

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

**Xerox University Microfilms**

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

76-16,231

MARTIN, George Eric, 1938-  
UNDERGRADUATE REHABILITATION STUDENTS'  
ETHICAL DISCRIMINATION ABILITY.

The University of Arizona, Ed.D., 1976  
Education, guidance and counseling

**Xerox University Microfilms,** Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

UNDERGRADUATE REHABILITATION STUDENTS'  
ETHICAL DISCRIMINATION ABILITY

by

George Eric Martin

---

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the  
REHABILITATION CENTER

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 7 6

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

I hereby recommend that this dissertation prepared under my  
direction by George Eric Martin  
entitled Undergraduate Rehabilitation Students' Ethical  
Discrimination Ability  
be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement of the  
degree of Doctor of Education

Thomas L. Fisher  
Dissertation Director

12-1-75  
Date

After inspection of the final copy of the dissertation, the  
following members of the Final Examination Committee concur in  
its approval and recommend its acceptance:\*

<u>R. L. Johnson</u>	<u>12-1-75</u>
<u>Paul H. ...</u>	<u>12-1-75</u>
<u>T. L. Fisher</u>	<u>12-1-75</u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>

\*This approval and acceptance is contingent on the candidate's  
adequate performance and defense of this dissertation at the  
final oral examination. The inclusion of this sheet bound into  
the library copy of the dissertation is evidence of satisfactory  
performance at the final examination.

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: \_\_\_\_\_

*H Eric Martin*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To those whose assistance made this dissertation possible, a special acknowledgment must be made:

To my committee chairman, Dr. Tom Fisher and Doctors Bob Gene Johnson and Paul Leung, who along with Dr. Fisher served as my major advisors.

To Doctors Bob Grant and Henry Butler, who as members of my minor committee, provided the interprofessional interest and support and whose contribution was of special significance.

To Tim and Ana Maria Tucker, Irene Armsworth, Shirley Joiner and Catherine Rodenkirch for their support in the preparation of this manuscript.

To my father, Arnold Martin, for both his personal and professional assistance and to my mother, Vera Martin for her considerable influence.

To Doctors Eugene A. Hall and Ned R. Ash for their special assistance.

A note of special thanks to my colleagues at Stephen F. Austin State University, Doctors David Jeffery, Ida Anderson, Ray Henke, Ms. Judy Newsome, Mr. Fred Hicks, Mr. Bob Bryan and Mr. Robert LaDuke, and especially to my Department Head, Dr. Bill W. Hamrick for the cooperation and advisement in the conduct of this research.

To my wife, Pamela, without whose warm support and understanding  
I might never have completed this project.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
ABSTRACT . . . . .	viii
1. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	1
Research Questions . . . . .	5
Limitations . . . . .	6
Definition of Terms . . . . .	6
Ethics . . . . .	6
General Ethics . . . . .	6
Counseling Ethics . . . . .	6
Testing Ethics . . . . .	7
Discriminatory Ability . . . . .	7
Appropriate Ethical Behavior . . . . .	7
2. RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	8
Overview of Selected Ethical Literature . . . . .	8
Review of Counseling Ethics . . . . .	10
Review of the Ethical Discrimination	
Research Literature . . . . .	13
Summary . . . . .	18
3. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	19
Selection Procedure . . . . .	19
Instruments . . . . .	20
Data Collection . . . . .	22
Data Analysis . . . . .	23
Analysis of Variance . . . . .	23
Summary . . . . .	24
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION . . . . .	25
SFA ANOVA Results . . . . .	25
Sex . . . . .	25
Age . . . . .	26
Religious Preference . . . . .	26
Class Standing . . . . .	26
Read Code of Ethics . . . . .	27



TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
Summary of SFASU ANOVA . . . . .	27
U of A Data . . . . .	28
Sex . . . . .	28
Read Code of Ethics . . . . .	28
Mean Percentage Scores for Stephen F. Austin State University . . . . .	29
Mean Percentage Scores for The University of Arizona . . . . .	29
Mean Percentage Scores for Total Group . . . . .	30
Summary . . . . .	31
5. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUMMARY . . . . .	32
Conclusions . . . . .	32
Arizona Data Discussion . . . . .	34
Conclusion Summary . . . . .	37
Recommendations . . . . .	37
Specific Recommendations . . . . .	38
Summary . . . . .	39
APPENDIX A: INSTRUMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS . . . . .	41
APPENDIX B: ANOVA TABLES . . . . .	50
REFERENCES . . . . .	66

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. One-way ANOVA F Values for the Variable of Sex, SFA . . . . .	25
2. One-way ANOVA F Values for the Variable of Age, SFA . . . . .	26
3. One-way ANOVA F Values for the Variable of Religion, SFA . . . . .	26
4. One-way ANOVA F Values for the Variable of Class Standing, SFA . . . . .	27
5. One-way ANOVA F Values for the Variable of Read Code, SFA . . . . .	27
6. One-way ANOVA F Values for the Variable of Sex, U of A . . . . .	28
7. One-way ANOVA F Values for the Variable of Read Code, U of A . . . . .	29
8. Mean Percentage Scores for SFA . . . . .	29
9. Mean Percentage Scores for U of A . . . . .	30
10. Total Mean Percentage Score for Total Group . . . . .	31

## ABSTRACT

Little systematic research has been done in counseling ethics.

This study was conducted to answer the following questions:

1. Can undergraduate students in two selected undergraduate programs select ethically appropriate behavioral responses from ethically inappropriate behavioral responses?
2. What relationships exist between the demographic variables of sex, age, religious preference, method of exposure and ethical discrimination ability?
3. Is the ability of undergraduate rehabilitation students' appropriate ethical discrimination response comparable to the APGA members' responses on the same instrument?
4. Is the ethical discrimination ability of advanced undergraduate students different from the ethical discrimination ability of beginning undergraduate student?

The Morris critical incident test and a demographic questionnaire were administered to undergraduate students in rehabilitation at two selected universities.

Data were analyzed on 212 Stephen F. Austin undergraduates and 29 University of Arizona undergraduates. Single classification analysis of variance was used. To determine which demographic variables were significant, alpha was set at the .05 level. The grand mean scores of

undergraduates were compared with the grand mean scores on the same criterion instrument of APGA members.

The variables of religion and the subscore test on general ethics and sex paired with counseling ethics were found significant at the .05 level or above for the Stephen F. Austin population. Subjects with no religious preference and females scored highest. Conclusions were tempered by several cautions and a strong recommendation for further investigation and research before major changes in programs be made based on this and previous ethical research. Undergraduate student groups scored lower on the ethical discrimination critical incident test than did APGA members previously sampled.

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### Statement of the Problem

Ethics have long been a concern in the history of Western thought. Ethics have been, and continue to be, a major area for the fields of philosophy, theology, the professions of law and medicine, as well as the disciplines of the behavioral and physical sciences. Recent occurrences in the social and political areas have indicated the importance of ethical matters. The older professions of medicine and law have been forced to reexamine ethical concerns. Particularly in light of the recent Watergate scandals, the legal profession has had to examine and to utilize its ethical codes of conduct and standards to insure public confidence in its professional practice. Ethics, however, are not the sole concern of philosophers, theologians, doctors, or lawyers. Schertzer and Morris (1972, p. 200) comment, "Ethics and ethically appropriate behavior have intrigued man throughout recorded history and are held to be of special import to those whose occupations involved them in helping their fellow man, doctors, lawyers, social workers or counselors." If the counseling profession is to avoid the current predicament in which other professions have found themselves, it is apparent that a serious examination of ethical issues and concerns must be made to insure that codes of ethics and ethical practices

are understood by the members of the profession. A profession such as counseling is defined in part by the adoption of a code of ethics. Moore (1970) discusses the one criterion, among others, which enables an occupation to be classified as a profession is the adoption of a code of ethics.

Gilbert C. Wrenn applied the APA ethical code to the counselor's work to enable the counseling profession to meet the requirements for developing professional standards. Wrenn did this by analyzing the counselor's loyalties to his clients, society, the employing institution, and himself (Schertzer and Stone, 1968). Interest in the emerging counseling profession's development of a code of ethics was further demonstrated by the American Personnel and Guidance Association's (APGA, 1961) code of ethics. Schertzer and Stone (1968, p. 496) state ". . . the setting down in 1953 of a list of ethical standards for psychologists and the approval by the APGA in 1961 of a code of ethics for its membership were major achievements by both organizations in providing ethical standards for all counselors for the members of these organizations or not."

The field of rehabilitation counseling, which traces its origin in the United States to the development of the state/federal vocational rehabilitation programs in the years following World War I, did not begin its professional level graduate rehabilitation counselor training programs until 1954. From 1954 until 1971, when a code of ethics specific to the field of rehabilitation counseling (Carnes, 1971) was developed, the rehabilitation counseling field and most rehabilitation

counselor training education programs had utilized the American Personnel and Guidance Association code of ethics as the guideline for counselor-conflict situations. The Ethical Practices Committee of the APGA, in order to further delineate ethical case practices, published the Ethical Standards Casebook in 1965. The importance of training in ethical conduct to graduate counseling programs was pointed out by Wrenn (1962) in his recommendations that the minimal two year graduate program should include an introduction to the problems of ethical relationships and legal responsibilities in counseling. Although the APGA publication of the code of ethics was a major step in the development of ethical conduct, it is limited in that it represents an intuitive rather than an empirical approach. Morris (1968, p. 4) states:

With the APGA's presentation of its code of ethics in an illustrative casebook, all has been done which can be done from an intuitive orientation. Correspondingly, enough position articles on ethics and appropriate ethical behavior and practice have accompanied the development of the professional code to give the counseling profession some idea regarding the proper implementation of its ethics. Research must now be undertaken to investigate the counselor's ability to discriminate between ethical and unethical practice and respond appropriately.

One empirical study reported by Schertzer and Morris (1972) was conducted to determine (a) whether APGA members could in a given situation select an ethically appropriate behavior response from inappropriate responses, and (b) whether certain demographic variables were related to the subject's discriminatory ability. Although the Schertzer and Morris study did not attempt to ascertain causes of unethical practice, it has been argued that one of the possible causes (Schwebel, 1955a) of unethical practice could be ignorance of

appropriate ethical conduct. The results of the study reported by Schertzer and Morris (1972) indicated that APGA members could discriminate ethical behavior options considered appropriate at a statistically significant level different than chance. Recent research in rehabilitation counseling has found no differences in the ability or performance between professionally trained and untrained counselors (Traux and Carkhuff, 1968). Although ethical behavior may not be related to counseling competence, it is most certainly an important and necessary aspect of the counselor's function. If undergraduate students who, in many instances, will become employed in the rehabilitation field after the baccalaureate degree, are unable to discriminate appropriate ethical behavior as well as members of the APGA, i.e., employed professionals, it would provide support for the existing emphasis on training at the graduate level or indicate the need for some strong remedial training at the undergraduate level. Schertzer and Morris (1972) point out that since the publication of the APGA code of ethics little professional literature has dealt with ethical concerns and even fewer articles on the subject have been derived from research evidence. This problem is now new. Both Schwebel (1955a) and Hobbs (1959) commented upon the dirth of research-based literature in this area and appealed to their colleagues to remedy the situation. Gazda, Duncan, and Sisson (1971) have indicated that the proliferation of counseling specialties and the growth of ethical concerns are even more important today because of the general increase of counseling practice.



It is the purpose of this study to investigate the problem of ethical discrimination ability of undergraduate rehabilitation students utilizing the ethical discrimination criterion instrument developed by Morris (1968). The study is intended to further investigate the demographic variables of religious preference and methods of exposure to professional ethics which were found significant in the Schertzer and Morris study on an undergraduate rehabilitation student population.

This study is directed to the following questions:

1. To what extent do undergraduate rehabilitation students recognize the ethical implications of situations which are apt to occur in their work?
2. Which variables seem to have a significant relationship to this discriminatory ability?
3. What differences are there, if any, between the ethical discrimination ability of undergraduate students and APGA members?

#### Research Questions

This study is designed to obtain answers to the following questions:

1. Can undergraduate students in two selected undergraduate programs select ethically appropriate behavioral responses from ethically inappropriate behavioral responses?
2. What relationships exist between the demographic variables of sex, age, religious reference, method of exposure and ethical discrimination ability?
3. Is the ability of undergraduate rehabilitation students' appropriate ethical discrimination response comparable to APGA members' responses on the same instrument?
4. Is the ethical discrimination ability of advanced undergraduate students different from the ethical discrimination ability of beginning undergraduate students?

### Limitations

Due to the method of selection for this study, the results could not be considered applicable to undergraduate students of other rehabilitation programs not included in the study nor can the subjects be regarded as representative of any population.

### Definition of Terms

#### Ethics

Those standards specified by the APGA ". . . to clarify to members, future members, and to those served by members the nature of ethical responsibilities held in common by its members" (Ethical Practices Committee, 1965, p. 5).

#### General Ethics

Those ethical standards covered in Section A of the APGA code of ethics. This section covers ". . . principles germane to the six areas and common to the entire work of the Association members" (Ethical Practices Committee, 1965, p. 5).

#### Counseling Ethics

Those ethical standards covered in Section B of the APGA code of ethics. This section refers ". . . to practices involving a counseling relationship with a counselee or client and is not intended to be applicable to practices involving administrative relationships with the persons being helped" (Ethical Practices Committee, 1965, p. 14).

### Testing Ethics

Those ethical standards covered in Section C of the APGA code of ethics. This section covers principles germane to appropriate ethical behavior in the measurement and evaluation phases of guidance.

### Discriminatory Ability

The ability of an individual to differentiate between appropriate ethical behavior in a given situation and inappropriate, unethical behavior in said situation.

### Appropriate Ethical Behavior

That response to the situation under consideration which is in accord with the ethical principle upon which the situation is based (Morris, 1968).

## CHAPTER 2

### RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter is divided into three parts. The first section presents a brief overview of selected literature on ethics; the second section provides a review of the literature of counseling ethics; the third section reviews ethical discrimination research in counseling and related fields.

#### Overview of Selected Ethical Literature

The Literature of Ethics in Western Culture points to long standing concern for guidelines for human conduct. Bertrand Russell (1945, pp. 172-173) says of Aristotle's ethics:

The view of Aristotle on ethics represent, in the main, the prevailing opinions of educated and experienced men of his day. They are not, like Plato's, impregnated with mystical religion; nor do they countenance such unorthodox theories as are to be found in the Republic concerning property and the family. Those who neither fall below nor rise above the level of decent, well-behaved citizens will find in the Ethics a systematic account of the principles by which they hold that their conduct should be regulated.

The concern for a systematic account of the principles by which conduct should be regulated is mirrored some 2,000 years later by Tramer (1953, p. 19) ". . . The only concern of professional ethics is how people behave especially in their relations with others . . . in professional life, normal actions may be conditioned by a particular

profession and it is with such situations that professional ethics have to deal."

Israel Scheffler (1965, p.6) points out this concern to the area of education by saying "It is hardly necessary to argue that education rests on considerations of value and principles of conduct."

Morris (1968, p. 10), in reviewing pioneer literature in counseling ethics, found the first application of the pertinence of Ethics to the field of counseling was made by Powell who noted the need for ". . . a simple code of ethics for the individual counselor. At present the author does not know of such a statement for counselors."

Morris further indicates that between the appearance of the Powell 1944 article and that of Wrenn (1962), which also dealt with counseling ethics, there appeared a series of four articles on ethics in psychology which seemed to catalyze the whole area of concern about professional ethics.

Sutich's (1944) listed and illustrated 51 duties and rights of counselors. Wrenn (1962, pp. 11, 12) indicates that reception of Sutich's article was influenced by Sutich's use of the non-directive point of view as a basis for his code. The "reception" mentioned by Wrenn refers to the reply articles of Sargent (1945), Bixler and Seeman (1946), and Meehl and McClosky (1947). The articles in reply to Sutich's article differed not in the need for a set of guidelines, but in arguments about what should be included in the guidelines. The result of all four articles was as Wrenn states, "We were still without a code of ethics."

### Review of Counseling Ethics

In 1952, Samuel Gluck proposed the first code of ethics for counselors. He and his associates carefully examined the codes of ethics of four other professions: law, medicine, psychology, and social work. The code presented was compiled by selecting principles from the four codes which were seen as applicable for counseling. Wrenn felt it necessary that a written code of ethics for counseling be established:

The ethics of dealing with the intimate self-stuff of a counseling interview takes both personal discernment and professional standards of behavior. Without a code of carefully conceived ethical principles a counselor may unwittingly injure himself in the eyes of both his client and his professional colleagues (Wrenn, 1962, p. 164).

Since the publication of the APGA code of ethics, McGowan and Schmidt (1962, p. 583) felt that the goal for counselors ". . . can be to work toward bringing their functions and those of their members of the profession into the framework provided by these statements of ethical standards." They felt the code served at least five separate and distinct purposes:

1. Provides a position on standards of practice to assist each member of the profession in deciding what he should do when situations of conflict arise in his work.
2. Helps clarify the counselor's responsibilities to the client and protects the client from the counselor's violation of, or his failure to fulfill, these responsibilities.
3. Gives the profession some assurance that the practices of members will not be detrimental to its general functions and purposes.
4. Gives society some guarantee that the services of the counselor will demonstrate a sensible regard for the social codes and moral expectations of the community in which he works.

5. Offers the counselor himself some grounds for safeguarding his own privacy and integrity (McGowan and Schmidt, 1962, pp. 585-586).

In his review of counseling ethics literature Morris notes the variety of articles which ". . . are primarily attempts on the part of the various authors to state an existing position (or state of affairs) concerning ethics and/or a personal, felt position concerning ethics." These articles run the gamut of professional ethics from confidentiality to legal considerations; from ethical responsibilities to ethics in counselor education (Morris, 1968, p. 17). Selected from these considerations are the writings of Beck, who noted that students look to counselor educators for guidelines, and that students assign several expectations to the counselor educator because he:

1. Has special skills useful in dealing with the usual problems.
2. Has had experiences which can provide patterns of approach for investigating and acting upon unusual or exceptionally serious problems.
3. Knows the limits within which his expertise lies.
4. Searches for ways to improve his services, and
5. Has the ability to pass on to others what he knows and does (Beck, 1967, p. 216).

It is Beck's contention that the APGA code of ethics not only sanctions, but obligates the counselor educator to meet all these expectations.

Schwebel's (1955b, pp. 123-125) article entitled "Why Unethical Practice?" which Morris cites as one of the few which attempts to delineate between ethical and unethical behavior, as does the Ethical Standards Casebook of the Ethical Practices Committee. Schwebel states three hypotheses with regard to the reasons behind unethical behavior. It is Schwebel's

belief that unethical behavior is the result of: "(1) the need for self-enhancement on the part of the counselor, (2) unsound judgement due to inadequate training and/or supervised experience, or (3) ignorance of proper ethical behavior"(Schwebel, 1955, pp. 123-125).

Patterson (1958) was concerned with the role and function of the counselor's ethics and values in the counseling relationship. He stated ". . . the counselor's ethics, values, and philosophy determined his goals in counseling, and he should not be required to compromise these if he does not choose to do so" (Patterson, 1958, p. 218). The writings of Segal (1959), Murphy (1955), and Williamson (1958 and 1962) all support the idea expressed by Patterson that the counselor's ethical beliefs are present and operative in the counseling relationship. Morris also notes that the writings of Curran (1960), Klinger (1962), Kagan (1959), Mann (1959), Meehl (1959), Nash (1964), Rosenthal (1955), Landfield and Nawas (1964), Sinick (1964), and Walters (1958) all support the concept that the counselor's ethical and/or valuational beliefs influence counseling outcomes.

Katz presented evidence indicating that unethical practices in the field of clinical investigations do indeed occur and they ". . . are more serious in nature than any rational thinking ethical investigator has any reason to expect"(1967, p. 360).

Morris (1968) comments, "The first demand for research into ethical behavior appeared in Schwebel's "Why Unethical Practice?" The plea for research oriented investigation was again made by Hobbs (1959). Since that time, a period of ten years, three research projects have



been undertaken. In Morris's judgment, this is an extremely minute amount of systematic exploration for an area which has received as much attention as that of professional ethics (Morris, 1968).

This section has indicated the ethical concerns of the counseling professional literature and the development of the need for research in counseling ethics.

#### Review of the Ethical Discrimination Research Literature

Jones (1929), was the forerunner in Ethical Discrimination Research Literature. An ethical discrimination test of 68 situations was administered to 118 adults interested in teaching. The test was marked in accordance with the adult's own ideal and, after a 12-hour interval, was marked in accordance with what was believed to be the generally accepted standard. There was little agreement as to what was right or wrong in either case. On the average there was a wide gap between personal ideals and accepted standards.

Donnelly (1941), used a questionnaire designed to discover attitudes and opinions regarding moral and ethical standards. Parental influence was most effective. Students who said they were guided by religious teachings presented a healthful attitude toward moral habits, rights of others, and maintenance of standards. A contrary point of view was expressed by students who reported being largely influenced by social approval. A high correlation was found between the latter group and strict home discipline.

Quimby (1944), conducted a survey study to check on ". . . the prevalence of pseudo practices and discern . . . what is being done to counteract them"(p. 77). His conclusion was that "Many schools seem to be aware of unethical practices but fail to warn their pupils" (Quimby, 1944, p. 78). Brell (1949) studied the relationships between (1) the value beliefs professed by elementary school teachers in two public schools in a selected community, (2) the value beliefs of these teachers as revealed by their professional practice, and (3) the social class status of these teachers. Brell found: (1) Eighty percent of teachers indicated by behavior beliefs that they were more authoritarian than democratic, (2) a wide discrepancy exists between what they profess as value beliefs and what they practice, (3) teachers of upper middle class standing do not differ from teachers of lower middle class standing either in profession or practice of value beliefs which relate to interpersonal relationships between teachers and children, (4) the study suggests that the very discrepancy between profession and practice of value beliefs documented by the investigation is what the behavior of middle class teachers perpetuate.

Mull (1952, p.69) measured ethical insight of 440 students. Mull found that "Ethical insight improves during the four-year college course; the oughts of custom and law are relatively well understood, those of safety and completeness, poorly." Mull's study indicated that self-help students are superior in ethical insight to nonself-help students as measured by the Hollingsworth Scale. Offenders against the rules of the honor system were less successful academically than non-offenders and may have been inferior in ethical insight.

Jones (1958, p. 2002) states "Efforts have been made to establish the ethical discriminatory level of various individuals and groups within our society. Such attempts have covered both juveniles and adults." Jones continued the efforts by determining if ". . . there was a measurable difference in the ability of high school students with disciplinary records and those with records of leadership to discriminate ethically between correct and incorrect actions" (Jones, 1958, p. 2002).

Utilizing ten problem situations based on common adolescent disciplinary infractions, Jones (1958) found significant differences in ethical discriminatory ability between the following groups: urban disciplinary and urban leadership, urban disciplinary and urban control, rural disciplinary and rural leadership, rural disciplinary and rural control. In each case the disciplinary groups rated lower in ethical discriminatory abilities; there were no significant differences in the other comparisons made; there were no significant differences between groups on the basis of economic background and home conditions.

Smith (1960), studying how secondary school counselors felt about revealing confidences discovered that they believed their social obligation choices were more important than their counselee obligations. She discovered that "The greater the amount of public school testing experience the respondent had, the greater was his degree of loyalty to society, and the lesser was his feeling of loyalty to the counselee," as reported in Adams (1965, p. 203).

Jones and Shaffer (1963) studied the ethical discriminatory abilities of high school students. He found that those students who come from

moderate to high income backgrounds and/or who were involved in leadership activities were quite adept in ethical discrimination and those who had disciplinary difficulties lacked the ability to discriminate ethically.

Hamsher and Reznikoff (1967) described a study in which a questionnaire dealing with ethical issues in psychological research and graduate training was sent to Connecticut psychologists. The authors found an inverse relationship between research involvement and ethical concern and consistent relationship between ethical position and occupational subgroup. That is, research psychologists seemed to have little concern about ethics, whereas other psychologists showed great interest in professional ethics, particularly those ethics pertaining to their APA division.

Morris (1968), through the use of a critical incident questionnaire administered to a random sample of APGA members, found:

1. Males did better on the testing ethics section
2. APGA members' religious preferences seemed important in the area of counseling and testing ethics
3. Amount of education seemed to be of importance in general counseling and total ethics
4. Members exposed via an entire graduate course did not acquire a working knowledge of counseling ethics or did not retain the knowledge conveyed to them through the course, as the method of exposure to the subject of professional ethics was significant in all areas of ethical concern.

Mykel (1971) attempted ". . . to bring group ethics into better focus by looking at aspects of the ethical practices of group psychotherapists" (p. 248). A questionnaire designed to elicit practical

procedures in several ethically sensitive areas were mailed to 70 psychologists, 16 psychiatrists and 6 psychiatric residents in a large Southern city. Moral and legal standards, client relationship, client welfare, were areas of confidentiality probed in the investigation.

Mykel's results indicated diversity in the responses in all three areas. Mykel (1971, p. 253) notes "In a very real way what therapists do to protect the welfare of their clients depends upon their theoretical orientation."

Gazda, Duncan, and Sisson (1971) sent a questionnaire to 1,000 members of the APGA Interest group to establish the extent of unethical practice in the broad field of group work. One hundred sixty-four returns reported 20 ethical violations, or what appeared to be violations of ethics.

Recommendations included revising current ethical codes to incorporate aspects particularly relevant to group practice.

Spence (1975) studied the effects of a programmed text in reinforcing ethical standards of the APGA in graduate counseling students. The experimental group did significantly better on the post-test than on the pre-test. The experimental group also scored significantly higher on the post-test than the control group. There were no significant differences between the pre-test and the post-test scores of the control group.

Summary

In summary, ethical discrimination research has been attempted in fields related to counseling, such as education, and psychology intermittently, for many years. However, in view of the magnitude and importance of the problem of ethical knowledge and abilities, little research has actually been done, and very few conclusions can be said to be based on empirical evidence. In short, there is still a minute amount of systematic exploration available in the area of counseling ethics.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the procedures which were used in the collection and analysis of the data. The chapter includes sections dealing with selection procedure, instruments, data collection, data analysis, analysis of variance, and a summary.

#### Selection Procedure

Since the proposed study was to carry out recommendations to extend the use of the criterion instrument to undergraduate populations as was stated in Chapter 1, two undergraduate populations were chosen. The undergraduate social and rehabilitation population at Stephen F. Austin State University was chosen as it is the second oldest undergraduate rehabilitation program in the United States. Although the undergraduate rehabilitation program at The University of Arizona is younger, its faculty is comprised of the members of one of the oldest graduate rehabilitation counseling programs in the country. Thus, both programs reflected considerable experience in the relatively new development of undergraduate rehabilitation education. As students from only two programs were to be tested, no attempt was made to randomly select subjects.

### Instruments

Two research instruments were administered to all subjects selected for participation in the study: (1) a Demographic and Personal Data Questionnaire (Appendix A), (2) the Morris Critical Incident Counseling Ethics Questionnaire (Appendix B). Administration of all instruments was untimed and was preceded by an explanation of the purpose of the study and instructions (Appendix C).

The Demographic and Personal Data Questionnaire (DPQ) was adapted from the demographic questionnaire developed by Morris (1968, p. 118) with the addition of questions appropriate to the goals of the present study and deletions of questions which were not appropriate for the undergraduate population (Appendix A). The purpose of the DPQ was to duplicate the demographic variable of sex, age, religious preference, educational exposure to the subject of professional counseling ethics as well as to identify school attended and class standing in their undergraduate program.

Because of the scarcity of research material available, the selection of the criterion instrument was limited to those instruments which had been used or developed in recent research. As the instrument used in this study has not been used other than the developmental research by Morris some discussion of the development of the instrument has been included:

Morris (1968) chose the critical incident technique developed and described by Flanagan (1954). Flanagan felt that an instrument



using critical incidents would most readily assess an APGA member's stated reaction to an incident by presenting ". . . instances of behavior considered to be especially favorable or unfavorable for a given purpose" (Anastasi, 1961, p. 631).

Morris developed the critical incidents by identifying and selecting such descriptive incidents as might already be available. He then judged them as to adaptability to the questionnaire format; he randomly selected the items chosen and inserted them into the multiple-choice format. He chose the Ethical Standards Casebook incidents since they were written by professional counselors for the consumption of other professional counselor using concepts, phrases, and settings similar to those encountered by the consumer of the casebook, the APGA member. Morris felt that the careful preparation of the EPC in perfecting the incidents for the consumption of their professional peers, provided a source of critical incidents having at least content validity.

Morris chose four critical incident situations from each of the first three sections of the code of ethics, each covering a different ethical statement within the code.

Morris then developed a distractor pool with the aid of members of the Purdue Counselor Education Program. From this pool a panel of three counselor educators pooled judgments concerning the plausibility of the response and the degree of ethical violation reflected by the distractor. Finally, four distractors were picked for each question.

The reliability of the instrument was established by the Test Retest Method. The reliability sample was chosen from the 729 individuals who returned the original packet.

The reliability study was conducted after an appropriate waiting period. The return N was 109, or 73.1% of the reliability sample N of 149. (The original N was reduced by the return of one packet marked undeliverable.)

A test retest reliability coefficient (Morris, 1968, p. 35) was obtained for each of three sections of the instrument and for the total test score. These coefficients are as follows:

1. Reliability for general ethics section, items 1-4 - .8102
2. Reliability for counseling ethics section, items 5-8 - .7233
3. Reliability for testing ethics section, items 9-12 - .7724
4. Reliability for total ethics score, items 1-12 - .9028

Use of the Fisher and Yates table for "Values of 4 for Different Levels of Significance" (Downie and Heath, 1965, p. 306) indicates that all four reliability coefficients are significant beyond the .01 level of significance.

#### Data Collection

The criterion instrument and the demographic questionnaire were administered to all 212 undergraduate students who were enrolled in Social and Rehabilitation courses at Stephen F. Austin State University during the Spring Semester, 1973. In addition, 29 students who were enrolled in the University of Arizona undergraduate program during the Spring Semester of 1973 also completed the demographic questionnaire

and the criterion instrument. The questionnaires and criterion instrument were administered by the faculty of Stephen F. Austin State University as a part of regularly scheduled class time. The questionnaires and criterion instrument along with the instruction sheets were sent to The University of Arizona program to be administered by the faculty of that institution. The data were collected during a three week period at Stephen F. Austin and during an eight week period at The University of Arizona.

#### Data Analysis

Once the data had been collected and returned to the investigator, the information on the demographic questionnaire, and the critical incident criterion test scores were coded and punched on IBM cards.

As described in Chapter 1, the prime purpose of this study is to answer the research questions concerning undergraduate rehabilitation students' ability to make appropriate ethical discriminations. To compare that ability, with the previously demonstrated ability of APGA members, and to explore the relationship between the demographic variables and the undergraduates' ethical discrimination ability.

#### Analysis of Variance

The critical incident questionnaire yields four measures of ethical discriminatory ability. Each subject received a score between zero and four, for the areas of general counseling and testing ethics, with the total ethics score ranging from zero to twelve. The analysis of variance method was chosen in order to facilitate comparisons between the SFA and Arizona data and the Morris APGA data.

The methodologies are similar for both studies and the suitability for unequal numbers was a major factor in choosing ANOVA (Glass and Stanley, 1970). Four ANOVA's were run for each demographic variable, one for each subscore and one for total score. The .05 alpha level was chosen. The results of the ANOVA are presented in Appendix B. The question of the undergraduates' ability to ethically discriminate was tested by inspection and comparison of the group means.

#### Summary

Chapter 3 has described the procedure for the selection of subjects, the instrument employed, and procedures used in the collection and analysis of data.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter will report statistical results obtained from the data on the undergraduate students at Stephen F. Austin State University and discuss the data obtained from The University of Arizona undergraduates. The ANOVA results on the SFA students will be discussed by listing each variable in order of its appearance on the DPQ. This will be followed by a table listing the obtained F values, and a brief discussion of the results observed in the table. The mean percentage scores on each subtest and the total test will be reported.

#### SFA ANOVA Results

##### Sex

The variable of sex and general ethics was found to be significant at better than the .05 level (Table 1). On this subscore females scored significantly higher than males,  $P < .05$ . No significant results were found on the variable sex and counseling testing or total ethics.

Table 1. One-way ANOVA F Values for the Variable of Sex, SFA

General Ethics	Counseling Ethics	Testing Ethics	Total Score
5.546	.506	.629	1.039

Age

For this variable subjects were grouped into two groups, under 25 and over 25 (Table 2). There were no significant results between the variable age and any of the four ethics scores.

Table 2. One-way ANOVA F Values for the Variable of Age, SFA

General Ethics	Counseling Ethics	Testing Ethics	Total Score
.980	.609	2.056	.671

Religious Preference

Table 3 indicates a significant result in the area Religion and Testing Ethics,  $P < .05$ . Subjects who had no religious preference scored significantly higher on this subtest than the subjects who had a religious preference.

Table 3. One-way ANOVA F Values for the Variable of Religion, SFA

General Ethics	Counseling Ethics	Testing Ethics	Total Score
1.145	.470	3.060	1.636

Class Standing

There was no significance on the variable of class standing (Table 4).

Table 4. One-way ANOVA F Values for the Variable of Class Standing, SFA

General Ethics	Counseling Ethics	Testing Ethics	Total Score
.586	.973	2.104	2.829

Read Code of Ethics

This variable identified those subjects who stated they had read the APGA Code of Ethics, and those who indicated that they had not read the APGA Code of Ethics (Table 5). Table 5 indicates no significant results on this variable.

Table 5. One-way ANOVA F Values for the Variable of Read Code, SFA

General Ethics	Counseling Ethics	Testing Ethics	Total Score
.364	.210	.537	.008

Summary of SFASU ANOVA

Of the 20 separate ANOVA's run on the Stephen F. Austin undergraduates, two responses were found to be significant at the .05 level or above. Female students scored higher than male students on the area of general ethics and students who had no religious preference scored higher on the subtest testing ethics than did students who expressed a religious preference. No other demographic variables were found significant.

U of A Data

The 29 University of Arizona subjects for which completed DPQ and critical incident data were gathered, were also analyzed by the ANOVA method. The 29 responses cannot be considered randomly selected representatives of the Arizona undergraduate rehabilitation population. The results of the analysis of variance are reported for interest only. Conclusions and comparisons cannot be made.

There were two variables which were found to be significant at the .05 level and beyond.

Sex

The variable of sex and counseling ethics was found to be significant statistically,  $P < .05$ . On the subtest counseling ethics females scored significantly higher than males (Table 6).

Table 6. One-way ANOVA F Values for the Variable of Sex, U of A

General Ethics	Counseling Ethics	Testing Ethics	Total Score
.224	5.544	1.881	3.489

Read Code of Ethics

U of A subjects who indicated that they had read the APGA Code of Ethics scored significantly higher on the subtests counseling ethics,  $P < .05$ , testing ethics,  $P < .05$ , and total ethics,  $P < .05$  (Table 7).



Table 7. One-way ANOVA F Values for the Variable  
of Read Code, U of A

General Ethics	Counseling Ethics	Testing Ethics	Total Score
.000	8.556	5.942	8.080

Mean Percentage Scores for Stephen F. Austin State University

Inspection of Table 8 indicated that Stephen F. Austin subjects as a group, scored highest on the testing ethics subtest and lowest on general ethics subtest.

Table 8. Mean Percentage Scores for SFA

General Ethics	Counseling Ethics	Testing Ethics	Total Score
35.9890	46.9780	53.8461	45.3407

Mean Percentage Scores for The University of Arizona

Table 9 shows that University of Arizona subjects scored highest on the counseling ethics subtest and lowest on the general ethics subtest. The total mean percentage score for Arizona subjects was higher than the total mean percentage score for Stephen F. Austin subjects.

Table 9. Mean Percentage Scores for U of A

General Ethics	Counseling Ethics	Testing Ethics	Total Score
30.6818	61.3636	54.5454	49.7272

Mean Percentage Scores for Total Group

The grand means of both the Stephen F. Austin population and The University of Arizona respondents indicates that both groups were able to ethically discriminate at a level above chance. Chance alone would lead to a probability of .20, as there were four incorrect choices and one correct choice, for each of the 12 questions. Utilizing the probability method (Guilford, 1956, Chapter 9), the following results were obtained:

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the grand mean of the SFA subjects and that mean one would expect from chance.

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant difference between the chance mean and that obtained from SFA.

$$\begin{aligned}
 m &= 12(1/5) & \alpha &= \sqrt{12(1/5)(4/5)} & z &= \bar{X} - m/\sigma \\
 m &= 2.4 & &= \sqrt{1.92} & &= 5.44 - 2.40/1.39 = 2.187
 \end{aligned}$$

Hypothesis 2 holds true since a  $z = 2.187$  is significant below the .05 level (Table 10).

Table 10. Total Mean Percentage Score for Total Group

General Ethics	Counseling Ethics	Testing Ethics	Total Score
35.4167	48.5294	53.9215	45.8137

#### Summary

The ANOVA results of the Stephen F. Austin State University students were reported and significant variables identified. Data on The University of Arizona subjects were presented with cautions and the total mean percentage scores on the ethical discrimination criterion were listed for both groups of subjects. The following chapter will contain conclusions and recommendations based on the findings of this chapter.

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUMMARY

The contents of this chapter will include conclusions based on the results of this study and their relationship to previous research evidence in counseling ethical discrimination. Also discussed will be the importance of the findings and recommendations for further research, followed by a summary.

#### Conclusions

The data and analysis in Chapter 4 indicate by inspection that undergraduate students in rehabilitation at Stephen F. Austin State University can ethically discriminate according to the criterion instrument at a level above that expected by chance alone.

Students in the Arizona undergraduate rehabilitation program for whom data were collected also scored higher than a chance expectation. However, since the Arizona subjects were not randomly selected and did not constitute the total population of undergraduate rehabilitation students at the time of the study, no general statement can be made about all students in the Arizona program. Thus, research question 1, Chapter 1, is answered in the affirmative for the total Stephen F. Austin population and for 29 selected students at The University of Arizona. Even though the data indicates that the undergraduate subjects met the criterion for research question 1, it should

be noted that for the Stephen F. Austin population 45.34% is a mean average of 5.44 questions correct out of a possible 12 correct answers, i.e., they made more wrong choices than correct choices. The Arizona raw score mean of 5.96 questions correct out of 12 questions, also indicates that they made incorrect responses slightly more often than correct responses. One implication that might be drawn from this data, is that if the criterion instrument is a valid measure of ethical discrimination ability, the undergraduate rehabilitation subjects when faced with a professional ethical decision would more often than not, make the wrong choice.

Research question 2, identifying the relationships between certain demographic variables and ethical discrimination as measured by the criterion instrument is answered by the following conclusions drawn from the analysis of variance of the data. The two variables found significant were:

1. The variable sex and general ethics subscore.

The data analysis revealed that females scored higher in general ethics subtest.

2. Religious preference and testing ethics subscore.

Because of the differing population used in this study, the following comparisons should be read with caution. This result is of interest also in contrast to the data reported by Schertzer and Morris (1972) in which it was found that the religious preference of APGA members to be of significance in the areas of counseling and testing

ethics. In the Morris study the subjects who indicated a religious preference scored higher than APGA members who stated no religious preference. A conclusion drawn from the Morris study, by Schertzer and Morris, was that religious preference might be important in ethical discriminations and a possible criterion for counselors. The results of the SFA subjects would indicate the opposite. A lack of religious preference would be desirable.

#### Arizona Data Discussion

As was stated previously, the Arizona subjects were not randomly selected but the ANOVA data are of interest, in that females did better on the counseling ethics subtest than did the males. Thus, all statistically significant results in this study on the variable of sex, found females doing better than males, which is an opposite finding of the Morris data.

The second major variable which showed significant results was the variable which was adapted from the Schertzer and Morris method of exposure variable as reported in Chapter 3. Arizona subjects who had read the APGA Code of Ethics did significantly better on the total, and both the counseling and testing ethics subsections. With all due respect to the cautions of interpretation, this seems reasonable to this investigator.

One significant finding from the Morris data, reported in the Journal of Counselor Education and Supervision (Schertzer and Morris, 1972), was that APGA subjects who had had a full course in ethics scored lower on the critical incident questionnaire than APGA subjects

who had been exposed to counseling ethics as a part of a course, or had no exposure at all. A conclusion drawn from this was that perhaps full ethics courses should be dropped from counselor education curricula. This conclusion sparked considerable interest in this investigator, as the consequences of following this recommendation are of obvious importance particularly if there is reason to question the validity of the results. To this investigator the conclusion drawn by Schertzer and Morris seemed to be what Gardner (1966, p. 416) has called "counter-intuitive." Gardner pointed out that in psychological research some experiments are done which produce results, which are counter-intuitive and embarrassing to conventional theory or logic. Gardner then hypothesized that these unreasonable results were the product of scattered small preliminary exploratory studies, which are confirmed by replication studies which are also reported in the literature because they report positive or significant findings. Negative findings are not published in the first wave of research reports. Publication of the positive results of the counter-intuitive phenomena then results in further exploration by ". . . frankly skeptical experimentors" (Gardner, 1966, p. 417), using more refined experimental designs, aimed at isolating some of the underlying variables. This would result in a group of studies reporting negative findings.

Although the Arizona data cannot be used to dispute or resolve the issue of whether counselor training programs in ethics be continued or dropped, general learning theories and reason would support the conclusion, that if a subject had read the APGA Code of Ethics they should score higher on a multiple choice test based on that code of ethics.

It should also be noted that differences in the results of this study on the demographic variables of sex and religion, should also be interpreted with the caution that this study is also what Gardner called "an early exploratory study" (p. 417).

The foregoing cautions also hold for the research questions 3 and 4 in Chapter 1. Question 3 compares the undergraduate students' responses to the responses of the APGA members. Simple inspection of the raw score grand mean shows that APGA members out of 12 possible correct ethical discrimination choices as sampled in the Morris study, obtained 7.49 correct answers. Undergraduates at Stephen F. Austin scored 5.44 correct and Arizona subjects scored 5.96. Converted to percentages, APGA members scored 62.41% correct, Stephen F. Austin 45.34%, and Arizona 49.72%. To answer question 3, it can be concluded that APGA members scored higher on ethical discrimination ability than did undergraduate students, and hence are more able to make correct ethical discriminations. However, the investigator's own ethical values insist that it be pointed out that if this test were given in a university classroom setting, it is unlikely that even the APGA members' 62.41% would be considered A level, B level, or even C level work.

Research question 4, based on the data analyzed in Chapter 3, found no statistically significant differences between advanced and beginning students, although a trend in the ANOVA of the Stephen F. Austin students indicated the F ratio was approaching significance,  $P .0904$ , with advanced students scoring higher on the total test than beginning students.



### Conclusion Summary

The results of the data analysis in Chapter 4 indicated that undergraduate students at Stephen F. Austin State University could select ethically appropriate responses: the analysis of variance results found statistically significant relationships between the demographic variables of religion and sex on the Stephen F. Austin State University undergraduates. ANOVA of the Arizona data was discussed. Undergraduate rehabilitation students' ethical discrimination ability was less than APGA members'. No significant differences were found between beginning and advanced students' ethical discrimination ability, although trends favoring advanced students were identified. Cautions concerning conclusions drawn were made which influence the recommendations.

### Recommendations

The following recommendations will include general recommendations, and specific recommendations based on readings and research, as well as the research data of this study.

A first general recommendation for further research in the area of ethics is that in most instances the knowledge and experience of the discipline which has long addressed itself to ethical issues has been underutilized in the development of professional ethical codes, the discipline of philosophy, in particular contemporary philosophy. Note, that existing professional ethical codes were the major basis in the development of the APGA code of ethics, primarily medicine, law and social work. These codes are based on philosophy at least 70 years old

(Warnock, 1969). The importance of the use of contemporary philosophy to behavioral science has been addressed by Day (1970). A code of ethics based on some contemporary philosophical position such as situational ethics (Warnock, 1969), would produce differing responses to examples listed in the Ethical Standards Casebook.

Thus, the first general recommendation for further research would include that study of contemporary ethical philosophy might contribute to a better understanding of the problems involved with current professional codes of ethics and empirical research in their use and abuse. A second general recommendation based on the cautions and questions raised by Gardner (1966) is that the results of this study be considered exploratory and tentative. A third general recommendation is that interpretations be carefully considered in relation to their impact on professional practice. For example, one conclusion is that undergraduates and APGA members can ethically discriminate at a level better than chance. The question remains, is that sufficient for the protection of clientele and should professionals be able to discriminate at least the 90% level utilizing such methods as the programmed instruction method developed by Spence (1975).

#### Specific Recommendations

This study was carried out in part based on the recommendation of Morris to determine if similar results would occur in other studies using the instruments and methodology. The results of this study differ, but may neither confirm nor deny the reliability of the methods

and the instruments. The results do raise further questions, therefore it is recommended:

1. That before major changes are initiated based on this and other studies using those instruments that additional investigation and research be conducted to explore the validity of the criterion instrument and the methodology.
2. That based on the results of this study a closer examination be made of the relevancy of the criterion instrument and its sensitivity to the complexity of the kind of material taught in a full graduate counseling ethics curriculum.
3. That consideration be given to improving the teaching methods or content of undergraduate curriculum concerning existing professional codes, or recognition of the level of ethical discrimination ability of undergraduates be considered in professional placement settings.
4. That a study include a control group of non-human service persons to see if the scores above chance are in fact above the knowledge level of the population at large.

#### Summary

Of the variables studied:

1. The evidence indicated possible differences in the ethical discrimination ability of undergraduates and APGA professionals. These results may be significant in that the kinds of ethical decisions that undergraduate students are capable of making would more often than not lead to unethical practice than graduate trained professionals based on the existing APGA code of ethics.

2. The differences in responses on the demographic variables of this study to previous studies, may represent differences in populations, methodology, criterion instrument, or chance errors.

3. That further research is recommended before any major changes in curriculum be made on variables that are counter-intuitive, such as dropping full ethics courses in counseling education.

4. That investigation into the discipline of contemporary moral philosophical knowledge is highly recommended to fully understand the results of this study and previous research on the APGA code of ethics and to formulate new approaches to ethical codes and research.

5. That research in the area of counseling ethics is still generally ignored as an area of systematic research concern and should receive extensive and careful attention.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS

TEST INSTRUCTIONS

The material that you are about to fill out will be used by G. Eric Martin for research purposes; in addition, it will be used for his dissertation at The University of Arizona.

The material includes a 7-part questionnaire and a short, 12-question, multiple-choice test of counselor ethics. Please fill out the questionnaire as completely as possible and answer all questions to the best of your ability.

The purpose of this study (aside from the obvious one of fulfilling dissertation requirements) is to compare your responses on the questionnaire and the test with other undergraduate students and with professionals in the field, i.e., American Personnel and Guidance Association members.

This same test and a similar questionnaire was administered to a national sample of members of the APGA. The results of that study may be found in the March 1972 issue of Counselor Education and Supervision as reported in an article entitled, "APGA Members Ethical Discrimination Ability," by Schertzer and Morris. The correct answers to the test questions may be found in the Ethical Standards Casebook published by the American Personnel and Guidance Association Ethical Practices Committee, 1965. If you read the Schertzer and Morris study, you may find that your participation in this research may have some impact on the future directions in counselor education and, at minimum, on the use of this test as a criterion instrument in counseling ethics research.

As your participation in this project is of obvious importance to me, I thank you for your cooperation.

Again, let me ask that you fill out completely the 7 questions by placing an X in the category which is most descriptive of you and by answering question 5 by stating your major and minor and indicating the number of hours completed.

Please indicate what you feel is the correct answer to each of the 12 test questions by marking the appropriate letter with a No. 2 pencil on the IBM answer sheet provided. You need list only your social security number and school on the IBM sheet.

Address any additional questions you might have to:

Eric Martin  
Assistant Professor  
Social & Rehabilitation Services Education Program  
Department of School Services  
Box 3019 SFA Station  
Nacogdoches, TX 75961

SAMPLE OF TEST

1. A school counselor learns that the guidance director and principal are proposing to establish a system of volunteering anecdotal data collected annually on each student to the parents of the students. The purpose is to improve the parents' understanding of their children's school behavior. The counselor makes repeated efforts to modify this proposal as he believes it psychologically unsound. He finds, however, general support for the original proposal among the staff.
  - a. Knowing that he cannot effect change in the proposal, he votes against it so that the record will reflect his opposition.
  - b. He subsequently seeks employment where institutional practices are more nearly consistent with his beliefs.
  - c. He attempts to solicit support from the teachers to block the proposal.
  - d. He actively attempts to educate the staff as to why this is psychologically unsound.
  - e. He voices his dissent, and once overruled, lives with the decision.
  
2. An APGA member who many years ago had completed all the requirements for a Ph. D. degree except his thesis accepts a position in a small college whose president is very ambitious for the school. The local newspaper referred to the member as "Doctor" on several occasions.
  - a. He acknowledges in personal associations that an oversight has occurred.
  - b. He makes no change, since he feels not being called "Doctor" will harm his effectiveness with clients and students.
  - c. He remains silent because, if he were to make a correction, the school and newspaper would be embarrassed.
  - d. He sends a letter of correction to both the school's public relations office and the newspaper.
  - e. He discusses this matter with the president and allows him to make the final decision as to whether corrective action is to be taken.
  
3. An agency's counseling supervisor was struck by the way in which a new counselor tended to look for the counseling cases he could "sink his teeth into." He thought he could best utilize his training in this manner. He became more and more involved with a few students to the exclusion of others seeking counseling. He seemed to believe he could handle anyone, and made no referrals. The rest

of the counseling staff became concerned when several of his counselees inquired about breaking off their relationship without raising his animosity.

- a. The supervisor becomes more actively involved in the selection of counselees for the staff, especially choosing a varied case-load for the new counselor.
  - b. The supervisor tells the counselor that it is not possible for staff members to see clients on a long-term basis.
  - c. The supervisor initiates this as a topic of discussion at the weekly staff meeting.
  - d. The supervisor asks the counselees to share their feelings with the counselor.
  - e. The supervisor initiates a series of conferences with the counselor to enable him to gain a more realistic view of his capabilities and limitations.
4. A television station made plans to promote the counseling services of the local school system. The plan was to have a counselor describe a vocational interest test on the initial program. Then any interested person could send his fee to the station which would mail the test to the client. In a subsequent program, the counselor was to administer the test to all clients who would then return the test booklets and answer sheets to the counselor for scoring and interpretation.
- a. The counselor refers the matter to APGA Ethics Committee.
  - b. The counselor indicates that he will not participate in the project.
  - c. The counselor, knowing the potential public-relations value of such a program, agrees to the plan, provided the confidentiality of the test results and the persons participating as subjects would not be violated.
  - d. The counselor agrees on the condition that he can meet with each individual to interpret the test.
  - e. The counselor suggests an alternate program, the playing of a video-taped counseling session with post-commenting by the counselor.
5. A high school senior girl interested in athletics indicates an interest in attending College X because some friends do. However, she indicates a strong desire for a major in physical education. The admissions counselor for College X knows that his school offers only a minimal curriculum in this field and also perceives that the liberal arts program required probably will not satisfy this student.
- a. The counselor encourages her to attend College X and then to consider transfer to another college if her interest in physical education continues.



- b. The student is advised of these limitations.
  - c. The student is admitted to College X.
  - d. The student is refused admission to College X.
  - e. The counselor processes the application recognizing the student's right to exercise her prerogatives and make her own decisions.
6. A professor of counselor education randomly selected some tapes of counseling sessions for the purpose of illustrating the process of psychotherapy. In one of the tapes the client had revealed student and professor names involved in his problem.
- a. The professor uses the tape since there was no negative implication related to the persons named.
  - b. The professor exercises reasonable caution in determining that no prospective listener is acquainted with the persons identified on the tape.
  - c. The professor edits out the names mentioned.
  - d. The professor advises the class to ignore the specific names and not to mention them outside of class.
  - e. The professor had already established the notion of confidentiality with the group and knew the information would not leave the room.
7. The counselor has had several interviews with a client concerning severe emotional problems. After careful consideration, he decided that the client would benefit only from long-term intensive therapy which he does not feel qualified to give. He informs the client of this and offers to refer the client to a qualified person. The client refuses to accept the suggested referral.
- a. The counselor agrees to continue on a supportive basis only.
  - b. The counselor explains to the client that he feels it necessary to terminate the relationship and does so.
  - c. The counselor elects to discuss this with an immediate member of the client's family.
  - d. The counselor seeks professional consultation so that he will be able to provide long-term therapy for the client.
  - e. The counselor continues to see the client for the purpose of effecting a change of mind in his willingness to seek other help.
8. A boy and his mother conferred with the counselor about taking a machine shop course. The mother had previously told the counselor that she did not want any more teachers to know about the boy's problem with epilepsy. When the counselor discussed alternative electives, the boy angrily insisted on a chance to try one of the machines to show what he was able to do.

- a. After the mother and boy had left, the counselor conferred with the principal and school physician.
  - b. After the mother was advised that liability for an accident rested with her, the counselor agreed to approve the boy's schedule for the machine shop course.
  - c. Because of "confidence obligations," the counselor is obligated to let the boy try.
  - d. The student's request should be respected, but under the watchful eye of an industrial education teacher.
  - e. The counselor consulted with the machine shop instructor, informing him of the boy's condition, before enrolling him in the course.
9. A business man wanted to hire a local counselor to give a single test in manual dexterity to candidates for a course in auto mechanics. The test was one chosen by the business man and one of unknown validity.
- a. The counselor refused employment.
  - b. The counselor accepted employment, but told the business man of the test's limitations.
  - c. The counselor accepted employment, and suggested that a research study be carried out to determine the test's validity for this particular situation.
  - d. The counselor administered the test and accepted a reasonable fee for his professional services.
  - e. Even though the test is not too useful, the counselor agrees since he may be able to make some subjective decisions based upon it.
10. During the giving of a new achievement test, a breakdown in the clocks caused the time cycle to be 2 minutes short for a sub-test. The error was discovered a week later when the clocks were used again. The principal was reluctant to report the matter to the testing service.
- a. The counselor agreed based on the fact that 2 minutes would not influence the test results since it was primarily a power test--(speed was only a convenience to the testing situation).
  - b. The counselor decided that, since all students were affected alike, no corrective action was necessary.
  - c. The counselor insisted that it be included in the report.
  - d. The counselor accepted the results and qualified the performance of students on the sub-test in individual interpretation.
  - e. Since student achievement is well known anyway, the counselor goes along with the principal to maintain good staff relations.

11. A counselor who serves as the administrator of a college testing program has applied for admission to a university to complete his doctoral program. It is learned that the university of his choice requires an academic ability test as a part of their admissions procedure. The counselor has administered the test often and knows its contents.
  - a. Since standardized testing takes a second place to other admissions materials, it will not make much difference if the counselor takes the test.
  - b. He gives no thought to this, since familiarity with the content does not give him the right answers.
  - c. He submits results of the required test along with those of other ability measure.
  - d. He so informs the department to which he is applying.
  - e. Since he has never actually completed the test, he selects the form with which he is least familiar and completes it under the supervision of another administrator.
  
12. A high school director of testing held a master's degree in guidance. Included in his preparation were both course work and clinical experience in the field of group testing. However, his experience with individual testing was limited to one clinical psychology course where several individual tests were surveyed and demonstrated.

Recently curriculum plans were completed in his school for a special group of slow learners. It was decided that individual psychological tests should be used in the process of selecting students for the group. As director of testing the counselor has been appointed by the principal to administer the individual tests.

- a. He undertakes this task with the understanding that he will now take further course work in individual testing.
- b. He consults with competent professionals in order to improve his skills in individual psychological testing.
- c. He asks a qualified university faculty member to review his worksheets and check his results for the first several individual tests.
- d. After reviewing the manual and all pertinent instructions, he practices his technique with students previously tested using the same instruments until his scores and reports are highly similar to those originally obtained by formally qualified administrators.
- e. He recommends that the selection process be limited to group testing or that a qualified person be engaged to do the special testing.

DEMOGRAPHIC PERSONAL DATA SHEET

PLEASE FILL IN YOUR SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_

1. SEX:
  - 1) \_\_\_\_\_ Female
  - 2) \_\_\_\_\_ Male
2. AGE:
  - 1) \_\_\_\_\_ 18-21
  - 2) \_\_\_\_\_ 22-25
  - 3) \_\_\_\_\_ 26-29
  - 4) \_\_\_\_\_ 30 and over
3. RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE:
  - 1) \_\_\_\_\_ No Preference
  - 2) \_\_\_\_\_ Protestant
  - 3) \_\_\_\_\_ Catholic
  - 4) \_\_\_\_\_ Jewish
  - 5) \_\_\_\_\_ Other
4. CLASS STANDING:
  - 1) \_\_\_\_\_ Freshman
  - 2) \_\_\_\_\_ Sophomore
  - 3) \_\_\_\_\_ Junior
  - 4) \_\_\_\_\_ Senior
5. STATE:
  - 1) Major \_\_\_\_\_ 2) Minor \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3) Number of major hours completed (including those you are now taking) \_\_\_\_\_
  - 4) Number of minor hours completed (including those you are now taking) \_\_\_\_\_
  - 5) Number of hours completed in Social and Rehabilitation Services \_\_\_\_\_
6. KINDS OF WORKING EXPERIENCES IN MAJOR FIELD:
  - 1) \_\_\_\_\_ Volunteer
  - 2) \_\_\_\_\_ Field Placement
  - 3) \_\_\_\_\_ Internship
  - 4) \_\_\_\_\_ Other
7. EDUCATIONAL EXPOSURE TO THE SUBJECT OF PROFESSIONAL COUNSELING ETHICS:
  - 1) \_\_\_\_\_ No formal exposure
  - 2) \_\_\_\_\_ Exposure in a class where counseling or professional ethics were mentioned or discussed as incidental elements of the course
  - 3) \_\_\_\_\_ Exposure in a course where counseling or professional ethics were an integral part of the course
  - 4) Have you read the American Personnel and Guidance Association's Code of Ethics? 1) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes 2) \_\_\_\_\_ No

KEY

GENERAL      1. b  
                 2. d  
                 3. e  
                 4. b

COUNSELING    5. b  
                 6. c  
                 7. b  
                 8. a

TESTING        9. a  
                 10. c  
                 11. d  
                 12. e

APPENDIX B

ANOVA TABLES

TABLES FOR SFA

Table B1. Sex and General Ethics

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	1510.0000	1	5.546	.0185
Within	272.2888	180		
Total	279.1270	181		

Table B2. Sex and Counseling Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	170.4375	1	.506
Within	337.0415	180	
Total	336.1211	181	

Table B3. Sex and Testing Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	399.8125	1	.629
Within	635.5996	180	
Total	634.2969	181	

Table B4. Sex and Total Score

Between	MS	df	F
Between	198.5625	1	1.039
Within	191.0243	180	
Total	191.0659	181	

TABLES FOR SFA

Table B5. Age and General Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	273.5000	1	.980
Within	279.1582	180	
Total	279.1270	181	

Table B6. Age and Counseling Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	205.1875	1	.609
Within	336.8484	180	
Total	336.1211	181	

Table B7. Age and Testing Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	1296.5000	1	2.056
Within	630.6179	180	
Total	634.2969	181	

Table B8. Age and Total Score

Source	MS	df	F
Between	128.3750	1	.671
Within	191.4142	180	
Total	191.0659	181	



TABLES FOR SFA

Table B9. Read Code and General Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	102.2500	1	.364
Within	281.0269	178	
Total	280.0281	179	

Table B10. Read Code and Counseling Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	71.0625	1	.210
Within	338.6108	178	
Total	337.1162	179	

Table B11. Read Code and Testing Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	343.7500	1	.537
Within	640.4497	178	
Total	638.7922	179	

Table B12. Read Code and Total Score

Source	MS	df	F
Between	1.5625	1	.008
Within	193.3114	178	
Total	192.2402	179	

TABLES FOR SFA

Table B13. Religion and General Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	318.6719	4	1.145
Within	278.2334	177	
Total	279.1270	181	

Table B14. Religion and Counseling Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	159.9531	4	.470
Within	340.1023	177	
Total	336.1211	181	

Table B15. Religion and Testing Ethics

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	1856.2656	4	3.060	.0179
Within	606.6816	177		
Total	634.2969	181		

Table B16. Religion and Total Score

Source	MS	df	F
Between	308.3125	4	1.636
Within	188.4163	177	
Total	191.0659	181	

TABLES FOR SFA

Table B17. Class Standing and General Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	163.8750	1	.586
Within	279.7673	180	
Total	279.1270	181	

Table B18. Class Standing and Counseling Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	327.0625	1	.973
Within	336.1714	180	
Total	336.1211	181	

Table B19. Class Standing and Testing Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	1326.3750	1	2.104
Within	630.4519	180	
Total	634.2969	181	

Table B20. Class Standing and Total Score

Source	MS	df	F
Between	535.0625	1	2.829
Within	189.1548	180	
Total	191.0659	181	

TABLES FOR U of A

Table B21. Sex and General Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	82.1836	1	.224
Within	366.6294	20	
Total	353.0842	21	

Table B22. Sex and Counseling Ethics

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	2639.0000	1	5.544	.0273
Within	476.0061	20		
Total	579.0059			

Table B23. Sex and Testing Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	1465.0820	1	1.881
Within	779.0186	20	
Total	811.6882	21	

Table B24. Sex and Total Score

Source	MS	df	F
Between	800.0078	1	3.489
Within	229.3180	20	
Total	256.4937	21	

TABLES FOR U of A

Table B25. Age and General Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	3.0078	1	.008
Within	370.5881	20	
Total	353.0842	21	

Table B26. Age and Counseling Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	1203.1875	1	2.196
Within	547.7969	20	
Total	579.0059	21	

Table B27. Age and Testing Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	1.3359	1	.002
Within	852.2061	20	
Total	811.6882	21	

Table B28. Age and Total Score

Source	MS	df	F
Between	87.2813	1	.329
Within	264.9541	20	
Total	256.4937	21	

TABLES FOR U of A

Table B29. Class Standing and General Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	78.2891	1	.214
Within	366.3547	21	
Total	353.2610	22	

Table B30. Class Standing and Counseling Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	126.8125	1	.188
Within	674.6040	21	
Total	649.7043	22	

Table B31. Class Standing and Testing Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	186.9844	1	.222
Within	842.5452	21	
Total	812.7471	22	

Table B32. Class Standing and Total Score

Source	MS	df	F
Between	6.2969	1	.021
Within	298.8843	21	
Total	285.5850	22	

TABLES FOR U of A

Table B33. Read Code and General Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	.0000	1	.000
Within	355.1135	22	
Total	339.6738	23	

Table B34. Read Code and Counseling Ethics

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	4083.3750	1	8.556	.0078
Within	477.2727	22		
Total	634.0596	23		

Table B35. Read Code and Testing Ethics

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	4380.2109	1	5.942	.0221
Within	737.2158	22		
Total	895.6069	23		

Table B36. Read Code and Total Score

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	1748.0352	1	8.080	.0093
Within	216.3318	22		
Total	282.9275	23		

TABLES FOR TOTAL GROUP

Table B37. Sex and General Ethics

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	1669.3125	1	5.935	.0150
Within	281.2886	202		
Total	288.1262	203		

Table B38. Sex and Counseling Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	4.1250	1	.011
Within	381.4590	202	
Total	379.6003	203	

Table B39. Sex and Testing

Source	MS	df	F
Between	1015.5000	1	1.568
Within	647.7585	202	
Total	649.5701	203	

Table B40. Sex and Ethics, Total Test Score

Source	MS	df	F
Between	480.9375	1	2.437
Within	197.3567	202	
Total	198.7537	203	



TABLES FOR TOTAL GROUP

Table B41. Age and General Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	336.0625	1	1.172
Within	286.6401	204	
Total	286.8813	205	

Table B42. Age and Counseling Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	1276.8750	1	3.388
Within	376.8552	204	
Total	381.2456	205	

Table B43. Age and Testing Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	866.7500	1	1.313
Within	660.3267	204	
Total	661.3337	205	

Table B44. Age and Ethics, Total Test Score

Source	MS	df	F
Between	9.1875	1	.045
Within	201.9399	204	
Total	200.9997	205	

TABLES FOR TOTAL GROUP

Table B45. Code of Ethics and General Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	120.5625	1	.418
Within	288.4248	202	
Total	287.5979	203	

Table B46. Code of Ethics and Counseling Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	643.1250	1	1.688
Within	381.0107	202	
Total	382.3020	203	

Table B47. Code of Ethics and Testing Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	1982.0625	1	3.008
Within	658.9900	202	
Total	665.5076	203	

Table B48. Code of Ethics and Total Test Score

Source	MS	df	F
Between	421.1875	1	2.095
Within	201.0736	202	
Total	202.1579	203	

TABLES FOR TOTAL GROUP

Table B49. Hours of Class and General Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	3.1875	1	.011
Within	288.2720	204	
Total	286.8813	205	

Table B50. Hours of Class and Counseling Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	96.4375	1	.252
Within	382.6418	204	
Total	381.2456	205	

Table B51. Hours of Class and Testing Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	2126.4375	1	3.251
Within	654.1519	204	
Total	661.3337	205	

Table B52. Hours of Class and Total Test Score

Source	MS	df	F
Between	274.1250	1	1.366
Within	200.6412	204	
Total	200.9997	205	

TABLES FOR TOTAL GROUP

Table B53. Religion and General Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	262.5938	4	.914
Within	287.3645	201	
Total	286.8813	205	

Table B54. Religion and Counseling Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	532.7656	4	1.409
Within	378.2302	201	
Total	381.2456	205	

Table B55. Religion and Testing Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	998.3750	4	1.525
Within	654.6265	201	
Total	661.3337	205	

Table B56. Religion and Total Score

Source	MS	df	F
Between	134.5625	4	.665
Within	202.3218	201	
Total	200.9997	205	

TABLES FOR TOTAL GROUP

Table B57. Class Standing and General Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	66.5625	1	.234
Within	284.0059	202	
Total	282.9346	203	

Table B58. Class Standing and Counseling Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	886.0625	1	2.338
Within	378.9585	202	
Total	381.4565	203	

Table B59. Class Standing and Testing Ethics

Source	MS	df	F
Between	1016.7500	1	1.560
Within	651.8022	202	
Total	653.5999	203	

Table B60. Class Standing and Total Score

Source	MS	df	F
Between	638.2500	1	3.204
Within	199.2351	202	
Total	201.3978	203	

## REFERENCES

- Adams, James F. "Ethical Responsibilities of the Counselor." The School Counselor. 12:197-205, May, 1965.
- American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA). Ethical Standards. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1961.
- Anastasi, Anne. Psychological Testing. New York: Macmillan Company, 1961.
- Beck, Carlton E. "Ethical Aspects of Change in Counselor Education." Counselor Education and Supervision. 6:216-221, Spring, 1967.
- Bixler, Ray and Julius Seeman. "Suggestion for a Code of Ethics for Consulting Psychologists." The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 41:497-490, October, 1946.
- Brell, Helen S. "An Investigation of the Value Beliefs of Elementary School Teachers in a Selected Community with Implications for Teacher Education." Dissertation Abstracts. 17:160, May, 1949.
- Carnes, G. D. "The Certification of Rehabilitation Counselors." Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin. 15:72-79, December, 1971.
- Curran, Charles A. "The Counseling Relationship and Some Religious Factors." Journal of Counseling Psychology. 6:266-270, Winter, 1960.
- Day, Willard F. "On the Application of Philosophical Analysis to Psychology." Unpublished manuscript, 1970.
- Donnelly, Rose. "An Attempt to Determine Some of the Causal Factors Behind the Formulation of Ethical Standards of Junior College College Students." Psychological Bulletin. 38:737, 1941.
- Downie, N. M. and R. W. Heath. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Ethical Practices Committee. Ethical Standards Casebook. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA), 1965.
- Flanagan, John C. "The Critical Incident Questionnaire." Psychological Bulletin. 51:327-358, July, 1954.

- Gardner, R. Allen. "On Box Score Methodology as Illustrated by Three Reviews of Overtraining Reversal Effect." Psychological Bulletin. 66:416-418, 1966.
- Gazda, G. M., J. A. Duncan and P. J. Sisson. "Professional Issues in Group Work." Personnel and Guidance Journal. 49:637-642, April, 1971.
- Glass, G. V. and J. C. Stanley. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Gluck Samuel. "A Proposed Code of Ethics for Counselors." Occupations. 30:484-490, April, 1952.
- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.
- Hamsher, J. Herbert and Marvin Reznikoff. "Ethical Standards in Psychological Research and Graduate Training: A Study of Attitudes within the Profession." Proceedings of the 75th Annual Convention of the American Psychologist Association. 2:203-204, 1967.
- Hobbs, N. "Science and Ethical Behavior." American Psychologist. 14: 217-225, 1959.
- Jones, Robert L., Jr. "A Study of Ethical Discriminatory Ability Among Selected High School Students." Dissertation Abstracts. 14: 2002, January-March, 1959.
- Jones, Robert L., Jr. and Robert H. Shaffer. "The Ethical Discriminatory Abilities of High School Students." Personnel and Guidance Journal. 41:518-521, February, 1963.
- Jones, V. "Disagreement Among Teachers as to Right and Wrong." Teachers' College Record. 31:24-25, 1929.
- Kagan, Henry Enoch. "Psychotherapy as a Religious Value." Journal of Counseling Psychology. 6:263-266, Winter, 1959.
- Katz, Martin M. "Ethical Issues in the Use of Human Subjects in Psychopharmacologic Research." American Psychologist. 22:360-363, May, 1967.
- Klinger, M. Robert B. "Moral Values Across Cultures." Personnel and Guidance Journal. 41:139-143, October, 1962.
- Landfield, A. W. and M. M. Nawas. "Psychotherapeutic Improvement as a Function of Communication and Adoption of Therapist's Views." Journal of Counseling Psychologist. 11:336-341, Winter, 1964.

- Mann, Kenneth W. "Religious Factors and Values in Counseling: Their Relationship to Ego Organization." Journal of Counseling Psychology. 6:259-262, Winter, 1959.
- McGowan, John F. and Lyle D. Schmidt. Counseling: Readings in Theory and Practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962.
- Meehl, Paul E. "Some Technical and Axiological Problems in the Therapeutic Handling of Religious and Valuational Materials." Journal of Counseling Psychology. 6:255-259, Winter, 1959.
- Meehl, Paul E. and Herbert McClosky. "Ethical and Political Aspects of Applied Psychology." The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 42:91-98, January, 1947.
- Moore, W. E. The Professions: Roles and Rules. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970.
- Morris, Kenneth T. An Analysis of Ethical Practice Discrimination Among American Personnel and Guidance Association Members. Michigan: University Microfilms, Inc. 69-2959, 1968.
- Mull, Helen K. "The Ethical Discrimination of Various Groups of College Women." Journal of Social Psychology. 35:69-72, 1952.
- Murphy, Gardner. "The Cultural Context of Guidance." Personnel and Guidance Journal. 34:4-9, September, 1955.
- Mykel, Nan. "The Application of Ethical Standards to Group Psychotherapy." Journal of Group Psychotherapy. 21:248-254, April, 1971.
- Nash, Paul. "Some Notes Toward a Philosophy of School Counseling." Personnel and Guidance Journal. 43:243-248, November, 1964.
- Patterson, C. H. "The Place of Values in Counseling and Psychotherapy." Journal of Counseling Psychology. 5:216-223, Fall, 1958.
- Powell, Warren T. "A Code of Ethics for Counselors." Education. 65:71-75, October, 1944.
- Quimby, Maurice. "Report of the New Jersey State Committee on Ethical Practices in Guidance." Education. 65:76-79, October, 1944.
- Rosenthal, D. "Changes in Some Moral Values Following Psychotherapy." Journal of Consulting Psychology. 19:431-436, December, 1955.
- Russell, Bertrand. A Western History of Philosophy. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1945, 172-173.



- Sargent, Helen. "Professional Ethics and Problems of Therapy." The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 40:47-60, January, 1945.
- Scheffler, Israel. Conditions of Knowledge. New Jersey: Scott Foreman, 1965.
- Schertzer, B. and K. Morris. "An APGA Members' Ethical Discrimination Ability." Counselor Education and Supervision. 11:200-206, March, 1972.
- Schertzer B. and S. C. Stone. Fundamentals of Counseling. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.
- Schwebel, M. "Some Ethical Problems in Counseling." Personnel and Guidance Journal. 33:254-259, 1955a.
- Schwebel, M. "Why Unethical Practice?" Journal of Counseling Psychology. 2:123-125, 1955b.
- Segal, Stanley J. "The Role of the Counselor's Religious Values in Counseling." Journal of Counseling Psychology. 6:270-274, Winter, 1959.
- Sinick, Daniel. "Ethical and Legal Implications of the Vocational Consultant Program." Personnel and Guidance Journal. 43:355-359, December, 1964.
- Smith, Carol Edwin. "A Survey of Opinions upon the Occupational Role of the Rehabilitation Counselor." Dissertation Abstracts. 21:2600, 1960.
- Spence, William Edward. "A Programmed Instruction of the APGA Ethical Standards." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1975.
- Sutich, Anthony. "Toward a Professional Code for Psychological Consultants." The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 39:329-350, July, 1944.
- Tramer, Maurice. "The Principles of Professional Ethics." International Journal of Professional Ethics. 1:19-21, 1953.
- Traux, C. B. and R. R. Carkhuff. Toward Effective Counseling and Psychotherapy. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1968.
- Walters, Orville S. "Metaphysics, Religion and Psychotherapy." Journal of Counseling Psychology. 5:243-252, Winter, 1958.

- Warnock, Geoffrey. Contemporary Moral Philosophy. New York: Macmillan Co., 1969.
- Williamson, Edmund G. "Value Orientation in Counseling." Personnel and Guidance Journal. 36:520-528, April, 1958.
- Williamson, Edmund G. "The Counselor as Technique." Personnel and Guidance Journal. 41:108-111, October, 1962.
- Wrenn, C. G. The Counselor in a Changing World. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1962.