Journal of Psychiatry
Psychotherapy & Communication

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). When Should a Therapist Disclose? Self-Disclosure, Immediacy, Boundaries, and the Therapeutic Alliance. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Sep 30;13(3):81-90

When Should a Therapist Disclose? Self-Disclosure, Immediacy, Boundaries, and the Therapeutic Alliance

Christian Jonathan Haverkampf

Narrative Clinical Review

Abstract—Therapists disclose more than personal facts. They reveal themselves through accent, appearance, office, timing, online traces, emotional responses, explanations of treatment, and the ways they use professional power. The clinical question is therefore not whether a therapist discloses, but what is made available, for whose benefit, under what conditions, and with what opportunity for the patient to respond. This narrative clinical review examines evidence available through 30 August 2024 and distinguishes deliberate personal self-disclosure, immediacy about the here-and-now relationship, treatment transparency, and unavoidable, accidental, or digitally discovered information. Meta-analytic and qualitative findings suggest that judicious disclosure is often followed by greater openness, insight, or relational connection, but studies are heterogeneous, context-sensitive, and vulnerable to selection and attribution bias. Disclosure can also burden a patient, blur roles, invite caretaking, expose third parties, intensify dependency, or substitute the therapist's story for the patient's work. A defensible decision links the disclosure to a patient-owned goal, considers culture and power, uses the least personal content needed, and plans how to return attention and assess impact. Immediacy is not identical to autobiography, and transparency about rationale, uncertainty, fees, records, and limits is often an ethical duty rather than a technique. Consultation and repair are required when disclosure has served the therapist or caused harm.

Index Terms—therapist self-disclosure, immediacy, therapeutic alliance, boundaries, ethics, social media, psychotherapy process

I. INTRODUCTION

The fantasy of a therapist who reveals nothing is difficult to sustain. Age, accent, clothing, room, disability, pregnancy, name, professional biography, scheduling, and reaction all communicate something. A patient may discover political activity, publications, family information, or an old photograph online before the first session. Even a refusal to answer a personal question conveys a position about privacy and the relationship.

Deliberate self-disclosure remains a real clinical choice within this wider field. A therapist may mention a personal experience, identity, value, feeling, or mistake. The intervention can normalize shame, model direct speech, acknowledge cultural location, or make a relational moment discussable. It can equally shift emotional labor to the patient, imply sameness where important differences exist, invite unwanted intimacy, or relieve the therapist at the patient's expense.

Research generally offers neither a prohibition nor a universal endorsement. Qualitative synthesis found that therapist self-disclosure and immediacy were often followed by beneficial processes, including stronger relationships, insight, and client openness, while also documenting awkward, pressured, or unhelpful responses (Hill et al., 2018). Experimental meta-analysis likewise suggests average benefits on perceptions and some immediate outcomes, but analogue studies and brief exposures do not reproduce the risks of an ongoing clinical relationship (Henretty et al., 2014).

The question “Should I disclose?” is therefore incomplete. A defensible decision asks what type of disclosure is being considered, which patient goal it serves, why it is arising now, what less personal intervention could accomplish the same purpose, how culture and power shape its meaning, and what will happen if the patient dislikes it. The standard is not therapist authenticity in the abstract. It is responsible usefulness within a relationship created for the patient's care.

II. SCOPE AND REVIEW METHOD

This narrative clinical review considered evidence publicly available through 30 August 2024, one month before the

Christian Jonathan Haverkampf, M.D., LL.M., is a psychotherapist working in private practice in Dublin, Ireland. Correspondence: jonathanhaverkampf@gmail.com. Website: www.jonathanhaverkampf.com.

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). When Should a Therapist Disclose? Self-Disclosure, Immediacy, Boundaries, and the Therapeutic Alliance. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Sep 30;13(3):81-90

nominal issue date. Searches emphasized systematic and qualitative reviews, meta-analyses, randomized and process studies, client-perspective research, alliance and rupture literature, ethics scholarship, professional codes, cross-cultural studies, and research on internet exposure and social media. Complete online-first publications available by the cutoff were eligible. No new systematic review or statistical synthesis was performed.

The primary setting is individual adult psychotherapy. Disclosure in child, family, couple, group, inpatient, forensic, compulsory, and community work raises additional questions about multiple audiences, consent, records, and power. Examples below describe categories of clinical action rather than patients or private clinical events. No patient case material or invented quotation is used.

The word disclosure is used broadly enough to distinguish forms that are often conflated. Deliberate personal disclosure communicates information about the therapist's life or identity. Immediacy addresses the therapist's experience of the present therapeutic relationship. Treatment transparency explains rationale, uncertainty, role, records, fees, limits, and options. Unavoidable, accidental, and online disclosure occur without a planned in-session decision, although the clinician can often shape the conditions around them (Barnett, 2019).

Evidence is heavily context-dependent. Orientation, patient preference, diagnosis, stage of therapy, content, timing, relationship quality, culture, and outcome measured can alter effect. Many studies examine client perception after a single disclosure or retrospectively sample disclosures memorable enough to report. Clinical recommendations therefore combine empirical findings with ethical duties concerning consent, competence, privacy, boundaries, and nonexploitation (American Psychological Association, 2017; British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy, 2018).

III. FOUR FORMS THAT REQUIRE DIFFERENT REASONING

Personal self-disclosure can be factual or experiential. It ranges from confirming parenthood, illness, faith, sexuality, migration, recovery, or loss to describing an event in enough detail that the therapist's story acquires emotional weight. Breadth and depth matter, but so do relevance, timing, and ownership. A brief statement about shared identity can be more consequential than a longer neutral anecdote.

Immediacy concerns what is happening now between patient and therapist: a sense of distance, pressure, warmth, confusion, irritation, concern, or change in contact. It may include a self-involving disclosure—"I notice that I am uncertain whether my questions are helping"—but its subject is the therapeutic interaction, not the therapist's biography. Case-process research suggests immediacy can open relational expression and can also feel awkward or pressuring (Kasper et al., 2008).

Treatment transparency is often mislabeled as self-disclosure. Explaining why a question is asked, what an exposure is intended to test, how a diagnosis was reached, what the evidence does not show, or what happens to records makes professional action intelligible. Transparency may reveal uncertainty or error, but it is principally part of informed consent and collaboration. Withholding rationale to preserve mystique is not therapeutic neutrality.

Unavoidable and accidental disclosures include visible characteristics, emotional reactions, chance encounters, office artifacts, technological interruption, or information disclosed by another person. Digital discovery adds content the therapist did not offer to this patient but did make accessible, sometimes long ago or through third parties. These events are not chosen interventions. They still require a clinical response when they affect the relationship.

The categories can overlap. An online fact may prompt an immediacy conversation; a transparent acknowledgment of an error may include a personal emotional response; disclosure of identity may be unavoidable in one context and deliberate in another. Classification does not decide whether an act is ethical. It clarifies which purposes, risks, and obligations need examination.

Table 1. Distinguishing forms of therapist disclosure

Form	Primary content	Potential purpose	Characteristic risk
Deliberate personal disclosure	Life, identity, experience, value	Normalize, model, acknowledge location or common ground	Therapist story displaces or burdens patient
Immediacy	Here-and-now experience of the therapeutic relationship	Clarify contact, rupture, pattern, or impact	Patient feels observed, blamed, or pressured
Treatment transparency	Rationale, uncertainty, role, limits, records, options	Support consent and collaboration	Explanation becomes persuasion or technical overload
Unavoidable or accidental	Visible trait, reaction, encounter, interruption	No planned therapeutic purpose	Shame, confusion, third-party privacy, boundary disruption
Online or public	Searchable biography, posts, images, publications	Professional information or public participation	Context collapse, false familiarity, privacy loss

IV. WHAT THE EVIDENCE CAN AND CANNOT SHOW

The disclosure literature has developed through analogue experiments, surveys, qualitative interviews, case-process studies, and a smaller number of clinical trials. A qualitative review found that helpfulness depended on timing, relevance, amount, relationship, and whether focus returned to the client (Henretty & Levitt, 2010). Practitioner guidance drawn from

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). When Should a Therapist Disclose? Self-Disclosure, Immediacy, Boundaries, and the Therapeutic Alliance. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Sep 30;13(3):81-90

research similarly emphasizes sparing, intentional use and attention to patient response rather than a rule based on theoretical school (Knox & Hill, 2003).

A meta-analysis of fifty-three experimental and quasi-experimental studies found generally favorable effects of counselor self-disclosure on client perceptions and willingness to disclose, with moderators and limitations that restrict translation to treatment outcome (Henretty et al., 2014). Participants often evaluated hypothetical or brief interactions. Liking a counselor after one disclosure is not the same as sustained symptom improvement, and a standardized disclosure removes the very responsiveness that clinical judgment is meant to supply.

Clinical studies are mixed but informative. In one randomized trial of brief integrative psychotherapy, immediate self-disclosure added to treatment was associated with improved symptoms and therapist perceptions, yet the study tested a defined intervention and population rather than unrestricted disclosure (Ziv-Beiman et al., 2017). An earlier trial found no simple overall advantage for therapist disclosure and suggested that client experience and process need examination beyond a binary disclosed-or-did-not-disclose variable (Barrett & Berman, 2001).

Recent process studies treat disclosure as time-varying and dyadic. Associations between immediate disclosure and outcome differed across and within clients, and temporal agreement between client and therapist perceptions carried information (Alfi-Yogev et al., 2021; Alfi-Yogev et al., 2023). A 2024 observational study associated immediate disclosure with greater diversity of reported emotions across diagnostic groups, but association does not establish that disclosure caused the change (Alfi-Yogev et al., 2024).

The most defensible summary is conditional. Judicious disclosure can support useful processes; poorly timed, excessive, self-serving, or culturally tone-deaf disclosure can interfere. Average positive findings do not identify the right disclosure for the person in front of the therapist. The intervention remains a hypothesis whose effect must be observed and discussed.

Integrative accounts frame disclosure as one intervention among many, selected in response to a formulation rather than adopted as a therapist identity (Ziv-Beiman, 2013). Ethical analyses reach a compatible conclusion from a different direction: anticipated benefit, foreseeable harm, role boundaries, treatment plan, culture, and consultation should inform the decision (Barnett, 2011). Neither source converts judgment into a checklist, but both make an unexamined habit harder to defend.

V. PURPOSE BEFORE CONTENT

A decision starts before composing the sentence. The therapist identifies the patient-owned goal and the immediate obstacle. If a patient believes that grief is shameful, the clinical task may be normalization; if a patient doubts the therapist understands racism, the task may be acknowledgment of social location and credibility; if the patient is caring for the therapist, disclosure is more likely to worsen the problem. The same personal fact can serve opposing functions.

Motivation requires scrutiny. An urge to relieve silence, demonstrate expertise, be liked, correct the patient's image, retaliate after criticism, or seek recognition should slow the decision. Therapists inevitably have needs and feelings; ethical practice does not depend on pretending otherwise. It depends on managing them outside the patient's treatment when disclosure would recruit the patient into that management.

Alternatives matter. Empathic recognition, a question, summary, normalization from evidence, explanation of treatment, or acknowledgment of uncertainty may accomplish the purpose with less personal content. Choosing the least revealing effective intervention is not emotional austerity. It preserves flexibility because disclosed information cannot be retrieved once the patient knows it.

The therapist also anticipates plausible meanings. A disclosure of shared loss may communicate understanding, competition, prediction that the patient should recover similarly, or an invitation to care for the therapist. A disclosure of difference may convey honesty or emphasize distance. The clinician cannot control interpretation, but can avoid acting as though only the intended meaning exists.

A planned return keeps the patient's work central. The disclosure can be brief, followed by a question about what it was like to hear and whether it helps with the issue at hand. If the patient changes topic to the therapist, the clinician responds courteously without allowing curiosity to determine the session. The boundary is maintained through process, not through pretending the statement had no interpersonal effect.

Timing includes the patient's available capacity. During acute bereavement, panic, dissociation, intoxication, severe shame, or cognitive overload, even relevant personal information may add processing demand. The therapist may record the impulse and return to it later, when the patient can evaluate rather than merely absorb it. Restraint can be responsive rather than remote.

Reversibility offers another test. A question can be withdrawn and a formulation revised; a personal fact remains in the relationship. The more identity-defining, intimate, politically charged, or searchable the content, the stronger the rationale should be. A clinician should imagine not only the

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). When Should a Therapist Disclose? Self-Disclosure, Immediacy, Boundaries, and the Therapeutic Alliance. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Sep 30;13(3):81-90

next minute but the next rupture, ending, public encounter, and records request before choosing to disclose.

Before disclosing, pause for seven questions

- Which patient goal and present obstacle would this serve?
- Why do I want to say it now, and whose relief would follow?
- Could a less personal intervention achieve the same purpose?
- How might culture, identity, trauma, or power alter its meaning?
- What information about third parties or my future privacy is involved?
- How will I return focus and invite an honest negative response?
- Would I document and discuss this decision comfortably in supervision?

VI. DELIBERATE PERSONAL DISCLOSURE

A deliberate personal disclosure should be no larger than its purpose. Briefly acknowledging that the therapist has also experienced bereavement is different from describing the death, family conflict, and recovery. Detail increases vividness, emotional obligation, and future questions. The relevant unit is not seconds of speech but the amount of relational space the disclosure occupies afterward.

Normalization is a common rationale. It can reduce shame when a patient believes an experience makes them uniquely defective. Evidence or ordinary human recognition may be enough; personal disclosure adds the claim of lived similarity. The therapist should ask whether similarity is accurate and useful. Shared diagnostic labels, identities, or losses do not ensure shared meaning, resources, culture, or outcome.

Modeling is another rationale. A concise statement can demonstrate naming an emotion, acknowledging uncertainty, or taking responsibility. Modeling becomes coercive if it implies that the patient should disclose equally, forgive quickly, or adopt the therapist's coping path. The patient remains free to respond with interest, discomfort, indifference, or a request not to know more.

Client-perspective studies describe disclosure as capable of removing barriers and humanizing the therapist, while also raising concern about boundaries and professional confidence (Audet, 2011; Hanson, 2005). These accounts caution against assuming that warmth and competence are opposites. Some patients need evidence that the therapist is a person; others need confidence that the therapist can contain the work without bringing a second life into the room.

Disclosure changes the future, not only the moment. Information about recovery, politics, religion, parenting, sexuality, or illness may influence later material and transferential meanings. The clinician should be willing to revisit it without insisting that the original intervention remain helpful. A well-intended disclosure can become burdensome as the patient's circumstances or the relationship changes.

Clinical dose is cumulative. Several individually modest disclosures can produce a relationship organized around therapist biography, especially when they cluster around one topic or occur after patient distress. Review should therefore consider the history of disclosure in this dyad, not judge each sentence in isolation. A statement that was useful early may become constraining if the patient later feels expected to share an identity, recovery story, political position, or view of family. Research-based guidance emphasizes amount, timing, relevance, and return of focus rather than a simple permitted category (Knox & Hill, 2003; Henretty & Levitt, 2010). The clinician can keep a prospective boundary: no further detail unless a new patient-owned purpose is clear, followed by later inquiry about whether existing knowledge changes what can be said. This is especially important when the therapist enjoys disclosure or works in a culture that treats informality as inherently authentic. Comfort for the clinician and warmth in the moment are data, not sufficient indications.

VII. IMMEDIACY WITHOUT MAKING THE PATIENT RESPONSIBLE

Immediacy gives language to the relationship as it unfolds. It may identify a loss of contact, a pressure to agree, a moment of warmth, or uncertainty about how an intervention was received. Used carefully, it can make patterns available for reflection and repair. Used carelessly, it can present the therapist's private reaction as evidence about the patient.

Observation should be distinguishable from inference. “I noticed that we both became quieter after I mentioned ending” describes a shared change; “you are making me feel abandoned” assigns motive and carries emotional demand. The therapist can own a feeling while holding its sources open: patient communication, clinician history, the immediate event, and ordinary uncertainty may all contribute.

Immediacy is often relevant during alliance strain. Repair literature recommends metacommunication that explores the patient's experience and the therapist's contribution rather than continuing technique unchanged (Safran et al., 2011). A therapist may say that the conversation feels pressured and ask whether their questions contributed. The purpose is to restore choice, not to obtain agreement that the therapist's perception is correct.

Positive immediacy also needs restraint. Saying that the therapist feels moved, appreciative, or connected may validate a significant moment. Repeated declarations of closeness can create obligation or exceptionalism. Patients with histories of boundary violation may experience praise or intimacy as threat rather than reward. The clinician asks how the comment landed and does not require visible gratitude.

The broader alliance evidence supports attention to collaboration but does not show that more relational processing is always better (Flückiger et al., 2018). Some patients prefer structured, task-focused work and may find frequent process comments distracting. The therapist can offer

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). When Should a Therapist Disclose? Self-Disclosure, Immediacy, Boundaries, and the Therapeutic Alliance. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Sep 30;13(3):81-90

immediacy as a way of understanding a specific obstacle, not as a compulsory route to depth.

VIII. TRANSPARENCY ABOUT TREATMENT AND ROLE

Transparency makes professional action discussable. A patient should know the proposed treatment, rationale, likely benefits and burdens, reasonable alternatives, confidentiality limits, fees, cancellation policy, record practices, and how to raise concerns. These are not favors earned through alliance. They support informed participation and are reflected in professional ethical frameworks (American Psychological Association, 2017; British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy, 2018).

Clinical reasoning can also be shared proportionately. Explaining why a question about sleep follows a report of elevated energy lets the patient evaluate the inquiry. Describing a diagnosis as provisional protects uncertainty. Naming that evidence is stronger for one treatment than another distinguishes recommendation from preference. Technical detail should be calibrated to what helps the decision rather than used to overwhelm dissent.

Therapists sometimes fear that acknowledging uncertainty will weaken confidence. Concealed uncertainty is more dangerous when it produces false certainty, missed consultation, or a surprise reversal. A statement such as “I have two plausible formulations and want to test which better fits” can model disciplined thought. The clinician still has responsibility to recommend, not merely hand complexity back to the patient.

Transparency about personal limits is equally important. A therapist who lacks competence for a presentation, cannot provide between-session contact, will be absent, or works within a service that shares records should state the limit early. The disclosure serves planning rather than eliciting sympathy. Where continuity is affected, the therapist offers feasible arrangements rather than presenting personal circumstance as a reason the patient must accommodate unsafe care.

An earlier JPPC discussion described questions as communication patterns that can redirect therapeutic information (Haverkampf, 2017). Transparency adds a safeguard: the patient can often be told why a consequential question is being asked and remains able to decline. The therapeutic value of curiosity is strengthened, not weakened, when its role and limits are visible.

IX. ACCIDENTAL, UNAVOIDABLE, AND ONLINE DISCLOSURE

Some disclosure arrives without invitation. A patient meets the therapist in a public place, hears a child during a video session, notices a physical change, or sees emotion before the therapist has decided how to speak about it. The clinician first considers privacy and immediate safety, then whether acknowledgment would reduce confusion. Denying an obvious event can be more disorganizing than a brief, bounded response.

Third-party privacy limits what can be explained. If a family emergency interrupts a session, the therapist can acknowledge the interruption, apologize where appropriate, and arrange continuity without describing another person's health. A chance encounter should ordinarily preserve the patient's confidentiality; advance discussion of how public contact will be handled prevents the therapist's nonrecognition from being mistaken for rejection.

Digital life expands unavoidable availability. Search engines can reveal professional profiles, publications, property records, political donations, legal proceedings, social accounts, and information posted by relatives. Earlier scholarship anticipated that psychotherapist transparency and privacy would change in the internet age (Zur et al., 2009). Social media now blurs professional and personal representations even when clinicians use privacy settings (Kaluzeviciute, 2020).

A 2024 systematic review of therapists' social-media dilemmas identified recurring concerns about self-disclosure, client searching, multiple relationships, privacy, and boundary management (White & Hanley, 2024). The evidence is mainly descriptive. A digital policy cannot prevent discovery, but it can explain professional accounts, contact requests, messaging, searching, and emergency communication. The policy should apply consistently and be revisited as platforms change.

When a patient mentions online information, the therapist need not interrogate how it was found or shame ordinary curiosity. The clinical response asks what was seen, what meaning it carried, and whether any boundary or safety concern follows. Factual correction may be appropriate. The therapist retains privacy and can decline further detail, while acknowledging that information already encountered now belongs to the relational context.

Table 2. Responding to unplanned disclosure

Event	Immediate priority	Possible response	Avoid
Public encounter	Patient confidentiality and physical safety	Follow the pre-agreed contact plan; review later if useful	Greeting in a way that reveals the relationship
Visible emotion or interruption	Contain the session and assess impact	Acknowledge briefly; decide whether explanation serves care	Denial or detailed personal account
Patient finds online information	Meaning, accuracy, boundary and safety	Discuss what was encountered without shaming curiosity	Demanding search details or promising impossible privacy

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). When Should a Therapist Disclose? Self-Disclosure, Immediacy, Boundaries, and the Therapeutic Alliance. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Sep 30;13(3):81-90

Event	Immediate priority	Possible response	Avoid
Third party reveals therapist information	Third-party privacy and continuity	Set limits, correct necessary facts, seek consultation	Recruiting patient into family or staff conflict
Accidental technical exposure	Secure data and assess breach	Follow privacy procedure and inform as required	Treating a governance problem only as therapy material

X. CULTURE, IDENTITY, AND POWER

Disclosure is interpreted through culture and unequal social positions. Direct personal sharing may signal warmth in one context and improper role reversal in another. A therapist's silence about identity can feel respectful, evasive, or falsely neutral. The clinician should not infer preference from group membership; the patient's prior experiences with authority, health care, family, and discrimination are more informative.

Cross-racial therapy research shows why effect cannot be predicted from disclosure alone. Some clients experienced therapist disclosure as common ground and recognition, whereas others experienced the content or timing as emphasizing social distance (Chang & Berk, 2009). European American therapists have described disclosures intended to acknowledge racism and oppression, with perceived benefits in selected cases, but qualitative samples cannot produce a universal rule (Burkard et al., 2006).

Cultural humility asks therapists to remain open to correction and aware of limits and power (Hook et al., 2013). Disclosure of social location may support that stance when relevant, especially if neutrality would conceal privilege or a material difference. It becomes performative when a declaration of identity substitutes for listening, or when the patient must affirm the therapist's awareness.

Culture-specific discussions of CBT likewise emphasize that disclosure may need different meaning and handling across contexts (Phiri et al., 2019). A shared identity can support trust but does not guarantee competence or sameness. A difference can be named without making the patient teach the therapist. Consultation and learning occur outside the session; the patient decides how much personal cultural material enters treatment.

Power also shapes whether a patient can say that disclosure was unwanted. A trainee, prisoner, employee referred by an organization, or person dependent on a scarce service may protect access by appearing receptive. The therapist should offer feedback routes that do not require face-to-face confrontation and should avoid using low complaint rates as evidence that the practice is benign.

Table 3. Cultural and power questions before identity disclosure

Question	Why it matters	More accountable action
Is identity directly relevant to the patient's concern?	Curiosity or therapist agenda may be mistaken for clinical need	Link disclosure to a stated goal or do not offer it
What similarity is being implied?	Shared label can erase class, culture, history, or privilege	Name limits of sameness and invite correction
What difference remains unspoken?	Silence may preserve a false neutrality	Broach the difference tentatively when it affects care
Can the patient safely dislike the disclosure?	Power makes polite assent unreliable	Provide low-cost feedback and respond without defense
Who does the emotional and educational work?	Patient may soothe or teach the therapist	Use supervision and independent learning

XI. BOUNDARIES, CONFIDENTIALITY, AND CLIENT BURDEN

A boundary defines the purpose and conditions of the therapeutic relationship. Disclosure is a boundary crossing in the descriptive sense only when it changes ordinary role behavior; not every crossing is a violation. Classic boundary analysis emphasizes context, exploitation risk, and the possibility of a slippery transition from minor deviation to harmful dual relationship (Gutheil & Gabbard, 1993). The relevant question is what the act does to safety, role clarity, and patient freedom.

Disclosure becomes burdensome when the patient must comfort, advise, reassure, keep secrets, tolerate unpredictability, or manage the therapist's unresolved emotion. A patient may stop mentioning grief after learning that the therapist is recently bereaved, or conceal disagreement after hearing how hurt the therapist felt. The clinician must look beyond the patient's polite response to what material disappears afterward.

Information about family, colleagues, or other patients presents confidentiality concerns even when names are removed. Distinctive circumstances can identify a person. Clinical teaching and normalization should rely on published evidence or carefully governed material rather than informal stories from another patient's therapy. Personal family members have not consented to become therapeutic examples.

Dependency is not created by one sentence, but repeated exceptional disclosure, special contact, gifts, secrecy, or claims of unique connection can alter the relationship. The therapist should examine whether the patient is being invited into mutual friendship, romance, business, advocacy for the clinician, or a privileged inner circle. Professional codes prohibit exploitation and require careful management of multiple relationships and conflicts (American Psychological Association, 2017).

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). When Should a Therapist Disclose? Self-Disclosure, Immediacy, Boundaries, and the Therapeutic Alliance. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Sep 30;13(3):81-90

Ethical self-disclosure also includes accuracy. Fabricating a personal story to create rapport treats the patient as an object of technique and risks profound loss of trust. A therapist can use metaphor, hypothetical examples, or role-play when named as such. Therapeutic purpose does not justify deception about the clinician's life.

A burden audit asks what new work the disclosure creates for the patient. Does the person now monitor the therapist's mood, avoid a subject, compare recovery paths, protect a family member mentioned by the therapist, or worry that disagreement will injure the relationship? Has ordinary scheduling acquired the meaning of rejection because the therapist previously described loneliness or loss? These effects may occur without an explicit boundary violation and without the patient naming distress. Client accounts show that the same disclosure can humanize a clinician or weaken confidence in professional containment (Audet, 2011; Hanson, 2005). The therapist should therefore look for changed participation over time and ask specifically enough that a polite 'it was fine' is not the only available answer. If the patient has acquired unnecessary emotional or practical labor, the response is to remove that labor through clearer limits and changed behavior, not to explain why the disclosure was intended to help.

XII. WHEN NOT TO DISCLOSE

Do not disclose when the primary purpose is the therapist's emotional relief, validation, revenge, loneliness, or wish to be known. This does not imply that such motives are shameful; they are material for reflection, personal support, or supervision. A patient cannot consent freely to becoming the therapist's confidant within a relationship they entered for care.

Avoid disclosure when the content is insufficiently processed. Recent trauma, acute grief, conflict, illness, or professional complaint may leak urgency and leave the therapist unable to tolerate questions or indifference. Even a brief statement can create an implicit demand for a particular response. Waiting is often the safer clinical action, and arranging cover may be necessary when personal circumstances compromise care.

Do not use disclosure to win an argument about diagnosis, politics, religion, parenting, recovery, medication, or values. The authority of personal experience can make disagreement harder rather than more informed. The therapist may state a professional recommendation and its evidence, acknowledge values, and support autonomous decision-making without presenting biography as proof.

High-risk moments require additional caution. A suicidal patient may experience disclosure of therapist fear or personal loss as burden, blame, or a reason to conceal intent. Some carefully bounded immediacy may support connection, but risk assessment, safety planning, and appropriate care must remain central. Disclosure should never substitute for escalation when acute safety needs exceed the setting.

A “no” can be communicated without coldness. The therapist may say that they keep some personal information private and ask what the answer would mean to the patient. The question is not a trick that converts every request into pathology. Sometimes a patient wants ordinary orientation or to assess safety. Professional background, approach, identity relevant to competence, and treatment policies may warrant a direct answer even when private biography does not.

XIII. WHEN A DISCLOSURE MISFIRES

A disclosure can misfire despite thoughtful intent. The patient may feel compared, intruded upon, disappointed, attracted, frightened, or obliged. The therapist's first task is to receive the effect rather than establish that research supports disclosure. Intention can be explained after impact is understood; it does not cancel impact.

Repair begins with a specific acknowledgment. The therapist can name what was said, recognize that it shifted focus or created pressure, apologize when appropriate, and ask what would make the work safer. A long account of decision-making repeats the centering. The corrective action may be a clearer boundary, less disclosure, a change in contact, consultation, or referral if trust cannot be restored.

Alliance-rupture research supports metacommunication and examination of the therapist's contribution (Safran et al., 2011). The patient may not want to process the event and should not be required to make it therapeutically meaningful. A complaint, transfer, or ending can be reasonable. The therapist must not reinterpret refusal as proof that the disclosure touched a defended truth.

Documentation should be factual and proportionate: the disclosure or event, clinical rationale where relevant, patient response, risk or boundary issues, consultation, and agreed plan. It should not pathologize criticism or include unnecessary private details. In serious breaches, ordinary incident, privacy, safeguarding, or regulatory procedures apply; psychotherapy language does not replace governance.

The therapist should also review pattern. Repeated unplanned disclosures may indicate inadequate privacy, poor digital boundaries, or personal impairment. Repeated personal disclosures at moments of silence may reveal difficulty tolerating uncertainty. Repair of one event matters, but prevention requires understanding what keeps producing it.

Effects may emerge after the session. A patient can respond warmly in the moment, then censor material, search for more information, feel embarrassed about curiosity, or reinterpret earlier interactions in light of what was learned. Immediate agreement therefore does not close evaluation. At a later

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). When Should a Therapist Disclose? Self-Disclosure, Immediacy, Boundaries, and the Therapeutic Alliance. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Sep 30;13(3):81-90

session the therapist can ask whether the disclosure affected what felt possible to discuss, the sense of the therapist's role, or any wish to continue, pause, or change treatment. Temporal research on client and therapist perceptions supports attending to sequence and possible disagreement rather than assuming a shared view of the event (Alfi-Yogev et al., 2023). The invitation should be brief and genuinely optional; repeated requests for reassurance can become another burden. If the patient reports no effect, the clinician need not manufacture one, but should remain alert to changes in topic, attendance, contact, or boundary expectations. Repair is demonstrated by restored freedom and role clarity over time, not by securing a favorable retrospective judgment from the patient.

XIV. SUPERVISION, DOCUMENTATION, AND DIGITAL HYGIENE

Supervision is most useful before a high-impact disclosure when possible. The therapist can state the proposed words, patient goal, alternatives, anticipated meanings, cultural context, risks, and plan for response. A supervisor should be able to challenge both rigid nondisclosure and enthusiastic authenticity. The decision belongs within the clinician's competence, professional code, setting, and local law.

Afterward, supervision examines sequence rather than asking only whether disclosure is generally acceptable. What preceded the urge, what was said, how did the patient's speech or behavior change, what did the therapist feel, and what happened in later sessions? Audio or video can reveal timing and tone when consent and governance permit. Memory tends to preserve intention more reliably than impact.

Documentation is not needed for every ordinary human response, but clinically significant disclosure, boundary change, patient concern, accidental exposure, or consultation may warrant a record. The note should serve continuity and accountability, not self-justification. Highly personal therapist information may be summarized only to the extent required to understand patient care.

Digital hygiene includes periodic searches of one's name, review of privacy and tagging settings, separation of professional and personal accounts where feasible, attention to family posts, strong account security, and a written communication policy. It cannot create anonymity. Public scholarship and advocacy may be legitimate; clinicians should decide what public identity means for current and future patients rather than assume that privacy settings settle the issue (Zur et al., 2009; White & Hanley, 2024).

Policies should state whether clinicians search for patients online. Routine covert searching risks privacy and trust; exceptional searching may be justified by a clear safety or legal purpose and should follow professional and organizational guidance. The therapist should consider whether consent can be sought, what information is reliable, how it will be documented, and how discovery will be discussed. Curiosity is not a sufficient clinical indication.

XV. LIMITATIONS OF THE EVIDENCE

Self-disclosure research uses heterogeneous definitions, content, dose, timing, therapies, and outcomes. Some studies combine personal facts with immediacy, while others exclude unavoidable disclosure. Analogue experiments often measure therapist liking, attractiveness, or willingness to disclose after a vignette. These are relevant proximal outcomes but cannot establish durable clinical benefit or safety.

Qualitative research provides the detail needed to understand helpful and harmful experiences, yet participants select memories and meanings retrospectively. Positive disclosures may be discussed by patients who remained in treatment, while those who left or never complained are harder to recruit. Therapists and patients may disagree about whether disclosure occurred and what followed (Hill et al., 2018; Alfi-Yogev et al., 2023).

Clinical trials are few, usually small, and tied to defined protocols. Process associations are vulnerable to selection: responsive therapists may disclose differently, and improving patients may experience the same disclosure more positively. Cultural evidence is especially limited, and broad group labels cannot specify how an individual will interpret identity, hierarchy, or privacy.

Digital platforms change faster than longitudinal research. Current studies largely describe dilemmas rather than test policies that prevent harm (White & Hanley, 2024). Future work should preregister disclosure categories, measure patient goals and preferences, capture delayed and adverse effects, include treatment leavers, and examine diverse settings. Outcomes should include agency, burden, boundary clarity, and trust, not only alliance or immediate affect.

XVI. CONCLUSION

Therapists cannot be blank, but they can be deliberate. Personal disclosure, immediacy, treatment transparency, and unplanned exposure are different events and require different reasoning. Evidence suggests that judicious disclosure can support openness, insight, and alliance; it does not show that more disclosure is better or that a favorable average predicts one patient's experience.

A responsible decision begins with a patient-owned purpose, examines therapist motive, culture, power, alternatives, privacy, and future consequences, and uses no more personal content than needed. Focus returns to the patient, and impact is invited without requiring approval. Transparency about treatment, limits, records, and uncertainty often carries a stronger ethical claim than autobiographical revelation.

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). When Should a Therapist Disclose? Self-Disclosure, Immediacy, Boundaries, and the Therapeutic Alliance. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Sep 30;13(3):81-90

When disclosure burdens, confuses, or harms, the therapist receives the effect, acknowledges contribution, changes practice, and seeks supervision or formal review where required. Sometimes the best disclosure is a concise human statement; sometimes it is a clear rationale or apology; sometimes it is no personal answer at all. The governing question is whether the communication protects a safe, intelligible relationship in which the patient remains free to do their own work.

XVII. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND DISCLOSURES

Conflicts of interest—The author developed and writes about Communication-Focused Therapy (CFT). Where CFT is discussed, it is presented as a formulation perspective and not as a substitute for established assessment, evidence-based treatment, or independent replication. No other conflict of interest was reported.

Funding—No specific funding was reported for this article.

Author contributions—Christian Jonathan Haverkampf is the sole named author and is responsible for the conception, literature review, manuscript preparation, and approval of the final draft.

Patient material—No identifiable patient material is presented. Any brief examples are generic composites created to illustrate clinical reasoning and are not case reports.

XVIII. REFERENCES

Alfi-Yogev, T., Hasson-Ohayon, I., Lazarus, G., Ziv-Beiman, S., & Atzil-Slonim, D. (2021). When to disclose and to whom? Examining within- and between-client moderators of therapist self-disclosure-outcome associations in psychodynamic psychotherapy. Psychotherapy Research, 31(7), 921-931. https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2020.1867774

Alfi-Yogev, T., Kivity, Y., Atzil-Slonim, D., Paz, A., Igra, L., Lavi-Rotenberg, A., & Hasson-Ohayon, I. (2024). Transdiagnostic effects of therapist self-disclosure on diverse emotional experiences of clients with emotional disorders and schizophrenia. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 80(3), 678-691. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.23648

Alfi-Yogev, T., Kivity, Y., Hasson-Ohayon, I., Ziv-Beiman, S., Yehezkel, I., & Atzil-Slonim, D. (2023). Client-therapist temporal congruence in perceiving immediate therapist self-disclosure and its association with treatment outcome. Psychotherapy Research, 33(6), 704-718. https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2022.2151947

American Psychological Association. (2017). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct (2002, amended effective June 1, 2010, and January 1, 2017). https://www.apa.org/ethics/code

Audet, C. T. (2011). Client perspectives of therapist self-disclosure: Violating boundaries or removing barriers? Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 24(2), 85-100. https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2011.589602

Barnett, J. E. (2011). Psychotherapist self-disclosure: Ethical and clinical considerations. Psychotherapy, 48(4), 315-321. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026056

Barnett, J. E. (2019). Psychotherapist self-disclosure. In M. Trachsel, Ş. Tekin, N. Biller-Andorno, J. Gaab, & J. Z. Sadler (Eds.), The Oxford handbook of psychotherapy ethics (pp. 381-397). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198817338.013.31

Barrett, M. S., & Berman, J. S. (2001). Is psychotherapy more effective when therapists disclose information about themselves? Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 69(4), 597-603. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.69.4.597

British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy. (2018). Ethical framework for the counselling professions. https://www.bacp.co.uk/media/3103/bacp-ethical-framework-for-the-counselling-professions-2018.pdf

Burkard, A. W., Knox, S., Groen, M., Perez, M., & Hess, S. A. (2006). European American therapist self-disclosure in cross-cultural counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53(1), 15-25. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.53.1.15

Chang, D. F., & Berk, A. (2009). Making cross-racial therapy work: A phenomenological study of clients' experiences of cross-racial therapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56(4), 521-536. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016905

Flückiger, C., Del Re, A. C., Wampold, B. E., & Horvath, A. O. (2018). The alliance in adult psychotherapy: A meta-analytic synthesis. Psychotherapy, 55(4), 316-340. https://doi.org/10.1037/pst0000172

Gutheil, T. G., & Gabbard, G. O. (1993). The concept of boundaries in clinical practice: Theoretical and risk-management dimensions. American Journal of Psychiatry, 150(2), 188-196. https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.150.2.188

Hanson, J. (2005). Should your lips be zipped? How therapist self-disclosure and non-disclosure affects clients. Counselling and Psychotherapy Research, 5(2), 96-104. https://doi.org/10.1080/17441690500226658

Haverkampf, C. J. (2017). Questions in therapy. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 6(1), 80-81.

Henretty, J. R., Currier, J. M., Berman, J. S., & Levitt, H. M. (2014). The impact of counselor self-disclosure on clients: A meta-analytic review of experimental and quasi-experimental research. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 61(2), 191-207. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036189

Henretty, J. R., & Levitt, H. M. (2010). The role of therapist self-disclosure in psychotherapy: A qualitative review. Clinical Psychology Review, 30(1), 63-77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2009.09.004

Hill, C. E., Knox, S., & Pinto-Coelho, K. G. (2018). Therapist self-disclosure and immediacy: A qualitative meta-analysis. Psychotherapy, 55(4), 445-460. https://doi.org/10.1037/pst0000182

Hook, J. N., Davis, D. E., Owen, J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Utsey, S. O. (2013). Cultural humility: Measuring openness to culturally diverse clients. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 60(3), 353-366. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032595

Kaluzeviciute, G. (2020). Social media and its impact on therapeutic relationships. British Journal of Psychotherapy, 36(2), 303-320. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjp.12545

Kasper, L. B., Hill, C. E., & Kivlighan, D. M. (2008). Therapist immediacy in brief psychotherapy: Case study I. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 45(3), 281-297. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013305

Haverkampf, C. J. (2024). When Should a Therapist Disclose? Self-Disclosure, Immediacy, Boundaries, and the Therapeutic Alliance. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2024 Sep 30;13(3):81-90

Knox, S., & Hill, C. E. (2003). Therapist self-disclosure: Research-based suggestions for practitioners. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 59(5), 529-539. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.10157

Phiri, P., Rathod, S., Gobbi, M., Carr, H., & Kingdon, D. (2019). Culture and therapist self-disclosure. The Cognitive Behaviour Therapist, 12, e25. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1754470X19000102

Safran, J. D., Muran, J. C., & Eubanks-Carter, C. (2011). Repairing alliance ruptures. Psychotherapy, 48(1), 80-87. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022140

White, E., & Hanley, T. (2024). Current ethical dilemmas experienced by therapists who use social media: A systematic review. Counselling and Psychotherapy Research, 24(2), 396-418. https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12678

Ziv-Beiman, S. (2013). Therapist self-disclosure as an integrative intervention. Journal of Psychotherapy Integration, 23(1), 59-74. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031783

Ziv-Beiman, S., Keinan, G., Livneh, E., Malone, P. S., & Shahar, G. (2017). Immediate therapist self-disclosure bolsters the effect of brief integrative psychotherapy on psychiatric symptoms and the perceptions of therapists: A randomized clinical trial. Psychotherapy Research, 27(5), 558-570. https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2016.1138334

Zur, O., Williams, M. H., Lehavot, K., & Knapp, S. (2009). Psychotherapist self-disclosure and transparency in the Internet age. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40(1), 22-30. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014745