Communication refers to efforts of revealing, sharing, giving, speaking, or discussing by a participant in the relationship. For communication, the supervisor described the act of self-disclosure as "speaking." Content refers to personal information about the discloser including details, stories, issues, and situations that are similar to the experiences of the other person and/or related to the discussion topic. For content, data from the supervisor's description of self-disclosure includes "the situation," "what they are dealing with," and "you as a person, not just as a professional." Purpose refers to efforts to bring about some type of change. For purpose, the researcher identified two subcategories from the supervisor's response data connected to the purpose of self-disclosure. These subcategories included teaching and bonding. Teaching refers to efforts to improve understanding or share insight. For teaching, the supervisor stated that self-disclosure can "help bring understanding to a topic while making it relatable to the situation." Bonding refers to general descriptions of improving the relationship. For bonding, the supervisor described both an empathic response "to show that person that you can relate to what they are dealing with" as well as a more intimate relationship "help them relate to you as a person, not just as a professional." In summary, the data for the

supervisor's response to survey question one included descriptive categories identified as relationship, communication, content, and purpose.

Supervisee. After analyzing the data from the question one response, the researcher identified four categories representative of the supervisee's conceptualization of self-disclosure. The descriptive categories included relationship, communication, content, and purpose. For relationship, the data from the supervisee's description included person to person "someone reveals information to them"; counselor to client "make a client feel at ease or enhance the counseling relationship"; and supervisor to supervisee "strengthen the supervisory relationship...the supervisor has been through some of the same situations as the supervisee." The supervisee data outlined multiple contexts for relationships. For communication, the supervisee described the act of self-disclosure with the terms "reveals" and "shares." For content, data from the supervisee's description of self-disclosure includes "information about...self" and "shares a situation that happened to them." For purpose, the researcher identified two subcategories from the supervisee's response data connected to the purpose of self-disclosure. These subcategories included bonding and normalizing experience. The supervisee described the impact of self-disclosure on the relationship as "to make a client feel at ease," "enhancing the counseling relationship," and "strengthening the supervisor/supervisee relationship." The data also included the idea of normalizing experience. Normalizing refers to the recognition that one's experiences reflect common experiences in the setting. This recognition often takes place when one hears of others in similar situations. The supervisee stated, "self-disclosure could be used...point out that the supervisor has been through some of the same situations as the supervisee." In summary, the data for the

supervisee's response to survey question one included descriptive categories identified as relationship, communication, content, and purpose.

Question two. Question two focused on the purpose or purposes the supervisor intended when using the specific SRSD from the partial transcript. The survey asked, "What was your perception of the purpose of using this supervisor self-disclosure with the supervisee?"

Supervisor. After analyzing the question two response, the researcher identified three categories representative of the supervisor's purpose for using self-disclosure in this instance. These descriptive categories included teaching, normalizing, and empathizing. For teaching, data from the supervisor's explanation of purpose included "help demonstrate" and "show the supervisee" in reference to the supervisor's own behavior while referencing supervisee perspectives with "wanted her to know," "have her understand," and "understand how hard it can be." For normalizing, the supervisor data contained multiple references to shared experiences. The data points referencing this concept included "I had dealt with a similar situation" and "I have dealt with and currently deal with the same situations." Empathizing refers to the sense that one person understands the experience of the other, in this case, by sharing similar experiences and feelings. For empathizing, the supervisor data included the statement, "I have dealt with...*understand how hard it can be.*" As reflected in the data, the concepts of empathizing and bonding appeared distinctive. Though communicating a sense of understanding could improve the relationship, the specificity of empathizing distinguishes it from bonding in the analysis. The response to question two included significant data related to the subject discussed in the partial transcript. The researcher

labeled this data as the topic and included it as a subcategory of teaching. For Case Two, the topic consisted of decision making including stress and client reactions. The supervisor data referenced deciding “to call DCS,” making “other decisions regarding the well-being of others,” and noting “there will always be tough decisions.” In addressing stress, the supervisor alluded to “how *difficult* it can be” to call DCS, emphasized “there will always be *tough* decisions when you are dealing with DCS situations,” and empathized “I...understand how *hard* it can be.” In addressing client reactions, data from the supervisor’s explanation of purpose included descriptions of two possible outcomes. Both “to have a student angry at you” and “something that is beyond your control” referred to considerations in the decision making process. In summary, the data for the supervisor’s response to survey question two included descriptive categories identified as teaching, normalizing, and empathizing.

Supervisee. After analyzing the question two response, the researcher identified four categories representative of the supervisor’s purpose for using self-disclosure in this instance. These descriptive categories included teaching, normalizing, empathizing and bonding. For teaching, data from the supervisee’s perception of the purpose included the statement “make the supervisee realize” on two occasions in the response to question two. For normalizing and empathizing, the supervisee data contained a direct statement referencing a shared experience and perspective. The supervisee stated, “It was also to make the supervisee realize that she (supervisor) has been in that situation before and *that is not easy.*” The researcher added italics to highlight the empathic response. For bonding, the supervisee’s perception of the supervisor’s purpose first addressed an attempt to by the supervisor to relate to the supervisee. The supervisee stated, “The

supervisor used self-disclosure to relate to the supervisee.” For the topic of decision making, the supervisee data included statements like “you have to make tough choices” and “no matter which choice you make.” As components of the topic of decision making, the researcher also identified an emphasis on stress and client reactions from the supervisee data. For stress, the supervisee perceived “*tough* choices” in these situations “that is *not easy*.” For client reactions, data from the supervisee’s explanation of purpose included a description of a possible outcome. “It will upset the client no matter which choice you make” referred to considerations in the decision making process. In summary, the data for the supervisee’s response to survey question two included descriptive categories identified as teaching, normalizing, empathizing, and bonding.

Question three. Question three focused on the effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. The survey asked, “What was your perception of the effect of this supervisor self-disclosure on the supervisee?”

Supervisor. After analyzing the data from the question three response, the researcher identified three categories representative of the supervisor’s perception of the effect this SRSD had on the supervisee. These descriptive categories included understanding, normalizing, and empathizing. For understanding, the data referenced “another way of helping the supervisee to process her decision” and “other options for the future.” For empathizing and normalizing, the supervisor data included the statement “I wanted to simply let her know that I understood her concerns and had been in a similar position.” reflecting descriptions of both categories. For the supervisor response to question three, the researcher determined the response data continued to refer to the supervisor’s purpose for using SRSD rather than sharing a perception of the actual effect

on the supervisee. The data reflected a perspective of what the supervisor hoped the effect would be rather than a perception of what actual effects occurred. For example, statements like “the disclosure would be another way of helping...” and “I wanted to simply let her know...” reflected the supervisor’s intentions for using the SRSD more than a perception of the effects the supervisee experienced through the SRSD. In summary, the data for the supervisor’s response to survey question three included descriptive categories identified as understanding, normalizing, and empathizing.

Supervisee. After analyzing the data from the question three response, the researcher identified three categories representative of the effect this SRSD had on the supervisee. These descriptive categories included bonding, understanding, and normalizing. For bonding, the supervisee data included two responses indicating an effect on the supervisee’s state of mind. For example, the supervisee stated, “Supervisee felt better that...” and “It also made the supervisee feel better about the situation...” For understanding, the supervisee data included the following response indicating an effect on the supervisee’s perspective. “It helped to realize that even as a professional school counselor, there are not always clearly defined answers and you have to make your own decisions.” For normalizing, the supervisee stated, “It made the supervisee...realize she was not the only person who had made a client mad before.” In summary, the data for the supervisee’s response to survey question three included descriptive categories identified as bonding, understanding, and normalizing.

Participant congruence. This section discusses the survey responses in regard to participant congruence (Prout & Wadkins, 2014). Participant congruence refers to the

degree to which the responses reflect common descriptive categories for the individual participant across the survey questions.

Supervisor congruence. In Case Two, supervisor responses to the survey revealed congruence among all questions. The higher levels of commonality of responses existed between questions one and three and between questions two and three.

Congruence between questions one and two. The researcher identified four descriptive categories related to the supervisor's conceptualization of self-disclosure in response to question one. Those categories included relationship, communication, content, and purpose. Within the category purpose, the researcher identified subcategories of teaching and bonding. While the shift to question two required the supervisor's conceptualization of self-disclosure to shift from the self and another person to supervisor-supervisee, the categories identified for the purpose of the SRSD in question two included teaching, normalizing, and empathizing. The subcategory of teaching linked to the purpose in question one and the category of teaching in question two overlap highlighting a level of congruence. Also, the category of content from question one included "what they are dealing with." The topic of decision making in question two served as the content alluded to from question one. The responses for questions one and two demonstrated multiple areas of congruence.

Congruence between questions one and three. With regards to question three, the researcher described three categories including understanding, empathizing, and normalizing ascribed to the supervisor's perception of the effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. From the category of purpose in the question one response, the supervisor described a purpose of self-disclosure as teaching. The supervisor's perception of the

effect on the supervisee included understanding. A purpose of teaching and an effect of understanding demonstrated congruence of responses. Additionally, the category of purpose in question one also included a purpose of bonding. The question three response addressed the effect of empathizing, the supervisor communicating an understanding of the supervisee and her situation. As explained in the description of empathy, communicating empathy toward the supervisee and using self-disclosure to bond with another person indicated some additional congruence of responses. These responses highlighted a high level of congruence between questions one and three.

Congruence between questions two and three. In addressing the responses to questions two and three, the supervisor data indicated strong congruence. The data for the question two response referenced teaching, normalizing, and empathizing. The response data for question three referenced understanding, normalizing, and empathizing. The purpose in question two of teaching and the data related to decision making resulted in the effect described in question three of understanding. The categories of normalizing and empathizing from question two related directly to the descriptions of empathizing and normalizing from the question three response as the supervisor described understanding her concerns and being in a similar position. Response data for questions two and three indicated a high level of congruence.

For the Case Two dyad, the supervisor data exhibited relative congruence between questions one and two. The data demonstrated greater congruence between questions one and three as well as between questions two and three.

Supervisee congruence. In Case Two, the supervisee responses to the survey revealed significant congruence among all three questions.

Congruence between questions one and two. The researcher identified four descriptive categories related to the supervisee's conceptualization of self-disclosure in response to question one. Those categories included relationship, communication, content, and purpose. Within the category of purpose, the researcher identified subcategories of bonding and normalizing experience. While the shift to question two required the supervisee's conceptualization of self-disclosure to focus on the supervisor-supervisee relationship, the categories identified for the purpose of the SRSD in question two included teaching, normalizing, empathizing and bonding. The subcategory of normalizing experience as a purpose in question one reflects participant congruence with the category of normalizing experience from question two. Similarly, the data in question one referencing the subcategory of bonding matched the data from the question two category of bonding. These commonalities in the response data for questions one and two represented congruence among the responses.

Congruence between questions one and three. With regards to question three, the researcher described three categories including bonding, understanding, and normalizing to account for the data on the perceived effects of the supervisee. After analyzing responses from questions one and three, the supervisee data from the subcategory of bonding in question one shared congruence with the effect of bonding in question three. Likewise, the subcategory of normalizing from question one shared congruence with normalizing in question three. However, the effect on the supervisee's realizations appeared unaccounted for based on the question one response data.

Congruence between questions two and three. In addressing the responses to questions two and three, the supervisee demonstrated some congruence. The data

included teaching as a purpose of the SRSD in question two. The response data for question three indicated the supervisee experienced understanding of new perspectives. Additionally, bonding and normalizing described in the question three response stemmed in part from the perceived bonding and normalizing efforts of the supervisor from question two. Responses for questions two and three demonstrated a high degree of congruence.

For the Case Two dyad, the supervisee response data demonstrated significant congruence among all three responses. The descriptive categories identified in each question often represented exact descriptions of one another.

Dyad congruence. This section discusses the survey responses in regard to dyad congruence (Retrum, Nowels, & Bekelman, 2013). Dyad congruence refers to the degree to which the responses reflect common descriptive categories among the supervision dyad members across the survey questions.

Question one congruence. The researcher compared the responses for the supervisor and the supervisee from question one. After analyzing the categories, the Case Two dyad response showed some congruence. Both the supervisor and the supervisee described self-disclosure in terms of a relationship between two people, a communication process, containing information about situations that happened, and serving a purpose as evidenced by the common descriptive categories of relationship, communication, content, and purpose. The supervisor and supervisee differed in the way they described this relationship. The supervisor described the relationship as the self and “the person to whom you are disclosing,” while the supervisee described the relationship to include the additional possibilities of counselor-client and supervisor-supervisee. Both members of

the dyad described self-disclosure as a communication process. The supervisor used “speaking” as a term to conceptualize self-disclosure, while the supervisee used “reveals” and “shares” as terms to conceptualize self-disclosure. In the category of informational content, both supervisor and supervisee described self-disclosure as including information about situations and information about the self. For the category of purpose, the supervisor and supervisee described multiple possibilities. Both members of the dyad included the idea of bonding as a purpose for self-disclosure. The supervisor also added the purpose of teaching. Likewise, the supervisee added the purpose of normalizing experience. The responses for the Case Two supervisor and supervisee showed congruence for the majority of the descriptive categories in question one.

Question two congruence. The researcher compared the responses for the supervisor and supervisee from question two. After analyzing the categories, the Case Two dyad response data showed a high level of congruence. Both the supervisor and supervisee described the purpose for the SRSD in terms of teaching, normalizing, and empathizing as evidenced by the descriptive categories. The supervisor and supervisee differed in their descriptions of teaching. The supervisor described teaching from the perspective of “demonstrating” and “showing” while the supervisee described teaching from the perspective making “the supervisee realize” something. In addressing the information and ideas from the topic of decision making, both supervisor and supervisee referred to the difficulty in making specific types of decisions and considered the response of the client. Both members of the dyad also included normalizing experience as a purpose for SRSD describing the supervisor’s prior experience in similar situations. Data for both supervisor and supervisee also included empathizing behavior with the

supervisor describing “how hard it can be” and the supervisee recognizing these situations are “not easy.” The supervisee data included an additional category, bonding. For the supervisee, the supervisor intended for the SRSD to enhance the supervisory relationship. The responses of the Case Two supervisor and supervisee showed congruence for the majority of the data in question two.

Question three congruence. The researcher compared the responses for the supervisor and the supervisee from question three. After analyzing the categories, the Case Two dyad response data showed overall congruence. The supervisor data represented categories identified as understanding, normalizing, and empathizing. The supervisee data represented categories identified as bonding, understanding, and normalizing. The descriptions of the categories of understanding and normalizing shared common ideas represented from perspectives of the differing roles in the relationship. The description of the supervisor response category of empathizing referred to the supervisor’s understanding of the supervisee. The supervisee response category of bonding related to this idea of understanding as the supervisee described feeling better knowing someone else (the supervisor) experienced similar situations.

Case Two summary. In summary, the Case Two SRSD occurred during a 34 minute supervision interaction between a female supervisor and a female supervisee at a middle school. See Table 2 for a summary of Case Two. This interaction focused on case consultation and supervisee development. The flow of the interaction reflected a structured approach guided by the supervisor beginning with case consultation, then moving into specific counseling experiences, and finally reflecting on skills developed in these experiences. SRSD occurred nine times during the interaction with one of those

SRSD events forming the basis of Case Two. The Case Two SRSD consisted of a therapeutic experience. Each member of the Case Two dyad completed an open-ended survey consisting of three questions. Responses from both supervisor and supervisee for question one included data related to a necessary relationship, a communication process, the content of self-disclosure, and the purpose of self-disclosure. Supervisor and supervisee also exhibited common responses to question two. The response data from both participants identified teaching, normalizing, and empathizing. The supervisee also perceived an additional purpose for the supervisor of bonding with the supervisee. The response data for question three addressed the effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. The supervisor reflected on intended effects rather than perceived effects with data related to understanding, empathizing, and normalizing. The supervisee described understanding, normalizing, and bonding as the effects of the SRSD. Refer to Table A4 for a summary of the descriptive categories for Case Two. Case Two concluded with a discussion of the congruence of responses for each participant and the congruence of responses between participants.

Table 2: Case Two Summary

Supervisor- 30 year old Caucasian female with 5 previous experiences as a site supervisor		Supervisee- 26 year old Caucasian female in her first internship experience
This session is a case consultation. SRSD occurred 9 times.		
Question 1	Self-disclosure described in terms of a relationship between two people, a communication process, containing information of a personal nature, and serving a purpose.	
Question 2	Both the supervisor and supervisee described the purpose for the SRSD in terms of teaching (decision making), normalizing supervisee experience, and empathizing.	
Question 3	The supervisor and supervisee described the effect of the SRSD in terms of understanding the topic and normalizing.	

Case Three

The researcher collected Case Three data during the fall semester of 2010.

Dyad demographic data. Each member of the Case Three dyad completed the demographic questionnaire. For Case Three, the supervisor identified as a 40 year-old White male. He reported eight years of experience working as a professional school counselor with extensive experience previously supervising 20 trainees. The supervisor failed to respond to the question related to previous training as a supervisor. The supervisee identified as a 39 year-old Caucasian female. She completed all of the required coursework in the school counseling program. This supervisee planned to complete both her first and second 300-hour internship experiences during the semester the researcher collected data indicating a full-time on site experience. In summary, the Case Three dyad consisted of a mixed-gender pairing of similar ethnicity. The supervision experience for Case Three occurred in an elementary school setting.

Audio recorded supervision session. The context of the SRSD provided by the audio recording of the supervision session of the Case Three dyad consisted primarily of a case consultation. The full 28 minutes of the supervision interview consisted of a dialogue focused on a single client of the supervisee. The supervisee directed the interaction by introducing the case and then describing her work with that client. For example, she started the interaction with “The student I want to talk about today is...” and then proceeded with “I met with him yesterday.” The supervisor demonstrated a consultative role throughout the interaction. He offered attending responses of “Mhm” and “ok” as the supervisee spoke. He asked probing questions including, “What were his thoughts on camp?” and “Who was that?” The supervisor also shared insights into the

client based on the supervisee's disclosures and his own work with the same client. For example, the supervisor shared, "There are so many instances with him where he keeps crossing up what his motives are, and then what his actions are, and what he wants the outcome to be with his peer groups." Another example from the supervisor included "Well, 'cause a big focal point of his last year was that he didn't want to stay here and he wanted to go live with his dad." The supervisor also demonstrated skill at summarizing the supervisee's work and perspective. The supervisor consolidates numerous details shared by the supervisee and focused the supervisee's perspective when responding with "There are two peers he's identified that he wants to be like best buddies with..." The supervisee responded to these supervisor behaviors with acknowledgement of the supervisor's perspective and the freedom to disagree. For example, the supervisor stated "Maybe if his family life is a little more grounded, it might give him a better start at a new school." After which the supervisee responded, "Yeah, we talked about that a little bit and I mean yeah, a fresh start could work for him but..." Similar exchanges continued throughout the interview giving the dialogue a strong tone of collegiality.

In reviewing the audio recording from the perspective of the supervisory working alliance, the session included goals and tasks for this supervision experience and for the supervisee's progress with this client. The discussion of the supervisee's work with her client focused on the goal of gaining insight necessary to better understand the case. To accomplish this goal, the supervisee's task required disclosing her perspective on the details of the case and listening to the reflections and insights of the supervisor. The supervisor required another goal of the supervisee to think about a goal for client progress. The supervisor asked, "I guess it kind of comes to...what else can we do for

him here?” In order to accomplish this goal, one of the tasks the supervisor identified is another check-in with the student. She stated, “Well, we’ll see what he comes back with. I’m going to check in with him at the end of the week.” In this interaction, the interplay of goals and tasks appeared as a component of the supervision process as well as a component of counselor development.

In this audio recording, clear examples of SRSD occurred four times. First, in the fifth minute, the supervisor disclosed a reaction to the supervisee and shared a therapeutic experience addressing the same situation the supervisee shared. This initial disclosure serves as Case Three because it occurred late enough in the interaction to exclude the possibility of casual conversation at the opening of the session but prior to any closing comments and because it consisted of sufficient length and detail to include the defined characteristics of a SRSD. See section SRSD below for more details. Second, in the 20th minute, the supervisor disclosed “When I was at that camp, J. sat next to me one full day of meals and stuff and I got to kind of...” to share his own therapeutic experience related to the supervisee’s case. The third example of SRSD found in the interaction occurred in the 24th minute. This example again consisted of a supervisor reaction to the supervisee’s insight. The supervisor stated, “I don’t think there’s one peer segment that has a big problem with him.” The fourth and final example of SRSD occurred in the 26th minute as a reaction to the client. The supervisor shared the insight, “I think it has something to do with what his real interests are.” The supervisor engaged in self-disclosure about his reactions to the supervisee, reactions to the supervisee’s clients, and his own therapeutic experiences.

Partial transcript. The Case Three data set included a partial transcript with 37 lines of dialogue; 13 spoken by the supervisor, 24 spoken by the supervisee. The first 27 lines of the dialogue (six spoken by the supervisor, 21 spoken by the supervisee) served to aid participant recall of contextual information from the interaction. The last 10 lines of the dialogue (seven spoken by the supervisor, three spoken by the supervisee) represented the Case Three SRSD addressed in the open-ended survey.

Contextual information pre-SRSD. To establish an understanding of the context, the researcher describes what occurs prior to the SRSD. This description includes the supervisee's attempt to share her insights into client issues as well as the attending responses of the supervisor.

The supervisee shared insights related to the client's social issues, incongruences between ideas, and general attitude. The supervisee drew attention to social issues with statements like, "named a student as wanting to be a really good friend of his" and "that student actually was the one who started the rumor that was what was said last year." The supervisee reflected incongruent ideas for the client by quoting "well that's really confusing to me because a few weeks ago..." from a session with the client. The supervisee shared her insight into the client's general disposition stating, "the whole up and down thing continues with how bad things are."

The supervisor voiced six attending responses during this portion of the dialogue. Though each comment represents attention and engagement, the supervisor communicated additional meaning. The supervisor communicated encouragement with the first three attending responses of "Yeah." The supervisor then responded to a supervisee comment with "Right," a statement of agreement towards her conclusion. The

dialogue continued with “Ohhh,” as the supervisor exclaiming significant interest in the supervisee’s conceptualization of the situation. Lastly, the supervisor communicated a level of understanding of the supervisee with the word “Okay.” This part of the data set included utterances that communicate encouragement, agreement, interest, and understanding.

SRSD. The SRSD event included both supervisor and supervisee participation in the dialogue. Analysis of the SRSD led to the identification of data described as therapeutic experience. The supervisee participated with attending responses. The Case Three SRSD follows:

Supervisor: I think so because the Tuesday before Thanksgiving you know, he left early...

Supervisee: Right

Supervisor: ...and told the kids, “I’m going to (*names a private school*).”

Supervisee: Exactly

Supervisor: ‘Cause one student in the cafeteria came up to me and asked me and I said, “Hey, that’s none of your business. I don’t...” And I was like, I don’t know.

Supervisee: Mmhm

Supervisor: You know but I said that’s up- you know “Oh because he told...” And, you know, this student- and it was another- it was a totally different student than anybody that (*client name*) has mentioned.

The therapeutic experience described in the SRSD presented an additional situation related to the supervisee’s insight into the client and an opportunity to

demonstrate appropriate boundaries for protecting client confidentiality. The supervisor's experience with another student not previously identified by the client ("it was a totally different student") reinforced the supervisee's perspective ("I don't know if the student was just inquiring."). The supervisor's statement, "Hey, that's none of your business." presented an example for the supervisee to understand the importance of protecting client confidentiality. The supervisor used information from another student to support his conceptualization of a client issue but maintained appropriate boundaries with the informant to protect client confidentiality. The disclosure of these experiences served both to support the supervisor's efforts at consultation and reinforce the development of appropriate professional boundaries with students.

Unlike the pre-SRSD phase of the partial transcript, the supervisee offered only attending responses at this stage. During the SRSD, the supervisee vocalized her interest by saying, "right," "exactly," and "mmhm" to indicate both engagement in the interaction and agreement with the supervisor's additional support.

Survey responses. Both members of the supervisory dyad in Case Three responded to the three survey questions. The open-ended survey questions allowed for responses in the participants' own words. See Table A5 for a summary of identified descriptive categories for Case Three.

Question one. Question one focused on the participants' understanding of the concept of self-disclosure by prompting them to, "Please explain your understanding of the concept of self-disclosure."

Supervisor. After analyzing the data from the question one response, the researcher identified four categories representative of the supervisor's conceptualization

of self-disclosure. The descriptive categories included relationship, communication, content, and purpose. Relationship refers to any interaction between two people in general and could include specific dyadic contexts for counselor-client and/or supervisor-supervisee. For relationship, data from the supervisor's description included "person" and "the individual who is absorbing this information." This data outlined the context for the relationship in general terms as the discloser and another person. Communication refers to efforts of revealing, sharing, giving, speaking, or discussing by a participant in the relationship. For communication, the supervisor describes the actual process of self-disclosure as "the manner a person discusses." Content refers to personal information about the discloser including details, stories, issues, and situations that are similar to the experiences of the other person and/or related to the discussion topic. For content, data from the supervisor's description of self-disclosure included "personal issue/situation" and "this information." Purpose refers to efforts to bring about some type of change. For purpose, the supervisor described "prompting...on any specific parameters." This statement associated the characteristic of purpose to the use of self-disclosure but assigned no additional specificity. In summary, the researcher analyzed the data for the supervisor's response to survey question one included descriptive categories identified as relationship, communication, content, and purpose.

Supervisee. After analyzing the data from the question one response, the researcher identified four categories representative of the supervisee's conceptualization of self-disclosure. The descriptive categories included relationship, communication, content, and purpose. For relationship, the data from the supervisee's description included "counselor or supervisor" and "client or supervisee." This response data

outlined multiple contexts for relationships. For communications, the supervisee described the process of self-disclosure as “when a counselor or supervisor (in this case) shares...” For content, data from the supervisee’s description of self-disclosure included “an experience that has happened to them before,” “is directly related to the discussion taking place,” and “an experience that the client (or supervisee) is going through at the current time.” For purpose, the researcher identified empathizing as a subcategory connected to the purpose self-disclosure. Empathizing refers to the sense that one person understands the experience of the other, in this case, by sharing similar experiences and feelings. The supervisee described the reason for self-disclosure as providing “the client/supervisee with an empathic response to the situation.” In summary, the data for the supervisee’s response to survey question one included descriptive categories identified as relationships, communication, content, and purpose.

Question two. Question two focused on the purpose or purposes the supervisor intended when using the specific SRSD from the partial transcript. The survey asked, “What was your perception of the purpose of using this supervisor self-disclosure with the supervisee?”

Supervisor. After analyzing the question two response, the researcher identified a single category representative of the supervisor’s purpose for using self-disclosure in this instance. This descriptive category included teaching. Teaching refers to efforts to improve understanding or share insight. For teaching, the supervisor included the word “heightens” to describe his purpose for addressing professionalism in counseling and supervision. The response to question two included significant data related to the subject discussed in the partial transcript. The researcher labeled this data as the topic and

included it as a subcategory of teaching. For Case Three, the topic consisted of establishing appropriate boundaries identified by the supervisor as professionalism. In this case, the supervisor's response included only 10 words. In summary, the data for the supervisor's response to survey question two included a descriptive category identified as teaching.

Supervisee. After analyzing the question two response, the researcher identified no category representative of the data related to the supervisor's purpose for using self-disclosure in this instance. This data focused on disagreement. In addressing SRSD, the supervisee's perception of the SRSD presented in the partial transcript failed to consider this supervisor intervention as an example of self-disclosure. The supervisee stated, "I do not really see this example as an episode of self-disclosure." The supervisee included descriptions similar to the categories noted in her conceptualization of self-disclosure. For example, the supervisee described this exchange "for me, my supervisor is simply sharing." reflecting an acknowledgement of a relationship. The context of the supervisor-supervisee relationship represented this interaction. For communication process, the supervisee described the supervisor's statement as "sharing." For content, the supervisee described this statement as "a piece of a conversation that he had with a fellow student who was inquiring as to the whereabouts of another student." Nevertheless, this content failed to resonate with the supervisee in any significant way associated with self-disclosure. In summary, the data for the supervisee's response to survey question two included no descriptive category associated with the purpose of this SRSD. Rather, the researcher's interpretation of this supervisor intervention as a SRSD differed from the supervisee's perspective.

Question three. Question three focused on the effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. The survey asked, “What was your perception of the effect of this supervisor self-disclosure on the supervisee?”

Supervisor. After analyzing the data from the question three response, the researcher identified a single category representative of the supervisor’s perception of the effect this SRSD had on the supervisee. This descriptive category included teaching. For example, the supervisor stated that the SRSD “promotes the supervisee to be reflective and open to feedback.” The topic described “reflective” and “open to feedback” as dimensions of supervisee development. For the supervisor response to question three, the researcher determined the response data continued to refer to the supervisor’s purpose for using SRSD rather than sharing a perception of the actual effect on the supervisee. The data reflected a perspective of what the supervisor hoped the effect would be rather than a perception of what actual effects occurred. For example, the supervisor’s use of the word “promotes” describes the action of the SRSD reflecting the supervisor’s intention for using the SRSD more than a perception of the effects the supervisee experienced through the SRSD. In this case, the supervisor’s response included only 12 words. In summary, the data for the supervisor’s response to survey question three included a descriptive category identified as supervisee development.

Supervisee. After analyzing the data from the question three response, the researcher identified a single category representative of the effect this SRSD had on the supervisee. This descriptive category included evaluation. Again, this data focused on disagreement. The supervisee’s perception of the SRSD presented in the partial transcript failed to consider this supervisor intervention as an example of self-disclosure. The

supervisee stated, “I do not see this as fitting the counseling definition of ‘self-disclosure.’” Evaluation refers to a dichotomous value judgment. For evaluation, the supervisee included two descriptions that represent this supervisor statement or intervention. Though the supervisee data reflected a disagreement with labeling this supervisor comment as a self-disclosure, she described the effect as “neither helpful nor harmful” in relation to its influence on her work in the supervision session. In summary, the data for the supervisee’s response to survey question three included a descriptive category identified evaluation.

Participant congruence. This section discusses the survey responses in regard to participant congruence (Prout & Wadkins, 2014). Participant congruence refers to the degree to which the responses reflect common descriptive categories for the individual participant across the survey questions.

Supervisor congruence. In Case Three, supervisor responses to the survey revealed strands of congruence as well as comparatively discrepant data among all questions.

Congruence between questions one and two. The researcher identified four descriptive categories related to the supervisor’s conceptualization of self-disclosure in response to question one. Those categories included relationship, communication, content, and purpose. While the shift to question two required the supervisor’s conceptualization of self-disclosure to shift from person and individual to supervisor-supervisee, the categories identified for the purpose of the SRSD in question two included teaching. Both questions included data representing the category identified as content. In question one, data representing content included “personal issue/situation,”

while in question two, the data included an interpretation of professional boundaries as the topic. The question one data also included a general purpose as a characteristic of self-disclosure. The response to question two indicated a definitive purpose associated with the SRSD. The response data for questions one and two showed areas of congruence. The question one data related to relationship and communication process shared no congruence with data in question two.

Congruence between questions one and three. With regards to questions three, the researcher described a category of teaching ascribed to the supervisor's perception of the effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. From the category of purpose in the question one response, the supervisor described "prompting the individual" as a purpose. That purpose aligned with the question three data. Data from question three indicated a change in the supervisee's reflectivity and "openness to feedback." A level of congruence existed between questions one and three.

Congruence between questions two and three. In addressing the responses to questions two and three, the researcher identified some congruence. The data for question two included the teaching of professionalism in counseling and supervision. The data for question three included teaching the supervisee in the areas of reflection and openness to feedback. These responses shared an emphasis on teaching the supervisee though the topics differ.

For the Case Three dyad, the supervisor response data demonstrated some strands of congruence among all three questions. The supervisor response data also included some comparatively discrepant data among the questions.

Supervisee congruence. In Case Three, supervisee responses to the survey revealed some congruence between all three questions with outlying descriptive categories preventing complete congruence across all questions.

Congruence between questions one and two. The researcher identified four descriptive categories related to the supervisee's conceptualization of self-disclosure in response to question one. Those categories included relationships, communication, content, and purpose. While the shift to question two required the supervisee's conceptualization of self-disclosure to focus on the supervisor-supervisee relationship, the lack of agreement on the description of the event as a SRSD prevented any identification of a purpose for the SRSD in question two. However, the supervisee's description of the partial transcript included data related to relationship, communication, and content similar to her conceptualization of self-disclosure. Since the supervisee disagreed with the interpretation of this event as a SRSD, the inclusion of these elements in the description appear incongruent. In addition to this discrepancy, the question one response identified data for the category of purpose. This contradictory and discrepant data prevented congruence between questions one and two.

Congruence between questions one and three. With regards to question three, the researcher described a single category including evaluation to account for the data on the perceived effects of the supervisee. After analyzing responses from questions one and three, the supervisee data demonstrated a small degree of congruence with a category of purpose in question one matching with the supervisee's question three response data related to evaluation. Though the supervisee again described disagreement with the

identification of the supervisor's statement as a self-disclosure, her response data included recognition of the possibility of a "helpful" or "harmful" effect.

Congruence between questions two and three. In addressing the responses to questions two and three, the supervisee demonstrated some congruence. For both questions, the supervisee disagreed with the identification of the supervisor statement as a self-disclosure. Likewise, the supervisee included no purpose or effect data in either response. The supervisee response to question three described possibilities of "helpful" and "harmful."

For the Case Three dyad, the supervisee response data demonstrated some congruence between questions one and three as well as between questions two and three. Some outlying data existed with the comparison of questions one and two.

Dyad congruence. This section discusses the survey responses in regard to dyad congruence (Retrum, Nowels, & Bekelman, 2013). Dyad congruence refers to the degree to which the responses reflect common descriptive categories among the supervision dyad members across the survey questions.

Question one congruence. The researcher compared the responses for the supervisor and the supervisee from question one. After analyzing the categories, the Case Three dyad response showed a high level of congruence. Both the supervisor and the supervisee described self-disclosure in terms of a relationship between two people, a communication process, containing information, and serving a purpose as evidenced by the descriptive categories of relationship, communication, content, and purpose. The supervisor and supervisee differed in the way they described this relationship. The supervisor described the relationship for self-disclosure as "a person" and "the individual

who is absorbing this information” while the supervisee described the relationship to be that of a counselor and client or supervisor and supervisee. For the category of communication, the supervisor described self-disclosure with “discusses” and the supervisee with “shares.” For content, the supervisor described self-disclosure as a “personal issue” or “situation” while the supervisee described self-disclosure as “an experience that has happened to them directly related to the discussion.” For purpose, the supervisor labeled the intention of self-disclosure as “prompting the individual” while the supervisee labeled the intention of self-disclosure as “an empathic response.” Though the specific descriptions of self-disclosure varied, both the supervisor and supervisee in the Case Three dyad showed congruence for the majority of the descriptive categories in question one.

Question two congruence. The researcher compared the responses for the supervisor and the supervisee from question two. After analyzing the categories, the Case Three dyad response data showed little congruence. The supervisor described the purpose of the SRSD with data related to teaching. The topic of content included professionalism. The supervisee disagreed with the description of the supervisor statement as a self-disclosure. She provided a description of the supervisor statement with data including relationship, communication, and content. The responses of the Case Three supervisor and supervisee showed little congruence for the majority of the data in question two.

Question three congruence. The researcher compared the responses for the supervisor and supervisee from question three. After analyzing the categories, the Case Three dyad response data showed no congruence. The supervisor data represented a category identified as teaching with a topic covering reflection and “openness to

feedback.” The supervisee disagreed with the description of the supervisor statement as a self-disclosure. She described the supervisor’s statement as “neither helpful nor harmful.” The responses of the Case Three supervisor and supervisee showed no congruence for the data in question three.

Case Three summary. In summary, the Case Three SRSD occurred during a 28-minute supervision interaction between a male supervisor and a female supervisee at a middle school. See Table 3 for a summary of Case Three. The interaction focused on a case consultation. The supervisor demonstrated asked probing questions, shared insights, and summarized case information in a collegial exchange. SRSD occurred four times during the interaction with one of those SRSD events forming the basis of Case Three. The Case Three SRSD consisted of a therapeutic experience. Each member of the Case Three dyad completed an open-ended survey consisting of three questions. Responses from both supervisor and supervisee for question one included data related to the relationship between two people, the process of communication, the content of the self-disclosure, and the purpose of self-disclosure. Brevity characterized the supervisor responses to both questions two and three. The question two response of the supervisor included data related to teaching. The question three response of the supervisor also included data related to teaching. The supervisee responses to questions two and three included a statement disagreeing with the identification of the Case Three SRSD example as a self-disclosing statement. The question two response of the supervisee included data describing the statement with a relationship, communication process and specific content. The questions three response of the supervisee included data evaluating the supervisor statement as neither helpful nor harmful. Refer to Table A5 for a summary of the

descriptive categories for Case Three. Case Three concluded with a discussion of the congruence of responses for each participant and the congruence of responses between participants.

Table 3: Case Three Summary

Supervisor- 40 year old White male with 20 previous experiences as a site supervisor		Supervisee- 39 year old Caucasian female in her first internship experience
This session is a case consultation. SRSD occurred 4 times.		
Question 1	Self-disclosure described in terms of a relationship between two people, a communication process, containing information of a personal nature, and serving a purpose.	
Question 2	Teaching- “heightens professionalism”	Disagreed with identification of statement as an example of SRSD.
Question 3	Teaching- “promotes the supervisee to be reflective and open to feedback”	Disagreed with identification of statement as an example of SRSD.

Case Four

The researcher collected Case Four data during the fall semester of 2013.

Dyad demographic data. Each member of the Case Four dyad completed the demographic questionnaire. For Case Four, the supervisor identified as a 64 year old White female. She reported 16 years of experience working as a professional school counselor with one hour of training and five previous experiences as a counseling supervisor. The supervisee identified as a 28 year old White male. He previously completed 14 graduate level counseling courses. This supervisee planned to complete his 600 hour internship experience during one semester indicating a full-time onsite experience. In summary, the Case Four dyad consisted of a mixed-gender pairing of similar ethnicity. Also of note in this case, the supervisor reported as 36 years older than

the supervisee. The supervision experience for Case Four occurred in a middle school setting.

Audio recorded supervision session. The context of the SRSD provided by the audio recording of the supervision session of the Case Four dyad consisted primarily of a formal evaluation. The entire 22 minute session captured a supervisor-directed evaluation of the supervisee's development and performance. Specifically, the supervisor and the supervisee reviewed the evaluation form used by the academic program for the final evaluation. Both members of the dyad compared current progress with a review of the mid-term evaluation. While the evaluation discussed each item, the conversation exhibited a professional, supportive, and complimentary tone. The supervisor and supervisee demonstrated agreement when discussing certain items from the evaluation form like *self-care, self-awareness, planned interventions and strategies*, and *personal/professional dispositions*. Less agreement occurred while discussing *attendance and punctuality*.

The following comments made by the supervisor while addressing the criteria of *self-care* from the form illustrated the style of interaction throughout the supervision session. "The best thing I saw you do... You picked up on that immediately." Similarly, when addressing *self-awareness* the supervisor commented, "You are so self-aware." Additionally, the supervisor provided feedback on performance with concrete examples from the supervisee's experience. For instance, while evaluating criteria referred to as *planned intervention and strategies*, the supervisor stated, "We did for the anxiety issues. We planned a strategy and we have some follow up with that." Responding to *personal/professional dispositions*, the supervisor stated "I agree, very good. The only thing that

impeded you on that was your other job.” To which the supervisee responded “Yeah, just a lot of other commitments. Otherwise I’d have been here the whole time.” The supervisor and supervisee agreed with evaluative judgments of the supervisee’s performance.

For categories where initial agreement failed to occur, the supervisor and supervisee worked to achieve consensus. For example, when addressing *attendance and punctuality* the supervisor stated “You put fair. I would say good. So we disagree on that.” In an effort to reflect consensus, the supervisee replied, “I thought I updated that one. I meant to update that.” From listening to the audio recording, the discussion of the discrepant viewpoints on supervisee performance never resulted in contentious debate.

In viewing the audio recording from the perspective of the supervisory working alliance, the discussion of the supervisee’s performance within the context of the evaluation form linked specific goals and tasks. For example, the supervisee’s efforts to send carefully worded messages to the faculty (task) exemplified for the supervisor the criteria referred to as *interpersonal communication* (goal). For another example, the supervisee completed a referral to DCS during the semester in a manner that regarded the professional ethics established by ASCA and ACA (task) in fulfilling the criteria *ethical and legal standards of the profession* (goal). The dyad used the criteria from the evaluation form to establish goals for the supervisee experience. The discussion of activities completed in relation to those criteria illustrated for the dyad the connections between those goals and tasks. The bond element within the supervisory working alliance appeared near the end of the session. The supervisor disclosed “I’m gonna miss ya.” With the supervisee responding “I’m gonna miss bein’ here. I really will.” For this dyad, the

audio recorded supervision session included all three components of the supervisory working alliance.

In this audio recording, clear examples of SRSD occurred six times. First, in the second minute, the supervisor followed up to the supervisee's response when addressing *working with staff* with this reaction, "I think one of the things that you discovered is that you don't, you don't work alone. You collaborate all day long with everybody in the building." The supervisee continued the dialogue, "Definitely, that's something I've really learned from this place is that it's a group effort for sure." Second, also in the second minute, the supervisor reacts to the supervisee's efforts to meet the criteria *seek and apply feedback from supervision and consultation* by stating, "I think you don't necessarily ask for feedback but you certainly listen when it's given. I don't know that you've had any occasion to ask because I'm pretty forthcoming with information anyway. (laughs)" Third, in the seventh minute, the supervisor reacts to the supervisee's efforts to appropriately manage off task behavior in a group counseling setting by stating, "I liked what you did when I observed you in a group." Fourth, in the 11th minute, the supervisor described her reaction to the supervisee's ability to maintain respect for struggling students. This disclosure serves as the Case Four example because it occurred late enough in the interaction to exclude the possibility of casual conversation at the opening of the session but prior to any closing comments and because it consisted of sufficient length and detail to include the defined characteristics of a SRSD. See section SRSD below for more details. Fifth, in the 12th minute, the supervisor again responds to the supervisee's efforts to intervene with a student by reflecting, "One of the best things I saw you do...(then describes the situation before reinforcing the supervisee's actions

with)...I think you picked up on that immediately.” The sixth and final example of SRSD occurred in the 22nd minute as a reaction to the supervisee. In reflecting on the semester long supervisory relationship, the supervisor stated, “I’m gonna miss ya.” The supervisor engaged in self-disclosure about her experience as a supervisor and her reactions to the supervisee.

Partial transcript. The Case Four data set includes a partial transcript with nine lines of dialogue; six spoken by the supervisor, three spoken by the supervisee. The first eight lines of the dialogue (five spoken by the supervisor, three spoken by the supervisee) serve to aid participant recall of contextual information from the interaction. The last line of the dialogue (spoken by the supervisor) represented the Case Four SRSD addressed in the open-ended survey.

Contextual information pre-SRSD. To establish an understanding of the context, the researcher describes what occurs prior to the SRSD. This description includes supervisor insights and as supervisee confirmation of those insights.

The supervisor shared insights related to the supervisee’s interaction style, the interaction style of “so many (other) people,” and the needs of disadvantaged students. First, the supervisor described the supervisee’s interaction style. The supervisor stated to the supervisee, “You had a way of talking to kids...that make them at ease without being condescending.” The tone of this statement appears complimentary toward the supervisee. The supervisor attempted to highlight for the supervisee his “way of talking” by reinforcing his ability to make students feel at ease and noting the absence of any condescending qualities. Second, in sharing insights into a different approach of communicating with students, the supervisor deliberately compares the supervisee’s “way

of talking” to that of “so many people...who come across as being condescending.” The negative description of this second approach as “condescending” attempted to clarify for the supervisee that his interaction style represents a comparatively more effective approach for communicating with disadvantaged students. Third, the supervisor shared insight into effectively working with disadvantaged student populations. Specifically, the supervisor identified “kids of poverty or kids who are minority kids” as in need of a particular approach by a person for effective communication to take place. This portion of the partial transcript failed to include any specific description of this approach for addressing these disadvantaged groups. However, from her observations, the supervisor pointed out that the supervisee’s interaction style effectively met those needs for communicating with disadvantaged student populations.

The analysis of the participant statements for the role of the supervisee included three confirmatory responses indicating understanding and agreement with the supervisor’s shared insights. The first statement, “Mmhm,” acknowledged simple agreement with the supervisor’s insight into the supervisee’s interaction style. The second statement clarified for the supervisor that her understanding of his approach to students compared well with his intentions. The supervisor stated, “Yeah, and that’s what I aim for.” The third statement, “Right,” acknowledged an understanding of and an agreement with the supervisor’s insight into the approach taken by “so many people” as being condescending.

SRSD. The SRSD event included only supervisor participation in the dialogue. Analysis of the SRSD led to the identification of data described as reactions to the supervisee. The Case Four SRSD follows:

Supervisor: And you never talk to kids like that and I really appreciate that.

The reaction to the supervisee described in the SRSD related to concepts of acknowledgement and appreciation. For acknowledgement, “you never talk to kids like that” referred to the previous discussion on the condescending approach people sometimes take towards disadvantaged students. With this part of the SRSD, the supervisor acknowledged a qualitative difference to the supervisee’s interaction style. Second, “I really appreciate that.” referred to the supervisor’s recognition of the importance of this quality to her frame of reference for working with disadvantaged students. This brief example of a SRSD reflected the supervisor’s reactions to the supervisee.

Survey responses. Both members of the supervisory dyad in Case Four responded to the three survey questions. The open-ended survey questions allowed for responses in the participants’ own words. See Table A6 for a summary of identified descriptive data categories for Case Four.

Question one. Question one focused on the participants’ understanding of the concept of self-disclosure by prompting them to “Please explain your understanding of the concept of self-disclosure.”

Supervisor. After analyzing the data from the question one response, the researcher identified four categories representative of the supervisor’s conceptualization of self-disclosure. These descriptive categories included relationship, communication, content, and purpose. Relationship refers to any interaction between two people in general and could include specific dyadic contexts for counselor-client and/or supervisor-supervisee. For relationship, data from the supervisor’s description specified the

“counseling setting” as the basis for her conceptualization. Further, the supervisor included the role of “student” in the description indicating that this “counseling setting” refers specifically to a school counseling setting. Communication refers to efforts of revealing, sharing, giving, speaking, or discussing by a participant in the relationship. For communication, the supervisor described the act of self-disclosure as “a process of revealing to the student.” Content refers to personal information about the discloser including details, stories, issues, and situations that are similar to the experiences of the other person and/or related to the discussion topic. For content, data from the supervisor’s description of self-disclosure included “shared experiences.” Purpose refers to efforts to bring about some type of change. For purpose, the researcher identified two subcategories from the supervisor’s response data connected to the purpose of self-disclosure. One subcategory related to normalizing experience. Normalizing refers to the recognition that one’s experiences reflect common experiences in the setting. This recognition often takes place when one hears of others in similar situations. For example, the statement “in order that the student understand that he is not alone” reflected the attempt to use self-disclosure to communicate that others share similar experiences. Therefore, these experiences of the student appeared somewhat normal. A second subcategory in the category of purpose for self-disclosure identified from the data related to teaching. Teaching refers to efforts to improve understanding or share insight. The supervisor stated that self-disclosure serves to “level the field.” This metaphor emphasized sharing new insight into the perspective of the relationship between the individuals involved in the self-disclosure experience. For the supervisor, this particular change in perspective involved shifting “from one of doling out wisdom to one of experiencing commonality

and thus sharing learning.” This statement described insight into a shifting perspective that no longer sees the discloser (a counselor in this setting) solely as an expert but rather also as a fellow human being. In summary, the data for the supervisor’s response to survey question one included descriptive categories identified as relationship, communication, content, and purpose.

Supervisee. After analyzing the data from the question one response, the researcher identified three categories representative of the supervisee’s conceptualization of self-disclosure. These descriptive categories included communication, content, and purpose. For communication, the supervisee described the act of self-disclosure as “a practice of revealing information.” For content, data from the supervisee’s description of self-disclosure included “information about yourself.” For the category reflecting purpose, the researcher identified two subcategories from the supervisee’s response data connected to the purpose of self-disclosure. These subcategories include motivating and teaching. Motivating refers to one’s efforts to encourage and support the other. The supervisee described “motivating some change” as a hopeful outcome for self-disclosure. The data also included the idea of teaching. Specifically, the supervisee described “the hope of...revelation in the object of the disclosure.” In summary, the data for the supervisee’s response to survey question one included descriptive categories identified as communication, content, and purpose.

Question two. Question two focused on the purpose or purposes the supervisor intended when using the specific SRSD from the partial transcript. The survey asked, “What was your perception of the purpose of using this supervisor self-disclosure with the supervisee?”

Supervisor. After analyzing the question two response, the researcher identified a single category representative of the supervisor's purpose for using self-disclosure in this instance. This descriptive category included teaching. For teaching, the supervisor data referenced the supervision skills of observing, identifying supervisee strengths, reinforcing behavior, and reflecting on progress. For example, the statement "In listening to (names supervisee)'s conversations with students" reflected the supervisor's attempts to provide direct observation for the supervisee. In identifying the supervisee's strengths, the supervisor stated, "It (tone) was one of the strengths he brought to the school counseling setting." To address reinforcing behavior, the supervisor recognized the opportunity to use self-disclosure as a means of positively reinforcing the supervisee's approach rather than choosing "to remind him that he is not here to rescue anyone." The supervisor skill discussed earlier, reflecting on progress, referred to the supervisor's ability to reflect on her own work as a supervisor. In reflecting on the purpose of this SRSD, the supervisor stated, "it was refreshing." The response to question two included significant data related to the subject discussed in the partial transcript. The researcher labeled this data as the topic and included it as a subcategory of teaching. For the topic of previous experiences, the supervisor explanation of purpose included "convey past histories." These histories referred to experiences with "people who work with students," "work with students from different backgrounds and experiences," "people...who speak to those students in a manner that can be interpreted as condescension," and "having heard other educators speak to students without any understanding of their experiences." For the topic of interaction style, the supervisor emphasized a purpose of differentiating between both those who approach students in the "manner that can be interpreted as

condescension” as well as the supervisee’s approach described as a “tone of respect and shared experiences” and “a tone of, if not commonality, then one of respect for the student’s experiences.” The ideas of “shared experiences” and “commonality” referred to another moment earlier in the supervision interaction when the supervisory dyad discussed the supervisee’s use of self-disclosure as a part of his interaction style. In summary, the data for the supervisor’s response to survey question two included a descriptive category identified as teaching.

Supervisee. After analyzing the question two response, the researcher identified a single category representing the supervisor’s purpose for using self-disclosure in this instance. These descriptive categories included motivating. For motivating, the supervisee stated, “the supervisor was attempting to encourage.” The response to question two included significant data related to the subject discussed in the partial transcript. The researcher labeled this data as the topic and included it as a subcategory of motivating. For the topic, the data from the supervisee’s perception of the purpose included “nonjudgmental behavior” as the object of this encouragement. In this case, the supervisee’s response included only 13 words. In summary, the data for the supervisee’s response to survey question two included a descriptive category identified as motivating.

Question three. Question three focused on the effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. The survey asked, “What was your perception of the effect of this supervisor self-disclosure on the supervisee?”

Supervisor. After analyzing the data from the question three response, the researcher identified three categories representative of the supervisor’s perception of the effect this SRSD had on the supervisee. These descriptive categories included

understanding, motivating, and affirming. For understanding, the supervisor stated, “He clearly understood the point I was making.” That point consisted of the supervisee’s ability to successfully engage disadvantaged students with an exceptional interactive style. For motivating, the supervisor continued with “and appeared to appreciate my recognition of his interaction with students.” Affirming refers to a positive acknowledgement or agreement with an idea or behavior. For affirming, the supervisor perception revealed that the supervisee “appeared to accept the disclosure as expected” and “he already knew and that that piece of information did not surprise him.” These statements reflected the idea that the supervisor disclosure affirmed what the supervisee already knew through self-reflection or prior feedback. In summary, the data for the supervisor’s response to survey question three included descriptive categories identified as understanding, motivating, and affirming.

Supervisee. After analyzing the data from the questions three response, the researcher identified two categories representing the effect this SRSD had on the supervisee. These descriptive categories included motivating and affirming. For motivating, the supervisee stated, “The disclosure had the intended effect.” From the supervisee’s question two response data, the intended effect perceived by the supervisee included “to encourage nonjudgmental behavior.” For affirming, the supervisee added “and let the supervisee know he was moving in the right direction.” This statement indicated that the supervisee possessed an awareness of his interaction style. Therefore, the supervisor’s disclosure affirmed his style to be effective. In summary, the data for the supervisee’s response to survey question three included descriptive categories identified as motivating and affirming.

Participant congruence. This section discusses the survey responses in regard to participant congruence (Prout & Wadkins, 2014). Participant congruence refers to the degree to which the responses reflect common descriptive categories for the individual participant across the survey questions.

Supervisor congruence. In Case Four, supervisor responses to the survey revealed congruence between some questions and a lack of congruence between others.

Congruence between questions one and two. The researcher identified four descriptive categories related to the supervisor's conceptualization of self-disclosure in response to question one. Those categories included relationship, communication, content, and purpose. While the shift to question two required the supervisor's conceptualization of self-disclosure to shift from the counseling setting to supervision, the category identified for the purpose of the SRSD in question two included teaching. The category of content from question one included "shared experiences." The topics of previous experiences and interaction style in questions two served as the content alluded to in question one. The category of purpose from question one included the subcategory of teaching and sharing insight to "level the field." The category of teaching also included efforts to share this type of insight through identifying supervisee strengths, reinforcing behavior, and reflecting on progress. The response data for questions one and two showed multiple areas of congruence.

Congruence between questions one and three. With regards to question three, the researcher described three categories including understanding, motivating, and affirming ascribed to the supervisor's perception of the effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. From the category of purpose in the question one response, the supervisor described intentions

of normalizing experience and teaching. The supervisor's perception of the effect on the supervisee included understanding "the point" and affirmation. The purpose of teaching and the effect of understanding demonstrate congruence of responses. Additionally, the perceived effect on the supervisee of affirmation corresponds with the purpose of normalizing experience. Though the question three response category of affirmation appeared discrepant from the question one descriptive categories, some congruence exists between the questions one and three responses.

Congruence between questions two and three. In addressing the responses to questions two and three, the supervisor data indicated some congruence. No overlapping categories existed in the response data for these two questions. However, within the category of teaching in question two, the skills of identifying supervisee strengths, reinforcing behavior, and reflecting on progress correspond with the effects of understanding and affirmation in question three. The effect of affirmation appeared unaccounted for based on the question two response data.

For the Case Four dyad, the supervisor response data included some congruence between questions one and two and between questions one and three. The data demonstrated less congruence between questions two and three.

Supervisee congruence. In Case Four, supervisee responses revealed some congruence. A strong reference in the question three response to the question two response highlighted congruence for the supervisee.

Congruence between questions one and two. The researcher identified three descriptive categories related to the supervisee's conceptualization of self-disclosure in response to question one. Those categories included communication, content, and

purpose. While the shift to question two required the supervisee's conceptualization of self-disclosure to include a context of supervisor-supervisee, the category identified for the purpose of the SRSD in question two included motivating. The question two response category of motivating related to the question one category of purpose. These responses reflected a strong degree of congruence. However, the question one category of content referred to personal information, while the question two subcategory of topic referred specifically to "nonjudgmental behavior." Though the researcher identified congruence for the questions one and two responses, some data lacked any significant degree of congruence.

Congruence between questions one and three. With regards to question three, the researcher described two categories including motivating and affirming. After analyzing responses from questions one and three, the supervisee data demonstrated congruence with a subcategory of motivation in the purpose category of question one and categories of motivating and affirming from question three. This included all data for question three. However, teaching as a subcategory of purpose from question one appeared unrelated to question three limiting the congruence between these responses.

Congruence between questions two and three. In addressing the responses to questions two and three, the supervisee demonstrated some congruence. The data included motivating as a purpose of the SRSD from question two. For question three, the supervisee's response data specified, "The disclosure had the intended effect." This reference to the question two response within the question three response indicated direct congruence between these questions. However, responses to questions two and three also

included additional data. The category of affirming from question three contained no overlap with the question two data.

For the Case Four dyad, the supervisee response data demonstrated some congruence between questions one and two and between questions one and three. The strongest degree of congruence appeared between questions two and three. Each comparison also contained outlying data.

Dyad congruence. This section discusses the survey responses in regard to dyad congruence (Retrum, Nowels, & Bekelman, 2013). Dyad congruence refers to the degree to which the responses reflect common descriptive categories among the supervision dyad members across the survey questions.

Question one congruence. The researcher compared the responses for the supervisor and the supervisee from question one. After analyzing the categories, the Case Four dyad response showed some congruence. Both the supervisor and the supervisee described self-disclosure in terms of being a communication process, including specific content, and serving a purpose as evidenced by the common descriptive categories of communication, content, and purpose. Both members of the dyad described self-disclosure as a communication. The supervisor used “process of revealing” as a description to conceptualize the communication occurring during self-disclosure, while the supervisee used “practice of revealing information” as a phrase to describe self-disclosure. The supervisor and supervisee differed in the description of the content necessary for a self-disclosure. The supervisor described self-disclosure as consisting of “shared experiences,” while the supervisee described self-disclosure as consisting of “information about yourself.” For the category of purpose, the supervisor and supervisee

described multiple possibilities. Both members of the dyad included the idea of teaching as a purpose for self-disclosure. The supervisor also added the purpose of normalizing experience. Likewise, the supervisee added the purpose of motivating. The supervisor's response data also included a descriptive category for relationship. The responses of the Case Four supervisor and supervisee showed congruence for the majority of the descriptive categories though some differences existed for the data within the categories.

Question two congruence. The researcher compared the responses for the supervisor and supervisee from question two. After analyzing the categories, the Case Four dyad response data showed some congruence. While no overlap existed for the category descriptions between the members of the dyad for question two, the underlying data reflected connections between the supervisor's subcategory of topic and the supervisee's category of topic, as well as between the supervisor's category of teaching and the supervisee's categories of motivating. The supervisor emphasized the supervisee's interaction style in her response to question two, while the supervisee described his interaction style less emphatically and simply as nonjudgmental behavior. The supervisor response data also included several references to the supervisor's teaching behaviors. Again, though no direct overlap occurred, the supervisee data referred to the dynamic interaction occurring between supervisor and supervisee. Likewise, the category of motivation in the supervisee's response data also corresponded with the supervisor response descriptive category of teaching. Though no direct overlap occurred between the supervisor and supervisee descriptive categories for question two, some congruence existed for the data within each category.

Question three congruence. The researcher compared the responses for the supervisor and the supervisee from question three. After analyzing the categories, the Case Four response data showed strong congruence. The supervisor data represented categories identified as understanding, motivating, and affirming. The supervisee data represented categories identified as motivating and affirming. The inclusion of affirmation by both members of the dyad reflected a strong congruent response. The supervisor categories of understanding and motivating related to the supervisee category of motivating. The supervisee understood the supervisor to be encouraging his interaction style. In the question three response the supervisee stated, “The disclosure had the intended effect.” The supervisor perceived these effects to be understanding and motivating, while the supervisee described this understanding of the supervisor and appreciation for her recognition as motivating for him. The Case Four dyad responses for question three included directly congruent descriptive categories with no outlying data.

Case Four member check. In an effort to enhance the trustworthiness of the data and the credibility of its interpretation, the researcher included member checking procedures whenever possible. A member check provides the participants an opportunity to review drafts of findings and offer feedback (Stake, 1995). Both members of the Case Four dyad reviewed portions of the case description.

The supervisor reviewed the interpretation of the dyad demographics, the audio recorded supervision session, the partial transcript, and the survey responses for the supervisor role. The supervisor described the interpretation presented to her as “interesting” and “on point and correct in the interpretation of discussions held.” She added, “At no point do the findings appear to be contrary to my recollection of the

interactions between the participants.” The supervisor objected to the characterization of her age as “twice the age of the supervisee.” She stated, “It is correct, but seeing it in print...well, may I say it reads, in print, a little harsher than when I said it out loud to (names supervisee).” In an effort to show fairness and respect to the participant, the researcher adjusted the wording. The description now reads, “The supervisor reported as 36 years older than the supervisee.” In summation of her assessment, the supervisor emphasized her enjoyment of the supervision experience with this supervisor and the openness of the supervisory relationship they shared concluding, “Relationships are essential to success.”

The supervisee reviewed the interpretation of the dyad demographics, the audio recorded supervision session, the partial transcript, and the survey responses for the supervisee role. The supervisee described the interpretation presented to him as “accurate and insightful” further stating, “I would agree with your summation throughout.” He added, “More than anything, it caused me to reflect on the experience again.”

Case Four summary. In summary, the Case Four SRSD occurred during a 22-minute supervision interaction between a female supervisor and a male supervisee at a middle school. See Table 4 for a summary of Case Four. This interaction focused on the academic program’s evaluation of the supervisee’s performance and experience with the supervisor. The tone of the interaction reflected a professional, supportive, and complimentary disposition by both members of the dyad. SRSD occurred six times during the interaction with one of those SRSD events forming the basis of Case Four. The Case Four SRSD included reactions to the supervisee. Each member of the Case Four dyad completed an open-ended survey consisting of three questions. Responses from both

supervisor and supervisee for question one included data related to communication, content, and purpose of self-disclosure. The supervisor included comments referring to the counseling relationship as the setting in which the self-disclosure might occur. Though some connections appeared between the responses of the supervisor and supervisee for question two, no common category descriptions existed. The supervisor described her purpose for using SRSD as teaching. The supervisee described the supervisor's purpose for using SRSD as motivating, directed toward nonjudgmental behavior. The response data for question three addressed the effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. The supervisor perceived the supervisee as understanding her preferences for his interaction style, motivated by her recognition, and accepting the feedback as reaffirming. Likewise, the supervisee described the effect of the SRSD as motivating and affirming. Refer to Table A6 for a summary of the descriptive categories for Case Four. Case Four concluded with a discussion of the congruence of responses for each participant and the congruence of responses between participants.

Table 4: Case Four Summary

Supervisor- 64 year old White female with 5 previous experiences as a site supervisor		Supervisee- 28 year old White male in his first internship experience
This session is a formal evaluation. SRSD occurred 6 times.		
Question 1	The supervisor and supervisee described self-disclosure in terms of being a communication process, including specific content, and serving a purpose.	
Question 2	Responses focused on the topic of supervisee interaction style/ nonjudgmental behavior. Teaching - Motivating	
Question 3	The supervisor and the supervisee described the effect of the SRSD in terms of motivating and affirming the behavior.	

Cross-Case Analysis

The cross-case analysis compared results for each type of data across cases. These data included dyad demographic data, audio recorded supervision sessions, partial transcripts, survey responses, and dyad congruence.

Dyad Demographic Data

Cross-case comparisons for demographic data highlighted data related to the age, gender, ethnicity, experience, and site placement. Demographic comparisons of age included a dyad in which the supervisee was older than the supervisor (Case One), a dyad in which the supervisor was 36 years older than the supervisee (Case Four), and two dyads in which the members were close to the same age with the supervisor being slightly older than the supervisee (Cases Two and Three). Demographic comparisons of gender included both mixed-gender dyads (Cases One, Three, and Four) and a same gender dyad (Case Two). Of the three mixed-gender dyads, Cases One and Four consisted of female supervisor/male supervisee pairings and Case Three consisted of a male supervisor/female supervisee pairing. Demographic comparisons of ethnicity identified all participants as Caucasian. Demographic comparisons of experience showed dyads in Cases Two, Three, and Four consisted of supervisors with six or more years of counseling experience and five or more prior site-supervision experiences paired with supervisees who completed 13 or more graduate-level counseling courses and enrolled in a full-time internship experience. Case One included a supervisor with the minimum professional experience of two years and no prior site-supervision experience paired with a supervisee who completed 10 graduate-level counseling courses and enrolled in a part-time internship experience. Demographic comparisons of site placement included two

elementary school settings (Cases One and Three) and two middle school settings (Cases Two and Four). Cross-case comparisons of demographic data illustrated similarities and differences on several variables for the four cases included in this study.

Audio-recorded Supervision Sessions

Cross-case analysis comparisons of audio-recorded supervision sessions highlighted data related to the context of the supervision session, connection to the supervisory working alliance, and overall use of SRSD. Findings related to each follow.

Context of the supervision session. In regard to context, Cases One and Four consisted of formal evaluations of the supervisee, while Cases Two and Three consisted of case consultations. The cross-case analysis of the context of the supervision sessions compared the cases by describing which role directed the session, which skills the supervisor employed, and how the members worked to achieve consensus. For Cases One, Two, and Four, the supervisor directed the flow of the supervision interaction. In Case Four, the supervisee directed the flow of the supervision session. In all four cases, the supervisors demonstrated specific skills for supervision such as providing specific feedback, asking probing questions, and sharing insight. The supervisors in Cases One and Four provided specific feedback to the supervisee's performance. The supervisors in Cases Two and Three asked probing questions about supervisee case descriptions to prompt greater personal reflection and case analysis. The Case Two supervisor also engaged in clarifying responses, while the Case Three supervisor regularly shared his own insights and often summarized case material. In addressing the concept of achieving consensus in supervision, Cases One and Three commonly displayed differing opinions of supervisee performance evaluations or case conceptualization. These dyads shared a

freedom to express disagreement. For Case Two, the interaction highlighted the work and development of the supervisee. The dyad achieved consensus through questioning and clarifying. Case Four worked actively and directly to achieve consensus on the evaluation. Though some disagreements persisted, dyad members often modified perspectives to achieve consensus. An examination of the supervision sessions and their relationship to the supervisory working alliance follows.

Connection to the supervisory working alliance. Supervision sessions in all four cases included elements of the supervisory working alliance, agreement on goals, agreement on tasks, and the development of a relational bond. Each dyad interaction displayed agreement of the goals necessary for change, growth, and development. For Cases One and Four, the evaluation criteria served to provide goals for the supervisee. In Cases Two and Three, the supervisor set goals that the supervisee agreed on like, “I want you to feel comfortable in the classroom” and “What else can we do for him here?” respectively. Likewise, each dyad interaction shared a common understanding of the tasks necessary for goal attainment. For example, the Case Two supervisor questioned, “I didn’t know if you wanted to do another classroom guidance.” The supervisee responded in kind, “I could do another one, probably.” The Case Three example illustrated above concluded with the supervisee agreeing to complete a task, “I’m going to check in with him at the end of the week.” Dyads representing Case Two and Case Four also included mutual feelings of liking, caring, and trust representative of the relational bond between the supervisor and supervisee. For example, the Case Four supervision session concluded with the supervisor stating, “I’m gonna miss ya” and the supervisee responding with,

“I’m gonna miss bein’ here. I really will.” Each supervisory dyad included elements of the supervisory working alliance in their audio-recorded supervision session.

Overall use of SRSD. Each supervision session included multiple examples of SRSD beyond the specific case examples included in the partial transcript. The Case One supervision session contained six SRSDs consisting of counseling struggles, similar training experiences, reactions to the supervisee, and professional experiences. The Case Two supervision session contained nine SRSDs consisting of counseling struggles, similar training experiences, reactions to the supervisee, reactions to the supervisee’s clients, and supervision struggles. The Case Three supervision session contained four SRSDs consisting of reactions to the supervisee, reactions to the supervisee’s clients, and therapeutic experiences. The Case Four supervision session contained six SRSDs consisting of reactions to the supervisee and experiences as a supervisor. All supervisor participants commonly employed SRSD as an intervention in supervision. The most frequently occurring examples consisted of reactions to the supervisee, reactions to supervisee’s clients, and struggles counseling clients.

Partial Transcript

The researcher created a partial transcript from the supervision interaction of each participating dyad. The information included in the partial transcript served to aid participant recall of the context in which the SRSD occurred. The partial transcript for Case One consisted of 24 lines of dialogue with 11 presenting contextual information and 13 representing the Case One SRSD. The partial transcript for Case Two consisted of 33 lines of dialogue with 28 presenting contextual information and five representing the Case Two SRSD. The partial transcript for Case Three consisted of 37 lines of dialogue

with 27 presenting contextual information and 10 representing the Case Three SRSD.

The partial transcript for Case Four consisted of nine lines of dialogue with eight presenting contextual information and one representing the Case Four SRSD.

Contextual information pre-SRSD. Each supervision interaction addressed different topics related to supervision and the members of the supervisory dyad. Though the topics varied, the researcher identified descriptions for the contextual information contained in the partial transcript. The partial transcript for the Case One dyad included descriptions related to the supervisor's disposition towards the supervisee, the supervisor's expectations of the supervisee, and the role of the supervisee. The partial transcript for the Case Two dyad included descriptions related to teaching the supervisee such as reflecting on experience, processing actions and outcomes, considering possibilities, and establishing a new perspective for decision making. The partial transcript for the Case Three dyad included descriptions related to supervisee insights and supervisor attending responses. The partial transcript for the Case Four dyad included descriptions related to supervisor insights and supervisee confirmation. The Case Two partial transcript interaction followed a conversational pattern of equal exchange that appeared unique among the four dyads. In the other three supervisory relationships, the dyad member who directed the supervision interaction continued that same pattern in the partial transcript exchange.

SRSD. The researcher chose SRSD examples for each case that occurred in the middle of the interaction sufficiently enough to exclude the possibility of casual conversation at the opening or closing of the session and consisted of sufficient length and detail to include the defined characteristics of a SRSD. The Case One SRSD

described a story consisting of both the professional experiences and therapeutic experiences of the supervisor. The 13 lines of dialogue presented an exchange in which the supervisor told the story and the supervisee participated with attending responses. The Case Two SRSD described a therapeutic experience of the supervisor. The five lines of dialogue presented an exchange in which the supervisor shared an experience and the supervisee participated with attending responses. The Case Three SRSD described a therapeutic experience of the supervisor. The 10 lines of dialogue presented an exchange in which the supervisor shared an experience and the supervisee participated with attending responses. The Case Four SRSD consisted of a single line of speech expressing the supervisor's reaction to the supervisee's style of interacting with students.

Survey Responses

Both members of each supervisory dyad responded to the three survey questions. The researcher analyzed the responses sorting the data into descriptive categories. The following sections compare these descriptive categories across each case in the study.

Question one. Question one focused on the participants' understanding of the concept of self-disclosure by prompting them to "Please explain your understanding of the concept of self-disclosure."

Question one data contained common responses across all cases. The Case One dyad response included four congruent descriptive categories identified as relationship, communication, content, and purpose. Relationship refers to any interaction between two people in general and could include specific dyadic contexts for counselor-client and/or supervisor-supervisee. Communication refers to efforts of revealing, sharing, giving, speaking, or discussing by a participant in the relationship. Content refers to personal

information about the discloser including details, stories, issues, and situations that are similar to the experiences of the other person and/or related to the discussion topic. Purpose refers to efforts to bring about some type of change. Within the category of purpose, both members of the Case One dyad described subcategories identified as bonding and normalizing experience. Bonding refers to general descriptions of improving the relationship. Normalizing refers to the recognition that one's experiences reflect common experiences in the setting. This recognition often takes place when one hears of others in similar situations. The supervisee in the Case One dyad introduced data for an additional subcategory identified as teaching for the purpose of self-disclosure. Teaching refers to efforts to improve understanding or share insight. The supervisor in the Case One dyad introduced data for a category described as harm. Harm refers to purposes of self-disclosure judged to be inappropriate.

The Case Two dyad response included four congruent descriptive categories identified as relationship, communication, content, and purpose. Within the category of purpose, the supervisor for the Case Two dyad described subcategories identified as teaching and bonding. The supervisee for Case Two described bonding and normalizing experience as subcategories for the purpose of self-disclosure.

The Case Three dyad response included four congruent descriptive categories identified as relationship, communication, content, and purpose. The supervisee for Case Three described empathizing as a subcategory for the purpose of self-disclosure. Empathizing refers to the sense that one person understands the experience of the other, in this case, by sharing similar experiences and feelings.

The Case Four dyad included three congruent descriptive categories identified as communication, content, and purpose. Within the category of purpose, both members of the Case Four dyad described a subcategory identified as teaching. The supervisor in the Case Four dyad introduced data for the subcategory identified as normalizing experience for the purpose of self-disclosure. The supervisee in the Case Four dyad introduced data for the subcategory of motivating for the purpose of self-disclosure. Motivating refers to one's efforts to encourage and support the other. The supervisor in the Case Four dyad included data for a category described as relationship.

All participants conceptualize self-disclosure as a communication process with specific content and purpose. Participants described these purposes for self-disclosure as normalizing, bonding, teaching, and motivating. Seven of the eight participants included the characteristic of relationship as a part of self-disclosure. One participant introduced data related to the potential for harm with the use of self-disclosure.

Question two. Question two focused on the purpose or purposes the supervisor intended when using the specific SRSD from the partial transcript. The survey asked, “What was your perception of the purpose of using this supervisor self-disclosure with the supervisee?”

The participant response data for question two identified multiple purposes for the use of the SRSDs in this study. The Case One dyad response included a congruent descriptive category for teaching as a purpose for the specific Case One SRSD. Both members of the dyad addressed professional accountability and advocacy as the topic of the shared SRSD experience. The response to question two included significant data related to the subjects discussed in the partial transcript. The researcher labeled this data

as the topic and included it as a subcategory of teaching or motivating. The Case One supervisee response also included data in a subcategory of teaching identified as significance of the topic shared in the SRSD.

The Case Two dyad response included three congruent descriptive categories identified as teaching, normalizing, and empathizing. Within the category of teaching, both members of the Case Two dyad identified stress and client reaction related to the topic of decision making. The supervisee for the Case Two dyad described data for a category identified as bonding for the purpose of this shared SRSD experience.

The Case Three dyad response included no congruent descriptive category for the purpose for self-disclosure. The supervisor in the Case Three dyad described teaching as a purpose and included professionalism as the topic for this shared SRSD experience. The supervisee in the Case Three dyad disagreed with the interpretation of this shared supervision experience as an example of SRSD. The supervisee included relationship, communication, and content in her description of this interaction.

The Case Four dyad response included no congruent descriptive categories. The supervisor response data included a descriptive category related to teaching and included data on previous experiences and interaction style as topics. The supervisee response data included a descriptive category related to motivating and also included interaction style as a topic.

The question two responses for the purpose of the SRSDs included a common descriptive category across cases. Each case included data describing teaching as a purpose of SRSD. Each case also discussed the subcategory of topic of the partial transcript information in the question two response. In Case One, the topic consisted of

professional accountability and advocacy. In Case Two, the topic consisted of decision making. In Case Three, the topic consisted of information on a supervisee's client. In Case Four, the topic consisted of the supervisee's nonjudgmental interaction style. Regarding purpose, Case Two added normalizing empathizing, and bonding as purposes of the SRSD. Case Four also added significance as a subcategory of teaching as a purpose for SRSD.

Question three. Question three focused on the effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. The survey asked, "What was your perception of the effect of this supervisor self-disclosure on the supervisee?"

The data for question three contained some common responses among the cases in this study. The Case One dyad response included a congruent descriptive category for understanding as an effect of the Case One SRSD. Both members of the dyad addressed professional accountability and advocacy as the topic of the SRSD. The Case one supervisee also included data in a category identified as motivation.

The Case Two dyad response included two congruent descriptive categories identified as understanding and normalizing for the effect of the Case Two SRSD. The supervisor for the Case Two dyad described data for a category identified as empathizing for an effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. The supervisee for the Case Two dyad described data for a category identified as bonding for an effect of this SRSD on the supervisee.

The Case Three dyad response included no congruent descriptive category for the effect of the SRSD. The supervisor for the Case Three dyad described data for a category identified as teaching for the effect on the supervisee. The supervisee in the Case Three

dyad disagreed with the interpretation of this shared supervision experience as an example of SRSD. The supervisee included a description of evaluating as data for the effect. Evaluating refers to the dichotomous value judgment of the intervention as helpful or harmful.

The Case Four dyad response included two congruent descriptive categories identified as motivating and affirming for the effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. The supervisor for the Case Four dyad described data for a category identified as understanding for the effect of the SRSD on the supervisee.

The question three responses for the effect of the SRSD on the supervisee included no congruent descriptions across all cases. Cases One, Two, and Four described data for a category identified as understanding for the effect of the SRSD. Cases One and Four also described data for a category identified as motivating for the effect of the SRSD. Case Two described data for categories identified as normalizing, empathizing, and bonding. Case Three included data for descriptive categories of teaching and evaluation as an effect on the supervisee. Case Four added a descriptive category of affirming to the question three response data.

Cross-case Summary

Both members of each supervisory dyad responded to the three survey questions. Responses to question one about the participants' conceptualization of self-disclosure contained common descriptive categories across all cases. See Table 5 for a cross-case summary. The researcher identified communication, content, and purpose as categories in each case. A descriptive category related to relationship existed in three of four cases. Outlying data for a category described as harm appeared in a single case.

Responses to question two about the supervisor's intended purpose for the SRSD contained a common descriptive category related to teaching with a subcategory of topic related to the content of the partial transcript across all cases. The researcher also identified normalizing, empathizing, and bonding as descriptive categories for purpose in Case Two. Likewise, the descriptive category identified as motivating appeared in Case Four. A subcategory for teaching, significance appeared in Case One.

Responses to question three about the perceived effect of the SRSD for the supervisee contained a common descriptive category related to understanding across three of the four cases. The researcher identified a common category of motivating across two cases. Normalizing, empathizing, bonding, teaching, and affirming appeared as data in single cases.

Table 5: Cross-case Summary

Participants	3 out of 4 dyads were mixed gender. All participants identified as Caucasian or White.
SRSD occurred 25 times in 124 minutes of supervision.	
Question 1	Self-disclosure described as a communication process with specific content and purpose.
Question 2	All cases included the purpose of teaching for the SRSD.
Question 3	The effect of supervisee understanding was common across 3 cases.

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented findings from both case-by-case and cross-case data analysis procedures. For the case-by-case analysis, the data presentation included a description of dyad demographic information, a description of the contextual information of the supervision session, and a description of the partial transcript to establish a context

for the survey response data. The description of survey response data included descriptive categories representative of the data for each question. The case-by-case analysis concluded with a discussion of participant congruence and dyad congruence. For the cross-case analysis, the data presentation included a comparison of the dyad demographic data, context of the supervision session, and partial transcript across cases. The researcher also compared the responses to survey questions based on the descriptive categories identified for each case and the level of congruence for those categories across cases.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Chapter Introduction

This study explored the shared experience of a supervisor self-disclosure (SRSD) within the context of site supervision for school counseling supervisees. The researcher collected participant survey data and audio-recorded supervision interviews between school counseling site placement supervisors and school counseling supervisees in order to address the following research questions:

1. How do the school counseling site supervisor and school counseling supervisee conceptualize and describe self-disclosure?
2. How do the school counseling site supervisor and the school counseling supervisee describe the intended purpose of a shared SRSD experience?
3. How do the school counseling site supervisor and the school counseling supervisee describe the perceived effect(s) of a shared SRSD experience?

Chapter Five discusses the results of the present investigation. First, a brief summary of the study highlights the purpose, context, and procedures used to explore SRSD. Second, the limitations of the findings present the boundaries of and the context for interpreting the results. Third, the researcher discusses the findings from the analysis of the data through the lens of the supervisory working alliance and the research questions. Fourth, the researcher includes reflections from the research process. Fifth, the final sections describe the implications of these findings for counselor education and future research.

Summary of the Study

The present investigation examined the shared experience of SRSD in the context of school counselor training. Through the use of a collective case study design, the researcher collected demographic information, audio recorded supervision interactions, and responses to an open-ended survey from four supervisory dyads engaged in an internship experience in a CACREP accredited counselor education program. The researcher analyzed the data describing the context of supervision, the survey responses, and the level of congruence for those responses between participants in each case. The researcher also compared the data for the context, the survey responses, and congruence across cases.

Limitations

As with all field research, limitations existed within this collective case study design. These limitations included researcher bias in data collection, researcher bias in data analysis, and limits to generalizability. The individual nature of dissertation research increased the potential for researcher bias for both data collection and data analysis. For example, the selection of the SRSD examples met defined parameters for the concept. However, after reviewing the audio recordings of the supervision session during the data analysis, the researcher discovered numerous examples of SRSD in each case. As indicated by the responses of the Case Three supervisee, the researcher and at least one participant interpreted the identification of the SRSD case examples differently. Though the researcher reviewed data analysis protocol and personal reflections before analyzing each case in an effort to avoid any unwarranted drift from the purpose of the study, the development of sensitivity to the concepts in question proved difficult, if not

unavoidable. Another example of researcher bias in data collection and analysis involved the use of the survey. An open-ended survey allowed for the collection of responses in the participants own words and created convenience for busy school counseling professionals to be able to participate in the research. However, the lack of direct interaction with participants limited any opportunity for additional probing or clarification of survey responses. Finally, the nature of qualitative research limited the generalizability of the findings. In this study, the findings represented the experiences of the participants engaged in school counseling site supervision in a specific location at a specific time. Beyond these basic generalizations, the reader establishes limits to the generalizability by asking, “What is there in this study that I can apply to my own situation, and what clearly does not apply?” (Walker, 1980, p. 34).

Discussion of Research Question and Supervisory Working Alliance

The supervisory working alliance represents the theoretical framework for the consideration of SRSD in this study. The supervisory working alliance consists of three components: an agreement on goals of supervision, an agreement on the tasks of supervision necessary to meet those goals, and an emotional bond between the supervisor and supervisee (Bordin, 1983). Agreement on *goals of supervision* refers to goals for expected change on the part of the supervisee. The level of mutual understanding between the supervisor and the supervisee regarding some combination of thought, feeling, and/or behavior change that may enhance supervisee development can determine the strength of the working alliance (Bordin, 1983). Agreement on *tasks of supervision* refers to a component of the working alliance that also must incorporate some level of mutual understanding between the supervisor and supervisee (Bordin, 1983).

Specifically, these tasks include activities and exercises for the personal development and awareness of the supervisee, practice with specific interventions related to a theoretical perspective, or demonstration of interpersonal skills necessary to facilitate positive relationships with clients (Borders & Brown, 2005). The *emotional bond between supervisee and supervisor* “will center around the feelings of liking, caring, and trusting that the participants share” (Bordin, 1983, p. 36). These relational bonds develop from efforts to achieve a common goal or the occurrence of sharing an emotional experience (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). The present investigation describes SRSD in school counseling site supervision through the framework of the supervisory working alliance.

Research Question One

How do the school counseling site supervisor and the school counseling supervisee conceptualize and describe self-disclosure?

This section considered participant responses to survey question one about the participants’ conceptualization of self-disclosure. After reporting the data, the researcher defines the concept of self-disclosure based on participant responses and compares these findings to the literature on self-disclosure, SRSD, and counselor self-disclosure. Next, the researcher discusses the purposes associated with the description of self-disclosure and compares these findings to the literature on SRSD. Finally, the researcher considered the connection of these findings to the supervisory working alliance.

Almost all of the participants in this study conceptualized self-disclosure similarly by describing characteristics of relationship, communication, content, and purpose. Relationship refers to any interaction between two people in general and could include specific dyadic contexts for counselor-client and/or supervisor-supervisee. Participant

descriptions included, “At times, self-disclosure can move the counselor client relationship forward.” and “...you are revealing parts of yourself to another person...” Communication refers to efforts of revealing, sharing, giving, speaking, or discussing by a participant in the relationship. Participant descriptions included, “the manner a person discusses” and “a process of revealing to the student.” Content refers to personal information about the discloser including details, stories, issues, and situations that are similar to the experiences of the other person and/or related to the discussion topic. Participant descriptions included, “giving personal details” and “shares a situation that has happened to them.” Purpose refers to efforts to bring about some type of change. Participant descriptions included, “prompting...on any specific parameters” and “motivating some change.”

Definition of Self-Disclosure. How do these categories enhance our understanding of self-disclosure? One way is to build a definition of self-disclosure based upon this aspect of the findings. The researcher summarizes these characteristics into the following definition to account for the conceptualization of self-disclosure for the school counseling site supervisors and the school counseling supervisees participating in these four supervisory dyads.

Self-disclosure is an interpersonal exchange in which one person purposefully communicates personal information or similar experiences related to the experiences of the other person.

In addition to the definition above, the researcher notes that participants often described this interpersonal relationship by referring to the contexts of counseling and supervision.

Participant descriptions included, “counseling setting” and “when a counselor or supervisor (in this case) shares...”

The definition of self-disclosure constructed by the researcher from the participant data corresponds with descriptions of self-disclosure, SRSD, and therapist self-disclosure identified in the literature. This description of self-disclosure expands the definition offered by Chaikin and Derlega (1974) as the revelation of personal information about one’s self. This definition of self-disclosure described both communication and content. However, the description omits any reference to a relationship or purpose. The researcher attributes these descriptive differences to the nature of the participants’ work as counselors and supervisors.

In the context of the supervisory relationship, Ladany and Lehrman-waterman (1999) defined SRSD as statements of personal information made by the supervisor to the supervisee such as counseling struggles, training events, or reactions to clients. This definition includes the descriptive characteristics of relationship, communication, and content. However, this definition omits the descriptive characteristic of purpose. The researcher attributes these descriptive differences to the nature of the participants’ work as counselors and supervisors. Professional school counselor training often includes a focus on accountability (Studer, 2005), while their work environment places additional expectations for accountability as a result of federal education laws (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). As a result, the school counselor’s experience necessitates an emphasis on using interventions and activities that effectively support a defined purpose. For example, the Case One supervisee response to survey question two illustrated this

experience, “It (the Case One SRSD) was to show me how important it is to be able to show what kind of work you are doing in the school.”

The description of self-disclosure offered by the participants in this study compared most closely with therapist self-disclosure in the counseling context. Farber (2006) defined self-disclosure as a therapist purposefully and consciously sharing private information about herself or himself to a client. This definition of self-disclosure included all of the descriptive characteristics of relationship, communication, content, and purpose identified from participant responses in this research. The researcher attributes the similarity of the descriptions the participants included for self-disclosure with the similarity of the Farber (2006) description of therapist self-disclosure to the therapeutic focus of the work of the participants in the school setting. Though this study focused on school counseling site supervision, supervision all participants engaged in school counseling behaviors over the course of participation in the study. For example, half of the participants included “counselor,” “client,” or “counseling setting” in their response to survey question one.

Purposes of self-disclosure. As indicated earlier, the participants described self-disclosure as having purpose. In this section, the researcher describes subcategories identified as specific purposes for the use of self-disclosure. After describing these purposes for self-disclosure, the researcher relates the significance of these findings to literature on SRSD.

Descriptions included as subcategories for the purpose of self-disclosure consisted of bonding, normalizing, and teaching; these appeared most often in the data. Bonding refers to general descriptions of improving the relationship. Participant descriptions

included, “form a bond” and “Self-disclosure can move the counselor-client relationship forward, especially if the client is not quick to trust.” Normalizing refers to the recognition that one’s experiences reflect common experiences in the setting. This recognition often takes place when one hears of others in similar situations. Participant descriptions included, “...because they (counselors) are using personal stories in order to demonstrate an understanding of how they have felt in similar situations.” and “Self-disclosure could be used...point out that the supervisor has been through some of the same situations as the supervisee.” Teaching refers to efforts to improve understanding or share insight. Participant descriptions included, “help bring understanding to a topic while making it relatable to the situation” and “explain a point.”

Though less common, empathizing and motivating also appeared as subcategories for purpose in the participants’ data describing self-disclosure. Empathizing refers to the sense that one person understands the experience of the other, in this case, by sharing similar experiences and feelings. Participant descriptions included, “It can at times provide the client with a sense that the counselor can empathize with how they feel.” and “provides the client/supervisee with an empathic response to the situation.” Motivating refers to one’s efforts to encourage and support the other. These descriptions of purpose for self-disclosure help form the participants’ conceptualization of self-disclosure.

Research on self-disclosure in supervision identified the most common purposes for SRSD as enhancing supervisee development and normalizing supervisee experience (Knox et al., 2008). In the present study, the participants’ descriptions of teaching and motivating represented efforts to enhance supervisee development. For example, “the purpose...to give the supervisee a concrete example,” and “the hope of...revelation in the

object of the disclosure,” describe the use self-disclosure as a teaching intervention to enhance supervisee development. Another example from the participant data, “motivating some change,” described the use of self-disclosure as a motivating intervention to enhance supervisee development. The participants’ description of normalizing represents efforts to normalize supervisee experience. For example, “...because they (counselors) are using personal stories in order to demonstrate an understanding of how they have felt in similar situation” and “self-disclosure could be used...point out that the supervisor has been through some of the same situations as the supervisee.” These findings support the conclusion of Knox et al. (2008) that supervisors commonly use SRSD to enhance supervisee development and normalize supervisee experience.

Knox et al. (2008) identified a less common purpose as strengthening the supervisory relationship. The present study extended what we know about participant experience related to strengthening the relationship. The researcher suggests that in the present study, the participants’ descriptions of bonding and empathizing represented efforts to strengthen the supervisory relationship. For example, “make a client feel at ease or enhance the counseling relationship” described the use of self-disclosure as a bonding intervention to strengthen the relationship, while “to demonstrate an understanding of how they have felt in similar situations,” described the use of self-disclosure as an empathizing intervention to strengthen the supervisory relationship. The findings related to the descriptions of bonding and empathizing as purposes for self-disclosure confirm similar findings by Knox et al. (2008).

The researcher found a lack of evidence to support two other purposes identified by Knox et al. (2008) including modeling self-disclosure and increasing the disclosures

of the supervisee. The researcher offers the following explanation for this result. Among the participants in this study, five out of eight described counseling or supervision as a context for self-disclosure by including counseling or supervision. All of these participants framed their responses conceptualizing self-disclosure in terms of counselor self-disclosure or SRSD. Of the remaining three participants, two described self-disclosure with first person pronouns. This evidence highlighted a limit to the participants' perspective. In other words, no data for the participants' conceptualization of self-disclosure considered the possibility of another person, client, or supervisee as the discloser or the possibility of one's self, the counselor, or the supervisee as the recipient of another person's self-disclosure. A counselor or supervisor without the perspective of receiving self-disclosures from clients or supervisees might not consider the possibility of using self-disclosure to model the practice for others or to increase the occurrence of self-disclosure in others.

Self-disclosure and the supervisory working alliance. The description of self-disclosure relates to the supervisory working alliance through one of the categories that represent the characteristic of purpose. Each of the descriptions of purpose associated with self-disclosure, bonding, normalizing, teaching, empathizing, and motivating represent a goal of supervision. SRSD represents a specific task designed to reach goal attainment. For example, the researcher suggested if normalizing experience represented the goal for supervision, then an SRSD sharing similar experiences represented a task for realizing that goal. In Case Two, the SRSD began, "The first time I ever told..." thus providing the supervisee with an opportunity to recognize that she and her supervisor experienced the same situation and to recognize that situation as an experience common

to many counselors. Likewise, a SRSD used as an intervention to bond might accomplish a goal of enhancing the supervisory relationship. In Case Four, the SRSD concluded with “and I really appreciate that” thus communicating a sense of caring and liking on the part of the supervisor toward the supervisee and creating an opportunity for the supervisee to reciprocate that same sense.

According to Bordin’s (1983) theory, in order for these characteristics to impact the supervisory working alliance, the supervisor and supervisee must reach a level of mutual understanding that these goals lead to supervisee development and that these tasks support the achievement of these goals. Additionally, efforts to develop an emotional bond must lead to mutual feelings of liking, caring, and trust (Bordin, 1983). The researcher explores this dynamic through efforts to answer research questions two and three.

In summary, this section described the findings related to participant conceptualization of self-disclosure. As a result of these findings, the researcher created a definition of self-disclosure reflective of the participants’ conceptualization. The researcher compared this definition to the literature on self-disclosure, SRSD, and counselor self-disclosure. Next, the researcher listed and described the purposes for self-disclosure identified in the participant data. The researcher compared these findings with the literature on SRSD. Lastly, the researcher discussed the findings related to the participants’ conceptualization of self-disclosure within the framework of the supervisory working alliance.

Research Question Two

How do the school counseling site supervisor and the school counseling supervisee describe the intended purpose of a shared SRSD experience?

All of the participants in this study described a purpose in their conceptualization of self-disclosure. In considering the second research question, the researcher identified three sets of findings related specifically to the participants' description of the intended purpose of this shared SRSD experience. These findings relate to the participants' conceptualization of self-disclosure compared to their perception of the supervisor's purpose for the SRSD case example, the collective list of purposes described in the conceptualization of self-disclosure, and the congruence of the descriptions of the purpose of the SRSD case example within the supervisory dyad as they relate to the supervisory working alliance.

Congruence with conceptualization of self-disclosure and intended purpose of SRSD. This section presents findings from the data comparing a supervisor's conceptualization of self-disclosure with his or her intended purpose of the SRSD case example. The descriptive categories identified for purpose in survey question two demonstrated congruence with the specific subcategories for purpose in the conceptualization of self-disclosure. For example, the Case Two supervisor identified teaching as a purpose for self-disclosure in her response to survey question one. Data from her description of self-disclosure included, "help bring an understanding to a topic." In her response to survey question two, she described her intended purpose for the SRSD as teaching. Only the description of the intended purpose of the SRSD by the Case One supervisor lacked congruence with data from a subcategory of purpose in question one.

For Case Two, though the supervisor and the supervisee described purposes of the SRSD demonstrating congruence with their responses to survey question one, both members described additional purposes for the Case Two SRSD in question two that the researcher failed to identify with their question one response. For example, the Case Two supervisor described her intended purpose for the Case Two SRSD by stating, “I had dealt with similar situations” and “I have dealt with and currently deal with the same situations.” The researcher described this data as normalizing. The Case Two supervisor included responses to question one described as teaching “help bring understanding to a topic” and bonding “help them relate to you as a person, not just a professional.” In most cases, the conceptualization of self-disclosure for the supervisor participants in this study informs their use of SRSD as an intervention in school counseling site supervision. For example, the Case Four supervisor described self-disclosure as “sharing learning” which the researcher categorized as teaching in the response data for survey question one. In response to survey question two, the Case Four supervisor described her intended purpose for the Case Four SRSD by stating, “...to remind him...” which the researcher again categorized as teaching.

The finding that school counseling site supervisors and school counseling supervisees conceptualize specific purposes for self-disclosure and experience SRSD with an awareness of purpose supports previous research by Ladany & Lehrman-waterman (1999), Ladany et al. (2001), Knox et al. (2008), and Knox et al. (2011). In these studies, supervisor and supervisee participants reported the intention of specific purposes in connection with the use of SRSD.

Congruence with the collective list of purposes for self-disclosure. Each participant in this study described one or more purposes for the supervisor's use of SRSD. Even though participants' descriptions of purpose for survey question two failed to demonstrate complete congruence with question one in all cases, the collective list of purposes identified in survey question one accounted for all participant response data for survey question two. The descriptions of purpose for survey question two included the same five descriptions from question one: teaching, normalizing, empathizing, bonding, and motivating.

The importance of self-disclosure as it relates to teaching is clear in the findings. First, though the response data for survey question one included equal attention for bonding, normalizing, and teaching, the purpose of teaching appeared most often relative to survey question two. For example, the Case Three supervisor described using SRSD for the purpose of teaching. He included, "Heightens professionalism in counseling and supervision" to address the purpose of the Case Three SRSD. The researcher interpreted "heightens" to refer to an emphasis on improving understanding. The Case Three SRSD described the supervisor's experience maintaining the confidentiality of one student when speaking to another. Participants in Cases One, Two, and Four also included teaching as at least one of the purpose for the SRSD. Second, at least one member of each dyad described teaching as the supervisor's purpose for the use of the SRSD case example. In Case One and Two, both supervisor and supervisee described teaching as a purpose for the SRSD. Third, in some instances, participant response data for survey question two included descriptions of teaching behaviors even if that participant's conceptualization of self-disclosure from the survey question one response omitted any description of

teaching. For example, the Case One supervisor included bonding, empathizing, and normalizing as purposes for self-disclosure in her response to survey question one. In her response to survey question two, she described teaching as the purpose. However, responses to survey question one from the Case One supervisee, the Case Two supervisor, the Case Four supervisor, and the Case Four supervisee all included teaching as a purpose for SRSD.

These results support the work of Knox et al. (2008) in which the researchers identified a list of five purposes for SRSD. Knox et al. (2008) identified enhancing supervisee development, normalizing supervisee experience, strengthening the supervisory relationship, modeling self-disclosure, and increasing self-disclosures. The researcher in the present investigation identified teaching, normalizing, bonding, motivating, and affirming as purposes of SRSD. Both the present study and Knox et al. (2008) study suggest a limited number of purposes supervisors consider when using SRSD and confirm common intentions to be teaching/enhancing supervisee development and normalizing/normalizing supervisee experience.

Dyad congruence and the supervisory working alliance. Dyad congruence reflects a mutual understanding of the supervisor's purpose by both members of the supervisory dyad. This section provides a case by case discussion of this dyad congruence and its relationship to supervisory working alliance. The case examples of SRSD represent shared experiences between specific supervisory dyads. Both members of each dyad described the intended purpose of the SRSD case example. In Cases One, Two, and Four, the supervisor and supervisee responses demonstrated congruence. For example, the Case One dyad described the purpose of the Case One SRSD as teaching.

Response data for survey question two included supervisor response like “the purpose...to give the supervisee a concrete example” and supervisee responses like, “demonstrated how” and “presented how.” This congruence represented the mutual understanding necessary for the development of a supervisory working alliance (Bordin, 1983; Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). For Case Three, the supervisor and supervisee responses failed to demonstrate congruence.

For Case One, both members of the dyad identified teaching as the purpose for the Case One SRSD. They also included descriptive data related to the topic of professional accountability and advocacy. For example, the supervisor responded to survey question two, “The purpose or goal was to give the supervisee a concrete example of how a well-managed accountability system can...” The supervisee responded to survey question two, “It was to show me how important it is to be able to show what kind of work you are doing in the school.” In terms of the supervisory working alliance, the goal for the SRSD in Case One included teaching the supervisee professional accountability and advocacy. Based on the congruence of responses to survey question two, the Case One supervisory dyad expressed mutual agreement for this goal.

For Case Two, both members of the dyad identified teaching, normalizing, and empathizing as purposes for the Case Two SRSD. They also included descriptive data related to the topic of decision making. For example, the supervisor responded to survey question two, “My perception was that this disclosure would show the supervisee that I have dealt with and currently deal with the same situations and understand how hard it can be...” The supervisee responded to question two, “It was also to make the supervisee realize that she (supervisor) has been in that situation before and that is not easy.” In

terms of the supervisory working alliance, the goals for the SRSD in Case Two included teaching the supervisee decision making, normalizing the dilemma of breaking confidentiality with a client, and empathizing with the stressful nature of those decisions. Based on the congruence of responses to survey question two, the Case Two supervisory dyad expressed mutual agreement for all three goals. The Case Two supervisee also described data identified as bonding. Bonding refers to general descriptions of improving the relationship, while empathizing refers to the sense that one person understands the experience of the other, in this case, by sharing similar experiences and feelings.

For Case Three, the supervisor identified teaching as a purpose, while the supervisee interpreted the supervisor's statement differently, disagreeing with its label as an SRSD. For example, the supervisor responded to survey question two, "Heightens professionalism in a counseling environment and in supervision." The supervisee responded to survey question two, "I am not entirely sure as I do not see this example as an episode of self-disclosure." In terms of the supervisory working alliance, the Case Three dyad failed to achieve a mutual understanding of the goal for supervision in this instance.

For Case Four, the supervisor identified teaching as the purpose while the supervisee identified motivating as the purpose for the Case Four SRSD. They also included descriptive data related to the topic of an interaction style of nonjudgmental behavior. Though the members of the Case Four supervisory dyad described the experience somewhat differently, the sense of mutual understanding permeates the case. For example, the supervisor responded to survey question two, "The purpose...was to convey...people who speak to those students in a manner that can be interpreted as

condescension. In listening to (names supervisee)...a tone of respect...was noted.” The supervisee responded to survey question two, “I believe the supervisor was attempting to encourage nonjudgmental behavior in the supervisee.” In terms of the supervisory working alliance, the goal for the SRSD in Case Four included teaching and motivating the use of the supervisee’s interaction style of nonjudgmental behavior. Based on the congruence of responses to survey question two, the Case Four supervisory dyad expressed mutual agreement for this goal.

The purpose of the shared SRSD experiences established congruence for the goal for supervision. These findings on congruence extended the research by Knox et al. (2011) in which counseling supervisees reported their perceptions of supervisors’ purpose for self-disclosure. The present investigation suggested that school counseling supervisees correctly perceive the purpose of self-disclosures by the supervisors. However, in the Knox et al. (2011) study, supervisees reported normalizing experiences as the most common purpose of SRSD. In this study, supervisees correctly identified teaching most often. Small samples in both studies limited additional generalizations.

Research Question Three

How do the school counseling site supervisor and the school counseling supervisee describe the perceived effect(s) of a shared SRSD experience?

Data for survey question three addresses the effectiveness of SRSD as a task in achieving supervision goals. In considering the third research question, the researcher identifies three sets of findings related to the possible effects of this shared SRSD experience. First, the researcher describes the list of possible effects represented in the response data to survey question three. Second, the researcher describes the findings

related to the participant's perception of the effect of the SRSD on the supervisee relative to the supervisor's intended purpose. Third, and finally, the researcher describes the congruence of the descriptions of perceived effect of the SRSD case example within the supervisory dyad as they relate to the supervisory working alliance.

Description of the perceived effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. The participants in this study described multiple effects of SRSD on the supervisee. The descriptive categories for the response to survey question three included understanding, motivating, normalizing, empathizing, bonding, teaching, and affirming.

Motivating, normalizing, empathizing, and bonding consist of the same descriptions found in the response to survey question two regarding purpose. For example, the Case Four supervisee response data for survey question two about purpose included, "I believe the supervisor was attempting to encourage nonjudgmental behavior in the supervisee." The researcher categorized this response as motivating. The Case Four supervisee response data for survey question three regarding the perceived effect of the SRSD included, "I perceive that the disclosure had the intended effect..."

The descriptive category of understanding refers to gaining new insights or new perspectives and reflects the effect of teaching. For example, the Case One supervisor response data for survey question two about purpose included, "The purpose of goal was to give the supervisee a concrete example of how a well-managed accountability system can go a long way..." The researcher categorized this response as teaching. The Case One supervisor response data for survey question three regarding the perceived effect on the supervisee included, "The perception gleaned is that the supervisee understood the point..." The researcher categorized this response as understanding. Affirming refers to a

positive acknowledgement or agreement with an idea or behavior. This effect appeared unaccounted for in the consideration of purpose based on the survey question two response data. The Case Three supervisor included data identified as teaching. His response reflected a sense of purpose more than effect, indicating he hoped the supervisee would learn to be more reflective and open to feedback.

The findings relative to the perceived effects of the shared SRSD experience both extend and confirm previous research results. Studies by Ladany & Lehrman-waterman (1999), Ladany et al. (2001), and Knox et al. (2011) identified outcomes for SRSD from the perspectives of supervisees or supervisors. These researchers focused findings on the supervisory relationship specifically, bonding or enhancing the supervisory relationship. The present study extends the findings to include additional effects on supervisees including understanding, motivating, affirming, empathizing, and normalizing. This conclusion confirms research by Knox et al. (2008) which concluded with multiple possibilities for the effect of SRSD on the supervisee including increasing supervisee disclosures, learning, and a sense of relief on the part of the supervisees.

Congruence with the intended purpose of the supervisor and the perceived effect of the supervisee. The descriptive categories identified for effect in survey question three demonstrated congruence with specific categories related to the intended purpose in survey question two. All of the participants perceived relative agreement when comparing the intended purpose with the perceived effect. A case by case description follows.

For Case One, both members of the supervisory dyad identified teaching as the intended purpose and understanding as the perceived effect. They also included

descriptive data related to the topic of professional accountability and advocacy. For example, supervisor response data regarding the intended purpose of the SRSD included descriptions of teaching like, “remind the supervisee” and “give the supervisee a concrete example.” This perceived effect described by the supervisor reflected data categorized as understanding, “the supervisee understood the point.” The supervisee response data regarding the intended purpose of the SRSD also included descriptions of teaching like, “to show me how important it is” and “It demonstrated how one can advocate.” This perceived effect described by the supervisee reflected data categorized as understanding, “I have a purpose for what it (professional accountability) is intended for.” The Case One dyad maintained congruence from intended purpose to perceived effect for the shared experience of a SRSD.

For Case Two, both members of the supervisory dyad identified teaching and normalizing as the intended purposes and understanding and normalizing as the perceived effects. They also included descriptive data related to the topic of decision making. For example, supervisor response data regarding the intended purpose of the SRSD included descriptions of teaching like, “this would help demonstrate how...” and descriptions of normalizing like, “I have dealt with and currently deal with the same situations.” The perceived effects described by the supervisor reflected data categorized as understanding, “another way of helping the supervisee process her decision” and as normalizing, “I wanted to simply let her know that I...had been in a similar position.” The supervisee response data regarding the intended purpose of the SRSD included descriptions of teaching like, “It was used to make the supervisee realize...sometimes it will upset the client no matter which choice you make.” and descriptions of normalizing like, “It was

also used to make the supervisee realize that she (supervisor) has been in that situation before.” The perceived effects described by the supervisee reflected data categorized as understanding, “It helped to realize that...there are not always clearly defined answers” and as normalizing, “It also made the supervisee realize she is not the only person who has made a client mad before.” The Case Two dyad maintained congruence from intended purpose to perceived effect for the shared experience of a SRSD.

For Case Three, the supervisor identified teaching as the intended purpose and the perceived effect. The supervisee provided no data regarding purpose of effect as she disagreed with the identification of the supervisor’s statement as a disclosure. The Case Three dyad response data failed to demonstrate from intended purpose to perceived effect for the shared experience of a SRSD.

For Case Four, members of the supervisory dyad differed as to the intended purpose of the SRSD but agreed on the perceived effects. They also included descriptive data related to the topic the supervisee’s use of a nonjudgmental interaction style. For example, supervisor response data regarding the intended purpose of the SRSD included descriptions of teaching like, “convey” and “have to remind him” This perceived effect described by the supervisor reflected data categorized as motivating, “appeared to appreciate my recognition of his interaction with students.” The supervisee response data regarding the intended purpose of the SRSD included descriptions of motivating like, “the supervisor was attempting to encourage nonjudgmental behavior” This perceived effect described by the supervisee reflected data categorized as motivating, “the disclosure had the intended effect (to encourage).” The Case Four dyad experienced a sense of congruence from intended purpose to perceived effect for the shared experience

of a SRSD even though there was a slight discrepancy in the categorical descriptions of the Case Four data.

These findings confirm and expand previous research on SRSD (Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999; Ladany et al., 2001; Knox et al., 2008; & Knox et al., 2011). The aforementioned studies examined purpose and/or effect of SRSD from a single role in the dyad. Ladany and Lehrman-waterman (1999) and Knox et al. (2011) collected data from supervisee participants reporting on both supervisor purpose and supervisee effect. Ladany et al. (2001) and Knox et al. (2008) collected data from supervisor participants reporting on both supervisor purpose and supervisee effect. The present investigation expands the participant sample to include perspectives from both members of the same dyad experiencing the same SRSD event. The congruence between dyad members' perspectives added support to the researcher's (Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999; Ladany et al., 2001; Knox et al., 2008; & Knox et al., 2011) conclusions for studies examining supervisee reports of supervisor behaviors and studies examining supervisor reports of supervisee behaviors.

Dyad congruence and the supervisory working alliance. Dyad congruence reflects a mutual understanding of the perceived effect on the supervisee by both members of the supervisory dyad. This section provides a case by case discussion of this dyad congruence and its relationship to supervisory working alliance. The case examples of SRSD represent shared experiences between specific supervisory dyads. Both members of each dyad described the perceived effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. In Cases One, Two, and Four the supervisor and supervisee responses demonstrated congruence. For example, the Case Four dyad described the perceived effect of the Case

Four SRSD as motivating. Response data for survey question three included supervisor response like, “appeared to appreciate my recognition of his interaction with students” and supervisee responses like, “encourage nonjudgmental behavior.” This congruence represents the mutual understanding necessary for the development of the supervisory working alliance (Bordin, 1983; Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). For Case Three, the supervisor and supervisee responses failed to demonstrate congruence.

For Case One, both members of the dyad identified understanding as the perceived effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. They also included descriptive data related to the topic of professional accountability and advocacy. For example, the supervisor responded to survey question three, “The perception gleaned is that the supervisee understood the point that the supervisor was making...” The supervisee responded to survey question three, “I have a purpose for what it (accountability system) is intended for...” In terms of the supervisory working alliance, the effect of understanding professional accountability and advocacy reflects an achievement of the goal established by the purpose of teaching. Based on the congruence of responses to survey question three, the Case One supervisory dyad realized a mutual agreement for the task of SRSD to achieve the goal. The Case One supervisee also described data identified as motivation for an additional perceived effect. For example, in his response to survey question three, he included, “it motivated me to work on developing my accountability system.” Though motivation differs from understanding, the two effects seem complimentary.

For Case Two, both members of the dyad identified understanding and normalizing as the perceived effects of the SRSD on the supervisee. The supervisor also

identified empathizing as a perceived effect, while the supervisee identified bonding as a perceived effect. They also included descriptive data related to the topic of decision making. For example, the supervisor responded to survey question three, “I have dealt with and currently deal with the same situations and understand how hard it can be...” The supervisee responded to survey question three, “It also made the supervisee feel better about the situation and realize she was not the only person...” In terms of the supervisory working alliance, the effects of understanding decision making and normalizing the dilemma of breaking confidentiality with a client reflect an achievement of two of the three goals established by the purposes of teaching, normalizing, and empathizing. Based on the congruence of responses to survey question three, the Case Two supervisory dyad realized a mutual agreement for the task of SRSD to achieve these goals. The goal of empathizing with the stressful nature of those decisions appeared accounted for by the Case Two supervisor’s response. Considering the inclusion of descriptive data for bonding in the supervisee’s response as complimentary to empathizing, the Case Two supervisory dyad seems close to agreement on all three goals established by the purposes discussed in response to research question two.

For Case Three, the supervisor identified teaching as an effect, while the supervisee interpreted the supervisor’s statement differently disagreeing with its label as an SRSD. For example, the supervisor responded to survey question three, “Promotes the supervisee to be reflective and open to feedback during supervision.” The supervisee responded to survey question three, “I do not have one as I do not see this as fitting the counseling definition of ‘self-disclosure’” In terms of the supervisory working alliance,

since the Case Three supervisee disagreed that the experience represented SRSD, the dyad experienced a lack of agreement on both goals and tasks for supervision.

For Case Four, both members of the dyad identified motivating and affirming as the perceived effects of the SRSD on the supervisee. They also included descriptive data related to the topic of an interaction style of nonjudgmental behavior. For example, the supervisor responded to question three, “He also appeared to accept the disclosure as expected as though he already knew and that that piece of information did not surprise him.” The supervisee responded to survey question three, “...let the supervisee know that he/she was moving in the right direction.” Though the members of the Case Four supervisory dyad described the effect somewhat differently from the purpose, a sense of mutual understanding and goal attainment permeate the case. In terms of the supervisory working alliance, the effects of motivating and affirming the supervisee’s interaction style of nonjudgmental behavior reflect an achievement of the goals established by the purpose of teaching and motivating. Based on the congruence of responses to survey question three, the Case Four supervisory dyad realized a mutual agreement for the task of SRSD to achieve the goals. The Case Four supervisor also described data identified as understanding for an additional perceived effect. The descriptive category of understanding reflects the effect of teaching identified as a purpose from survey question two.

These findings on congruence extended the research by Knox et al. (2008) in which counseling supervisors reported their perceptions of the effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. The present investigation suggested that school counseling site supervisors correctly perceived the effect of specific SRSDs. However, in the Knox et al. (2008)

study, supervisors reported increasing supervisee self-disclosure, learning, and a sense of relief as perceived effects. In this study, supervisors correctly identified understanding, normalizing, motivating, and affirming as perceived effects. Small samples sizes in both studies limited additional generalizations.

Researcher Reflections

This study focused on the shared experience of SRSD between a school counseling site supervisor and a school counseling supervisee. After completing the investigation, the researcher reflected on several impressions from the experience. These impressions consisted of challenges soliciting participants, unexpected discoveries related to SRSD, and developing sensitivity to multiple examples of SRSD.

Identifying potential participants through the school counseling program coordinator at the university proved to be a straightforward process during each semester participant solicitation occurred. During the first attempt to solicit participants in the pilot study, five dyads agreed to participate and two declined. The reasons provided for declining participation included time limitations and an inability to get both members of the dyad to participate. For example, a supervisor noted, “We were unable to work this into our schedule this semester.” Additionally, a supervisee emailed the following message, “My supervisor declined to participate in your study.” Of the five dyads that agreed to participate, one dyad returned no informed consent, one dyad returned an informed consent for the supervisor only, and three actually returned an informed consent for both members of the dyad. The three dyads who returned the informed consent completed all requirements for participation.

During the second attempt to solicit participants, one dyad agreed to participate, one declined participation, one declined first, then agreed, and two others sent no response after multiple follow-up attempts to solicit participation. Reasons given for declining participation included time limitations and concerns over anonymity. For example, a supervisor emailed the following message, “(supervisee name) just feels like she has too much on her plate right now to take this on.” The potential participant with concerns over anonymity eventually agreed to participate after consulting with her supervisor. However, neither she nor her supervisor returned an informed consent. The dyad who returned the informed consent completed all the requirements for participation, though these participants submitted the final open-ended surveys about three months after their supervisory relationship ended.

During the third attempt to solicit participants, two dyads agreed to participate, four dyads declined participation, and three gave no direct response to the researcher after multiple follow-up attempts to solicit participation. Most of the potential participants responded with “I will be unable to participate in the research study at this time.” One respondent stated specifically, “At this time, I do not feel I have time to devote to your research.” The two dyads who returned the informed consent completed all requirements for participation. However, the survey data for these participants arrived too late to be included in the study.

The researcher attempted to understand the declining willingness for school counseling interns and their site supervisors to participate in the study. Several explanations exist. First, the work demands on professional school counselors require varying amounts of time (Studer, 2005). When a school counselor becomes a site

supervisor for a counselor in training, this role adds additional responsibilities. Though participation in this research required minimal time, supervisors and supervisees perceived effort as an additional time requirement and declined participation in an attempt to conserve this fixed and limited resource.

Once the researcher completed the participant solicitation, he encountered unexpected discoveries related to the research process. The researcher's first interaction with SRSD in the context of collecting data for this study occurred as the attempt to identify an SRSD example. From the literature, the researcher expected to identify self-disclosing statements used by the supervisor (Ladany & Lehrman-waterman, 1999). However, the data from the audio-recorded supervision sessions proved messy. The researcher discovered the identification of SRSDs to be more complicated. The SRSDs resembled stories more than statements. For example, the Case One SRSD is a 13 line exchange with the supervisee. To the researcher, these SRSDs seemed more like personal metaphors or parables for teaching the supervisee.

Once the researcher began analyzing data for the study, he recognized an increasing sensitivity to examples of SRSD. As the researcher continued to examine data from additional participants and reviewed audio-recorded supervision sessions multiple times for the case descriptions, a level of sensitivity developed related to an ability to distinguish SRSDs in the supervision interactions. During the stage of data collection when the researcher identified an SRSD for the partial transcript, many of the SRSDs went unnoticed. During the review of the audio recordings for the case descriptions, the researcher identified six SRSDs in Case One, nine SRSDs in Case Two, four SRSDs in Case Three, and six SRSDs in Case Four. Therefore, the Case Three Supervisee's

disagreement with the Case Three SRSD example appears entirely valid for two reasons. First, with limited exposure to SRSD, the supervisee lacked sufficient sensitivity to interpret that event as a self-disclosure by her supervisor. Second, early in the data collection process, the researcher's interpretation of SRSD lacked sufficient sensitivity to identify a more favorable example.

In summary, at the conclusion of the present investigation the researcher reflected on impressions from the research process. The section on researcher reflections described impressions related to challenges soliciting participants, unexpected discoveries related to SRSD, and sensitivity to multiple examples of SRSD.

Implications for Counselor Education

Clinical supervision is an integral component of counselor training (Studer, 2006). The field of counselor education includes preparation in teaching and in the practice of clinical supervision (Studer & Diambra, 2010). This section addresses the implications for the present study on the field of counselor education. These implications focus on a better understanding of what happens in the clinical supervision of school counselors related to SRSD, how school counselor training programs work with field site supervisors, and how school counselor training programs prepare supervisees for the internship experience.

First, this study helps counselor educators better understand what site supervisors know about self-disclosure, how these supervisors use self-disclosure, and what happens in a site supervision dyad. Within the context of the partial transcript and the open-ended survey, school counseling site supervisors demonstrated a working knowledge of SRSD. School counseling site supervisors described self-disclosure as an interpersonal exchange

in which one person purposefully communicates personal information or similar experiences related to the experiences of the other person. School counseling site supervisors used self-disclosure mainly as an intervention to teach topics related to school counseling. However, SRSD also helped supervisors empathize with supervisees, bond with supervisees, motivate supervisees, and normalize supervisee experience. The supervisors' efforts to use self-disclosure generally achieved their purpose. Counselor educators can use this knowledge as they prepare orientation and training materials for site supervisors. The researcher discusses this training in more depth in a section that addresses how school counselor training programs work with field site supervisors.

This study also provided counselor educators with a description of the experiences between a site supervisor and an internship student. In most cases, supervisors and supervisee perceived the shared experience of SRSD similarly, agreeing on the purposes for using specific disclosures and the outcomes of the intervention. The counseling accrediting body, CACREP, highlights "understanding supervision" as a standard for educating school counselors. Sharing this in-depth knowledge of self-disclosure in supervision, as one aspect of the supervisor-supervisee experience, can sensitize students to its use and potential to enhance their development. The researcher explains additional implication for school counselor practicum and internship in more depth later.

Second, accredited school counselor training programs provide relevant training in counseling supervision to site supervisors. In this capacity, counselor training programs should consider exploring the intervention as part of the "relevant training in counseling supervision" expected of school counseling site supervisors working with

CACREP accredited programs (CACREP, 2009, III.C.4). This study highlights three implications for site supervisor training including promoting a common understanding of the concept of self-disclosure, exploring the purpose and effects of SRSD, and creating a level of sensitivity for recognizing their own SRSD and the disclosures of supervisees.

Site supervisors in the present study shared common descriptions for self-disclosure. Counselor training programs promoting this common understanding of self-disclosure might standardize its use in field site placements and in university based supervision seminars. This common understanding and standardized use might bring increased cohesion for students working in multiple sites through practicum and internship experiences.

Site supervisors in the present study demonstrated a lack of awareness for supervisee self-disclosure. This lack of awareness highlights implications for exploring the purposes and effects of SRSD. The results from Knox et al. (2008) indicated increasing supervisee self-disclosures as a purpose and effect of SRSD. Data from the present study reflected a limited knowledge of the possibilities for SRSD. Counselor training programs could provide site supervisor training to expand options for the use of SRSD as an intervention. The expanded possibilities for SRSD could also inform school counseling site supervisors of the benefits related to the supervisory working alliance.

Another benefit to adding SRSD to site supervisor training would be to create an increased sensitivity for the concept making self-disclosure more identifiable. As described by the researcher in his reflections, increased attention toward identifying self-disclosures could increase sensitivity toward recognizing self-disclosures in themselves and from others.

Third, counselor education programs coordinate clinical experiences for students through practicum and internship training. This study highlights three implications for counselor education programs to address the preparation of students for the practicum or internship experience including promoting a common understanding of the concept of self-disclosure, exploring a greater awareness for client and supervisee self-disclosure, and creating a level of sensitivity for recognizing self-disclosure. The supervisee data from this study reflected a common understanding of self-disclosure and a lack of awareness that clients or supervisees also engage in self-disclosure. Counselor training programs teaching about self-disclosure might emphasize this common understanding and expand awareness to include client and supervisee self-disclosure as part of the concept. This knowledge will better prepare students to consider the use of self-disclosure for site based training experiences in counseling and supervision including the possibility of future experiences as a supervisor and increase sensitivity toward recognizing self-disclosures in themselves and from others.

Considerations for Future Research

This research study expanded the research on SRSD to include both supervisor and supervisee perspectives of a shared experience. Additionally, the participant sample focused on a school counseling site supervisors, a group of counseling supervisors with limited training in counseling supervision. With these developments established, this section notes describes areas for future research.

Future research on SRSD might expand the sample of participants included in this type of research by replicating these procedures with different participant groups. These groups could include other university training programs in other regions of the country

and of the world. Furthermore, this research strategy could specify other site supervision contexts like mental health counseling or other educational contexts like the practicum experience or counselor training programs that lack CACREP accreditation. The addition of supervisory dyads consisting of different races or ethnicities would further enhance the literature on the topic. Replicating the present study with additional and varied participant groups represents an area for future research.

Future research on SRSD could benefit from additional methods of investigation. The collective case study allowed for the inclusion of multiple dyads. However, other qualitative and quantitative designs allowing for the inclusion of larger numbers of participants would expand our knowledge of SRSD. These studies might include mixed-methods strategies that incorporate measures for supervisory style, SRSD, and the supervisory working alliance along with structured or semi-structured interview protocols. Future designs might allow the supervisor to review the audio recording, select an SRSD, and proceed with either the open-ended survey or a semi-structured interview protocol. This practice would eliminate the researcher interpretation of SRSD when considering case examples.

Future research could also benefit from the use of these methods in the exploration of other variables in site supervision. For example, researchers could review audio recorded segments of supervision interactions to study supervision dynamics like giving feedback, addressing difficult clients, addressing difficult supervisees, self-awareness, and termination. After evaluating the audio recordings, collecting through interview protocols or other instruments would serve to increase our understanding of these dynamics.

Chapter Summary

This chapter began by summarizing the present investigation including a description of the selection of participants, types of data collected, and areas of data analysis. After describing the research methods, a summary of the limitations of the study included researcher bias and limited generalizability. Next, the researcher presented the findings with respect to the research questions and the theoretical framework. Findings from this research include congruent conceptualizations of self-disclosure across all participants, participant congruence between the conceptualization of self-disclosure and the purpose of the SRSD case examples, dyad congruence across most cases in regard to intended purpose of the supervisor for using SRSD, and dyad congruence across most cases in regard to perceived effect of the SRSD on the supervisee. Then, the researcher described personal reflections from the experience of conducting this research. These reflections describe challenges soliciting participants, identifying SRSDs, and developing sensitivity to the data. This chapter concludes by addressing the implications for counselor education and future research. The primary implications for counselor education address site supervisor training related to SRSD. Implications for Future research consider expanding participant samples, adapting the present methods, and researching additional dynamics.

REFERENCES

- Abramson, P. R. (1992). *A case for case studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Al-Darmaki, F., & Kivlighan, D. M., Jr. (1993). Congruence in client-counselor expectations for relationship and the working alliance. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40*, 379-384. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.40.4.379
- Alpher, V. S. (1991). Interdependence and parallel processes: A case study of structural analysis of social behavior in supervision and short-term dynamic psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy, 28*, 218-230. doi: 10.1037/0033-3204.28.2.218
- Altman, I., & Taylor, D. A. (1973). *Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- American Counseling Association. (2005). *ACA Code of Ethics*. Retrieved November 2011 from <http://www.counseling.org/ethics/feedback/ACA2005Code.pdf>
- American Psychological Association, Presidential Task Force on Evidence-Based Practice. (2006). Evidence-based practice in psychology. *American Psychologist, 61*, 271-285. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.61.4.271
- Anfara, V. A., Jr., Brown, K. M., & Mangione, T. L. (2002). Qualitative analysis on stage: Making the research process more public. *Educational Researcher, 31*(7), 28-38. doi: 10.3102/0013189X031007028
- Archer, R. L. (1979). The role of personality and the social situation. In G. J. Chelune (Ed.), *Self-disclosure*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bahrack, A. S. (1989). *Role induction for counselor trainees: Effects on the supervisory working alliance*. The Ohio State University). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 110-110 p. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/303821611?accountid=14766>. (303821611).

- Baker, D. E. (1990). *The relationship of the supervisory working alliance to supervisor and supervisee narcissism, gender, and theoretical orientation*. University of Southern California). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 0-1. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/303846511?accountid=14766>. (303846511).
- Barlow, D. H. (2004). Psychological Treatments. *American Psychologist*, 59, 9, 869-878. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.59.9.869
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 226-244. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.61.2.226
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2009). *Fundamentals of Clinical Supervision* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Bloomgarden, A., & Mennuti, R. B. (Eds.). (2009). *Psychotherapist revealed: Therapists speak about self-disclosure in psychotherapy*. New York: Routledge.
- Borders, L. D., & Brown, L. L. (2005). *The new handbook of counseling supervision*. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bordin, E. S. (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 16, 252-260. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.61.2.226
- Bordin, E. S. (1983). A working alliance based model of supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 11, 35-41. doi: 10.1177/0011000083111007
- Bordin, E. S. (1994). Theory and research in the therapeutic working alliance: New directions. In A. O. Horvath & L. S. Greenberg (Eds.), *The working alliance: Theory, research and practice*. (pp. 13-37). New York: Wiley.

- Buber, M. (1958). *I and thou* (2nd ed.). New York: Scribner's.
- Butler, S. F., Henry, W. P., & Strupp, H. H. (1992). *Measuring adherence and skill in time-limited dynamic psychotherapy*. Unpublished manuscript, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.
- Campbell, J. M. (2006). *Essentials of Clinical Supervision*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.
- Chaikin, A. L., & Derlega, V. J. (1974). Variables affecting the appropriateness of self-disclosure. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 588-593. doi: 10.1037/h0036614
- Cochran, J. L., & Cochran, N. H. (2011). Filial therapy. In S. Goldstein & J. Naglieri (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of child behavior and development* (pp. 654-657). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- Corey, M., & Corey, G. (2011). *Becoming a helper* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole, Cengage Learning.
- Corsini, R. J. (2008). Introduction. In R. J. Corsini & D. Wedding (Eds.). *Current psychotherapies* (8th ed., pp. 1-14).
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). (2009). *2009 Standards*. Retrieved January 15, 2009, from www.cacrep.org/2009standards.pdf
- Cozby, P. C. (1972). Self-disclosure, reciprocity, and liking. *Sociometry*, 35, 151-160. doi: 10.2307/2786555
- Cozby, P. C. (1973). Self-disclosure: A literature review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 79, 73-91. doi: 10.1037/h0033950
- Crawford, C. (2010). Popular counseling theories used by school counselors. In J. R.

- Studer & J. F. Diambra (Eds.), *A guide to practicum and internship for school counselors-in-training* (pp. 31-45). New York: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Culbert, S. A. (1968). Trainer self-disclosure and member growth in two T-groups. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 4, 47-73. doi: 10.1177/002188636800400103
- Danish, S. J., D'Augelli, A. R., & Brock, G. W. (1976). An evaluation of helping skills training: Effects on helpers' verbal responses. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 23, 259-266. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.23.3.259
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Derlega, V. J., & Berg, J. H. (Eds.). (1987). *Self-disclosure: Theory, research, and therapy*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Dies, R. (1973). Group therapist self-disclosure: An evaluation by clients. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 20, 344-348. doi: 10.1037/h0034808
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method*. (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley & Sons.

- Dodd, J. B. (1986). Supervision of psychology trainees in field placements. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 17, 296-300.
- Doehrman, M. J. G. (1976). Parallel process in supervision and psychotherapy. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, 40(1), 3-10.
- Dollarhide, C. T., & Miller, G. M. (2006). Supervision for preparation and practice of school counselors: Pathways to excellence. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 45, 242-252. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00001.x
- Dow, D. M. (2001). *Supervisors' and supervisees' paired reports of events during counseling psychology supervision sessions*. Temple University). ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, 87-87 p. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/251716410?accountid=14766>. (251716410).
- Dowd, E. T., & Boroto, D. R. (1982). Differential effects of counselor self-disclosure, self-involving statements, and interpretation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 29, 8-13. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.29.1.8
- Duan, C., & Roehlke, H. (2001). A descriptive “snapshot” of cross-racial supervision in university counseling center internships. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 29, 131-146. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-1912.2001.tb00510.x
- Duban, W., & Rabin, H. M. (1969). The working alliance: Description and theory. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 23, 696-706.
- Edwards, C. E., & Murdock, N. L. (1994). Characteristics of therapist self-disclosure in the counseling process. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 72, 384-389. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.1994.tb00954.x
- Efstation, J. F., Patton, M. J., & Kardash, C. M. (1990). Measuring the working alliance

- in counselor supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 37, 322-329. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.37.3.322
- Elliott, R. (1985). Helpful and nonhelpful events in brief counseling interviews: An empirical taxonomy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 32, 307-322. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.32.3.307
- Farber, B. A. (2003). Patient self-disclosure: A review of the research. *Journal of Clinical Psychology/In-Session*, 59, 589-600. doi: 10.1002/jclp.10161
- Farber, B. A. (2006). *Self-disclosure in psychotherapy*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Fielding, N., & Fielding, J. (1986). *Linking data*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Fowler, F. J. Jr. (2002). *Survey research methods*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Freeman, E. M. (1985). The importance of feedback in clinical supervision: Implications for direct practice. *Clinical Supervisor*, 3, 5-26. doi: 10.1300/J001v03n01_02
- Freud, S. (1966). Recommendations to physicians practicing psychoanalysis. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 12, pp. 109-120). London: Hogarth Press.
- Friedlander, M. L., Siegel, S. M., & Brenock, K. (1989). Parallel process in counseling and supervision: A case study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 36, 149-157. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.36.2.149
- Friedlander, M. L., & Snyder, J. (1983). Trainees' expectations for the supervisory process: Testing a developmental model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 22, 342-348. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.1983.tb01771.x
- Friedlander, M. L., & Ward, L. G. (1984). Development and validation of the supervisory styles inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31, 541-557. doi:

10.1037/0022-0167.31.4.541

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Gray, L. A., Ladany, N., Walker, J. A., & Ancis, J. R. (2001). Psychotherapy supervisees' experience of counterproductive events in supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 48, 371-383. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.48.4.371

Greenson, R. R. (1967). *The technique and practice of psychoanalysis*. New York: International Universities Press.

Griffith, B. A., & Frieden, G. (2000). Facilitating reflective thinking in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 40, 82-93. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2000.tb01240.x

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1982). The epistemological and methodological bases of naturalistic inquiry. *Educational Communications and Technology Journal*, 31, 233-252. doi: 10.1007/978-94-009-6675-8_18

Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (2000). *Developing and managing your school guidance program* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Haynes, R., Corey, G., & Moulton, P. (2003). *Clinical supervision in the helping professions: A practical guide*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Helms, J. E., & Carter, R. T. (1990a). Preliminary overview of the cultural identity attitude scale. Unpublished manuscript.

Helms, J. E., & Carter, R. T. (1990b). Development of the white racial identity inventory. In J. Helms (Ed.). *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 67-80). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

- Hendrick, S. S. (1987). Counseling and self-disclosure. In V. J. Derlega & J. H. Berg (Eds.), *Self disclosure: Theory, research, and therapy* (pp. 303-327). New York: Plenum Press.
- Henretty, J. R., & Levitt, H. M. (2010). The role of therapist self-disclosure in psychotherapy: A qualitative review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 30*, 63-77. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2009.09.004
- Hill, C. E., Helms, J. E., Spiegel, S. B., & Tichenor, V. (1988). Development of a system for categorizing client reactions to therapist interventions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35*, 27-36. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.35.1.27
- Hill, C. E., Helms, J. E., Tichenor, V., Spiegel, S. B., O'Grady, K. E., & Perry, E. S. (1988). Effects of therapist response modes in brief psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35*, 222-233. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.35.3.222
- Hill, C. E., & Knox, S. (2002). Self-disclosure. In J. C. Norcross (Ed.), *Psychotherapy relationships that work: Therapist contributions and responsiveness to patients* (pp. 255-265). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hill, C. E., Mahalik, J. R., & Thompson, B. J. (1989). Therapist self-disclosure. *Psychotherapy, 26*, 290-295. doi: 10.1037/h0085438
- Hill, C. E., & Stephany, A. (1990). Relation of nonverbal behavior to client reactions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37*, 22-26. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.37.1.22
- Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., Cogar, M. C., & Denman, D. W., III. (1993). Beneath the surface of long-term therapy: Therapist and client report of their own and each other's covert processes. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40*, 278-287. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.40.3.278

- Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., & Williams, B. N. (1997). A guide to conducting consensual qualitative research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 25, 517-572. doi: 10.1177/0011000097254001
- Holloway, E. L., & Wampold, B. E. (1984). *Dimensions of satisfaction in the supervision interview*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association Convention, Toronto, Canada.
- Horvath, A. O., & Greenberg, L. S. (1986). The development of the working alliance inventory. In L. S. Greenberg & Pinsof (Eds.), *The psychotherapeutic process: A research handbook* (pp. 529-556). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Horvath, A. O., & Greenberg, L. S. (1989). Development and validation of the working alliance inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 36, 223-233. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.36.2.223
- Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 428-444). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hutt, C. H., Scott, J., & King, M. (1983). A phenomenological study of supervisees' positive and negative experiences in supervision. *Psychotherapy: Theory, research, and practice*, 20, 118-123. doi: 10.1037/h0088471
- Johnson, D. W., & Noonan, M. P. (1972). Effects of acceptance and reciprocation of self-disclosures on the development of trust. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 19, 411-416. doi: 10.1037/h0033163
- Jourard, S. M. (1958). Some factors in self-disclosure. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 56, 95-99. doi: 10.1037/h0043357

- Jourard, S. M. (1961a). Age and self-disclosure. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 7, 191-197.
- Jourard, S. M. (1961b). Religious denomination and self-disclosure. *Psychological Reports*, 8, 446. doi: 10.2466/pr0.1961.8.3.446
- Jourard, S. M. (1961c). Self-disclosure patterns in British and American college females. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 54, 315-320. doi: 10.1080/00224545.1961.9922143
- Jourard, S. M. (1962). Self-disclosure and grades in nursing college. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 45, 244-247. doi: 10.1037/h0040361
- Jourard, S. M. (1964). *The transparent self*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- Jourard, S. M. (1971). *Self-disclosure: An experimental analysis of the transparent self*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Jourard, S. M., & Jaffe, P. E. (1970). Influence of an interviewer's disclosure on the self-disclosing behavior of interviewees. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 17, 252-257. doi: 10.1037/h0029197
- Kagan, N., Krathwohl, D. R., & Miller, R. (1963). Stimulated recall in therapy using videotape – A case study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 10, 237-243. doi: 10.1037/h0045497
- Kivlighan, D. M., Jr. (1990). Relation between counselors' use of intentions and clients' perception of working alliance. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 37, 27-32. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.37.1.27
- Kivlighan, D. M., Jr., & Schmitz, P. J. (1992). Counselor technical activity in cases with improving working alliances and continuing-poor working alliances. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 27, 16-21. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.39.1.32
- Knox, S., Burkard, A. W., Edwards, L. M., Smith, J. J., & Schlosser, L. Z. (2008).

- Supervisors' reports of the effects of supervisor self-disclosure on supervisees. *Psychotherapy Research*, 18, 543-559. doi: 10.1080/10503300801982781
- Knox, S., Edwards, L. M., Hess, S. A., & Hill, C. E. (2011). Supervisor self-disclosure: Supervisees' experiences and perspectives. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/a0022067
- Knox, S., Hess, S. A., Petersen, D. A., & Hill, C. E. (1997). A qualitative analysis of client perceptions of the effects of helpful therapist self-disclosure in long-term therapy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 44, 274-283. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.44.3.274
- Kokotovic, A. M., & Tracey, T. J. (1990). Working alliance in the early phase of counselor. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 37, 16-21. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.37.1.16
- Kroninger, A., Domm, B. A., Webster, M. L., & Troutman, A. E. (2010). Understanding the school culture. In J. R. Studer & J. F. Diambra (Eds.), *A guide to practicum and internship for school counselors-in-training* (pp. 15-29). New York: Routledge.
- Ladany, N., Brittan-Powell, C. S., & Pannu, R. K. (1997). The influence of supervisory racial identity interaction and racial matching on the supervisory working alliance and supervisee multicultural competence. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 36, 284-304. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.1997.tb00396.x
- Ladany, N., Ellis, M. V., & Friedlander, M. L. (1999). The supervisory working alliance, trainee self-efficacy, and satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 77(4), 447-455. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.1999.tb02472.x

- Ladany, N., & Friedlander, M. L. (1995). The relationship between the supervisory working alliance and supervisee role conflict and role ambiguity. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*, 220-231. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.1995.tb00244.x
- Ladany, N., & Lehrman-waterman, D. E. (1999). The content and frequency of supervisor self-disclosures and their relationship to supervisor style and the supervisor working alliance. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38*, 143-160. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.1999.tb00567.x
- Ladany, N., Lehrman-waterman, D. E., Molinaro, M., & Wolgast, B. (1999). Psychotherapy supervisor ethical practices: Adherence to guidelines, the supervisory working alliance, and supervisee satisfaction. *The Counseling Psychologist, 73*, 443-475. doi: 10.1177/0011000099273008
- Ladany, N., & Melincoff, D. S. (1999). The nature of counselor supervisor nondisclosure. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38*, 161-176. Doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.1999.tb00568.x
- Ladany, N., & Walker, J. A. (2003). Supervisor self-disclosure: Balancing the uncontrollable narcissist with the indomitable altruist. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 59*, 611-621. doi: 10.1002/jclp.10164
- Ladany, N., Walker, J. A., & Melincoff, D. S. (2001). Supervisory style: Its relation to the supervisory working alliance and supervisor self-disclosure. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40*, 263-275. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2001.tb01259.x
- LaFromboise, T. D., Coleman, H. L. K., & Hernandez, A. (1991). Development and

- factor structure of the cross-cultural counseling inventory revised. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 22, 380-388. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.22.5.380
- Lanning, W. (1986). Development of the supervisor emphasis rating form. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 25, 191-197. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.1986.tb00667.x
- LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J., with Tesch, R. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. (2nd ed.). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Lehrman-waterman, D., & Ladany, N. (2001). Development and validation of the evaluation process within supervision inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 48(2), 168-177. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.48.2.168
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W., & Silverman, S. J. (2007). *Proposals that work: A guide for planning dissertations and grant proposals* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Luft, J. (1969). *Of human interaction*. Palo Alto, CA: National Press Books.
- Martin, J. S., Goodyear, R. K., & Newton, F. B. (1987). Clinical supervision: An intensive case study. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 18, 225-235. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.18.3.225
- Matazzoni, T. A. (2008). *The influence of supervisor self-disclosure on the supervisory working alliance in beginning and advanced therapists-in-training*. The Wright Institute). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 174. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304443645?accountid=14766>. (304443645).

- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McCarthy, P. R., & Betz, N. E. (1978). Differential effects of self-disclosing versus self-involving counselor statements. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 25, 251-256. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.25.4.251
- McNeill, B. W., Stoltenberg, C. D., & Romans, J. S. C. (1992). The integrated developmental model of supervision: Scale development and validations procedures. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 23, 504-508. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.23.6.504
- Menninger, K. A. (1958). *Theory of psychoanalytic technique*. New York: Basic Books.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mueller, W. J., & Kell, B. L. (1972). *Coping with conflict: Supervising counselors and Psychotherapists*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Muse-Burke, J. L., Ladany, N., & Deck, M. D. (2001). The supervisory relationship. In L. Bradley & N. Ladany (Eds.), *Counselor supervision: Principles, process, and practice* (3rd ed., pp.28-62). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Myers-Briggs, I. (1962). *The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Norcross, J. C. (Ed.). (2002). *Psychotherapy relationships that work: Therapists contributions and responsiveness to patients*. New York: Oxford University

- Press.
- Norcross, J. C., & Halgin, R. P. (1997). Integrative approaches to psychotherapy supervision. In C. E. Watkins, Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp.3-11). New York: Wiley.
- Olk, M. E., & Friedlander, M. L. (1992). Trainees' experiences of role conflict and role ambiguity in supervisory relationships. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 39, 389-397. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.39.3.389
- Osgood, C. E. (1952). The nature and measurement of meaning. *Psychological Bulletin*, 49, 197-237. doi: 10.1037/h0055737
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. J., & Kivlighan, D. M., Jr. (1997). Relevance of the supervisory alliance to the counseling alliance and to treatment adherence in counselor training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 44, 108-115. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.44.1.108
- Pedersen, D. M., & Higbee, K. L. (1969). Personality correlates of self-disclosure. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 78, 81-89. doi: 10.1080/00224545.1969.9922342
- Phillips, G., & Wagner, C. (2003). *School culture assessment*. Vancouver, British Columbia: Agent 5 Design.
- Pope, K. S., & Wedding, D. (2008). Contemporary Challenges and Controversies. In R. J. Corsini & D. Wedding (Eds.), *Current psychotherapies* (8th ed.). (pp. 512-540). Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.
- Prout, T. & Wadkins, M. (2014). *Essential interviewing and counseling skills: An integrated approach to practice*. Danvers, MA: Springer.

- Rabinowitz, F. E., Heppner, P. P., & Roehlke, H. J. (1986). Descriptive study of process and outcome variables of supervision over time. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33*, 292-300. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.33.3.292
- Ramos-Sanchez, L., Esnil, E., Goodwin, A., Riggs, S., Touster, L. O., Wright, L. K. ... Rodolfa, E. (2002). Negative supervisory events: Effects on supervision satisfaction and supervisory alliance. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 33*, 197-202. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.33.2.197
- Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1979). The narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports, 45*, 590. doi: 10.2466/pr0.1979.45.2.590
- Ratliff, D. A., Wampler, K. S., & Morris, G. H. (2000). Lack of consensus in supervision. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 26*, 373-384.
- Regan, A. M., & Hill, C. E. (1992). Investigation of what clients and counselors do not say in brief therapy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39*, 168-174. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.39.2.168
- Retrum, J. H., Nowels, C. T., & Bekelman, D. B. (2103). Patient and caregiver congruence: The importance of dyads in heart failure care. *Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing, 28*, 129-136.
- Rossmann, G., & Rallis, S. F. (1998). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Safran, J., & Muran, J. C. (2000). *Negotiating the therapeutic alliance: A relational treatment guide*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Schmidt, J. J. (1999). *Counseling in Schools: Essential Services and Comprehensive Programs* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Shapiro, J. G., Krauss, H. H., & Truax, C. B. (1969). Therapeutic conditions and disclosure beyond the therapeutic encounter. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 16, 290-294. doi: 10.1037/h0027722
- Simon, J. (1988). Criteria for therapist self-disclosure. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 42, 404-415.
- Simone, D. H., McCarthy, P., & Skay, C. L. (1998). An investigation of client and counselor variables that influence likelihood of counselor self-disclosure. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 76, 174-182. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.1998.tb02390.x
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stake, R. E. (1998). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (pp. 86-109). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sterba, R. F. (1934). The fate of the ego in analytic therapy. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 38, 140-157.
- Studer, J. R. (2005). *The professional school counselor: An advocate for students*. Belmont, CA: Books/Cole.
- Studer, J. R. (2006). *Supervising the school counselor trainee: Guidelines for practice*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Studer, J. R., & Diambra, J. F. (Eds.). (2010). *A guide to practicum and internship for school counselors-in-training*. New York: Routledge.
- Studer, J. R., Diambra, J. F., & Gambrell, J. R., Jr. (2010). The management system component. In J. R. Studer & J. F. Diambra (Eds.), *A guide to practicum and internship for school counselors-in-training* (pp. 107-118). New York: Routledge.

- Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools*. New York: Falmer.
- U. S. Department of Education. (2002). Pub. L. No. 107-110-Jan. 8, 2002, 115 Stat. 1425. Retrieved November 2011 from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf>
- Walker, R. (1980). The conduct of educational case studies: Ethics, theory, and procedures. In W. B. Dockerrell and D. Hamilton (Eds.), *Rethinking educational research* (pp. 30-63). London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Watkins, C. E. (1990). The effects of counselor self-disclosure: A research review. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 18, 477-500. doi: 10.1177/0011000090183009
- Wittmer, J. (2000). *Managing your school counseling program: K-12 developmental strategies*. Minneapolis, MN: Educational Media Corporation.
- Woodside, M., & McClam, T. (2006). Working with the difficult trainee. In J. R. Studer, *Supervising the school counselor trainee: Guidelines for practice* (pp. 85-99). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Worthen, V., & McNeill, B. W. (1996). A phenomenological investigation of “good” supervision events. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 43, 25-34. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.43.1.25
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yourman, D. B. (2003). Trainee disclosure in psychotherapy supervision: The impact of

shame. *In Session/Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 59, 601-609. doi:

10.1002/jclp.10162

Yourman, D. B., & Farber, B. A. (1996). Nondisclosure and distortion in psychotherapy supervision. *Psychotherapy*, 33, 567-575. doi: 10.1037/0033-3204.33.4.567

Zetzel, E. R. (1956). Current concepts of transference. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 37, 369-376.

APPENDICES

Table A1: Summary of Research Using Supervisory Working Alliance Assessment Instruments

Reference	Instrument	Participants	Significance
Efstation et al., 1990	SWAI	S & T	Established reliability for the SWAI Correlated with factors on the SSI & SEI to establish validity
Bahrack, 1989	WAI for Supervision Parallel forms for S & T	S & T	Evaluations of supervision are positively related to SWA bond scale
Baker, 1990	Revised WAI Parallel forms for S & T	S & T	Negative correlations between narcissism and SWA bond scale Gender differences found in certain supervisory relationship pairings
Ladany & Friedlander, 1995	WAI-T (Bahrack, 1989)	T	Stronger SWA correlated with less role conflict and role ambiguity
Patton & Kivlighan, 1997	SWAI	S, T, & C	Positive relationship between the supervisee's perception of SWA and client's perception of the TWA; indication that SWA has a stronger influence on relational aspects of the supervisee in therapy versus supervisee technical skill development
Ladany et al., 1997	WAI-T (Bahrack, 1989)	T	Positive correlations between racial identity development and SWA
Ladany, Lehrman-waterman, et al., 1999	WAI-T (Bahrack, 1989)	T	Adherence to supervisor ethical behavior led to a stronger SWA
Ladany, Ellis, et al., 1999	WAI-T (Bahrack, 1989)	T	Positive correlations between supervisee satisfaction and bond scale SWA remained stable over time
Ladany & Lehrman- waterman, 1999	WAI-T (Bahrack, 1989)	T	More frequent SRSD correlated with a stronger SWA Sharing counseling struggles positively influenced the bond scale
Lehrman-waterman & Ladany, 2001	WAI-T (Bahrack, 1989)	T	Positive experiences with evaluation correlate with a stronger SWA
Ladany et al., 2001	WAI-S (Baker, 1990)	S	Supervisor's interactional style is related to the strength of the SWA and supervisor's perceived frequency of SRSD
Ramos-Sanchez et al., 2002	WAI-T (Baker, 1990)	T	Negative events reported by supervisees led to a weaker SWA
Matazzoni, 2008	WAI-T (Bahrack, 1989)	T	Distinguished experiential SRSD from extraneous SRSD Experiential SRSD lead to a stronger SWA bond Extraneous SRSD correlated with a weaker SWA bond Advanced supervisee development can mitigate this difference

Legend: S- supervisor; T- supervisee; C- client; WAI-T- Working Alliance Inventory- Trainee version; WAI-S- Working Alliance Inventory- Supervisor version; SWA- supervisory working alliance; TWA- therapeutic working alliance; SRSD- supervisor self-disclosure

Table A2: Analysis of Partial Transcript and Survey Data

Time	Supervisor	Notes	Supervisee	Notes
Pre-SRSD				
SRSD				
Q #1				
Q #2				
Q #3				

Table A3: Descriptive Categories for Case One Survey Responses

	Supervisor Categories	Supervisor Subcategories	Supervisee Categories	Supervisee Subcategories
Question 1	Relationship		Relationship	
	Communication		Communication	
	Content		Content	
	Purpose	-Bonding -Normalizing -Empathizing	Purpose	-Bonding -Normalizing -Teaching
	Harm			
Question 2	Teaching	-Topic	Teaching	-Topic -Significance
Question 3	Understanding	-Topic -Theory to Practice	Understanding	-Topic
			Motivating	

Table A4: Descriptive Categories for Case Two Survey Responses

	Supervisor Categories	Supervisor Subcategories	Supervisee Categories	Supervisee Subcategories
Question 1	Relationship		Relationship	
	Communication		Communication	
	Content		Content	
	Purpose	-Bonding -Teaching	Purpose	-Bonding -Normalizing
Question 2	Teaching	-Topic	Teaching	-Topic
	Normalizing		Normalizing	
	Empathizing		Empathizing	
			Bonding	
Question 3	Understanding		Understanding	
	Normalizing		Normalizing	
	Empathizing		Bonding	

Table A5: Descriptive Categories for Case Three Survey Responses

	Supervisor Categories	Supervisor Subcategories	Supervisee Categories	Supervisee Subcategories
Question 1	Relationship		Relationship	
	Communication		Communication	
	Content		Content	
	Purpose		Purpose	-Empathizing
Question 2	Teaching	-Topic	(Disagreement)	-Topic
Question 3	Teaching	-Topic	(Disagreement)	
			Evaluating	

Table A6: Descriptive Categories for Case Four Survey Responses

	Supervisor Categories	Supervisor Subcategories	Supervisee Categories	Supervisee Subcategories
Question 1	Relationship			
	Communication		Communication	
	Content		Content	
	Purpose	-Teaching -Normalizing	Purpose	-Teaching -Motivating
Question 2	Teaching	-Topic	Motivating	-Topic
Question 3	Motivating		Motivating	
	Affirming		Affirming	
	Understanding			

Appendix A

Open-ended Survey on Participant Perceptions

Please respond to the following questions regarding the bolded supervisor self-disclosure on the previous page. I ask that you take your time and respond with as much detail and thoroughness as possible. Thank you.

1. Please explain your understanding of the concept of self-disclosure.

2. What was your perception of the purpose of using this supervisor self-disclosure with the supervisee?

3. What was your perception of the effect of this supervisor self-disclosure on the supervisee?

[illegible]

Appendix B

Supervisee Demographic Questionnaire

Please respond to the following items in the space provided below.

Age: _____ Gender: _____ Ethnicity: _____

How many courses have you completed in the school counseling program? _____

How many hours of supervision have you received so far this semester? _____

What placement level are you fulfilling at your current site? (mark all that apply)

Practicum _____

1st Internship (0-300 hours) _____

2nd Internship (301-600) _____

Appendix C

Supervisor Demographic Questionnaire

Please respond to the following items in the space provided below.

Age: _____ Gender: _____ Ethnicity: _____

How many years have you worked as a professional school counselor? _____

How many school counseling supervisees have you previously supervised? _____

How many hours of training in supervision have you experienced? _____

Please select level of school placement: (check one)

Elementary _____ Middle _____ High _____

VITA

Jeffrey R. Sweeney was born in Knoxville, TN. He earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology from Tennessee Wesleyan College in 1999 and a Master of Science degree in Counseling from the University of Tennessee in 2002. He defended his dissertation on May 6, 2014 and will be conferred with a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Counselor Education on August 9, 2014.