

1 Self-Disclosure within the Sport Psychologist-Athlete Relationship

2 **Abstract**

3 This article explores the use of self-disclosure within the sport psychologist-athlete
4 relationship. A summary of prior research relevant to concept definition, contextual factors,
5 and typologies of self-disclosure is provided. The conscious use of self-disclosure as an
6 effective consultancy skill, alongside both the organic and facilitative integration of self-
7 disclosure is discussed. We then position self-disclosure within the dynamics and boundaries
8 of a unique practitioner context, that of the sport psychologist-athlete relationship, using Katz
9 and Hemmings' (2009) professional relationship framework. This article proposes that future
10 research into self-disclosure explores its integration within published models of best practice
11 for consulting.

12 *Keywords:* self-disclosure, typology, sport psychologist-athlete relationship, consultancy

13 Psychologists, pre-dominantly in clinical and counselling settings (Gaines, 2003;
14 Ruddle & Dilks, 2015), have held a long-standing interest in the role of practitioner self-
15 disclosure. Edwards and Murdock (1994) reported that 90% of therapists engaged in self-
16 disclosure. Recent research has moved beyond examining the frequency of self-disclosure to
17 offer concept definition (Barnett, 2011; Knox, Hess, Petersen & Hill, 1997), understanding of
18 therapist and client factors influencing self-disclosure (Barnett, 2011; Hill & Knox, 2002), as
19 well as meeting calls for the recognition of a self-disclosure typology (Knox & Hill, 2003;
20 Zur, 2008). Most recently, Ruddle and Dilks (2015) situated self-disclosure within direct
21 practical applications for effective delivery within therapy settings, whilst Henretty, Currier,
22 Berman, and Levitt (2014) signaled towards the key role[s] wider contextual factors play in a
23 practitioner's decision regarding why, when and how to self-disclose. Similarly, Way and
24 Vosloo (2016) recently called for a more developed understanding of self-disclosure, as a key

25 influencing skill, within the context of applied sport psychology consultancy. Their research
26 raised numerous practical considerations for self-disclosure (i.e. benefits, drawbacks,
27 awareness of client individual differences, and the importance of timing), and concluded with
28 a set of guidelines for practitioners in the application of self-disclosure within a sport
29 environment. These guidelines suggested that self-disclosure should be infrequent, given
30 prior consideration, be sensitive to the client's needs and feelings, and the content of which
31 should not be emotionally-charged for the practitioner. Despite Way and Vosloo's (2016)
32 excellent opening foray exploring self-disclosure within applied sport psychology there
33 remains a paucity of research into this area, particularly with regard to its implications for the
34 long-term boundaries and dynamics of the sport psychologist-athlete relationship.

35 The purpose of this article, therefore, is twofold; firstly, to extend the conversation on
36 self-disclosure in applied sport psychology and more specifically to summarise self-
37 disclosure focused applied sport psychology research utilising a typological framework (Zur,
38 2008), and secondly, to propose the use of a professional relationship model (Katz &
39 Hemmings, 2009) for better understanding the role and function of self-disclosure as
40 perceived by both consultant and athlete within a relational context.

41 **Self-disclosure: What is it?**

42 A significant challenge in conceptualising self-disclosure is posed through the
43 quantity and diversity of published definitions (Hill & Knox, 2001; Knox et al., 1997). The
44 definitions offered typically refer to various influential factors but tend to lack consistency.
45 For example, Barnett (2011, p. 315) simply describes self-disclosure as "the sharing of
46 personal information by the psychotherapist to the client", whereas Knox et al. (1997)
47 suggest that self-disclosure be defined as, "an interaction in which the [practitioner] reveals
48 personal information about him/herself, and/or reveals reactions and responses to the client as

49 they arise in the session” (p. 275). Consistent with Knox et al. (1997), Way and Vosloo
50 (2016) position self-disclosure, in applied sport psychology, as a form of verbal or non-verbal
51 communication that reveals information about the consultant and/or their responses to the
52 client, directly, or indirectly, through the consultancy process. While universal consensus
53 definition remains elusive, due to the range and complexity of factors influencing self-
54 disclosure conceptualisation, there is sufficient research and experiential evidence to suggest
55 that self-disclosure has the potential to significantly influence key consultancy process related
56 factors and valued psychological outcomes (Ruddle & Dilks, 2015; Way & Vosloo, 2016).

57 **Key factors influencing practitioner self-disclosure**

58 In the past, philosophically entrenched attitudes towards the use of self-disclosure
59 have been somewhat negatively framed (Knox & Hill, 2003), with psychoanalytical
60 practitioners in-particular suggesting that self-disclosure could only have a detrimental effect
61 on the client, preferring to adopt the Freudian impenetrable mirror, i.e. not sharing or
62 revealing anything at all personal, and reflecting the client’s focus back to the individual
63 themselves (Peterson, 2002), and arguing that “self-disclosure irrevocably contaminates and
64 damages the therapeutic process” (Harmell, 2010, p. 27). Similarly, Way and Vosloo (2016)
65 signpost towards the potential for less immediate and non-verbal forms of self-disclosure
66 infiltrating the consultancy process with an unintended consequence of diverting attention
67 more towards consultant, rather than client needs. In contrast, practitioners who advocate a
68 working alliance (Joyce & Sills, 2014) report more favourable responses to therapist self-
69 disclosure (Hill & Knox, 2002; Knox et al., 1997), with clients perceiving it with positive
70 regard when it was related to a significant event, or when it normalised their own
71 experiences, providing a positive model for behaviour change.

72 Practitioners guided by more humanistic and existentially framed philosophical
73 traditions (Hill & Knox, 2001; Nesti, 2004) emphasising greater authenticity and trust within
74 the client-consultant relationship may, however, utilise and experience self-disclosure
75 differently. Within existential practice, practitioners use self-disclosure as a core higher order
76 influencing skill and a vehicle by which storytelling is often used to inspire the client (Hill &
77 O'Brien, 1999). In sport psychology, existentially grounded research and practice (Nesti &
78 Littlewood, 2011) has long made use of personal narratives in supporting athletes to confront
79 'issues' and, in so-doing, facilitated an enhanced awareness towards the realisation of a more
80 self-fulfilling, authentic and resilient self-concept (Nesti, 2004). For existentialists, the
81 primacy placed on the subjective experience and authentic self-disclosure between athletes
82 and consultants reflects the need for the existence of a highly genuine, personal, and co-
83 operative relationship within the immediacy of the consultancy encounter (Nesti, 2004), and
84 beyond.

85 Significantly, however, instances of storytelling within applied sport psychology
86 consultancy (Windsor, Barker, & McCarthy, 2011) may often reflect more instrumental
87 motives for utilising self-disclosure and/or storytelling (e.g. normalising the consultancy
88 experience; establishing 'buy-in' to psychological skills training programmes). Within some
89 philosophical traditions (e.g. cognitive-behavioural, humanism) self-disclosure may be
90 viewed as a technique or tool (e.g. questioning, imagery, goal setting), whereas others (e.g.
91 existentialism) would position it as an implicit element of the relationship dynamics between
92 athlete and consultant. The use of self-disclosure in the context of sport psychology
93 consultancy is likely, therefore, to be significantly influenced by consultants' expertise in
94 achieving congruence of philosophy and method (Lindsay, Thomas, Breckon, & Maynard,
95 2007), and also in recognising the implications for the nature and conditions supportive of
96 'effective' sport psychologist-athlete relationships.

97 The suggestion that self-disclosure plays an influential role in shaping valued
98 facilitative conditions (e.g. establishing trust, developing an empathetic understanding,
99 achieving congruence and unconditional positive regard) associated with effective practice
100 has typically received more empirical attention in clinical psychology than in sport. Henretty
101 et al.'s (2014) meta-analysis highlighted several client responses to therapist self-disclosure
102 which resonate with some elemental relationship building factors such as similarity,
103 familiarity and complementarity (Hogg & Vaughan, 2005), but also caution that there are
104 significant moderators to the impact of self-disclosure such as timing, positive regard, and the
105 duration of the professional relationship. It may be that in the context of applied sport
106 psychology consultancy, self-disclosure is likely to be significantly influenced by individual
107 differences factors (e.g. age, gender, appearance), as well as environment and contextual
108 factors (e.g. intervention setting, consultant experience) and the subjective awareness and
109 efficacy of consultants' meta-skills influencing self-disclosure regulation (e.g. reflective
110 practice skill). Whilst acknowledging the over-riding sentiment that every self-disclosure
111 carries with it an element of risk and potential threat to the perceived 'quality' and conditions
112 associated with the consultant-client relationship, it is also important to recognise the
113 potential for a more facilitative interpretation of self-disclosure within the context of the
114 consultancy relationship.

115 **Self-disclosure as an 'effective' intervention strategy**

116 Knox and Hill (2003) suggested that self-disclosure be viewed as a useful intervention
117 strategy, asserting its judicious use guided by client need and practitioner preference.
118 However, while there are certain involuntary elements of practitioner self-disclosure which
119 may be impossible to avoid (Mahalik, van Ormer, & Simi, 2000), an overriding principle of
120 self-disclosure is that it is consented to by the client. Although, to assume only a conscious

121 verbal disclosure, fails to acknowledge the more emotional self-disclosures (Mahalik et al.,
122 2000), for example body language, gestures, facial expressions, which are often
123 unconsciously transmitted via non-verbal responses to the client's dialogue, as well as
124 reflected through a sport psychology consultant's immersion within applied sport settings i.e.
125 visible presence at early-morning training sessions, wearing the team colours/kit, or
126 attendance at competitions. Despite the recent emergence of typologies and classification
127 systems for self-disclosure (Knox & Hill, 2003; Zur, 2008), there remains little consensus
128 regarding an organised structure for understanding the diverse types and efficacious (or not)
129 uses of self-disclosure based on empirical evidence across a range of populations or
130 disciplines. Ultimately for any practitioner, be it in a clinical, counselling, or sports
131 psychology setting, the active use of self-disclosure as an intervention or technique is likely
132 to be highly subjective, sensitive to situational determinants governing its efficacious use,
133 and may vary on a case-by-case basis.

134 It is also important, at this stage, to advance the assertion that the relationships created
135 between *sport* psychology consultants and athletes are often forged in radically different
136 environments and governed by potentially differing philosophies (Poczwardowski, Sherman,
137 & Ravizza, 2004) and often using different processes and models (Keegan, 2016), to those in
138 therapeutic and clinical settings. Therefore, to fully understand and appreciate the potential
139 for self-disclosure to influence the practice of applied sport psychologists, it is important to
140 conceptualise self-disclosure in the context of the specific demands and challenges facing
141 applied sport psychologists rather than viewed through a 'therapeutic' lens.

142 **Self-disclosure in the context of applied sport psychology consultancy**

143 In the sport psychology literature, despite some empirical evidence locating self-
144 disclosure as a key inter-personal professional skill influencing athlete attitudes and

145 expectations (Martin et al., 2001) as well as athletes' overall perceptions (Sharp & Hodge,
146 2013; Windsor, Barker & McCarthy, 2011) of sport psychologist effectiveness, there is a
147 relative lack of research attention afforded to understanding how self-disclosure is used and
148 influenced, in the context of applied sport psychology practice. Unlike psychological practice
149 in a clinical setting, "the professional context of peripatetic work environments place
150 particular demands on sport psychologists in ensuring and maintaining effective professional
151 relationships" (Katz & Hemmings, 2009, p.19), as such the relationship may fluctuate
152 dependent on the client and the consultant successfully navigating not only complex
153 interpersonal dynamics, but also highly variable and potentially pressure-infused
154 organisational and environmental backdrops to the consultancy. For example, travel to
155 competitions with a team or individual athlete will incur a variety of social situations such as
156 dining, socialising, presence at training and/or competition environments, all of which may
157 potentially reveal another layer of both the athlete and/or the sport psychology consultant
158 (Sharp & Hodge, 2013). Furthermore, the aforementioned research would suggest a need for
159 acute awareness and understanding of the contextually sensitive tacit knowledge and skills
160 associated with on-going monitoring, management, and evaluation of the consultancy (Katz
161 & Hemmings, 2009). It is imperative, therefore, that the sport psychologist is aware of the
162 potential consequences and opportunities this presents for rationalising the use of self-
163 disclosure, and importantly how this fits into their own ethos of best practice (Barnett, 2011;
164 Hill & Knox, 2001; Ruddle & Dilks, 2015).

165 **A typology of self-disclosure in applied sport psychology research**

166 As previously mentioned, self-disclosure plays an influential role in shaping valued
167 facilitative conditions (e.g. establishing trust, developing an empathic understanding,
168 achieving congruence and unconditional positive regard) associated with effective sport

169 psychology practice. Significantly, much of the literature reflecting self-disclosure (see Table
170 1) within the context of the sport psychology consultancy process has not sought to examine
171 the strengths, limitations, or professional practice implications of self-disclosure to the same
172 extent as in clinical settings. This lack of consideration is surprising given that self-disclosure
173 represents a skill capable of orchestrating an effective working alliance, promoting
174 authenticity, and supplementing the conditions for positive professional relationships (Ruddle
175 & Dilks, 2015).

176 Despite the relative proliferation of research into self-disclosure from a clinical
177 psychology perspective, compared with sport psychology; there remains a paucity of research
178 that seeks to contextualise self-disclosure beyond the clinical setting and approach it from
179 both consultant and client perspectives. Zur (2008, 2009) offers a unique digitally-mediated
180 advance on self-disclosure, suggesting that research into practitioner and client self-
181 disclosure (either sub-conscious or strategic) needs to move beyond the consulting room and
182 be understood in terms of a wide range of potential factors (e.g. internet searches, spirituality,
183 and political ideology) influencing self-disclosure aetiology, application, interpretation, and
184 possible outcome[s] across settings. For example; with more and more sport psychology
185 consultants engaging in self-promotion and advertising their services online, there is
186 increasing opportunity for curious athletes (or ‘clients’) to uncover personal and professional
187 ‘disclosures’ (e.g. sexual orientation, client testimonials, social media ‘posts’), that might
188 contaminate the sport psychologist-athlete relationship and/or significantly influence the
189 outcome of any future consultancy. Therefore, future research into the effective practice of
190 applied sport psychology consultants, both experienced and neophyte, should be mindful of,
191 and seek to further explore, the personal, professional, and ethical implications of self-
192 disclosure use, in applied sport psychology settings.

193 Pragmatically, for a sport psychologist to decide when, and how, to use self-
194 disclosure intentionally within the consultancy process, there needs to be a much clearer
195 understanding of the diverse types of self-disclosure and how sport psychology consultants
196 might intentionally, as well as unintentionally, apply self-disclosure to benefit the athlete and
197 ensure congruence with the intervention goals. In other words, a broader and multi-layered
198 understanding of self-disclosure will better ensure a wider and more critical approach in
199 considering this aspect of applied practice (Ziv-Beiman, 2013). In light of this, a review of
200 the applied sport psychology literature - exploring for examples of self-disclosure use within
201 applied sport psychology research, utilising Zur's (2008) typology as an a-priori framework –
202 is provided (see Table 1) to not only stimulate further research, but also raise awareness as to
203 consultants' own use of self-disclosure and to facilitate relevant professional development.

204 Zur (2008) proposes five types of self-disclosure: deliberate, unavoidable, accidental,
205 inappropriate, and client-initiated. 'Deliberate' self-disclosure either refers to the intentional,
206 and/or strategic, revealing of personal information (*self-revealing*; e.g. consultant disclosing
207 sensitive information from their past), and/or the consultant's self-disclosure occurring in
208 response to the athlete in the context of the consultancy (*self-involving*; e.g. showing concern
209 in response to the athlete's own disclosures, perhaps represented by a sensitively timed touch
210 on the arm and/or accompanying empathic statement). 'Unavoidable' self-disclosure includes
211 individual differences (e.g. age, gender, disability), personal factors (e.g. family background,
212 religion, spirituality), specific behavioural responses (e.g. body language, frowns), and
213 environmental factors (e.g. work location, competition travel/support); all of which may not
214 be fully under control. 'Accidental' self-disclosure refers to unplanned moments whereby
215 consultants unwittingly disclose information to athletes (e.g. being observed talking with a
216 coach, or a team mate, either prior to or post consultation). 'Inappropriate' self-disclosure
217 involves consultants sharing their own struggles and/or sacrifices with the athlete, which may

218 have the un-intended consequence of psychologically burdening the athlete (e.g. disclosing
219 marital/relational difficulties, time-pressure, or a heavy work-load). Finally, ‘client-initiated’
220 self-disclosure is when athletes (or clients) deliberately seek out information on the
221 consultant which may have consciously (e.g. business card, website, social media posts) or
222 unwittingly (e.g. internet search results, online social media posts and social networks) been
223 disclosed.

224

INSERT TABLE 1

225 The extant sport psychology literature (see Table 1) reveals more frequent (compared
226 with unavoidable, accidental, inappropriate, client-initiated) instances of deliberate self-
227 disclosures in the context of sport psychology practice. Therefore, it could be that deliberate
228 self-disclosure is pre-dominantly used by sport psychology consultants as a means of inviting
229 athlete self-disclosure as an entry point to the opening-up and relationship-building process
230 (Way & Vosloo, 2016), and in creating facilitative conditions underpinning effective practice
231 (Katz & Hemmings, 2009; Sharp, Hodge & Danish, 2015; Windsor, Barker & McCarthy,
232 2011). Adopting this point-of-view, however, poses some interesting paradoxes of practice.
233 Firstly, despite deliberate self-disclosure being the most prevalent type of self-disclosure
234 found within the professional practice evidence-base, there is little explicit acknowledgment
235 of the term ‘self-disclosure’, and next to no evidence of more refined references to the
236 specific type (e.g. deliberate) of self-disclosure being utilised by sport psychology
237 consultants. Secondly, if deliberate self-disclosure is considered important to the opening-up
238 and/or maintenance of the sport psychologist-athlete relationship, then it might be reasonable
239 to expect to see more empirical evidence addressing cause and effect of deliberate self-
240 disclosure (either planned for, or unwittingly) at different stages throughout the consultancy
241 process. However, this does not appear to be the case with the evidence base reflecting a

242 preponderance of deliberate self-disclosure use in the early phases of the consultancy process
243 and being more focused towards trust and rapport-building (e.g. Windsor, Barker &
244 McCarthy, 2011; Woodcock, Richards & Mugford, 2008; see Table 1). The implication
245 being, perhaps, that relationship-building between consultant and athlete, utilising deliberate
246 self-disclosure intervention[s], is prioritised during early phases of consultancy as a function
247 of consultants' reliance on neatly defined, and sequentially organised, consultancy process
248 models (e.g. Keegan, 2016). It may also be that sport psychologists lack the professional
249 language, culturally and contextually sensitive training practices, and a sufficient professional
250 evidence base to accurately identify self-disclosure in all its forms, thus restricting its
251 efficacious use across the entire consultancy encounter.

252 It would therefore appear warranted, to explore how self-disclosure might be
253 deliberately applied within the broader consultancy framework of a consultancy process
254 model (Keegan, 2016). For example, understanding self-disclosure in the context of different
255 phases (e.g. case formulation, needs analysis, strategy formulation and intervention plan).
256 However, it is also feasible that other types of self-disclosure, in the context of applied sport
257 psychology consultancy, may permeate the consultancy process and sport psychologist-
258 athlete relationship. These may be dynamically influenced by a wide-range of personal,
259 environmental, contextual, and cultural factors, which extend beyond deliberate self-
260 disclosures and include more unavoidable and client-initiated self-disclosures (Bull, 1995;
261 Sarker, Hill & Parker, 2014; Windsor et al., 2011). During consultation it is likely that
262 consultants' meta-skills (e.g. self-awareness, self-regulation, empathic accuracy, and
263 reflection) will be key determinants in the timing and appropriateness of self-disclosure and
264 will exert significant influence over on-going client and consultant perception of self-
265 disclosure use (Cropley, Miles, Hanton & Niven, 2007), as the consultancy unfolds.

266 A worthwhile exploration would be to investigate the determinants of successful self-
267 disclosure beyond the relational factors previously discussed. It appears evident that several
268 factors could shape the perception and outcome of more unavoidable, accidental, and client-
269 initiated self-disclosures. For example, thanks to social media both parties respectively may
270 have formed an impression of the other long before they have even met, therefore careful
271 consideration and attention to privacy settings must be a priority for any practitioner starting
272 out. Additionally, the disclosure of one's religious beliefs may inadvertently create tension
273 within the sport psychologist-athlete relationship where dissonance exists, and the potential
274 for a shift to a more 'personal' stance in instances of congruence in spiritual or religious
275 beliefs. There is little evidence supporting this assumption, but perhaps the question has just
276 not been asked in sport consultancy settings.

277 From a professional development perspective, therefore, the use of a typology poses
278 important professional practice-related questions for the sport psychologist as to the
279 pertinence and qualified use of self-disclosure in practice. The consultant must initially
280 consider not only the source of the [deliberate] self-disclosure in terms of personal and/or
281 professional origins, but also ensure that it is something that is already resolved on a personal
282 level and that self-disclosures of a professional nature are subjected to appropriate reflexive
283 self-enquiry. The sport psychology consultant must also consider how the self-disclosure will
284 be perceived by the client on a personal and professional level, and the resultant implications
285 for the relationship and future professional judgment and decision-making (Martindale &
286 Collins, 2013).

287 **Navigating self-disclosure within the sport psychologist-athlete relationship**

288 It is important to consider the multi-faceted nature of the sport psychologist-athlete
289 relationship – professional and personal – and the key roles played by the facilitative

290 conditions (e.g. self-disclosure, empathy, trust, genuineness) supporting the relationship.
291 Indeed, the boundaries and dynamics of the personal-professional roles implicit within the
292 consultancy process will shape the very nature of the ongoing consultant-athlete relationship
293 itself. For example, an internet search might yield a client-initiated and somewhat
294 unavoidable self-disclosure (e.g., that the sport psychologist supports a particular team, a
295 photo out socialising with friends) that shapes the athlete's perception of the sport
296 psychologist as a person and might be reflected upon with reference to the athlete's beliefs
297 and values of the sport psychologist as a person and a professional, which might subsequently
298 influence the dynamics of the professional relationship. Alternatively, the sport psychologist
299 might deliberately self-disclose within a consultation (e.g. that they support a particular
300 team), reflecting the athlete's own interest in that sport, with the intention to build trust and
301 authenticity, generating a personal connection, which subsequently influences the
302 professional relationship. Katz and Hemmings' (2009) 1:1 Consultation Model provides an
303 appropriate framework for exploring the aforementioned boundaries and dynamics of the
304 sport psychologist-athlete relationship (see Figure 1). The impact of such revelations, such as
305 the examples described above, could be perceived as either constructive or destructive
306 dependent upon a number of contextual factors (i.e. nature/culture of the sport, stage of
307 relationship, athlete values and interests, sport psychologist-athlete goals) and the subjective
308 perceptions of both parties. Therefore, a dynamic and contextually sensitive understanding of
309 self-disclosure which is more representative of the multitude of considerations facing applied
310 practitioners, both immersed and/or consulting in applied sport settings, is needed.

311 INSERT FIGURE 1

312 Further applied sport psychology research and reflections from both neophyte and
313 experienced practitioners would provide greater understanding of experiences of the varying

314 types of self-disclosure and their practical application within the context of sport psychology.
315 Moreover, positioning this construct within published models of good practice and effective
316 consulting (Keegan, 2016; Martin et al., 2001; Partington & Orlick, 1987, Poczwadowski et
317 al., 1998; Poczwadowski, et al., 2004; Sharp et al., 2015; Windsor et al., 2011) to assist in
318 formulating and maintaining effective sport psychologist-athlete relationships, may in turn
319 further understanding of the unique and evolving role of the applied practitioner within a
320 sporting context.

321

322

References

- 323 Barker, J. B., McCarthy, P. J., & Harwood, C. G. (2011). Reflections on consulting in elite
324 youth male English cricket and soccer academies. *Sport & Exercise Psychology*
325 *Review*, 7(2), 58-69.
- 326 Barker, J. B., Evans, A. L., Coffee, P., Slater, M. J., & McCarthy, P. J. (2014). Consulting on
327 tour: A dual phase personal-disclosure mutual-sharing intervention and group
328 functioning in elite youth cricket. *The Sport Psychologist*, 28, 186-197.
- 329 Barnett, J. E. (2011). Psychotherapist self-disclosure: Ethical and clinical considerations.
330 *Psychotherapy*, 48(4), 315-321.
- 331 Brewer, B. W. & Petitpas, A. J. (2005). Returning to the self: The anxieties of coming back
332 after injury. In M. B. Andersen (Ed.), *Sport psychology in practice* (pp.93-108).
333 Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- 334 Bull, S. J. (1995). Reflections on a 5-year consultancy program with the England women's
335 cricket team. *The Sport Psychologist*, 9, 148-163.

- 336 Cropley, B., Miles, A., Hanton, S., & Niven, A. (2007). Improving the delivery of applied
337 sport psychology support through reflective practice. *The Sport Psychologist*, 21,
338 475–494.
- 339 Edwards, C. E. & Murdock, N. L. (1994). Characteristics of therapist self-disclosure in the
340 counselling process. *Journal of Counselling and Development*, 72, 384-389.
- 341 Gaines, R. (2003). Therapist self-disclosure with children, adolescents, and their parents.
342 *JCLP/In Session*, 59(5), 569-580.
- 343 Giges, B. (1998). Psychodynamic concepts in sport psychology: Comment on Streaan and
344 Streaan (1998). *The Sport Psychologist*, 12, 223-227.
- 345 Harmell, P. H. (2010). To disclose or not disclose: That is the question. *The California*
346 *Psychologist*, March/April, 27-28.
- 347 Henretty, J. R., Currier, J. M., Berman, J. S., & Levitt, H. M. (2014). The impact of
348 counsellor self-disclosure on clients: A meta-analytic review of experimental and
349 quasi-experimental research. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 61(2), 191-207.
- 350 Hill, C. E. & Knox, S. (2001). Self-disclosure. *Psychotherapy*, 38(4), 413-417.
- 351 Hill, C. E. & Knox, S. (2002). Self-disclosure. In: Norcross, J. C. (Ed.) *Psychotherapy*
352 *relationships that work*. (pp. 255-265). New York: Oxford.
- 353 Hill, C. E. & O'Brien, K. M. (1999). *Helping skills: Facilitating, exploration, insight and*
354 *action*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- 355 Hogg, M. A. & Vaughan, G. M. (2005). *Social psychology* (4th edn). Harlow: Pearson
356 Education Limited.

- 357 Joyce, P. & Sills, C. (2014). *Skills in Gestalt: Counselling and psychotherapy*. (3rd edn).
358 London: Sage Publications.
- 359 Katz, J. & Hemmings, B. (2009). *Counselling skills handbook for the sport psychologist*.
360 Leicester: British Psychological Society.
- 361 Keegan, R. (2016). *Being a sport psychologist*. London: Palgrave.
- 362 Knox, S., Hess, S. A., Petersen, D. A., & Hill, C. E. (1997). A qualitative analysis of client
363 perceptions of the effects of helpful therapist self-disclosure in long-term therapy.
364 *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 44(3), 274-283.
- 365 Knox, S. & Hill, C. E. (2003). Therapist self-disclosure: Research-based suggestions for
366 practitioners. *JCLP/In Session*, 59(5), 529-539.
- 367 Lindsay, P., Breckon, J.D., Thomas, O., & Maynard, I.W. (2007). In Pursuit of Congruence:
368 A Personal Reflection on Methods and Philosophy in Applied Practice. *The Sport*
369 *Psychologist*, 21(3), 335-352. DOI:10.1123/tsp.21.3.335
- 370 Mahalik, J., van Ormer, E., & Simi, N. (2000). Ethical issues in using self-disclosure in
371 feminist therapy. In Brabeck, M. (Ed.), *Practicing feminist ethics in psychology*.
372 Washington, DC: APA.
- 373 Martindale, A. & Collins, D. (2013). The development of professional judgement and
374 decision-making expertise in applied sport psychology. *The Sport Psychologist*, 27(4),
375 390-398. doi:10.1123/tsp.27.4.390
- 376 Martin, S. B., Akers, A., Jackson, A. W., Wrisberg, C. A., Nelson, L., Leslie, P. J., & Leidig,
377 L. (2001). Male and female athletes' and nonathletes' expectations about sport

- 378 psychology consulting. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 13(1), 18-39. doi:
379 10.1080/10413200109339002
- 380 Nesti, M. (2004). *Existential Psychology and Sport: Theory and Application*. Oxon:
381 Routledge
- 382 Nesti, M. & Littlewood, M. (2011). Making your way in the game: Boundary situations in
383 England's professional football world. In: D. Gilbourne and M. B. Anderson (Eds.).
384 *Critical essays in applied sport psychology* (pp. 233-250). Champaign, IL: Human
385 Kinetics.
- 386 Partington, J., & Orlick, T. (1987). The sport psychology consultant evaluation form. *The*
387 *Sport Psychologist*, 1, 309-317.
- 388 Peterson, Z. (2002). More than a mirror: The ethics of therapist self-disclosure.
389 *Psychotherapy: Theory/Research/Practice/Training*, 39(1), 21-31.
- 390 Petitpas, A. J., Giges, B., & Danish, S. J. (1999). The sport psychologist-athlete relationship:
391 Implications for training. *The Sport Psychologist*, 13, 344-357.
- 392 Poczwadowski, A., Sherman, C. P., & Henschen, K. P. (1998). A sport psychology service
393 heuristic: building on theory and practice. *The Sport Psychologist*, 12, 191-207.
- 394 Poczwadowski, A., Sherman, C. P., & Ravizza, K. (2004). Professional philosophy in the
395 sport psychology service delivery: building on theory and practice. *The Sport*
396 *Psychologist*, 18, 445-463.
- 397 Ruddle, A. & Dilks, S. (2015). Opening up to disclosure. *The Psychologist*, 28(6), 458-461.
- 398 Ryba, T. V., Stambulova, N. B., Si, G., & Schinke, R. J. (2013). ISSP position stand:
399 Culturally competent research and practice in sport and exercise psychology.

- 400 *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11, 123-142.
401 doi:10.1080/1612197X.2013.779812
- 402 Sarkar, M., Hill, D. M., & Parker, A. (2014). Working with religious and spiritual athletes:
403 Ethical considerations for sport psychologists. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 15,
404 580-587. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.05.006
- 405 Sharp, L. & Hodge, K. (2013). Effective sport psychology consulting relationships: two
406 coach case studies. *The Sport Psychologist*, 27, 313-324.
- 407 Sharp, L., Hodge, K., & Danish, S. (2015). Ultimately it comes down to the relationship:
408 experienced consultants' views of effective sport psychology consulting. *The Sport*
409 *Psychologist*, 29(4), 358-370.
- 410 Way, W. & Vosloo, J. (2016). Practical considerations for self-disclosure in applied sport
411 psychology. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action*, 7(1), 23-32.
- 412 Windsor, P. M., Barker, J., & McCarthy, P. (2011). Doing sport psychology: personal-
413 disclosure mutual-sharing in professional soccer. *The Sport Psychologist*, 25, 94-114.
- 414 Woodcock, C., Richards, H., & Mugford, A. (2008). Quality counts: Critical features for
415 neophyte professional development. *The Sport Psychologist*, 22(4), 491-506.
- 416 Ziv-Beiman, S. (2013). Therapist self-disclosure as an integrative intervention, *Journal of*
417 *Psychotherapy Integration*, 23(1), 59-74.
- 418 Zur, O. (2008). Google factor: Therapists' self-disclosure in the age of the internet.
419 *Independent Practitioner*, 28(2), 83-85.
- 420 Zur, O. (2009). Psychotherapist Self-Disclosure and Transparency in the Internet Age.
421 *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 40(1), 22-30.

Table 1:

Overview of Zur's (2008) self-disclosure types applied to sport psychology

SD Types	Description	Applied Examples	Strengths/Weaknesses	Practice Implications
Deliberate	<i>Intentional disclosure of personal information, verbal or otherwise. Either self-revealing or self-involving (reactive)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Barker et al. (2011)</i> - Complete integration within the environment; presence at training / events ➤ <i>Cropley et al. (2007); Sharp & Hodge, (2013)</i> – Sharing personal stories to engage athletes, group sharing, and emphasise salient points ➤ <i>Woodcock et al. (2008)</i> – Honest and informal ➤ <i>Windsor et al. (2011); Barker et al. (2014)</i> – Mutual sharing for team building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Enhances rapport and credibility with athletes; provides support to coaches; ➤ Strengthens relationship; asserts genuine support in athlete's development; normalises concerns ➤ Encourages trust; enhances team cohesion; increases understanding and knowledge of others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Authenticity of disclosure required for building trust ➤ Avoid excessive deliberate disclosure ➤ Take time to consider the timing, context, appropriateness and athletes' individual differences ➤ Ensure disclosure is brief and focus is promptly brought back to the athlete
Unavoidable	<i>Gender, age, physical appearance, life outside the office.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Bull (1995)</i> – Gender & social interactions ➤ <i>Ryba et al. (2013)</i> – Cultural awareness ➤ <i>Sarkar et al. (2014)</i> – Religious and spiritual beliefs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Both athlete and practitioner bring their own cultural, appearance and personal beliefs to the relationship ➤ Little guidance on self-disclosure with regards to religion or spirituality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Engage in supervision ➤ Ethical code of conduct ➤ Practitioners engage in reflection and be mindful of personal beliefs
Accidental	<i>Spontaneous reaction</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No evidence found 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ n/a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Further investigation required
Inappropriate	<i>Beneficial to practitioner, may burden the client with information about self</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Petitpas et al. (1999)</i> – Considering motives behind disclosure ➤ <i>Brewer & Petitpas (2005)</i> – Sharing experiences to prove credibility/knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lack of self-awareness may compromise relationship ➤ Sharing of emotionally unresolved information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ensure disclosure is for benefit of the athlete ➤ Avoid emotionally unresolved information
Client-initiated	<i>Client seeks professional and personal information about the practitioner</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Windsor et al. (2011)</i> - PDMS ➤ <i>Giges (1998)</i> – Meeting clients' needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Information obtained by client via other sources (i.e. social media, websites). Disclosed to satisfy client needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Professional judgment needed regarding response to client ➤ Manage information published

Figure 1:

Katz and Hemmings' (2009) 1:1 Consultation Model

