

1. **Title of submission:** A Survey of the Relationships Between Ethics Training of Counselor Educators and Ensuing Professional Motives, Attitudes, and Responses to Attraction with Counseling Students
2. **Name of Author:** Louis Downs, Ph.D.
3. **Affiliation:** Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling, California State University, San Bernardino
4. **Mailing Address:** Faculty Offices 209, California State University, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, California, 92407
5. **E-mail address:** downsl@prodigy.net

A Preliminary Survey of the Relationships Between Ethics Training of Counselor Educators and Ensuing Professional Motives, Attitudes, and Responses to Attraction with Counseling Students

Notable documentation exists to suggest the importance of guidelines for relationships between counseling-related faculty and students. Topics addressed include parallel process in supervision (Bernard, & Goodyear, 1992; Bernard, 1987), power differentials (Ellis & Douce, 1994; McCarthy, Kulakowski, & Kenfield, 1994; Davies, 1991), gender-based differences in counselor training and supervision (Bernstein, 1993; Twohey & Volker, 1993), ethics of counselor education (Guest, 1996; Bowman, Hatley, & Bowman, 1995; Dickey, Housley, & Guest, 1993; Ryder & Hepworth, 1990), counselor educator ethical training (Stadler & Paul, 1986), and ethical dilemmas during counseling-related training (Cruikshanks, 2000; Schwab & Neukrug, 1994; Fitzgerald, Weitzman, Gold, & Unerod, 1988; Kitchner, 1986; Pope, Levenson, & Schoner, 1979; Butler, 1975). Further review of counseling literature reveals that counseling ethics literature has been established in the areas of instruction (CACREP, 1994, 2000; Ryder & Hepworth, 1990), supervision (Bernard, 1987; Dye & Borders, 1990), and practice (Gilbert, 1987; Kurpius, Gibson, Lewis, & Corbet, 1991).

In response to research defining ethical violations (Bowman, et al., 1995; Schwab & Neukrug, 1994; Dickey, et al., 1993) and recognizing the lack of counselor and counselor educator ethical training (Stadler & Paul, 1986), substantial contributions have been made toward development of ethical standards and standards for teaching ethics (CACREP, 2000; Kitchener, 1986), although research indicates that these standards are not universally endorsed by professional counselors nor counselor educators (Guest, 1996). Models have been developed to teach moral sensitivity in ethics coursework (Harding, 1993) and to introduce a social role perspective for moral development within the confines of ethics training, (Morris, 1981). Further, empirical evidence has been presented of a learning effect when an ethics course exists in a counselor education program (Chase, 1999).

In spite of the efforts of counselor educators to explore and develop ethics pedagogy, there also is evidence that, at least in some areas of the country, ethics training

and supervision are undertaught (Navin, Beamish, & Johanson, 1995). Additionally, one piece of empirical literature has documented existing dual relationships in counselor education (Milde, 1995). The study reported several counselor educators' concern about inappropriate relationships between counseling instructors and graduate counseling students.

Empirical data regarding supervision in training or practice have suggested that consultation concentrating on ethical decision-making has been shown to be effective (Bowers, 2000). Yet, two separate studies presented evidence that supervision consistently has not met national standards in either supervision of practice (Navin, et al., 1995) nor in ethical training of counseling students (Guest, 1996). At the same time, a study of counselor education graduate assistants discovered that, although the assistants stated high ethical ideals, ethical decision-making was significantly lower than those ideals (Branstetter & Handelsman, 2000).

In light of this evidence, it becomes apparent that there are still dramatic deficiencies in ethics training in counselor education. So, how might these deficiencies affect the later practice of counselors and counselor educators? A few studies provide some answers.

Evidence from psychologist training programs suggests that ethical dilemmas have occurred regularly in counseling-related training. Although the empirical evidence is dated, the lack of more current studies and the dramatic nature of the earlier literature impels review. Three studies (Pope, et al., 1979; Fitzgerald, et al., 1988; Butler, 1975) found that instructors and supervisors frequently were sexually involved with students.

A survey of practicing psychologists (Pope, et al., 1979) revealed that 17% of female psychologists reported having experienced sexual contact with faculty during training. Thirteen percent of male educators reported sexual contact with students. Further, Pope and associates reported that women who had sexual contact with male supervisors while in training had a significant increase in sexual contact with supervisees and clients as professionals.

A study of sexuality in psychological counselor training (Fitzgerald, Weitzman, Gold, & Unerod, 1988) disclosed that only 6% of women who had not had sexual interaction with an instructor during training acknowledged sexual contact with clients

while women who had experienced sexual contact approximated men's statistics with a 23% report of later sexual contact with clients (Fitzgerald, et al., 1988). An earlier study of psychologists (Butler, 1975) suggested that 95% of those who had sexual contact with clients had felt guilt, conflict and fear, but fewer than one-half had sought consultation .

Glaser and Thorpe (1986) also reported finding that 17% of psychologist trainees had experienced sexual contact with psychology educators. Most students reported later feeling that they had been coerced and that the contact had hindered their professional development. A recent study not only found continuing existence of sexual contact between counselor educators and students but reported that the most significant factors leading up to sexual contact were gender (male supervisors were more likely to violate sexual ethical standards) and the instructor's own attraction to students (Cruikshanks, 2000)

Both the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 1994, 2000) and the American Counseling Association (ACA, 1995) have recognized the need for ethical practice on the part of counselor educators and for ethics education of graduate students and have acted to set standards for programs and for faculty. However, little evidence has been compiled to document either the progress of these endeavors or the state of ethical practice and teaching in counselor education. Because substantial associations have been discovered between the relationships formed during counselor training and later practice, there appears to be a need for such study.

The purpose of this study was to determine the state of ethical preparation in counselor education currently and the extent of ethical dilemmas faced by counselor educators and their reactions to occurring dilemmas. Also, the study undertook to ascertain the results of ethical training on the actions of counselor educators.

Method

Participants

The population for this study consisted of counselor educators ($N=1562$) listed in the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision section of the American Counseling Association Directory (ACA, 1996). A sample of 200 participants was

selected using a table of random numbers. Thirty-six percent ($n=72$) of the participants responded. The sample represents 4.7% of ACES membership.

Participants who returned questionnaires included 41 females and 31 males ranging in age from 25 to 81 ($m=51.8$, $SD=10.6$). Educational background included that 61% of the subjects had received a Ph.D., 16.7% had an Ed.D., 5.6% other doctoral degrees, and 16.7% Master's degrees. Professional licenses or certificates held included 37.5% Licensed Professional Counselor licenses (LPC), 16.7% Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) certifications, 11.1% Psychologist licenses, 1% Social Work license, 4.2% Marriage, Family and Child Counselor licenses, 20.8% National Board of Certified Counselor certifications (NCC), and 8.3% did not report any licensure.

Participants reported a range of clinical counseling experience from none to 41 years ($m=18.2$, $SD=10.89$). Teaching experience included a range of one to 40 years of master's-level teaching ($m=11.4$, $sd=9.5$) and none to 37 years of doctoral-level teaching ($m=8.7$, $sd=10.87$). Also, the population reported a range of experience as a clinical supervisor of none to 37 years ($m=12.41$, $sd=9.01$).

Primary teaching settings of participants were reported to be classroom teaching ($n=61$, 84.7%), clinical supervision ($n=39$, 54.2%), fieldwork supervision ($n=38$, 52.8%), and research supervision ($n=11$, 15.3%), while 6 (8.3%) reported other primary teaching duties. Respondents reported more than one primary teaching setting, so that the researcher could not determine how many participants served in one main role.

Participants were asked to identify their primary theoretic orientations to counseling. Seventeen (23.6%) reported themselves to be cognitive in orientation, 13 (18.1%) integrated, 6 (8.3%) humanist, 6 (8.3%) psychodynamic, 1 (1.4%) behaviorist, 5 (6.9%) systems-oriented, 5 (6.9%) existential, 4 (5.6%) post-modern, 3 (4.2%) solution-oriented, 1 (1.4%) psychoanalytic, and 9 (12.5%) reported other orientations to counseling.

The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision was solicited for demographic data and a chi-square was performed to discover if the sample was representative of the counselor educator and supervisor population. Of the matching data, there was no evidence of significant difference on gender, $\chi^2(1, N=1634)=2.00$,

$p=.16$, on type of degree held, $\chi^2(4, N=1634)=6.00$, $p=.20$, and on primary teaching assignment, $\chi^2(4, N=1634)=6.00$, $p=.20$. To the degree that could be determined from available ACES data, the sample was representative of the ACES population.

Procedure

A questionnaire was developed that first asked what sorts of environments for learning participants received. These learning environments, were categorized according to Bandura's theory of social learning (Bandura, 1977). The possibilities included a discrete ethics course during graduate training (modeling), practicing alternatives to ethical dilemmas in either counseling or counselor education (application), exploration of personal beliefs and attitudes toward sexuality in counseling (integration), ongoing supervision (evaluation), and finally supervision of sexual transference phenomena in counseling (synthesis). To discover the moral rationale that counselor educators had developed, a self-report instrument that categorizes moral level decision-making based on Kohlberg's (1983) ethical development model, Rest's (1974) Defining Issues Test (DIT), because it is the most widely used and validated measure of moral development across many populations (Ketefian, 1989). Responses were grouped by stage of moral reasoning. To discover how counselor educators responded to sexual attraction with counseling students, one of the most widely used (Lazarus, 1993) self-report instruments that categorizes reactions to ethical dilemmas was used, the Ways of Coping Questionnaire (Folkman, & Lasarus, 1988).

Demographic variables -- gender, age, licensure, degree, clinical, masters-level teaching, and doctoral-level teaching experience, primary teaching assignment, and theoretical orientation were analyzed for significance with all other variables. Whenever a demographic variable was significant, statistical analysis was performed to control for the variable.

The questionnaire and a self-addressed, stamped return envelope was mailed to each participant -- there was only a single mailing. All quantitative analyses were carried out using the SPSS version 4.0. The critical interval for most analyses was set at .05.

A pilot study was conducted using a convenience sample ($n=20$) solicited at a regional conference of counselor educators. Comments of respondents were incorporated

into the final form of the questionnaire. A Chronbach's Alpha procedure was performed on the national survey to determine the reliability of the instrument. Because some participants did not answer either the Ways of Coping Questionnaire or the Moral Reasoning Questionnaire, an analysis of the instrument as a whole could not be performed. Notwithstanding, these separate scales were analyzed. As separate instruments, there was evidence of high reliability ranging from $r=.64$ to $r=.96$.

Results

The first question to be investigated was the ethics educational experiences of study participants. Respondents reported that 29.8%, $n=25$, had experienced modeling (ethics courses), 58.3%, $n=49$, had encountered application (role play) experiences, 36.9%, $n=31$, had experiences that allowed integration (self-exploration, identified as counseling), 22.2%, $n=16$, had ongoing evaluation (reported as clinical supervision) experiences, and 6%, $n=5$, reported synthesis experiences (specific ethical supervision) at some point during training. An analysis of variance discovered a significant relationship between differences in several demographic variables and pedagogical strategies of training received. Because demographic variables were related to form of training, initial analyses were performed using an MANOVA to determine relationships between training, demographics, and later professional attitudes and practices. Whenever a difference was identified, a Student's t-test was performed to confirm these differences (Ramsey & Schafer, 1995, pp. 317-321).

Relationship between populations receiving various ethics training modes

There was evidence that respondents receiving one model of ethics education were less likely to have received other levels of education. A Pearson's product moment revealed that correlations ranged from .13 to .51, $M=.26$. Evidence that the populations who received the various forms of ethics education were, for the most part, different confirmed that the effects of each level of ethics education should be investigated.

Relationship Between Ethics Education and Responses During Graduate Training

One area of interest in the study was whether there was any relationship between the sexual beliefs and attitudes of respondents' own graduate instructors and the

pedagogical strategies used in their own ethical preparation. There was evidence that respondents who reported having experienced application of ethics teaching (role play) in the classroom were more likely to agree that their practicum and field experience supervisors had not addressed sexuality in counseling, $t(48.55)=-3.63$, $p=.001$. There was also evidence that respondents who had experienced integration (counseling) of ethical learning were more likely to have sought supervision from a faculty member whenever sexual feelings became evident in a counseling session during graduate training, $t(67.56)=-2.21$, $p=.03$. Evidence also existed that respondents who reported having experienced evaluative learning of ethics (supervision) were more likely to have sought out a faculty member for supervision whenever attraction occurred in a counseling session during graduate training, $t(68)=-2.41$, $p=.02$.

Relationship Between Form of Ethics Training and Ensuing Comfort Level with Clinical Sexuality Issues and Pedagogical Strategies Used

Another area of interest was the relationship between pedagogical strategies used in training of participants and ensuing comfort levels with sexual issues as well as differences in pedagogical strategies for teaching ethics. There was evidence of a relationship between increased comfort when responding to issues of student sexual feelings in the counseling relationship and having experienced application of sexual ethics training (role play) during graduate school, $t(68)=-2.09$, $p=.04$.

There was also evidence of a relationship between pedagogical strategies used in training of participants and later differences in pedagogical strategies used as counselor educators. Respondents who had experienced application of ethical training (role play) during graduate school were more likely to use a broad array of pedagogical strategies, $t(34.81)=-4.52$, $p<.000$, while respondents who reported having experienced integration (counseling), $t(69)=-2.44$, $p=.02$, or evaluation ethical learning experiences (supervision) were more likely to use very limited strategies to teach sexual ethics, $t(69)=-2.36$, $p=.02$. Those who had experienced integration of training (counseling) were more likely to use behavioral coaching (66%, $n=2$) or no teaching strategies at all (59%, $n=16$), while those who had experienced evaluative learning of sexual ethics

(supervision) were less likely to use any specific pedagogical strategies to teach sexual ethics (10%, $n=7$).

Relationship Between Ethics Training and Emotions, Reasoning and Response to Attraction to or from Counseling Students

Several questions were asked of respondents to determine whether and how often they had been attracted to students, how they felt about the attraction and how deeply, whether they had considered acting on the attraction, what reasoning was employed and how influential it was, and what actions were taken and to what degree. Respondents reported that 36.1% ($n=26$) had rarely (once or twice) been attracted to counseling students, 38.9% ($n=28$) had been attracted occasionally (three to ten times), and 25% ($n=18$) had been attracted frequently.

Emotional responses to attraction to counseling students was measured on a five point Likert-type scale from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1). The most frequent reported emotional responses were recognition that the emotion need not be acted upon, $M=3.73$, $sd=.62$, and ownership of the feelings and self-acceptance, $M=3.2$, $sd=.81$. The least frequent reported responses were shame, $M=.75$, $sd=1.08$, confusion, $M=.95$, $sd=1.10$, guilt, $M=1.09$, $sd=1.12$, anxiety, $M=1.28$, $sd=1.1$, and enjoyment of the feeling, $M=1.75$, $sd=1.01$.

When asked how often they had considered sexual involvement with a graduate student or counselor trainee, respondents reported that 31% ($n=26$) had never considered involvement, 41% ($n=35$) had rarely considered involvement, 11.9% ($n=10$) had occasionally considered it, and 1.2% ($n=1$) had frequently considered it. Influence of student attributes on this consideration was measured on a Likert-type scale from very influential (3) to not influential (1) or not applicable (0). Study participants reported that they were most attracted to the trainee's physical beauty, $M=2.58$, $sd=.67$, student's intelligence, $M=2.33$, $sd=.49$, attraction of student to faculty member, $M=2.33$, $sd=.49$, warmth, $M=2.17$, $sd=.58$, and love for the student, $M=1.70$, $sd=.67$. Conversely, feelings of power were not influential.

The next questions dealt with the moral reasoning whenever a faculty member chose not to engage in sexual activity with the student. Results revealed that the mean

stage of moral reasoning on the Kohlberg scale was conventional, social systems morality (right is fulfillment of duties), the third highest of Kohlberg's moral stages, $M=4.36$, $sd=1.63$. Of those who responded 35.6%, $n=16$, reasoned at the Post-Conventional Universal (self chosen principles) level, 22.2%, $n=10$, reasoned at the Post-Conventional Social Contract (aware of others) level, none reasoned at the Conventional Social Systems (duty fulfillment) level, 3.3%, $n=15$, reasoned at the Conventional Mutual (role expectations met) level, while 4.4%, $n=2$, based decisions on Preconventional Instrumental (self interest) thinking, and 4.4%, $n=2$, considered reactions from the Preconventional Heteronomous (might is right) level of moral reasoning.

There were differences between types of ethics training received and respondent reactions to the attraction. These reactions were classified using Kohlberg's scale of moral development. There was evidence of a relationship between having experienced integration of ethics learning (counseling) and being influenced less often by Universal Ethical Morality when choosing not to act on attraction to a student of counseling, $t(43)=-2.84$, $p<.00$, $sd=.23$.

Several questions were asked to determine awareness of respondents of student attraction to them and their subsequent emotional reactions and behavioral responses. The mean response to how often faculty were aware of student attraction, on a Likert scale from never to frequently, was seldom, $M=1.09$, $sd=.88$. There was evidence of a relationship between having experienced integration of ethical learning (counseling) and an increase in awareness of student attraction, $t(53.96)=-2.92$, $p<.00$. The mean response of participants who had not experienced integrative ethics education was rarely to occasionally, while those who had experienced integrative educational experiences were aware occasionally to frequently.

When given choices about emotional responses, counselor educators most often reported accepting the feelings of the student, $M=3$, $sd=0$, with feeling flattered the second most prevalent emotion, $M=2.7$, $sd=.91$ and uncomfortable, $M=2.28$, $sd=.93$. The least reported emotions were disgust, $M=1.14$, $sd=.52$. feeling coerced, $M=1.2$, $sd=.60$ and angry, $M=1.2$, $sd=.64$. Educational experiences were not related to any variance in emotional response.

Participants were asked to choose from several possible behavioral responses that they felt described their behavioral responses to student attraction, using a Likert-type scale from 0 (does not describe my behavior) to 4 (very strongly describes my behavior). The most prevalent behaviors reported were acknowledgement of the attraction to the student, $M=2.84$, $sd=.90$, increased attention to boundaries, $M=2.63$, $sd=1.07$, discussed boundaries with student, $M=1.79$, $sd=1.32$, and sought consultation, $M=1.77$, $sd=1.49$. The least reported behavioral responses were engaging in sexual encounter, $M=.17$, $sd=.70$, manipulating the student nonsexually, $M=.19$, $sd=.70$, and pushing the student away, $M=.53$, $sd=.88$.

There was evidence of a relationship between study participants having experienced the ethics integration learning environment (counseling) and choosing to consult with a colleague whenever they recognized attraction from a student, $t(40.92)=-2.13$, $p=.035$. There was a positive correlation between consultation and acknowledgement of attraction to a student, $r=.63$, $p<.000$, $n=43$, and between seeking consultation and discussion of appropriate boundaries with the counseling student, $r=.63$, $p<.000$, $n=45$. There were also negative correlations between seeking consultation and manipulation of students who were attracted for nonsexual purposes, $r=-.45$, $p=.008$, $n=33$, and between seeking consultation and engaging in sex with the student, $r=-.45$, $p<.01$, $n=32$.

Discussion

The results of this study suggest that ethics education is inconsistent for counselor educators. Only 29.8% of respondents in this random sample reported having had a discrete ethics course. Most of the study's participants received their ethics education through supervision. There is evidence that ethics coursework has increased over time by several indicators. Age, doctoral and master's level teaching experience and years of experience as a clinical supervisor were all related to ethics course increases. Further, there was evidence of an increase in systematic preparation for ethical responses in either clinical or educational sexual dilemmas such as role-play or behavioral coaching. However, the fact remains that ethics education was diverse across study participants. In

fact, this reality becomes important in light of the relationships between various modalities of teaching and ensuing responses to counselor education dilemmas.

An interesting result of this study was that some self selection of later roles in counselor education seemed to have occurred related to background educational experiences. Counselor educators who served as clinical supervisors had clinical supervision more often themselves, while classroom instructors tended to have had less formal ethics training than other counselor educators.

Further consideration of the question, "Is ethics training venue related to ensuing counselor education teaching," revealed that ethical dilemma response role play was related to an increase in a wider array of pedagogical strategies as a counselor educator, while counseling or supervision were related to a propensity for use of few or no pedagogical strategies to teach sexual ethics. A discrete ethics course, either during graduate school or afterward, or supervision as a professional counselor was not related to differences in teaching strategies. Further, counselor educators who had experience role play or coaching of potential later dilemmas were significantly more comfortable bringing up the topic of sexuality in the clinic or classroom. Considering that no single pedagogical strategy had produced a high Kohlberg reasoning level unilaterally in the participants, these findings suggest that preparation for counselor education teaching effectiveness should include some form of preparatory practice in anticipation of potential ethical and sexual dilemmas, not so much for an effect on ensuing responses to those dilemmas as to open options of later pedagogical range.

The researcher also attempted to chronicle the responses of counselor educators to sexual ethical dilemmas in teaching. Because of the high reported incidence of sexuality in counseling related education and the link that Fitzgerald and colleagues (1988) reported between sexual contact during education and later sexual contact with clients as a professional counselor, this question has import.

Attraction to counseling students materialized frequently among study participants. Not only did no one report never having been attracted, but 64% reported being attracted to students more than a few times. This common occurrence supports the ongoing discussion of parallel process in counselor training and supervision. Emotional

responses of participants to attraction to students were, for the most part, healthy. Ownership and the recognition that one does not have to act on the attraction were the strongest responses.

However, these sentiments did not interpret into curtailing consideration of becoming involved with a student. Seventy-nine percent of respondents had considered sexual contact with students and 13.1% on several occasions. There was some suggestion in the data of mutuality of attraction between professor and student. This result concurs with the results of two separate studies (Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Pope et al., 1979) that the most frequent sexual contact in counseling related training is between older, divorced graduate students and instructors.

Interestingly, while respondents were themselves attracted to students, they seldom tended to become aware of student attraction to them. This fact may be related to the power differential that exists in counselor training or to focus, but the results of the survey pointed out that counselor educators who had experience counseling themselves were more aware than others. When faculty became aware of student attraction to them, their typical emotional response was acceptance of the student, flattery, and discomfort.

The most important issue in relation to faculty reaction to student attraction was that consideration of sexual involvement and other inappropriate responses existed. If scaled responses are consolidated so that "minimally described" is combined with "not at all," then 7.2% of respondents had some degree of sexual involvement with students, and 9.3% stated that they manipulated student attraction in nonsexual ways. If one considers other questions more conservatively, using the standard that respondents reported that the each statement described their behavior to some extent, then 48% of respondents met student attraction with passivity, hoping for resolve without any action, while 41 % minimized time with the student, and 13% invoked behaviors that pushed the student away. Furthermore, only 60.4% used the opportunity to any extent as a teaching moment, to discuss appropriate boundaries with the student, and only 30.2% made a strong effort to do so.

When considering the question of moral rationale for a decision not to act on attraction to a student, counselor educators tended either to rationalize at the highest

levels of moral reasoning on Kohlberg's scale or at the lowest levels. Fifty-eight percent of respondents reported rationale at the two highest moral stages, while 8.8% reported rationale at the lowest two stages of moral development. For the most part, respondents reported functioning at least at the conventional level, adequate to responsible performance of their roles. The group that functioned most consistently at the highest level of moral reasoning, postconventional, universal (self-chosen principles) were respondents who had experienced counseling themselves.

The only variable that was related both to an increase in seeking consultation whenever attraction occurred both while a counseling student and later as a counselor educator was respondents having attended counseling themselves. This becomes increasingly compelling when one considers the strong correlations between consultation and ensuing behaviors. Some counselor education programs require students to attend counseling during graduate training - though not doctoral students (Downs, 2000), yet there is trepidation on the parts of instructors to enforce the requirement. Results of this study lend support to the argument that the most effective way to produce ethically responsible counselor educators is to require counseling.

Conclusion

The major limitation of this study is sample size. This is complicated further by the fact that as high as 42% of study participants did not answer the most personal questions. Although the n of this study is small, due to moderate survey return rates, the random sampling of counselor educators allows limited inferences to the overall counselor educator population. It also allows restrained inference to be made regarding cause.

Further, it suggests directions for future research into the ethical preparation of counselor educators. Study of the factors within ethics training that are associated with moral development and best practice is suggested by the outcome of this survey. Additionally, study into outcome differences between CACREP programs and those not nationally certified would shed light on the results of efforts in the field to infuse ethics into pedagogy. Replication of this study, using a larger sample, would provide increased data to inform the field of the state ethical education and practice of counselors and enrich the study.

It appears that the field of counselor education has neither fully enacted ethical training programs nor standardized curricula. Even though CACREP (1994, II.J) requires an ethics course and the ACA states that counselor education programs are ethically obligated to teach and to model ethical behavior (ACA, 1995, F.1.a-c), best practices have not been implemented universally.

The inconsistency of coursework available to respondents and the associated responses to later ethical dilemmas suggests that no single pedagogical strategy is adequate to guarantee attitudes and ethical reasoning commensurate with best practices. The results of this study suggest that ethical information and practice toward dilemmas should not be contained to a discrete course but should be pervasive of doctoral graduate training. If counselors are responsible for ethical choices in professional practice, how much more are counselor educators for the product they produce. The two most important components of ethical training appear to be systematic practice of responses to ethical dilemmas and reflective self-exploration through counseling. These results may suggest that the CACREP requirement of coursework needs to be reconsidered to include stipulations for pedagogical additions to those standards.

It also appears that neither ethical bearing nor open sexual ethics discussions are instinctive for counselor educators. Notwithstanding, empirical literature suggests that there is potential harm in less than optimal infusion of ethics education. Allen, Szollos and Williams (1986) found that faculty who had the most effective outcomes were open to feedback about relationships to students. Ellis and Douce (1994) have suggested that the issue of sexuality is normal and needs to be dealt with openly. Kadushin (1968) has stated that supervisory countertransference stems from feelings of powerlessness, importance, or desire for admiration and override the objectivity of the supervisor. The innate power differential between counseling faculty and students creates an inherent need for broad based ethical preparation of counselor educators. Only the highest standards appear to result in best practices both as counselor educators and as counseling professionals.

References

- American Counseling Association. (1996). American Counseling Association Membership Directory. White Plains, NY: Bernard C. Harris Publishing Co.

- American Counseling Association. (1995). ACA Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice Retrieved (2001, November), from <http://www.counseling.org/resources/codeofethics.htm>.
- Allen, G., Szollos, S. & Williams, B. (1986). Doctoral students' comparative evaluations of the best and worst psychotherapy supervisors. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 17, 91-99.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Social Learning Theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bernard, J. M. (1987). Ethical and legal considerations for supervisors. In Borders, L. D. and Leddick, G. R. Handbook of Counseling Supervision. Alexandria, VA: American Association of Counseling and Development. 52-57.
- Bernard, J. M. & Goodyear, R. K. (1992). Fundamentals of Clinical Supervision. Boston, Mass: Allyn and Bacon. 212-219.
- Bernstein, B. L. (1993). Promoting gender equity in counselor supervision: Challenges and opportunities. Counselor Education and Supervision, 32, 198-202.
- Bowers, M., Pipes, R. B. (2000). Influence of consultation on ethical decision making: An analogue study. Ethics and Behavior, 10, 65-79.
- Bowman, V. E., Hatley, L. D., & Bowman, R. L. (1995). Faculty-student relationships: The dual role controversy. Counselor Education and Supervision, 34 (3), 232-242.
- Branstetter, S. A., & Handelsman, M. N. (2000). Graduate teaching assistants: Ethical training, beliefs and practices. Ethics and Behavior, 10, 27-50.
- Butler, S. E. (1975). Sexual contact between therapists and patients. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. California School of Professional Psychology.
- Cruikshanks, D. R. (2000). An investigation of factors affecting sexual boundary violations in counseling supervision. Dissertation Abstracts International, 61 (5-A), 1750.
- Chase, N. M. (1999). A cognitive development approach to professional ethics training

- for counselor education students. (Doctoral dissertation, College of William and Mary, 1999). Dissertation Abstracts International, 59 (8-A), 2865. (University Microfilms No. AAM99-03261.
- Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (1994). CACREP 1994 Standards. Retrieved (2001, November) from http://www.counseling.org/cacrep/cacrep_standards.htm
- Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (2000). CACREP 2003 Standards Retrieved (2001, November) from http://www.counseling.org/cacrep/cacrep_standards.htm.
- Davies, J. A. (1991). The relationship of power and involvement in supervision to counselor trainee experience level. Dissertation for the Division of Counseling Education. University of Oregon.
- Dickey, K. D., Housley, W. F., & Guest, C. (1993). Ethics in supervision of rehabilitation counselor trainees: A survey. Rehabilitation Education, 7 (3), 195-201.
- Downs, L. L. (2000). A study of the outcomes of required counseling during counselor training at a CACREP accredited university (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. CG030227)
- Dye, H. A. & Borders, L. D. (1990). Counseling supervisors: Standards for preparation and practice. Journal of Counseling and Development, 69, 27-32.
- Ellis, M. V. & Douce, L. A. (1994). Group supervision of novice clinical supervisors: Eight recurring issues. Journal of Counseling and Development, 72, 520-524.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Weitzman, L. M., Gold, Y., & Unerod, M. (1988). Academic harassment: Sex and denial in scholarly garb. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12 (3), 329-340.
- Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1988). Manual for the Ways of Coping Questionnaire. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Gilbert, L. A. (1987). Female and male emotional dependency and its implications for the therapist-client relationship. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18, 555-561.
- Glaser, R. D. & Thorpe, J. S. (1986). Unethical intimacy: A survey of sexual contact

- and advances between psychology educators and female graduate students.
American Psychologist, *41* (1), 43-51.
- Guest, C. L. (1996). Ethical issues in field-based clinical counseling supervision. (Doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, *56* (10-A), 3837. (University Microfilms No.AAM96-04861.
- Harding, S. S. (1993). Moral sensitivity training: Directions in counselor education, counseling psychology, and clinical psychology training programs. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, *54* (2-B), 1076-1077. (University Microfilms No. AN95-71788-001.
- Kadushin, A. (1968). Games people play in supervision. Social Work, *3*, 23-32.
- Ketefian, S. (1989). Moral reasoning and ethical practice. Annual Review of Nursing Research, *7*, 173-195.
- Kitchener, K. S. (1986). Teaching applied ethics in counselor education: An integration of psychological processes and philosophical analysis. Journal of Counseling and Development, *64* (5), 306-310.
- Kohlberg, L., Levine, C., & Hewer, A. (1983). Moral stages: A current formulation and response to critics. New York: Karger.
- Kurpius, D., Gibson, G., Lewis, J. & Corbet, M. (1991). Ethical issues in supervising counseling practitioners. Counselor Education and Supervision. *31*, 48-55.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1993). Coping theory and research: Past, present, and future. Psychosomatic Medicine, *55* (3), 234-237.
- McCarthy, P., Kulakowski, D. & Kenfield, J. A. (1994). Clinical supervision practices of licensed psychologists. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, *25* (2), 177-181.
- Milde, C. A. M. (1995). Counselors: Reactions to perceived unethical behavior of professional peers (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University). Dissertation Abstracts International, *56* (7-A), AAM9536569.
- Morris, M. L. (1981). A study of moral development and social role perspectives in

- counselor education programs. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42(4-A). (University Microfilms No. AN82-71120-001).
- Navin, S., Beamish, P., & Johanson, G. (1995). Ethical practices of field-based mental health counselor supervision. Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 17 (2), 243-253.
- Pope, K. S., Levenson, H. S., & Schoner, L. R. (1979). Sexual intimacy in psychological training. American Journal of Psychotherapy, 34 (8), 682-689.
- Ramsey, F., & Schafer, D. (1995). The statistical sleuth. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University Press.
- Rest, J. (1979). Development in Judging Moral Issues. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ryder, R. & Hepworth, J. (1990). AAMFT ethical code: Dual Relationships. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 6 (2), 127-132.
- Schwab, R. & Neukrug, E. (1994). A survey of counselor educators' ethical concerns. Counseling and Values, 39, 42-55.
- Stadler, H., & Paul, R. D. (1986). Counselor educators' preparation in ethics. Journal of Counseling and Development, 64 (5), 328-330.
- Twohey, D. & Volker, J. (1993). Listening for the voices of care and justice in counselor supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 32, 189