

2019

## Confidentiality in Counselor Experiential Training Groups: An Exploratory Study

Poonam V. Doshi  
*Pace University*

Rostyslaw W. Robak  
*Pace University*

Paul W. Grffin  
*Pace University*

Alfred W. Ward  
*Pace University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jcrp>



Part of the [Counselor Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Doshi, Poonam V.; Robak, Rostyslaw W.; Grffin, Paul W.; and Ward, Alfred W. (2019) "Confidentiality in Counselor Experiential Training Groups: An Exploratory Study," *Journal of Counseling Research and Practice*: Vol. 5: Iss. 1, Article 3.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56702/UCKX8598/jcrp0501.3>

Available at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jcrp/vol5/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Education, School of at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Counseling Research and Practice* by an authorized editor of eGrove. For more information, please contact [egrove@olemiss.edu](mailto:egrove@olemiss.edu).

**Poonam V. Doshi**  
**Rostyslaw W. Robak**  
**Paul W. Griffin**  
**Alfred W. Ward**  
*Pace University*

**Abstract**

This study investigated whether maintaining confidentiality influenced members' self-disclosure and perceptions of benefitting from group experience in the context of an instructor-led experiential graduate-level training group. Participants were 31 counselors-in-training in a 60-credit master's degree program in mental health counseling enrolled in an experiential group dynamics class. The findings indicate that maintaining confidentiality is positively associated with increased self-disclosure among group members as well as perceived benefit from the group. The implications of these findings for educators as well as practicing counselors and researchers are discussed.

**Overview of Confidentiality & Experiential Groups**

Confidentiality is essentially an ethical construct that requires a professional counselor to safeguard the information shared by the client in order to protect client's privacy. Maintaining confidentiality in a counselor-client relationship helps establish a trusting relationship between the two parties and thus promote client growth (American Counseling Association [ACA], 2014). Within the context of group counseling, maintaining confidentiality is important, but made more difficult, because there are not only client-counselor interactions but also multiple member-to-member interactions involved. The overarching importance of confidentiality is examined in this study within the context of an experiential training group for mental health counseling graduate students.

Experiential groups within professional training programs are inherently prone to issues of confidentiality due to dual relationships (Pepper, 2004). For

instance, the course instructor is often the leader of the group. Moreover, members may already be familiar to each other as classmates or friends prior to the group. Nonetheless, experiential groups are widely used in counselor education programs and are perceived as valuable for the preparation of counselor trainees (Shumaker, Ortiz, & Brenninkmeyer, 2011). The researchers of the present study were interested in understanding the effects of confidentiality on group members' behaviors and experiences in experiential training groups.

**Ethical Standards and Guidelines Relevant to Confidentiality and Experiential Groups**

The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2015) requires training activities that "contribute to personal and professional growth" in counseling students (Standard II.C, p. 10). CACREP has set a minimal standard for such training experiences. This standard, pertaining to the preparation of counselors in the area of

group counseling, states that part of such preparation should include “direct experiences in which students participate as group members in a small group activity” (CACREP, 2015, p. 13). The professional training standards of the Association for Specialists in Group Work (ASGW, 2000) also require, as part of their core training standards, an experience of at least 10 clock hours. The standards also recommend 20 clock hours of observation and supervised participation in a group experience as a group member and/or as a group leader. Thus, experiential training groups are an integral component of counselor training.

Confidentiality is not only a therapeutic imperative but also an ethical mandate (International Association of Group Psychotherapy [IAGP], 2009). The accountability for clearly describing confidentiality and its limits rests on the part of group leaders (Wheeler & Bertram, 2008). Section B.4.a of the American Counseling Association code of ethics states that, “in group work, counselors clearly explain the importance and parameters of confidentiality for the specific group” (ACA, 2014, p. 7). Section A.7.d of the best practices guidelines of the Association for Specialists in Group Work (Thomas & Pender, 2008) recommends that the group leader should clearly state confidentiality as well as its limitations to the group members. For instance, this includes describing the ethical and legal obligations by the counselor to safeguard the information shared as well as circumstances under which the confidentiality is broken, such as risk of harm to self or others. Although this legal obligation does not apply to group members, ASGW guidelines strongly recommend that group leaders discuss with the members the effects of maintaining, as well as costs of

revealing, confidential information shared by the peers in their group.

### **Research on Confidentiality in Groups**

Experiential training groups in counseling programs consist of elements such as exploring personal issues related to the focus of the group while providing counselor trainees with knowledge about the group processes and skills (Kiweewa, Gilbride, Luke, & Seward, 2013). Experiential training groups have been found to have beneficial effects including powerful learning in a practical sense and personal development of the counselor trainees (Kajankova, 2014; Ohrt, Ener, Porter, & Young, 2014; Smith & Davis-Gage, 2008). In a qualitative study of 22 professional counselors, Ohrt et al. (2014) found that counselors reported several key learning outcomes in their own training groups. These included the opportunity to practice leading a group, observing an experienced leader, receiving feedback, and their “experiential group participation.” One study of a 10 hour personal growth group showed that students who were enrolled in this group as a part of their masters’ level counselor education curriculum, gained knowledge of such group processes as group development, therapeutic factors in group, and personal growth (Young, Reysen, Eskridge, & Ohrt, 2013). While the use of group counseling has long been a mainstay of counseling practice (Scheidlinger, 2000; Yalom & Leszcz, 2005) and while many aspects of the group counseling process have been examined, there is relatively little empirical research in the area of confidentiality in experiential training groups, in particular. The purpose of this study, therefore, is to understand the effects of confidentiality on members’ behaviors such as self-disclosure and feedback exchange as well as experiences such as

perceived benefits within an experiential training group.

Research indicates that maintaining confidentiality in a group can be difficult for group leaders (Welfel, 2006). Absolute confidentiality in any counseling group is difficult because of the intense nature of group interactions and the number of participants involved (Pepper, 2004). This may be particularly applicable within professional preparation training groups because of the ongoing relationships among students. Lasky (2005) found that 34% of the 315 practicing group leaders whom she surveyed reported that one or more of their group members broke the confidentiality of a member during the most recent two years of their practices. Lasky (2005) also reported that 63% of the surveyed group leaders felt that addressing confidentiality as well as its limits may actually positively affect self-disclosure. A study by Roback, Ochoa, Bloch, and Purdon (1992) found that of 300 experienced group leaders about 54% felt that group members had violated confidentiality. Of the surveyed group leaders in this earlier study, only 57% of the group leaders had discussed the costs of violating confidentiality.

It is important to note that the members of groups, in contrast to group leaders, are not ethically bound by confidentiality (Rapin, 2004; Roback, Moore, Bloch, & Shelton, 1996). Lasky and Riva (2006) asserted that group members' beliefs that possible violations of confidentiality have occurred during a group have the potential of minimizing the central counseling process of self-disclosure, which in turn may decrease therapy outcomes.

### **Confidentiality and its Effect on Self-disclosure and Perceived Benefits in Experiential Groups**

Kiweewa et al. (2013) defined self-disclosure as a growth factor where members disclose personal information or/and experiences in the group consisting of past or present thoughts, actions, behaviors, feelings, etc. Since the interaction among group members is a defining component of group counseling, mutual self-disclosures are very important (Welfel, 2006). Hough (1992) stated that self-disclosure and confidentiality conjointly operate in the dynamics of a meaningful counseling group. He asserted that self-disclosure is an asset without which the members of the counseling group could not make significant gains and progress. Kiweewa et al. (2013) reported that the group members in their study experienced cathartic benefits from the group by expressing aspects of their lives and by observing others self-disclose. Group members, therefore, directly benefit from the mutual self-disclosure within an emotionally safe environment that is greatly supported through confidentiality.

Shumaker et al. (2011) reported in their survey of counseling training programs that approximately 90% of programs utilize experiential training groups. An emphasis on confidentiality and emotional safety within such groups is important because it acknowledges and highlights the sensitive nature of these experiences. Robson and Robson (2008) asked student counselors about their experiences in an experiential training group and found that safety was the dominant theme. Confidentiality is essential to promoting a sense of safety in group experiences.

In a study involving 82 instructors, Shumaker et al. (2011), reported that 28% believed that there were problems with

students' violations of confidentiality in their groups, and 8% believed that there were instructor violations of confidentiality. Pierce and Baldwin (1990) highlighted the importance of addressing privacy in the training of counseling students. They offered a set of nine suggestions for professional training programs; four of these points involve confidentiality. These include being sensitive to students' privacy needs, guiding appropriate participation, guiding appropriate self-disclosure, and assisting students to select topics for self-disclosure. Kiweewa et al. (2013) studied growth factors using a critical incident questionnaire with master's level counselor trainees enrolled in an experiential training group. They found twelve growth factors, including self-disclosure, that accounted for the majority of reported critical incidents which affected students' personal growth. Finally, while absolute confidentiality is impossible to guarantee, it is reasonable to assume that the degree to which members maintain some agreed upon level of confidentiality will have effects on the degree to which members feel safe to participate, to self-disclose, to give feedback to others, and to benefit from the group in personal and professional domains.

Confidentiality should be addressed in the beginning of any counseling group. Effectiveness of a group depends on multiple factors, but the two most salient are adherence to confidentiality by both group leader and members and also the degree of mutual self-disclosure (Roback et al., 1996; Shumaker et al., 2011). However, the literature addressing the relationship between these variables is limited. Therefore, we attempted to address this gap in the literature by studying the relationship between maintaining confidentiality and perceived outcomes of maintaining confidentiality including increased self-

disclosure and perceiving the benefits in an experiential training group. Several studies have shown that participating in an experiential group facilitates trainees' growth and development as counselors (Anderson, Gariglietti, & Price, 1998; Hensley, Smith, & Thompson, 2003; Luke & Kiweewa, 2010).

In this study, we hypothesized that: (1) There would be a significant increase in the importance that group members attach to confidentiality by the end of their groups; (2) There would be significant correlations between the group members' recognition of the importance of confidentiality and the outcomes of both benefiting from the group and of the processes of engaging in self-disclosure and exchanging feedback; and (3) Group members who were tempted to break confidentiality at pre-group would disclose less and benefit less from the group experience.

## **Method**

In the present study, students in a required "Group Dynamics" course in a master's-level training program in mental health counseling took part in an 8-session experiential training group. The first-session included a detailed discussion of confidentiality. Every group then came to a specific consensus (details included in section describing training procedures) about the confidentiality within their particular group before any other activities were initiated.

Participants were asked to complete measures of perceived importance of confidentiality both pre-group and post-group. Participants also responded to an outcome measure inquiring about self-disclosure within the group as well as their

self-perceived benefits from the group experience.

## **Participants**

The researchers obtained approval from the University's Institutional Review Board (IRB). Fifty-two counselors-in-training in a 60-credit master's degree program in mental health counseling at a mid-sized university in the Northeast United States participated in this study. Because we added certain post-test measures at a later point, 31 students are considered in our final statistical analyses. Students over the span of five semesters participated in one of the five Group Dynamics sections offered during that time. Each group consisted of no more than 10-11 participants. All groups were led by the same group leader who also was the professor for the course. The students were not asked to identify their ages or their genders because such identification could easily compromise their anonymity in such small groups. However, since every student in the program enrolls in this course, we used the population numbers of students in the program and took the total enrollment numbers during those academic years as reasonable estimates of the student distributions in our groups. During this timeframe, 23 students were women and 8 students were men. Of the 31 respondents, 23 students were between the ages of 22-35 and 8 students were over 35. The participants were in the first year of a 60-credit master's program in mental health counseling. In terms of ethnicity, 18 participants were White/Caucasian (non-Hispanic), 4 participants identified as African American/Caribbean (non-Hispanic), 4 identified as Latino/Hispanic, 1 participant was Asian (or Pacific Islander), 1 identified as non-resident alien, and finally 2 participants reported their ethnicity as multi-racial.

There were no penalties for declining to participate and no rewards for participating in the study. Volunteers were treated in accordance with the American Counseling Association Code of Ethics (2014), the "Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct" ("2010 Amendments to the 2002 'Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct'," 2010; "Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct," 2002).

## **Training Group Procedures**

When the groups met on the first day of class, each student in the study agreed to participate by way of written informed consent which included a description of the procedures and a statement that they may choose to not participate in the data collection while still remaining in the group. Then, at the start of the first group meeting, students completed a set of questionnaires. The questionnaires were administered again at the end of the last group session as a post-group measure.

The bulk of the first class session was devoted to a discussion of the overall structure of the training group and of confidentiality in particular. The group leader stated that participation in this group did not require anyone to talk about personal issues. The overall trajectory of the group would consist of structured exercises as well as some less-structured portions in which a here-and-now focus would be emphasized. The group leader then indicated that the group would work toward reaching a consensus on the rules of confidentiality for their specific group. The group would not proceed until everyone had asserted their opinions. The group leader then explained the importance of confidentiality and the risks inherent in members' breaking

confidentiality. The group leader then presented three models of confidentiality: 1) strict (“what is said in this room stays in this room”), 2) laissez faire (“anything goes” or “no limits”), and 3) a modified or middle-of-the-road approach that allowed members to speak of group events with people outside the group without using identifying information. The group leader presented the possible advantages and limitations of each model. The last approach (middle-of-the-road) was ultimately chosen by consensus in all of the groups. Members discussed the definitions of possible circumstances surrounding such talk as agreed to by the group at this time. Possible circumstances included such questions as: who could be used as a confidant (e.g., no staff, no faculty, and no students outside of this course), where such talk should occur (e.g., specific places on campus, often-frequented places off campus, or any form of “social media”), and the definition of “identifying information” (e.g., no use of names or personal pronouns which could identify the gender of who would be included in any discussion of a group experience). The group did not proceed until unanimous agreement on a set of summarized conditions of confidentiality was reached. The range of times for such consensus to be reached by the groups was 1-1.5 hours. Finally, the leader made a brief statement about the ethically required breaches by the leader (e.g., descriptions of harm to self or others).

The total number of training group sessions was eight. Each session was approximately three hours long. The development of the overall group was organized through a combination of both structured activities and open discussion so as to parallel the stages of a typical therapy group’s life as outlined in *Theory and Practice of Group Counseling* (Corey,

2012). The typical set of activities included more structured exercises in the early sessions and less structured activities in later sessions. Structured activities (and their usual session) included: “Who am I?” in the initial stage/session 1 (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1973); setting goals (initial stage/session 1 or 2) identifying fears and conflicts regarding the group (transition stage/session 3); the Orpheus exercise (early working stage/ session 4) (Spira, 1997); “Johari Window” (working stage/session 5) (Luft, 1970); student led sessions (working stage/session 5, 6, 7); “Coins: Symbolic Feedback” (ending stage/session 8) (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1973) and reviewing the group (ending stage/session 8).

The instructor was a tenured professor in the program with over ten years of group experience including addictive settings and loss and bereavement counseling. He has taught the Group Dynamics course at least once a year for over ten years. His theoretical orientation is integrative, with an existentially-humanistic focus.

## Measures

**Importance of confidentiality.** The participants responded to five questions intended to measure the level of importance that they attach to confidentiality at pre-training group and also at post-training. The questions asked were as follows (worded in the past tense in the post-training version):

1. I think I will feel (felt) tempted to break confidentiality at some point during the life of the group.
2. I may break (broke) the rules of confidentiality inadvertently / by accident.
3. I will adhere (adhered) to the rules of confidentiality.

4. Confidentiality is (was) very important to me.
5. Other group members will adhere (adhered) to our rules of confidentiality.

Following the suggestion by Clark and Watson (1995), the first step in developing a scale such as this is a sound theoretical model. The items for this measure were based on issues highlighted in the best practice guidelines of ASGW articulated by Thomas and Pender (2008) as well as in the guidelines for ethical and legal practice in counseling and psychotherapy groups outlined by Rapin (2004). Five items were used, based on the representativeness of the issues as judged by two of the current researchers. The dimensionality of the five items was analyzed using principal components factor analysis utilizing data from an unpublished pilot study of 209 individuals. Two criteria were used to determine the number of factors to rotate: the a priori hypothesis that the measure was unidimensional and the scree test. The scree plot indicated that our hypothesis of unidimensionality was correct. The total scores on this scale reflect a single "Importance of Confidentiality" scale. The Cronbach's alpha in the present study was .52.

**Outcome measures.** The participants responded to six statements that measured the perception of group members' own outcomes as well as their perceptions of other group members' outcomes. The items for this scale were derived from a theoretical foundation based on practice-based evidence (Siefert & DeFife, 2012) and were related to earlier published measures of counseling outcomes which focused on process and on outcome (e.g. Pascual-Leone & Yeryomenko, 2017; Sarracino & Dazzi, 2007). The present measure utilized a 5-point Likert-type rating scale indicating

participants' level of agreement with each item. This outcome measure was administered immediately following the last session of the training group. The Cronbach's alpha for the items in this measure was reported in an earlier study as .77 (Robak, Kangos, Chiffrieller, & Griffin, 2013). The Cronbach's alpha in the present study was .78. The dimensionality of the 6 items was analyzed using principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation, using data from a pilot study of 209 individuals. Three criteria were used to determine the number of factors to rotate: the a priori hypothesis that the measure was two dimensional, the scree test, and the interpretability of the factor solution. The rotated solution yielded two interpretable factors: process (self-disclosure and feedback) and benefiting (from the group). The process factor accounted for 44.9% of the item variance and the benefiting factor accounted for 17.03% of the item variance. These six items are reported as two subscales:

**Process outcome.** This sub-scale consists of the following items on self-disclosure and feedback:

1. Overall, I self-disclosed in this group.
2. Overall, others self-disclosed in this group.
3. Overall, I gave others feedback and support.
4. Overall, others gave me feedback and support.

**Benefited outcome.** This sub-scale consists of the following two items:

5. Overall, I felt that I benefited from this group experience.
6. Overall, I felt that others benefited from this group experience.



## Results

We compared the pre-group and post-group scores on the importance of confidentiality measure. A paired-samples *t*-test was conducted to evaluate whether group members tended to rate the importance of confidentiality more highly following the group than before the group. The results indicated that the mean importance-of-confidentiality score after the group ( $M = 23.96, SD = 1.19$ ) was significantly greater than the mean before the group ( $M = 16.93, SD = 0.92$ ),  $t(30) = 24.76, p = .001$ . The paired *t*-test results showed a significant increase in importance of confidentiality at post-group.

In order to examine how the importance of confidentiality and the process and the benefiting outcomes related to one another, Pearson product moment correlations were calculated and analyzed. All correlations reported below are based on an *n* of 31. There was a significant correlation between the importance of confidentiality at pre-group and the benefiting outcome at post group ( $r = .43, p = .01$ ). The correlations between the members' post-group importance of confidentiality and benefiting outcome ( $r = .51, p = .002$ ) was also significant. Finally, the correlation between the post-group importance of confidentiality and the process outcome ( $r = .48, p = .003$ ) was also significant.

Not surprisingly, the two outcome measures of process (self-disclosure and feedback) and benefiting were highly correlated ( $r = .65; p = .001$ ). In addition, at the item level, the self-disclosure question (“Overall, I self-disclosed in this group”) yielded some interesting results. Self-disclosing in the group was strongly associated with the perception that other

members (“Overall, other self-disclosed in this group”) were self-disclosing as well ( $r = .70; p < .001$ ). Self-disclosure was significantly correlated with the perception of receiving feedback and support (“Overall, others gave me feedback and support”) ( $r = .41; p = .01$ ). It is noteworthy that there was also a strong correlation between receiving feedback and support (“Overall, others gave me feedback and support”) with self-perceived benefits (“Overall, I felt that I benefited from this group experience”) ( $r = .84; p < .001$ ).

Specific correlations (Table 1) at the item level showed that simply thinking about the possibility of breaking confidentiality (“I felt tempted to break the rules of confidentiality...”) was significantly correlated with less self-disclosure in the process outcome subscale (“Overall, I self-disclosed in the group”) ( $r = -.39, p = .02$ ). Individuals who were tempted to break confidentiality at pre-group (“I think I will feel tempted to break confidentiality at some point during the life of the group”) were less likely to perceive benefits from the group experience for themselves (Overall, I benefited from the group) ( $r = -.41; p = .01$ ). These individuals showed a negative (although not significant) correlation between anticipating being tempted at pre-group and the benefiting outcome at post-group ( $r = -.22; p = .23$ ).

## Discussion

The importance of confidentiality is a critical factor associated with perceived benefits in group counseling. Our study provided support for this claim. We also found that the importance of confidentiality can increase for counselor trainees over the course of an experiential training group.

Our findings indicate that it is productive to initiate a group with an in-depth discussion of confidentiality. That discussion should include the members' consensus about the detailed definition of confidentiality. Such an intervention can enhance the process outcomes, i.e. self-disclosure and provision of feedback to other members as well as the self-perceived benefit outcomes of the group experience. This is in line with previous research. Lasky (2005) found that a large majority of surveyed group leaders reported that discussing confidentiality led to greater self-disclosure by the group members. Welfel (2006) asserted that mutual self-disclosure among group members is important because it facilitates interaction and feedback. It may be that a first-session discussion and consensus regarding confidentiality is effective because it fosters cohesiveness and is a way for a group to begin to create an overarching group narrative as described by research as that of Travaglini, Treadwell, and Reisch (2012).

We noted a number of impacts of the importance of confidentiality on group members' experiences. First, the groups showed a significant increase from pre-group to post-group scores on the "Importance of Confidentiality" measure. In addition, we found a strong association between the importance of confidentiality to members and positive outcomes in both process (self-disclosure and feedback) and in self-reported benefiting from the group experience. Group members who reported being tempted to break confidentiality were less likely to report benefiting from the group experience. Furthermore, members who agreed with the importance of adhering to the rules of confidentiality were more likely to engage in self-disclosure.

Confidentiality is a complex, yet an important component of the overall group counseling process (Younggren & Harris, 2008). Our findings illustrate that when members embraced confidentiality by adhering to the rules, they self-disclosed. These findings are clearly consistent with Lasky & Riva's (2006) argument that confidentiality helps ensure the facilitation of trust and self-disclosure. Moreover, self-disclosure was associated with a number of benefits. Self-disclosure was significantly positively correlated with both the members' perception of receiving feedback and support and of ultimately benefiting from the group experience. Indeed, the relationship between receiving feedback and support and benefiting from the group was so high ( $r = .84$ ) that the two variables seem to go hand-in-hand. It may be that we cannot have one without the other.

Groups work best when members feel safe enough to share and receive constructive feedback in the process. In a study by Luke and Kiweewa (2010), safety was one of the 30 identified factors as being significant to counselor trainees' personal growth and awareness within participation in an experiential group. In our study, findings suggested that the group experience worked best for all members when members were disclosing and receiving support for doing so. Self-disclosure and providing feedback are clearly important to a group's process because they have been said to be related to increased group interaction (Welfel, 2006).

In considering the importance of these findings, the following limitations should be kept in mind. The present study's analyses are based on a relatively small sample of participants. This smaller number not only limits statistical analyses, but also makes it more difficult to generalize

findings. Future research should include larger samples so that predictive factors of outcomes might be studied via regression analyses. Multiple regressions may have offered insight into the predictive relationship between variables such as maintaining confidentiality and such outcomes as self-disclosure and benefitting from the group. Second, direct behavioral observation in addition to self-report of the group members might be included in further research. Finally, while we relied on quantitative forms of data collection and analysis, a qualitative methodology of asking the participants to provide subjective responses of their experiences within the experiential group might also provide valuable personal insights into the overall group experience by the counselor trainees.

Even with these limitations in mind, the findings of the present study are of practical significance in that they can help serve counselor educators, researchers, and practicing counselors in the future. Our findings show that merely thinking about the possibility of breaking confidentiality was associated with less self-disclosure. For educators, having trainees understand the importance and complexity of confidentiality early in their group training experiences can enhance students' willingness to deal directly with confidentiality in their own practice. Given the fundamentally important role that a group dynamics/group counseling course plays in all counselor training programs, it would behoove educators to institutionally implement assessment measures within their group courses in order to better understand how changes in students take place over time.

The findings of the present study reinforce that confidentiality and disclosure are essential components of successful

training experiences. Our results indicate that spending time on the rules of confidentiality positively correlated with the dynamics of the experiential group training. The current study provides empirical evidence for the importance of confidentiality to counseling group processes in general, although considerably more research is still needed to add to the knowledge base. Future studies could replicate our findings to reinforce the importance of confidentiality and its effects on group processes as well as outcomes. More prospective studies like the current one will allow researchers to understand how confidentiality contributes to therapeutic outcomes. Future researchers are also encouraged to use qualitative methodologies for in-depth exploration of counselor trainees' perceptions of confidentiality and related growth factors in an experiential group setting. Further research, utilizing regression analyses, is needed to examine if there is a predictive link between the importance of confidentiality in experiential groups and personal development outcomes. In conclusion, the findings of this study lead us to recommend the explicit verbalization of confidentiality as a valuable practice because this activity was significantly associated with higher levels of both process (self-disclosure and feedback) outcomes and benefiting outcomes.

## References

- 2010 Amendments to the 2002 'Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct'. (2010). *American Psychologist*, 65(5). Retrieved from <http://rilib.pace.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psych&AN=2010-14198-011&site=ehost->

- live&scope=site.  
doi:10.1037/a0020168
- American Counseling Association. (2014). *ACA Code of Ethics*. Alexandria, VA Retrieved from [www.counseling.org/resources/aca-code-of-ethics.pdf](http://www.counseling.org/resources/aca-code-of-ethics.pdf)
- Anderson, R. D., Gariglietti, K. P., & Price, G. (1998). *A Model for Training Group Counselors*. Retrieved from <http://rlib.pace.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED420817&login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Association for Specialists in Group Work. (2000). *Professional standards for the training of group workers*. Retrieved from [http://asgw.org/pdf/training\\_standards.pdf](http://asgw.org/pdf/training_standards.pdf)
- CACREP. (2015). 2016 Cacrep Standards. <https://www.cacrep.org/for-programs/2016-cacrep-standards/>
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 309-319. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.7.3.309
- Corey, G. (2012). *Theory and practice of group counseling (8th ed.)*. Belmont, CA US: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2015). *2016 CACREP Standards*. Retrieved from <https://www.cacrep.org/for-programs/2016-cacrep-standards/>
- Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct. (2002). *American Psychologist*, 57(12), 1060-1073. Retrieved from <http://rlib.pace.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2002-11464-006&login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Hensley, L. G., Smith, S. L., & Thompson, R. W. (2003). Assessing competencies of counselors-in-training: Complexities in evaluating personal and professional development. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 42(3), 219-230. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2003.tb01813.x
- Hough, G. (1992). When confidentiality mandates a secret be kept: A case report. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 42(1), 105-115. doi:10.1080/00207284.1992.11732582
- International Association of Group Psychotherapy. (2009). *Ethical Guidelines and Professional Standards for Group Psychotherapy*. Retrieved from <https://iagp.com/about/ethicalguidelines.htm>
- Kajankova, M. (2014). *The negotiation of power and dual relationships as occurring in counselor training groups*. (Doctoral dissertation), Retrieved from <https://search-proquest-com.rlib.pace.edu/docview/1430475138> Available from EBSCOhost psyh database.

- Kiweewa, J., Gilbride, D., Luke, M., & Seward, D. (2013). Endorsement of growth factors in experiential training groups. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 38*(1), 68-93. doi:10.1080/01933922.2012.745914
- Lasky, G. B. (2005). *Confidentiality in groups: Rate of violations, the consent process, and group leader level of experience* (Doctoral dissertation.), Retrieved from <http://rilib.pace.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2005-99022-294&login.asp&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Lasky, G. B., & Riva, M. T. (2006). Confidentiality and privileged communication in group psychotherapy. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 56*(4), 455-476. doi:10.1521/ijgp.2006.56.4.455
- Luft, J. (1970). *Group processes: An introduction to group dynamics*. Bethesda, MD US: National Press Books.
- Luke, M., & Kiweewa, J. M. (2010). Personal growth and awareness of counseling trainees in an experiential group. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 35*(4), 365-388. doi:10.1080/01933922.2010.514976
- Ohrt, J. H., Ener, E., Porter, J., & Young, T. L. (2014). Group leader reflections on their training and experience: Implications for group counselor educators and supervisors. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 39*(2), 95-124. doi:10.1080/01933922.2014.883004
- Pascual-Leone, A., & Yeryomenko, N. (2017). The client 'experiencing' scale as a predictor of treatment outcomes: A meta-analysis on psychotherapy process. *Psychotherapy Research, 27*(6), 653-665. doi:10.1080/10503307.2016.1152409
- Pepper, R. S. (2004). Confidentiality and dual relationships in group psychotherapy. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 54*(1), 103-114. doi:10.1521/ijgp.54.1.103.40379
- Pfeiffer, J. W., & Jones, J. E. (1973). *A handbook of structured experiences for human relations training: Volume IV*. Oxford England: University Associates.
- Pierce, K. A., & Baldwin, C. (1990). Participation versus privacy in the training of group counselors. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 15*(3), 149-158. doi:10.1080/01933929008411925
- Rapin, L. S. (2004). Guidelines for ethical and legal practice in counseling and psychotherapy groups. In J. L. DeLucia-Waack, D. A. Gerrity, C. R. Kalodner, M. T. Riva, J. L. DeLucia-Waack, D. A. Gerrity, C. R. Kalodner, & M. T. Riva (Eds.), *Handbook of group counseling and psychotherapy*. (pp. 151-165). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Roback, H. B., Moore, R. F., Bloch, F. S., & Shelton, M. (1996). Confidentiality

- Roback, H. B., Moore, R. F., Bloch, F. S., & Shelton, M. (1996). Confidentiality in group psychotherapy: Empirical findings and the law. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 46(1), 117-135. doi:10.1080/00207284.1996.11491487
- Roback, H. B., Ochoa, E., Bloch, F., & Purdon, S. E. (1992). Guarding confidentiality in clinical groups: The therapist's dilemma. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 42(1), 81-103. doi:10.1080/00207284.1992.11732581
- Robak, R. W., Kangos, K. A., Chiffrieller, S. H., & Griffin, P. W. (2013). The working alliance in group counseling: an exploratory study. *Psychological Reports*, 113(2), 591-604. doi:10.2466/21.02.PR0.113x19z7
- Robson, M., & Robson, J. (2008). Explorations of participants' experiences of a personal development group held as part of a counselling psychology training group: Is it safe in here? *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 21(4), 371-382. doi:10.1080/09515070802602153
- Sarracino, D., & Dazzi, N. (2007). Motivational Areas Rating Scale: Developing a new tool for studying psychotherapy process and outcome. *Psychotherapy Research*, 17(6), 721-732. doi:10.1080/10503300701303369
- Scheidlinger, S. (2000). The group psychotherapy movement at the millennium: Some historical perspectives. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 50(3), 315-339. doi:10.1080/00207284.2000.11491012
- Shumaker, D., Ortiz, C., & Brenninkmeyer, L. (2011). Revisiting experiential group training in counselor education: A survey of master's-level programs. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 36(2), 111-128. doi:10.1080/01933922.2011.562742
- Siefert, C. J., & DeFife, J. A. (2012). Ten diverse outcome measures for psychodynamic psychotherapy research. In R. A. Levy, J. S. Ablon, & H. Kächele (Eds.), *Psychodynamic psychotherapy research: Evidence-based practice and practice-based evidence*. (pp. 529-552). Totowa, NJ: Humana Press.
- Smith, C. K., & Davis-Gage, D. (2008). Experiential group training: Perceptions of graduate students in counselor education programs. *Groupwork: An Interdisciplinary Journal for Working with Groups*, 18(3), 88-106. doi:10.1921/81142
- Spira, J. L. (1997). Existential group therapy for advanced breast cancer and other life-threatening illnesses. In J. L. Spira & J. L. Spira (Eds.), *Group therapy for medically ill patients*. (pp. 165-222). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Thomas, R. V., & Pender, D. A. (2008). Association for specialists in group work: Best practice guidelines 2007 revisions. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 33(2), 111-117. doi:10.1080/01933920801971184

- Travaglini, L. E., Treadwell, T. W., & Reisch, E. E. (2012). Confidentiality and cohesion in groups: Collaborative story building and telling as a means of improving the therapeutic experience. *Group, 36*(4), 317-331.  
doi:10.1037/e579742011-006
- Welfel, E. R. (2006). *Ethics in counseling and psychotherapy: Standards, research, and emerging issues (3rd ed.)*. Belmont, CA, US: Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Wheeler, A. M., & Bertram, B. (2008). *The counselor and the law: A guide to legal and ethical practice (5th ed.)*. Alexandria, VA, US: American Counseling Association.
- Yalom, I. D., & Leszcz, M. (2005). *The theory and practice of group psychotherapy (5th ed.)*. New York, NY US: Basic Books.
- Young, T. L., Reysen, R., Eskridge, T., & Ohrt, J. H. (2013). Personal growth groups: Measuring outcome and evaluating impact. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 38*(1), 52-67.  
doi:10.1080/01933922.2012.745915
- Younggren, J. N., & Harris, E. A. (2008). Can you keep a secret? Confidentiality in psychotherapy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 64*(5), 589-600.  
doi:10.1002/jclp.20480

Table 1

*Correlations between Post-Training Confidentiality and Self-Reported Outcome Measures*

Confidentiality & Self-Disclosure scores	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.Tempted to break confidentiality	-										
2.Broke confidentiality by accident	.65*	-									
3.Adhered to rules of confidentiality	-.24	-.07	-								
4.Confidentiality was important to me	-.06	.11	-.15	-							
5.Felt that others adhered to rules	.03	.04	.13	.01	-						
6.I self-disclosed in this group	-.39*	-.19	.35								
			*	.13	.16	-					
7.Others self-disclosed in this group	-.30	.00	.52								
			*	.01	.01	.70*	-				
8.I gave others feedback and support	.00	.02	.15	.26	.09	-.15	.06	-			
9.Other gave me feedback and support	-.27	-.31	.07	.06	.25	.41*	.22	.27	-		
										.84	
10.I felt that I benefitted from this group	-.41*	-.51*	.06	-.07	.27	.47*	.21	.05	*	-	
										.67	.77
11.I felt that others benefitted from this group	-.40*	-.44*	.09	.03	.06	.32	.26	.18	*	*	-

Note.  $n = 31$ ,  $*p < .05$ .