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ABSTRACT

The training of clinical psychologists was examined to better understand the influence graduate school and professional socialization has on future therapists' views of dual role relationships with clients. Graduate students currently enrolled in clinical or counselling psychology programs in Canada were surveyed (response rate of 37.9%). A questionnaire was developed to measure the frequency with which students experienced a variety of professional, social, financial, and dual role interactions with their educators. The Therapeutic Practice Survey developed by Borys (1988) was used to solicit graduate students' judgements of the ethicality of various behaviours between therapist and client. Male students reported more social interactions with their educators than did female students. In contrast, female students experienced more professional role violations by their educators, particularly major/professional dual role violations such as sexual harassment and having had an educator who was also their therapist. Standard multiple regression analyses were used to evaluate the ability of selected variables, such as students' experiences with their educators, to predict the ethicality judgement scores for Incidental Involvements, Social/Financial Involvements, and Dual Professional Roles subscales of the Therapeutic Practice Survey. Students' experiences with their educators, level of clinical experience, and the presence or absence of ethics education contributed significantly to students' ethical judgements regarding Social/Financial Involvements and Dual Professional Roles with
therapy clients. Students who had reported professional role violation experiences with their educators judged Dual Professional Roles between therapists and their clients to be more ethical than did students who did not report such experiences. This suggests that students’ experiences with their educators influence students’ views about dual role relationships between therapist and client. This effect is mediated by student gender. Therefore, educators need to do more than teach ethics to their students - they need to behave ethically as well. Changes in clinical training needs to begin with educators and the present learning environment of universities.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Graduate training and professional socialization play a vital role in the development of therapists. Education has been looked upon as one solution to decreasing the occurrence of therapist sexual dual role relationships with clients (Gabbard & Lester, 1995; Strasburger, Jorgenson, & Sutherland, 1992). Few people, however, have considered that education might be fostering such behaviour. It is my contention that academic training has, perhaps inadvertently, been socializing therapists in a manner that is conducive to the existence of dual role relationships between therapists and clients. This is a cause for concern because dual role relationships increase the risk of clients being harmed. The current study indirectly investigated the relationship between the training of therapists and the existence of dual role relationships between therapists and clients.

In the last few years there has been a proliferation of debate and discussion on the advisability and consequences of dual role relationships in therapy (Borys, 1992; Epstein, 1994; Gabbard & Lester, 1995; Herlihy & Corey, 1992; Kitchener, 1988; Pope, 1991; Ryder & Hepworth, 1990; Younggren & Skora, 1992). Most books addressing issues of ethics now include a section or chapter on dual role relationships (Corey, Corey, & Callanan, 1993; Haas & Malouf, 1989; Herlihy & Golden, 1990; Herlihy & Corey, 1996; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Pope & Vasquez, 1991; Rave & Larsen, 1995). Moreover,
models of decision making specifically designed to help therapists evaluate the potential risks of dual role relationships have recently been proposed (Brown, 1994b; Gottlieb, 1993; Herlihy & Corey, 1992; Kitchener, 1988; Valentich & Grinton, 1992). One assertion which has been made in the past is that sexual dual role relationships between educators and students contribute to the occurrence of therapist-client sexual dual role relationships (Bouhoutsos, 1984; Epstein, 1994; Folman, 1991; Kitchener, 1992b; Pope, 1989; Pope, Levenson, & Schover, 1979; Vasquez, 1988, 1992). One of the purposes of this study was to test such an assertion.

The focus of this introduction is on dual role relationships between therapist and client, and educator and student. Utilizing the theory of dual role relationships and a feminist analysis of power, the training of clinical psychologists was examined in order to better elucidate the influence graduate school and professional socialization has on future therapists' views of dual role relationships with clients. The theory of dual role relationships, including a definition, will be discussed presently under the section titled "Dual Role Relationships". Feminist theory will be used to evaluate and explain the therapist-client and student-educator relationships and will be evident in the interpretations of such issues as therapist sexual misconduct and sexual harassment in academia raised in this paper. The primary unit of study when seeking explanations will be macro as opposed to micro: institutions and society as opposed to the individual. Emphasis will be on sex discrimination, gender

It is an underlying assumption of this document that sexual dual role relationships or sexual contact between therapist and client is always an abuse of power by the therapist. For many reasons, including the vulnerable position the client occupies relative to the therapist, the client cannot consent to the sexual dual role relationship (Baylis, 1993; Feldman-Summers, 1989; Lerman & Rigby, 1990). Thus, when discussing sexual activity between therapist and client the term "sexual misconduct" will be used to emphasize the abuse of power inherent in such acts. Likewise, it is an assumption of this paper that the educator-student relationship is based on an imbalance of power with the educator possessing power over the student (see American Counseling Association, 1995; American Psychological Association, 1992; Fitzgerald, Weitzman, Gold, & Ormerod, 1988; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Matthews, 1991; Pope et al., 1979; Zalk, 1990). Consequently, sexual dual role relationships between educator and student are also viewed as an abuse of power.

**The Therapist-Client Relationship**

The therapeutic relationship is a relationship based on power. Furthermore, the power is unequally distributed between the therapist and the client with the therapist possessing more power than the client (Feldman-
Summers, 1989; Luepker & Schoener, 1989; Peterson, 1992; Russell, 1993). The unequal power distribution is attributable to many factors. First, people who have gone to a therapist often if not always see the therapist as an authority figure or expert in the field of human behaviour (Luepker & Schoener, 1989; Peterson, 1992; Russell, 1993). This is the reason an individual goes to see a therapist for help. Professionals such as therapists, doctors, and professors are also accorded status, power, and authority by our society (Lerman & Rigby, 1990; Peterson, 1992). Secondly, the power held by the therapist is increased during the process of therapy as the client reveals intimate details of her or his life (Feldman-Summers, 1989; Peterson, 1992). Thirdly, there is the issue of transference contributing to a client's vulnerability and enhancing a therapist's authority. Although not all theoretical orientations use the term transference, most would agree that clients do develop strong feelings towards their therapists. The intensity of these feelings can leave the client vulnerable to the demands and manipulations of her or his therapist (Feldman-Summers, 1989; Luepker & Schoener, 1989; Peterson, 1992). The fourth issue of importance is the relative power accorded people based on gender. In North American society, men are accorded higher status than women (Lips, 1991; Unger & Crawford, 1992). Thus, the situation in which male therapists see female clients is one that emphasizes the power differential between men and women and reflects gender-based power differences found in society in general (Holroyd, 1983). Finally, there is the fiduciary nature of the relationship (Jorgenson,
1995b; Feldman-Summers, 1989). This means that the client expects the therapist to act in her or his best interest and may not readily question the therapist for this reason.

In addition to the asymmetrical nature of power, each member of the dyad assumes a specific, identifiable, and unexchangeable role. The therapist role involves certain duties and obligations. The core responsibilities upon which every other aspect of the therapist role is based are those of beneficence and nonmaleficence (Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985). Beneficence refers to the prescription to help and to use one's abilities solely for the client's benefit. Nonmaleficence refers to avoiding harming a client. Beneficence and nonmaleficence are framed within the language and concept of both fiduciary and therapeutic relationships. Consequently, acknowledging the power differential between therapist and client should result in the therapist not using the client to meet his/her own personal, social, sexual, or financial needs. This recognition assists the therapist in helping and not taking advantage of the client.

The therapist role involves more than the emphasis on the obligation of the therapist to not use the power inherent in that role to the client's detriment. The therapist role also involves the power to make such decisions as setting the fee, setting the time and place of the meeting, and choosing what he/she will or will not reveal to the client. The client role encompasses dependency, self-disclosure, trust and expectations such as relief, solutions to her/his
problems, support, safety, and comfort. The client role also involves the responsibilities of paying for the therapist’s services, attending the scheduled sessions, and actively engaging in the process of therapy. The role of a client makes any individual who enters this relationship vulnerable and less powerful (not necessarily powerless) than if engaged in another type of relationship. Some aspects of the unequal distribution of power will be present whether they are acknowledged or not. It is the therapist’s obligation to understand the construction and sources of power in the therapist-client relationship and to act accordingly. This obligation is recognized in the ethical codes of the American and Canadian Psychological Associations and the American Counseling Association (ACA, 1995; APA, 1992; Canadian Psychological Association, 1991).

Dual Role Relationships

Therapists can abuse the power they possess by not understanding or acknowledging the inequities of power between themselves and their clients, or by purposely exploiting the power imbalance. Abuse of power can manifest itself in the existence of dual role relationships between therapist and client. According to Pope (Pope, 1991; Pope & Vasquez, 1991), a dual role relationship occurs when the therapist is in another, significantly different relationship with one of his or her clients. Most commonly, the second role is social, sexual, financial, or professional. In some cases, one relationship occurs after the termination of the original relationship. The fact that the two roles are
sequential in nature rather than clearly simultaneous does not, in and of itself, mean that the two relationships do not comprise a dual role relationship. Examples of nonsexual dual role relationships include entering into professional relationships with close friends, family members, employees or students, socializing with clients and students, service bartering, the trading of therapy for therapy by two or more mental health professionals, accepting gifts and favours from clients, and treating significant others of clients (Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985).

Pope’s definition is the most conservative definition offered by experts in the field and it is not unanimously accepted. Presently there is continued debate surrounding the issue of who is a client and whether former clients should receive the same kind of protection as current clients (Appelbaum & Jorgenson, 1991; Gabbard, 1994; Kitchener, 1992a; Shopland & VandeCreek, 1991; Vasquez, 1991). Throughout this paper the use of the term dual role relationship will be based on Pope’s definition (Pope, 1991; Pope & Vasquez, 1991). It is acknowledged that other kinds of relationships or extra-therapeutic contacts between therapist and client do occur. For instance, accidental encounters refer to chance meetings that occur outside the therapist’s office while both people are conducting their daily lives. These encounters are unplanned and unintentional on the part of both people and are a result of circumstances of life. In contrast, dual role relationships involve planned extra-therapeutic contacts for nontherapeutic purposes.
Defining what constitutes a dual role relationship in professional ethics codes has been problematic. Sexual and nonsexual dual role relationships have received differing amounts of attention. While nonsexual dual role relationships are mentioned in the professional codes of ethics for mental health professionals, they are not as clearly defined or as expressly prohibited as sexual dual role relationships. The two relevant factors involved in defining dual role relationships in ethics codes are the determination that a dual role relationship exists and an evaluation that the dual role relationship is detrimental to the client. Sexual dual role relationships with clients have been judged to be harmful and hence are clearly prohibited. Nonsexual dual role relationships are judged to be unacceptable only if the relationship is exploitative and harms the client (ACA, 1995; APA, 1992; CPA, 1991). It is left up to each psychologist to decide, without explicit guidance from ethics codes, whether or not her or his particular dual role relationship is exploitative. Perhaps because of this a majority of nonsexual complaints processed by ethics committees and professional licensing boards involve charges of extratherapeutic social, financial or business activities with clients, or being involved in a dual professional role such as being a student's supervisor and therapist (Ethics Committee of the APA, 1988; Pope, 1989; Report of the Ethics Committee, 1993).

Ethical guidelines, as evaluated by mental health professionals, have been found to be too vague regarding the question of dual role relationships
(e.g., Sonne, 1994). In a recent survey of ethical dilemmas encountered by psychologists the second most frequently described type of incident involved the issue of possible dual role involvement with a client (Pope & Vetter, 1992). Seventeen percent of all the critical incidents and ethical challenges raised involved the issue of dual role relationships (Pope & Vetter, 1992). Other studies have also underscored the uncertainty therapists feel regarding the ethicality of various behaviours including dual role relationships (Borys & Pope, 1989; Conte, Plutchik, Picard, & Karasu, 1989; Gibson & Pope, 1993; Haas, Malouf, & Mayerson, 1986; Pope, Tabachnick, & Keith-Spiegel, 1987; Tymchuk et al., 1982). For psychologists in one study, 12 out of 83 behaviours were very difficult for respondents to evaluate on the basis of ethics and one fourth of these behaviours concerned sexual issues (Pope et al., 1987). Gibson and Pope (1993) reported a number of behaviours on which counsellors disagreed with regard to their ethicality. Almost half of the contentious behaviours involved nonsexual dual role relationships such as "providing counselling to student/supervisee", "providing counselling to one of your employees", and "going into business with a former client" (Gibson & Pope, 1993, p. 334).

Professional codes of ethics obviously cannot provide the answer to the question of whether or not a particular dual role relationship is exploitative and hence should cease. It is impossible to clearly specify in a code of ethics every conceivable harmful dual role relationship. Rather, mental health professionals are encouraged to use their ethics codes as a tool to assist them in making
decisions when faced with an ethical dilemma (Sinclair, 1993). The task must be seen as one of developing decision making skills as opposed to stating in concrete terms the "don'ts" of clinical practice (Brown, 1994a; Lerman & Porter, 1990). Ethics codes need to be formulated as a process rather than a set of unchanging rules in order to emphasize the responsibilities of all mental health professionals to be actively involved in this task. One of the functions served by ethics committees and licensing boards is to clarify the issue of appropriate ethical and professional behaviour (Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Schoenfeld, Gottlieb, & Sell, 1988). But, as pointed out by Hogan and Kimmel, "[p]erhaps the primary limitation of an ethics code is that it can neither help academicians acquire the moral-reasoning skills required to negotiate ethical dilemmas nor provide the behavioral skills necessary to carry out ethical actions" (Hogan & Kimmel, 1992, p. 208). Ultimately the responsibility for acting ethically lies with the individual therapist and relies on the therapist's ability to make good ethical decisions.

**Sexual Dual Role Relationships**

Sexual dual role relationships will be addressed first because they have received the most attention and research to date. One of the reasons for such attention is that there has been a substantial increase in complaints to state licensing boards and in legal actions against therapists on the basis of sexual dual role relationships between therapists and their clients in the recent past (Gottlieb, Sell, & Schoenfeld, 1988; Committee of the APA, 1988; Sell, Gottlieb,
& Schoenfeld, 1986; Seto, 1995). An examination of sexual dual role relationships has led to a discussion of nonsexual dual role relationships and an articulation of the concept of dual role relationships. As will be seen in the upcoming discussion, both research and theory on nonsexual dual role relationships lag far behind that of sexual dual role relationships. Although the organization of this paper treats sexual and nonsexual dual role relationships as two distinct entities, theoretically they are best understood as instances of violations of appropriate therapeutic and treatment boundaries. Their distinctness stems from the extent to which they are exploitative and damaging to clients, in actuality or potentiality, and the extent to which sex is judged to be part of the therapeutic boundary violation. Nonsexual dual role relationships can be as problematic and as exploitative as sexual dual role relationships (Anderson & Kitchener, 1996; Gutheil & Gabbard, 1993; Nerison, 1992).

**Prevalence of sexual dual role relationships.**

National survey studies of psychologists conducted in the United States have reported anywhere from 1.0% to 12.1% of surveyed male psychologists and 0.4% to 3.0% of surveyed female psychologists have engaged in sexual activity with a client at some time in their careers (Akamatsu, 1988; Borys & Pope, 1989; Holroyd & Brodsky, 1977; Pope, Keith-Spiegel, & Tabachnick, 1986; Pope et al., 1979; Pope et al., 1987). The median prevalence rate for male psychologists is 6.5%. The mean rate for female psychologists is 1.9%. Surveys of psychiatrists have reported similar overall rates of sexual
misconduct and similar gender differences between male and female therapists (Gartrell, Herman, Olarte, Feldstein, & Localio, 1986; Kardener, Fuller, & Mensh, 1973). Furthermore, a study which surveyed national samples of psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers in the United States found no significant difference among the professions in terms of overall rates of sexual misconduct (Borys & Pope, 1989).

The most frequently reported therapist-client dyad in which sexual dual role relationships occur is that of a male therapist and a female client, found in 92% of the cases by Bouhoutsos, Holroyd, Lerman, Forer, and Greenberg (1983) while Gartrell et al. (1986) reported it occurring 88% of the time. The second most common dyad is that of a male therapist and a male client reported in 3.4% and 7.6% of the cases. The third most common dyad is that of a female therapist and male client reported in 2.4% and 3.5% of the cases. The least common therapist-client dyad is that of a female therapist and a female client, reported in 1.7% and 1.4% of the cases surveyed by these two studies. Both studies reported the same pattern regarding the frequency of the four possible dyad combinations. This pattern holds even when the overall rates of male and female therapists and male and female clients are taken into account.

The three most recent surveys of psychologists have reported a substantial decrease in self-reported sexual misconduct with clients made by male psychologists (Akamatsu, 1988; Borys & Pope, 1989; Pope et al., 1987). Whereas past studies consistently found a self-report rate between 9.4% -
12.1%, these most recent studies have found the rate to be between 1.0% - 3.6%. (During this same period there has not been a significant difference for the rate of sexual misconduct reported by female psychologists: 2.5% - 3.0% in comparison to 0.4% - 2.3% found by the most recent studies.) A number of reasons for this trend have been proposed. It may be that these rates represent an actual decrease of the behaviour being studied (Borys & Pope, 1989; Pope et al., 1987). For example, the increased awareness on the part of therapists regarding the harmful consequences of therapist sexual misconduct may have helped to change therapist behaviour (Pope et al., 1987; Pope, 1990). It is also possible that these rates represent a decrease in the willingness of therapists to report such behaviour particularly with the increased media coverage of those cases brought to court and the fact that in some states sexual misconduct with a client is now a felony (Borys & Pope, 1989; Pope et al., 1987). With stricter laws being passed and the public increasingly seeking redress via professional and legal channels, it is possible that the decrease in self-reported sexual misconduct with clients by psychologists is due to a change in self-reporting behaviour rather than a substantial change in the occurrence of sexual misconduct. There are three reasons why the second explanation seems more likely. First, there has not been a corresponding decrease in the rate of sexual misconduct reported by female psychologists during the same time period. Secondly, there have only been a few years between studies with significantly different rates of sexual misconduct reported for male psychologists (e.g., 1986
a reported rate of 9.4% versus 1989 a reported rate of 1.0%). Such a dramatic change in behaviour would seem to require a longer period of time to occur. Finally, there has, in fact, been an increase in complaints about sexual dual role relationships between therapists and their clients to state licensing boards in recent times (Gottlieb et al., 1988; Committee of the APA, 1988; Sell et al., 1986; Seto, 1995).

Research has found differences between the sexes to be consistent. Male therapists are most often the perpetrators and female clients are most often the victims of therapist sexual misconduct. It is important to recognize the existence of a gender-based power differential in society and within the therapeutic relationship. Holroyd (1983) refers to therapist sexual misconduct as an example of sex-biased therapy, which she defines as therapy that differs for men and women, has no therapeutic rationale, and relates to sex-role stereotypes. The differential rate of sexual contact with male and female clients is seen as reflecting the patriarchal social structure and power distribution of our society. She suggests that "the normative conditions for sexual liaison in our patriarchal society are reproduced only when the therapist is male and the patient is female" (Holroyd, 1983, p. 293). Female therapist-male client dyads are discordant with societal expectations for power distribution. Hence, this dyad is uncommon. Holroyd’s analysis highlights the importance gender plays in the construction and maintenance of the power differential in the therapeutic relationship and how it mirrors gender roles in society.
Attitudes about sexual dual role relationships.

Research surveys that study the rate of specific behaviour often inquire concurrently about therapists' attitudes regarding that same behaviour. What has been found is that an overwhelming majority of psychologists, psychiatrists, and counsellors agree that sexual activity with clients is unethical and harmful to the client (Borys & Pope, 1989; Gechtman, 1989; Gibson & Pope, 1993; Herman et al., 1987; Holroyd & Brodsky, 1977; Kardener et al., 1973; Pope et al., 1987; Stake & Oliver, 1991). While agreement on this issue is overwhelming, it is not unanimous: In one survey 4.5% stated that sexual involvement could be appropriate if the therapist fell in love with the client and an additional 4% reserved judgement in this instance (Herman et al., 1987). Other studies have also reported that a small minority of therapists (approximately 5%) believe that under some circumstances sexual activity with clients is ethical (Gechtman, 1989; Holroyd & Brodsky, 1977; Pope et al., 1987). Hence, a small minority of mental health professionals consistently believe that, at least under certain circumstances, sexual involvement with a client is acceptable. The caveat "under certain circumstances" seems to refer to whether or not the therapist is in love with or marries the client.

Evidence from some of these same studies also show that there are attitudinal differences between male and female therapists. Male therapists are more likely to express the belief that sexual contact may be beneficial to therapy than are female therapists (Holroyd & Brodsky, 1977) and female
therapists are more likely to favour mandatory reporting of therapist sexual misconduct than are their male counterparts (Gartrell et al., 1987). Overall, female therapists consider sexual and nonsexual dual role relationships to be less ethical than male therapists (Borys & Pope, 1989).

**Consequences of sexual dual role relationships.**

One reason for the concern about sexual dual role relationships is that they disrupt and often seriously hamper the goal of providing therapy to a person (Pope, 1991; Sonne, 1994). The therapeutic and fiduciary contract entered into by the therapist is to provide assistance to the client: placing the client’s best interests and needs before the needs of the therapist (Feldman-Summers, 1989). With the development of a dual role relationship there is an increased chance of the therapist making decisions that are based on self-interest rather than the needs of the client (Borys, 1992; CPA, 1991; Committee on Women in Psychology, 1989; Pope, 1991; Pope & Bouhoutsos, 1986; Sonne, 1994). Thus there ensues a general confusion of roles with the client being used to meet the needs of the therapist and the reason for the client initially seeking therapy often being ignored. As the review of the literature will illustrate, sexualized relationships between therapists and clients cause a great number of problems for the client, the therapist, for the families of the client and the therapist, for other mental health professionals, and for society in general.

There is a growing body of literature which indicates that the consequences of sexual dual role relationships with clients are overwhelmingly
detrimental to the client and to the therapeutic process (Bouhoutsos et al., 1983; Feldman-Summers & Jones, 1984; Gartrell, Herman, Olarte, Feldstein, & Localio, 1987; Pope & Vetter, 1991; Sonne, Meyer, Borys, & Marshall, 1985; Vinson, 1984). For the most part, these studies have examined the consequences for female clients because no male clients were involved in the study (e.g., Feldman-Summers & Jones, 1984; Sonne et al., 1985) or male clients comprised a small minority of the sample (e.g., Bouhoutsos et al., 1983; Pope & Vetter, 1991). Researchers have examined the consequences of sexual dual role relationships as evaluated by clients and by subsequent treating therapists. In one study, 87% of responding psychiatrists who reported treating clients who had been sexually involved with their previous therapist assessed the previous sexual contact as always harmful to the client (Gartrell et al., 1987). Two survey studies which asked therapists to evaluate their clients who had told them of sexual contact with a previous therapist assessed that between 80% - 95% of those involved sexually with their previous therapist suffered some ill effects either regarding their personal life functioning or in the breakdown of the therapeutic process (Bouhoutsos et al., 1983; Pope & Vetter, 1991). One study compared female clients who had had sexual contact with their therapists with female clients who had not (Feldman-Summers & Jones, 1984). They reported that female clients who had had sexual contact had a greater mistrust of, and anger toward men and therapists, and also had a greater number of psychological symptoms than did female clients who had not
experienced sexual contact with their therapists (Feldman-Summers & Jones, 1984).

Frequently reported consequences of sexual dual role relationships for the female client include difficulties trusting others, particularly men and therapists, poor self-concept, low self-esteem, problems expressing anger, loss of self-confidence in her own judgement, depression, feelings of guilt, impaired social adjustment, loss of motivation, worsened intimate relationships, increased drug and alcohol use, hospitalization, and suicidal feelings and behaviour (Bouhoutsos et al., 1983; Pope, 1994; Schoener, Milgrom, & Gonsiorek, 1985; Sonne et al., 1985). Other identified negative consequences for the female client included that help was not obtained for the initial reason for seeking treatment, the ability to seek assistance from future health care professionals was impaired, and new problems arose which were a direct result of the sexualized therapeutic relationship (Bouhoutsos et al., 1983; Feldman-Summers & Jones, 1984; Sonne et al., 1985).

Damaging consequences of sexual dual role relationships are not limited to the client. They can also occur at both a professional and personal level for the therapist involved. Professionally, the therapist can face disciplinary, civil (malpractice litigation) and/or criminal proceedings which may result in censure, the loss of the license to practice, financial costs for legal fees and settlement agreements with the client, and a possible criminal conviction (Bisbing, Jorgenson, & Sutherland, 1995; Perr, 1989; Smith & Bisbing, 1987). In some
states where sexual misconduct is a felony a therapist may be found guilty of a criminal offense (Bisbing et al., 1995; Jorgenson, 1995b; Jorgenson, Randles, & Strasburger, 1991). Although in Canada sexual misconduct is not a criminal offense, therapists can still face disciplinary and malpractice litigation. For example, in Ontario the consequences of being found guilty of sexual misconduct involving sexual contact results in the mandatory revocation of the therapist's license for a minimum of five years, a possible fine of up to $35,000, and an order to reimburse the client who was abused for up to $10,000 to pay for additional therapy (Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991; see also Mactavish, 1994). Personally, the therapist may experience estrangement from his partner and children and/or isolation from friends and colleagues (Pope & Bouhoutsos, 1986). In summary, therapists may become isolated and alienated from family, friends, and colleagues, lose their license to practice psychotherapy, be sued successfully, and/or be found guilty of a criminal offense.

People close to the client such as partners, children, and friends are also often affected by the relationship (Luepker & O'Brien, 1989; Milgrom, 1989). All these people are the secondary victims of the sexual dual role relationship. Male spouses/partners often experience an extreme sense of isolation, confusion, loss of self-esteem, frustration, helplessness, and anger towards the perpetrators and towards their wives/partners for becoming sexually involved with their therapist (Luepker & O'Brien, 1989). If the partner is not informed, the
relationship is affected by the client's keeping of a secret. In all cases, the client's relationships with friends and family are changed and sometimes lost due to the sexual dual role relationship as often the client has invested a substantial amount of time and energy into the relationship with the therapist. Simultaneously, the therapist often encourages the client's isolation from family and friends in order to protect the relationship from being discovered.

Brown (1988) has discussed the effects of sexual dual role relationships between women on the lesbian community, including other clients and professional colleagues. Although discussing sexual relationships with former clients, it is possible to extrapolate her observations to relationships with current clients. Other therapists aware of a friend's or colleague's relationship with a former client express feelings of hurt and anger particularly when attempts to talk with their colleague have been met with defensiveness and hostility. In addition, current and former clients of the therapist who are aware of the relationship frequently express feelings of abandonment, grief, jealousy, and a feeling of loss of safety (see also Milgrom, 1989). It appears that many therapist-client sexual relationships are known by colleagues, acquaintances, and other clients. Therefore, it is not only the two individuals involved in the relationship who are affected but also those in the greater community in which the relationship occurs. Therapists as a group and regardless of professional affiliation are perceived by the larger community as not protecting current or former clients (Brown, 1988). Sexual dual role relationships damage the
integrity of the profession and of the majority of therapists who practice in a competent and ethical manner (Gabbard & Menninger, 1991; Kitchener & Harding, 1990; Regehr & Glancy, 1995).

In general, therapists view sexual dual role relationships as unethical, inappropriate, exploitative, antitherapeutic, and harmful to the client. Even with the accumulating evidence of the harmful consequences of sexual dual role relationships some therapists continue to disagree with this conclusion however. Interestingly, there appear to be significant differences in beliefs held between therapists who have reported sexual involvement with clients and those who have not. Psychiatrists who have reported sexual involvement with clients, although they stated that sexual contact is inappropriate in most circumstances, were much more likely to allow for exceptions to that rule than their colleagues (Herman et al., 1987). For instance, only 3.5% of therapists who did not report sexual involvement with clients believed that sexual contact could be appropriate if the therapist fell in love with the client (Herman et al., 1987). In contrast, 21% of therapists who reported sexual involvement with clients held this belief (Herman et al., 1987). There is also evidence that abusing therapists tend to minimize the negative impact of their actions and tend to evaluate clients who have had sex with a previous therapist as improved or not affected by the contact more than therapists who have never been sexually active with a client (Bouhoutsos et al., 1983; Gartrell et al., 1987; Herman et al., 1987; Holroyd & Bouhoutsos, 1985). Therefore, therapists who have engaged in
sexual misconduct judge such behaviour as less harmful than therapists who
have never engaged in such behaviour.

**Nonsexual Dual Role Relationships**

*Prevalence of nonsexual dual role relationships.*

In contrast to the research activity on sexual dual role relationships, nonsexual dual role relationships have received little attention. There has been only one national and cross-disciplinary study conducted in the United States which examined nonsexual and sexual dual role relationships between therapists and their clients (Borys, 1988; Borys & Pope, 1989). A total of 4,800 psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers (return rate of 49%) were surveyed to assess their attitudes and practices with regard to dual role situations which may occur with clients. Half of the participants surveyed rated the ethicality of each behaviour presented and half indicated the frequency with which they had engaged in each behaviour. A factor analysis differentiated 17 behaviours surveyed into four clusters: incidental involvements, dual professional roles, social involvements, and financial involvements.

There was no significant difference among the professions in terms of the frequency of engaging in sexual activity with a client or former client, or nonsexual dual role relationships such as social involvements or financial involvements with clients. The only difference amongst the professions was that psychologists engaged in incidental involvements or social encounters with clients more frequently than psychiatrists and social workers. However, there
were a number of significant differences based on gender. Male therapists, regardless of professional affiliation, engaged more often in nonsexual dual role relationships, social involvements, and financial involvements with their clients than did female therapists. Female therapists engaged more often in incidental involvements with their clients than did male therapists. Thus there was found to be a significant gender difference regarding therapist behaviour when confronted with potential dual role situations. Female therapists tended to engage more often in incidental involvements or social encounters which by definition were "typically 'one-time' events or special occasions in which the therapeutic roles or boundaries were altered at the initiation of the client" (Borys, 1988, p. 66). On the other hand, male therapists engaged more often in extra-therapeutic social, financial or business activities with their clients, and engaged more often in dual professional roles such as being an individual's employer and therapist.

Within the field of clinical psychology there have been three studies which have examined nonsexual dual role relationships between psychologists and their clients. Tallman (1981; as cited in Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985) conducted a small-scale survey of psychologists in the state of California and their practices of socializing with clients currently in treatment. There are a number of limitations to this study including the small sample size. Still, the study is useful for descriptive purposes. Like Borys and Pope (1989), Tallman found that male psychologists reported more social involvements with their
clients than did female psychologists. He found that approximately one-third of the 38 psychologists who responded reported having formed social relationships, occasionally, with selected clients and usually their clients' partners. To be noted is that although the sample was composed equally of male and female therapists, only male therapists reported nonsexual social relationships with selected clients. In more than half of these cases the nonsexual relationship continued after the termination of the therapeutic relationship. Another third of the psychologists surveyed, in this case mostly female psychologists, reported that they had attended, on the invitation of their client, special social events in their clients' lives such as a wedding or Bar Mitzvah. They indicated that these were one-time happenings that were attended for the meaning they held for the client and were not seen as an opportunity for personal socializing. The remaining third of the sample strictly refrained from any contact with clients outside of the professional setting because the risk of adverse consequences was too high. This last group was composed of both male and female psychologists.

Only one large scale survey study has looked at the frequency of various nonsexual dual role relationships for psychologists (Pope et al., 1987). It was found that approximately a quarter of the surveyed psychologists indicated that they had provided therapy to their students or supervisees, friends, and employees. Another 10% reported initiating business relationships with their former clients while 2% reported initiating business relationships with
current clients. Sixteen percent reported having invited a client to a party or social event while a third of the psychologists reported accepting a client's invitation to a party. Finally, approximately three-quarters of the psychologists responding indicated that they had attended a client's special social event such as a wedding at least once. There was no statistically significant differences between male and female psychologists in the frequency of engaging in these behaviours. According to this study then, extra-therapeutic social, financial or business activities with clients, or being involved in a dual professional role such as being an individual's clinical supervisor and therapist is a relatively common practice.

One study has investigated the frequency of sexual and business relationships between therapists and their former clients (Lamb et al., 1994). Business relationships with former clients were reported by 29% of the therapists. Male therapists reported engaging in this type of relationship at a significantly higher rate than female therapists.

In summary, there are only four studies which have examined nonsexual dual role relationships, one of which is unpublished (Tallman, 1981) and another one which examined business dual role relationships with former clients (Lamb et al., 1994). The conclusions to date are mixed. According to Borys and Pope (1989) and Lamb et al., (1994) there are distinct and consistent differences between male and female therapists while Pope et al. (1987) found no such differences. Interestingly, some of the behaviours investigated by Pope
et al. (1987) were also studied by Borys and Pope (1989). According to Borys
and Pope (1989) male therapists more often engage in nonsexual dual role
relationships with their clients than their female colleagues. That is, male
therapists whether psychiatrists, social workers, or psychologists more
frequently become involved in ongoing social, financial, or business dealings with
their clients than do female therapists. What is more, they tend to engage in
these dual roles more often with their female clients. In contrast, female
therapists more often engage in one-time events or social encounters with their
clients at the client's initiation. This too occurred most often with female clients.
In contrast, Pope et al. (1987) found no differences between male and female
psychologists regarding the frequency with which they engaged in various
behaviours with their clients. Where both Borys and Pope (1989) and Pope et
al. (1987) do agree is that many psychologists are consistently involved in
nonsexual dual role relationships with their clients in one form or another.
Lastly, Lamb et al. (1994) reported that male therapists more often engage in
business dual role relationships with former clients than do their female
colleagues. Further research is necessary to investigate the issue of systematic
differences between therapists based on gender and help clarify the current
contradictory evidence.

Attitudes about nonsexual dual role relationships.

Male and female therapists have been found to hold different attitudes
about nonsexual dual role relationships. In general, male therapists tend to rate
dual professional roles and extra-therapeutic social, financial, or business involvements as more ethical than female therapists (Borys & Pope, 1989). Male therapists who indicated they saw mostly female clients also viewed incidental involvements or social encounters as more ethical than all other therapist-client gender pairings (Borys & Pope, 1989).

Borys and Pope (1989) also reported attitudinal differences among the professions. Psychologists viewed incidental involvements as more ethical than either psychiatrists or social workers while psychiatrists rated social and financial dual role relationships as less ethical than either psychologists or social workers (Borys & Pope, 1989).

In summary, not only is there disagreement amongst mental health professionals regarding appropriate and ethical professional behaviour in various situations but what may be of an even greater concern is the systematic differences in these views amongst male and female therapists. There is evidence from Borys and Pope (1989) that the attitudinal and behavioral differences amongst male and female therapists are systematic and may be based on the larger socialized gender differences between men and women.

A Comparison of Sexual and Nonsexual Dual Role Relationships

The purpose of this section is to more clearly articulate the possible connections between sexual and nonsexual dual role relationships from both a theoretical and empirical perspective. There has been found to be empirical evidence supporting a number of similarities between sexual and nonsexual
dual role relationships. More male therapists engage in sexual, social, and financial activities with their clients than do female therapists (Borys & Pope, 1989). Also, more male therapists engage in financial activities with their former clients than do female therapists (Lamb et al., 1994). Furthermore, more female than male clients are involved in sexual and/or nonsexual dual role relationships (Borys & Pope, 1989; Boughoutsos et al., 1983; Gartrell et al., 1986). On the other hand, female therapists view sexual and nonsexual dual role relationships as less ethical than do male therapists (Borys & Pope, 1989). Thus, the pattern of behaviours and attitudes for male and female therapists are identical for sexual and nonsexual dual role relationships with more male than female therapists engaging in, and judging to be ethical, sexual and nonsexual dual role relationships.

Additionally, nonsexual dual role relationships appear to be a necessary but not sufficient condition for the occurrence of sexual misconduct. The literature provides evidence, both anecdotal and empirical, that nonsexual boundary violations almost always occur prior to sexual dual role relationships (Borys, 1988; Borys & Pope, 1989; Gabbard, 1996, 1989; Gutheil & Gabbard, 1993; Simon, 1992, 1989). This does not mean that all nonsexual dual role relationships culminate in sexual activity between therapist and client. Rather, a link has been reported between various nonsexual boundary violations and later sexual misconduct by mental health professionals (Borys, 1988). It has been found that social, financial, or professional dual role relationships increase the
probability of future sexual misconduct by a therapist with the same client that was subjected to the initial nonsexual dual role relationship (Borys, 1988). In addition, the blurring of therapeutic boundaries such as therapy sessions increasing in length, being rescheduled at the end of the day, and becoming more social and less clinical in nature have been suggested as possible precursors to sexual misconduct (Borys & Pope, 1989; Epstein, 1994; Gabbard, 1996; Gabbard & Lester, 1995; Gutheil & Gabbard, 1993; Simon, 1992, 1989).

Theoretically, sexual and nonsexual dual role relationships are best understood as different examples of the same thing - the blurring of therapeutic/treatment boundaries.

Whether the dual role relationship is sexual or not, there is the potential for conflict of interest for the therapist, impairing his or her objectivity and/or increasing the risk of exploitation or harm to the client (ACA, 1995; Borys, 1992; CPA, 1991; Committee on Women in Psychology, 1989). The main issue of dual role relationships is the potential exploitation of the client by the therapist. It is possible for a therapist to exploit a client without sexually exploiting her or him. While the identification and understanding of nonsexual dual role relationships may assist in the prevention of sexual dual role relationships (Gabbard & Nadelson, 1995), the prevention of nonsexual dual role relationships is a laudable goal in its own right. In both instances, the goal is to prevent therapists from making mistakes which harm their clients. Future research needs to further our understanding of the relationship between sexual
and nonsexual dual role relationships. Research also needs to examine the connection between the existence of dual role relationships between educators and therapists-in-training and the prevalence of these same kind of relationships between therapist and client.
CHAPTER II
THE TRAINING OF THERAPISTS

There are many reasons to examine the process of training clinical psychologists. Perhaps the most obvious reason is that training influences the type of professionals who graduate. The benefits of improving the training of psychologists could also be experienced within institutions of learning. By evaluating and improving their own departments’ learning environments, psychology could become a role model for other departments. Psychology as a discipline has unique knowledge and skills which could greatly assist academic institutions in formulating and implementing policies regarding such issues as sexual harassment.

The issue of betterment goes beyond that of the profession and of academia, however. In recent times all health care and mental health professions have found themselves working in a world which is changing dramatically. Society is demanding more accountability from all health care professions, as exemplified in recent professional/provincial task forces (e.g., College of Physicians and Surgeons in Alberta, British Columbia, and Ontario) and legislative changes (RHPA in Ontario). At the same time, it appears that society has lost confidence in the different professions’ ability to regulate themselves (e.g., Task Force on Sexual Abuse of Patients, 1991). This has led to such things as the mandatory requirement of health care professionals to report instances of sexual abuse by health care professionals in Ontario.
(Mactavish, 1994; RHPA, 1991). Accountability for such things as therapist sexual misconduct is being demanded of, not only the offending therapist, but also the institutions that regulate, employ, and train that therapist (Custer, 1994; Jorgenson, 1995a; Pope, 1989). Thus there are many different forces which are providing the impetus for all health care and mental health professions to closely examine themselves now and to make appropriate changes.

An examination of the training of therapists needs to address not only course content and the curriculum of the training program but also the entire process of professional socialization. The general atmosphere of academia and the behaviour of educators both inside and outside of the classroom needs to be considered. Issues of possible relevance include the question of the existence of a chilly climate for women in academia, the types of relationships formed between educators and students, and the influence of educator-student relationships on professional development. These larger issues encompass more specialized matters such as sexual harassment and mentoring in academia. The following discussion will focus on the graduate training of clinical psychologists. While the issue of course curriculum, specifically the existence of formal ethics courses will be explored, the primary emphasis will be on other aspects of professional socialization. The relevance of professional role models, mentoring, sexual harassment, and the fundamental nature of the educator-student relationship will be addressed. Dual role relationship theory will be the primary theory used to evaluate educator-student relationships.
**Ethics Education**

Following on the heels of research examining the prevalence of therapist-client sexual and nonsexual dual role relationships, there have been many discussions about how to reduce such occurrences. One of the most frequent recommendations is for improved ethics training at the graduate school level (e.g., Gabbard & Lester, 1995; Strasburger et al., 1992). The sometimes unstated assumption is that there is a strong relationship between ethical problem solving abilities and ethical behaviour and more simplistically between ethics education and ethical behaviour. Thus it is believed that better or more training in ethics will improve the ethical behaviour of mental health professionals.

Psychology has witnessed a steady increase in the number of graduate training programs in the United States which require students to take a course in ethics. In 1956 only 6% of the surveyed graduate programs included a separate required course in ethics while an additional 34% of the surveyed programs offered either an optional course in ethics or ethics as a discussion topic in other courses (DePalma & Drake, 1956). By 1979, 96% of the surveyed clinical psychology training programs reported some attention to the teaching of ethics, with 67% of these programs utilizing a separate course or planned discussions on ethics in other courses (Tymchuk et al., 1979). Furthermore, in 1979 the American Psychological Association mandated that all psychology programs required a separate course on ethics in order to receive APA
accreditation (APA, 1979). Likewise in Canada a substantial number of training programs presently offer ethics training. A survey of all universities in Canada offering graduate degrees in psychology found that 55% offered separate ethics courses while an additional 29% offered more informal means of training students in ethics such as class discussions (Pettifor & Pitcher, 1982). The Canadian Psychological Association also requires programs to have compulsory formal courses in ethics for their accreditation (CPA, 1984). Therefore, all APA and CPA accredited psychology programs have formal courses in ethics (APA, 1979; CPA, 1984). Additionally, many unaccredited programs also incorporate formal ethics courses in their programs.

Although most psychology programs now include ethics education as a requirement to graduate and it is often assumed that training in ethics will improve ethical behaviour, there has been very little research examining the relationship between ethics training and acting ethically. The little research that has been done is inconclusive and contradictory (Baldick, 1980; Bernard & Jara, 1986; Bernard, Murphy, & Little, 1987; Smith, McGuire, Abbott, & Blau, 1991; Wilkins, McGuire, Abbott, & Blau, 1990). Only one study has specifically examined the influence of ethics courses on the ability of students to make ethical judgements consistent with professional codes of ethics (Baldick, 1980). This study reported that graduate students who had completed an ethics course were better able to identify the ethical implications implicit in hypothetical cases than were graduate students who had not completed a course in ethics.
(Baldick, 1980). However, research which has specifically examined the decision to act ethically have reported a discrepancy between knowledge of what ought to be done and what is done (Bernard & Jara, 1986; Bernard et al., 1987; Smith et al., 1991; Wilkins et al., 1990). One study, for example, examined what graduate students believed should be done in specific situations and then asked whether they would be likely to follow through with such action (Bernard & Jara, 1986). The majority of students had taken a separate ethics course yet 50% of those surveyed reported they would do less than they believed they should. Furthermore, there was found to be no statistical association between ethics education and willingness to carry out the ethical action. Thus, while psychologists at every level of training are capable of identifying ethical dilemmas and the appropriate course of action according to ethics codes, they often report that they would not follow through with the action they believe to be appropriate (Bernard & Jara, 1986; Bernard et al., 1987; Smith et al., 1991; Wilkins et al., 1990). One suggested explanation for these findings is that personal values and practical considerations greatly influence what someone is willing to do when faced with an ethical dilemma (Smith et al., 1991). In summary, while most graduate psychology students now receive training in ethics there is no evidence to support the notion that an ability to make ethical decisions results in people behaving ethically.

The Educator-Student Relationship

There has been very little written about the relationship between the
educator and the student, their respective roles, and how each member of the
dyad affects the other (for exceptions, see Blevins-Knabe, 1992; Keith-Spiegel
& Koocher, 1985; Keith-Spiegel, Wittig, Perkins, Balogh & Whitley, 1993;
regarding the influence that educators, as a group, have on students is
somewhat surprising as educators play a pivotal role in the development of
professional therapists, researchers, and educators.

In contrast to the agreement amongst therapists about the nature of the
therapeutic relationship, the nature of the educator-student relationship has
been less clearly defined and more open to disagreement. Even the question of
whether the educator-student relationship is based on an unequal distribution of
power has not been wholly resolved. A fundamental premise of this paper is
that the educator-student relationship is based on an imbalance of power with
the educator possessing power over the student (ACA, 1995; APA, 1992;
Fitzgerald, Weitzman et al., 1988; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Matthews,
1991; Pope et al., 1979; Zalk, 1990). Some psychologists have even noted that
students are, in some sense, in a more and/or different kind of vulnerable
position than clients (Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Valentich & Gritton,
1992). For instance, while clients can fire their psychologists, students cannot
fire their educators. Furthermore, students engaged in dual role relationships
with educators not only risk damage to themselves personally but also risk
damage to their professional careers (Blevins-Knabe, 1992; Keith-Spiegel &
Koocher, 1985).

The power that the educator holds in relation to the student is attributable to a variety of factors. Firstly, university professors, like therapists and doctors, are accorded status, power, and authority by our society (Zalk et al., 1991). Secondly, the educator is a role model to students who often identify with and want to be like the educator (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992). Finally, an educator's power is derived from evaluating students and making decisions about their success or failure in courses. An educator's power goes far beyond grades, however. An educator's power includes the implicit or explicit prospect of students obtaining from an educator introductions to colleagues, sponsorship to professional associations, opportunities for research experience or publications, and letters of recommendations for scholarships, clinical internships and jobs while a graduate student and upon graduation (Bacchi, 1994; Hotelling, 1991; O'Connor-Slimp & Burian, 1994; Zalk et al., 1991). On the other hand, students enjoy minimal formal power or authority regarding their education.

There are dissenting opinions regarding the issue of educators' power which have been most clearly articulated by individuals defending the right of educators and students to engage in sexual dual role relationships. Often the argument focuses on American constitutional issues such as the right to privacy and freedom of association for educators and students (Keller, 1988). Another argument is that forbidding various types of interactions between educator and
student denies a student the right to be treated as an adult member of society by eliminating the student's right to make his or her own decisions (Hoffman, 1986; Lloyd, 1992). In effect, prohibitions against sexual dual role relationships are seen as infantilizing or disempowering to students. This same reasoning could also be used to argue for the acceptability of other types of educator-student dual role relationships such as friendships. One educator states that a blanket prohibition against dual role relationships denies students "the opportunity through free choice to cross the boundaries established by titles, institutions, and ethical standards" (Lloyd, 1992, p.62). A study investigating sexual harassment in academia confirms the notion that some educators do not believe that there is an inherent power differential between educator and student, and thus educators and students have the right to become involved with each other in whatever manner they see fit (Fitzgerald, Weitzman, et al., 1988).

A glaring deficit to date is the lack of a clear delineation of the responsibilities of an educator. Long (1992) notes that "Teaching has fewer structural restraints imposed upon it than almost any other professional relationship." (p. 144). Academia and the process of training therapists results in educators balancing precariously between dual role relationships and conflict of interests on an almost daily basis because of the very nature of their responsibilities (Herlihy & Corey, 1992; Keith-Spiegel, 1994; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Matthews, 1991; O'Connor-Slimp & Burian, 1994; Tabachnick,
Keith-Spiegel, & Pope, 1991). For example, situations where students are permitted to help an educator conduct research or teach a class in exchange for academic credit, while fairly common in some universities and often part of a formal institutional policy, can be problematic (Keith-Spiegel, 1994). A more generic dual role relationship and conflict of interest situation which occurs very often is a situation where an educator is not only engaged in the role of teacher but is also a teaching assistant supervisor and research collaborator with the same student (Herlihy & Corey, 1992; Keith-Spiegel, 1994; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Keith-Spiegel, Wittig, et al., 1993; Kitchener, 1992b). While universities actively foster professional socialization via mentoring and other types of relationships between educators and students, they have provided very little guidance for either their educators or their students to navigate such complex mazes of personal and professional alliances.

The mentoring relationship is a good example of the paradoxes of academia and dual role relationships within academia. Mentoring can be viewed as the "sponsorship by a more experienced individual as an influence on the professional development and career advancement of a young person" (Bogat & Redner, 1985, p. 851). Mentors can provide both career and psychosocial benefits to their students (Kram, 1985). For these reasons, mentoring relationships between educators and students are frequently encouraged. In one sense, the mentoring relationship is a dual role relationship encouraged by academia because of its potential benefits to students. It can also be viewed as
a dual role relationship which has a low risk of harm (Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Kitchener & Harding, 1990). Notwithstanding the benefits to students, people writing about mentoring generally recognize both the benefits and the risks associated with the mentoring relationship (Gilbert & Rossman, 1992; Hall & Sandler, 1983; Kitchener & Harding, 1990; O'Leary & Mitchell, 1990; Rosenbach, 1993). Risks can often involve personal disillusionment with the relationship and can be similar to risks involved in any kind of interpersonal relationship (Brooks & Haring-Hidore, 1987; Collins, 1993). When a mentoring relationship falters however, it may be hard for the student to disengage from the relationship and the student may experience serious professional repercussions. A special risk associated with the male mentor-female protegé relationship is the possible sexualization of the relationship (Gilbert & Rossman, 1992; Hall & Sandler, 1983; Haring-Hidore & Paludi, 1989; Heinrich, 1991; Rosenbach, 1993). Of course, the potential sexualization of the mentoring relationship is intimately associated with educator-student sexual dual role relationships and the sexual harassment of students (Haring-Hidore & Paludi, 1989).

Relevant to the present discussion but lacking in the literature on mentoring is a definitional refinement of the types of interactions between mentor and protegé which are acceptable. For example, what types of socializing are acceptable? Is there such a thing as socializing which can be harmful to the relationship and the individuals involved? These kinds of
questions are not addressed in the mentoring literature but are just beginning to be addressed in the literature on dual role relationships. Some psychologists, for instance, are calling for their colleagues to carefully consider their relationships with their students, sometimes offering suggestions on how to best evaluate the inherent difficulties in these relationships and avoid exploitative and harmful dual role relationships (Blevins-Knabe, 1992; Keith-Spiegel, 1994; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Valentich & Gripton, 1992). One example is the recommendation that educators limit their socializing with students to institutionally sponsored activities (Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985).

In addition to educators making specific recommendations about educator-student interactions, a few theories which have been developed to assist in the evaluation of the possible benefits and harm involved in therapist-client dual role relationships could be applied to the evaluation of educator-student relationships. For instance, Kitchener (1988) has suggested three guidelines to help a therapist decide whether a dual role relationship has a high probability of leading to difficulty or whether it is less likely to become a problem. The guidelines focus on the incompatibility of expectations between roles, the obligations of the different roles, and the differences in power and prestige between the professional's and client's roles. Kitchener (1988) argues that the potential for harm in dual role relationships increases to the extent that these three guidelines are violated. Kitchener and Harding (1990) recommend that only after deciding that the risks of harm are minimal should one engage in
relationships that involve dual roles or expectations. In addition, Kitchener (1988) notes that "professionals are responsible for redressing problems should they arise even when the potential for harm is low" (p. 220).

Valentich and Gripton (1992) have recommended looking at seven factors when evaluating the potential harm of therapist-client and educator-student dual role relationships. These factors include the vulnerability of the consumer, the power differentials between the professional and consumer, accessibility of alternative sources of professional services, risks for the professional, clarity of professional boundaries, the specificity or diffuseness of the professional role, and the values of the community regarding dual role relationships (Valentich & Gripton, 1992).

Dual role relationships between educators and students will continue to occur in training facilities as they are built into the present system of training (Herlihy & Corey, 1992; Keith-Spiegel, 1994; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Matthews, 1991; O'Connor-Slimp & Burian, 1994; Tabachnick et al., 1991). Hence, not all dual role relationships can be avoided (ACA, 1995; APA, 1992; Herlihy & Corey, 1992; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Kitchener, 1988). As evidenced by the discussion about mentoring relationships, not all dual role relationships between educators and students are harmful. Nevertheless, dual role relationships do need to be carefully evaluated both on an individual and institutional basis (Keith-Spiegel, 1994; Kitchener, 1992b). There appears to be a need for greater conceptual clarity regarding mentoring and dual role
relationships within academia. There is also an urgent need to be better able to identify potentially beneficial versus potentially harmful educator-student relationships.

The ensuing discussion will look at sexual and nonsexual dual role relationships separately although it is acknowledged that such a categorization is awkward and artificial. The particular consequences of sexual role relationships will be addressed following an examination of the prevalence of such relationships. Lastly, the little information available regarding nonsexual dual role relationships will be reviewed.

**Sexual Dual Role Relationships**

**Prevalence of educator-student sexual dual role relationships.**

Sexual dual role relationships are not limited to the sphere of therapist-client interactions. The existence of sexual relationships between university professors or clinical supervisors and students has been scrutinized (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Hammel, Olkin, & Taube, 1996; Kitchener, 1992b; Pope, 1989; Pope et al., 1979; Pope, Schover, & Levenson, 1980; Robinson & Reid, 1985; Sanderson, 1989; Shearn, Harding, & Kitchener, 1994; Tabachnick et al., 1991; Vasquez, 1992). The incidence rate of sexual harassment in academia and its effects on students and the learning environment has also been investigated (Adams, Kottke, & Padgitt, 1983; Dziech & Weiner, 1984; Hotelling, 1991; McKinney, Olson, & Satterfield, 1988; Sandler, 1990; Schneider, 1987; Shearn et al., 1994).
The frequency of sexual dual role relationships between professors and students in the field of psychology has been studied since 1979 (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Hammel et al., 1996; Pope et al., 1979; Robinson & Reid, 1985; Shearn et al., 1994; Tabachnick et al., 1991). There have been surveys of former students, and of current professors and clinical training supervisors. Between 13.6% and 17.9% of all female students surveyed reported sexual contact with at least one of their educators during graduate school (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Hammel et al., 1996; Pope et al., 1979; Robinson & Reid, 1985; Shearn et al., 1994). Most studies have focused on female students because the first study which examined both female and male students found that only 3% of the male students reported such sexual intimacies versus 16.5% of female students (Pope et al., 1979). A more recent study found similar gender differences, with 14.7% of the female students compared to only 2% of the male students having reported engaging in sexual contact with one of their educators (Hammel et al., 1996).

Psychology educators have also acknowledged sexual contact with their students in numbers comparable to the students’ reports. Thirteen percent of educators in psychology in one study (8% of the female and 19% of the male respondents; Pope et al., 1979) have reported becoming sexually involved with a student while a more recent study found the incidence rate to be a comparable 11% (Tabachnick et al., 1991). The study did not examine possible

---

1 The term educator encompasses psychology teachers, research supervisors, clinical supervisors, and university administrators.
gender differences. In addition to finding that 11% of the surveyed educators reported becoming sexually involved with a student, 15% reported dating a student, 1% reported sexually harassing students, and 7% of the respondents reported "telling a student: 'I'm sexually attracted to you'" (Tabachnick et al., 1991, p. 512). Another study which examined the sexual and social interactions between educators and students in a large American university found that 26% of the male educators responding reported engaging in sexual relationships with their students (Fitzgerald, Weitzman, et al., 1988)\(^2\).

Similar to the research in the field of therapist-client interactions, gender differences were found. Male educators were more likely to become sexually involved with a student than were female educators (Fitzgerald, Weitzman, et al., 1988; Pope et al., 1979; Tabachnick et al., 1991). Lastly, the two studies which surveyed both female and male students found that more female than male students reported sexual contact with their educators (Hammel et al., 1996; Pope et al., 1979). To summarize, significantly more female than male students report sexual contact with their educators while significantly more male educators than female educators report sexual contact with their students.

The study by Pope and his colleagues is the only one to ask respondents if they had engaged in sexual contact with their psychology educators as students, if they had engaged in sexual contact with their students

\(^2\)The number of female educators who reported sexual contact with their students was too small to analyze reliably.
as psychology educators, and if they had engaged in sexual contact, as therapists, with their clients (Pope et al., 1979). They found that for women, engaging in sexual contact as students with their psychology educators was related, statistically, to later sexual contact with their own students or clients.³ Twenty-three percent of the female respondents who had sexual contact as a student reported becoming sexually involved as a professional in comparison to only 6% of those who had no sexual contact with their educators when a student becoming sexually involved as a professional. Thus sexual involvement as a student was statistically related to later sexual involvement with students and clients.

It is also probable that the consequences of sexual dual role relationships extend beyond the direct participants. In fact, Hammel (1993) asserts that "sexual contact between a student and an educator reverberates beyond the relational dyad, reaching out through the wider educational milieu" (p. 43). Gilbert and Scher (1987) interpret sexual dual role relationships as an example of sexism and men’s sense of entitlement and view that women should meet their needs. They go on to suggest that such behaviour in academia "promotes a climate in which male entitlement, rather than being confronted and understood, is unconsciously acted upon in ways that perpetuate the problem".

³ Pope et al. were unable to analyze the relationship between sexual contact as a student and sexual contact as a professional for men because the sample of men reporting sexual contact with their psychology educators was too small (n = 7).
(Gilbert & Scher, 1987, p. 105). Accordingly, it has been argued that sexual dual role relationships between educators and students is one factor which contributes to the occurrence of therapist-client sexual dual role relationships (Bouhoutsos, 1984; Epstein, 1994; Kitchener, 1992b; Pope, 1989; Pope et al., 1979; Vasquez, 1988, 1992). Institutions of higher learning may be inadvertently training their students to act unethically.

**Attitudes about educator-student sexual dual role relationships.**

Many of the studies which reported the frequency of sexual dual role relationships between students and educators also investigated participants' beliefs. The Pope et al. study reported that 21% of the respondents to their survey believed that sexual dual role relationships between students and educators might be beneficial to both students and educators (Pope et al., 1979). Furthermore, there were significant attitudinal differences based on whether the individual had been involved in a sexual dual role relationship. Individuals who had been involved in a sexual dual role relationship, either as a student or as an educator, were more likely to hold the belief that such relationships could be beneficial to both parties involved (Pope et al., 1979). Three of the studies which surveyed former graduate students reported that the majority believed that sexual dual role relationships are unethical and would have a harmful effect on the working relationship (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Robinson & Reid, 1985; Shearn et al., 1994). Still, similar to the findings of Pope et al. (1979), a small minority of students do not believe that sexual dual
role relationships are unethical or harmful (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Robinson & Reid, 1985; Shearn et al., 1994). Furthermore, attitudes become more diverse when the issue becomes sexual dual role relationships with psychology educators who are not directly working with the student. While 96.2% of respondents in one study believe that sexual dual role relationships which occur during the working relationship are unethical, that percentage drops to 72.8% if the same relationship occurs when the two individuals are not working with one another at the time of the relationship (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986).

Similar beliefs have been reported for psychology educators. The Tabachnick et al. study (1991) examined, in depth, both the behaviours and beliefs of educators in the field of psychology. The majority of educators in this study believed that it is unethical to engage in a sexual dual role relationship with a student. However, a small minority of educators did believe it was ethical to become sexually involved with a student in most or all circumstances. The percentage of psychology educators who held this belief jumped from 6% to 25.7% when the sexual dual role relationship occurred after the student had completed the educator’s course and the grade had been submitted (Tabachnick et al., 1991). An additional 17% of the respondents were unsure whether this constituted unethical behaviour (Tabachnick et al., 1991). Another study which examined the behaviours and attitudes of educators in one American university reported that many male faculty did not believe there existed a power difference between themselves and their students which would
make sexual relationships problematic and inappropriate (Fitzgerald, Weitzman et al., 1988).

In summary, a small minority of students and educators believe it is ethical to engage in sexual dual role relationships. This small minority increases substantially when the sexual relationship between educator and student occurs after the termination of their formal working relationship. Finally, students and educators who had been involved in a sexual dual role relationship were more likely to hold the belief that such relationships could be beneficial to both parties involved than were people who had never engaged in such relationships (Pope et al., 1979).

Sexual harassment in academia.

Sexual relationships between educators and students have been presented as a specific type of sexual harassment and/or sex discrimination (e.g., Bartell & Rubin, 1990; Fitzgerald, Weitzman, et al., 1988; Schneider, 1987; Zalk et al., 1991). Some universities have, for instance, addressed this issue in their formal policies on sexual harassment (Bacchi, 1994; Hoffman, 1986; Paludi & Barickman, 1991; Stites, 1996a). Thus, while not unanimous, some definitions of sexual harassment address both explicitly and implicitly coercive sexual behaviour. Both sexual harassment and sexual dual role relationships involve exploitation of students and the misuse of power by educators (Bacchi, 1994). Therefore, it is almost impossible to treat sexual harassment and sexual dual role relationships as entirely unrelated concerns.
(Keller, 1988; Walker et al., 1985).

Three studies of former graduate students in psychology found that between 25% to 48.1% of the women reported some type of sexual harassment during their graduate training (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Robinson & Reid, 1985; Shearn et al., 1994). In two of these studies, sexual harassment usually took the form of flirting, joking, or excessive attention while in the Shearn et al. study the definition used was that of "sexual advances from educators which did not lead to sexual contact" (p. 9). The widely accepted prevalence rate for sexual harassment of women attending university is 20% - 30% (Dziech & Weiner, 1984; Fitzgerald, Shullman, et al., 1988; Sandler, 1990).

Sexual harassment and sexual dual role relationships are important issues because they affect the learning environment within which future psychologists learn how to interact with clients. The widespread presence of sexual harassment and educator-student sexual dual role relationships can be viewed as an assertion by men of the primacy of a woman's sexuality over her role as a student (Walker et al., 1985). Sexual harassment conveys the message that women are not truly valuable members of the university community.

In conclusion, a substantial number of female graduate students in psychology are subjected to unwanted sexual advances by educators and sexualized dual role relationships while working towards their educational and professional goals. A close examination of academia shows that the learning
environment in university is substantially different for students based on their gender (Caplan, 1993; Cohen & Gutek, 1991). Female students are forced to deal with issues and obstacles to their learning that are often not part of a male student’s experience of university (Caplan, 1993; Cohen & Gutek, 1991).

**Consequences of educator-student sexual dual role relationships and sexual harassment in academia.**

Educator-student sexual dual role relationships and sexual harassment adversely affect the learning environment in academia (Caplan, 1993; Epstein, 1994; Hotelling, 1991; Kitchener, 1992b; Pope, 1989; Stites, 1996b; Zalk et al., 1991). As is the case with dual role relationships between therapist and client, there is an increased chance that educators will lose their objectivity and make student evaluations and other decisions that are not in the best interests of the student (Pope, 1989; Pope et al., 1980). Furthermore, students well aware of the power and influence of educators may make choices based on their perceptions of what educators want in an effort to mollify them. Audi (1990) writes that "the very invitation to join a professor in a purely social activity may be felt to be hard to refuse, or even coercive" (p. 128). Although educators may have no intention of taking advantage of their status students may act as if they will, agreeing to social interactions because they feel they have no choice (Bacchi, 1994; O'Connor-Slimp & Burian, 1994; Tauna, 1985).

A sexual relationship can have three possible effects on an educator and a student. First, an educator may evaluate the student's work far more
positively than it merits. Conversely, an educator may take advantage of the sexual relationship and not fulfil his teaching obligations (Audi, 1990). Although the educator is spending time with the student, the student is neither being taught nor being trained. Finally, an educator is not influenced by the sexual relationship and is able to continue to objectively evaluate the student’s work. Even if this last situation is possible (a contention that is disputed by many), educators must not only be fair in their evaluations of students but they must be viewed by others as being fair (Cahn, 1994). Therefore, sexual dual role relationships also have implications for nonparticipants, particularly other students and educators in the department. Other students may perceive individuals engaged in a sexual dual role relationship with an educator as being favoured and having gained unfair advantages (Blevins-Knabe, 1992; Pyke, 1996; Skeen & Nielsen, 1983; Stites, 1993 as cited in Stites, 1996b). The advantages can take the form of unearned or inflated grades, and additional opportunities in instruction and advisement not available to those students not sexually involved with the educator. Even the appearance of favouritism is sufficient to lessen the credibility of an educator’s evaluations not only of the student he is sexually involved with, but his evaluations of all students (Cahn, 1994).

Educators in the department not involved in a sexual dual role relationship may also be adversely affected (Blevins-Knabe, 1992). Two casebooks which focused on the ethics of various situations encountered in
academia presented, in a particularly compelling manner, the disruptive force of a sexual dual role relationship for other faculty members (Keith-Spiegel, Wittig, et al., 1993; Payne & Charnov, 1987). Obviously there are concerns regarding favouritism. However, there is also increased awkwardness, confusion, and tension during social gatherings when the educator brings his student-lover. Awkwardness and tension can also surface when the student-lover takes a colleague’s course. It is possible that other educators’ uneasiness is a result of the conflicting roles of educator and lover which are especially apparent to those not directly involved in such a relationship.

Finally, sexual dual role relationships may damage the reputation of the department and university (DeChiara, 1988; Ingulli, 1987; Keller, 1990; Stites, 1993 as cited in Stites, 1996b). For instance, negative publicity about such relationships can adversely affect the reputation of the university (DeChiara, 1988; Keller, 1990; Ingulli, 1987). Educator-student sexual dual role relationships may give the impression that educators are abusing their power which could taint the public’s view of the university (Keller, 1990). The results of a recent study of faculty and graduate students found that the vast majority believed that sexual dual role relationships compromised the university’s credibility in the public’s eyes and also damaged the department’s integrity in the eyes of graduate students (Stites, 1993 as cited in Stites, 1996b).

The above mentioned consequences have only received limited exposure in the literature. One specific consequence of sexual dual role relationships
between educator and student which has been more openly discussed is the potential loss in educational and professional opportunities if the student should decide to drop out of her graduate program as a result of the relationship. In the Shearn et al. study (1994), 17% of the respondents reported knowing graduate students who had dropped out of their graduate programs because of sexual relationships with, or sexual harassment from, educators in their programs. Although by definition all the respondents in the Glaser and Thorpe study (1986) successfully completed their doctorates, several respondents volunteered that they had seriously considered dropping out.

Besides leaving graduate school, students have reported avoiding taking classes from educators who sexually harass them (Fitzgerald, Shullman, et al., 1988; McKinney et al., 1988), dropping classes (Fitzgerald, Shullman, et al., 1988; McKinney et al., 1988), changing research or academic advisors (McKinney et al., 1988), taking a temporary leave of absence from school (McKinney et al., 1988), and changing majors (McKinney et al., 1988). In addition, studies have found that students avoided working with or enrolling in courses taught by educators who were known or rumoured to have made sexual advances to other students (Adams et al., 1983; Schneider, 1987).

The supervisory relationship in clinical training is of special importance to the field of clinical psychology. Sexual dual role relationships between clinical supervisor and student can greatly damage the supervisory relationship in several ways. First, the clinical supervisor can become a model for abuse of
power, demonstrating through his or her actions that it is acceptable to place one's own needs ahead of the needs of a student or a client with whom one is working with (Conroe & Schank, 1989; Conroe et al., 1989; Vasquez, 1992). Secondly, the student may be reluctant to raise various issues in supervision for fear that the supervisor will see this as an invitation to initiate a more intimate discussion of the student's personal life (Brodsky, 1980). Thus the student's opportunity to learn is constricted and the client's treatment is affected (Conroe & Schank, 1989; Conroe et al., 1989). Lastly, the clinical supervisor may lose the ability to fairly evaluate the student or the student may believe her/his future career is reliant on her/his acquiescing to the supervisor (Conroe & Schank, 1989; Conroe et al., 1989).

As Hall and Sandler noted in 1982, "whether overt or subtle, differential treatment based on gender is far from innocuous. Its cumulative effects can be damaging not only to individual women and men students but also to the educational process itself" (p. 3). Sexual dual roles relationships between educators and students and sexual harassment by educators are models of behaviour that imply the endorsement of abusing one's position of power and authority in order to get one's needs met, while simultaneously ignoring another person's welfare in favour of one's own interests (Bouhoutsos, 1984; Kitchener, 1992b, 1994; Pope et al., 1980; Vasquez, 1988). The issue of modelling is an illustration that the consequences of such behaviour reverberate far beyond the educator and student involved in a sexual dual role. The entire learning
environment and students' learning experiences are coloured by the existence of sexual dual role relationships and sexual harassment (Bond, 1988).

**Nonsexual Dual Role Relationships**

**Prevalence of educator-student nonsexual dual role relationships.**

There has been relatively little written about nonsexual dual role relationships between educators and students (for an exception, see Blevins-Knabe, 1992). This mirrors the lack of research studies conducted to date (Fitzgerald, Weitzman, et al., 1988; Tabachnick et al., 1991). Tabachnick and her colleagues (1991) have gathered information regarding the behaviours and beliefs of psychologists functioning as educators in universities and colleges. A number of activities such as attending students' parties and asking small favours of students such as getting a ride home were found to be very common behaviours amongst educators. Three-quarters of the educators reported such activities with their students. Additionally, more than half the educators acknowledged having loaned money to students at least on rare occasions. This study also found that a quarter of the educators reported selling merchandise such as books or a car to their students on at least rare occasions. Lastly, half of the respondents stated that at least occasionally, they have given academic credit instead of a salary for student assistants. Similar results were reported by Fitzgerald, Weitzman, et al. (1988). Slightly over a fifth of the male faculty surveyed had loaned money to students and three-quarters had had a student home for dinner (Fitzgerald, Weitzman, et al., 1988).
Some of the dual role relationships studied between educators and students have been compared to the findings between therapists and clients. Tabachnick and her colleagues (1991) compared their findings for educators to those reported by Pope et al. (1987) for therapists. Behaviours engaged in more frequently by educators than therapists included asking small favours of students, lending money to students, selling goods to students, attending a student's party or social event, and becoming sexually involved with a student either during or after taking a course from the educator. Furthermore, educators view these behaviours as more ethical than do therapists. Based on the studies cited it is quite common for educators to socialize with their students. In fact, as is to be expected, it is more common for educators to engage in such activities with their students than for therapists to engage in such activities with their clients. It is possible that therapists-in-training do not make such a clear distinction regarding the appropriateness of various behaviours between educator and student, and therapist and client. Therapists-in-training may use the same guidelines for educator-student relationships as for therapist-client relationships.

Attitudes about educator-student nonsexual dual role relationships.

Few studies have conducted even preliminary explorations of educators' or students' views regarding the ethicality or appropriateness of various educator behaviours (Bowman, Hatley, & Bowman, 1995; Keith-Spiegel, Tabachnick, & Allen, 1993; Naas, 1992; Tabachnick et al., 1991). These studies
defined the types of behaviour investigated very narrowly making it more appropriate to refer to them as nonsexual behaviours as opposed to nonsexual dual role relationships. Only two of these studies explored nonsexual interactions between educators and students relevant to the present work. The Tabachnick et al. study (1991) studied psychology educators’ beliefs about such nonsexual behaviours as asking students small favours and accepting a student’s invitation to a party. More than one third of the educators sampled viewed asking students small favours as generally unethical. Most educators saw no ethical problem with lending money to students under rare circumstances while there was no consensus as to the ethicity of selling goods to students. Lastly, less than a quarter of the educators responding saw any ethical problems with accepting a student’s invitation to a party.

The one other study which investigated educators’ and students’ views regarding the ethicity of different nonsexual educator-student interactions reported that female students and educators were more likely to rate behaviours as unethical than were their male counterparts (Bowman et al., 1995). Moreover, female educators viewed attending social events with students as friends and sharing personal feelings with students in friendship as more unethical than did male educators (Bowman et al., 1995). They proposed that differing views regarding the acceptability of various types of educator-student interactions may be influential in educators’ decisions to engage in those same behaviours (Bowman et al., 1995).
In summary, the complexity of the educator-student relationship has only recently been a topic engendering examination (Blevins-Knabe, 1992; Kitchener, 1992b; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Keith-Spiegel, Wittig, et al., 1993; Zalk et al., 1991). Various psychologists are recommending that educators become more aware of their role as models of appropriate ethical behaviour to students training to be therapists (Herlihy & Corey, 1992; Kitchener, 1992b; Pope et al., 1987; Vasquez, 1988, 1992). Many psychologists are calling for their colleagues to carefully consider their relationships with their students, sometimes offering suggestions on how to best evaluate the inherent difficulties in these relationships and avoid exploitive and harmful dual role relationships (Blevins-Knabe, 1992; Keith-Spiegel, 1994; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Valentich & Gripton, 1992). Some educators and mental health professionals believe that sexual dual role relationships between students and educators promote the occurrence of sexual dual role relationships between therapists and clients in part by providing examples of exploitive behaviour (Bouhoutsos, 1984; Epstein, 1994; Folman, 1991; Kitchener, 1992b; Pope, 1989; Pope et al., 1979; Vasquez, 1988, 1992). It is important to study more thoroughly the influence of educator’s behaviour on the training of clinical psychologists and their future ethical behaviour. Of equal import when discussing sexual dual role relationships is to understand that the reason for such a discussion is the exploitive nature of the relationship and not the fact that sex is involved (Bacchi, 1994; Gonsiorek, 1994). Therefore, the relevance
of studying nonsexual dual role relationships is clear: all dual role relationships
have the potential to be exploitative and based on the self-interests of the
person who holds more power in the relationship.

There is an increasing interest in sexual and nonsexual dual role
relationships and the connection between them. The question now becomes
whether the field of research will be drawn into focusing on the content or on
the nature of dual role relationships (Gonsiorek, 1994). If the content of the
relationship becomes the main focus then the key issue will be seen as that of
sex. If the nature of the relationship is emphasized then the abuse of power
and betrayal of trust will be seen as the key issue. This author, like Gonsiorek
(1994), believes that the key issue isn’t sex but betrayal of trust and
exploitation. Therefore, an examination of nonsexual dual role relationships will
add to the understanding of these relationships and the exploitation of clients
and students. The increased knowledge regarding dual role relationships assists
in the understanding of all dual role relationships, sexual and nonsexual,
exploitative and nonexploitative alike. Furthermore, this information will come at
a time when society is demanding increased accountability from its academic
institutions, and from its professionals both individually and collectively.
Information gathered about dual role relationships can be used to assist
universities, the mental health professions, and individual professionals to better
meet their responsibilities to society.
Limitations of Previous Studies

There are methodological limitations to the previously cited studies. Two issues of particular relevance to research examining sexual dual role relationships are self-report biases and the potential differences between people who respond and people who do not respond (Borys & Pope, 1989; Pope, 1990b). Self-report biases include such issues as social desirability and the respondent's selective memory and particular perception of the event being studied. Problems in sample selection, particularly when studying the effects of therapist sexual misconduct, centre around the fact that studies use volunteers. It has been argued that such studies are misleading and of limited utility because it is only those individuals who believe they have been hurt or negatively affected by sexual involvement with their therapist who are motivated to participate (Williams, 1990, 1992). There has been no evidence to substantiate this assertion, however. With regard to surveys relying on therapists' self-report of sexual activity with clients, there is the issue of how social desirability might affect the results. The most recent surveys have reported a decrease in self-reported sexual misconduct by male psychologists. It is unclear how much of the decrease is due to an actual decrease in behaviour and how much is due to the decrease in the social acceptability of such behaviour and increased fear in facing the harsh legal and professional consequences of such behaviour which has resulted in a corresponding decrease in admissions of sexual misconduct.
The research on educator-student sexual dual role relationships and sexual harassment has not reported a similar decrease in the reporting of such behaviour (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Hammel et al., 1996; Pope et al., 1979; Robinson & Reid, 1985; Shearn et al., 1994; Tabachnick et al., 1991). There are two possible explanations for this situation. First, the difference may be a result of those being surveyed: decreases in sexual misconduct are being reported by therapists (Akamatsu, 1988; Borys & Pope, 1989; Pope et al., 1987) but not by students or educators (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Hammel et al., 1996; Pope et al., 1979; Robinson & Reid, 1985; Shearn et al., 1994; Tabachnick et al., 1991). Secondly, only recently has there been an explicit prohibition against educator-student sexual involvement (APA, 1992) and all but one of the published studies examining educator-student relationships gathered their data prior to this explicit prohibition. The one study which gathered data after 1992 still surveyed only those people who had graduated prior to 1992 (Hammel et al., 1996). No student who has received training since the explicit prohibition against educator-student sexual involvement was implemented has been surveyed.

Finally, an issue whenever dealing with the results of survey studies is that of the rate of return. Studies examining the prevalence of sexual misconduct have reported response rates ranging from 39.5% to 70.0% (Akamatsu, 1988; Borys & Pope, 1989; Holroyd & Brodsky, 1977; Pope et al., 1986, 1987). Studies examining sexual dual role relationships and sexual
harassment between professors and students have reported rates of return between 30% and 51% (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Hammel et al., 1996; Pope et al., 1979; Robinson & Reid, 1985; Shearm et al., 1994). The two studies which examined nonsexual dual role relationships between therapists and their clients reported return rates of between 45% and 49% (Borys & Pope, 1989; Pope et al., 1987). Keeping the questionnaire short is one way of increasing the response rate. It was also believed that by focusing on nonsexual rather than sexual dual role relationships, potential participants were more likely to respond because the ethicality of nonsexual dual role relationships are less clear than the ethicality of sexual dual role relationships. Furthermore, there are no explicit prohibitions against nonsexual dual role relationships between educators and students.

Although such methodological problems cannot be completely eliminated, researchers have tried a variety of techniques to complement one another and hence strengthen the research conducted in this area. Research on the effects of therapist sexual misconduct has utilized self-report data from therapists, data from clients who have returned to therapy and those who have not, and data from secondary sources such as that provided by therapists about a client's report of sexual activity with their previous therapist. Researchers in their discussion sections also clearly indicate the methodological problems specific to their work and the qualified nature of inferences that can be drawn from it. Reviews of the relevant literature in the field also discuss in detail the current
methodological issues including the possibility of response bias in the decision of people, whether therapists or clients, to participate in the research (e.g., Pope, 1990a, 1990b). Even with these cautions, research has provided strong evidence for the existence of sexual dual role relationships in therapy and the negative consequences of such relationships. Additional research has demonstrated the occurrence of educator-student sexual dual role relationships and the prevalence of sexual harassment in academia.

Rationale for the Present Study

The present study examined the relationship between aspects of graduate training of clinical psychologists in Canada and the judgements made by therapists-in-training regarding the ethicality of sexual and nonsexual dual role relationships between therapist and client. Information gathered from individual students encompassed information related to the informal learning environment such as the prevalence of sexual harassment and dual role relationships between educators and student, and students’ perceptions of the prevalence of such behaviour, and formal learning experiences such as whether or not the student had completed an ethics course. The ethical dilemmas used to assess the decision making process of the students training to be psychologists were based on those developed by Borys (1988) with the modification that the gender of the client was stipulated.

The main purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the training environment of students and students’ attitudes about dual role
relationships between therapist and client. It is not known what effects the learning environment has on the attitudes and behaviours of future therapists. However, as previously discussed, educators involved in dual role relationships may act in their own best interests when engaged in such relationships and ignore the welfare of their students (Bouhoutsos, 1984; Kitchener, 1992b; Pope et al., 1980; Vasquez, 1988). In addition, sexual harassment has been found to have a detrimental effect on the learning environment regardless of the field of study (Caplan, 1993; Hotelling, 1991; Kitchener, 1992b; Zalk et al., 1991). It is possible to extrapolate the generalized effects of dual role relationships from the research on sexual harassment and the writings on the ethics of teaching.

There are two proposed hypotheses. The first hypothesis was that students' experiences in graduate school would influence students' judgements regarding the ethicality of dual role relationships between therapist and client. More specifically, it was hypothesized that students who had experienced dual role relationships with their educators would evaluate therapist-client dual role relationships as more ethical than students who had not had such experiences.

The second hypothesis involves the investigation of sex differences. Male and female therapists have been found to hold different attitudes about nonsexual dual role relationships. Overall, male therapists tend to rate dual professional roles and extra-therapeutic social, financial or business involvements as more ethical than female therapists (Borys & Pope, 1989). Thus, it was hypothesized that this difference between the sexes regarding the
judgements of the ethicality of various dual role relationships will also be reported by the graduate students surveyed. Female graduate students will judge dual role relationships between therapists and clients as less ethical than will male graduate students.

There are a number of supplementary purposes of this study which complement the main hypotheses and address issues raised in previous research and theory in the areas of dual role relationships, sexual harassment, and the ethics of teaching. In some cases these supplementary hypotheses are meant to confirm and expand upon previous research findings. In other cases the proposed research questions represent an initial attempt to gather and organize specific types of information and expand the frontiers of dual role relationship theory and the knowledge about educator-student relationships.

The primary example of unchartered territory is that of nonsexual dual role relationships, especially with regards to educator-student relationships. Nonsexual dual role relationships in academia have not been the subject of extensive study or discussion. In the academic environment the concept of dual role relationships has yet to emerge as a primary organizing force in how educator-student relationships are viewed - whether they be sexual or nonsexual. The prevalence rate of dual role relationships between educator and student is not known, nor have the consequences of such relationships been studied. It is not known which types of dual role relationships are seen to be the most and the least problematic, the most and the least ethical.
The two survey studies which have explored social interactions between educators and students have reported that social activities are very common (Fitzgerald, Weitzman, et al., 1988; Tabachnick et al., 1991). It was believed that students may be more forthcoming regarding nonsexual dual role relationships because there are no explicit prohibitions in professional ethics codes against nonsexual dual role relationships between educators and students. Therefore, social desirability probably plays less of a role when questions focus on nonsexual rather than sexual dual role relationships. Based on the little information available, it was hypothesized that dual role relationships between educators and students will be a common experience reported by graduate students.

The literature regarding therapist behaviour has found a significant gender difference when therapists are confronted with potential dual role situations (Borys & Pope, 1989). Female therapists tend to engage more often in incidental involvements which are defined as “typically ‘one-time’ events or special occasions in which the therapeutic roles or boundaries were altered at the initiation of the client” (Borys, 1988, p. 66). In contrast, male therapists engage more often in extra-therapeutic social, financial or business activities with their clients, and engage more often in dual professional roles such as simultaneously being an individual’s employer and therapist (Borys & Pope, 1989). It was hypothesized that a similar pattern of behaviour will manifest itself regarding educator-student interactions, with male educators more often
engaged in nonsexual dual role relationships with their students than are female educators.

A final, related topic of interest is that of ethics. In this case, ethics refers to professional codes of ethics, ethical behaviour, ethical decision making, and the teaching of ethics to therapists-in-training. Much has been made of the now very explicit prohibition against sexual activity with a client in most professional codes of ethics (e.g., ACA, 1995; APA, 1992; CPA, 1991). In addition, it has been noted that most graduate programs require students to complete a course in ethics and that all APA or CPA accredited programs have such a requirement (APA, 1979; CPA, 1984). Information was gathered about students’ training in ethics in order to answer the question: How will the completion of an ethics course affect students’ judgements of the ethicality of dual role relationships between therapists and clients? This was an exploratory question and as such no specific finding was hypothesized.

Further lacking are any studies examining the process of decision making when one encounters an ethical dilemma. It has been found that therapists using the same criteria often disagree and arrive at different conclusions regarding an ethical dilemma (Haas, et al., 1986; Tymchuk, 1985). In order to correct this oversight, information was gathered on how individuals arrived at their decisions regarding the ethicality of a number of behaviours.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Participants

Students currently enrolled in either an English language masters or doctoral program in psychology in Canada were recruited to participate. Letters were first sent to the chairperson of psychology departments in Canadian universities which offer at least a M.A., M.Ed., or M.Sc. in clinical or counselling psychology (see Appendix A). A list of students presently enrolled in that department’s clinical or counselling psychology program was requested. If, for any reason, a list of students was not or could not be made available, permission was requested to send the required number of questionnaire packages to one person in the department who would then forward them to the students’ university mailbox. The University of Windsor was excluded from this sample because of the involvement of graduate students with the development of the questionnaires.

Of the 22 universities approached, 17 universities permitted access to their graduate students, two universities did not respond, one university had no one enrolled in their graduate program, and two universities refused access to their students. A total of 857 questionnaires were sent out to students at the 17 participating universities. Universities returned 34 questionnaires as extras due to overestimations of the number of students in their respective programs. Hence, a total of 823 students were sent questionnaires. Questionnaires were
returned by 315 of the potential participants. Of these, 5 were returned blank with statements that the students were not enrolled in a clinical or counselling program. Therefore, there were 310 usable questionnaires comprising an overall response rate of 37.9%.

**Measures**

**Therapeutic practice survey.** A Therapeutic Practice Survey developed by Borys (1988) was used to solicit graduate students' judgement of the ethicality of various behaviours. The survey (see Appendix B) consisted of a list of dual role relationships and incidental involvements that may arise between therapist and client. Borys developed the survey "from a review of malpractice and ethics complaint cases and from the available research and clinical literatures in this area" (Borys, 1988, p. 61-62). Respondents indicated their judgements using a 6 point scale: always ethical (5), ethical under most conditions (4), ethical under some conditions (3), ethical under rare conditions (2), never ethical (1), not sure (0). The scale was treated as a 5 point scale, excluding the choice "not sure" when conducting the statistical analyses.

The original survey did not specify the sex of the client. Rather client sex was operationalized as the predominant sex of the therapist's client population (Borys, 1988). However, Borys recommended that a better measure be utilized in future research because of the importance of client sex in the therapist-client dyad. Therefore the sex of the client was stipulated in this study. Consequently, the survey included a male and female version of each item to measure more
accurately how an individual views the ethicality of various interactions with male and female clients. This resulted in a doubling of the number of items in the original questionnaire from 20 to 40 items.

Additionally, information was gathered regarding respondents' decision making process. Following the items about the ethicality of dual role relationships, both quantitative and qualitative information was solicited from respondents. Open-ended solicitation was done first to ensure that participants' own views shaped their responses. Participants were asked how they went about deciding the ethicality of the various situations presented and what information was important to them when making such decisions. Different sources of information which might be used when making a decision were then listed. Respondents rated the extent to which they considered each when making their decisions using a 5 point Likert-type scale from never to most of the time. While the quantitative information gathered is presented in its entirety, only a preliminary analysis of the comments regarding participants' decision making process is presented here.

The three factors from Borys' original work were used as the basis of subscales for the Therapeutic Practice Survey especially since her sample size was quite large, exceeding 1,100 respondents (Borys, 1988). The three factors are Incidental Involvements, Social/Financial Involvements, and Dual Professional Roles. See Appendix C for a list of items comprising each factor. One item, "Inviting female clients to a personal party or social event" was
mistakenly repeated twice with no corresponding "Inviting male clients to a personal party or social event". Thus, the Social/Financial Involvement subscale consists of 19 instead of 20 items.

The three subscales, Incidental Involvements, Social/Financial Involvements, and Dual Professional Roles constituted the three dependent or criterion variables for subsequent analyses. In initial analyses, "not sure" was treated as a missing value. However, a different procedure was necessary because the occasional use of the "not sure" response by participants would have resulted in a substantial loss of data. This was especially true for the Social/Financial Involvements subscale as the large number of items increased the probability of at least one of the 19 items being missing and thus necessitated a weighting procedure. Consequently, missing values were handled by weighting the subscale score by the total number of valid responses for that subscale. The number of items in the subscale was divided by the number of valid items for the individual and then multiplied by their subscale score result. As a conservative measure only those participants who had answered a minimum of 74% of the items for a subscale were included in future analyses. Hence, a total of 17, 8, and 6 participants were treated as having missing data for the Incidental Involvements, Social/Financial Involvements, and Dual Professional Roles subscales, respectively. Responses to items comprising the factors were summed to yield the three index scores for each participant used in further analyses.
Students’ perceptions and experiences with faculty questionnaires. A questionnaire was developed for the current study to examine the academic environment (see Appendix B). The questionnaire was based on a review of the relevant theoretical and empirical literature. Attempts were made, where possible, to use items previously tested so as to be able to compare current results with previous ones. Certain items were taken from the empirical research of Borys (1988), Borys and Pope (1989), Fitzgerald, Weitzman, et al. (1988), Keith-Spiegel, et al. (1993), Pope et al. (1987), and Tabachnick et al. (1991). See Appendix D for a detailed account of the origins of each individual questionnaire item. Theoretical writings which guided the development of the questionnaire included the work of Blevins-Knabe (1992), Keith-Spiegel (1994), Keith-Spiegel and Koocher (1985), Kitchener (1992b), Valentich and Gripton (1992), and Zalk et al. (1991).

There were three parts to the questionnaire; two quantitative and one qualitative. The two quantitative sections each consisted of 25 items. The first quantitative part labelled Perceptions of Students’ Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire asked participants to judge how common they believed a variety of behaviours educators may engage in with students were, using a 5 point Likert-type scale. The second quantitative part of the questionnaire labelled Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire asked participants about their own experiences regarding these same behaviours. Participants indicated how often they had been involved in such an experience
and if they had had such an experience whether the educator involved was a man or a woman. If they had had such experience more than once, they were asked whether the educators involved were all men, all women, or both men and women. In this manner, both the students' perceptions of the frequency of various interactions between educators and students, and the actual frequency of such interactions were measured. The third part of the questionnaire was a section which invited participants' written comments about their most positive and most negative experiences with educators. Finally, general comments were solicited. While participants' comments will be used to illustrate points originating from the quantitative data, only a preliminary analysis of the comments is presented here.

Three items were excluded from the factor analyses for both quantitative parts of the questionnaire: "Asked to borrow money from you", "Agreed to write a letter of recommendation and then has missed the deadline for handing it in", and "Is late for class or an appointment with a student". The first item was designed as a filler/distracter item to mirror an item exploring the frequency of educators lending money to students. The other two items were included to gauge the willingness of respondents to endorse items which were unflattering to educators. In other words, they were meant as an unrefined measure of social desirability but were not part of the definition or understanding of social involvements, role violations, or dual role relationships between educators and students.
**Student perceptions.** A principal components analysis with Varimax rotation was used to assess the factor structure of the Perceptions of Students' Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire. Varimax rotation was used to aid in the conceptual differentiation of the subscales. All participants' questionnaires were used in the principal components analysis because the questionnaire was designed to study graduate students and their experiences with educators regardless of program affiliation. A scree plot suggested that the 22 items yielded three conceptually meaningful factors. Refer to Table 1 for the items comprising each factor and their factor loadings. Factor 1 (Professional Role Violations), accounted for 27% of the variance, and described behaviours involving violations or transgressions of the professional role of the educator, and/or behaviours defined as sexual harassment. Factor 2 (Social Involvements), accounted for 11.7% of the variance, and described social and financial interactions between educators and students. Factor 3 (Professional Role Involvements), accounted for 7% of the variance, and described behaviours congruent with the role of a faculty member of a post-secondary institution.

Each factor formed the basis of an index by summing the respondent's scores for each item loading on the factor. These indexes were used as predictor variables for subsequent analyses.

**Student experiences.** The Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire differed from the Perceptions of Students' Experiences
Table 1

Factor Subscales for the Student Perceptions of Students' Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1  Professional Role Violations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in sexual activity with you.</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked you out on a date.</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made an unsolicited attempt to stroke, caress, or touch a student.</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted to draw you into a discussion of personal or sexual matters.</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought advice or support from you concerning their personal life (e.g., family, financial or sexual matters).</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been your therapist.</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted to sell goods to you such as a car or books.</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2  Social Involvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave you a gift worth under $10.</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave a student a gift worth over $50.</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered to lend you money.</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited you to a personal party or social event.</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited a student home to dinner with their family.</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked a student to house sit, pet sit or baby sit for them.</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked small favours from you (e.g., a ride home).</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted your invitation to a personal party or social event.</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3  Professional Role Involvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered you a job related to university work (e.g., teaching or research assistantship).</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended department sponsored gatherings (e.g., wine and cheese socials).</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was a co-author with a student on a journal article or conference presentation.</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote you a letter of reference.</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lent you books or articles from their personal library.</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered you a job outside of the university (e.g., clinical private practice work, clerical work).</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged work-related meetings after hours or off campus.</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with Faculty Questionnaire only in that the former requested the number of times the respondent had experienced various kinds of interactions while the latter requested their perceptions of the frequency of such interactions. For this reason, the process of arriving at the factor solution for student experiences with faculty was identical to that described above. Again, questionnaires from all students were utilized. A principal components analysis with Varimax rotation was used to assess the factor structure of the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire resulting in two conceptually meaningful factors. Refer to Table 2 for the items comprising each factor and their factor loadings for students' experiences with faculty. Factor 1 (Professional/Social Involvements) accounted for 20.4% of the variance, and described both social and financial interactions between educator and student, and interactions consistent with, or prototypical of, the professional role of an educator. Factor 2 (Professional Role Violations) accounted for 8.6% of the variance, and described financial interactions, behaviours involving role violations between educator and student, and/or behaviours defined as sexual harassment. Two items, "Asked a student to house sit, pet sit or baby sit for them" and "Attempted to sell goods to you such as a car or books", loaded equally weakly on both factors. For theoretical reasons the items were assigned to the Professional Role Violations factor.

The Professional Role Violations index was further refined to enhance its explanatory power. It was believed that relying solely on the frequency of the
Table 2

Factor Subscales for the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1  Professional/Social Involvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited you to a personal party or social event.</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted your invitation to a personal party or social event.</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited a student home to dinner with their family.</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered you a job related to university work (e.g., teaching or research assistantship).</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave you a gift worth under $10.</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was a co-author with a student on a journal article or conference presentation.</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged work-related meetings after hours or off campus.</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked small favours from you (e.g., a ride home).</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lent you books or articles from their personal library.</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended department sponsored gatherings (e.g., wine and cheese socials).</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote you a letter of reference.</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2  Professional Role Violations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made an unsolicited attempt to stroke, caress, or touch a student.</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted to draw you into a discussion of personal or sexual matters.</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked you out on a date.</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought advice or support from you concerning their personal life (e.g., family, financial or sexual matters).</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in sexual activity with you.</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered to lend you money.</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered you a job outside of the university (e.g., clinical private practice work, clerical work).</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave a student a gift worth over $50.</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been your therapist.</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked a student to house sit, pet sit or baby sit for them.</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted to sell goods to you such as a car or books.</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
occurrence of role violations could possibly obscure the results partly because the behaviours were not of equal severity. Therefore the eleven items comprising the Professional Role Violations index were divided into two separate categories based on theoretical rationale. One category consisted of minor and/or financial role transgressions between educator and student and the second category consisted of major and/or professional dual role violations between educator and student. Consult Table 3 for the items comprising each category.

Severity of the role violation was based on the existence of prohibitions against such behaviour in professional codes of ethics, the potential for the action to confuse or blur roles between the participants, and Kitchener's guidelines regarding the harmfulness of dual role relationships (Kitchener, 1988). The items designated as minor and/or financial role transgressions involved interactions which may be related to the professorial role but are not required of educators to fulfil their responsibilities. These interactions do represent some blurring of boundaries between educator and student but they are not explicitly prohibited by professional associations. In contrast, four of the five items categorized as major and/or professional dual role violations involved behaviour which are explicitly prohibited by professional codes of ethics. Three of the items, "Engaged in sexual activity with you", "Asked you out on a date", and "Made an unsolicited attempt to stroke, caress, or touch a student", constitute sexual harassment. Based on Kitchener's guidelines, house sitting,
Table 3

The Professional Role Violations Subscale Recoded Based on the Severity of the Role Violation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor/Financial Role Transgressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attempted to draw you into a discussion of personal or sexual matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought advice or support from you concerning their personal life (e.g., family, financial or sexual matters).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted to sell goods to you such as a car or books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered to lend you money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered you a job outside of the university (e.g., clinical private practice work, clerical work).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave a student a gift worth over $50.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major/Professional Dual Role Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in sexual activity with you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked you out on a date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made an unsolicited attempt to stroke, caress, or touch a student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been your therapist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked a student to house sit, pet sit or baby sit for them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pet sitting, and baby sitting are dual role activities that violate the educator-student roles and could be detrimental to the student. For instance, these activities demonstrate an incompatibility of expectations between roles, different obligations for the different roles, and differences in power and prestige between the different roles of educator and student or house owner and house sitter. Therefore, house sitting, pet sitting, and baby sitting were categorized as major and/or professional dual role violations.

Furthermore, it was believed that the more serious professional role violations would occur the least often. Thus relying on the frequency of occurrence as the primary measure of importance was believed to be inappropriate. In the revised index the frequency of occurrence was no longer a factor in the calculation of the index. The existence or nonexistence of an occurrence was the new determining criterion. The revised index was recoded based on whether or not a participant had experienced a Professional Role Violation and on what kind of role violation it was (minor/financial or major/dual role). This resulted in four distinct categories, increasing in seriousness: 1) experienced no professional role violation; 2) experienced at least one minor role violation; 3) experienced at least one major dual role violation, and; 4) experienced at least one minor role and one major dual role violation.

The Professional/Social Involvements factor formed the basis of the second index used as a predictor variable for subsequent analyses. Items on this subscale were summed to yield the index score for each participant.
**Background questionnaire.** Another component of the survey was a brief list of questions on the demographic characteristics of the respondents, such as their sex, age, and current level of education (see Appendix B). Characteristics of respondents' graduate training program, for example whether their program was CPA or APA accredited, were also requested. This questionnaire was placed last in every questionnaire package to ensure that participants had some comfort level with the task prior to being asked to reveal professionally and personally sensitive information.

**Procedure**

Each questionnaire package consisted of a cover letter, the Therapeutic Practice Survey, the Perceptions of Students' Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire, the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire, and the background measure. The order for the Therapeutic Practice Survey, the Perceptions of Students' Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire, and the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire was counterbalanced. The cover letter was always first and the background measure was always last in each questionnaire package. A specialty tea bag and the opportunity to receive a summary of the survey's results were used as incentives for completing the questionnaire package. It was estimated that the questionnaires would take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

The cover letter (see Appendix B) included such information as the
purpose of the survey and how the respondent had been selected. In addition, because the nature of the information to be gathered could be considered sensitive, procedures for establishing the anonymity of the respondent were explained. The returned questionnaires were to be sent to one location and the postcards requesting the results were addressed to a different location. Upon receipt of the returned questionnaire, the questionnaire was removed from its envelope and the envelope destroyed, thus destroying the postmark. In this manner, it was impossible to accidentally identify any respondent or the respondent’s university. Nowhere on the questionnaires was the individual’s name, the name of the university they were attending, or any other readily identifying information requested. An additional precaution was that no attempt was made to code or identify questionnaires for any follow up procedure after the initial mail out. Participation was voluntary. Consent was presumed by the act of returning the completed questionnaire and this was outlined in the cover letter. These procedures are similar to those first used by Pope et al. (1979) and now considered to be an essential requirement for conducting this kind of research.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Sample Characteristics

Three hundred and ten graduate students ranging in age from 21 to 57
years old (SD = 7.0) returned completed questionnaires. The sample was
77.1% female (n = 239) and 22.9% male (n = 71). The unequal representation
of men and women in the final sample of 281 clinical/counselling students was
representative of the population of graduate students sampled. Of the almost
400 students mailed individually addressed questionnaire packages and whose
sex could be identified by their first names, 78.9% were female and 21.1% were
male. This is not statistically different from the percentage of female and male
clinical students who returned completed questionnaires \( \chi^2 (1, N = 281) =
0.30, p > .05 \).

On average, participants had attended their respective universities for 8.6
terms. The range was 1 to 28 terms. Thirty-nine respondents (13%) indicated
that it was their first term. Refer to Tables E.1 - E.4 in Appendix E for additional
information about the participants including the highest degree they currently
held, the type of program (i.e., clinical, social) they were attending, and the
amount of clinical experience they had.

Information about the different university programs gathered from the
participants revealed that the majority of university programs held joint
accreditation from APA and CPA, and offered a mandatory ethics course.
Tables F.1 - F.3 in Appendix F contain additional information regarding accreditation status, the existence of ethics courses, and the theoretical orientation of the program.

For all statistical analyses performed, only the data from the 281 students attending a clinical or counselling program were included, unless otherwise noted. Only clinical and counselling students were used for the majority of analyses because they were the target population of this study. The 29 questionnaires received from students in programs other than clinical or counselling were due to the inexactness of the recruiting process.

**Subscale Reliabilities**

**Therapeutic practice survey.** Reliability analyses were performed on all subscales. See Table 4 for the reliabilities, range of possible scores, means, and standard deviations. All subscales had moderate to high internal consistency.

**Student perceptions.** All indexes had high internal consistency. See Table 4 for the reliabilities, range of possible scores, means, and standard deviations for each index of the Perceptions of Students’ Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire.

**Student experiences.** The two student experiences indexes had acceptable internal consistency. Please refer to Table 4 for the reliabilities, range of possible scores, means, and standard deviations for these two subscales measuring students' experiences with faculty.
Table 4

Range of Possible Scores, Means, Standard Deviations, and Alpha Coefficients for All Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Range of Possible Scores</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Therapeutic Practice Survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Incidental Involvements</td>
<td>0 - 30</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social/Financial Involvements</td>
<td>0 - 95</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dual Professional Roles</td>
<td>0 - 40</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions of Students’ Experiences with Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Professional Role Violations</td>
<td>0 - 35</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social Involvements</td>
<td>0 - 40</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Professional Role Involvements</td>
<td>0 - 35</td>
<td>20.01</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students’ Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Professional/Social Involvements</td>
<td>0 - 66</td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Professional Role Violations</td>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prior to any further analyses, the possible effect of questionnaires' order of presentation was assessed. As mentioned previously the order for the Therapeutic Practice Survey, the Perceptions of Students' Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire, and the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire was counterbalanced. Three MANOVA's were performed with the order of questionnaires as the independent variable and the subscales of the questionnaire as the dependent variables: one MANOVA for each of the different questionnaires. The order of presentation did not significantly affect any of the questionnaire subscales and hence subsequent analyses did not include this variable ($F (5, 250) = 1.01, p = .41$, $F (5, 250) = .97, p = .44$, and $F (5, 250) = .71, p = .62$ for Incidental Involvements, Social/Financial Involvements, and Professional Dual Roles, respectively; $F (5, 274) = 2.63, p = .02$, $F (5, 274) = .88, p = .49$, and $F (5, 274) = .64, p = .67$ for Professional Role Involvements, Professional Role Violations, and Social Involvements, respectively; $F (5, 275) = 1.30, p = .27$ and $F (5, 275) = 1.51, p = .19$ for Professional Role Violations and Professional/Social Involvements, respectively; all subscales for all three questionnaires $p > .01$).

**Therapeutic Practice Survey**

**Sex differences.** Three MANOVA's were performed with the sex of participant as the between subjects variable, the sex of client as the within subjects variable and the three subscales of the Therapeutic Practice Survey as dependent variables. No main effects for the sex of the participant was found
for any of the subscales \( F(1, 279) = .48, p = .49, F(1, 272) = 2.20, p = .14, \) and \( F(1, 276) = 1.15, p = .28, \) Incidental Involvements, Social/Financial Involvements, and Professional Dual Roles, respectively). No main effects for the sex of the client was found for any of the subscales \( F(1, 279) = .29, p = .59, F(1, 272) = .82, p = .37, \) and \( F(1, 276) = 1.54, p = .22, \) Incidental Involvements, Social/Financial Involvements, and Professional Dual Roles, respectively). There was also no significant interactions for any of the subscales \( F(1, 279) = .01, p = .93, F(1, 272) = 1.38, p = .24, \) and \( F(1, 276) = .14, p = .71, \) Incidental Involvements, Social/Financial Involvements, and Professional Dual Roles, respectively). In summary, neither the participant's sex, the client's sex, or the interaction effects significantly influenced students' ethicality ratings on any of the three Therapeutic Practice Survey subscales.

The ethical decision making process. Quantitative and qualitative information was gathered regarding respondents’ decision making process. Open-ended solicitation was done first to ensure that participants’ own views shaped their responses. Participants were asked how they went about deciding the ethicality of the various situations presented and what information was important to them when making such decisions. Over 87% of participants \( (n=271) \) responded to the question about their decision making process while 80.3% \( (n=235) \) provided written responses to the question about the type of information they utilized. Both questions elicited similar types of responses. In fact, 14 students commented that their answers were the same for both
questions.

The written comments about decision making could be categorized into seven themes with most students addressing two or more of these themes in their comments. Many students (n=81; 29.9% of the responses) pointed to using professional ethics codes when making their decisions. Students (n=30; 11.1% of the responses) also reported relying on knowledge acquired from ethics courses or consultation with supervisors (n=13; 4.8% of the responses). Two main themes which share similarities were recognizing the imbalance of power between therapist and client (n=32; 11.8% of the responses) and raising the implications of engaging in the behaviour described for the client and for the therapeutic process (n=37; 13.7% of the responses). One student wrote:

The therapist/client relationship is not an equal one. Any activity which may place a therapist in a position to potentially misuse that "one-up" position, or which might place the clients' best interests in jeopardy or in a vulnerable position must be unethical. Certain activities - less risky, or potentially harmful to the client-therapist relationship as such may be considered to be innocuous. However, it is always better to err on the side of caution for the clients' sake.

Another student described their decision making process as follows:

Primarily judging whether the situation would have potential to harm the client, whether it would conflict with a therapist/client relationship and whether it would adversely affect my ability to be an effective therapist.

Other comments focused more on the "how" of making decisions, stating that they would imagine themselves in that situation either as the therapist (n=15; 5.5% of the responses) or as the client (n=9; 3.3% of the responses). "For some [situations] I 'envisioned' the situation to see if there would be some
circumstances under which I could see the activity as ethical." Students frequently reported such a method of searching to see if the described behaviour could be ethical in any circumstances and basing their decision on their answer to that question.

The last theme related to an emphasis that the situations presented did not lend themselves to definitive yes or no responses. Rather, students sometimes (n=19; 7.0% of the responses) introduced the possibility of special circumstances which they believed needed to be taken into account when making a decision. For instance, one student wrote that "No decision is absolute; for instance, there could be situations outside of professional life, long after therapy has ended, where it is not possible to avoid socializing with former clients." Similarly, another student commented that "Some of these situations were difficult to judge because they were subject to situational variables and sometimes you can say you won't do something (i.e. become friends) but find it happening."

Responses to the question "What information was important to you in helping make your decision?" elicited many themes similar to those just discussed. Students noted relying on professional ethics codes (n=40; 17.0% of the responses), knowledge acquired from ethics courses (n=15; 6.4% of the responses), and discussions with supervisors (n=10; 4.3% of the responses) as important sources of information. Recognition of the power held by the therapist (n=19; 8.1% of the responses) and the potential harmful consequences to the
client or the therapeutic process if a therapist engaged in the behaviour described (n=20; 8.5% of the responses) were again raised. One student wrote that "a therapist has no business being **DIRECTLY** involved in a client's personal life. Also, a lot of the situations involved position of power by the therapist which would be abused if the therapist engaged in the situations described here." Two issues not previously raised involved the lack of enough information to make an informed decision (n=7; 3.0% of the responses) and the issue of living and working in a small community (n=13; 5.5% of the responses).

More information about context would have been useful. For example, often when I answered "Rare Conditions" I was thinking of the rural psychologist who should not be expected to completely isolate him/herself from the town or the client who seeks a service (eg. a course) that only the psychologist offers. Of course, the client’s welfare must always be the primary concern when such decisions are made.

Comments in response to both questions included statements about "dual roles" and therapeutic "boundaries". Dual roles was mentioned 64 times while the issue of boundaries was raised 31 times. The following comments are representative of the kind of thought students displayed about dual role relationships and the boundaries of the therapeutic relationship.

Any dual role can produce conflicts of interest that prove to be anti-therapeutic.

The degree to which the boundaries of the therapeutic relationship were violated [**was important to consider**].

The degree of risk for altering therapeutic boundaries between client and therapist. Accepting a small gift **may** be therapeutic depending upon the circumstances under which it was given by the client, but out of session
social meetings would alter, likely in a negative fashion, the therapeutic relationship and should, on that rationale, be avoided.

Most of the situations involved dual-roles, so I considered to what degree the dual role situation would harm one or the other of the relationships. Some, such as minor gifts, are trivial. Others, such as sexual contact, are so potentially damaging to the client that they are absolutely unethical. Other situations fall somewhere in the middle. I counted many as rarely ethical because, while they should be avoided, circumstances may make this impossible (eg., practicing in a small town).

A key factor is the importance of keeping the client-therapist role clearly defined without any confusion or crossover into other roles (eg., client-friend, student, confidant, business associate ...). I think that keeping roles clearly defined is important to the therapeutic process in maintaining standards of privacy, respect, and safety. Hence, both the interests of the client and therapist can best be protected.

The questionnaire package distributed to students made no mention of dual role relationships, boundary violations, or any other similar type of terminology. It would seem that these issues, while relatively new, have already permeated the training and awareness of the next group of clinical psychologists to graduate. Furthermore, these concepts are helping to shape how therapists evaluate various therapist-client interactions.

The quantitative information gathered from participants regarding their decision making process is presented in Table 5 from the most often to the least often used. Nine different sources of information which might be used when making a decision were listed and respondents rated the extent to which they considered each using a 5 point Likert-type scale ranging from "never" to "most of the time". As can be seen from the table, participants reported most often visualizing themselves as the therapist in the situation described. Quite
Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for the Different Kinds of Information Utilized in Deciding the Ethicality of Situations Presented in the Therapeutic Practice Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you visualize yourself in that situation as the therapist?</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you recall what clinical supervisors have recommended?</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you recall what professors have recommended?</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you refer to (or want to refer to) professional codes of ethics?</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were there special circumstances about the situation you considered?</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you recall what your colleagues or peers have recommended?</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you visualize yourself in that situation as the client?</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you refer (or want to refer) back to written materials such as textbooks or journal articles?</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you use (or want to use) some formal decision making tool developed by someone?</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rating codes: 0=never, 1=rarely, 2=sometimes, 3=often, 4=most of the time.
frequently the decision making process also included considering professional
codes of ethics and the recommendations of educators. Furthermore, special
circumstances of a situation, although left for the individual to define, reportedly
played a part in participants' decisions. (Some of these special circumstance as
noted by participants' written comments involved living in a small community.)
By comparison, participants rarely utilized formal decision making tools or
written reference material.

The role played by ethics courses. A MANOVA was performed with the
two levels of ethics education as the independent variable (have completed and
have not taken an ethics course) and all three subscales of the Therapeutic
Practice Survey as the dependent variables to test the hypothesis that ethics
education would result in lower or more conservative ethical judgement scores.
Having taken an ethics course did not result in lower scores on the Incidental
Involvements subscale ($F (1, 252) = 0.10, p > .05$). However, students who had
taken an ethics course did have significantly lower Social/Financial
Involvements scores ($F (1, 252) = 10.69, p = .001$) and Professional Dual Roles
scores ($F (1, 252) = 5.82, p = .017$) than students with no course. Participants
who had taken an ethics course were more conservative in their ethical
judgements of social and financial involvements, and dual professional roles
than were participants who had not taken an ethics course.
Student Experiences

The prevalence of various types of educator-student interactions. Based on students' reports, most students have interacted, at least on occasion, with educators in a variety of social and professional situations. The interactions defined as Professional/Social Involvements were experienced by between 29% to 99% of all participants at least once. The most common Professional/Social Involvements were obtaining a letter of reference from an educator, being offered a university related job, and borrowing books from educators. Almost 90% of all students reported such interactions had occurred at least once in their graduate career. The least common Professional/Social Involvement was being invited to dinner by an educator which was reported by 29% of all students. Experiences defined as Professional Role Violations were reported by 2% to 37% of all participants. While situations described as Professional Role Violations were less common than Professional/Social Involvements, a notable minority of students still reported experiencing them. For instance, close to 20% of all students reported having been asked to house sit, pet sit or babysit for an educator while 13% were in situations where an educator had offered to lend them money. See Table 6 for a complete summary of the percentage of clinical students who reported at least one instance of the listed behaviours from the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire. The two items utilized as an unrefined measure of social desirability demonstrated that students were willing to endorse items which were unflattering to
Table 6

Prevalence, in Percentages, of Various Interactions Between Students and Educators as Measured by the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional/Social Involvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote you a letter of reference.</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lent you books or articles from their personal library.</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended department sponsored gatherings (e.g., wine and cheese socials).</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered you a job related to university work (e.g., teaching or research assistantship).</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was a co-author with a student on a journal article or conference presentation.</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged work-related meetings after hours or off campus.</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited you to a personal party or social event.</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked small favours from you (e.g., a ride home).</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted your invitation to a personal party or social event.</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave you a gift worth under $10.</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited a student home to dinner with their family.</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Role Violations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted to draw you into a discussion of personal or sexual matters.</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered you a job outside of the university (e.g., clinical private, clerical work).</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought advice or support from you concerning their personal life (e.g., family, financial or sexual matters).</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked a student to house sit, pet sit or baby sit for them.</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered to lend you money.</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made an unsolicited attempt to stroke, caress, or touch a student.</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted to sell goods to you such as a car or books.</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked you out on a date.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been your therapist.</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave a student a gift worth over $50.</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in sexual activity with you.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Filler/Distractor and Social Desirability Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked to borrow money from you.</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed to write a letter of recommendation and then has missed the deadline for handing it in.</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been late for class or an appointment.</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
educators.

**Students' written comments.** In addition to gathering information regarding the prevalence of various types of interactions, the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire solicited students' comments about their most positive and negative experiences with educators, along with an opportunity to provide any other general comments they might wish. A comprehensive analysis of this qualitative data is beyond the scope of this project. A preliminary examination has been conducted to survey the type of general issues raised by participants. Students' written comments will also be used to illustrate points originating from the quantitative data. The written comments are a valuable tool in the discussion on mentoring, the academic environment, and the educator-student relationship. They provide stories which anchor the discussion.

Eighty-seven per cent of participants (n=268) wrote descriptions regarding their most negative experiences with their educators. An examination of the data revealed some general themes raised by the graduate students who responded. The theme which was raised by the most students (n=48; 17.9% of the responses) dealt with their perception of unfair, subjective grading practices in courses and in clinical work, or complaints about the quality of teaching.

Each [negative] incident concerned a paper(s) I had written in which my basic sympathy and predilection for a psychoanalytic/dynamic orientation was evident. Although there was nothing wrong with the papers in terms of error in fact, he withheld a good grade and expressed his disdain for my orientation. In each case, I requested a re-read and in each case the grade was changed from a B to an A.
Another identifiable theme focused on descriptions of boundary or professional role transgressions by educators and student's feelings about such interactions. Forty-five students (16.8% of the responses) reported such experiences and interestingly, they themselves labelled such interactions as dual relationships or boundary problems even though no such terminology was used anywhere in the questionnaire. For example, one student wrote that negative experiences included:

...a professor who may be having personal problems and consequently boundary problems - talking about personal problems, asking for advice or a professor (intoxicated) becoming overly friendly in a social/department context. The negatives are the discomfort re how to handle these situations in a diplomatic "damage control" fashion to minimize consequences and discomfort re boundary violations or professional inappropriateness in general. I would add these have occurred rarely but even where other types of situations have occurred i.e. being asked to do favours (house sit, etc.) I work at maintaining a strong boundary and have been fortunate that these difficulties have never occurred in the mentoring relationship (mentioned above [in response to the question about positive experiences]).

Students (n=27; 10.1% of the responses) also complained of sexual harassment and sexism while in graduate school. The incidents described included a professor who when having drinks in a bar with graduate students remarked that he "enjoyed teaching summer courses because that's when the female students in the class will wear tight fitting shirts and short shorts" to sexual innuendos and outright sexual propositions by male faculty.

Some students (n=23; 8.6% of the responses) described poor working relationships with their research advisors and clinical supervisors which did not include any role problems but simply focused on their supervisors’ perceived
poor skills. For example:

My most negative experience has been my relationship with my M.Sc. supervisor. He is a socially inept tyrant who is well-hated by his students. Although I could detail many facets of his unsupportive, suspicious, and negativistic behaviour, my worst experience with him has been due to his scattered manner of thinking and poor memory. While I was writing a proposal for my thesis, he would make some points which he felt were essential to the project. Once I had incorporated his suggestions into the draft and resubmitted it to him, he would point out those same additions to me, tell me they were garbage, and demand that I remove them. It took me a full 4 months longer to prepare the proposal for presentation than I believe it would have if I'd had a different advisor.

Other general issues raised by students included complaints about educators being late for appointments (n=15; 5.6% of the responses), not handing in letters of recommendations which had significant impact upon their professional careers (n=5; 1.9% of the responses), and disagreements over the ownership of ideas, data, and authorship (n=10; 3.7% of the responses). One student wrote about:

A disagreement over **data management**. As a Ph.D. level student who was to invest my money and time into dissertation research I felt I was entitled to a copy of the data (without subject identification). The educator I was working with was adamant about retaining complete control (I was to access the subjects through her). We ended up severing our relationship, leaving me after a considerable time investment without a research project.

Finally, 11 students (4.1% of the responses) reported that they had had no negative experiences.

Eighty-seven per cent of participants (n=272) wrote descriptions regarding their most positive experiences with their educators and six main themes were identified. The most frequent comments (n=63; 23.2% of the
responses) were about positive supervisory relationships with faculty and with clinical supervisors on practicum placements or internships (n=15; 5.5% of the responses). Typical of these comments, is the following:

My experiences with my advisor have been very positive. I am allowed to work autonomously at all times yet have immediate and consistent access to his counsel when needed. He is very generous with his time, highly knowledgeable and always available.

Students (n=40; 14.7% of the responses) also frequently commented on constructive, valuable, and enjoyable social interactions with educators such as attending parties or going out to lunch with educators. Generally, these students wrote that they enjoyed the opportunity to exchange personal information with their educators and to socialize and that they felt like they were treated as equals. For example:

As a graduate student there seems to be a better social relationship with the profs. This may be a function of the particular university and/or the individual profs. But because they socialize with the grad students I perceive a greater degree of respect from them and for them. It seems to reduce the power differential to some degree and it seems the profs accept us as individuals.

Students (n=18; 6.6% of the responses) also remarked favourably on opportunities to actively participate in intellectual discussions with supervisors and other faculty members. A similar theme was that of constructive collaborations with supervisors on articles and conference presentations mentioned by 19 students (7.0% of the responses). Students also referred to good letters of reference and educators providing them with financial assistance via jobs or collaboration on grant applications as positive events attributable to
their educators' efforts (n=13; 4.8% of the responses and n=16; 5.9% of the responses, respectively). Only a few comments could not be grouped into these main themes.

Slightly over 35% of participants (n=109) took the time to respond to a solicitation for general comments and observations regarding their graduate training experience. As to be expected with such a general request for comments, there was less cohesion regarding the topics raised than with the previous comments. Many students used the opportunity to elaborate on their previous comments about their most positive or negative experiences in graduate school. Two new themes which did emerge were educator-student dual roles or possible problems with socializing with educators (n=10; 9.2% of the responses), and more global complaints about the negativity of academia and the hardships of being a student (n=20; 18.3% of the responses). Two examples of the insightful comments graduate students wrote about the educator-student relationship follows.

In my graduate career I have been a TA, an RA and thesis student and at the same time taken a course all with the same supervisor at the same time (during course of semester or two). I think as grad students we should not be placed in dual - often multiple roles with the same person. I think when both people involved are professional - NO problems arise But it does create an environment where the potential for conflict is greater! If anything, the senior authority figure should set an example and ensure the student is Not placed in such a situation. Not the other way around.

In general I prefer firm boundaries between educator and student. However I think as students mature it is important to allow some personal interactions so as to initiate them into a more realistic work environment where they will work with coworkers, older and more
experienced. A personal touch to education is often more important than much of the academics. Of course this does not involve sexual contact and it is unfortunate that the abuse of power and crossing of boundaries produces such a negative stereotype and atmosphere of apprehension and fear.

General complaints of students included the economic hardships of being a student, criticism of student maternity leave policies of universities, and the political intrigues and generally unsupportive environment of academia. The following are a sample of students' concerns and the general tone of the comments is in keeping with the uncited comments.

Application of scientist practitioner model a problem. Students feel pulled both ways by clinical and research/course demands. Little coordination between both.

Most faculty are too busy fighting their political battles in house and working on their own career, to be bothered with students - M.A., Ph.D., or undergrads.

From my own personal experiences and from my discussions with other grad students, I feel that grad students are generally exploited. We put in an incredible number of hours, with little recognition and acknowledgement from educators. Grad school is supposed to provide us with an increasing sense of competency and self-confidence. Rather, most of us come out of grad school wondering whether we have the abilities and confidence to compete in a professional world. Supervisors have power - they know it, abuse it, and students have no choice but to submit. At present, I am one of the lucky students because I have a great supervisor.

This last comment also raises a point expressed throughout. Even when students noted that they had had a positive graduate experience, and a number of students did report this (n=14; 12.8% of the responses), there was often the sense that they were very lucky. For instance, "I'd like to say that, for the most part, I've been very appreciative of the efforts and demonstrated skills of my
educators. I have never once been placed into an awkward ethical situation, although I realize others have." Few students were as unequivocal in their praise as the following student: "I have had no negative experiences thus far during my graduate training. I am very happy with my program so far and all students in our program receive a great deal of 1:1 training. Coming to this school was definitely the right choice for me."

A more complete analysis of students' written comments will likely provide for some interesting revelations including a valuable look at the educator-student relationship as seen by students. Students do not seem to be demanding perfection from their educators as often a student's most positive and most negative experiences occurred with the same educator. Students do seem, however, to be asking for common courtesies such as being on time for appointments and keeping agreements about letters of recommendations and authorship on publications. And while there is not unanimous agreement about the extent to which socializing should be part of the graduate experience, there does appear to be agreement that educators hold a great deal of power over them; both as a student within their respective programs and upon graduation when they are searching for a job. Many students appear to be painfully aware of this imbalance of power and have either suffered from an educator's misuse or abuse of it or have witnessed other students' agonizing experiences.

Sex of student. Sex differences were found for both the Professional/Social Involvements and the Professional Role Violations subscales (F (1, 279)
\[ F = 7.55, \ p = .006 \text{ and } F (1, 279) = 3.86, \ p = .05, \text{ respectively}. \] For the Professional/Social Involvements subscale, male students reported more professional and social interactions with their educators than did female students (\( M = 32.64 \) interactions compared to \( M = 28.16 \) interactions). However, for the Professional Role Violations subscale the pattern was reversed. Female students more often experienced major/professional dual role violations than did male students. Male students experienced the fewest Professional Role Violations overall, and when they did experience such interactions, it was most likely a minor/financial role transgression (see Table 7 for more details).

**Sex of faculty.** When participants reported experiencing an educator-student interaction they were asked whether the educator involved was a man, a woman, or both. The option of both was to be checked off if the individual had experienced the same kind of interaction more than once and it had occurred with both a male and female educator. The total number of incidents reported by students was first calculated and then broken down by educator and student sex. Refer to Tables 8 - 10 for the frequencies, expressed in number of incidents and percentages, with which male and female students reported Professional/Social Involvements, Minor/Financial Role Transgressions, and Major/Professional Dual Role Violations with male and female educators.

It was hypothesized that male educators would engage in nonsexual dual role relationships with their students more often than would female educators. In order to investigate this hypothesis the number of interactions male and
Table 7

**Number and Percentage of Male and Female Clinical Students Experiencing Minor and Major Professional Role Violations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Violation</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>All Participants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor and Major</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

The Different Educator-Student Dyads Based on Sex of the Participants Involved in Professional/Social Involvements (Percentage Excluding Both Category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>39.2 (81.6)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.8 (8.4)</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>30.9 (62.8)</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>18.3 (37.2)</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>32.9 (67.2)</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>16.1 (32.8)</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

The Different Educator-Student Dyads Based on Sex of the Participants Involved in Minor and/or Financial Role Transgressions (Percentage Excluding Both Category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>(73.4)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>(26.6)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>(60.5)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>(39.5)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>(63.6)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

The Different Educator-Student Dyads Based on Sex of the Participants Involved in Major and/or Professional Dual Role Violations (Percentage Excluding Both Category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>(86.7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>(72.0)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>(28.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>(73.7)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>(26.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
female educators engaged in was calculated, excluding the interactions reported for the "both" male and female educator option. This information is presented in parentheses in Tables 8 - 10 and was used to calculate chi squares.

To ensure that differences were not solely the result of the sex composition of faculty, the analyses were calculated taking this factor into account. According to the information gathered by APA (1996) 73.7% of full time faculty employed in Canadian university psychology departments are male and 26.3% are female. The chi square analyses were weighted by these proportions of male and female educators believed to be employed in Canadian universities. When controlling for the sex composition of faculty there were no significant differences between male and female educators regarding their interactions with graduate students \( (\chi^2 (1, N = 997) = 0.09, p > .05, \chi^2 (1, N = 269) = 0.20, p > .05, \text{ and } \chi^2 (1, N = 133) = 0, p > .05, \) Professional/Social Involvements, Minor/Financial Role Transgressions, and Major/Professional Dual Role Violations, respectively).

Gender and the educator-student dyad. Although the sex of the educator was not a significant factor when examined in isolation and when the absolute number of male and female educators was controlled for, it could be an important feature of the dynamics of dual role relationships when investigating the interaction between faculty sex and student sex. Therefore, additional analyses were conducted focusing on the four possible educator-student dyads:
male educator-male student, male educator-female student, female educator-male student, and female educator-female student. In order to investigate this supposition the number of interactions male and female educators engaged in was calculated, excluding the interactions reported for the "both" male and female educator option. Refer to Tables 11 - 13 for the frequencies, expressed in percentages and the number of incidents, with which male and female educators were engaged in Professional/Social Involvements, Minor/Financial Role Transgressions, and Major/Professional Dual Role Violations with male and female students.

Chi square analyses were calculated taking into account the proportion of male and female psychology graduate students enrolled in Canadian universities. This was done to address the issue of the composition of the sexes comprising the student body. Based on Statistics Canada, 67.6% of Ph.D. students enrolled in psychology in Canada for the 1994-95 school year were women (as cited in Canadian Association of University Teachers, 1996). It was this information and the information presented in Tables 11 - 13 which was used to calculate chi squares for the four possible educator-student dyads.

Examination of the male educator-male student dyad found that significantly fewer Major/Professional Dual Role Violations were reported than would be predicted based on the sex composition of the student body ($\chi^2 (1, N = 98) = 11.26, p < .01$). There were no significant differences found for the frequency of Professional/Social Involvements and Minor/Financial Role
Table 11

**Breakdown of Educators' Professional/Social Involvements by Sex of Student -- Number of Incidents and Percentages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Educators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Incidents</td>
<td>Number of Incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

Breakdown of Educators’ Minor and/or Financial Role Transgressions by Sex of Student -- Number of Incidents and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Breakdown of Educators' Major and/or Professional Dual Role Violations by Sex of Student -- Number of Incidents and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Educators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Incidents</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number of Incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transgressions between male educators and male students reported and expected \( \chi^2 \ (1, \ N = 670) = 0.47, \ p > .05 \) and \( \chi^2 \ (1, \ N = 171) = 0.74, \ p > .05 \), respectively.

Statistical analysis of the male educator-female student dyad revealed that significantly more Major/Professional Dual Role Violations were reported by female students than would be expected \( \chi^2 \ (1, \ N = 98) = 5.40, \ p < .05 \). There were no significant differences found for the frequency of Professional/Social Involvements and Minor/Financial Role Transgressions between male educators and female students reported and anticipated \( \chi^2 \ (1, \ N = 670) = 0.23, \ p > .05 \) and \( \chi^2 \ (1, \ N = 171) = 0.36, \ p > .05 \), respectively.

When examining the female educator-male student dyad, male students reported significantly fewer Professional/Social Involvements, Minor/Financial Role Transgressions, and Major/Professional Dual Role Violations with their female educators than would be anticipated based on the number of male graduate students involved in the study of psychology in Canadian universities \( \chi^2 \ (1, \ N = 327) = 11.50, \ p < .01 \), \( \chi^2 \ (1, \ N = 98) = 7.04, \ p < .01 \), and \( \chi^2 \ (1, \ N = 35) = 22.00, \ p < .01 \), respectively.

Finally, the investigation of the female educator-female student dyad revealed that significantly more Professional/Social Involvements and Major/Professional Dual Role Violations were reported than would be expected \( \chi^2 \ (1, \ N = 327) = 5.51, \ p < .05 \), and \( \chi^2 \ (1, \ N = 35) = 10.55, \ p < .01 \), respectively. There was no significant difference found for the frequency of Minor/Financial
Role Transgressions between female educators and female students reported and expected ($\chi^2 (1, N = 98) = 3.37, p > .05$).

To summarize, there are a number of interesting results based on the analyses of the number of interactions male and female educators engaged in with male and female students (excluding the interactions participants’ reported for the “both” male and female educator option). Female students reported more Major/Professional Dual Role Violations, regardless of the sex of the educator, than would be predicted based on their numbers. Male students, on the other hand, reported fewer Major/Professional Dual Role Violation experiences with male educators than would be expected. Male students, regardless of the type of interaction (professional, social, or dual role), reported experiencing fewer interactions with female educators than would be anticipated based on the population of male psychology graduate students. In comparison, female students reported more Professional/Social Involvements with female educators than would be envisioned based on their presence in graduate school. In conclusion, the interaction between faculty sex and student sex does appear to be an important factor when investigating educator-student relationships.

**Students’ Experiences with Their Educators and Their Ethicality Ratings on the Therapeutic Practice Survey**

Three standard multiple regression analyses were used to evaluate the ability of selected variables to predict the ethicality judgement scores for
Incidental Involvements, Social/Financial Involvements, and Dual Professional Roles. Specifically, the main hypothesis to be tested was whether or not experiencing professional role violations by educators influenced a student's judgement about the ethicality of various social, financial, and dual role interactions between therapist and client.

In each case, the first set or block of variables entered into the equation were the demographic variables of sex and age. The second set of variables were students' experiences with their educators as measured by the Professional/Social Involvements and Professional Role Violations subscales of the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire, students' perceptions of the frequency of various interactions as measured by the Professional Role Violations, Social Involvements, and the Professional Role Involvements subscales of the Perceptions of Students' Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire, the level of clinical experience, the level of ethics education, and interaction terms of sex by Professional/Social Involvements, Professional Role Violations, and students' perceptions of Professional Role Involvements because of findings of sex differences in earlier analyses.

The overall regression model did not significantly predict ethicality ratings for Incidental Involvements (see Table 14). For Social/Financial Involvements the overall regression equation was significant ($F_{(12, 257)} = 2.63$, $p = .0025$). The results of this analysis are presented in Table 15. The model accounted for 10.9% of the variance. The demographic variables entered in the first block
Table 14

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis on the Incidental Involvements Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>sr²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLOCK 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLOCK 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Social Experiences</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Role Violation Experiences</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Professional Role Violations</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Social Involvements</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Professional Involvements</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Course</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Experience</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Professional/Social Experiences</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Professional Role Violation Experiences</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Perceptions of Professional Involvements</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R = .21
R² = .04  Adjusted R² = -.00
ΔR² = .04
F = .92  p > .05
Table 15

**Results of Multiple Regression Analysis on the Social/Financial Involvements Subscale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLOCK 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLOCK 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Social Experiences</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Role Violation Experiences</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Professional Role Violations</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Social Involvements</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Professional Involvements</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Course</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Experience</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Professional/Social Experiences</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Professional Role Violation Experiences</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Perceptions of Professional Involvement</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple $R = .33$

$R^2 = .11$  Adjusted $R^2 = .07$

$\Delta R^2 = .09$

$F = 2.63$  $p = .0025$

$^* \quad p < .03$

$^{**} \quad p < .006$
were not significant predictors (they accounted for only 1.8% of the variance). The main block of variables were significant and predicted 9.2% of the variance. Examination of the regression coefficients for individual predictors indicated that ethics education, and the sex by Professional/Social Involvements interaction contributed significantly to the regression equation. Having completed an ethics course resulted in lower scores or more conservative ethicality judgements on the Social/Financial Involvements subscale of the Therapeutic Practice Survey. A further investigation of the sex by Professional/Social Involvements interaction revealed that male students who experienced more Professional/Social Involvements with their educators judged Social/Financial Involvements between therapist and client to be more ethical than those with fewer Professional/Social Involvements. In comparison, the more Professional/Social Involvements female students experienced with their educators, the less ethical they judged Social/Financial Involvements between therapist and client to be.

For Dual Professional Roles the overall regression equation was significant ($F (12, 259) = 2.46, p = .0047$). Table 16 contains the details of the regression analysis. Overall, the model accounted for 10.2% of the variance. The demographic variables of sex and age entered in the first set significantly predicted 3.9% of the variance (refer to Table 16). The educational context variables added 6.4% to the model. Examination of the regression coefficients for individual predictors indicated that clinical experience, Professional Role
Table 16

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis on the Professional Dual Role Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>sr²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLOCK 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLOCK 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Social Experiences</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Role Violation Experiences</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Professional Role Violations</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Social Involvements</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Professional Involvements</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Course</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Experience</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Professional/Social Experiences</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Professional Role Violation Experiences</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Perceptions of Professional Involvement</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R = .32  
R² = .10  Adjusted R² = .06  
ΔR² = .06  
F = 2.46  p = .0047

* p < .05  
** p < .01
Violations experiences with educators, and the sex by Professional Role Violations interaction contributed significantly to the regression equation. Students with more clinical experience had lower scores or more conservative ethicality judgements on the Dual Professional Roles subscale. Students who had reported Professional Role Violation experiences with their educators judged Dual Professional Roles between therapists and their clients to be more ethical than did students who did not have such experiences with their educators. Finally, the sex by Professional Role Violations variable revealed that male students who had experienced both a minor and a major dual role violation judged Dual Professional Roles to be more ethical than all other male and female students regardless of their Professional Role Violation experiences (see Table 17).
Table 17

Mean Ethicality Ratings for the Professional Dual Role Subscale Based on Male and Female Students' Professional Role Violation Experiences with Their Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Violation</th>
<th>Male Students</th>
<th>Female Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor and Major</td>
<td>15.60*</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant difference from all other means p. < .01 using the Tukey's HSD test.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The current study investigated the relationship between the training of therapists and the attitudes toward dual role relationships between therapists and clients. Specifically, the training of clinical psychologists was investigated to better understand the influence graduate school and professional socialization has on future therapists’ views about dual role relationships with clients. Results of this study provide evidence that dual role relationships between educators and students increase the likelihood that students will go on to judge dual role relationships between therapists and clients as being ethical and appropriate behaviour for a therapist. This may well contribute to the occurrence of therapist-client dual role relationships.

At this time the mechanism by which this occurs remains unclear. It is proposed that a person’s judgements about the ethicality of certain behaviours is related to that person’s actual behaviour. For instance, therapists are more apt to engage in behaviour that they consider to be ethical as opposed to unethical (Borys, 1988; Thoreson, Shaughnessy, Heppner, & Cook, 1993). Therefore, students’ attitudes about therapist-client dual role relationships are very likely to influence students’ behaviour with their clients and provides confirmatory evidence for the proposal that sexual dual role relationships between educators and students foster therapist sexual dual role relationships with their clients (Bouthoutsos, 1984; Epstein, 1994; Folman, 1991; Kitchener,

The educator-student framework presented in this paper is meant to generate thoughtful dialogue and further empirical research. The two factor solution derived from the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire is an initial attempt to better articulate the kinds of behaviours which comprise educator-student relationships. While such behaviour as sexual harassment is viewed as egregious and clearly falls outside of the bounds of acceptable educator behaviour, other behaviour such as asking students to house sit, has not even been mentioned when discussing the educator-student relationship. Therefore, the Professional/Social Involvement and Professional Role Violation factors as defined in this work are a way to introduce into the discussion behaviours which have been ignored up until now. Some of these previously ignored behaviours need to be examined if only because of the frequency of their occurrence. For instance, almost 20% of all graduate students reported being asked by an educator to house sit, pet sit or baby sit for them and another 25% were offered jobs unrelated to university work such as doing clerical or clinical work for an educator’s private practice.

The term Professional Role Violations used throughout this paper was chosen, in part, to maintain some consistency with the language used in writings about therapist-client dual role relationships (e.g., Brown, 1991; Gutheil & Gabbard, 1992). It was also chosen to reflect the contention that the behaviours comprising this factor represent a breach of the professorial role.
There was no attempt to insinuate that certain behaviours are malicious or intentional by referring to them as role violations. Doubtless educators believe that certain dual role relationships or most interactions between educator and student are usually beneficial to students or are, at the worst, benign. When deciding to name the factor Professional Role Violations the intentionality of the educator (or the student for that matter) was not considered. As Goodyear, Cregg, and Johnson (1992) have remarked: "The salient issue, though, is one of protecting the student from exploitation, for the power differential is such that the student is at greater risk in these relationships than the faculty member - no matter how well intentioned the involved parties might be" (p. 207). Additionally, it is the potential risk that these behaviours pose for the student that has been considered, not the actual outcome of a particular situation. Thus, harm need not be experienced by every student who has engaged in a particular situation to ultimately conclude that such behaviour is inappropriate.

**Students' Experiences in Graduate School**

What follows is a discussion of the findings of the current study in the context of the academic environment as experienced by graduate students training to be psychologists. The discussion will highlight the issue of dual role relationships and sexual harassment and the significance of gender when investigating such matters.

Students interact with their educators in many different ways including in professional, social, or financial situations. Personal preferences and styles of
both student and professor influence the types of interactions commonly engaged in. A study which utilized semi-structured interviews of graduate students found that student behaviour appears to be based upon both the individual's personal coping style and the particular situation they face (Acker, Transken, Hill, & Black, 1994). The researchers identified five typologies of student styles of coping with the demands and frustrations of academia. They postulated that these coping styles were more a reflection of situational factors than an essential personality trait and that if students had had a different type of supervisor they would have adjusted their behaviour accordingly (Acker et al., 1994). Obviously more research is required before speculating about how personality characteristics affect the educator-student relationship.

Situational variables play an important role in shaping educator-student interactions and they have received far more attention than such matters as personality characteristics and the supervisory styles of educators. Therefore, it is these factors which will be the main focus of the discussion. There are many demand characteristics which are unique to academia and the professorial role such as the power differential between educator and student and the importance of the thesis or clinical supervisor to a student's successful completion of graduate school. In addition, dual role relationships between educators and students are built into the current system of training therapists (Herlihy & Corey, 1992; Keith-Spiegel, 1994; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; O'Connor-Slimp & Burian, 1994) thus making it impossible to avoid such

Certainly the most common types of experiences students reported in this study involved activities that are directly associated with professional goals such as opportunities for co-authorships and conference presentations, university related job offers (teaching or research assistantships), and borrowing professional and research articles and books from educators. Obtaining a letter of reference from an educator, being offered a university related job, and borrowing books from educators were the most common Professional/Social Involvements with almost 90% of all students reporting such interactions had occurred at least once, with many of these students reporting more than 5 occurrences in their graduate career. None of these professional situations involved vastly differing experiences for male and female students. Other types of professional situations, such as opportunities for co-authorships and conference presentations, were reported by three-quarters of all students and also occurred equally often for male and female students.

It was also quite common for educators to socialize with their students outside of the classroom and the university. More than half the students had attended a personal party or social event with an educator at least once and almost all students had attended department sponsored gatherings with educators such as wine and cheese socials. It is acknowledged that it can be difficult to separate from one another the two activities of socializing and
learning. For instance, friendliness in a relationship reduces anxiety and can thereby facilitate learning. Some students described socializing as a means to begin or continue discussions about professional issues. "[Going out to dinner] was positive because it was an informal atmosphere for discussion of many topics relevant to clinical psychology that usually are not discussed." In comparison, some students remarked that what made the social activities enjoyable was the fact that there was no "shop talk" but rather it was an opportunity to get to know their educators as people: "Christmas party at educator's home with family and other graduate students. More intimate, personalized, human experience. Activity was festive rather than academic."

Based on students' responses, this study found that social interactions between educators and students are very common, whatever students' motivation for socializing with their educators. These results are consistent with past findings which, based on educators' responses, also found that socializing amongst students and educators is very common (Fitzgerald, Weitzman, et al., 1988; Tabachnick et al., 1991).

It is not surprising to discover that students and educators do more than simply meet in a classroom to discuss issues of intellectual interest and relevance to the practice of psychology. What was surprising about educator-student social interactions was the evidence which demonstrated differences based on the gender of the student. Male students reported more social interactions such as attending parties or poker at an educator's home or going
out for a drink, lunch or dinner than did female students. In contrast, female students more often experienced major/professional dual role violations such as having an educator who was also their therapist, being asked by an educator to house sit, pet sit or baby sit for them, or being sexually harassed (i.e., being asked out on a date, engaging in sexual activity with an educator) than did male students, regardless of the sex of the educator. In other words, female students more often experienced major/professional dual role violations initiated by male and female educators than would be predicted based on the number of female students attending psychology graduate programs.

When examining more closely the different items comprising the major/professional dual role violation factor, it was found that female educator-female student major/professional dual role violations were primarily that of female educators asking female students to house sit, pet sit or baby sit for them. There were only four reports each of female educator-female student sexual harassment and of having a therapist who was also their educator. Male educator-female student major/professional dual role violations included the entire range of behaviours - sexual harassment, asking female students to house sit, pet sit or baby sit for them, and simultaneously being the student's therapist and educator. Male students experienced the fewest professional role violations overall, and when they did experience such interactions, it was most likely a minor/financial role transgression such as a male educator giving a gift worth over $50 or trying to sell them something. When male students did report
experiencing major/professional dual role violations they overwhelmingly
involved a male educator asking them to house sit, pet sit or baby sit or being
the student's therapist.

There appears to be a division of social interactions between educator
and student based on gender. Male educator-male student dyads are by far the
most common educator-student pairings. Like one previous investigation, this
study provides evidence that male students primarily obtain their social and
professional support from male educators (Cohen & Gutek, 1991). For instance,
male students in this study reported experiencing fewer professional, social, or
dual role interactions with female educators than would be anticipated based on
their numbers while also reporting more overall social and professional
interactions than female students. So, male students are very socially and
professionally active within the university community but these findings suggest
that male students are spending more time interacting with male rather than
female educators. In comparison, a substantial minority of female students
reported interacting very often with female educators, more so than might be
anticipated based on the number of female students attending graduate school.
This result, like past research, suggests that many female students seek out
female educators to work with (or vice versa) (Berg & Ferber, 1983; Cohen &
Gutek, 1991). Still, based on the sex composition of faculty and students, the
majority of female students interact with male educators and have male clinical
and research supervisors.
The mentoring literature also notes that same-sex mentoring relationships are more common than any other educator-student dyad (Berg & Ferber, 1983; Hall & Sandler, 1983; Noe, 1988). Self-selection by both students and educators probably plays a significant role in the frequency of various educator-student dyads in addition to the actual proportion of male and female students and educators presently active in academic life. Specifically when discussing the male mentor-female protegé dyad, a number of reasons have been put forward to explain male educators’ hesitation to mentor women (Gilbert & Rossman, 1992; Hall & Sandler, 1983; Noe, 1988). The reasons include the view by some male educators that female students are less dedicated and less promising than male students, the assumption colleagues will make that the relationship is sexual (whether or not this is true), and the belief that if a female protegé fails this fact will be broadcast more loudly than if it were a male protegé and thus the mentor’s reputation will suffer increased damage (Gilbert & Rossman, 1992; Hall & Sandler, 1983; Noe, 1988). On the other hand, female students may actively seek out same sex mentors, more so than male students (Gilbert, 1985). Thus, many factors contribute to the hindrance of successful male mentor-female protegé dyads.

At the same time that male students are interacting in a positive manner with their educators and future colleagues, female students are not only experiencing such interactions less often than their male peers, they are also experiencing negative interactions more frequently. These negative events
include being sexually harassed and experiencing difficult dual role situations such as having an educator who is also their therapist, being asked to house sit, pet sit or baby sit, or being asked out on a date. In a sense, male students experience dual role relationships which help advance their careers and increase their sense of self-worth while female students experience dual role situations which are obstacles to career advancement, damage a person's self-esteem, and contribute to a person questioning her ability. Furthermore, these kinds of interactions encourage female students to think of themselves in terms of traditional socialized gender caretaking roles rather than as professionals even when functioning in the world of work.

Educators balance precariously between dual role relationships and conflict of interests on an almost daily basis because of the nature of their work responsibilities (Herlihy & Corey, 1992; Keith-Spiegel, 1994; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Matthews, 1991). However, when examining students' experiences it appears that educators balance between different kinds of dual role relationships based on the gender of the educator and student. Male educators balance between professional and social roles with their male students and professional and sexual roles with their female students. Female educators appear to balance between professional and social roles with their female students. When female educators interact with male students it seems they are involved primarily in professional activities with little crossing over into social or sexual roles. Although not all dual role relationships between
educators and students are harmful, as Keith-Spiegel and Koocher (1985) have noted, they do need to be carefully scrutinized. The disparate treatment that male and female students experience in training to be a therapist is of concern not because of its disparity but rather because it has very different consequences for a person's personal and professional life. What follows are examples of behaviour by male educators female students must constantly manage. Male students, on the other hand, do not have to manage such behaviours while pursuing their university education.

Sexual harassment and sexual dual role relationships. There were three items in the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire which examined the prevalence of sexual harassment. The one item which asked students if an educator had ever "made an unsolicited attempt to stroke, caress, or touch [them]" was used as a rough measure of a very specific type of sexual harassment. Almost 1 out of every 5 female students responded affirmatively to this item even though this study was not designed to investigate the gamut of behaviours defined as sexual harassment. Female participants in this study did, nonetheless, describe in the qualitative section of the questionnaire other types of sexual harassment they had experienced that were not explored in the quantitative section. Some examples of sexual harassment not covered by the definition used in this study follow.

Have a faculty member in charge of grad students tell me that I will just have to get used to the sexism in the department because it isn't going to go away just to make me happy.
My most negative experience was being in a class with a prof who made countless sexual innuendos and references in his lectures.

A male supervisor was offering (unsolicited) suggestions for the content of an upcoming therapy session with a woman survivor of abuse who was about to be released from hospital back into an abusive situation. He suggested that because her self-esteem is low, I should go in and offer hair and make-up lessons.

When I approached a male professor about my entering graduate school and wondering if he would write a letter for me. I felt very uncomfortable during the meeting - the chairs were too close, he seemed a little too interested - there was a sexual undertone to his behaviour which left me very uncomfortable. He was quite encouraging of my aspiration and then when he learned of my marital status things seemed to change - he recommended I pursue an education in teaching or social work and seemed to be discouraging me. I felt quite disappointed and confused. His behaviour was so covert that I couldn’t address it directly. I felt powerless and also angry that he conducted himself this way.

The second item of the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire which examined the prevalence of sexual dual role relationships inquired about sexual activity between educator and student. Three per cent of the female participants responded affirmatively to such an inquiry. The last item to be discussed here asked students if they had ever been asked out on a date by an educator and was another way of measuring educator-student sexual dual role relationships. This questionnaire item is difficult to interpret and compare with previous studies because it can be understood as a measure of sexual harassment or as a measure of sexual dual role relationships. (Previous research investigating psychology graduate students did not ask this question.) For instance, some women in their comments stated that they had interpreted such behaviour as sexual harassment and had found it to be very distressing.
One student wrote about a negative experience with an educator as follows:

One male educator - repeatedly asking me out on dates, making me feel sorry for him. Extremely negative because he had power over me as he was my thesis supervisor. He eventually stopped asking me out on dates, but started to volunteer to outside agencies I was working with.

Another student described the following experience:

The most negative experience I have had was when my undergraduate thesis supervisor asked me to go out. Because I lived far away from his office, he would drive me back and forth (about 45 minutes). Once when he dropped me off, he casually said "If you ever want to go to a movie or anything, let me know." I thought it kind of strange but I said "Sure", with no intention of pursuing the issue. On another occasion when he was driving me home, he stopped at a gas station to gas up in the middle of nowhere and said casually "Do you want to do something?". I said I was tired but felt very awkward. When we got home I told him that sort of thing made me uncomfortable. He just said "O.K." No apology and he didn't bring it up again. At the time I didn't know what to think but now that a few years have gone by, I realize that by definition, there was a power differential in our relationship, and his actions were inappropriate.

In contrast, a few women who had indicated that they had been asked out on a date also indicated that they had engaged in sexual activity with an educator which could lead to the interpretation that this item encompassed the realm of sexual dual role relationships and was interpreted by these women as a consensual romantic involvement. The following narrative illustrates that some students may be agreeable to having a sexual relationship with their educator and thus may view it as consensual.

My supervisor last year went out of his way to get me to work with him, cotherapy (group therapy) co-counselling, supervision sometimes more than once a week, lunch etc. He treated me very nicely. He also made it clear he was attracted to me (some leering gestures were unwanted on my part). Anyway the bottom line was to wait until the supervisor/supervisee relationship was over and then we'd see each other. I waited and waited. I found out recently he is engaged and had been before I
ever met him. I know we never dated, but it was still a rotten experience for me.

Finally, a few women who indicated they had engaged in sex with an educator did not endorse the item involving being asked out on a date. That being said, 9.2% of all female students reported being asked out on a date by a male educator: not one male student reported having had such an experience. The only previous study examining students' experiences of dating in a variety of graduate departments (not only psychology) found that 13% of their sample had dated a faculty member at least once, while a total of 22% of the female students had been asked out on a date (Schneider, 1987).

When all things are considered, it is highly probable that the 3% prevalence rate of educator-student sexual dual role relationships based on the one item is an underestimation of such behaviour. Rather the finding that almost 10% of all female students reported being asked out on a date must also be considered when discussing the prevalence of educator-student sexual dual role relationships in this study. This pattern of actual sexual contact occurring less often than opportunities or requests for sexual contact has been observed and reported in the past (Carr, Robinson, Stewart, & Kussin, 1991; Schneider, 1987).

In summary, there are a number of plausible reasons for the decreased rate of sexual contact between educator and student found in this study. Firstly, this could be an accurate reflection of the situation in Canadian graduate clinical training programs and could be partly due to APA's recent explicit prohibition
against educator-student sexual involvement (APA, 1992). All but one of the previously published studies examining educator-student sexual relationships gathered their data prior to this explicit prohibition (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Pope et al., 1979; Robinson & Reid, 1985; Shearn et al., 1994). The one study which gathered data after 1992 still surveyed only those people who had graduated prior to 1992 (Hammel et al., 1996). No student who had received training since the explicit prohibition against educator-student sexual involvement was implemented had been surveyed prior to the present study.

Secondly, the decrease could represent a decrease in the willingness of students to report sexual contact with their educators because of social desirability factors (such behaviour is now expressly prohibited) or students are concerned about repercussions if they should report such behaviour even anonymously because they are still students attending the university where it occurred or is occurring. This study was the only one to survey students while still in graduate school. Previous studies have asked former students about their past experiences in graduate training (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Hammel et al., 1996; Pope et al., 1979; Robinson & Reid, 1985; Shearn et al., 1994). Even though participants’ anonymity was protected in this study, one respondent who described a difficult nonsexual situation with an educator specifically stressed that nowhere should I describe this situation as he/she was fearful of being identified. A study which examined critical incidents in the supervision of student research cited an example of a psychology professor who removed a student’s
name off an article after she had confronted his sexually harassing behaviour (Goodyear et al., 1992). And a recent court case found that a woman had been unfairly expelled from her clinical-community psychology doctoral program after complaining that some of her professors were engaged in sexual dual role relationships with their students and had made racist and sexist remarks (Shen, 1996). Thus, there appears to be face validity to the notion that students were not wholly forthcoming because of fears about reprisals.

Another possibility related to surveying current graduate students is that the amount of time in school may have affected their responses. For instance, students surveyed had, on average, attended their respective universities for roughly 9 terms or almost three years and 13% of the sample reported that it was their first term. Thus many respondents had not been in graduate school for very long and more time in graduate school would result in more interactions with educators and possibly more opportunities to engage in sex with an educator and experience other types of sexually harassing behaviours. Thoreson, Shaughnessy, and Frazier (1995) found that people with doctoral degrees in counselling were more likely to have engaged in sexual contact with their educators than were people who held only a Master’s degree. They suggested that the increased length in school resulted in increased opportunities for sexual contact with educators and thus increased educator-student sexual dual role relationships (Thoreson et al., 1995).

Lastly, it is possible that the reported decrease in sexual contact
between educator and student is partly due to the different wording of the items used to measure this behaviour in the current study. Adding up the affirmative responses for both of the "engaged in sexual activity" with an educator and asked out on a date by an educator items, results in a prevalence rate of 12%, much closer to previous reported rates.

While the prevalence of sexual contact between educator and student may have decreased, it continues to be something experienced more often by female than male students. Like the two previous studies which surveyed both female and male students (Hammel et al., 1996; Pope et al., 1979), the present study found that more female than male students reported sexual contact with their educators.

This study also found that male educators were more likely to become sexually involved with a student or ask a student on a date than were female educators. These results are consistent with previous research which found that male educators were more likely to become sexually involved with a student than were female educators (Fitzgerald, Weitzman et al., 1988; Pope et al., 1979; Tabachnick et al., 1991). All the incidents reported in this study (N=29) were between a male educator and a female student. Thus the only reported educator-student dyad in which sexual dual role relationships occurred was that of a male educator with a female student.

In North American universities, the male educator-female student is the most common dyad for sexual dual role relationships (Fitzgerald, Weitzman et
al., 1988; Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Hammel et al., 1996; Pope et al., 1979; Robinson & Reid, 1985; Shearn et al., 1994; Tabachnick et al., 1991). The male educator-female student sexual dual role relationship is the expected one for our North American culture as it reflects everyday differences in power based on gender found in our society (Katz & Vieland, 1988). Both males and professors are ascribed more authority and status in our society relative to women and students. It has been suggested that cultural norms favour the male initiating escalating contact and/or boundary alterations in opposite sex interactions (Borys, 1992; Rutter, 1989). Thus, cultural norms regarding power relationships may have a disinhibiting effect on male professionals' behaviour with female subordinates.

The academic environment is not equally welcoming to male and female students (Caplan, 1993; Cohen & Gutek, 1991). Female students, to a greater degree than male students, must deal with situations such as educator-student sexual dual role relationships which can and do impact negatively on their educational experiences, including their rates of graduation. The widespread presence of sexual harassment and educator-student sexual dual role relationships is an assertion by men of the primacy of a woman's sexuality over her role as a student (Walker et al., 1985). Sexual harassment, in whatever form it manifests itself, is the inappropriate sexualization of an otherwise nonsexual relationship. Sexual dual role relationships between male educators and female students can obviously meet the definition of sexual harassment
(Walker et al., 1985). While members of the psychology profession have looked to education as one important solution to therapist sexual misconduct the current conduct of some psychology educators is helping to perpetuate the problem. This issue will be dealt with in more detail presently.

**Students' Experiences with Their Educators and Their Attitudes About Therapist-Client Dual Role Relationships**

The central idea guiding this work was the potential influence of dual role relationships between educators and students on students' judgements about the ethicality of various therapist-client dual role relationships. The focus of the investigation was broadened so as to include other possible contributory factors such as students' perceptions of the frequency of various educator-student interactions, clinical experience, and ethics education. For instance, it was thought that if students believed that certain types of educator-student interactions were very common, they might interpret this as permission to engage in such interactions regardless of the actual ethicality of such behaviour. Evidence did not confirm such a hypothesis. There was supporting evidence for the other variables, however. Students' experiences with their educators, clinical experience, and ethics education were found to contribute significantly to students' ethical judgements regarding Social/Financial Involvements and Dual Professional Roles between therapist and client.

Students' social experiences with their educators influenced students' judgements about social dual role relationships between therapist and client. In
the case of both educator-student and therapist-client social interactions, such interactions could be considered less serious kinds of boundary blurrings or transgressions. When students experienced more serious role violations such as sexually harassing behaviours or clear dual role relationships such as an educator simultaneously being a student’s therapist and research supervisor, students’ judgements about more serious role violations between therapist and client such as a therapist providing therapy to an employee were less conservative than those reported by students who had not experienced serious role violations.

There are many similarities between the activities which comprise the educator-student Professional/Social Involvements factor of the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire and the therapist-client Social/Financial Involvements subscale of the Therapeutic Practice Survey. Both subscales included items that dealt with inviting students or clients to parties or out to eat, hiring/employing students or clients, and inviting them to social gatherings at the work place. In all of these situations, the member of the dyad with more formal power (educator, therapist) engages in social and financial interactions with the individual occupying the lower status position (student, client). Hence, if therapists-in-training use the same guidelines for educator-student relationships as for therapist-client relationships, there may develop difficulties in the therapeutic relationship which may not even be recognized by them as therapists.
Students' social experiences with their educators influenced students' judgements about therapist-client social dual role relationships although this effect was mediated by student gender. The more social involvements male students had experienced with their educators, the more ethical they judged social dual role relationships between therapist and client to be. In contrast, the more social involvements female students experienced with their educators, the less ethical they judged therapist-client social dual role relationships to be.

Therefore, students' professional and social experiences with their educators contributed to their attitudes about appropriate therapist-client therapeutic boundaries. Furthermore this effect is mediated by the gender of the student. For male students, increased social involvements with their educators seem to result in less stringent role prescriptions between therapist and client. It is as if male students use the same guidelines they have used for their educator-student relationships for their therapist-client relationships. They believe what has been successful for them as students in academia will also be successful for them when interacting with clients in the role of therapist.

Interestingly, the more social involvements female students experienced with their educators, the less ethical they judged therapist-client social involvements to be. Female students, unlike male students, do appear to make a different choice regarding the appropriateness of various behaviours between educator and student, and therapist and client. Perhaps male and female students assign different meanings to their graduate school experiences and
hence ultimately come to different conclusions about them. This may be partially attributable to the fact that most educator-student interactions are same sex for male students and opposite sex for female students. Perhaps female students even in positive professional and social involvements with male educators do occasionally experience discomfort or uncertainty about educator expectations (Katz & Vieland, 1988) and hence are more cautious about judging such interactions between individuals with unequal power as invariably appropriate, ethical, or benign. On the other hand, it is possible that male students, not subjected to sexual harassment by their male educators for instance, evaluate their experiences as primarily positive and therefore do not consider that such social interactions could ever be problematic.

Female students may be more sensitive to the possible negative consequences of social involvements with educators in academia. Studies on sexual harassment, for instance, have demonstrated that men and women interpret some behaviours differently (Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1991; Kenig & Ryan, 1986; Powell, 1986). Women are more likely than men to label such behaviour as sex-stereotyped jokes or educator-student sexual dual role relationships as harassing (Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1991; Kenig & Ryan, 1986). Kenig and Ryan (1986) point out that women are, in most cases, the victims of sexual harassment and men, while aware of the issue, may chiefly view it as something they are worried about being accused of perpetrating. Similarly, Borys (1988) has suggested that female therapists may be more cautious about
avoiding potentially harmful dual role relationships with clients because of a greater identification with the role of the oppressed individual. Therefore, female students may be more apt to conclude that even some social situations which were positive for them (or at least benign) could conceivably have a different and unfavourable outcome.

It is likely that social situations between male educators and female students are potentially more hazardous than other dyads as it is easier for male educators to shift from a social occasion to a primarily sexual situation (Katz & Vieland, 1988). Thus while socializing for male students gives them an opportunity to be better known by their educators which could assist in professional development and advancement, socializing for female students could lead to a sexualization of the professional relationship and unanticipated difficulties and consequences. Therefore, female students even when engaging in apparently benign social interactions are more apt to be cautious as they have more familiarity than male students with the fact that any relationship, including a professional one, can be sexualized, abused, or sabotaged.

Students, regardless of gender, who had reported experiencing the more serious kind of professional role violation with their educators judged the more serious kind of dual role relationships between therapists and their clients to be more ethical than did students who did not have such experiences with their educators. This finding has parallels to previous findings that students and educators who had been involved in a sexual dual role relationship were more
likely to hold the belief that such relationships could be beneficial to both parties involved than were people who had never engaged in such relationships (Pope et al., 1979). It would appear that people who have engaged in professional dual role relationships are more likely to judge them to be ethical and proper behaviour. Additionally, therapists are more apt to engage in behaviour that they consider to be ethical as opposed to unethical (Borys, 1988; Thoreson et al., 1993). Thus the more conservative ethicality judgements or increased sensitivity female students displayed about therapist-client social dual role relationships was not demonstrated in the case of therapist-client dual role relationships. Female students, like male students, who had reported experiencing the more serious kind of professional role violation with their educators judged the more serious kind of therapist-client dual role relationships to be more ethical than did students who did not have such experiences with their educators.

Another type of connection between sexual dual role relationships experienced as a student and later sexual dual role relationships as a professional with a student or client has been reported by Pope et al. (1979). They found that for women, engaging in sexual contact as students with their

---

4 Even the recognition of what constitutes ethical behaviour is no guarantee of a therapist actually behaving ethically. Previous research has found that often therapists report that they would not follow through with the action they believe to be ethically appropriate (Bernard & Jara, 1986; Bernard et al., 1987; Smith et al., 1991; Wilkins et al., 1990). However, therapists are more likely to engage in behaviour judged to be ethical than they are to engage in behaviour which is clearly prohibited by professional codes of ethics (Borys, 1988; Thoreson et al., 1993).
psychology educators was related, statistically, to later sexual contact with their own students or clients (Pope et al., 1979). They were unable to analyze the relationship between sexual contact as a student and sexual contact as a professional for men because the sample of men reporting sexual contact with their psychology educators was too small (n = 7). The data from the current study suggest the same pattern would be likely for men. Perhaps, ultimately, when referring to dual role relationships such as having an educator who is also one's therapist and sexual dual role relationships, familiarity breeds acceptance regardless of gender.

In the case of Dual Professional Roles between therapist and client, there was also an interaction effect between the sex of the student and the students' experiences with their educators. Male students who had experienced a variety of dual role violations from minor to major ones judged therapist-client Dual Professional Roles to be more ethical than anyone else regardless of their graduate training experiences or their sex. Therefore, male students who experienced at least one major and one minor professional role violation by their educators viewed therapist-client Dual Professional Roles as being the most ethical. This pattern of blurring of boundaries across all domains from minor boundary blurrings to clearly serious role confusion or role reversal thus appears to greatly influence the attitudes of male students.

Male students have a decreased likelihood of experiencing major dual role violations which are also defined as sexual harassment. Thus when
discussing male students and major dual role violations with their educators, after eliminating items pertaining to sexual harassment, we are referring to students having an educator who was also their therapist and being asked by an educator to house sit, pet sit or baby sit for them. These behaviours may be less clearly problematic than items which refer to sexual harassment and hence male students may not judge their own dual role situations to be detrimental to them and thus do not judge such situations as something which need to be eschewed. Male students then may be more apt to engage in other types of dual role relationships particularly when they now occupy the higher status position as would be the case when they are a therapist.

In summary, dual role relationships between educators and students did influence students' judgements about the ethicality of therapist-client dual role relationships in the direction hypothesized. Students who had reported the most serious role violation experiences with their educators judged dual role relationships between therapists and their clients to be more ethical than did students who did not have such experiences. This effect was mediated by student gender. Male students who had experienced a variety of dual role violations from minor to major ones judged therapist-client Dual Professional Roles to be more ethical than did any other respondents regardless of their graduate training experiences. Even the more minor boundary blurrings such as social involvements between educators and students demonstrated a significant student experiences by student gender effect. Within the group of students who
reported experiencing social involvements with their educators, the more social involvements female students experienced, the less ethical they judged therapist-client social involvements to be while the more social involvements male students experienced, the more ethical they judged therapist-client social involvements to be. Thus, while gender did not directly affect an individual's ethicality rating regarding therapist-client dual role relationships, the interplay of training experiences and gender is crucial to our understanding of therapists' attitudes and possibly behaviour towards their clients.

Students' Attitudes About Therapist-Client Dual Role Relationships: The Significance of Formal Training in Ethics

The current study found that students who had taken an ethics course were more conservative in their ethical judgements of social and financial involvements, and of dual professional roles, than were students who had not taken an ethics course. This is consistent with an earlier study which found that graduate students who had completed an ethics course were better able to identify the ethical implications implicit in hypothetical cases than were graduate students who had not completed a course in ethics (Baldick, 1980).

Current clinical training, including formal ethics education, may be helping to change students' judgements about the ethicality and appropriateness of engaging in various behaviours. Since Borys' 1988 study there has been a proliferation of written material on the issue of dual role relationships and therapeutic boundary violations (e.g., Borys, 1992; Epstein,
1994; Gabbard & Lester, 1995; Herlihy & Corey, 1992; Peterson, 1992; Pope, 1991; Simon, 1992; Younggren & Skora, 1992). Discussions in the professional literature have become almost commonplace and changes have recently occurred in professional ethics codes and codes of conduct reflecting the larger debate (e.g., APA, 1992). Furthermore, there now are models of decision making specifically designed to assist therapists in their handling of dual role relationships and conflict of interest situations (Brown, 1994b; Gottlieb, 1993; Herlihy & Corey, 1992; Kitchener, 1988; Valentich & Gripton, 1992).

It would appear that current students who have completed an ethics course have developed a better awareness about the ethical implications of dual role relationships between therapist and client and are approaching such situations more cautiously than those students who have not taken an ethics course. Thus, completion of a formal course in ethics does appear to be useful in informing therapists and therapists-in-training about ethical and legal issues relevant to the practice of clinical psychology. Whether formal training in ethics will improve the behaviour of therapists is still unclear and a question which is beyond the scope of this paper. It is sufficient here simply to note that research which has specifically examined the decision to act ethically have reported a discrepancy between knowledge of what ought to be done and what is done (Bernard & Jara, 1986; Bernard et al., 1987; Smith et al., 1991; Wilkins et al., 1990). Other research, however, has found that psychologists who have completed an ethics course are more likely to seek help if they experience a
problem with drugs, sexual attraction to a client, or burnout (Wood, Klein, Cross, Lammers, & Elliott, 1985). Whatever the effect on behaviour, those therapists-in-training who have completed a course in ethics do demonstrate an improved capacity for identifying and analyzing ethical dilemmas.

Methodological Issues

To this point, I have focused on the meaning of the findings by reviewing relevant issues in such areas as mentoring, sexual harassment, and educator-student relationships. However, a few important issues pertaining to this study's methodology need to be raised. In particular, the benefits and limitations of the Therapeutic Practice Survey and the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire will be examined.

Gender and the therapeutic practice survey.

In this study, neither the client’s sex, the participant’s sex, nor the interaction between the two significantly influenced students’ ethicality ratings on any type of therapist-client boundaries investigated. These results are contrary to proposed hypotheses and also previous results. In past research, male therapists who indicated they saw mostly female clients viewed incidental involvements or social encounters as more ethical than all other therapist-client gender pairings (Borys & Pope, 1989). Client sex was operationalized as the predominant sex of the therapist's client population. Upon completion of her study, Borys had recommended a better measure of client sex be developed and utilized in future research because of the importance of client sex in the
therapist-client dyad and her recognition that her measure had been imprecise (Borys, 1988).

Another study which utilized the Therapeutic Practice Survey found no client sex effects nor did the researchers find effects of interactions of therapist's sex and client's sex to be significant (Baer & Murdock, 1995). In that study, participants received a Therapeutic Practice Survey which instructed them to either consider only psychotherapy with adult female clients or adult male clients. Unlike Borys and Pope's 1989 study, the interaction of therapists' sex and client's sex did not affect therapists' ethicality ratings. The authors suggested that the different findings could be due to increased nonexistent treatment of clients or that their emphasis of client sex in the instructions heightened participants' tendencies to respond in a socially acceptable manner particularly when considering behaviours, such as therapist sexual misconduct, which have received attention in the media and professional domain (Baer & Murdock, 1995).

The present study stipulated the sex of the client for each individual item of the Therapeutic Practice Survey. Client sex was found not to significantly affect students' ethicality ratings on any of the three subscales. It is likely that no differences were found because the stipulation of client sex alerted participants to the probability of the study examining how client sex influenced participants' attitudes and heightened their desire to be "fair" or be perceived as "fair". Following the items about the ethicality of dual role relationships,
information was gathered regarding respondents' decision making processes. Supporting the contention that there was heightened sensitivity to gender issues when responding to the question about what information was important to them when making such decisions, 22% of the participants made comments about the relevance of client sex. Almost three-quarters of those comments strongly emphasized the irrelevance of client sex on their decisions and some respondents went so far as to castigate the researcher for even raising the issue. This suggests the possibility of social desirability influencing participants' responses. The methodological problems experienced in trying to examine the issue of the sex of the client on students' ethicality ratings means that this study really cannot help answer this important question.

This study does, however, add to the body of knowledge regarding the influence of therapist sex on therapists' attitudes about dual role relationships, although the information may complicate rather than simplify the picture. In previous research male and female therapists have been found to hold different attitudes about dual role relationships. Male therapists, for example, are more likely to express the belief that sexual contact may be beneficial to therapy than are female therapists (Holroyd & Brodsky, 1977). In general, female therapists consider sexual and nonsexual dual role relationships to be less ethical than male therapists (Borys & Pope, 1989). In another study, male therapists rated dual professional roles as more ethical than did female therapists supporting Borys' previous results (Baer & Murdock, 1995). Unlike Borys and Pope (1989)
however, Baer and Murdock (1995) did not find that male therapists rated extra-
therapeutic social, financial, or business involvements as more ethical than
female therapists. The current study found that male and female therapists-in-
training did not report different attitudes about dual role relationships as
measured by the Therapeutic Practice Survey when sex was examined alone.
However, gender did mediate the effects of students' experiences with their
educators and their attitudes about dual role relationships between therapist
and client. This suggests that the gender of the therapist is still crucial to a
complete understanding about therapists' attitudes and behaviours but the
relationship is more complicated than was first thought.

The second methodological issue regarding the Therapeutic Practice
Survey relates to the use of the "not sure" choice. Respondents in this study,
like Borys' respondents, indicated their ethicality judgements using a 6 point
scale from always ethical (5) to never ethical (1) and not sure (0). The scale
was initially treated as a 5 point scale, treating the choice "not sure" as missing
data. However, a different procedure was ultimately necessary. The increased
number of items in this revised survey in conjunction with the increased
utilization of the "not sure" response would have resulted in a substantial loss of
data. In Borys' study on average 2.2% of participants utilized the "not sure"
choice per item (range 0.4% - 5.2%) whereas in this study on average 3.5% of
participants utilized the "not sure" choice per item (range 0% - 21.7%). The
different utilization of the "not sure" response by participants may be partly due
to the different populations being surveyed. Participants in this study had not yet completed their clinical training and only 20% had completed their one year clinical internship while participants in Borys’ study had 16 years of postdoctorate clinical experience. Perhaps participants with far less clinical experience are more apt to utilize a "not sure" option when given the chance. It might be preferable to use a forced choice format minus a "not sure" option when surveying students or less experienced therapists. This would minimize the loss of data and eliminate the need to extrapolate from the participants’ known responses to their "not sure" responses and thus improve accuracy of the information gathered.

Some researchers who have investigated psychologists’ opinions about the ethicality of various behaviours have chosen to use the "not sure" option as the middle anchor point of their Likert scale (Pope et al., 1987; Tabachnick et al., 1991) rather than as an auxiliary option as in this study. In the future, researchers should carefully consider if and how they are going to work with a "not sure" option as it could have important ramifications for the interpretability of the information collected.

The professional and social experiences with faculty questionnaire.

In the current study, factor analysis was used to assess the factor structure of the 25 item Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire. Factor analysis revealed two conceptually meaningful factors which were named Professional/Social Involvements and Professional Role
Violations. The Professional Role Violations factor was further sorted into two
categories to enhance its interpretability. One category consisted of minor
and/or financial role transgressions between educator and student and the
second category consisted of major and/or professional dual role violations
between educator and student.

While the reliability of the Professional and Social Experiences with
Faculty Questionnaire is acceptable (a coefficient alpha of 0.77 for Professional/
Social Involvements and 0.64 for Professional Role Violations), the two factor
solution based on the present sample of 310 respondents could be debated.
Some decisions relevant to test construction were based on theoretical rather
than statistical or psychometric reasoning. For instance, four items with lower
factor loadings than the traditional 0.40 cut off point (between 0.25 - 0.32) were
retained in the solution rather than being discarded. In addition, two
questionnaire items ("Asked a student to house sit, pet sit or baby sit for them"
and "Attempted to sell goods to you such as a car or books") loaded weakly on
both factors and were assigned to the Professional Role Violations factor for
theoretical reasons as opposed to statistical rationale. For these reasons, it is
possible that another study would produce a different factor solution. In fact, a
three factor solution was obtained for the Perceptions of Students' Experiences
with Faculty Questionnaire in this study. The only difference between the two
questionnaires was that one requested participants' perceptions and the other
requested the participants' experiences of the same educator-student
interactions. The three factors of the Perceptions of Students' Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire shared more similarities than differences with the two factor solution of the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire. Only four items changed locations in the two different solutions. "Gave you a gift worth over $50" and "Offered to lend you money" went from the Social Involvement factor of the Perceptions of Students' Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire to the Professional Role Violation factor of the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire. "Offered you a job outside of the university" and "Asked a student to house sit, pet sit or baby sit" went from the Professional Role Involvement factor of the Perceptions of Students' Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire to the Professional Role Violation factor of the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire. Thus all four items moved to the Professional Role Violation factor from either the Social Involvement or the Professional Role Involvement factor when switching from the three factor to the two factor solution.

This item movement is perhaps an indication that while some behaviours clearly fall outside of the purview of an educator's professional role, there are still other behaviours that are not so easily categorized. The two factor solution derived from the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire in this study is an initial attempt to better articulate the kinds of behaviours which make up the educator-student relationship. The three factor solution just mentioned is more attractive, being more easily interpretable than
the two factor solution. One set of behaviours clearly falls within the purview of professional responsibilities (Professional Role Involvements), one set of behaviours is unquestionably inappropriate behaviour (Professional Role Violations), and one set of behaviours (Social Involvements) exists in a grey area being neither always appropriate or always inappropriate. While it is believed that this questionnaire is a good measurement tool and could greatly assist in future empirical research, its factor solution awaits replication and quite possibly refinement.

While there are areas of possible improvements for the two primary questionnaires used in the current research, overall the questionnaires are valuable research tools. The Therapeutic Practice Survey and the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire demonstrate acceptable to good reliability, face validity, and because of the interpretability of results, probably good construct validity as well. It is believed that the use of both questionnaires in future research could greatly assist with investigating the many questions still unanswered in this field of study. Use of these questionnaires would assist in the ability of researchers to more easily compare across studies and thus could lead to a quicker development of a core body of knowledge which could then be further expanded. What is more, the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire could be used to investigate more global learning environment issues beyond that of sexual harassment across disciplines and help collect preliminary data about the
prevalence of a wider variety of educator-student interactions than has been studied to date.

**Concluding Remarks**

While formal courses in ethics seem to be having the desired effect of educating graduate students about such important issues as dual role relationships between therapist and client, educator behaviour with students seems to be having the opposite effect. Graduate students who have experienced dual role relationships with their educators view dual role relationships between therapists and clients as more ethical than students who have not had such experiences. It would appear that universities are sending out mixed messages to their students, as formal and informal channels may be circulating contradictory advice or models of behaviour.

Although professional socialization is not often a topic of discussion, it is a very significant component of formal education. The general atmosphere of an institution as exemplified by its formal written policies and the behaviour of its representatives is as relevant to the development of professionals as the formal curriculum and the university degree necessary to become a member of a particular profession. Educators are more than just teachers dispensing knowledge during class time. They play a vital role in the development of professional therapists, researchers, and educators via informal means. For students the educator is a role model, helping them work through issues surrounding professional identity. This occurs often by simply observing how
educators behave (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992). Educators are the primary agents of professional socialization for graduate students (Girves & Wemmerus, 1988; Goodyear & Sinnett, 1984; LaPidus & Mishkin, 1990). They are ascribed status because of their membership in the university community and their membership in professional associations. Educators impart to students the norms and expectations of the profession they are training to enter (Girves & Wemmerus, 1988; LaPidus & Mishkin, 1990).

Another example of the importance of educators' actions involves the contrast between what educators teach and how they act. Students pay attention not only to what their educators say, they also take note of what they do. This has led to some psychologists encouraging educators to become more aware of their role as models of appropriate ethical behaviour to students training to be therapists (Kitchener, 1992b; Pope et al., 1987; Vasquez, 1988, 1992). It is not sufficient to simply teach appropriate professional conduct; an educator must also follow such teachings (Herlihy & Corey, 1992; Kottler, 1992). Indeed, some respondents in this study noted their frustrations of having educators telling them how to behave and later observing those same educators behaving in less than an ideal manner. This was particularly salient for students when they broached their beliefs to educators that another educator was acting unethically or inappropriately. One student, for example, wrote:

I have observed that many (though not all) educators will not support a student if it in any way places them in conflict with other faculty. I have
noticed, in particular, that while many teach that to ignore unethical behaviour is itself unethical, they will ignore it if the behaviour was enacted by a colleague. I have observed this to be the case even when more than one student attempts to bring the unethical behaviour to the attention of appropriate persons. This has left me feeling quite disillusioned about academia, and has resulted in my questioning any original intentions of pursuing an academic career.

Thus, educators may be unwittingly providing poor models of ethical behaviour or professional conduct even when they themselves are not behaving inappropriately towards students.

Students’ responses in this study add support to existing evidence that the university environment is substantially different for male and female students (Caplan, 1993; Cohen & Gutek, 1991). Social interactions between educator and student appear to be segregated by gender. Furthermore, female more than male students must deal with situations such as educator-student sexual dual role relationships which impact negatively on their educational experiences and achievements. In a sense, male students experience dual role relationships which help advance their careers while female students experience dual role situations which are an impediment to career advancement. Differential treatment of graduate students based on gender, especially sexual dual role relationships between male educators and female students, can be interpreted as an example of sexism (Gilbert & Scher, 1987) and sex discrimination (Walker et al., 1985). The widespread presence of sexual harassment and educator-student sexual dual role relationships in academia is a reminder to women that it is still permissible for men to view
woman primarily as sexual objects rather than as students (Walker et al., 1985) and that this attitude and corresponding behaviour is condoned and fostered by academic institutions.

Sexual harassment and sexual dual role relationships between educators and students could become a credibility issue for educators and academia. It has been found, for instance, that perceived sexism within graduate school classrooms damages the credibility of educators who engage in such behaviours (Myers & Dugan, 1996). Furthermore, sexual dual role relationships may damage the reputation of the department and university in the eyes of the public (DeChiara, 1988; Ingulli, 1987; Keller, 1990). Universities have a long history of telling other professionals such as lawyers and doctors how to behave but have paid surprisingly little attention to how they conduct their own business (Smith & Reynolds, 1990). What is the effect on students of teaching that sexual harassment is unacceptable behaviour for therapists when it continues to be so prevalent in universities? Educators need to do more than teach ethics - they need to behave ethically. Universities must address their own problems before they can be a credible vehicle for the provision of adequate solutions to other professions. While members of the psychology profession have looked to education as one important solution to therapist sexual misconduct the current conduct of some psychology educators is helping to perpetuate the problem.

Universities have begun to discuss matters related to appropriate
educator behaviour, although often reluctantly. Sexual harassment has been one type of educator behaviour which has been researched and is clearly prohibited by universities and professional associations (e.g., ACA, 1995; APA, 1992; Canadian Association of University Teachers, 1992; CPA, 1991).

Additionally, in 1992, the American Psychological Association finally instituted an explicit prohibition against educator-student sexual involvement after many years of psychologists calling for such guidelines (Pope, 1989b; Schover, Levenson, & Pope, 1983). This explicit prohibition deals only with educators who have evaluative or direct authority over a student, however (APA, 1992). It has been suggested that all instances of educator-student sexual dual role relationships are "problematic" and "inappropriate" because of "the potentially negative consequences for students (both participant and peers) and the exploitative quality of the relationship deriving from the power differential" (Pyke, 1996, p.17). Even when educators do not have a direct evaluative role with a student, their position as a faculty member who votes and is privy to decision making regarding all students' achievements, including the distribution of scholarships and university jobs, places them in a position where they may advance one student's interest at the expense of others or may simply be viewed as doing so (Paludi, 1996; Pyke, 1996). Therefore, although there are formal policies regarding sexual dual role relationships between educators and students there is room for improvement and a need for further discussion and research regarding this issue.
It is hoped that the results of this study encourage research and
discussion beyond the scope of sexual harassment and sexual dual role
relationships between educators and students. All the possible types of
relationships between educators and students need to be examined further
including mentoring relationships and friendships. For example, very little has
been written about educator-student friendships and whether they are
appropriate behaviour for an educator (for exceptions see Audi, 1990; Markie,
1990). Friendships like sexual dual role relationships need to be investigated
because they raise the issue of favouritism and the power difference between
educator and student places the student at risk of being exploited (Audi, 1990;
Markie, 1990; Zanna & Darley, 1987). Therefore, dual role relationships can be
a disruptive force for all people, not only the direct participants. Nonsexual and
sexual dual role relationships between educator and student need to be
carefully evaluated both on a case-by-case and institutional-wide basis (Keith-
Spiegel, 1994; Kitchener, 1992b). This has yet to be done.

To date, there has been far too little study or discussion about the
professorial role and the kind of conduct which is befitting a professor.
Educator-student relationships have for too long been part of the invisible
academic environment. A goal of this study is to highlight different types of
interactions between educator and student and suggest that such behaviour is
a legitimate and necessary focus of investigation and inquiry. Issues which still
need to be addressed include what relationships are appropriate for educators
to initiate and maintain with students. There also appears to be a need for conceptual clarity regarding mentoring relationships within academia. Questions which need to be asked and answered include the following: What types of socializing are acceptable? Is there such a thing as socializing which can be harmful to the educator-student relationship and the individuals involved? Is employing a student as a baby sitter appropriate behaviour for an educator? Is it in a student's best interests? Should such behaviour be discouraged?

Authors of ethical guidelines for educators have just begun to wrestle with the issue of socializing and nonsexual dual role relationships (CAUT, 1992; Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 1996). For example, Principle 5: Dual Relationships With Students of the Ethical Principles in University Teaching reads as follows:

To avoid conflict of interest, a teacher does not enter into dual-role relationships with students that are likely to detract from student development or lead to actual or perceived favoritism on the part of the teacher. (STLHE, 1996, p.7)

It goes on to note that "excessive socializing with students outside of class, either individually or as a group" is considered a "potentially problematic dual relationship" (STLHE, 1996, p.7).

Although there are difficulties with attempting to articulate a formal policy addressing educator-student relationships, I believe there are more problems with not having such policies. Clear guidelines are designed and intended for the mutual benefit and protection of students and educators. They help to inform all individuals about what are appropriate types of relationships between
educators and students (Keller, 1990). When there are no formal written
guidelines to assist educators in making decisions about their interactions with
students, educators and students are subjected to the whims of university
administrators and selective enforcement of informal codes of conduct (Keller,
1990). In addition, the lack of formal guidelines allows for considerable latitude
based on educators' individual preferences. University policies prohibiting
educator-student sexual dual role relationships can help to reinforce prohibitions
against other types of sexual harassment by clearly defining unacceptable
educator behaviour (DeChiara, 1988; Keller, 1990). Formal policies can also
help reduce incidents of apparent or real favouritism between educators and
students (DeChiara, 1988).

A note of caution must be put forward, however. There needs to be a
change in behaviour, not simply a proliferation of policies which are neither
respected nor heeded. "Professional ethical statements are worthless in our
filing cabinets" (Loader, 1995, p. 36). It will take more than the development of
policies to change behaviour.

The phrase "unequal collegial relationship" may be the most appropriate
description of educator-student relationships. It may be, however, that
educators and students focus on different aspects of the relationship. Educators
may emphasize the collegiality and positive working relationship, playing down
the power differential between themselves and their students. In contrast,
students may be more cognizant of the power an educator has over them
whether that power is used, misused, or even mentioned. As has been observed: "No matter how much a professor encourages his female students and colleagues to call him by his first name, engage in confessional office chat, and go to his home for pot-luck dinners - institutional hierarchy will not go away, and neither will the male professor's potential power" (Quinn, 1993, p. 24). A student in this study wrote:

I feel that both educators and students are frequently guilty of violating boundaries that should exist between people when there is an imbalance of power. Educator-student relationships are first and foremost professional relationships - it requires maturity to maintain a personal and professional relationship that is separate and leaves neither party feeling that one is influencing the other, particularly when a rupture occurs in a personal relationship. I have seen countless students feel abused and that personal information is used/influences a professional relationship.

Perhaps, ultimately what needs to be recognized is that the educator-student relationship is first and foremost a professional relationship. Like any relationship between two people, the breakup of the relationship can be unpleasant or even traumatic. However, the breakup or breakdown, of a relationship which was meant to be a working, professional one can result in serious consequences for the person occupying the less powerful role (Collins, 1993). It is for this reason that the propriety of certain relationships between educator and student needs to be thoroughly explored. Because the educator-student relationship is a professional relationship it is subject to public scrutiny and limits. When we more fully recognize it as a professional relationship existing in the context of the university and the larger society, we will be freer to
examine and discuss it. The educator-student relationship in all its permutations needs to become a legitimate focus of study and discussion which could then result in changed attitudes and behaviour.

It would appear that while therapists have looked to academia for solutions to decrease the occurrence of therapist sexual dual role relationships with clients, we should be coming to the realization that academia is also a reflection of our larger society and hence is poorly equipped for such a task. In both therapist-client and educator-student situations, men who occupy the high power role - therapist or educator - are significantly more likely than women to engage in sexual dual role relationships. In contrast, it is women who occupy the low power role - client or student - who are significantly more likely than men to experience sexual dual role relationships. While formal education may alert therapists-in-training to the problems of therapist-client dual role relationships, it would seem that educator-student interactions may be simultaneously educating students about the benefits and acceptability of dual role relationships in professional dealings. It is only with a fundamental change within academia can we hope to address such issues as therapist sexual misconduct. Altering formal curriculum without altering the entire academic environment will result in very limited success in addressing this problem. Hence, teaching ethics without teaching ethically will not work, no matter how many ethics courses we require our students to attend.
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APPENDIX A

Letter to the Chairperson of the Psychology Department
Dear (name of the chairperson of the department):

We are writing to ask your help in surveying the experiences and views of graduate students training to be psychologists in Canada. This survey is my dissertation research being conducted under the supervision of Charlene Senn, Ph.D.. In particular, this study examines the social and professional relationships between psychology educators and students in graduate school. We have been writing to all universities with a clinical or counselling psychology program across Canada asking for assistance in identifying graduate students in such programs so that they can be sent the questionnaire package. We are requesting a list of students currently enrolled in your department’s clinical or counselling program. If you do not have such a list of names, would you provide a list of all students enrolled in your psychology program regardless of their speciality. I do not need anyone’s home address as I wish to mail the questionnaires addressed to individual students at the university.

This study has received ethics clearance by the Ethics Committee of the Department of Psychology at the University of Windsor. If you have any questions or comments about this study you can contact myself, Elizabeth Minerva Moore, M.A. or Charlene Senn, Ph.D. at the Department of Psychology, University of Windsor, 401 Sunset Avenue, Windsor, Ontario, Canada N9B 3P4 (519) 253-4232 ext. 2217. You may also address concerns or comments to Roland Engelhart, Ph.D., Chair of the Ethics Committee at the same address.

Participation in this study involves the completion of a questionnaire package to be returned in the enclosed, stamped envelope. All responses are confidential and the questionnaires contain no identifying information. One questionnaire requests information about students’ experiences with educators and students’ perceptions of how common various social and professional interactions between educators and students are. Another questionnaire requests students’ opinions about the ethicality of various practices between therapists and their clients. The last questionnaire requests such information as the respondents sex, age, and whether their program is CPA or APA accredited. We would like to hear from all graduate students, at all levels of training across the country. The questionnaires should take approximately 30 minutes, in total, to complete. Consent to participate in the study is assumed when the questionnaire is completed and mailed back. Results will be analyzed and discussed as group data only. Individual responses can not be matched to a student’s program, city, or province. Thank you very much for your help.

______________________________   ________________________________
Elizabeth Minerva Moore, M.A.     Charlene Senn, Ph.D.
APPENDIX B

The Questionnaire Package: Cover Letter, Therapeutic Practice Survey, Perceptions of Students' Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire, Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire, and Background Questionnaire
Dear Graduate Student:

We are writing to ask your help in surveying the experiences and views of graduate students training to be psychologists in Canada. In particular, this study examines the social and professional relationships between psychology educators and students in graduate school. This survey, which is my dissertation research being conducted under the supervision of Charlene Senn, Ph.D., is being mailed to all graduate students enrolled in a clinical or counselling psychology program in Canada.

This study has received ethics clearance by the Ethics Committee of the Department of Psychology at the University of Windsor. If you have any questions or comments about this study you can contact myself, Elizabeth Minerva Moore, M.A. or Charlene Senn, Ph.D. at the Department of Psychology, University of Windsor, 401 Sunset Avenue, Windsor, Ontario, Canada N9B 3P4 (519) 253-4232 ext. 2217. You may also address concerns or comments to the Chair of the Ethics Committee at the same address.

Your participation in this study involves the completion of a questionnaire package to be returned in the enclosed, stamped envelope. All responses are confidential and the questionnaires contain no identifying information. Your participation is completely voluntary and you can withdraw from the study at any time. You can refuse to answer any part of the questionnaire if you so desire. Any of your responses you wish to share will be of assistance to the study and are greatly appreciated. One questionnaire requests information about your experiences with educators and your perceptions of how common various social and professional interactions between educators and students are. Another questionnaire requests your opinions about the ethicality of various practices between therapists and their clients. The last questionnaire requests such information as your sex, age, and whether your program is CPA or APA accredited. Previous clinical experience with psychotherapy or psychological assessment is not required for participation. We would like to hear from all graduate students, at all levels of training across the country. The questionnaires should take approximately 30 minutes, in total, to complete.

If you agree to participate, please complete and return the questionnaire in the enclosed, stamped envelope as soon as possible. Your consent to participate in the study is assumed when you complete and mail back the questionnaires. Your individual responses can not be matched to your program or city. Upon receipt of the returned questionnaire, the questionnaire will be removed from its envelope and the envelope will be promptly destroyed, thus destroying the postmark. If you would like a summary of the study findings, please record your name and address on the enclosed postcard, which is addressed to a different location than the questionnaire return envelope. Thank you very much for your time and your participation. Enclosed is a teabag for
you. Please enjoy a cup of tea on me for considering to participate in this study.

____________________________________________________________

Elizabeth Minerva Moore, M.A.                                   Charlene Senn, Ph.D.
**Therapeutic Practice Survey**

Below are listed a number of behaviours which therapists may engage in as part of their clinical practice. For each behaviour, please indicate, by checking the box under the phrase, whether you consider it: ALWAYS ETHICAL, ETHICAL UNDER MOST CONDITIONS, ETHICAL UNDER SOME CONDITIONS, ETHICAL UNDER RARE CONDITIONS, NEVER ETHICAL or if you are NOT SURE.

In responding to each item, please consider only psychotherapy with adult clients (including family therapy and parent guidance). Unless otherwise indicated, items refer to a therapist’s behaviour with clients he or she is currently treating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>ALWAYS ETHICAL</th>
<th>ETHICAL UNDER MOST CONDITIONS</th>
<th>ETHICAL UNDER SOME CONDITIONS</th>
<th>ETHICAL UNDER RARE CONDITIONS</th>
<th>NEVER ETHICAL</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a gift worth under $10 from a male client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing a female client to enroll in one’s class for a grade.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a client’s invitation to a special occasion (e.g., his wedding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing therapy to a current male student or supervisee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a service or product as payment for therapy from a female client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing individual therapy to a relative, friend, or lover of an ongoing female client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming friends with a male client after termination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inviting female clients to a personal party or social event.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling a product to a male client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in sexual activity with a current male client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a gift worth over $50 from a female client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying goods or services from a male client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing therapy to a then-current female employee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going out to eat with a female client after a session.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in sexual activity with a female client after termination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therapeutic Practice Survey Continued

Below are listed a number of behaviours which therapists may engage in as part of their clinical practice. For each behaviour, please indicate, by checking the box under the phrase, whether you consider it: ALWAYS ETHICAL, ETHICAL UNDER MOST CONDITIONS, ETHICAL UNDER SOME CONDITIONS, ETHICAL UNDER RARE CONDITIONS, NEVER ETHICAL or if you are NOT SURE.

In responding to each item, please consider only psychotherapy with adult clients (including family therapy and parent guidance). Unless otherwise indicated, items refer to a therapist’s behaviour with clients he or she is currently treating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>ALWAYS ETHICAL</th>
<th>ETHICAL UNDER MOST CONDITIONS</th>
<th>ETHICAL UNDER SOME CONDITIONS</th>
<th>ETHICAL UNDER RARE CONDITIONS</th>
<th>NEVER ETHICAL</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a handshake offered by a male client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing a female client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling sexually attracted to a female client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inviting male clients to an office/clinic open house.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosing personal details of current personal stresses to a male client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a gift worth under $10 from a female client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inviting female clients to an office/clinic open house.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a client's invitation to a special occasion (e.g., her wedding).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing a male client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a service or product as payment for therapy from a male client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going out to eat with a male client after a session.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming friends with a female client after termination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying goods or services from a female client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling a product to a female client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in sexual activity with a current female client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a gift worth over $50 from a male client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therapeutic Practice Survey Continued

Below are listed a number of behaviours which therapists may engage in as part of their clinical practice. For each behaviour, please indicate, by checking the box under the phrase, whether you consider it: ALWAYS ETHICAL, ETHICAL UNDER MOST CONDITIONS, ETHICAL UNDER SOME CONDITIONS, ETHICAL UNDER RARE CONDITIONS, NEVER ETHICAL or if you are NOT SURE.

In responding to each item, please consider only psychotherapy with adult clients (including family therapy and parent guidance). Unless otherwise indicated, items refer to a therapist’s behaviour with clients he or she is currently treating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>ALWAYS ETHICAL</th>
<th>ETHICAL UNDER MOST CONDITIONS</th>
<th>ETHICAL UNDER SOME CONDITIONS</th>
<th>ETHICAL UNDER RARE CONDITIONS</th>
<th>NEVER ETHICAL</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in sexual activity with a male client after termination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing therapy to a then-current male employee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inviting female clients to a personal party or social event.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing individual therapy to a relative, friend, or lover of an ongoing male client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a handshake offered by a female client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing therapy to a current female student or supervisee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling sexually attracted to a male client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing a male client to enroll in one’s class for a grade.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosing personal details of current personal stresses to a female client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therapeutic Practice Survey Continued

People have different ways in which they go about making decisions. Please describe how you went about deciding the ethicality of the various situations presented to you.

What information was important to you in helping you make your decision?
Therapeutic Practice Survey Continued

What information was important to you in helping you make your decisions across the various situations? Listed below are many different types of information someone may use to help them make a decision. For each type of information, please indicate, by circling the appropriate number, whether you considered it: Never (1), Rarely (2), Sometimes (3), Often (4), or Most of the time (5).

Were there special circumstances about the situation you considered?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you visualize yourself in that situation as the therapist?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you visualize yourself in that situation as the client?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you recall what professors have recommended?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therapeutic Practice Survey Continued

Did you recall what clinical supervisors have recommended?

1  2  3  4  5
Never Rarely Sometimes Often Most of the time

Did you recall what your colleagues or peers have recommended?

1  2  3  4  5
Never Rarely Sometimes Often Most of the time

Did you refer (or want to refer) back to written materials such as textbooks or journal articles?

1  2  3  4  5
Never Rarely Sometimes Often Most of the time

Did you use (or want to use) some formal decision making tool developed by someone?

1  2  3  4  5
Never Rarely Sometimes Often Most of the time

Did you refer to (or want to refer to) professional codes of ethics?

1  2  3  4  5
Never Rarely Sometimes Often Most of the time
Perceptions of Students’ Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire

Below are listed a number of behaviours which educators may engage in as part of their university responsibilities. For each item, please indicate, by checking the box underneath the word or phrase which most closely describes how common you believe these behaviours to be for psychology educators, regardless of your own experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you think an educator...</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>RARELY</th>
<th>SOMETIMES</th>
<th>OFTEN</th>
<th>VERY OFTEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writes a letter of reference for a student?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepts a student’s invitation to a personal party or social event?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks small favours from students (e.g., a ride home)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts to draw a student into a discussion of personal or sexual matters?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts to sell goods to a student such as a car or books?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives a student a gift worth under $10?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks a student out on a date?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lends a student books or articles from their personal library?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrees to write a letter of recommendation and then has missed the deadline for handing it in?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers to lend money to a student?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks advice or support from a student concerning their personal life (e.g., family, financial or sexual matters)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends department sponsored gatherings (e.g., wine and cheese socials)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers a student a job related to university work (e.g., teaching or research assistantship)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers a student a job outside of the university (e.g., clinical private practice work, clerical work)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks to borrow money from a student?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages in sexual activity with a student?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invites a student to a personal party or social event?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranges work-related meetings after hours or off campus?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a student’s therapist?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives a student a gift worth over $50?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks a student to house sit, pet sit or babysit for them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes an unsolicited attempt to stroke, caress, or touch a student?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invites a student home to dinner with their family?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a co-author with a student on a journal article or conference presentation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is late for class or an appointment with a student?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire

Below are listed a number of behaviours which educators may engage in as part of their university responsibilities. For each item, please indicate, by checking the box underneath the number which most closely describes your own experience. If you check 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or more than 5 (+5), please indicate whether the educator involved was a man, a woman, or both by checking under the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you ever been in a situation where an educator has...</th>
<th>HOW MANY TIMES HAS IT HAPPENED?</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written you a letter of reference?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted your invitation to a personal party or social event?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked small favours from you (e.g., a ride home)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted to draw you into a discussion of personal or sexual matters?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted to sell goods to you such as a car or books?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given you a gift worth under $10?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked you out on a date?</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lent you books or articles from their personal library?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed to write a letter of recommendation and then has missed the deadline for handing it in?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered to lend you money?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought advice or support from you concerning their personal life (e.g., family, financial or sexual matters)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended department sponsored gatherings (e.g., wine and cheese socials)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered you a job related to university work (e.g., teaching or research assistantship)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered you a job outside of the university (e.g., clinical private practice work, clerical work)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked to borrow money from you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in sexual activity with you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited you to a personal party or social event?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged work-related meetings after hours or off campus?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been your therapist?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire Continued

Below are listed a number of behaviours which educators may engage in as part of their university responsibilities. For each item, please indicate, by checking the box underneath the number which most closely describes your own experience. If you check 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or +5, please indicate whether the educator involved was a man, a woman, or both by checking under the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you ever been in a situation where an educator has...</th>
<th>HOW MANY TIMES HAS IT HAPPENED?</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Given you a gift over $50?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 +5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked you to house sit, pet sit or babysit for them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made an unsolicited attempt to stroke, caress, or touch you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited you home to dinner with their family?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been a co-author with you on a journal article or conference presentation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been late for class or an appointment with you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire Continued

Students experience a variety of encounters and relationships with educators, both positive and negative, helpful and unhelpful. Using the previous list of possible interactions with faculty as examples of interactions between students and educators, please describe your most positive experience with an educator. It can be a specific incident or a description of a series of interactions. What made it a positive experience for you?

Please describe your most negative experience with an educator. It can be a specific incident or a description of a series of interactions. What made it a negative experience for you?
Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty Questionnaire Continued

Educators may engage in a variety of behaviours as part of their university responsibilities. Students may experience a variety of encounters and relationships with educators. If you have any additional comments or observations about your graduate training experience, please feel free to use the space below to express them.
Background Information

Male _____  Female _____

Age: ________ years

Sexual orientation: heterosexual _____ lesbian _____ gay _____ bisexual _____

Present level of education: completing M.A., M.Ed., or M.Sc. ________
have M.A., M.Ed., or M.Sc. ________
completing Ph.D. ________
other (please specify) ________________

What degree are you ultimately planning to complete? ________________

Program currently enrolled in: clinical psychology ________
counselling psychology ________
experimental psychology ________
social psychology ________
industrial/organizational psychology ________
educational/school psychology ________
other (please specify) ________________

Number of terms attending the university’s graduate program: ________ terms

For clinical/counselling students only:
Present level of clinical experience: completing practicum ________
have completed practicum ________
completing clinical internship ________
have completed clinical internship ________
already registered, upgrading ________
no clinical experience ________

Population of main focus for your training:

child _____  adolescent _____  adult _____
Background Information on Your Graduate Training

1. Is the university program you are enrolled in CPA accredited?  
   Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't know ☐

2. Is the university program you are enrolled in APA accredited?  
   Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't know ☐

3. Does your program have a mandatory ethics course?  
   Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't know ☐  
   If No, skip to question 6.

4. If your program does have a mandatory ethics course, have you taken it yet?  
   Yes ☐ No ☐

5. If you have taken the ethics course, which of the following were emphasized:  
   _____ the teaching of specific professional codes of ethics  
   _____ the application of specific professional codes of ethics to cases  
   _____ the facilitation of ethical decision making  
   _____ the discussion of issues such as professional identity and guidelines for licensing  
   _____ don't know  
   _____ other/please specify: _______________________________

6. If there is NO mandatory ethics course, is there an optional ethics course offered?  
   Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't know ☐

7. If there is an optional ethics course, have you taken this course yet?  
   Yes ☐ No ☐

8. If you have taken the optional ethics course, which of the following were emphasized:  
   _____ the teaching of specific professional codes of ethics  
   _____ the application of specific professional codes of ethics to cases  
   _____ the facilitation of ethical decision making  
   _____ the discussion of issues such as professional identity and guidelines for licensing  
   _____ don't know  
   _____ other/please specify: _______________________________
Background Information on Your Graduate Training

9. Does your university program provide ethics education embedded throughout the course curriculum?  Yes ☐  No ☐  Somewhat ☐  Don’t know ☐

10. Does your program provide a seminar or workshop about sexual attraction to clients?  Yes ☐  No ☐  Somewhat ☐  Don’t know ☐

11. Does your program provide instruction or guidance about sexual attraction to clients?  Yes ☐  No ☐  Somewhat ☐  Don’t know ☐

12. Many psychology programs are influenced by one or more theoretical orientations which they strongly identify with. Please rank order the following theoretical orientations in terms of the degree to which your program has emphasized it. One (1) is most influential while six (6) is least influential.

_____ Behavioral  _____ Cognitive  _____ Eclectic
_____ Humanistic/Experiential  _____ Psychodynamic/Psychoanalytic
_____ Other/Please specify: ____________________________
APPENDIX C

Factor Subscales for the Therapeutic Practice Survey Based on Borys (1988)
Factor Subscales for the Therapeutic Practice Survey

Incidental Involvements
Accepting a gift worth under $10 from a male client.
Accepting a gift worth under $10 from a female client.
Accepting a gift worth over $50 from a male client.
Accepting a gift worth over $50 from a female client.
Accepting a male client's invitation to a special occasion.
Accepting a female client's invitation to a special occasion.

Social/Financial Involvements
Becoming friends with a male client after termination.
Becoming friends with a female client after termination.
Engaging in sexual activity with a male client after termination.
Engaging in sexual activity with a female client after termination.
Employing a male client.
Employing a female client.
Disclosing personal details of current personal stresses to a male client.
Disclosing personal details of current personal stresses to a female client.
Going out to eat with a male client after a session.
Going out to eat with a female client after a session.
Selling a product to a male client.
Selling a product to a female client.
Inviting male clients to an office/clinic open house.
Inviting female clients to an office/clinic open house.
Accepting a service or product as payment for therapy from a male client.
Accepting a service or product as payment for therapy from a female client.
Buying goods or services from a male client.
Buying goods or services from a female client.
Inviting female clients to a personal party or social event.

Dual Professional Roles
Providing therapy to a then-current male employee.
Providing therapy to a then-current female employee.
Providing therapy to a current male student or supervisee.
Providing therapy to a current female student or supervisee.
Providing individual therapy to a relative, friend, or lover of an ongoing male client.
Providing individual therapy to a relative, friend, or lover of an ongoing female client.
Allowing a male client to enroll in one's class for a grade.
Allowing a female client to enroll in one's class for a grade.
APPENDIX D

A Detailed History of the Items Comprising the Professional and Social Experiences with Faculty and the Perceptions of Students' Experiences with Faculty Questionnaires
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS FROM THE PROFESSIONAL AND SOCIAL EXPERIENCES WITH FACULTY AND THE PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS' EXPERIENCES WITH FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRES</th>
<th>PREVIOUS RESEARCH WHICH USED THE SAME OR SIMILARLY WORDED ITEMS</th>
<th>ITEM #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invited you to a personal party or social event?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted your invitation to a personal party or social event?</td>
<td>Borys &amp; Pope, 1989; Pope, Tabachnick, &amp; Keith-Spiegel, 1987; Keith-Spiegel, Tabachnick, &amp; Allen, 1993; Tabachnick, Keith-Spiegel, &amp; Pope, 1991</td>
<td>2; 14; 33; 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked small favours from you (e.g., a ride home)?</td>
<td>Tabachnick, Keith-Spiegel, &amp; Pope, 1991</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted to draw you into a discussion of personal or sexual matters?</td>
<td>Fitzgerald, Weitzman, Gold, &amp; Ormerod, 1988; Keith-Spiegel, Tabachnick, &amp; Allen, 1993</td>
<td>5; 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted to sell goods to you such as a car or books?</td>
<td>Borys &amp; Pope, 1989*; Keith-Spiegel, Tabachnick, &amp; Allen, 1993; Tabachnick, Keith-Spiegel, &amp; Pope, 1991</td>
<td>5; 15; 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given you a gift worth under $10?</td>
<td>Borys &amp; Pope, 1989*; Tabachnick, Keith-Spiegel, &amp; Pope, 1991*</td>
<td>1; 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lent you books or articles from their personal library?</td>
<td>Fitzgerald, Weitzman, Gold, &amp; Ormerod, 1988</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed to write a letter of recommendation and then has missed the deadline for handing it in?</td>
<td>Keith-Spiegel, Tabachnick, &amp; Allen, 1993</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Item is worded differently
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS FROM THE PROFESSIONAL AND SOCIAL EXPERIENCES WITH FACULTY AND THE PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS' EXPERIENCES WITH FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRES</th>
<th>PREVIOUS RESEARCH WHICH USED THE SAME OR SIMILARLY WORDED ITEMS</th>
<th>ITEM #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sought advice or support from you concerning their personal life (e.g., family, financial or sexual matters)?</td>
<td>Fitzgerald, Weitzman, Gold, &amp; Ormerod, 1988*; Keith-Spiegel, Tabachnick, &amp; Allen, 1993*</td>
<td>4; 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended department sponsored gatherings (e.g., wine and cheese socials)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered you a job related to university work (e.g., teaching or research assistantship)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered you a job outside of the university (e.g., clinical private practice work, clerical work)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked to borrow money from you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written you a letter of reference?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged work-related meetings after hours or off campus?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Item is worded differently
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ITEMS FROM THE PROFESSIONAL AND SOCIAL EXPERIENCES WITH FACULTY AND THE PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS' EXPERIENCES WITH FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRES</strong></th>
<th><strong>PREVIOUS RESEARCH WHICH USED THE SAME OR SIMILARLY WORDED ITEMS</strong></th>
<th><strong>ITEM #</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Been your therapist?</td>
<td>Keith-Spiegel, Tabachnick, &amp; Allen, 1993*; Pope, Tabachnick, &amp; Keith-Spiegel, 1987*</td>
<td>85; 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given you a gift worth over $50?</td>
<td>Borys &amp; Pope, 1989; Tabachnick, Keith-Spiegel, &amp; Pope, 1991*</td>
<td>6; 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked you to house sit, pet sit or babysit for them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made an unsolicited attempt to stroke, caress, or touch you?</td>
<td>Fitzgerald, Weitzman, Gold, &amp; Ormerod, 1988; Tabachnick, Keith-Spiegel, &amp; Pope, 1991*</td>
<td>19; 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited you home to dinner with their family?</td>
<td>Fitzgerald, Weitzman, Gold, &amp; Ormerod, 1988</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been a co-author with you on a journal article or conference presentation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been late for class or an appointment with you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Item is worded differently
APPENDIX E

Educational Characteristics of Respondents
Table E.1

**Present Education Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completing M.A., M.Ed., or M.Sc.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have M.A., M.Ed., or M.Sc.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have M.A., M.Ed., or M.Sc. and are completing Ph.D.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completing Ph.D.</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 309
Table E.2

Area of Specialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational/School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 310
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Clinical Training</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing practicum</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed practicum</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing internship</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed internship</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed/Upgrading</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 293
Table E.4

**Primary Population of Clinical Training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Population</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Adults</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Adolescents</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults &amp; Adolescents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children, Adults &amp; Adolescents</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 304
APPENDIX F

Characteristics of Respondents' University Programs
Table F.1

Program Accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint CPA and APA</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 277
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethics Course</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Course</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Course</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 286
Table F.3

Theoretical Orientation of the Psychology Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Orientation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclectic</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychodynamic</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 292
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