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PHOTOTHERAPY TO ENHANCE SELF-DISCLOSURE AND CLIENT–THERAPIST ALLIANCE IN AN INTAKE INTERVIEW WITH ETHIOPIAN IMMIGRANTS TO ISRAEL

Zipora Shechtman
Ilana Tsegahun
University of Haifa, Israel

This study investigated phototherapy as a technique to increase self-disclosure and interviewer–interviewee alliance in an intake interview conducted in 2 meetings with Ethiopian immigrants to Israel. Forty participants were assigned in equal numbers to an experimental (phototherapy) group and a control group. All semistructured interviews were conducted by 1 professional counselor at a learning center, recorded, and analyzed by 2 independent raters. Results indicate a higher level of self-disclosure (on both simple and intimate levels) in the phototherapy group. Client–counselor alliance (emotional contact) tended to be higher in the experimental group, but the significance was only marginal. A positive relationship between self-disclosure and working alliance was revealed only with the expression of feelings and the sharing of issues related to work.

Some people demonstrate difficulties in verbal communication caused by language deficit, emotional constrains, and sociocultural restrictions. In psychotherapy, Carl Rogers (1957) noted long ago that client-centered therapy is restricted to people who have difficulties in verbalization. Since then, many indirect and nonverbal interventions have been proposed under the general name of expressive arts (Gladding, 1998), including art, dance, and music therapy; storytelling/bibliotherapy; and phototherapy. All these are methods to help clients express thoughts, emotions, and past and present experiences on the conscious and unconscious levels. However, verbalization difficulties are not restricted to psychotherapy only; in fact, they may be a disturbing factor in any type of interaction: social interaction, friendship and intimate relationships, or the workplace (Derlega, Mettz, Petronio, & Margulis, 1993). In the current study, phototherapy was applied in an intake interview, to investigate its impact on self-disclosure and client–therapist alliance, with a special population for whom self-expressiveness is believed to be particularly difficult.

Phototherapy is defined as an interactive system of counseling techniques that makes use of clients’ interactions with ordinary simple photographs, such as their own personal snapshots and family albums as well as photos taken by others. Its
The purpose is to help clients connect with feelings and memories too deep or complex to be fully reached or encompassed through words alone (Berman, 1993; Weiser, 1993). Personal snapshots make visible the ongoing stories of people’s lives, serving as mirrors of memory, visual footprints marking where they have been or perhaps may still be heading. Therapeutically, it is not only what is shown on the surface of a photo that is meaningful but what these visual comments mean: the stories they tell and related feelings they evoke. In permanently recording each selected “frozen slice of time” along with the embedded stories captured within that unique moment, personal photos can serve as “bridges” for finding, exploring, and communicating about feelings and memories, current needs, and future aspirations (Weiser, 1993). This indirect technique helps clients to deal with strong emotions or disturbing thoughts, which might have not been verbalized without pictures (Berman, 1993; Weiser, 1993). Norris-Shortle, Parks, Walden, & Hayman-Hamilton (1999), for example, found that the use of pictures helped the therapist establish rapport with clients who were quite withdrawn, learn about clients’ problems, and increase interaction with them.

Successful therapy requires the client’s full cooperation in the process, expressed in openness and self-exploration (Hill & O’Brien, 1999; Orlinsky, Grawe, & Park, 1994), for which self-disclosure is a basis in both individual and group therapy (Rogers, 1957; Yalom, 1995). Given the importance of the client’s involvement in the therapy process and the association of such involvement with the therapeutic relationships, therapists should attempt to establish and strengthen their relationship with their client (Bachelor & Horvath, 1999; Lambert & Bergin, 1994). A number of studies have clearly established that early alliance is a particularly significant predictor of treatment outcome (Bachelor & Horvath, 1999); therefore, the development of a positive therapist-client relationship is critical from the onset of therapy. There appears to be a “window of opportunity” in the early sessions to establish a viable therapeutic relationship, and if it is missed the client may withdraw prematurely (Mohl, Martinez, Ticknor, Huang, & Cordell, 1991).

Moreover, it appears that the therapeutic alliance may also be a factor in helping relations not specifically structured as therapy (Bachelor & Horvath, 1999). In fact, any intake interview is the beginning of longer contact or cooperation (Gambrill, 1983), and gathering the maximum of information is meaningful for future work with those interviewees.

However, many clients may not readily acknowledge the importance of their active participation in the therapeutic process (Bachelor, 1995). They may expect the therapist, as a perceived expert, to assume full charge of the therapeutic endeavor. Moreover, they may be resistant to the required behavior in therapy (e.g., self-disclosure) because of cultural codes of behavior, or they may be unable to cooperate in therapy because of lack of required skills. In short, client variables have an important impact on client-therapist alliance as well as on outcomes (Bachelor & Horvath, 1999; Orlinsky et al., 1994).

As a group, the Ethiopian immigrants in Israel are characterized as clients who may express difficulties in therapy and related situations in which verbalization of thoughts, needs, and emotions is required. Belonging to a collectivistic culture, they are brought up to obey authority, cherish family hierarchy and ties, and suspect the outside world (Ben-Ezer, 1992). As new immigrants to Israel, their sense of isolation and mistrust even increases. Central norms of this group suggest caution with strangers, refraining from spontaneous expression of feelings, and keeping secrets within the family.
To establish early on a positive working alliance and facilitate self-disclosure, facilitative techniques are necessary. Phototherapy was selected because it serves as a bridge between the therapist and the client, provides useful information on the client’s past and present, and helps to create a dialogue despite a limited vocabulary.

It was hypothesized, therefore, that the use of personal and family photos in an intake interview with Ethiopian immigrants to Israel would

1. Increase clients’ self-disclosure compared with a control group.
2. Enhance client–therapist alliance (emotional contact), compared with this alliance in a control group.

Method

Participants

Participants were 40 Ethiopian immigrants to Israel in a learning center (Ulpan) who had lived in the country no longer than 2 years. Age ranged from 18 to 27 years (M=19.8 years). There were 21 males and 19 females, who were randomly divided into an experimental group and a control group; the number of males and females were equal in the two groups. Thirty-five of the participants were single and 5 were divorced. The majority (n=23; 57.5%) had elementary education, 10 (25%) had no formal education, and 7 (17.5%) had 10 to 12 years of school. Most of them had immigrated to Israel from cities (67.5%).

Instruments

The Working Alliance Inventory (WAI; Horvath & Greenberg, 1989). This instrument measures quality of emotional bonding, agreement on the purpose of sessions, and agreement on the assignment. The reported internal consistency is high (α=.93, range=.88–.91). Predictive validity was established based on a comparison with the CPQ (r=.42). Content validity was established based on comparison with CRF (r=.66–.76). Answers are given on a scale ranging from 1 (very much agree) to 5 (do not agree at all). A high score indicates poor working alliance. The instrument has been translated to Hebrew and often used.

In the current study, in conformity with the structure of a study investigating an intake interview, only items related to the quality of the emotional contact were used (10 items). Internal consistency was satisfactory (α=.71). Items were translated into Amharic by the required procedure. A sample item is “I felt comfortable with the interviewer.”

Rating Scale for Self-Disclosure (Vondracek & Vondracek, 1971). This instrument measures the frequency and intensity of self-disclosure in eight categories: family, friends, self, transgression, activities, self-respect, attitudes, and expression of feelings. Frequency of self-disclosure is measured on two levels: Level 1 (simple level) refers to the disclosure of facts; and Level 2 (intimate level) refers to the disclosure of strong emotions and meaningful experiences. Categorization and measurement are based on transcripts of recorded sessions. The reported test–retest reliability is high (r=.92). The instrument has been used in Israel in several earlier studies (e.g., Shechtman, Hiradin, & Zina, 2003) showing high reliability. To reduce
the number of subscales appropriate to the size of the current sample, only four categories were selected: work/study, family, friends, and expression of feelings. Two independent raters classified each unit of speech following the Hill procedure (Hill & O'Brien, 1999). Agreement between raters was high both for level of disclosure (κ=.91) and category of disclosure (κ=.94). The following are sample items:

1. Work/study: Level 1, special skills or events; Level 2, admission to pleasure or failure on some tasks.
2. Family: Level 1, names, status, numbers relevant to family members; Level 2, personality characteristics of family members; family secrets.
3. Feelings: Level 1, expression of moderate feelings—simple worries, dislikes; Level 2, feelings of shame, anger, guilt.
4. Friends: Level 1, routine data about friends (taste); Level 2, remarks about personality characteristics, misbehavior.

The Intervention

Both interviews were semistructured and adhered to the following routine: First, the interviewer introduced herself and explained the goals for the two interviews. She explained the need to record the sessions as part of a research project and received the interviewees’ permission to do so. Participants in the experimental group were asked to bring pictures from their albums, chosen freely by themselves before the first meeting. In the second phase of the interviews, participants in both groups were asked a few broad and similar questions, referring to self-introduction, life in Ethiopia, the move to Israel and life there, meaningful people in their lives (past and present), specific difficulties or needs, goals, and future orientation. The second interview started with an act of joining, followed by the broad questions outlined previously. In the final phase of termination, the interviewer summarized the central information gathered, checked feelings at termination, and thanked interviewees for their cooperation.

Procedure

The intervention occurred at one immigration learning center known as an Ulpan. Participants were immigrants from Ethiopia living in Israel up to 2 years. They met with a mental health professional (Ilana Tsegahun) in a routine procedure to learn about their current difficulties, needs, and expectations. This professional, who is also Ethiopian, met each participant for two consequent 30-min intake interviews. She spoke with them in Amharic, recording all the sessions. The interviews were conducted over 5 months. Two independent and trained raters classified self-disclosure into the four selected categories. Training of raters included several hours of discussion and experimentation with Ilana Tsegahun, who is familiar with the scale and the coding procedure from previous studies. Then the two raters experimented on other interviews until full agreement between the two was obtained. Finally, each of them coded separately 20 interviews, and kappa was measured to establish rater reliability. The high kappa permitted further analyses based on one rater.

The Work Alliance Instrument was presented to participants by their community worker also of Ethiopian origin after the second interview. These people were not involved in the interviews.
Results

Self-Disclosure

Frequencies of self-disclosure, per level of disclosure (simple/intimate), for the experimental and control groups are presented in Table 1. Frequency of self-disclosure appeared higher in the experimental group, at both times of measurement (Interviews 1 and 2) and on both levels of disclosure. In the experimental group, family seemed to be the most frequent category of disclosure on both levels of disclosure. In the control group, it was work (Level 1) and friends (Level 2). Work was second in the experimental group only on the simple level; on the intimate level, it was last. In the control group, work was also less important on the intimate level. Expression of emotion was the least presented.

Because the major difference in the means appears to be between the levels of self-disclosure, a $t$ test was performed on the averaged score (across categories) of self-disclosure, on the two levels of disclosure, separately for the experimental and control groups. Results indicated a significant difference for both

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Exp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Interview 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Interview 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Interview 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Interview 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings Interview 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings Interview 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work\study Interview 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work\study Interview 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
groups, $t(19)=12.02$ and $8.82$ for the experimental and control groups, respectively ($p<.01$ for both). This result justified further analyses separately for each level of disclosure.

Two multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAS) with repeated measures were performed, with group as the between-group variable and time (first and second interviews) and category as within-group variables for simple and intimate levels of disclosure separately. Results indicated a between-group difference, $F(1, 36)=15.75$ and $27.37$, for Levels 1 and 2 of disclosure, respectively ($p<.01$ for both). This result suggests that the experimental group was significantly different from the control group. The means suggest that self-disclosure was higher in the experimental group than in the control group on both levels of disclosure (see Table 1).

A time difference was revealed only on Level 2 of self-disclosure, $F(1, 36)=6.69$, $p<.05$, so self-disclosure was higher at the second interview only on the intimate level. Moreover, a category effect was revealed only on the simple level of disclosure, $F(3, 34)=25.08$, $p<.01$, as well as an interaction between time and category, $F(3, 34)=3.49$, $p<.05$. In other words, not all the categories were equally discussed on the simple level of disclosure, and there were variations between the first and second interviews. These differences, however, were not revealed on the intimate level of self-disclosure (Table 2).

A series of paired $t$ tests were, therefore, performed to investigate the differences between the categories on the simple level of self-disclosure only. Results indicated that at Time 1 (first interview) family and work were significantly more frequently presented than friends and feelings (family $>$ friends and feelings; work $>$ friends and feelings). Means and standard deviations, in order of frequency, were as follows: $7.79(5.11)$, $7.36(4.59)$, $4.79(4.21)$, and $3.58(4.06)$ for family, work, friends, and feelings, respectively. At Time 2 (second interview), results of the $t$ test indicated that family $>$ friends and feelings; work $>$ friends and feelings; work $>$ family. Means and standard deviations, in order of frequency, were as follows: $8.56(6.2)$, $6.66(4.50)$, $4.87(4.33)$, and $3.82(3.87)$ for work, family, friends, and feelings, respectively. Although the means show some differentiation between the experimental and control groups, the Category $\times$ Group interaction was insignificant; therefore, this analysis was performed on the total population. The interaction of Time $\times$ Category refers only to work/study; work was more frequently discussed in the second interview.

### Table 2. Results of MANOVA With Repeated Measures for Time, Group, Categories of Self-Disclosure, and for Simple and Intimate Levels Separately

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F(df)$</td>
<td>$F(df)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>$6.69(1, 36)^*$</td>
<td>$0.10(1, 36)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time $\times$ Group interaction</td>
<td>$2.05(1, 36)$</td>
<td>$3.10(1, 36)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>$1.35(1, 34)$</td>
<td>$25.08(3, 34)^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category $\times$ Group interaction</td>
<td>$0.60(1, 34)$</td>
<td>$1.61(3, 34)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time $\times$ Category interaction</td>
<td>$1.82(1, 34)$</td>
<td>$3.49(3, 34)^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time $\times$ Category $\times$ Group interaction</td>
<td>$0.79(1, 34)$</td>
<td>$0.79(3, 34)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>$27.37(1, 36)^{**}$</td>
<td>$15.75(1, 36)^{**}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p $< .05$. **p $< .01$.}
Results indicated that the working alliance tended to be higher in the experimental group: \( M = 9.45, SD = 2.56 \), and \( M = 11.45, SD = 3.77 \) for the experimental and control groups, respectively (note that the lower score indicated better alliance). However, a one-way analysis of variance indicated only a marginal effect, \( F(39) = 3.84, p = .06 \).

**Working Alliance**

The relationship between working alliance and self-disclosure was significantly related only with the expression of feelings and work/study in the experimental group. In the control group, the relationship revealed was with family and feelings (Table 3).

**Self-Disclosure and Working Alliance**

The relationship between working alliance and self-disclosure was significantly related only with the expression of feelings and work/study in the experimental group. In the control group, the relationship revealed was with family and feelings (Table 3).

**Discussion**

The purpose of the study was to investigate the impact of phototherapy on clients’ self-disclosure and client–therapist working alliance. Results confirmed the positive impact of photos on self-disclosure, but the emotional contact between client and therapist was only marginally higher in the phototherapy group.

The experiment was conducted with a group of young Ethiopian immigrants to Israel. The idea of using phototherapy was based on the observed difficulties of these people to express themselves openly, an observation supported by the literature (Ben-Ezer, 1992). As a group, these people are believed to be reserved, withdrawn, and shy. Being new immigrants to Israel only increased such tendencies. There was a need to find a way to improve the communication, so that more information about their difficulties, needs, and aspirations could be gathered and possibly better understood.

Results regarding self-disclosure indicated that participants interviewed with photos, more frequently disclosed private information than did their counterparts who were interviewed by the same interviewer and by the same semistructured interview but without photos. Photos appeared to ease self-expressiveness in all areas studied: family, work/study, friends, and feelings. The positive results may be attributed to the projective technique, which limits the use of direct communication; to the visual stimulation, which may increase verbalization; or to the connection that pictures make among past, present, and future (Berman, 1993; Weiser, 1993).
For example, one person said, “When I looked at her picture many memories came back to me very strongly which I tend to forget. I feel as if I just separated from her, she is always with me.” This is a powerful expression of feelings of longing, which might have been difficult to express without the photo. In another case, a person admitted that after the interviewer’s question, “Who is missing in the family picture?,” she realized that she had no photo of her father. “I made an effort to get a picture from my aunt; I have had it framed for myself and my sister, who did not have the chance to get to know him.” At still another session, an interviewee said, “The photo made me think of my parents who were left behind in Ethiopia. I know they need help and I feel guilty and helpless.” Such a level of intimacy and self-disclosure is hard to expect in an initial contact, all the more in a unique population such as the Ethiopians, without the assistance of photos.

The greatest difference seemed to be between the simple and intimate levels of self-disclosure; participants disclosed much more on the superficial level than on the intimate level. This is understandable considering that only the first two meetings (the intake interview) were under investigation. It takes time to develop trust and to be able to share more meaningful information about self.

Two interviews were used to confirm the consistency of the results. A significant difference was revealed only on the intimate level of disclosure; participants disclosed intimate information more frequently in the second interview regardless of type of intervention. This further signifies the importance of time for one to be able to disclose meaningful information about self.

Another significant result was the difference in the categories of self-disclosure. This difference was found only on the simple level of disclosure, yet clearly some topics were more frequently presented than others. Overall, family and work were the subjects most often raised, and work was more frequently discussed in the second interview. The fact that participants discussed family is quite understandable, using family photos. However, the interviewees also talked about work/study, which probably bothered them greatly, although much less of it might have been presented in the pictures. Thus, perhaps once people open up with the use of a helping device, they will continue using the channel of communication with more ease.

The results for the emotional contact with the interviewer are less salient. Relationships tended to be higher in the group in which photos were used, but the significance was only marginal. Two short meetings are certainly not enough to establish meaningful emotional contact, but the fact that the difference was almost significant suggests that perhaps in a longer period of time the difference would be more salient. After all, the scale is used for measuring relationships in therapy, which are naturally longer than two meetings.

Interestingly, the relation between self-disclosure and working alliance was present mostly in the expression of feelings and work/study. Although family was the most frequent category of disclosure, and the expression of feelings was the least frequent, the latter was found related to emotional contact with the therapist. The expression of feelings is mentioned as the most meaningful behavior in both individual and group therapy (Hill & O’Brien, 1999; Orlinsky et al., 1994; Yalom, 1995). Thus, it is not surprising that when participants were able to express emotions, they were more connected emotionally to the therapist, or vice versa; in a good working alliance, the interviewees were better able to express feelings. The relation between work and alliance could be explained by the importance of work at the particular stage when people were studied: They were young adults in a new
country, who had to build their future under quite difficult economic conditions. Their ability to discuss such major issues in their lives with a helper might have increased the emotional contact between them and their therapist.

**Limitations and Applications**

The study was conducted with a very special population, under unique circumstances, which limits the generalization of results. More studies, with a varying population and places, seem worthwhile considering the results of this study.

Second, the interviews were performed by one of the authors of this article, who was aware of the goals of the study, which might have a biased influence on the results.

Finally, the study has confirmed the positive impact of phototherapy in an intake interview. It is not clear whether a similar pattern would be found in a therapy process or other helping situations because most of the literature on phototherapy is clinical, not research based. Yet considering the difficulties in the helping processes with this unique population, it might pay to implement phototherapy in additional counseling settings. Furthermore, it may be worth investigating other populations who might have difficulties in self-expressiveness (e.g., other new immigrants, young children, minority populations) by this unique technique. This study is only a first step on a road not traveled, yet it is exciting to observe the power of this newly developed technique, which should be further developed and encouraged.
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Sommario
Questo studio ha investigato la FOTO-Terapia come una tecnica per aumentare l’apertura e l’alleanza intervistato-intervistatore in una intervista condotta in 2 incontri con emigranti etiopi in Israele. Sono stati assegnati 40 partecipanti in egual numero ad un gruppo sperimentale (Foto-Terapia) ed ad un gruppo di controllo. Tutte le interviste semi-strutturate erano condotte da un consulente professionale al centro di apprendimento, registrate, ed analizzate da 2 valutatori indipendenti. I risultati indicano un alto numero di aperture (su entrambi i campioni e livelli) nel gruppo psicoterapeutico. L’alleanza intervistato-intervistatore (contatto emozionale) tendeva ad essere più alto nel gruppo sperimentale, ma la significatività era solo marginale. Una relazione positiva tra apertura ed alleanza di lavoro era rilevata solo con le espressioni di sentimenti ed il gradimento di argomenti legati al lavoro.
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