

Daniel L. Segal *Editor*

Diagnostic Interviewing

Fifth Edition

 Springer

Diagnostic Interviewing

Daniel L. Segal
Editor

Diagnostic Interviewing

Fifth Edition

 Springer

Editor

Daniel L. Segal
Department of Psychology
University of Colorado
Colorado Springs, CO, USA

ISBN 978-1-4939-9126-6 ISBN 978-1-4939-9127-3 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-9127-3>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2019932992

© Springer International Publishing AG 1994, 2003, 2010, 2019

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Science+Business Media, LLC part of Springer Nature.

The registered company address is: 233 Spring Street, New York, NY 10013, U.S.A.

*Daniel L. Segal: To Cindy, Shaynie,
Mom, and my oldest brother Phil, and
to the memory of my Dad and my middle
brother Eddie.*

Preface

The first three editions of this book had Michel Hersen and Samuel M. Turner as its editors. After Sam's untimely death, Michel invited me to join the team and we co-edited the fourth edition together, which was published in 2010. Now that Michel has retired, I remain as the sole editor for this new fifth edition. That being said, I owe a debt of gratitude to both Sam and Michel for conceiving of the vision for this book and affording me the opportunity to play a role in its continuing evolution. Michel has been a great mentor and friend to me since we met in 1992, and I remain greatly appreciative of all that he has taught me about writing, publishing, supervising, mentoring, and teaching.

As stated in the first edition of this book, one of the most difficult milestones in a new clinician's career is the completion of the first interview with a real live client (as opposed to role playing with other students). Generally, such endeavor is fraught with much apprehension. However, if the interview goes well, there is much rejoicing. On the other hand, if the interview falls flat, there will be considerable consternation on the part of the clinician and usually heavy doses of constructive feedback from the supervisor. Regardless of the amount of preparation that has taken place before the interview, the beginning clinician will justifiably remain apprehensive about this endeavor. Thus, this new edition of *Diagnostic Interviewing*, like the prior editions, remains devoted to providing clear guidance and structure for new and seasoned clinicians in successfully engaging with a large variety of clients and presenting problems in diverse interviewing settings. I sincerely hope that readers of this book find many pearls of wisdom in these pages and that this book helps them become better clinicians.

In consideration of the positive response to the first four editions of this book, our editor at Springer, Sharon Panulla, and I decided that it was time to update the material. However, the basic premise that a book of this nature needs to encompass theoretical rationale, clinical description, and the pragmatics of "how to" once again has been dutifully followed. Thus, the reader will find consistencies between this new fifth edition and the prior ones that have been published. We still believe that students definitely need to read the material covered herein with consummate care. We are particularly concerned that in the clinical education of our graduate students,

interviewing unfortunately continues to be given insufficient attention. Considering that good interviewing leads to appropriate clinical and research targets, we continue to underscore the critical importance of this area of training.

Many years have elapsed since publication of the first edition, and many developments in the field have occurred, including repeated revisions of the DSM system of classification and diagnosis. However, the basic structure of this new edition remains identical to those of the prior ones, in that Part I deals with General Issues, Part II with Specific Disorders, and Part III with Special Populations. Chapters in Parts II and III generally follow the outline below:

1. Description of the Disorder, Problem, or Special Population
2. Procedures for Gathering Information
3. Recommendations for Formal Assessment
4. Case Illustrations
5. Impact of Gender, Race, Culture, Age, and Other Aspects of Diversity
6. Information Critical to Making a Diagnosis
7. Dos and Don'ts
8. Summary
9. References

Many individuals have contributed to the development and production of this new edition. First, I wish to thank our eminent contributors for sharing with us their clinical and research experience and expertise. Second, I would like to thank Sylvana Ruggirello and Chitra Gopalraj for their technical assistance and for their excellent work in shepherding the book through production. Third, I wish to thank my departmental colleagues and friends at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS) for their support, and likewise I am grateful to my students at UCCS from whom I have learned so much. Finally, I once again thank my friend and editor at Springer, Sharon Panulla, for her appreciation of the need for this new edition of our text and for her ongoing enthusiasm and support for this endeavor.

Colorado Springs, CO, USA

Daniel L. Segal

Contents

Part I General Issues

- 1 Basics and Beyond in Clinical and Diagnostic Interviewing 3**
Daniel L. Segal, Andrea June, and Marissa Pifer
- 2 Interviewing Strategies, Rapport, and Empathy 29**
Catherine Miller
- 3 Presenting Problem, History of Presenting Problem,
and Social History 55**
Thomas B. Virden III and Melissa Flint
- 4 Mental Status Examination 77**
Brenna N. Renn and Samantha E. John
- 5 Consideration of Neuropsychological Factors in Interviewing. 103**
Brian P. Yochim and Stephanie Potts

Part II Specific Disorders

- 6 Anxiety Disorders 129**
Cierra B. Edwards, Amber L. Billingsley, and Shari A. Steinman
- 7 Obsessive-Compulsive and Related Disorders 155**
Michelle L. Davis, Elizabeth McIngvale, Sophie C. Schneider,
Wayne K. Goodman, and Eric A. Storch
- 8 Trauma and Stressor-Related Disorders. 179**
Osnat Lupesko-Persky and Lisa M. Brown
- 9 Depressive Disorders. 213**
Leilani Feliciano, Amber M. Gum, and Katherine A. Johanson
- 10 Bipolar Disorders 239**
Samantha L. Connolly and Christopher J. Miller

11 Schizophrenia 261
Jason E. Peer and Zachary B. Millman

12 Personality Disorders 293
Neil Bockian

13 Substance Use Disorders 325
Catherine E. Paquette, Jessica F. Magidson, Surabhi Swaminath,
and Stacey B. Daughters

**14 Sexual Dysfunctions, Gender Dysphoria, and Paraphilic
Disorders** 349
Caroline F. Pukall, Tony Eccles, and Stéphanie Gauvin

15 Eating Disorders 375
Brittany K. Bohrer, Danielle A. N. Chapa, Alexis Exum,
Brienne Richson, Michaela M. Voss, and Kelsie T. Forbush

16 Dissociative Disorders 401
Tyson D. Bailey, Stacey M. Boyer, and Bethany L. Brand

Part III Special Populations

17 Children 427
Rebecca A. Grossman, Niza A. Tonarely, and Jill Ehrenreich-May

18 Older Adults 455
Rachael Spalding, Emma Katz, and Barry Edelstein

19 Interviewing in Health Psychology and Medical Settings 481
Jay M. Behel and Bruce Rybarczyk

Index 505

Contributors

Tyson D. Bailey Private Practice, Lynnwood, WA, USA

Jay M. Behel Department of Behavioral Sciences, Rush Medical College of Rush University, Chicago, IL, USA

Amber L. Billingsley West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, USA

Neil Bockian Department of Psychology, Adler University, Chicago, IL, USA

Brittany K. Bohrer University of Kansas, Department of Psychology, Lawrence, KS, USA

Stacey M. Boyer Christiana Care Health System, Newark, DE, USA

Bethany L. Brand Towson University, Towson, MD, USA

Lisa M. Brown Palo Alto University, Palo Alto, CA, USA

Danielle A. N. Chapa University of Kansas, Department of Psychology, Lawrence, KS, USA

Samantha L. Connolly VA Boston Healthcare System, Center for Healthcare Organization and Implementation Research (CHOIR), Boston, MA, USA

Harvard Medical School, Department of Psychiatry, Boston, MA, USA

Stacey B. Daughters University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

Michelle L. Davis Baylor College of Medicine, Menninger Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Houston, TX, USA

Tony Eccles Forensic Behavior Services, Kingston, ON, Canada

Barry Edelstein West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, USA

Cierra B. Edwards West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, USA

Jill Ehrenreich-May Department of Psychology, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL, USA

Alexis Exum University of Kansas, Department of Psychology, Lawrence, KS, USA

Leilani Feliciano University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, CO, USA

Melissa Flint Midwestern University, Glendale, AZ, USA

Kelsie T. Forbush University of Kansas, Department of Psychology, Lawrence, KS, USA

Stéphanie Gauvin Sexual Health Research Laboratory, Department of Psychology, Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada

Wayne K. Goodman Baylor College of Medicine, Menninger Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Houston, TX, USA

Rebecca A. Grossman University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL, USA

Amber M. Gum Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute University of South Florida, Tampa, FL, USA

Katherine A. Johanson University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, CO, USA

Samantha E. John Department of Neurology and Goizueta Alzheimer's Disease Research Center, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, USA

Andrea June Department of Psychology, Central Connecticut State University, New Britain, CT, USA

Emma Katz West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, USA

Osnat Lupesko-Persky Palo Alto University, Palo Alto, CA, USA

Jessica F. Magidson University of Maryland, College Park, College Park, MD, USA

Elizabeth McIngvale Baylor College of Medicine, Menninger Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Houston, TX, USA

Catherine Miller Pacific University, School of Graduate Psychology, Hillsboro, OR, USA

Christopher J. Miller VA Boston Healthcare System, Center for Healthcare Organization and Implementation Research (CHOIR), Boston, MA, USA

Harvard Medical School, Department of Psychiatry, Boston, MA, USA

Zachary B. Millman Department of Psychology, University of Maryland Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD, USA

Catherine E. Paquette University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

Jason E. Peer VA Maryland Health Care System, Baltimore, MD, USA

Marissa Pifer Department of Psychology, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, CO, USA

Stephanie Potts VA Saint Louis Health Care System, St. Louis, MO, USA

Caroline F. Pukall Department of Psychology, Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada

Brenna N. Renn Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

Brianne Richson University of Kansas, Department of Psychology, Lawrence, KS, USA

Bruce Rybarczyk Department of Psychology, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, USA

Sophie C. Schneider Baylor College of Medicine, Menninger Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Houston, TX, USA

Daniel L. Segal Department of Psychology, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, CO, USA

Rachael Spalding West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, USA

Shari A. Steinman West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, USA

Eric A. Storch Baylor College of Medicine, Menninger Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Houston, TX, USA

Surabhi Swaminath University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

Niza A. Tonarely University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL, USA

Thomas B. Virden III Midwestern University, Glendale, AZ, USA

Michaela M. Voss Children's Mercy – Kansas City, Department of Adolescent Medicine, Kansas City, MO, USA

Brian P. Yochim VA Saint Louis Health Care System, St. Louis, MO, USA

Part I
General Issues

Chapter 1

Basics and Beyond in Clinical and Diagnostic Interviewing



Daniel L. Segal, Andrea June, and Marissa Pifer

The ability to conduct an efficient and effective clinical and diagnostic interview is arguably one of the most valued skills among mental health professionals. It is during the interview that the clinician learns about the difficulties and challenges experienced by the client and begins to form the foundations of a healing professional therapeutic relationship. Although the metaphor is not a novel one, the job of the interviewer may be likened to that of a detective trying to collect enough data and organize the clues to “solve the mystery,” in this example, the presenting problem and diagnosis of the client. The most important aspect of this detective metaphor is that effective interviewers (detectives) are served well by their natural curiosity (truly wanting to understand all aspects of the client’s experiences, no matter how painful or uncomfortable) and the thoughtfulness of their approach (being guided by strategies and principles for gathering data while also forming an emotional connection with the client).

Broadly construed, the clinical interview is the foundation of all clinical activity in counseling and psychotherapy (Hook, Hodges, Segal, & Coolidge, 2010; Segal, Maxfield, & Coolidge, 2008). Indeed, one cannot be a good clinician without well-developed interviewing skills. Although specific attention is often paid to the initial clinical interview (or first contact between clinician and client), it is ill-advised to think that clinicians first *complete* an interview and *then* start treatment. Rather, it is more accurate to view the clinical interview as an *ongoing* part of the psychotherapeutic process (Hook et al., 2010). For the beginning clinician, trying to manage the content and process of the interview can seem like a daunting task, one that often evokes considerable anxiety. However, with guidance, feedback-informed practice, and a good deal of self-reflection on one’s clinical strengths and still-developing

D. L. Segal (✉) · M. Pifer
Department of Psychology, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, CO, USA
e-mail: dsegal@uccs.edu

A. June
Department of Psychology, Central Connecticut State University, New Britain, CT, USA

skills, many beginning clinicians find that they are able to refine their interviewing skills over time and become much more comfortable with the process. Indeed, when successfully mastered, clinical and diagnostic interviewing skills become an important part of the clinicians' repertoire. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss and elucidate some of the key factors that can facilitate the interview process. The overview presented in this chapter of the basic issues regarding clinical interviewing will also set the stage for the following chapters in this volume that provide considerable depth in the major areas of clinical and diagnostic interviewing, including many disorder-specific approaches. We begin with discussions of the different settings in which interviews occur, confidentiality, and the basic skills used in interviews. Next, we describe the importance of understanding the impact of client diversity on the interview process and pay targeted attention to the issues faced by mental health professionals who are in the beginning stages of professional development as a clinician and interviewer. We conclude this chapter with a discussion of some dos and don'ts of clinical and diagnostic interviewing.

The Impact of the Interview Setting

Perhaps the first critical factor that influences the nature of the interview is the setting in which the interview takes place. There are a variety of settings in which interviews may occur and the type of setting often determines how the client is approached. Specifically, the setting will help determine the depth and length of the interview, the domains of functioning that are assessed, the types of questions that should be asked, and the degree of cooperation that can be expected. For example, the level of cooperation that can be expected from a juvenile delinquent forced to participate in court-ordered psychotherapy will be substantially different than that from an adult or older adult who is burdened with responsibilities of caring for a frail family member and who is eagerly seeking psychotherapy at a community mental health clinic. As such, each interview will require a different approach because of the circumstances of how each client comes to be interviewed and the expectations established for client behavior. To address the issues of the setting on the interviewing process, we discuss emergency and crisis settings, outpatient mental health settings, medical settings, and jail, prison, and courthouse settings.

Emergency and Crisis Settings

Emergency and crisis settings are diverse and include general hospital emergency rooms, inpatient psychiatric hospitals, and crisis centers. Clients who may be encountered in these settings include individuals with acute medical problems that are compounded by psychiatric factors (including those in acute pain), people who are brought for psychiatric evaluation by law enforcement or emergency medical

personnel, individuals involved in voluntary or involuntary psychiatric commitment proceedings, and people who are experiencing an acute, often volatile crisis situation. Individuals requiring emergency care may exhibit psychotic disturbances, including active *hallucinations* (false sensory experiences, such as hearing voices when none are objectively present), *delusions* (false beliefs, not supported by one's culture, such as paranoid ideation), and *disorganized thinking and speech* (incoherent, confused, rambling, or tangential thinking and speech, along with decreased problem-solving ability); drug and alcohol problems, including acute intoxication and disorientation; organic brain syndromes, such as a traumatic brain injury, delirium, or other types of neurological disorders; depressive disorders (e.g., severe depression with psychotic features and/or active suicidal thoughts); and personality disorders, especially those characterized by volatile and impulsive behaviors (e.g., borderline personality disorder).

Because the interview occurs under emergency conditions, clinicians should be prepared to alter the style and format of the traditional interview. Clients in emergency settings are often frightened by their perceptions and feelings, as well as by the surroundings in which they find themselves, and they often exhibit extremes in emotions. They may be too agitated, frightened, or paranoid to provide detailed histories. Thus, the goal in such settings is to gain enough information to make a tentative diagnosis and offer emergency treatment planning, including whether to hospitalize the person or not. One primary focus should be a thorough assessment of dangerousness, including suicidal or homicidal ideation or plans. Some emergency departments in the USA have enacted a universal screening approach to suicidality, which has resulted in greater screenings and greater detection of those at risk for suicide (Betz et al., 2015). Nevertheless, challenges remain even in these settings, including barriers to lethal-means assessment (Betz et al., 2018) and some disparities in screening and treatment for older adults (Arias et al., 2017; Betz et al., 2016).

In emergency settings, a careful examination of the client's current mental status is more important than a detailed social history or formal psychological testing. It is helpful to strive to try and pinpoint how and why the client is in the current state of crisis and what the immediate precipitating events were (Dattilio & Freeman, 2010), although the full story may not always be easy to discern. Keep in mind that a calm and understanding attitude on the part of the clinician can increase the client's comfort level enough to allow the interviewer to obtain a reasonable sense of the nature of the problem. Collateral interviews with concerned others are usually important in emergency settings, especially if the client is unwilling or unable to participate in the interview.

Outpatient Mental Health Settings

Compared to clients seen in emergency settings, clients served by outpatient community mental health centers and private outpatient practices will have a more varied range of psychopathology. Whereas psychotic disturbances and suicidal ideation

may be encountered within this setting, typically clients are more stable and not in severe enough crisis to warrant hospitalization. Therefore, the nature of the interview will be considerably different from that in emergency and crisis settings.

The objective of the interview in this setting is to learn as much about the client's current psychological and emotional functioning as possible, including the client's reasons for seeking psychotherapy, and to fully explore the client's personal history (often called the social history) to put the client's current problems in a proper context. The interview is typically guided by the problems and fortitude of the client, and because there is generally little or no mystery for the client as to the purpose of the interview, there is generally less resistance during the interview. Thus, the interviewer will typically have more time and less trouble in conducting a comprehensive interview, which typically occurs during a 60–90-minute session. A thorough understanding of the client's current and past difficulties and the contexts in which the struggles occur is necessary for the clinician to develop an initial conceptualization of the problem and to develop an appropriate initial treatment plan.

Compared to the pressure of emergency settings, interviewers in outpatient settings are usually afforded the luxury of time to establish rapport with the client and lay the groundwork for a productive therapeutic relationship. In outpatient settings, clients may be inquisitive about the nature of their problems or disorders (sometimes requesting a formal diagnosis), the causes of their problems or disorders, and the pragmatics of treatment (e.g., fees, length of treatment, and the theoretical orientation or general approach of the clinician). These questions should be addressed candidly and sensitively to promote transparency and to foster trust in the relationship (Faust, 1998). Of course, there is no crystal ball to precisely determine how long treatment will last for a particular client, but it is often helpful to establish a general time frame with the client and to secure an initial agreement to treatment with a plan to review progress in a short period of time: "How would you feel about making an initial commitment to weekly psychotherapy for the next 8 weeks? At the end of that time (if not sooner), let's evaluate how we are doing together and decide how we should proceed, to determine if we need to contract for another series of sessions." The manner in which questions about diagnosis and treatment are answered will help the client develop an informed perspective on his or her treatment, specifically, what can and cannot be done and what the long-term prognosis entails. Even if the client does not request such information, it may be helpful for the clinician to address these types of issues with the client at the end of the initial interview.

Medical Settings

Medical settings (e.g., medical school hospitals, rehabilitation hospitals, Veterans Affairs medical centers, integrated care settings) present a unique challenge for clinical work. Often, medical patients do not request to consult with a mental health professional, but rather the referral is the decision of the treating physician. The reason for the referral may or may not have been explained to the patient, and

therefore the patient may be initially hesitant or reluctant to communicate to the clinician and, in some cases, may even refuse to be interviewed (Faust, 1998). Individuals in this setting frequently have various medical illnesses and therefore have defined their “problem” as solely a medical one. As such, they may not understand why a mental health professional has been called to see them.

It behooves the mental health clinician in medical settings to be prepared for varying levels of knowledge about and active participation in the referral process among patients, and thus at the beginning of the interview should introduce him or herself, explain the purpose of the consultation, and state who requested it. In medical settings, the clinician is likely to garner cooperation with the medical patient when the clinician presents himself or herself as an information gatherer and acknowledges the client’s physical condition without immediately suggesting that there is a psychological disturbance, even if one is suspected. If the clinician is fortunate enough to work within an interdisciplinary team within an integrated care setting, the interview can be framed as “comprehensive care” which may decrease some of the stigma associated with mental health treatment.

In these settings, clinicians also should be prepared to adjust the format and length of the interview according to the needs of the medical patient. Depending upon the medical conditions experienced by the patient, he or she may be in considerable discomfort which impacts one’s ability to engage in a dialogue and answer questions. Some medical patients may need a period of cultivation (e.g., having a few informal visits to get to know the patient) before they are willing to delve into emotional concerns or psychological topics, requiring the clinician to be flexible on the number of visits needed to complete the interviewing task. Clinicians in medical settings also need to be mindful of the other professionals working within the facility and the schedules to which these other professionals must adhere. Some flexibility and coordination with the other care providers help to ensure the interview sessions and treatment sessions have as few interruptions as possible.

If the clinician is a consultant in a medical setting, it is particularly important to avoid being manipulated into siding with the client against the physician. It is critical to maintain the stance of an investigator with no specific position. Consultant clinicians must remember they are invited by the treating physician to render their expert advice on a particular problem. A major difficulty can arise in this setting if negative statements and judgments about other aspects of the patient’s care are rendered by the clinician. This type of behavior will most certainly have a negative impact on the doctor-patient relationship and the doctor-clinician relationship to work in the best interest of the medical patient.

Jail, Prison, Corrections, and Courthouse Settings

There are certain aspects of correctional facilities which present unique challenges to the clinical interviewer including population factors, limits to confidentiality, and environmental factors. Depending upon the reason for referral, these settings can

have a distinctly unpleasant adversarial tone. Clients may range from being very resistant and defiant of the entire process to being overly attentive and concerned. Some clients, in fact, may honestly want psychological assistance. A client's motivation to be truthful, forthright, and forthcoming with information will also depend upon the perceived referral question and the circumstances of the interview (Faust, 1998). Jail and prison settings have higher rates of mental disorders compared to the general population. As such, mental health screens are particularly important in these settings (Abram, Teplin, & McClelland, 2003; Fazel & Seewald, 2012). Without adequate assessment for potential mental disorders and subsequent treatment, inmates may be at risk of harming themselves or other inmates, may become a target for violence, or may become disruptive to prison operations (Lee, 2015).

In these settings, privacy is likely to be limited when conducting interviews as other people (e.g., fellow inmates, guards, attorneys) may be within listening proximity to the interview. Additionally, because many of these evaluations are court mandated, confidentiality of records does not apply (Faust, 1998). In these cases, clinicians should be clear and honest with the client about these limits and the role of the clinician. The clinician may also be restricted by time in this setting. In an emergency hearing, for example, the clinician may have limited time to interview the client and make recommendations. Prisons tend to have rigid schedules, and clinical interviewers often have little-to-no control over the schedule or time allotted for the interview. At other times, the clinician will need to coordinate his or her schedule with others at the jail or prison, limiting flexibility as compared to some other settings. Safety is another important concern in these settings. It is important for clinicians to be aware of their surroundings and to avoid exposure to vulnerable positions as much as possible (Lee, 2015). Although most inmates are not aggressive or violent toward clinicians, certain inmates may need to be left in restraints throughout the interview, and often a prison guard will remain present or just outside the door throughout the interview process (Lee, 2015).

During interviews in this setting, the clinician may want to look for inconsistencies in the client's behavior and self-report because there may be perceived benefits to the client to either minimize reports of psychopathology or conversely to exaggerate mental health concerns. When possible, interviewing and observing the significant people in the client's life (e.g., spouses, parents, children) may also be informative (Faust, 1998). For example, referrals concerning adult guardianship often require the court-appointed clinician to interview both parties vying for guardianship as well as other people involved in the adult's life (e.g., guardian ad litem, the adult protective agency worker, the adult's children, other kin). These additional interviews can help to verify information, uncover inconsistencies, and ultimately help the clinician determine the most optimal course of action. It is especially important for clinicians to evaluate their personal biases and reduce judgment which may occur when working in prison settings. Clinicians may naturally have more negative views about inmates than the general population, especially those inmates who have committed especially heinous crimes such as child sexual abuse or murder. Negative reactions to the interviewee may cause the clinician to lose objectivity; this may lead to difficulty exploring all relevant areas or missing diagnoses.

Inmates are also often expecting judgment and therefore may be more sensitive to changes in the clinician's demeanor which may suggest negative feelings toward the inmate. This will damage rapport and make diagnostic interviewing more difficult and less effective (Lee, 2015). Clinicians should be careful to assess their biases and maintain a nonjudgmental attitude, no matter the population.

Confidentiality

A hallmark feature of a professional therapeutic relationship is *confidentiality*, which is the requirement that mental health clinicians protect their client's privacy by not revealing the contents of psychotherapy or counseling. Indeed, confidentiality is a critical aspect to address in an initial interview. Guidelines for psychologists regarding confidentiality are established by the American Psychological Association (APA) in the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct* (APA, 2017). Specifically, the APA ethical principle (standard 4.01) states that "Psychologists have a primary obligation and take reasonable precautions to protect confidential information obtained through or stored in any medium, recognizing that the extent and limits of confidentiality may be regulated by law or established by institutional rules or professional or scientific relationship."

Because a breach in confidentiality is such a serious action, clients must be fully and dutifully informed of the limits of confidentiality at the onset of a clinical interview, prior to any other information discussed (see Table 1.1 for common limitations to confidentiality). Such disclosure is almost always done verbally with the client and provided in written form, as part of an informed consent document. We advise taking a straightforward approach when discussing and educating clients about the limitations of confidentiality. Although there is no clear answer about whether the conversation should take place at first contact over the phone or at first contact in the session, it is probably best to wait until meeting the client for the first time to fully explain the concept so that the clinician can see the client's response and gauge the client's understanding. However, there may also be times where it is appropriate to discuss such limitations over the phone. For example, if a new client

Table 1.1 Common limitations to confidentiality in counseling and psychotherapy

Clinicians may disclose private information without consent in order to protect the client or the public from serious harm, for example, when a client discusses serious plans to attempt suicide or to harm another specific person

Clinicians are commonly required to report child abuse or neglect, elder abuse or neglect, and abuse or neglect of persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities

Clinicians may release confidential information if they receive a court order from a judge. This event may occur when a client's mental health comes into question during legal proceedings

Note: The client's right to confidentiality has legal as well as clinical implications. Laws pertaining to confidentiality vary from state to state, so mental health clinicians should refer to their state's specific laws as well as their discipline-specific code of ethics

became overly detailed about his or her struggles over the phone, it would behoove the clinician to make attempts to respectfully curtail such disclosures until confidentiality has been addressed sufficiently.

Confidentiality is such an important topic that state laws regulating the practice of psychologists typically have provisions about confidentiality and guidelines pertaining to the clinician-client relationship. In short, clinicians must maintain the privacy of their client's communications and records in order for effective evaluation and treatment to be possible. Caution must be exercised in releasing information to anyone but the client, and it is always best to err on the conservative side (Faust, 1998). If in doubt, do not release information without written consent from the client or court order. Several important factors that may impinge on confidentiality are discussed next.

Age

The age of consent to psychological evaluation or treatment varies among the states. Therefore, a 15-year-old adolescent seeking mental health services without parental or legal guardian consent may be able to do so legally in one state but not the other. In a state where it is legal to provide services to a 15-year-old without parental or guardian consent, all confidentiality laws of that state and professional ethical guidelines would apply. In other states, persons under the age of 18 would be considered minors, and no services may be rendered without parental or guardian consent. In such cases, the minor client should be informed of this requirement prior to the interview, and the client should also be made aware that his or her parents or guardians have a legal right to all records of evaluation and treatment.

Confidentiality of Written Records

Written records of psychological assessment and treatment are confidential documents. These records may not be released to any third party (including other professionals) without written consent from the client. For unlicensed professionals or students in training, the supervisor or clinical supervision team will be privy to the information, and the client should be duly informed of this, usually in writing in the informed consent document. It is the responsibility of each professional to maintain up-to-date, detailed, and accurate records of treatment and to provide safeguards for such material. Given the number of people who could potentially access records (i.e., whomever the client releases the information to, third-party payers, legal guardians, etc.), it is prudent to take care when documenting in the record. It would be wise for clinicians to imagine that judges, attorneys, insurance company personnel, physicians, and the client himself or herself are looking over their shoulder while documenting treatment (Faust, 1998). Alternatively, whereas one must be

careful and prudent when documenting in charts, records should have enough detail to facilitate treatment planning and meet the requirements for reimbursement from third-party payers. Certain aspects of the clinical record (e.g., dates of sessions, diagnoses) may be released to a third-party payer for reimbursement. Maintaining adequate records is particularly important should the client transfer to another agency or clinician in the future. Although malpractice claims or lawsuits arising from interviews or treatments are relatively uncommon, an appropriately detailed record may also be an important part of the clinician's defense.

The security of client records is the responsibility of the treating clinician. Written or printed information should never be left unattended and should be filed promptly and properly when not being used. Written or printed records should be kept in locked files with limited access. As most records are now created and stored digitally or electronically, this has resulted in new challenges, for example, ensuring that computers and servers are physically secure and that no data breaches occur. Indeed, the safety of electronic records is an increasingly important issue. At a minimum, electronic records must be stored on a password-protected computer in a locked office. However, more secure methods of storing records electronically are preferred. Often, this includes use of encryption software or a secure medical record system. Electronic medical record systems make it easier and more convenient for mental health providers to document and access client medical and mental health records. They also can add more security to client information than was previously offered with written records. Confidentiality concerns may arise with electronic medical records though, especially in settings where interprofessional collaboration is common or where access is not heavily restricted (Richards, 2009). Clinicians may need to be particularly mindful of information they include in a client's chart, especially if that information may be available to other providers. However, as technology advances, developers are adding new ways to control who can access client information, as well as where, when, and how they are able to access the information (Nielsen, 2015). As with all record keeping, clinicians should be mindful of the information they include in the chart as well as mindful of who may potentially have access to those records.

Duty to Warn and Protect

As noted above, one noteworthy limitation of confidentiality is the legal and ethical responsibility of mental health professionals to protect their clients and members of society from imminent danger. Although clinicians are legally and ethically required to maintain confidentiality between themselves and their clients, clinicians also have an obligation to protect dangerous clients from themselves (i.e., suicide) and to protect potential victims from dangerous clients (i.e., homicide, child or elder neglect, or abuse). This blurring of the responsibility of confidentiality occurred because of the landmark *Tarasoff v. Regents of University of California* case in 1976. In this landmark case, the California Supreme Court required clinicians to

take steps to protect individuals who are potential victims of their clients. This law held that psychotherapists in the state of California have a duty to protect intended victims of their patients if their intended conduct “presents a serious danger of violence to another.” Since this ruling in 1976, 33 other states have formally established similar laws (Bersoff, 2014). Therefore, should a client inform a clinician that he or she has a specific and imminent homicidal plan with an identified potential victim, the following actions may need to be taken: the clinician has a duty to warn an intended victim, the clinician may need to commit the client to a psychiatric facility, and the clinician may need to notify the police about the client’s plan (Faust, 1998). Consultation with supervisors or professional colleagues is clearly advised during these types of situations to think through the necessary steps one must take to protect clients and members of society.

A full assessment of suicidal and homicidal ideation or thoughts should be a part of most, if not all, clinical interviews with a new client. New clinicians may avoid asking about suicidal or homicidal ideation for fear of the response and added responsibility. However, failing to assess for either suicidal or homicidal ideation is dangerous, and a clinician could be held liable if someone is hurt and the clinician had failed to reasonably assess the client. Before addressing thoughts of suicidal or homicidal ideation, it is important to discuss the limits of confidentiality. Limits to confidentiality must be discussed thoroughly at the start of treatment to ensure clients are aware of them and choose what information to disclose accordingly (APA, 2017). In some cases, clients who have been told these confidentiality limits may choose not to disclose information concerning suicidal or homicidal thoughts. If thoughts of harm are suspected the most a clinician can do is communicate concern and emphasize the importance of client safety. Further guidance about the duty to warn and protect is provided by Werth (2017).

Managing the Temptation to Discuss Cases

Information gathered from clinical interviews should not be the topic of casual conversation under any circumstances. Even anecdotal de-identified information can be highly identifiable if the situation is distinct. Describing a client during the course of a conversation with professional colleagues in what may seem to be a private setting may actually include unintended listeners who can identify the client’s information due to the distinguishing features of the story. Novice clinicians may be more prone to discussing aspects of therapeutic experiences with peers in inappropriate settings (e.g., restaurants, bars, etc.). They may also be compelled to discuss clients in areas of the treatment setting where other listeners may be present (e.g., at the front desk, elevators, hallways). Remember that confidentiality is the rule for information gathered in a clinical interview, not the exception, and that respect for confidentiality is one of the most important elements in forging an open and honest dialogue. Violation of the client’s confidentiality without just cause is a serious offense, both legally and ethically, so great caution is always advised.

The issue of confidentiality is serious and complex with many potential ramifications. It can be tricky to navigate and must be handled with care. One simple rule of thumb is to avoid saying anything to anyone about the client that the clinician would be uncomfortable saying to them in front of the client, the client's attorney, and the clinician's supervisor. Whereas the intent of this section was to alert the clinician to the primary issues, for more in-depth coverage of confidentiality, the interested reader is referred to Knapp, VandeCreek, and Fingerhut (2017), Koocher and Keith-Spiegel (2016), and the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct* (APA, 2017).

Interviewing Basics

In this section, we provide a broad overview of some of the foundational concepts and skills that impact the clinical interview.

Establishing Rapport

Establishing rapport refers to creating an open, trusting, warm, and safe relationship with the client. Of course, this is easier said than done, but establishing rapport with the client is an important requisite for effective interviewing and ongoing psychotherapy. Indeed, research has consistently identified that a positive therapeutic relationship is essential to the success experienced by most clients (see through review by Norcross, 2011). The therapeutic relationship is one of the so-called "common factors" of psychotherapy that robustly contributes to the benefits of treatment (Wampold, 2015).

At the most basic level, for clients to participate in psychotherapy, it is vital that they feel at ease with the clinician, which facilitates the clients in disclosing and discussing intimate and personal details of their lives. Remember that, initially, many clients do not know what to expect from psychotherapy or from the clinician. Clients are faced with the task of being expected to reveal private and emotionally sensitive information to a veritable stranger! As such, they may be apprehensive, embarrassed, or downright terrified at the beginning of the first interview. Some clients find it difficult to ask for help because of the stigma associated with mental disorders and their treatment. Others may have been in psychotherapy before but did not find it useful and therefore are cautious and skeptical of what the clinician can offer.

Faced with these challenges, the role of the clinician is to convey to the client an appreciation of their feelings and a willingness to listen without judgment to whatever the client may present. If the clinician keeps in mind that the client must be permitted time and patience for the establishment of trust, favorable results are likely to follow. Indeed, trust must be earned and should not be automatically

expected. Critically important to the establishment of trust is the client's belief that the psychotherapy will provide new perspectives, change, and the possibility for growth. If the clinician can demonstrate this hope, clients will likely experience the freedom and security to more fully disclose and explore their problems. The course of establishing an effective client-clinician relationship will be varied, but two overarching goals of the clinician are to establish and maintain a trusting and respectful therapeutic relationship with the client.

Being Empathic

A fundamental skill for any clinician is the ability to empathize with another person's experiences and convey such empathy through validation and understanding. Empathy is the ability to perceive and understand a client's feelings "as if" the clinician was experiencing them and to communicate that accurate understanding to the client (Faust, 1998). Always keep in mind that no two clients are the same and the clinician should be attuned to the subtleties of the client's thoughts, feelings, behaviors, and lived experiences. A distinction to be made is that empathy is understanding, not sympathy. By responding empathically, the client knows that the clinician is accepting, understanding, and joining his or her "world" without judgment, rather than just "feeling bad" for the client (Johnston, Van Hasselt, & Hersen, 1998). This empathic understanding enhances trust and increases the likelihood that the client will reveal intimate details of his or her life, possibly details that the client has never previously revealed to anyone.

Empathy can be conveyed in many ways (e.g., nonverbal behaviors, such as listening attentively, nodding, showing a concerned facial expression, verbal communication of understanding, and support), allowing the clinician to choose a style that is most comfortable for him or her. It is hard to do any of these things while taking notes, so keep note-taking to a minimum. Other important strategies for conveying empathy and validation include tone of voice, time and rate of comments and questions, and the area of questioning. When used correctly, these latter, seemingly trivial, strategies can be critical in conveying warmth and understanding.

Using Reflection

Reflection statements address what the client has communicated (verbally or non-verbally) and are typically used to highlight a specific point. A reflection statement, however brief, usually marks a specific feeling or point of information and thus can be divided into *reflection of feelings* or *reflection of content*. Liberal use of both throughout clinical interviews is advised. Indeed, reflection is an important tool for any interviewer. When a clinician reflects a client's feelings or the content of what

a client is saying, or both simultaneously, this accomplishes two important tasks. First, it conveys a sense of empathy to the client by sending a message that the client is accurately understood, which strengthens the therapeutic bond. Second, it provides a mirror image for the client of what they are feeling and saying. This “clinician mirror” is an invaluable method for the client to learn about himself or herself (Johnston et al., 1998). Reflection is a skill that assists clients to monitor and identify different feeling states and also to express those states in a healthy way.

Mastery of this skill does not mean that the clinician mimes or mimics the responses of the client. Reflection of feeling can be delivered in a simple phrase, such as “Sounds like you are feeling ...,” “You must be feeling ...,” or “I hear that you are feeling ...” Reflection of content means that the clinician accurately paraphrases or summarizes the client’s statements, reflecting the “essence” of what the client communicated but not using the exact words or phrases. Think of this skill as helping the client in “getting to the heart of the matter” (Johnston et al., 1998) but not parroting back to the client exactly what he or she said. In summary, reflective statements can aid in the development of rapport as clients perceive that they are being truly and deeply understood. In turn, the client may relay more information that further strengthens the bond and ultimately assists the clinician in determining appropriate interventions.

Paying Attention to Language and Avoiding Jargon

An integral part of a successful interview is the communication between clinician and client. To arrive at an accurate diagnostic picture, the clinician must communicate to the client what is being asked of him or her. The clarity and comprehensibility of the questions will facilitate identification of pertinent information while enhancing rapport and trust in the client-clinician relationship (Faust, 1998). A common mistake that new clinicians sometimes make is their use of jargon or non-familiar vocabulary. The clinician’s use of vocabulary heavy in psychological terminology often hinders effective communication. For example, a graduate student asked her new client, “What kind of boundaries do you have with your mother?” The term *boundaries* may mean something completely different to the client than it does to the clinician. In this example, the student clinician risks her client answering without a clear understanding of what is being asked and possibly hindering development of an accurate case formulation. Similar risks are possible with respect to unfamiliar language. Clinicians should consider the client’s level of education, intelligence, age, background, and geographical location (Faust, 1998). This does not mean that the clinician should “talk down to” the client in any way. It does mean that words should be chosen with consideration.

Using Humor

The image of the stoic, impersonal, unflappable, and humorless clinician who is devoid of feelings is an outdated one. Certainly, being able to see the humorous elements even in the most challenging situations in one's life can be an adaptive coping strategy for clinicians and clients alike. In the interview setting, humor has the potential to "take the edge" off a discussion of particularly painful material and can serve to release physical tension. Smiling or even laughing together can be a source of bonding between clinician and client. These positive aspects of humor notwithstanding, some judicious caution in the use of humor is advised. For the clinician, the use of jokes or humor should be done sparingly and with caution before a therapeutic relationship is solidly formed. Although the intention of the clinician may be to lighten the mood, a humorous remark is typically not appropriate during the course of an initial clinical evaluation. When clients show the pattern of habitually using humor, sarcasm, or jokes as a way to distance themselves from feelings that are too painful or scary, the clinicians' reaction should be dependent on the context of the situation. At times, the clinician may choose to offer a gentle interpretative statement, such as "I have noticed that when you start to experience or discuss very painful feelings, you sometimes seem to make a joke to get away from those feelings. Have you noticed this in yourself?" Like all interventions and tactics, humor has its place in the clinical interview, especially if it is timed correctly and not overused. Regardless of when humor is used, it is most imperative that clinicians *laugh with clients* and not at them or their predicaments.

Responding to Questions from Clients and Managing Self-Disclosure

How one responds to questions from clients depends on the clinician's level of training and the types of questions being asked. In the early stages of training, beginning clinicians should generally be cautious about offering diagnostic or disposition information without first discussing the topic in supervision. For example, if during an interview a client asks, "Do you think I have schizophrenia?," the clinician should address the client's feelings that are associated with the label but delay answering the question directly until after a consultation with the supervisor has occurred. In contrast to emotionally laden or complicated questions, simple questions of a pragmatic nature, for example, about agency policies, should be answered directly (e.g., questions about billing, payment, or times the clinic is open).

Some clients ask clinicians to reveal personal information which can be a difficult situation to navigate. Should clinicians self-disclose and if so, what kind of details and how much should they reveal? Whereas clinicians have highly divergent opinions on the potential costs and benefits of self-disclosure, an occasional sharing of personal information can facilitate the interview and enhance rapport (Knox &

Hill, 2003). However, like the use of humor, self-disclosure must be timed appropriately and used limitedly, and perhaps most important, the “shadow side” of self-disclosure must be carefully considered.

One negative impact of revealing personal details is that it frequently switches the focus of the interview from the client (where it rightfully should be) to the clinician. In some cases, clients prod clinicians for self-disclosures to test the limits of the psychotherapy relationship. Therefore, clinicians must always ask themselves about the intent and impact the disclosure could have on the client’s progress toward his or her identified goals. An inappropriate disclosure can also burden the client. As such, beginning clinicians should generally keep self-disclosure to a minimum. One guiding principle is to freely disclose details one would not mind seeing printed in the local newspaper, such as one’s age, level of training and education, and the name of one’s supervisor. Clinicians should be cautious about disclosing details of a more personal nature. When a personal disclosure is made, the clinician should be able to articulate to the supervisor the reason why the disclosure was made including the goal the clinician was trying to accomplish specifically by the disclosure. Clinicians should also ask themselves “Could the goal have been accomplished in another fashion that does not carry the risks associated with self-disclosure?” If not, another general guiding principle is to disclose feelings rather than facts: “I know what it feels like to be hurt by somebody I trusted” rather than “I also felt hurt when my ex-spouse cheated on me.” Should clients press for a self-disclosure (e.g., “Have you ever been raped?”), it is advisable to reflect the client’s curiosity and try to understand what is behind the question, to illuminate the client’s assumptions or concerns about the clinician. It also helps to refocus the discussion back to the client. Under no circumstances is it appropriate for the clinician to self-disclose about any ongoing personal problems or problems with other clients.

Diversity and the Interview Process

Culture refers to a common sense of beliefs, norms, and values among a group of people. Culture impacts whether individuals seek help, what type of help they seek, what types of coping styles and social supports are available, and how much stigma is attached to having a mental disorder (US Department of Health and Human Services [DHHS], 2001). The main purposes of a diagnostic interview are to establish a therapeutic relationship with the client and to begin to formulate a clinical diagnosis. Failing to consider issues of diversity can negatively impact both the relationship and the diagnosis, which can ultimately reduce the effectiveness of psychotherapy. Diversity, as it is discussed here, includes all aspects of cultural identity such as age, gender, geographic location, physical ability, race and ethnicity, religious preference, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status. Consideration of multicultural issues is particularly important given the increasing diversity of the USA and the likelihood of clinicians encountering clients from cultural backgrounds different from their own, sometimes markedly so. Three major domains of

multicultural competence are (1) awareness of one's own assumptions, values, and biases, (2) understanding the worldview of culturally diverse clients, and (3) knowledge of culturally appropriate intervention strategies and techniques (Sue & Sue, 2016). Culturally sensitive and competent clinicians intentionally work to understand the worldview of others without negative judgments (Fawcett & Evans, 2012). Moreover, as Chung and Bemak (2012) state, "social justice is at the very core of multicultural counseling competencies" such that clinicians must understand ecological factors that influence clients and pose the skills to challenge any systemic barriers that impede growth to enhance well-being. Next, we briefly touch upon each of these domains with the caveat that this section provides a general overview of the issues and therefore is not intended to provide the necessary background material for clinicians to adequately assess clients from different cultural groups. Recommendations for additional reading are provided at the end.

Impact of Diversity on the Therapeutic Relationship

As we have highlighted earlier, a good working alliance is crucial for psychotherapy to be effective. Particularly during the first few sessions, clinicians must create good rapport and establish their credibility in a way that is sensitive. Among refugee populations and other minority groups who have experienced significant oppression, trust may not be as easily established as with White American clients (Chung & Bemak, 2012; Ward, 2005). For example, Dana (2002) describes a process by which African American clients may "size up" a mental health clinician and suggests that African Americans look for signs of genuineness, authenticity, and approachability in mental health clinicians. It is often necessary to spend time during the clinical and diagnostic interview to discuss, define, and clarify roles of the client and psychologist and to explore the client's expectations regarding psychotherapy; this may be especially true for clients from non-Western cultures, where personal problems are not usually shared with people outside the family network (Chung & Bemak, 2012). For instance, different meanings for the term *clinician* can be found across different cultural groups, ranging from physician, to medicine man/woman, to folk healer (Paniagua, 2014).

Moreover, in some cultures, confidentiality may mean that family members or close friends may have access to the client's personal information, so it is important for the clinician to ensure a workable definition that the client feels comfortable with and agrees upon (Chung & Bemak, 2012). Individuals from more collectivistic cultures may also experience confusion about the "distance" or "coolness" of the Western counselor who defines the social and professional relationship more narrowly and refuses social invitations to family events (Chung & Bemak, 2012).

Traditional psychological intervention strategies are often bound by the Western cultural norms and practices with which they were created. The culturally competent counselor is able to adapt, alter, and modify these techniques to meet the needs

of the diverse client. Sue and Sue (2016) describe several culture-bound values of psychology including focus on the individual; preference for verbal, emotional, behavioral expressiveness; insight; self-disclosure; scientific empiricism; distinctions between mental and physical functioning; ambiguity; and patterns of communication. Nonverbal communication, such as bodily movements (e.g., eye contact, facial expression, posture), the use and perception of personal and interpersonal space, and vocal cues (e.g., loudness of voice, pauses, rate, inflection), can vary depending on cultural factors (Sue & Sue, 2016). Clinicians should be aware of their own communication style and anticipate how it may affect clients with a different communication style. To facilitate rapport with clients of a different culture, it may be helpful for clinicians to match the client's rhythm and pace of speech, maximize awareness of their comfort level with eye contact and physical distance, show respect for hierarchy in the family and extended family, and use appropriate metaphors and symbols (Ingram, 2006).

Adjustments can be made to the interview that may help to increase the comfort level of the client and serve to strengthen the therapeutic relationship. For example, clients with a visual impairment may require large print questionnaires and informed consent forms. Alternatively, the clinician could offer to read printed materials aloud. Hearing amplifiers can be offered to those clients with a hearing impairment. Translators or interpreters may be used when the clinician and client do not share the same language, although such practice is not without notable complications. Paniagua (2014) cautions that the use of translators introduces a third person into the psychotherapeutic process, which can lead to miscommunications or misunderstandings, and that the use of a translator may be perceived negatively by some clients, who would prefer to speak to a clinician who understands their language. If translators must be used, and no better options exist, then professional translators should have formal training in mental health and culture-related syndromes and also share a similar level of acculturation as the client. Due to possible privacy and confidentiality concerns, use of a client's relative or friend as a translator for psychotherapy is cautioned and should be considered and discussed within the client's definitions of these concepts (Paniagua, 2014).

Modifications in the diagnostic interview may also include clinicians being more flexible in their role and shifting the traditional boundaries of "clinician." For example, for a client who has difficulty getting to the mental health clinic because of lack of transportation, the clinician may conduct the interview outside of the office, such as in the client's home or another convenient location. Having a more active style by offering concrete advice and assistance may be necessary, such as providing information on obtaining social services if they are needed by the client. Consulting family members and paraprofessionals or folk healers may be appropriate in some cases in order to better understand the struggles and sources of resilience of culturally diverse clients (Paniagua, 2014). Where traditional talk therapy may not be the natural means of resolving problems, culturally competent clinicians will be open to incorporating alternative techniques (Chung & Bemak, 2012).