QRE
Qualitative Research in Education

Hipatia Press
www.hipatiapress.com

Instructions for authors, subscriptions and further details:

http://qre.hipatiapress.com

Turkish First-Time Supervisees' Disclosure and Nondisclosure in Clinical Supervision

Betül Meydan[1]

1) Department of Educational Sciences, Ege University, Turkey

Date of publication: February 28th, 2020
Edition period: February 2020 – June 2020

To cite this article: Meydan, B. (2020). Turkish First-Time Supervisees' Disclosure and Nondisclosure in Clinical Supervision. *Qualitative Research in Education, 9*(1), 1-31. doi:10.17583/qre.2020.4304

To link this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.17583/qre.2020.4304

Qualitative Research in Education Vol.9 No.1 February 2020 pp. 1-31

Turkish First-Time Supervisees' Disclosure and Nondisclosure in Clinical Supervision

Betül Meydan
Ege University

(Received: 09 May 2019; Accepted: 14 February 2020; Published: 28 February 2020)

Abstract

This study sought to examine Turkish first-time supervisees' opinions regarding disclosure and nondisclosure in clinical supervision via a case study design. The data was collected from 19 volunteer first-time supervisees through a semi-structured interview form and analyzed with content analysis. Results indicated that supervisees' content of disclosures included supervisory needs and thoughts about supervisor while content of nondisclosure consisted of personal issues, supervision-related issues, and negative feelings about client. Nevertheless, supervisee disclosure was positively influenced by supervisor's personal characteristics and interventions; supervisee's expectations from disclosure and personal characteristics, as well as existence of peers in supervision environment and strong supervisory relationship. However, supervisor's personal characteristics; supervisee's personal characteristics, negative attitudes toward disclosure, and supervision; and also peers, poor supervision time, poor structure for supervision, evaluation concerns, and weak supervisory relationship have some negative effects on supervisee disclosure. Moreover, supervisee disclosure and nondisclosure had intense effects on supervisee and supervision.

Keywords: disclosure, nondisclosure, clinical supervision, supervisee

ISSN: 2014-6418
DOI: 10.17583/qre.2020.4304

Hipatia Press
www.hipatiapress.com

Qualitative Research in Education Vol.9 No.1 February 2020 pp. 1-31

Divulgación y No Divulgación en Supervisión Clínica de los Supervisados Primerizos Turcos

Betül Meydan
Ege University

(Recibido: 09 de mayo de 2019; Aceptado: 14 de febrero de 2020; Publicado: 28 de febrero de 2020)

Resumen

En este estudio se trató de examinar las opiniones de los supervisados primerizos turcos sobre la divulgación y la no divulgación en la supervisión clínica mediante un diseño de estudio de casos. Los datos se recogieron de 19 supervisados voluntarios por primera vez mediante un formulario de entrevista semiestructurado y se analizaron con un análisis de contenido. Los resultados indicaron que el contenido de las revelaciones de los supervisados incluía las necesidades de supervisión y los pensamientos sobre el supervisor, mientras que el contenido de la no revelación consistía en cuestiones personales, cuestiones relacionadas con la supervisión y sentimientos negativos. No obstante, la divulgación de información por parte de los supervisados se veía influida positivamente por las características e intervenciones personales del supervisor; las expectativas del supervisado respecto de la divulgación y las características personales, así como la existencia de compañeros en el entorno y una fuerte relación de supervisión. Sin embargo, las características personales del supervisor y de la persona supervisada, las actitudes negativas hacia la divulgación y la supervisión; y también los compañeros, el escaso tiempo de supervisión, la mala estructura de supervisión, las preocupaciones por la evaluación y la débil relación de supervisión tienen algunos efectos negativos en la divulgación de información por parte de la persona supervisada. Además, la divulgación y la no divulgación de la información por parte de la persona supervisada tuvieron efectos intensos sobre ambos

Palabras clave: divulgación, no divulgación, supervisión clínica, supervisión

ISSN: 2014-6418
DOI: 10.17583/qre.2020.4304

The disclosure and nondisclosure in clinical supervision have become a hot topic over the past decade. Studies (e.g. Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996, Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999; Mehr, Ladany, & Caskie, 2010; Yourman & Farber, 1996) indicated that upon various reasons, supervisees have selectively decided which information to disclose and/or withhold in supervision discussions. Research also maintained that both spoken and unspoken contents play essential roles in clinical supervision because talking and not talking about personal, clinical, and supervision-related issues have significant positive and negative effects on promoting the growth of supervisee's therapeutic competence (Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996) and monitoring client's development (Yourman & Farber, 1996). The term supervisee disclosure has been used for spoken contents in supervision literature whereas the term supervisee nondisclosure has been used for unspoken contents.

Supervisee Disclosure

Disclosure has been generally defined as explanations for personal information about oneself to another (Watkins, 1990). In clinical supervision, supervisee disclosure essentially indicates what supervisee's needs and expectations from supervisor and provides for supervisors to give appropriate feedback and create comfortable supervision environment for supervisee. Therefore, supervision theorists and researchers (e.g. Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Ladany et al., 1996; Mehr et al., 2010; Yourman & Farber, 1996) widely accepted that supervisee disclosure is one of the key elements for qualified supervision.

Various supervision models (Bernard, 1979; Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Rønnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981) aim to facilitate supervisee's therapeutic competence and professional growth. To that end, supervisee must disclose fundamental personal information, as well as her/his own experiences regarding client, therapeutic process, and supervisory process in supervision meetings (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Ladany et al., 1996). In one of the first studies examining the contents of supervisee disclosure in supervision by Yourman and Farber (1996), supervisees reported that they were willing to disclose about their relationship with client to the supervisor while they withheld clinical mistakes. Similarly, in another study (Pisani, 2005), most supervisees

reported that it is difficult to talk about their attitudes and feelings toward supervisor, as well as their clinical errors. Nevertheless, supervisees mostly preferred to disclose information and experiences about their clients' issues in supervision (Pisani, 2005).

Several researchers made considerable efforts to find out why supervisees feel comfortable for talking about these issues and which factors contribute to their willingness to disclose in supervision. Studies indicated that supervisee's willingness to disclose in supervision are related to supervisee-related factors such as low anxiety level (Mehr et al., 2010) and developmental stage, as well as supervisor-related factors, for instance, supervisor disclosure (Knox, Burkard, Edwards, Smith, & Schlosser, 2008; Knox, Edwards, Hess, & Hill, 2011; Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999; Ladany, Walker, & Melincoff, 2001) and encouragements for disclosure (Nelson, Barnes, Evans, & Triggiano, 2008). In addition, strong supervisory working alliance (Mehr et al., 2010; Webb & Wheeler, 1998) and satisfaction with supervision (Yourman & Farber, 1996) are also correlated with supervisee's willingness to disclose in supervision.

Supervisee Nondisclosure

Although the term *nondisclosure* is theoretically not defined in the literature, there is a growing body of empirical work examining this concept. The term nondisclosure consists of every single significant or insignificant information that supervisee withhold or distort in supervisory discussions or session reports. Ladany et al. (1996) found that 97.2% of supervisees reported to withhold information from their supervisors. Mehr et al. (2010), in a study which focused on single session supervision, reported that 84.3% of supervisees kept information back from their supervisors. These huge portions of supervisee nondisclosure has been drawn attention of researchers what to withhold or distort by supervisees in supervision discussions and why.

Supervisee nondisclosure mostly include supervisor- and supervision-related issues such as positive and negative feelings about supervisor and supervision (Hess et al., 2008; Ladany et al., 1996; Pisani, 2005; Yourman & Farber, 1996), evaluation concerns (Ladany et al., 1996; Hess et al., 2008; Pisani, 2005), and supervisory relationship (Hess et al., 2008; Ladany et al., 1996; Mehr et al., 2010; Pisani, 2005; Yourman & Farber, 1996). In addition

to supervisor- and supervision-related issues, supervisees are also reluctant to talk about personal issues (Ladany et al., 1996; Mehr et al., 2010) and clinical mistakes (Ladany et al., 1996; Hess et al., 2008; Yourman & Farber, 1996).

Regarding the question why supervisees withhold or distort information from their supervisors, it is found that supervisees do not want to be perceived incompetent (Ladany et al., 1996; Mehr et al., 2010; Reichelt et al., 2009) and evaluated negatively (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Hess et al., 2008; Ladany et al., 1996; Yourman & Farber, 1996) by their supervisors. Nevertheless, they keep information back from their supervisors if they felt negative feelings toward their supervisors (Bang & Goodyear, 2014; Ladany et al., 1996; Mehr et al., 2010) or unprofessional feelings toward their clients (Yourman & Farber, 1996), have weak supervisory working alliance (Ladany et al., 1996; Mehr et al., 2010; Sweeney & Creaner, 2014), blame their supervisors for creating inadequate supervision environment, especially in group supervision (Mehr et al., 2010; Reichelt et al., 2009). Moreover, supervisees are more likely to refrain from disclosing if they perceived the concern too personal or unimportant (Ladany et al., 1996), feel inadequacy, shame or embarrassment based on their developmental stages (Yourman & Farber, 1996), and want to protect themselves from peers' and supervisor's any hurts (Bang & Goodyear, 2014; Mehr et al., 2010).

The Purpose of the Study

Supervisee disclosure about personal information, as well as supervisee's client-, clinical, and supervision-related experiences play a primary role for better learning opportunities, greater satisfaction with supervision, and success of supervision (e.g. Davidson, 2011; Ladany et al., 1996; Yourman & Farber, 1996). However, supervisee nondisclosure has negative effects on supervisee learning from supervision, as well as the effectiveness of whole supervision process. Studies (e.g. Bang & Goodyear, 2014; Ladany et al., 1996; Mehr et al., 2010) support that nondisclosure inhibit supervisee learning opportunities from supervision, diminish satisfaction with supervision; cause to experience negative feelings and attitudes toward supervisor and supervision; and decrease the quality of the supervision and supervisory relationship.

In spite of the primary value of supervisee disclosure and nondisclosure for the effectiveness of supervision, research is limited about these topics in clinical supervision in Turkey. In fact, there are few studies related to different aspects of supervision included findings about first-time supervisees' supervisory needs and expectations from supervision and factors affecting the supervisory relationship. For example, in a study by Meydan and Denizli (2018), first-time supervisees reported that as basic developmental need, they needed to be supported about their clinical issues and as intermediate developmental need to discuss their personal issues in supervision meetings. In another study (Meydan, 2019), first-time supervisees noted that both supervisors' some interventions, personal characteristics and their own attitudes toward supervision and personal characteristics could affect the supervisory relationship.

Even if these findings give a perspective for understanding the contents of disclosure needs and the reasons for disclosure and nondisclosure of first-time supervisees in Turkey, it can be clearly claimed that this perspective is limited to only indirect findings of studies. Therefore, it can be also claimed that little is known regarding Turkish first-time supervisees' opinions about content, reasons, and outcomes for disclosure and nondisclosure, as well as factors increasing and decreasing their willingness to disclose. Because disclosure and nondisclosure in clinical supervision in Turkey have still remained understudied topics, further research is needed to gain deeper understanding of Turkish first-time supervisees' opinions regarding disclosure and nondisclosure in clinical supervision. To that end, this study sought to examine Turkish first-time supervisees' opinions regarding disclosure and nondisclosure in clinical supervision depending upon this research question: What are first-time supervisees' opinions regarding disclosure and nondisclosure in clinical supervision?

Investigating first-time supervisees' opinions regarding disclosure and nondisclosure in clinical supervision is believed to be helpful for supervisors to gain a wider perspective about the contents, reasons, and outcomes of first-time supervisees' disclosure and nondisclosure. Therefore, this perspective may contribute to the effectiveness of supervision practices in Turkey. Nevertheless, it is thought that this study will be an initial step for researchers to further studies regarding disclosure and nondisclosure in clinical supervision in Turkey.

Method

Research Model

This study is a case study design. The case study is a kind of qualitative research design attempting to examine a *case* in its real world context, especially when the boundaries between case and context are not evident (Yin, 2003). Therefore, the *case* examined in this study was the views of first-time supervisees regarding disclosure and nondisclosure within Individual Counseling Practice course during fall semester of 2018-2019 academic year. In Individual Counseling Practice course, supervision was provided in seven separate supervision classes at the beginning of the semester. In each supervision classes, supervisees were supervised by group supervision and supervision groups were composed of nearly nine or 10 first-time supervisees. Supervisees in supervision groups conducted counseling sessions with volunteer clients. After they audio- or video-recorded the counseling sessions, they transcribed the sessions and wrote session reports. Before supervision classes, supervisors read transcriptions and session reports. During supervision classes, supervisees explained their sessions for their peers and also it was expected them to explain their supervisory needs and expectations in supervision discussions. According to supervisees' transcriptions, session reports, and explanations, supervisors and peers gave feedback.

Study Group

Maximum variation sampling method was preferred for participant selection to increase the reliability of the study results obtained from various cases (Patton, 2002; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013). Because first-time supervisees were supervised by separate supervisors in separate supervision classes in this study, maximum variation sampling method provided to ensure the variety of first-time supervisees' views regarding disclosure and nondisclosure in each supervision classes. During the fall semester of the 2018-2019 academic year, 67 first-time supervisees (54 female, 13 male) enrolled in Individual Counseling Practice course in the Guidance and Counseling Undergraduate Program of a state university located in west coast of Turkey. However, researcher was one of supervisors who was assigned to

supervision classes. Because interviews were conducted by researcher, the supervision group supervised by researcher was removed from the study to protect the privacy of supervisees. As a result, research was announced to six supervision classes which was composed of total 57 supervisees (46 female, 11 male) and 19 of them (14 female, 5 male) volunteered to participate to interviews. Age of supervisees ranged from 21 to 28, and the mean age was 22.74 (*SD*=1.56). Their counseling and supervision experiences ranged from seven to 11 counseling sessions under supervision. None of supervisees had prior counseling or supervision experiences.

Data Collection Tool

The data was collected through a semi-structured interview form. The researcher reviewed the supervision literature in terms of the research questions of the study to create a draft interview form. Open-ended, clear, and nondirective interview questions were included for draft interview questions as proposed by Patton (2002). The draft interview questions were evaluated by two researchers who had doctoral degrees in Counseling and Guidance and were experienced in qualitative research methods. Nevertheless, the draft interview questions were also evaluated by one researcher who had doctoral degree in Curriculum and Instruction and had a special focus on qualitative research methods. The researchers shared their opinions to prevent ambiguity of questions. The researcher revised the interview questions upon experts' feedback. This revision resulted in rephrasing some of the questions. After revision was completed, a pilot interview was conducted with a first-time supervisee before actual interviews. The interview questions also revised based on the pilot study experiences of the researcher. As a result, the interview form included eight open-ended questions. Some examples in the interview form such as "What topics/information did you choose or prefer for sharing in your supervision group? Could you give me some specific examples?", "What were your reasons for sharing these kind of information in your supervision group? Could you give me some specific examples?", "What topics/information did you choose or prefer for not sharing in your supervision group? Could you give me some specific examples?", "What were your reasons for not sharing these kind of information in your supervision group? Could you give me some specific examples?", and "What is your opinions regarding the effects

of sharing or not sharing information in your supervision group on your personal or professional development?".

Data Collection

The researcher informed supervisors about the study in the beginning of the semester on September 2019. After their consent for their supervisees' participations in the study was obtained with verbal permissions, research was announced to supervisees on December 2019. The supervisees were informed about the aim of the study and asked to participate in the study. The supervisees' consent to participation of the study was obtained with a written informed-consent form in the beginning of the interviews. Nevertheless, because the end of the semester was the evaluation time for supervision process, the interviews conducted at the end of the formal evaluation process of Individual Counseling Practice course. Therefore, researcher tried to prevent the data of this research from supervisees' evaluation concerns. As a result, the semi-structured, face-to-face, and individual interviews were conducted on January 2019 by the researcher in the same office to create a standard interview environment for each voluntary supervisee. Interviews were completed in two weeks. Each interview took approximately 25 minutes and was audio-recorded.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

The data were analyzed with content analysis (Schreier, 2014). The researcher transcribed 19 interviews which lasted 487 minutes. After the raw data set was read by researcher twice without any interruption, the researcher coded data set. The categories and sub-categories were named on the basis of the supervision literature. To provide confidentiality, each supervisee was coded as S1-S19 before feedback of two researchers who had doctoral degrees in Counseling and Guidance and were experienced in qualitative research was asked. Two researchers coded the transcripts, separately. Finally, researchers came together and discussed the coding lists and their possible conflicts. The researcher made necessary revisions before finalizing the analysis. The representative quotations with contradictory statements of supervisees were selected from the transcripts.

Validity and Reliability

Researcher took certain precautions to ensure the trustworthiness of the study. For *credibility*, open-ended questions and semi-structured interview forms were used to collect data. As expert opinion precaution, expert views were used to revise interview questions and coding list. Pilot interview was conducted to check the functionality of interview form. Interviews were audio-recorded and were transcribed in detail. For *transferability*, purposive sampling method was preferred. Descriptions of supervisees' characteristics and the theoretical framework of the study were explained in detail. Direct representative quotations were used without any interruptions. For *dependability*, interviews were audio-recorded. Researcher and experts spent sufficient time in in-depth data coding. For *conformability*, data and methodology of the study, and also role of researcher were explained in detail.

The Role of the Researcher

The researcher had doctoral degree in Guidance and Counseling. The doctoral thesis of the researcher was about clinical supervision. Nevertheless, her research interests are focused on counselor training and supervision and supervisory relationship. She had both quantitative and qualitative studies about supervision, supervisory relationship, and supervisee and supervisor disclosure in clinical supervision. She also supervised first-time supervisees since the fall semester of the 2017-2018 academic year. Therefore, it is believed that the researcher's theoretical background, supervision experiences, national and international academic publications regarding supervisee and supervisor disclosure in clinical supervision contributed to structure this article, code the data set, discuss the results with existing supervision literature, and also take necessary precautions to ensure the validity and reliability of the study.

Results

The content analysis indicated three main categories content, reasons, and outcomes for disclosure and nondisclosure. Findings of categories, sub-

categories, themes, and frequencies regarding disclosure and nondisclosure are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Findings of categories, sub-categories, themes, and frequencies regarding disclosure and nondisclosure

	Content	**Reasons**	**Outcomes**
Disclosure	Supervisory Needs (*n*=19) Thoughts about Supervisor (*n*=10)	Supervisor-Related Factors -Personal Characteristics (*n*=10) -Interventions (*n*=6) Supervisee-Related Factors -Expectations from Disclosure (*n*=13) -Personal Characteristics (*n*=9) Supervision-Related Factors -Peer Effects (*n*=9) -Strong Supervisory Relationship (*n*=2)	Effects on Supervisee (*n*=17) Effects on Supervision (*n*=8)

Continue

Table 1
Findings of categories, sub-categories, themes, and frequencies regarding disclosure and nondisclosure (continuation)

	Content	**Reasons**	**Outcomes**
Nondisclosure	Personal Issues (*n*=8) Supervision-Related Issues (*n*=4) Negative Feelings about Client (*n*=4)	Supervisor-Related Factors -Personal Characteristics (*n*=3) Supervisee-Related Factors -Personal Characteristics (*n*=4) -Negative Attitudes Toward Disclosure (*n*=4) -Negative Attitudes Toward Supervision (*n*=1) Supervision-Related Factors -Peer Effects (*n*=5) -Poor Supervision Time (*n*=4) -Poor Structure for Supervision (*n*=2) -Evaluation Concerns (*n*=2) -Weak Supervisory Relationship (*n*=2)	Effects on Supervisee (*n*=9) Effects on Supervision (*n*=3)

Content

Disclosure

Supervisees' content of disclosure was categorized under two sub-categories as supervisory needs and thoughts about supervisor. Under *supervisory needs* sub-category, all of the supervisees (*n*=19) reported that they were willing to disclose their thoughts and questions with supervisor about how they should manage the session and use counseling skills in sessions more effectively. Nevertheless, they were also willing to disclose their feelings related to client's issues such as anger, tension, and embarrassment and their performance anxiety with their supervisor to learn how to cope with them effectively. For example, one supervisee pointed out:

> I sometimes felt incompetent. I did not know what to do, I got stuck, had difficulty conducting the session. I disclosed to ask for help with these issues. (S8)

Several supervisees (*n*=10) reported that they were willing to disclose their positive and negative *thoughts about supervisor* with him/her. For example, one expressed:

> We held a session on giving feedback to our supervisor. We provided feedback about him/her. S/he asked about our positive and negative opinions about supervision. We talked and gave positive and negative feedback about him/her. (S9)

Nondisclosure

Supervisees' content of nondisclosure was categorized into three sub-categories as personal issues, supervision-related issues, and negative feelings about client. In terms of *personal issues*, several supervisees (*n*=8) reported that they withheld their personal thoughts, feelings, and questions in supervision meeting discussions. For example, one supervisee mentioned:

> My supervisor told me to think about my feelings toward my client. But I did not mention or bring it up. …Actually, I have recently had

> confusing ideas about my own self and in fact, I wish I could talk about it. I did not disclose my personal issues much. (S19)

Accordingly, some supervisees (*n*=2) expected from supervisors *more discussions about their own feelings* in supervision meetings. For example, one supervisee recommended:

> When supervisor asked what you felt about an issue on the basis of our reactions to the client, disclosure became easier. Our reactions were not really handled from that perspective during supervision. If it was handled like that, it would be easier for us to disclose. What ideas do we hold, what kind of behavior do we have; I would like to have these revealed. (S2)

Supervisees (*n*=4) kept back their negative feelings to supervisor such as anger and embarrassment, as well as her/his thoughts and feelings about supervision and supervisory relationship in supervision meetings. For example, one supervisee reported:

> In the beginning of the supervision, since I did not know and s/he did not explain how we would be conducting sessions, I was annoyed with my supervisor. But I did not express these feelings of mine to him/her. (S2)

Similarly, some supervisees (*n*=4) withheld their *negative feelings about client* in supervision meetings. For example, one supervisee pointed out:

> For example, a few weeks ago, I was so bored of conducting sessions with my client. I wanted to proceed quickly. But I could not tell my supervisor that I was bored with my client, it would not be professional. (S5)

Reasons

Disclosure

Supervisees' reasons for disclosure were categorized into three sub-groups: supervisor-, supervisee-, and supervision-related factors. Supervisor-related

factors sub-category was formed of two main themes such as supervisor's *personal characteristics* and *interventions*. Supervisees (*n*=10) mentioned that supervisor's *personal characteristics* had main importance for disclosure in supervision. A supervisor who was sincere, soothing nonjudgmental, open to criticisms, humorous, understanding, and supportive facilitated supervisees' disclosure in supervision. For example, one supervisee asserted:

> Our supervisor was really listening and wanted to help. If I shared, [my supervisor] wouldn't judge me and would try to figure me out, s/he wouldn't be mistaken about me. I shared as I knew this." (S11)

Supervisees (*n*=6) mentioned some of supervisor's *interventions* such as open-ended questioning, encouragement, giving feedback, and disclosure facilitated disclosure in supervision. For example, one supervisee stated:

> Our supervisor kept asking "what do you think?, what do you feel?"... S/he said what you feel in sessions is important as well. This was very encouraging as of the first week. (S11)

In terms of *supervisee-related factors*, supervisees mentioned that *expectations from disclosure* (*n*=13) and *personal characteristics* (*n*=9) such as to be motivated and extrovert contributed to disclosure in supervision. For example, with reference to expectations from disclosure, one supervisee reported:

> I needed to receive feedback because I had a client for the first time; I also needed to be supported. I think that's why I opted for disclosure. (S6)

Regarding personal characteristics, one supervisee noted:

> I am an extrovert, so there was nothing I withheld information from my supervisor. (S12)

Under supervision-related factors, *peer effects* (*n*=9) and *strong supervisory relationship* (*n*=2) facilitated supervisees' disclosure in supervision. For example, with reference to peer effects, one supervisee said:

> When my peers were enthusiastic about disclosure and when I realized they had been through the same things as me, I disclosed to the supervisor, too. (S17)

Nondisclosure

Reasons for nondisclosure were categorized into three sub-categories as supervisor-related factors, supervisee-related factors, and supervision-related factors. Some supervisees reported that and *supervisor's personal characteristics* (*n*=3) such as being close to change/criticisms, authoritative, and having negative attitudes toward supervisees' disclosure negatively affected supervisees disclosure. For example, one supervisee, with reference to supervisor's personal characteristics, expressed:

> I more or less knew [my supervisor] from the past years. S/he did not seem to be able to change something. S/he was strict and reserved. Therefore, I felt unwilling to disclose. I thought I would not be understood. (S7)

Correspondingly, some supervisees (*n*=2) reported that they want more kind supervisors. For example, one supervisee suggested:

> I have no problem with being criticized. If [my supervisor] was more kind, it would be better… We had communication problems. If we could have better communication, if s/he were more kind, I would disclose more easily. (S7)

Nevertheless, supervisees' personal characteristics (*n*=4), negative attitudes toward disclosure (*n*=4), negative attitudes toward supervision (*n*=1) hindered disclosure. For example, one supervisee, regarding personal characteristics, said:

> The reason for nondisclosure could be my shyness. I was a bit shy and I did not say anything. (S5)

Another one, with respect to negative attitudes toward disclosure, expressed:

> I know my own mistakes in daily life. But it was hard for me to say that I was wrong to others. Therefore, I found it difficult to share. (S16)

As supervision-related factors, supervisees listed *peer effects* (*n*=5), *poor supervision time* (*n*=4), *poor structure for supervision* (*n*=2), *evaluation concerns* (*n*=2), and *weak supervisory relationship* (*n*=2) as hindering factors for disclosure in supervision meetings. For example, one supervisee reported:

> This is a course; after all, we will be graded. This also made me feel anxious. I was worried whether I would have to retake it and I did not disclose much. (S18)

In parallel with supervision-related factors, some supervisees (*n*=8) wanted more structuring in the beginning of supervision process, opportunity for individual supervision, integration of individual and group supervision methods, more supervision time for feedback, and less peers in supervision groups. For example, one supervisee, regarding individual supervision, suggested:

> Perhaps I would be more willing to disclose if it was one-to-one rather than in groups because even though I did not have any problems with my peers there and I knew that I would not get negative feedback from them, there were still five more persons other than my supervisor in supervision group. I would have disclose more easily if it had been individual [supervision], maybe. (S16)

Outcomes

Disclosure

Outcomes were sub-categorized into *effects on supervisee* and *effects on supervision.* In terms of *effects on supervisee*, supervisees (*n*=17) mentioned that disclosure helped them to gain self-awareness, to feel relaxed, and be understood. Nevertheless, disclosure helped supervisees to present effective counseling, improve his/her counseling self-efficacy, use disclosure in their counseling sessions, normalize his/her performance anxiety. For example, one supervisee reported:

> I attended supervision [sessions] comfortably. I did not think about what my supervisor would say because I knew that my supervisor would help me in a supportive way. Therefore, I felt a lot more comfortable for disclosure. (S6)

Regarding *effects on supervision*, supervisees (*n*=8) stated that disclosure helped them to be supervised in a qualified supervision environment, be satisfied from supervision, be a model for peers to use disclosure in supervision, take more effective feedback from supervisor. For example, one said:

> I always realize that I am so merciless to myself. When I shared this, it made me feel good to see myself through my supervisor's eyes. Of course, s/he did not always give me positive feedback. I learnt about the issues I am insufficient in and those I have rational ideas about as I asked and shared. (S19)

Nondisclosure

Outcomes category was formed of two sub-categories as *effects on supervisee* (*n*=9) and *effects on supervision* (*n*=3). Under *effects on supervisee*, supervisees (*n*=9) reported that nondisclosure were caused to feel them anxious, bored, uneasiness, poor self-efficacy, and confusion in supervision. For example, one supervisee noted:

> It all bottled up in me and I felt uneasy since I did not disclose [to my supervisor]. (S8)

Last sub-category for outcomes of nondisclosure was *effects on supervision*. Some supervisee (*n*=3) expressed that nondisclosure caused to feel unmotivated for supervision and have negative attitudes toward supervision. One supervisee mentioned:

> I thought I would not be able to express myself, nor would [my supervisor] understand, so I decided not to try in vain and made a brief summary of the session. I started to care less about the supervision. We talked over the main topics and it was over. (S7)

Discussion

This study aimed to examine Turkish first-time supervisees' opinions regarding disclosure and non-disclosure in clinical supervision. The findings indicated that supervisees' content of disclosure included supervisory needs and thoughts about supervisor while content of nondisclosure consisted of personal issues, supervision-related issues, and negative feelings about client. Nevertheless, supervisee disclosure was positively influenced by supervisor's personal characteristics and interventions; supervisee's expectations from disclosure and personal characteristics, as well as existence of peers in supervision environment and strong supervisory relationship. However, supervisor's personal characteristics; supervisee's personal characteristics, negative attitudes toward disclosure, and supervision; and also peers, poor supervision time, poor structure for supervision, evaluation concerns, and weak supervisory relationship have some negative effects on supervisee disclosure. Moreover, supervisee disclosure and nondisclosure had intense effects on supervisee and supervision.

Reviewing the contents for supervisee disclosure, it was revealed that supervisory needs were the most frequently stated sub-category by all participants. This finding is consistent with the findings of other studies in the related literature. According to developmental supervision models (Loganbill et al., 1982; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981), first-time supervisees are inexperienced in managing the process as they conduct counseling sessions for the first time. Therefore, they need to learn how to conduct the sessions and use their counseling skills in the most effective way from the supervision and the supervisor (Loganbill et al., 1982; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981). Thus, the supervisors of first-time supervisees are expected to be directive and instructive in supervision meetings (Jacobsen & Tanggard, 2009; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981; Worthington, 2006). In this regard, considering that the participants of the present study were all first-time supervisees, it is understandable that they expected to learn how to deal with the client, the client's problem and their emotions toward their clients from the supervision. In other words, participants' professional developmental levels were shown to be consistent with their supervisory needs and expectations. Thus, their

disclosure in the supervision to get information on how to manage counseling sessions is an expected result. Consistently, in a study by Meydan and Denizli (2018) first-time supervisees reported that they expected from their supervisors to develop strong relationship, so that they believed that this they could easily share their supervisory needs in supervision meetings. In fact, this is partly related with Turkish culture; because, Turkish people generally share their needs and expectations with ones whom they establish close relationship as one of the characteristics of collectivist culture (Mocan-Aydın, 2000).

Another finding of the study concerning contents for supervisee disclosure was supervisees' positive and negative thoughts about the supervisor. Considering this finding, it is important that the first-time supervisees mention their opinions about the supervisor, but not their emotions. Studies have shown that it was easier for first-time supervisees to share their opinions rather than emotions during supervision (Hess et al., 2008; Ladany et al., 1996; Pisani, 2005; Yourman & Farber, 1996). For instance, in a study conducted by Pisani (2005), it was found that supervisees had difficulty in expressing their emotions and attitudes toward their supervisors. Consistent with the findings of the present study, this finding clearly pointed out that it was easier for supervisees to share their opinions than their emotions during supervision. Because people generally wants to feel in secure for talking about their negative emotions in collectivist cultures, it is claimed that this is related with cultural characteristics of Turkish people. On the other hand, the supervisees participating in the present study also stated that they did not only disclose their negative opinions but their positive opinions as well to the supervisor. This finding indicated that expressing negative opinions together with positive ones (Wood, 2013) made it easy for supervisees to share their negative opinions with the supervisor. In addition, another point to be considered based on this finding is that supervisees receiving supervision from supervisors who hold supervision evaluation discussions stated they easily shared their positive and negative opinions about the supervisor. First of all, this finding explicitly showed that first-time supervisees participating in the present study felt the need to express their opinions about the supervisor and they waited for an opportunity/environment to do so. Moreover, it was revealed that supervisor's facilitative attitude about receiving feedback from supervisee about him/herself is a critical initiator step toward allowing supervisees to

express their opinions. Studies in Turkey found (e.g. Aladağ, 2014; Meydan & Denizli, 2018; Meydan & Koçyiğit, 2019) that first-time supervisees wanted to deal with polite, caring, supportive, understanding, and helpful supervisors. These facilitative supervisor characteristics and attitudes contributed the supervisory relationship and facilitated give feedback to supervisors (e.g. Meydan & Denizli, 2018; Meydan & Koçyiğit, 2019). In addition to this, particularly taking into consideration that it was the participants' first supervision experience, their anxiety is not surprising (Loganbill et al., 1982; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981). Studies have reported that supervision had an anxiety-provoking effect for first-time supervisees (Mehr et al., 2010) and that these supervisees experienced anxiety both for performance and evaluation (Bradley & Ladany, 2001). Thus, it could be claimed that supervisors' providing opportunities of disclosure for the supervisees participating in the study had an extremely significant effect for their disclosure.

Reviewing contents for supervisee nondisclosure, it was found that the supervisees reported having difficulty in disclosing personal issues, supervision-related issues, and negative feelings about client. Personal issues are known to be among the issues which are most frequently found to be difficult to share by supervisees during supervision (Ladany et al., 1996; Mehr et al., 2010). This could be interpreted from several perspectives. Firstly, nondisclosure may occur as supervisees with shy and introvert characteristics think that revealing personal issues during supervision may make them feel ashamed (Yourman & Farber, 1996) or that the issue to be shared is too deep or too personal for supervision (Ladany et al., 1996). Secondly, supervisees may have withheld their personal issues during supervision with the fear of being negatively evaluated or judged by their peers or the supervisor (e.g. Nielsen et al., 2009). Thirdly and lastly, it is likely that they chose to hide their personal issues as they thought it would be unfair to their peers to spend the limited feedback time during group supervision. In addition to all these, according to developmental supervision models (Loganbill et al., 1982; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981) as mentioned before, inexperienced supervisees tend to have more expectations to learn about session management and gather information in their first supervision experience. The findings of the present study supported this tendency as well. Contents such as sharing personal issues and self-awareness are more advanced professional developmental supervisory needs

and expectations (Loganbill et al., 1982; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981). Hence, it is possible that the first-time supervisees who participated in the present study could not find an opportunity to question their personal issues and bring them up since they focused on how to manage sessions due to their inexperience and prioritized mentioning these topics during supervision.

In terms of supervision-related issues, first-time supervisees found it difficult to disclose negative feelings toward supervisor and supervision. According to findings of existing studies, negative feelings about supervisor and supervision (Hess et al., 2008; Ladany et al., 1996; Pisani, 2005; Yourman & Farber, 1996), and supervisory relationship experiences (Hess et al., 2008; Ladany et al., 1996; Mehr et al., 2010; Pisani, 2005; Yourman & Farber, 1996) were most frequent issues which concealed in supervision discussions. This resulted from supervisees' feelings about shame (Yourman & Farber, 1996) and evaluation concerns (Ladany et al., 1996; Hess et al., 2008; Pisani, 2005). Nevertheless, Bang and Goodyear (2014) found that supervisees were afraid of disclosing their negative feelings toward supervisor, *especially in group supervision*. Supervisees, who perceived that their supervisor was ineffective, were afraid to be perceived as mature or inadequate by peers and supervisor while peers perceived the supervisor as effective (Bang & Goodyear, 2014). Participants in this study were supervised in group supervision; they might feel the above-mentioned group pressure in their supervision discussions. Moreover, Bang and Goodyear (2014) found that supervisees perceived their supervisors as authorities and they believed that they should respect them. It is thought that this attitude may also affect first-time supervisees in this study. In other words, this finding may also be explained by cultural background of supervisees in this study. Because generally speaking, as mentioned before, Turkey is a collectivist country (Mocan-Aydın, 2000). Respect to elders and the authority are expected actions. Inexperienced supervisees who grew in such a cultural environment may think that listening elders and authorities (supervisors) and obeying them was as a kind of respect. Therefore, supervisees experienced difficulties for talking about negative feelings about supervisor, as an authority in supervision meetings, and supervision which held by supervisor.

Negative feelings about clients were the last finding about supervisee nondisclosure of this study. Likewise, Reichelt et al. (2009) found that 36%

supervisees withhold negative reactions to the client from their supervisors. Because of negative feelings about clients, some supervisees reported that they were fear of losing their control on client (Abernethy & Cook, 2011) and conducting ineffective sessions with clients (Yourman & Farber, 1996). In addition, they were anxious that negative feelings about clients brought along deeper issues such as transference and countertransference (Yourman & Farber, 1996) which should be discussed in supervision. Nevertheless, first-time supervisees thought that negative feelings about clients was a kind of clinical mistake. Because most supervisees were involuntary to disclose clinical mistakes (Ladany et al., 1996; Yourman & Farber, 1996) in supervision discussions and they fear of the above undesirable consequences, it is thought that first-time supervisees participated in this study may withhold negative feelings about clients.

Reviewing the reasons for supervisee disclosure and nondisclosure, first-time supervisees' disclosure was affected by supervisors' personal characteristics and interventions. Reviewing supervisors' personal characteristics, first-time supervisees listed that a supervisor should be sincere, soothing nonjudgmental, open to criticisms, humorous, understanding, and supportive. Nevertheless, they reported that a supervisor should not have negative attitudes toward disclosure, be close to change/criticisms, and authoritative. These needs and expectations are supported by various studies in literature. For instance, supervisor disclosure (Knox et al., 2008; Knox et al., 2011; Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999; Ladany et al., 2001) and encouragements for disclosure (Nelson et al., 2008) facilitate the supervisee disclosure. Additionally, Turkish first-time supervisees generally expect their supervisors to be polite, relieving, caring, humorous, supportive/encouraging, sincere, understanding, soothing, fair, helpful, and respectful (Aladağ, 2014; Meydan, 2019; Meydan & Denizli, 2018; Meydan & Koçyiğit, 2019) and to use interventions such as disclosure, open-ended questions, active listening, supportive confrontation (Meydan, 2019; Meydan & Denizli, 2018; Meydan & Koçyiğit, 2019). In this context, it could be asserted that the supervisor is important for first-time supervisees in several aspects. The supervisor is a role-model for the counselor trainee both as an instructor and an experienced member of counseling profession. The supervisor is expected to be an initiator and facilitator for the supervisee to express himself/herself in order to build the supervisory relationship and to create an appropriate supervision environment for supervisees to learn.

Thus, the supervisor is required to have basic communication skills as well as the supervision skills and interventions. In this regard, it is considered to be understandable that the supervisors having the abovementioned personal characteristics and intervention skills in the present study facilitated supervisees' disclosure.

Another noteworthy finding regarding reasons for supervisee disclosure and nondisclosure was that supervisee's expectations from disclosure and personal characteristics. To be extrovert and motivated facilitated their disclosure whereas their personal characteristics such to be introvert, shy, and anxious and to have negative attitudes toward disclosure and supervision contributed their nondisclosure. Studies (e.g. Bang & Goodyear, 2014; Mehr et al., 2010; Yourman & Farber, 1996) found that feeling inadequacy, shame, embarrassment, evaluation anxiety and fear of any hurts by peers or supervisor resulted from keeping back information from supervision. In this study, supervisees experienced their first counseling practices as a counselor and attended their first supervision meetings as a supervisee. It is an expected result for supervisees who are introvert, shy, anxious, and have negative attitudes toward disclosure and supervision not to be willing to disclose in supervision. It is thought that supervisor and supervision may provoke first-time supervisees' supervision and evaluation anxiety when they felt shame and embarrassment. As an expected consequence of these feelings, they did not want to disclose information in supervision.

The last finding about reasons for supervisee disclosure and nondisclosure was supervision-related factors. Peers effects and supervisory relationship affected both supervisee disclosure and nondisclosure. In addition, supervision time, structure for supervision, and evaluation concerns had also effects on supervisee nondisclosure. Regarding peer effects, studies (e.g. Ladany et al., 1996; Reichelt et al., 2009) had controversial findings just like the findings of this study. For example, Ladany et al. (1996) indicated that most supervisees usually disclosed the information with peers. Whereas, Reichelt et al. (2009) found that supervisees, who were supervised in a group, blamed their supervisors for creating inadequate supervision environment and did not disclose information with him/her or peers. Likewise, in this study, the existence of peers in supervision group was a facilitative factor for some supervisees while others reported that peers hindered their disclosure. Additionally, supervisees who reported that peers hindered their disclosure also stated that peers caused to decrease their feedback time in supervision.

It is thought that this situation was related to supervisees' developmental level in this study. First-time supervisees need more structure and feedback from their supervisors in a strong supervisory relationship (Loganbill et al., 1982; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981). Furthermore, the supervisory relationship, for whole developmental stages; but, especially, for first-time supervisees, was found to demonstrate a significant influence on their disclosure (e.g. Gray, Ladany, Walker, & Ancis, 2001; Ladany et al., 1996; Ladany et al., 1997; Mehr et al., 2010; Webb & Wheeler, 1998). Therefore, it is quite understandable that peer effects, poor supervision time, poor structure for supervision, and weak supervisory relationship contributed their nondisclosure in this study. Additionally, first-time supervisees in this study reported that they needed individual supervision. Nielsen et al. (2009) found that supervisees preferred to discuss their supervision material, especially personal issues, in an individual supervision rather than group supervision. In this study, nearly half of the supervisees reported that they could not disclose personal issues in supervision discussions. It can be explained that supervisees, who could not disclose personal issues in supervision discussions, may need to talk about their personal issues and supervision-related factors on a one-to-one basis in supervision.

The final category of this study was the outcomes of disclosure and nondisclosure. This category included effects on supervisee and effects on supervision. Knox (2015) found that supervisees felt more anxious and decrease their self-confidence in counseling and supervision if they did not disclose in supervision. Likewise, findings of this study indicated that first-time supervisees experienced positive feelings personally (e.g. relaxed) and professionally (e.g. competent) and they were satisfied with supervision when they disclosed information with supervisor. Furthermore, if supervisees refrain from disclosing information in supervision, supervisee nondisclosure has also deleterious effects on client services (Knox, 2015). As a result, supervisee disclosure and nondisclosure have inevitable effects on not only supervisee and supervision but also on client services. Therefore, supervisee disclosure and nondisclosure should be absolutely taken into consideration in clinical supervision.

Limitations

Although this study is one of the initial studies regarding supervisee disclosure and nondisclosure in clinical supervision in Turkey, the primary limitation of the study arose from participants' developmental stages, personal characteristics, dual relationship concerns. Supervisees in this study continued their formal counselor training after data were collected and they took some courses from same supervisors as lecturers. Nevertheless, because of first-time supervisees' performance and evaluation anxiety based on developmental supervision models (Loganbill et al., 1982; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981) or their anxious personality characteristics, supervisees may feel uncomfortable to answer the questions of this study. As a final limitation, collecting data from only one university may limit the transferability of the results.

Implications for Clinical Supervision and Further Research

Considering the findings, contents and affecting factors for supervisee disclosure and nondisclosure indicated important implications for clinical supervisors. The most obvious implication is that the supervisee disclosure has primary effects on supervisees' professional growth and also satisfaction with supervision. Therefore, supervisors should carefully take into consideration both the affecting factors and their own roles and responsibilities for supervisee disclosure and nondisclosure and the effectiveness of supervision. Keeping in mind first-time supervisees' developmental characteristics, supervisors should pay attention to decrease their own hindering effects for supervisee disclosure. Because of higher anxiety level of first-time supervisees in the beginning of the semester, supervisors should carefully structure the supervision process and use role induction for supervisees about disclosure Thus, it is believed that supervisees will understand the supervision process, their own and supervisor's roles and responsibilities within supervision, and the importance of disclosure for their personal and professional growth.

Furthermore, supervisors should pay attention to share some necessary information regarding which contents can be disclosed by supervisees in supervision discussions in the beginning of the semester. This will provide for supervisees to gain a perspective about that they can disclose their

successes and strengths as well as clinical mistakes, personal issues, and negative feelings about supervision and supervisor in supervision meetings. Nevertheless, supervisors should create a supportive supervision environment for supervisee disclosure. Based on this, supervisors should encourage supervisees for disclosure via both their supervision interventions and mid-term evaluation opportunities for supervision process. Because of importance of supervision environment, especially in group supervision, creating a supportive supervision environment will facilitate the supervisee disclosure.

Eventually, yet, little is known about the supervisee disclosure and nondisclosure in clinical supervision in Turkey. Therefore, it is hope that this initial attempt to explore the supervisee disclosure and nondisclosure in Turkey will encourage researchers to conduct further studies with more advanced research designs. Increasing research interest on this hot topic will provide a wider perspective for supervisors to facilitate the supervisee disclosure in clinical supervision.

References

Abernethy C., & Cook, K. (2011) Resistance or disconnection? A relational-cultural approach to supervisee anxiety and nondisclosure. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health, 6*(1), 2-14. doi:10.1080/15401383.2011.560067

Aladağ, M. (2014). Critical incidents in individual counseling practicum supervision across different levels of counselor education. *Ege Education Journal, 15*(2), 428–475.

Bang K., & Goodyear, R. K. (2014) South Korean supervisees' experience of and response to negative supervision events. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 27*(4), 353-378. doi:10.1080/09515070.2014.940851

Bernard, J. M. (1979). Supervisor training: A discrimination model. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 19*(1), 60-68. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.1979.tb00906.x

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2009). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision*. MA: Pearson.

Bradley, L. J., & Ladany, N. (2001). *Counselor supervision: Principles, process, and practice* (3rd ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Brunner-Routledge.

Davidson, C. (2011). The relation between supervisor self-disclosure and the working alliance among social work students in field placement. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, *31*(3), 265-277. doi:10.1080/08841233.2011.580248

Gray, L. A., Ladany, N., Walker, J. A., & Ancis, J. R. (2001). Psychotherapy trainees' experience of counterproductive events in supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *48*(4), 371-383. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.48.4.371

Hess, S. A., Knox, S., Schultz, J. M., Hill, C. E., Sloan, L., Brandt S., Kelley, F., & Hoffman, M. A. (2008). Predoctoral interns' nondisclosure in supervision, *Psychotherapy Research*, *18*(4), 400-411. doi:10.1080/10503300701697505

Jacobsen, C. H., & Tanggaard, L. (2009). Beginning therapists' experiences of what constitutes good and bad psychotherapy supervision: With a special focus on individual differences. *Nordic Psychology*, *61*, 59-84. doi:10.1027/1901-2276.61.4.59

Knox, S. (2015) Disclosure—and lack thereof—in individual supervision, *The Clinical Supervisor*, *34*(2), 151-163. doi:10.1080/07325223.2015.1086462

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*(5), 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*, *48*(4), 336-341. doi:10.1037/a0022067

Ladany, N., Hill, C. E., Corbett, M. M., & Nutt, E. A. (1996). Nature, extent, and importance of what psychotherapy trainees do not disclose to their supervisors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *43*(1), 10-24. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.43.1.10

Ladany, N., & Lehrman-Waterman, D. E. (1999). The content and frequency of supervisor self-disclosures and their relationship to supervisor style and the supervisory working alliance. *Counselor*

Education and Supervision, *38*(3), 143-160. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.1999.tb00567.x

Ladany, N., O'Brien, K. M., Hill, C. E., Melincoff, D. S., Knox, S., & Petersen, D. A. (1997). Sexual attraction toward clients, use of supervision, and prior training: A qualitative study of predoctoral psychology interns. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *44*(4), 413-424. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.44.4.413

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*(4), 263-275. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2001.tb01259.x

Loganbill, C., Hardy, E., & Delworth, U. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *10*(1), 3-42. doi:10.1177/0011000082101002

Mehr, K. E., Ladany, N., & Caskie, G. I. (2010). Trainee nondisclosure in supervision: What are they not telling you? *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, *10*(2), 103-113. doi:10.1080/14733141003712301

Meydan, B. (2019). Facilitative and hindering factors regarding the supervisory relationship based on supervisors' and undergraduate supervisees' opinions. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi*, *9*(1), 171-208. doi:10.14527/pegegog.2019.007

Meydan, B., & Denizli, S. (2018). Turkish undergraduate supervisees' views regarding supervisory relationship. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 74*, 1-24. doi:10.14689/ejer.2018.74.1

Meydan, B., & Koçyiğit, M. (2019). The Supervisory Relationship Experiences of Turkish First-Time and Advanced Supervisees. *Qualitative Research in Education, 8*(1), 89-121. doi:10.17583/qre.2019.3942

Mocan-Aydin, G. (2000). Western models of counseling and psychotherapy within Turkey: Crossing cultural boundaries. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *28*(2), 281-298. doi:10.1177/0011000000282007

Nelson, M. L., Barnes, K. L., Evans, A. L., & Triggiano, P. J. (2008). Working with conflict in clinical supervision: Wise supervisors' perspectives. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *55*(2), 172-184. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.55.2.172

Nielsen, G. H., Skjerve, J., Jacobsen, C. H., Gullestad, S. E., Hansen, B. R., Reichelt, S., Rønnestad, M. H., & Torgersen, A. M. (2009). Mutual assumptions and facts about nondisclosure among clinical supervisors and students in group supervision: A comparative analysis. *Nordic Psychology, 61*(4), 49-58. doi:10.1027/1901-2276.61.4.49

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* Sage Publications.

Pisani, A. (2005). Talk to Me: Supervisee disclosure in supervision. *Smith College Studies in Social Work, 75*(1), 29-47. doi:10.1300/J497v75n01_03

Reichelt, S., Gullestad, S. E., Hansen, B. R., Rønnestad, M. H., Torgersen, A. M., Jacobsen, C. H., Nielsen, G. H., & Skjerve, J. (2009). Nondisclosure in psychotherapy group supervision: The supervisee perspective. *Nordic Psychology, 61*(4), 5-27. doi:10.1027/1901-2276.61.4.5

Rønnestad, M. H., & Skovholt, T. M. (2003). The journey of the counselor and therapist: Research findings and perspectives on professional development. *Journal of Career Development, 30*(1), 5-44. doi:10.1177/089484530303000102

Schreier, M. (2014). Qualitative content analysis. In U. Flick (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis* (p. 170-183). Sage Publications. Retrieved from http://www.ewipsy.fuberlin.de/einrichtungen/arbeitsbereiche/qualitative_sozial_bildungsforschung/Medien/58869_Flick__The_SAGE_HB_of_Qualitative_Data_Analysis_Chapter1_mapping-the-field.pdf

Stoltenberg, C. (1981). Approaching supervision from a developmental perspective: The counselor complexity model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28*, 59–65. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.28.1.59

Sweeney, J., & Creaner, M. (2014). What's not being said? Recollections of nondisclosure in clinical supervision while in training. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 42*(2), 211-224. doi:10.1080/03069885.2013.872223

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Qualitative research methods in the social sciences* (9th ed.). Ankara: Seçkin Publications.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yourman, D. B., & Farber, B. A. (1996). Nondisclosure and distortion in psychotherapy supervison. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 33*(4), 567-575. doi:10.1037/0033-3204.33.4.567

Watkins, C. E. (1990). The separation-individuation process in psychotherapy supervision. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 27*(2), 202-209. doi:10.1037/0033-3204.27.2.202

Webb, A., & Wheeler, S. (1998). How honest do counsellors dare to be in the supervisory relationship?: An exploratory study. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 26*(4), 509-524. doi:10.1080/03069889808253860

Wood, A. (2013). The feedback sandwich—tasty or bitter? Retrieved from http://projectcommunityonline.com/the-feedback-sandwich-tasty-or-bitter.html

Worthington, E. L. (2006). Changes in supervision as counselors and supervisors gain experience: A review. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 18*(3), 133-160. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.18.3.189

Betül Meydan is Research Assistant Doctor of the Department of Educational Sciences at Ege University, Turkey.

Contact Address: Betül Meydan, Ege University, Department of Educational Sciences, Ege Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü Gençlik Caddesi 35040 Bornova-İZMİR, Turkey. Email: betull_benzer@yahoo.com