4-1991

A Study of Dual Relationships in Small College Counseling Centers

Terry W. Darling

Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations

Part of the Counseling Commons

Recommended Citation
https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/2022
A STUDY OF DUAL RELATIONSHIPS IN
SMALL COLLEGE COUNSELING CENTERS

by
Terry W. Darling

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education
Department of Counselor Education
and Counseling Psychology

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
April 1991
A STUDY OF DUAL RELATIONSHIPS IN
SMALL COLLEGE COUNSELING CENTERS

Terry W. Darling, Ed.D.
Western Michigan University, 1991

The purpose of this study was to address the following questions: What are the attitudes and practices of counselors in small college counseling centers regarding dual relationships? What are the counselor characteristics that appear to affect counselors' attitudes and practices? How do the attitudes and practices of counselors in small colleges compare to other professionals' attitudes and practices?

A nationwide, random sample of 300 small college counselors was surveyed. Half of the sample received a Counseling Practices Survey: Ethics, which sought information about the respondents' attitudes regarding 17 nonsexual and sexual dual relationship behaviors. The other half of the sample received a Counseling Practices Survey: Practice, in which they were asked to report the frequency with which they engaged in these 17 behaviors. Both Counseling Practices Survey forms were adapted from Borys' (1988) Therapeutic Practices Survey. With 217 respondents to the survey, the following conclusions were drawn:
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1. A range of views was reported regarding the ethicality of the dual relationship behaviors addressed in the study, though the majority of dual relationship behaviors were likely to be viewed as unethical in most circumstances.

2. Respondents were unambiguous in their attitudes against sexual involvement with current or former clients, and no respondents reported any sexual involvement with a current or past client.

3. A significant correlation existed ($r = .902$, $p < .001$) between ratings of ethicality and actual reported practices related to dual relationships. Respondents were less likely to reportedly engage in a behavior than they were to view it as ethical.

Respondents' attitudes and practices were examined in relation to five variables (gender, theoretical orientation, educational background, number of available referral sources, and memberships in professional organizations). Females were least likely to report engaging in most dual relationship behaviors but no statistically significant difference was found between male and female respondents' attitudes toward dual relationships. In addition, theoretical orientation had a statistically significant relationship to some reported dual relationship practices, and also to some attitudes toward dual relationships.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Importance of the Study

In recent years, various researchers and ethicists in the fields of counseling and psychotherapy have become increasingly concerned with dual relationships between therapists and their clients (Schafer, 1990; Kitchener, 1988; Corey, Corey, & Callanan, 1988; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985). Though the dual relationship that is most clearly identified as being unethical is a sexual relationship between a therapist and a client, many other dual relationships are also viewed as unethical either implicitly or explicitly by various professional codes of conduct (American Association for Counseling and Development, 1988; American Psychological Association, 1981; and American College Personnel Association, 1989). For example, in the American Psychological Association Ethical Standards (1981), Principle 6a states that "psychologists [should] make every effort to avoid dual relationships that could impair their professional judgment or increase the risk of exploitation. Examples of
such dual relationships include, but are not limited to . . . treatment of employees, students, supervisees, close friends, or relatives" (p. 636).

One problem with these ethical guidelines is that the vast majority of research on dual relationships has focused on sexual involvement between therapists and clients. Research on other forms of dual relationships has been almost nonexistent (Borys, 1988). In a recent national study by Borys (1988), 1,600 psychologists, 1,600 psychiatrists, and 1,600 social workers were surveyed to determine both their perceptions and their practices of sexual and nonsexual dual relationships with clients. Borys' study was done, in part, to provide normative data for those who are involved in adjudication of ethics and malpractice complaints.

One group of professionals not delineated in Borys' study was counselors who work in small college counseling centers. Counselors in these small colleges often have several roles, including teaching, disciplining, and academic advising. In addition, because of the limited number of trained counselors available in small colleges, students have fewer options available to them if they find themselves in need of counseling. For example, the Small College Counselor's Association of Michigan is composed of a group of 10 loosely associated small colleges, including Adrian College, Albion College, Alma
College, Aquinas College, Kalamazoo College, Olivet College, Siena Heights College, Spring Arbor College, Nazareth College, and Hope College. None of these colleges has more than two full-time counselors. This limitation in personnel and the variety of roles often played by these counselors results in settings that are considerably different from the normative group described by Borys (1988).

Regulatory agencies, such as licensing boards for psychologists, have seen a greater number of complaints by consumers regarding both sexual and nonsexual dual relationships in recent years (American Psychological Association, 1988). Judgments by these regulatory agencies and by the courts regarding malpractice often rely on a determination of whether a particular behavior is within the scope of generally accepted standards of practice (Pope, Simpson, & Weiner, 1978). If future lawsuits against counselors are to be based, in part, on Borys' normative data, it is important to obtain data on the "generally accepted standards of practice" in small college counseling centers where counselors find that many types of dual relationships with student clients, excluding sexual relationships, are often unavoidable (Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985).
Statement of the Problem

As already stated, dual relationships, other than sexual ones, have received very little attention in the research literature, despite the fact that these dual relationships are, for the most part, condemned in the various ethical standards related to counseling (American Psychological Association, 1981; American Association for Counseling and Development, 1988). Also, psychologists consider dual relationships to be among the most difficult ethical issues that they face (American Psychological Association, 1988). In addition, no research published to date addresses the practices and perceptions of ethicality of dual relationships in small college settings. These settings are particularly important to study for the following reasons. First, multiple duties and roles exist for counselors in small college settings (Richardson, Seim, Eddy, & Brindley, 1985). Second, few counseling options exist for students in small college settings (Grayson, 1986). These factors contribute to settings which make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for counselors to avoid dual relationships. Therefore, research regarding the prevalence of dual relationships and the perception of dual relationships by counselors in small college settings was important to obtain.
In addition, though the primary emphasis of the current study was on nonsexual dual relationships, some prior research has established a relationship between sexual and nonsexual dual role behaviors (Borys, 1988). Therefore, it was also important to explore any possible connection between sexual and nonsexual dual relationships in small college settings.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study were to:

1. Determine the attitudes and practices of counselors in small college counseling centers regarding dual relationships with student clients.

2. Compare the attitudes and practices of small college counselors regarding dual relationships to the attitudes and practices of other mental health professionals.

Research Questions

The primary questions addressed in this study were:

1. What are small college counselors' attitudes regarding the ethicality of dual relationships with clients?

2. How frequently do counselors engage in dual relationships with clients in small college settings?
3. What are the similarities and differences between small college counselors' attitudes regarding the ethicality of dual relationships with student clients and the frequency with which small college counselors report engaging in these behaviors?

4. What is the relationship between nonsexual dual relationships and sexual dual relationships in small college counseling centers?

5. What is the relationship between counselors' attitudes related to dual relationships in small college counseling centers and the attitudes of psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers in other settings?

6. What is the relationship between counselors' dual relationship practices in small college counseling centers and the practices of psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers in other settings?

7. Do counselors' attitudes and practices regarding each type of dual relationship vary according to gender, theoretical orientation, educational background, number of counselors employed at the college, and membership in professional organizations?

Definitions of Terms

Dual relationship--A relationship in which a counselor simultaneously or sequentially plays two or more roles with a client (Kitchener, 1988). The current study
measured 15 separate practices that, through factor analysis, could be grouped into four conceptually meaningful categories:

1. Social Involvement, which includes: (a) accepting a client's invitation to a special occasion, (b) going out to eat with a client of the same gender, (c) going out to eat with a client of the opposite gender, (d) inviting a client to a personal party or social event.

2. Dual Professional Role Involvement, which includes: (a) providing counseling to a student employee, (b) providing counseling to a student currently enrolled in one's class, (c) allowing a client to enroll in one's class for a grade.

3. Personal/Sexual Involvement, which includes: (a) accepting a gift valued under $10 from a client, (b) becoming friends with a client after termination of counseling, (c) disclosing details of one's current personal stresses to a client, (d) engaging in sexual activity with a client after termination of counseling, (e) engaging in sexual activity with an ongoing client (not included in factor analysis but conceptually part of this factor).

4. Conflict-of-Interest Role Involvement, which includes: (a) providing counseling to a relative or
friend of an ongoing client, (b) involvement in the decision-making process regarding campus disciplinary action for a client, (c) involvement in committee or project work with a client.

Small college--A four-year undergraduate college or university with less than 2,000 students. This number is consistent with classifications used in prior research on "small" colleges (Voss, 1985) and on "small" college counseling centers (Richardson et al., 1985).

Counseling center--The office on a college campus to which students are referred when they are having psychological difficulties. This office is distinguishable from other offices on the campus in that the primary function of this office is to help students to better cope with psychological difficulties. The majority of small colleges have identifiable counseling centers. Eighty-nine percent of institutions with 1,000-1,999 students and 73% of institutions with under 1,000 students have counseling centers (Richardson et al., 1985).

Counselor--The individual(s) employed in a small college counseling center responsible for working with students who are identified as having personal or emotional problems.

Attitude--The degree (based on a 6-point Likert scale) to which survey respondents view a particular dual role behavior as ethical or unethical.
Practice--The frequency (based on a 6-point Likert scale) with which survey respondents engage in a particular dual role behavior.

Conceptual Framework

The focus of this study was on behavior for which certain norms, expectations, and roles exist. Therefore, open systems theory (Tubbs, 1988) and role theory (Heiss, 1981) were used to help conceptualize dual relationships in counseling. Systems theory focuses on relationships at various levels within a system (Ritzer, 1983). The most complex type of system, and the one most relevant to this study, is the social system. Social systems are viewed as "open" in the sense that they are affected by environmental changes.

An inherent quality of a system is the interrelatedness of the parts of the system. In addition, boundaries exist in all social systems where differentiation of functions exists. These boundaries help to clarify the different tasks, roles, and activities within the system. Boundaries vary in their degree of permeability. In a system in which considerable overlap exists between two parts, more permeability is expected between those parts (McGuinness, 1987).

A final relevant aspect of a social system is that
roles and role expectations develop in these systems (McGuinness, 1987), which leads to a discussion of role theory. Role theory (Stryker & Statham, 1985) uses as its primary metaphor the theater in which actors play certain assigned parts (roles). Interactions which are significant develop certain expectations about the "proper modes of relationships between and among persons involved in the interactions" (Stryker & Statham, 1985, p. 331). Role conflict or role "strain" occurs when an individual has two or more conflicting roles in a relationship. The greater the incompatibility between one's roles, the greater the likelihood that frustration will occur for that individual and for others interacting with him or her (Kitchener, 1988).

The relationship between the counselor and the client is an open system with certain norms, expectations, barriers, and roles inherent in that relationship. A homeostatic balance exists in that relationship, and when role and boundary alterations occur, as happens with dual relationships, adjustments must be made in the system to maintain the complementarity in that system. The combination of open systems theory and role theory, then, provides the conceptual framework for this study of dual relationships.
Organization of the Dissertation

In Chapter I, the importance of this study was discussed, the research questions were stated, terms important to the study were defined, and a conceptual framework for the study was elucidated. Literature concerning dual relationships and small colleges is reviewed in Chapter II. The method of the study and the data gathering procedures are addressed in Chapter III. Chapter IV includes the analysis of the survey data. Finally, Chapter V includes a summary of the study, conclusions, limitations of the study, implications of the results for small college counselors, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

A dual relationship in counseling occurs when the client and counselor "have a relationship in addition to the therapeutic one" (Haas & Malouf, 1989, p. 55). This dual relationship can take many forms. As already mentioned, the most commonly studied dual relationship in counseling involves a sexual relationship between the counselor and the client. Many other types of dual relationships that are nonsexual in nature have received far less attention in the research literature. In the following review of the relevant research in the area of dual relationships it is appropriate to begin with a discussion of the ethical guidelines related to the counseling profession.

Ethical Guidelines

Several professional codes of conduct provide guidelines that are relevant to dual relationships in college settings. A primary reason for the existence of these ethical guidelines is to help delineate the roles and boundaries of those professionals engaging in a
therapeutic relationship with a client. The ethical standards provided by the American Association for Counseling and Development (1988), American Psychological Association (1981), and American College Personnel Association (1989) all have relevance to dual relationship practice. All of the above standards explicitly state that a sexual relationship between counselor and client is clearly unethical regardless of the client's academic status. Despite the specific guidelines that proscribe sexual involvement with clients, other types of dual relationships are treated with less specificity in the various ethical codes, though some of these have become more explicit in recent ethical guidelines.

The American Psychological Association ethical guidelines (1981) not only provide general standards to follow but also give some examples of dual relationships to be avoided. The American Psychological Association guidelines maintain that psychologists should make every effort to "avoid dual relationships that could impair their professional judgment or increase the risk of exploitation. Examples of such dual relationships include but are not limited to, research with and treatment of employees, students, supervisees, close friends or relatives" (p. 636). The ethical code of the American Association for Counseling and Development states that dual relationships with clients "that might impair the
member's objectivity and professional judgment (e.g., as with close friends or relatives, sexual intimacies with any client) must be avoided and/or the counseling relationship terminated through referral to another competent professional" (p. 4). The newly revised American College Personnel Association standards (1989) identify counselor/employer, supervisor/best friend, and faculty/sexual partner as examples of dual relationships that may involve conflicting or incompatible roles and, therefore, should be avoided.

The final, and most ambiguous, ethical code that could relate to college and university counseling practices is the American Association of University Professors (1987) ethical code. No dual relationships, including sexual relationships, between professors and students are specifically identified as unethical, but they do state that professors should "demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors . . . and avoid any exploitation of students" (p. 49).

Though the above guidelines are helpful to college counselors who work with student clients, problems remain for the counselor in a small college setting. Not only are some identified dual relationships extremely difficult to avoid, but other possible dual relationships are
not addressed in the ethical codes.

Casebooks, published by the various professional organizations, help to "flesh out" the meaning of the ethical codes. For example, Callis (1976) provides an example of a counselor who also has teaching responsibilities. One of her students, depressed and possibly suicidal, approaches her. The ethical response by this counselor/teacher, according to Callis, is to refer the student to another counselor, except for "instances where such an alternative is unavailable and where the individual's condition definitely warrants counseling intervention" (Callis, 1976, p. 38).

In the Casebook on Ethical Principles of Psychologists (American Psychological Association, 1987) two cases were cited in which psychologists with teaching and supervising responsibilities were censured for becoming involved in dual relationships. In the first case a clinical supervisor of psychology graduate students had provided individual therapy for a student whom she was supervising. In the second case a psychologist ran a psychotherapy group as part of a group process course that he taught. Since he was in a position to evaluate the progress of these students and help make decisions about financial awards to them, the American Psychological Association Ethics Committee found this behavior unacceptable and censured the psychologist accordingly,
despite the psychologist's claim that the psychology department to which he belonged was small.

The American Association for Counseling and Development, in its most recent ethical standards casebook (Herlihy & Golden, 1990), provides a case study of a dual relationship in which a faculty member in a master's degree program in counseling had the responsibilities as a major advisor, professor, and practicum supervisor for a student (Sandra). Because of the rapport that the student felt with this faculty member, she began to see him to address some of her personal problems. When the professors in the counseling program met to review the progress of the first year students, the faculty member mentioned to his colleagues that Sandra was having personal problems (a violation of Sandra's right to confidentiality). In addition, when the time came for Sandra to apply for candidacy, the faculty member (as her primary advisor) was unwilling to sign her candidacy form because of her unresolved personal problems. The American Association for Counseling and Development Ethics Committee found the faculty member guilty of ethical violations and suspended him for two years from membership in the American Association for Counseling and Development (Herlihy & Golden, 1990).

It is clear from the above casebook examples and the
ethical codes discussed earlier in the paper that the authors of the relevant ethical guidelines consistently view engaging in dual relationships as unacceptable practice for counselors. For the counselor who can easily avoid any dual relationships, it may be sufficient to know that dual relationships should be avoided. For counselors who are in positions where dual relationships are much more difficult to avoid, such as in small college settings, it becomes important to understand what it is about dual relationships that can make them unacceptable. In this way, these counselors can be sensitized to the specific dangers of different dual relationships.

Research on Dual Relationships

Though no dual role relationship, other than a sexual one, can be considered unethical on an a priori basis (Haas & Malouf, 1989) several models have been proposed to support the notion that counselors should eschew dual role relationships. Haas and Malouf (1989) have proposed three reasons why dual relationships should be generally avoided. First, dual relationships may exploit a client. Because a clear power differential exists between the counselor and the client, the client can rarely determine when the counselor is acting as a counselor and when the counselor is acting in some other role. For example, clients may feel intimidated into
providing information that they do not want to provide if their counselor is also their teacher or supervisor.

Second, dual relationships may affect the therapist's ability to make appropriate clinical decisions. For example, if the counselor is also a friend of the client, the counselor's ability to confront the client can be damaged either because objectivity has been lessened by the friendship or because of the counselor's own very natural need to be liked by his or her friends.

Finally, dual relationships may inhibit counselors' freedom of action or sense of privacy. An example of this given by Haas and Malouf (1989) is counselors who feel uncomfortable at social gatherings where they find it difficult to "let their hair down" when one of their clients is present.

Stadler (1986) focuses on a more specific type of dual relationship. She has developed a list of reasons why counselor educators should refrain from counseling their graduate students. She maintains that a counselor educator who counsels students in his or her classes, a clearly proscribed dual relationship in both the American Psychological Association and the American Association for Counseling and Development ethical guidelines, is facing many unpleasant consequences. First, the student may be harmed by this dual relationship if the student
knows that it is an unethical behavior, particularly because students use their professors as professional role models. Consequently, the student may develop inappropriately lax attitudes toward dual relationships and ethical guidelines in general. Second, other students who are aware that a certain professor engages in dual relationships may lose respect for that professor, toward the graduate program, and toward the profession. Third, other faculty members may be adversely affected by either being misled about appropriate ethical behavior or by being put in the position of confronting or condoning this behavior. Fourth, the counseling profession may be negatively affected because of a loss of morale, credibility, and prestige because members have not taken their ethical responsibilities seriously.

Still another consequence of dual relationships can be their effects on society. Stadler (1986) maintains that the counseling profession may lose prestige due to ethical misconduct by its members. As a consequence, fewer people may choose to use counselors, thus limiting the overall benefit that can accrue through counseling. Finally, engaging in dual relationships may affect counselors in adverse ways. These counselors may be forced to cope with increased guilt or anxiety over having violated ethical standards of the profession. Furthermore, counselors may find it easier to violate
other ethical standards after violating those pertaining to dual relationships.

Stadler leaves room for certain exceptions to the proscription against dual relationships. For example, a seriously suicidal individual could be seen by his or her instructor for crisis intervention but should then be quickly referred to another professional. She makes it clear, though, that engaging in dual relationships with students, particularly those students in counselor education programs, is unacceptable and can have dramatic and extensive implications (Stadler, 1986).

One helpful aspect of Stadler's position is that she goes beyond merely relying on the American Psychological Association (1981) and American Association for Counseling and Development (1988) ethical guidelines as her basis for avoiding dual relationships. She also relies on three basic ethical principles to support her case that dual relationships should be avoided. These principles are autonomy, beneficence, and justice. Stadler claims that student autonomy can be compromised by involvement in dual relationships with counselors. The student's ability to make choices as a free agent, a basic aspect of autonomy, can be undermined if the student feels, for example, that his or her academic evaluation might be affected by information expressed during a
counseling session. Stadler emphasizes the point that under ideal circumstances, a client has more autonomy in a counseling relationship unencumbered by dual roles. Unfortunately, small college counseling centers do not exist in the midst of ideal circumstances. Furthermore, Stadler does not address another manifestation of autonomy, namely the client's right to choose freely which counselor he or she wants to see, even if this counselor happens to have another role, such as a teacher or academic advisor, in the student's life.

The principle of beneficence involves promoting good and preventing evil or harm. Stadler particularly stresses the potential for harm to the client, to others close to the situation (e.g., friends of the client or colleagues of the counselor), and to the profession of counseling if dual relationships go unchecked.

The principle of justice is the final ethical principle discussed by Stadler as it relates to dual relationships. Other students who are aware that dual relationships exist between certain students and faculty members may feel resentful that they have not also been singled out for special attention from the faculty member. This is an example of a perception of a lack of fairness or justice by these other students. It should be noted, though, that a perceived lack of justice by students, though unfortunate, does not necessarily
violate the principle of justice.

Stadler's contribution to the literature is clear. She moves beyond the unsatisfying and sometimes circular reasoning of other researchers who merely claim that dual relationships should be avoided because the ethical guidelines state that they should be avoided. Unfortunately, though, Stadler still relies on a theoretical analysis of the potential ethical dangers of dual relationships instead of providing any evidence that clients perceive that their freedom is compromised (the question of autonomy), that engaging in dual relationships results in harm to clients (the question of beneficence), and that observers do feel that fairness is compromised in dual relationships (the question of justice).

Through studying Stadler's ideas, the small college counselor has a better explanation of how and why the proscription against dual relationships has developed. Stadler offers no proof, though, that nonsexual dual relationships significantly interfere with basic ethical principles of counseling.

Another theoretician in the field of ethics in counseling psychology is Karen Strohm Kitchener. Her ideas are useful because she addresses the question, "What is the line between those [dual] relationships that are clearly unethical and those that are acceptable when
they are handled with caution?" (Kitchener, 1988, p. 218). She relies on role theory, part of the conceptual framework for this current study discussed in Chapter I, to help draw this line. A basic tenet of role theory is that social roles have attached to them certain expectations. "Role strain" occurs when an individual occupies two or more social roles that conflict. The more incompatible the expectations of the roles, the greater the role strain and the higher the likelihood of frustration and disequilibrium for those interacting with the person who has the conflicting roles. Role conflict can also occur because of incompatible obligations and from differing amounts of power and prestige associated with the roles.

Based on these aspects of role theory, Kitchener identifies three guidelines that can help the counselor to distinguish between dual relationships that are likely to be problematic and those that are much less likely to cause harm. First, as the incompatibility between role expectations increases, so will the likelihood of harm and misunderstanding. Second, as different role obligations diverge, an increasing likelihood of a loss of objectivity and divided loyalty on the part of the counselor occurs. Finally, as the prestige and power between the counselor's roles and the client's roles increase, so does the potential for exploitation of
clients. Also, clients may have less capacity to remain objective about their welfare. Consequently, when the role expectations are highly incompatible, the power differential is large, and the conflict of interests is great, then the dual relationship is unethical. Conversely, if the role expectations are compatible, the power differential minimal, and the conflict of interests small, then there is little danger of harm and those relationships should be acceptable.

Despite Kitchener's laudable attempt to help the counselor make distinctions between those dual relationships that have a high potential for harm and those that do not, she does not provide practical criteria for determining compatibility of role expectations, degree of power differential and amount of conflict of interest. For example, for the counselor who is attempting to determine the potential danger of counseling a close friend of a current client, how does the counselor determine the amount of conflict of interest? Though Kitchener's model helps to provide a theoretical framework for discussing the potential harm of different dual relationships, the counselor still has the decidedly difficult and ambiguous task of determining how incompatible the expectations of his or her roles are, how much power differential exists, and how much conflict of interest
exists.

In a very thorough discussion of dual relationships, Keith-Spiegel and Koocher (1985) elaborate on several specific types of dual relationships and their potential dangers. These researchers state that "it is probably impossible to create clear guidelines for psychologists with regard to dual-role relationships not involving sexual intimacy, since each situation presents unique features that must be considered" (p. 267). A significant hurdle in setting these guidelines is the extreme difficulty in developing operational definitions of different dual relationships. For example, engaging in a professional counseling relationship with a friend is considered a dual relationship. How does one define the word "friend"? What distinguishes an acquaintance from a friend? These and many other possible examples highlight the difficulty in providing specific ethical guidelines to govern dual relationships in counseling.

Keith-Spiegel and Koocher (1985) discuss several dual relationships and conflict-of-interest situations that are relevant to small college counseling centers. These practices include counseling friends or family members, socializing with clients, counseling significant others of existing clients, and "small world hazard" relationships in which the counselor has a difficult blending of roles with certain clients. An example given
of a small world hazard was a psychologist whose client was also his son's teacher. Most of these categories of dual relationships are discussed by giving examples of how they could possibly be destructive to the counseling process. Unfortunately, only one study was cited that addressed any of these dual relationships in a systematic and quantified way. This study by Tallman (in Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985) found that fully one-third of the psychologists surveyed socialized with some clients outside their office. Another one-third attended special, "meaningful" events in the lives of clients, such as weddings or Bar Mitzvahs. Only the remaining one-third refused to have social contact with clients. Since Tallman only included 38 psychotherapists in his sample, his findings must be viewed with some caution. Still, his study does give some limited indication of the prevalence of this type of dual role behavior among counselors.

A modest amount of other research has been done to determine dual relationship practices and beliefs of counselors and therapists. Pope, Tabachnick, and Keith-Spiegel (1987) attempt to provide some normative data on the beliefs and practices of psychotherapists who are members of the American Psychological Association. The authors make it clear that norms of beliefs and practices
are not equivalent to ethical standards. Still, these norms do provide a means of checking the degree to which therapists agree with and adhere to professional ethical guidelines.

Pope et al. (1987) divide dual relationships, among many other behaviors, according to several ethical principles. This approach goes beyond the theoretical work of Stadler (1986) by providing a framework for their research results regarding the various practices of psychologists. Pope et al. (1987) claim, for example, that the ethical principle of "do no harm" relates to the practice of lending money to clients. Whereas 79% of the psychologists surveyed in their study viewed this practice as rarely or never ethical, over 25% of these same psychologists admitted that they had lent money to clients.

Another ethical principle, "do not exploit," relates to several dual relationships ranging from sexual contact between psychologists and clients to therapy with supervisees/students and friends. Thirty-one percent of psychologists at least occasionally engaged in therapy with students or supervisees. In addition, over 28% of psychologists engaged in therapy with friends.

According to Pope et al. (1987), the principle of treating people with respect for their dignity as human beings includes therapists' social involvement with
clients. Examples of this type of practice could include attending a client's social event such as a wedding (which approximately 75% of psychologists had done) or accepting an invitation to a party by a client (which 1/3 of the psychologists had done).

Like Stadler (1986), Pope et al. (1987) have helped to clarify the ethical principles that appear to be violated by certain dual relationships. Unfortunately, the authors did not discuss in adequate depth their rationale for claiming that certain behaviors violate the ethical principles mentioned above. For some behaviors it was obvious why they violated a particular ethical principle, while for others it was much less self-evident. For example, it is easy to see how sexual involvement with a client would be exploitative. It is much less clear, though, why accepting a client's invitation to a party violates the principle of treating people with respect for their dignity as human beings.

In analyzing the Pope et al. (1987) study it is evident that they did not provide adequate explanations as to why certain practices of psychologists violate various ethical principles. The authors recognized this drawback of their research and encouraged further study with narrower focuses on specific psychologist practices (Pope et al., 1987).
Another conclusion that can be drawn from Pope et al. (1987) is that many psychologists engage in behaviors, including dual relationships, which are discouraged or prohibited by the American Psychological Association (1981) ethical guidelines. As mentioned earlier, a large percentage of psychologists have indicated that they engage in dual relationship practices that are clearly prohibited in the American Psychological Association (1981) guidelines.

Roberts, Murrell, Thomas, and Claxton (1982), in a study of counselor educators, found that 34% believed that it is ethical for faculty members to have counseling relationships with students who are currently in their classes. Furthermore, 72% claimed that they have seen their students for at least short-term counseling. These examples demonstrate that a discrepancy exists between certain counselor practices and the relevant ethical guidelines. Further research is needed to understand more fully the reasons for this discrepancy.

As discussed earlier, the most thorough analysis to date of nonsexual dual relationships among mental health professionals was done by Borys (1988). She identified several dual relationships and incidental boundary violation behaviors that can occur between counselors and clients.
In obtaining her information, Borys designed her study differently from Pope et al. (1987) and other researchers who have attempted to study counselor practices and beliefs. In her study, half of her sample were asked what their actual practices were and the other half were asked what they saw as ethical behavior by people in their profession. In this way, Borys hoped to eliminate any potential response bias from her respondents. Interestingly, this attempt to "clean up" the research design did not result in convincing evidence that prior research findings were contaminated by asking respondents to identify both their practices and their beliefs about what behaviors are ethical for counselors (Borys & Pope, 1989).

Borys (1988), Pope et al. (1987), and Borys and Pope (1989) all point out the need for counselors to understand more fully the "research-based literature in which the nature, causes, and consequences of dual relationships are explored" (Borys & Pope, 1989, p. 291). Unfortunately, this research base almost exclusively relates to dual relationships involving sexual behavior. Therefore, further research is needed in the area of nonsexual dual relationships.
Research Relating Sexual and Nonsexual Dual Relationships

Only one research study (Borys, 1988) has been done to date that attempts to identify a relationship between sexualized dual relationships and nonsexual dual relationships. Her theoretical approach is such that she views dual relationships from a systems perspective. Consequently, role boundaries and norms in the counseling relationship, like those in the family, serve as a protection against exploitation. From her statistical analysis, Borys found a clear relationship between sexual and nonsexual dual relationships. Involvement in social activity of a non-sexual nature with clients was the best predictor of sexual involvement between counselors and clients after treatment had been terminated.

Borys' study was not designed in such a way that causal claims could be made, so it cannot be inferred that non-sexual dual relationships led to sexual relationships. Yet since most of the questions about social involvement with clients focused on the time period during treatment and the sexual involvement occurred after treatment was terminated, it seems logical to assume that social involvement preceded and contributed to sexual involvement between clients and counselors. The prospect that nonsexual dual relationships can lead
to sexual dual relationships (which are destructive to clients) provides a strong incentive for further investigation of this relationship in settings that were not studied by Borys, such as small college counseling centers.

Research in College and University Settings

Research in colleges and universities helps to provide some additional information for the small college counselor attempting to deal with dual relationships. Goodyear and Sinnett (1984) claim that "problems posed by dual relationships are probably the most frequently encountered by academically housed counseling psychologists" (p. 91). Hayman and Covert (1986) found that dual relationships were among the three most commonly identified ethical dilemmas in college counseling centers in western New York state. These findings, primarily based on data from large universities, help to support the point that dual relationships do pose significant and frequent problems for college counselors.

Grayson (1986), in a study of mental health confidentiality on the small campus, discussed certain peculiarities of small college counseling, some of which relate to dual relationships. Small college counselors are more visible on small campuses than are counselors on larger campuses. In addition, it is common for clients
who know one another to share the same counselor. For these reasons alone small college counselors frequently have what Grayson calls "entangling therapeutic relationships," a synonym for dual relationships. Grayson claims that on a large counseling staff when a counselor encounters an entangling relationship, it is not difficult to transfer that client to another counselor. On the small campus, however, the paucity of counselors and the large number of interconnections among students results in serious dilemmas for the counselor. According to Grayson, "everyone concerned must make do with the dual relationships; friends and lovers must share therapists, and therapists must treat people whose lives are intertwined" (p. 189). Though Grayson (1986) appears to have some useful insights into specific problems in the small college counseling center, his approach is not research-oriented. Thus, his assertions about the realities of the small college setting are not substantiated by any systematic research.

In another study, Gallagher (1989) found that 58% of small college counseling centers had problems referring students elsewhere because of inadequate finances or insurance coverage. Consequently, small college counselors are left with a difficult dilemma in which they may have to choose between counseling a student with whom
they have some other relationship or refusing to work with the student and risking the probability that the student will not receive any counseling. Goodyear and Sinnett (1984) identify a manifestation of this dilemma when they state: "Another dual relationship issue that has not been satisfactorily resolved occurs when counseling students who wish counseling have available to them only the campus counseling center where their faculty serve as staff" (p. 91).

Research in Small Geographical Communities

Some similarities between geographical communities and college communities have been noted in the research literature (Arnstein, 1972). Research done on the practices of counselors in small communities is relevant to the current study because of the similarities between small college communities and small geographical communities. Sobel (1984) discusses some ethical issues that confront child and adolescent psychotherapists in small communities. She maintains that small-town psychotherapists are placed in dual role situations almost daily. If therapists refuse to see clients with whom they may have some other relationship, then the client may not receive any psychotherapy at all because of the lack of available qualified therapists.

Hargrove (1986) discusses the "multiple levels of
personal and professional relationships" (p. 20) that occur in small communities. These "sociocultural realities" (p. 22) in small communities result in significant ethical dilemmas that are much less likely to be encountered in larger communities. The complexities of the small community have led several small-town psychologists to complain to the American Psychological Association ethics board that the American Psychological Association ethical guidelines regarding dual relationships are not appropriate for their settings (Borys, personal communication, October 15, 1989).

The small world hazards that occur in small geographical communities (Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985) are at least as prevalent in small colleges (Grayson, 1986). Consequently, small college counselors face frequent and sometimes unavoidable dual relationship dilemmas with clients.

Summary

In summarizing the research as it relates to dual relationships in small college counseling centers, it is clear that in recent years more effort has been given to identifying dual relationships and the problems associated with them. Attempts have been made to relate ethical principles to various dual relationship behaviors. These
efforts, however, need to be more focused and specific, particularly since research indicates that many counselors continue to engage in at least certain types of proscribed dual relationships with clients.

Furthermore, research that directly measures the effects of nonsexual dual relationships on clients is needed. The theoretical frameworks that have been developed are important to help focus research efforts but if dual relationship behaviors are to be condemned in the various professional ethical guidelines, research evidence that demonstrates damage to clients from these dual relationships is crucial. Borys' (1988) finding which suggests that social contact between counselors and clients is predictive of later sexual involvement is an excellent argument against any social dual relationships because of the established link between counselor/client sexual contact and damage to clients. But since Borys did not study small college settings this link may not be accurate in those settings. In small colleges the same community interconnections that make dual relationships so much more difficult to avoid may also make clandestine sexual relationships between counselors and students less possible.

Research focused primarily on large counseling centers indicates that dual relationship dilemmas occur repeatedly. Research on counseling practices in small
communities also reveals frequent dual relationship hazards between counselors and clients. The similarities between small communities and small colleges make it highly likely that small college counselors face constant dual relationship dilemmas.

Many questions remain unanswered regarding dual relationship dilemmas in the small college setting. Exactly how frequent are nonsexual and sexual dual relationships in small college counseling centers? Should small college counselors be bound by ethical standards that prohibit dual relationships when these relationships are much less avoidable in small-college settings? Which nonsexual dual relationships are the most potentially harmful to clients?

Some strides have been made in the research literature in terms of understanding the potential dangers of dual relationships. Small college counselors need to be aware of the damage that can occur to clients when inappropriate role blending takes place. The above questions, though, have not yet been adequately addressed. Further research is needed to answer these difficult questions for small college counselors so that they will be better equipped to meet the psychological needs of their students. As with the research done on sexualized dual relationships, research regarding dual relationships
in small college settings needs to begin with data regarding attitudes toward and practices of dual relationships. Further research can then add to this data base.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

Study Design

The design in this study was a cross-sectional survey design. Questionnaires were sent to 300 randomly selected small college counselors in the United States. One form of the questionnaire (Ethics form) was sent to half of the sample (n=150) and sought information regarding the ethicality of certain dual relationships. A second form of the questionnaire (Practice form) was sent to the other half of the sample and sought information regarding actual counselor practices. The reason for this design was that cognitive dissonance and other biases might have contaminated the respondents' ratings if they had been asked to respond to both aspects of dual relationships (ethicality and practice). This design and rationale was consistent with Borys' (1988) study.

Subjects and Sampling Plan

Colleges and universities in the United States where the combined part-time and full-time enrollment on campus during the 1988-89 academic year was less than 2,000
students were the population for the study. To select the sample, each college and university listed in the College Blue Book (1989) was assigned a number. A computer-generated random numbers table was then printed and institutions were selected in the order that they appeared in the random numbers table. After a college or university was selected that had fewer than 2,000 students, that institution was called to determine whether a counseling center existed there, and if one was in existence, then the name(s) of the counseling center staff was obtained so that the survey could be more personalized to increase the response rate. If no counselor was employed at an institution, then that institution was removed from the study, since there was no identifiable person to whom to send the survey.

After calling 392 institutions, 300 institutions were identified that met the criteria for inclusion in the study. For the following reasons 90 institutions that were called were rejected for the study. Fifty-seven institutions just said "no" when asked if a counseling center existed on campus. Twelve institutions, upon further research, did not meet the size criteria. Ten colleges stated that they contracted out counseling services to outside agencies. Seven institutions were unable to identify a counselor by name. For example, one college was in the process of hiring a new counselor.
Two schools had closed. One institution stated that its policy was not to participate in surveys and a final college could not be reached by phone. Two schools were placed on an alternate list in case they were needed.

Some institutions selected for the sample had more than one identified counselor. Since no institution had more than five identified counselors, separate random numbers tables were generated for schools that had two, three, four or five identified counselors. If an institution had more than one counselor, then the counselors identified for that institution were each assigned a number and the appropriate random numbers table was used to determine which counselor should be selected for inclusion in the study.

For identification purposes each institution selected for the study was assigned a number from 1-300. Every other institution (1, 3, 5, . . . 299) received a form of the survey regarding their attitudes about dual relationships (Ethics form). The remaining institutions (2, 4, 6, . . . 300) received a form of the survey regarding actual counselor practices of dual relationships (Practice form).

All surveys were mailed on September 29, 1990. Fifteen days after the surveys were sent out a follow-up letter and another copy of the survey were sent to all
non-respondents. A cut-off date of November 20, 1990 was set and no more returned surveys were included after that time.

For the Ethics form of the survey, over 78% of the surveys were completed while 66% of the Practice forms were returned. The combined return rate was 72%. In addition, four counselors returned the Practice form with explanations of why they were not qualified to complete it, while one counselor returned the Ethics form and indicated that she could not complete it.

Assessing Non-Response Bias

The 47 counselors who did not return the Practice form and the 30 counselors who did not return the Ethics form were a concern because there was no way to know if a non-respondent bias existed. To address this issue of non-respondent bias, each non-responding counselor was assigned a number. Then, drawing from computer-generated random numbers table, 10% of each group of non-respondents (n=9) were called and asked the following: "Recently, you were sent a questionnaire about counseling practices in small colleges. We are doing a follow-up on a random sample of people who didn't send back the questionnaire. Would you be willing to tell me why you didn't return the questionnaire?"

Almost all of the non-respondents who were contacted
(7/9) gave as their reason for not returning the survey that they had not had enough time to complete it. These comments included: "I'm just swamped--I don't have time to complete questionnaires"; "It's in my file of things to do--I have so many questionnaires in there right now"; "It's a bad time of the year--it is still sitting on my desk"; "I was just swamped timewise and I didn't have time to fool with it"; "I'm busy--I started it but it looked like it would require more time so I put it aside--I don't even know where it is right now"; "I gave it to our new counselor--he's only been here for 5 weeks so he probably was too busy setting up his new office to fill it out yet"; "It's hard to get through all my mail--I did finish it yesterday and it's sitting on my floor to be mailed."

One of the non-respondents who did not fit into the "time crunch" category said: "I would not be considered a counselor here--that is why I did not return the questionnaire." The other counselor would give no specific reason why he had not returned the survey. He simply said: "Oh, I've got to send that in yet--it's still sitting on my desk."

Instrumentation

The Therapeutic Practices Survey was developed by
Borys (1988). Borys had two forms of her survey in order to determine the degree to which her sample of psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers engaged in, and saw as ethical, 22 dual relationship practices. For the current study, the Counseling Practices Survey was adapted from Borys' (1988) Therapeutic Practices Survey and from other sources that more specifically address dual relationship behaviors in college settings (Hayman & Covert, 1986; Herlihy & Golden, 1990; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; and feedback from members of the Small College Counselors' Association). The Counseling Practices Survey has two forms that sought information related to dual relationship practices in small college counseling centers (see Appendices C and D). These surveys were identical except that one of the surveys (Ethics form) sought counselors' attitudes toward certain dual relationship behaviors. Respondents were asked to rate these dual relationship behaviors on the following scale: ALWAYS ETHICAL (5), ETHICAL UNDER MOST CONDITIONS (4), ETHICAL UNDER SOME CONDITIONS (3), ETHICAL UNDER RARE CONDITIONS (2), NEVER ETHICAL (1), or NOT SURE (0). The second section of the survey requested demographic information, such as the counselor's gender, educational background, primary theoretical orientation, number of referral sources on campus, and number and type of membership in different professional organizations (see
Appendix C).

The other form of the survey (Practice form) obtained a self-report of the actual practices of the counselors being studied on a 6-point scale. Counselors were asked whether they had engaged in certain dual relationship behaviors with: ALL CLIENTS (5), MOST CLIENTS (4), SOME CLIENTS (3), FEW CLIENTS (2), NO CLIENTS (1), or NO OPPORTUNITY (0). Counselors were instructed to use the "NO OPPORTUNITY" rating if they had never had the opportunity to engage in the behavior while counselors who had the opportunity to engage in the behavior but had chosen not to do so were instructed to use the "NO CLIENTS" rating. The second section of the Practice Form asked the identical demographic questions that were asked in the Ethics Form (see Appendix D).

Both surveys included 15 potential boundary-altering (dual relationship) situations. These situations were identified through a review of ethics complaint cases and other available research literature (American Psychological Association, 1988; Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985; Pope et al., 1987; Borys, 1988; and Roberts et al., 1982). In addition, two dual relationships (involvement in the decision-making process regarding campus disciplinary action with a client and involvement in committee or project work with a client) were suggested for inclusion
in the survey by members of the Small College Counselor's Association of Michigan because these dual relationships are uniquely present in college and university settings.

Both forms of the Counseling Practices Survey also included two questions that were designed to help identify the presence (if one existed) of a social desirability response bias in the respondents. Pope et al. (1987) found in a survey of psychologists that over 98% of the individuals surveyed reported having offered or accepted a handshake from one or more clients. Another survey of psychologists, also by Pope, Keith-Spiegel, and Tabachnick (1986) found that 83.3% of the respondents indicated that they had felt sexually attracted to at least one client. It was hypothesized that if the respondents to the current survey gave a similar response pattern to these two questions, the assumption could be made that the respondents' responses were less likely to have been contaminated by a social desirability response bias (Borys, 1988).

Background Variables

An additional aspect of the survey was to obtain background information on several areas that may be related to the prevalence of dual relationship practices by small college counselors. The first of these background variables was gender. Many differences between
males and females in the type of dual relationships in which they tend to participate have been demonstrated in prior studies (Borys, 1988; Tallman, in Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985).

Educational background is another variable that may affect perceptions of ethicality and dual relationship behavior. It was hypothesized that counselors with the least educational attainment (B.A./B.S), would be less likely to have been exposed to relevant course work on ethics and, consequently, would be dissimilar regarding views of counseling practice to counselors with a higher degree of educational attainment.

Still another variable related to dual relationships was the primary theoretical orientation of the counselor. Borys (1988) found that therapists whose primary theoretical orientation was psychodynamic were less likely to engage in dual relationship behaviors with clients than were therapists with other primary theoretical orientations.

Membership in professional organizations was yet another factor hypothesized to be related to dual relationship behavior. Because of the ethical guidelines and educative efforts by various professional organizations, members of those organizations may differ from non-members regarding dual relationship behavior.
Also analyzed in this study was the relationship between nonsexual and sexual dual relationships. Borys (1988) found that engaging in nonsexual social activities with clients was the best predictor of sexual involvement with clients after termination of the therapy relationship. Therefore, this current study attempted to determine if any similar relationship could be found with the subjects in small college settings. At a conceptual level, open systems theory would predict that changes in the role boundaries in one area (e.g., social involvement) would require adaptation in the system as a whole and could affect other realms of behavior (e.g., sexual involvement).

A final variable that was studied was the number of available referral sources for the counselors who were surveyed. Open systems theory would predict that those counselors who have the fewest referral options would be most likely to make adjustments in the boundaries and roles in the counseling relationship.

**Pilot Testing**

Before being distributed, the Counseling Practices Survey was pilot-tested with 11 members of the Small College Counselors' Association of Michigan to determine the face validity of the instrument. These individuals were also asked to identify any ambiguous, biased, or
redundant items in the questionnaire and to suggest any other potential dual relationship behaviors that should be added to the survey. The final forms of the survey included changes that were suggested by the pilot respondents.

Factor Analysis

Descriptive statistics were obtained that indicated the attitudes and practices of small college counselors regarding 15 alternate (dual) relationships. Because of the large number of attitudes and practices that were studied, a principal components factor analysis of the responses was made so that the different practices and attitudes could be narrowed down into fewer categories for statistical purposes to avoid an inflated potential of committing Type I errors in data analysis.

Ethics Form

In the factor analysis of the ethicality ratings, three items were not included: "Accepting a handshake offered by a client," "Feeling sexually attracted to a client," and "Engaging in sexual activity with an ongoing client." The first two items were excluded because they had only appeared in the survey as a means to check for social desirability bias in respondents. The third item
regarding sex with current clients was eliminated because it had almost no variability in the responses to it since 99.2% of the respondents viewed this behavior as never ethical.

For the responses to the Ethics form of the survey, factor analysis yielded four conceptually meaningful factors. Each item was assigned to the factor to which it had the highest loading. All items had loadings between .64 and .93 in the factors to which they were assigned (as seen in Table 1). Factor I included items which centered around social involvement between the counselor and the client and, thus, was labeled "Social Involvement." Since each item had a range of values from 0-5, and since this factor included four items, the range of possible values for Factor I was 0-20.

Factor II contained three items which focused on situations in which the counselor had a blending of professional roles with a client. Therefore, this factor was labeled "Dual Professional Roles." This factor had a range of possible values from 0-15.

Factor III included items related to involvement with a client of either a personal or a sexual nature. Hence, its label was "Personal/Sexual Involvement" and it contained four items with a possible range of values from 0-20.
Table 1

Item Grouping Through Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Social Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accepting a client's invitation to a special occasion (e.g., wedding, funeral, graduation party)</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Going out to eat with a client of the same gender</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Going out to eat with a client of the opposite gender</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inviting a client to a personal party or social event</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Dual Professional Roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing counseling to a student employee</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allowing a client to enroll in your class for a grade</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing counseling to a student you have in class</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Personal/Sexual Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accepting from a client a gift valued under $10</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Becoming friends with a client after termination of counseling</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engaging in sexual activity with a client after termination of counseling</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disclosing details of your current personal stresses to a client</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Conflict-of-Interest Roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing counseling to a relative or friend of an ongoing client</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Loading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Involvement in the decision-making process regarding campus disciplinary action for a client</strong></td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Working on a committee or project with a client</strong></td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, Factor IV, composed of three items, was labeled "Conflict-of-Interest Roles" because of the nature of the items which were present in this factor. Possible values ranged from 0-15.

Practice Form

Factor analysis of responses to the Practice form did not yield factors which were conceptually meaningful. Borys (1988) also had this difficulty and, as with her study, it is likely that the reason conceptually meaningful factors did not emerge was because the large percentage of respondents who reportedly engaged in the target behaviors with "NO CLIENTS" skewed the results. As a consequence, factor analysis was unable to discriminate well enough between variables due to the lack of variance. Therefore, the same four factors found in the factor analysis of the responses to the Ethics form were used for the Practice form.

Critical Value

Because of the number of different statistical analyses that were performed in the study, alpha was set at .01. This critical value lessened the likelihood of committing Type I errors in data analysis.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The research questions addressed in the study were:

1. What are small college counselors' attitudes regarding the ethicality of certain dual relationship behaviors between the counselor and the client?

2. How frequently do small college counselors engage in dual relationship behaviors with clients?

3. What are the similarities and differences between small college counselors' attitudes regarding the ethicality of dual relationship behaviors with student clients and the frequency with which small college counselors report engaging in these behaviors?

4. What is the relationship between nonsexual and sexual dual relationships in the counseling relationship?

5. What is the relationship between counselors' attitudes regarding dual relationships in small college counseling centers and the attitudes of mental health workers in other settings?

6. What is the relationship between counselors' dual relationship practices in small college counseling centers and the practices of mental health workers in
other settings?

7. Do counselors' attitudes and practices regarding each type of dual relationship behavior vary according to gender, theoretical orientation, educational background, number of counselors employed at the college, or membership in professional organizations?

Characteristics of the Sample

Completed surveys were returned by 217 of the potential 300 members of the sample. In addition, five surveys were returned uncompleted with explanations as to why those counselors thought that they were unqualified to complete their surveys. A total of 78 counselors constituted the non-responders. Of these non-responders, nine were called to find out why they did not return the questionnaire. As stated previously, the majority of the non-responders who were called stated that they had been too busy to fill out the questionnaire.

The overall response rate of over 70% (72%) is considered to be "very good" by Babbie (1973, p. 165). Also, this response rate is considerably higher than response rates in similar research of therapists' practices and attitudes about ethicality (Pope et al., 1987; Borys, 1988).
Gender

The overall percentage of female respondents in this study was 56.9% (n=123), while males constituted 43.1% (n=93). No statistically significant differences existed in the gender distribution for the separate forms of the questionnaire. In the original sample of 300, of those whose gender could be identified (n=281), 54.8% were female while 45.2% were male. See Table 2 for a summary of these data.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethics %</th>
<th>Practice %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No statistically significant difference in gender by survey form

Region of Residence

The sample for this study was drawn from 48 states and the District of Columbia. The respondents, however, represented 44 states and the District of Columbia. For the respondents, 21.0% were located in the Northeast,
34.7% were from the Midwest, 34.2% were located in the South, and 10.7% were from the West.

Educational Background

The most common educational degree held by the survey respondents was a Master's degree (55.5%), while 34.3% had a doctoral degree. The other educational categories (Bachelor's, Specialist, and Other) each contained fewer than 6% of the respondents. See Table 3 for the complete distribution of respondents' educational backgrounds.

Table 3
Distribution of Respondents' Educational Background by Survey Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A./B.S.</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A./M.S.</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D./Ed.D./Psy.D.</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Columns may not sum to 100 due to rounding. No statistically significant difference in educational achievement by survey form.
Theoretical Orientation

The largest percentage of respondents (34.1%) selected the "Cognitive" orientation as their primary theoretical orientation. The same percentage (16.1%) selected "Behavioral" and "Psychodynamic" as their primary orientations (see Table 4).

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Orientation</th>
<th>Ethics %</th>
<th>Practice %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychodynamic</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestalt</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No significant difference in primary theoretical orientation by survey form.

*aThe largest percentage of respondents using the "Other" category was 19.9% who identified "Family Systems"; 14.6% identified "Client-centered" and 12.2% identified "Biblical" as their primary theoretical orientation.
Another 18.5% of respondents selected "Other" as their primary theoretical orientation. Almost one fifth of the respondents who used the "Other" category identified "Family Systems" as their primary theoretical orientation.

Referral Sources

A total of 30.1% of the respondents had one other qualified counselor on their campuses to whom they could refer clients. The next largest percentage of respondents (23.2%) had no other counselor to whom they could refer clients.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Sources</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Columns may not sum to 100 due to rounding. No statistically significant difference in referral sources by survey form.
Membership in Professional Organizations

The majority of respondents (81.6%) indicated that they belonged to at least one professional organization related to counseling. A total of 46.1% claimed membership in the American Association for Counseling and Development. A smaller percentage of respondents indicated that they belonged to the American College Personnel Association (30%); and 20.7% reported membership in the American Psychological Association (see Table 6).

Table 6

Distribution of Respondents' Professional Memberships by Survey Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APA</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AACD</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACPA</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reported memberships</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Columns do not sum to 100 due to memberships in more than one organization. No statistically significant difference in professional membership by survey form.
Sample Representativeness

A difficult issue to address in the current study was the representativeness of the sample selected. Because of the dearth of research on small college counselors, no norms exist to which the sample of this study could be compared. One study by Levine and Kaplan (1990) found that 53% of "small" colleges (as self-defined by the counselor) had one or two counselors employed there. This figure compares to 48.3% of the respondents in the current study who claimed that there was either one qualified counselor or no qualified counselors to whom the respondent could refer clients. Though this similarity in number of counselors employed does not prove that the sample of the current study is representative of small college settings, it is at least reassuring to note that a similarity does exist between the small college counselors studied by Levine and Kaplan (1990) and the respondents in the current study. In addition, the research design used in the present study in which subjects were selected on the basis of simple random sampling procedures helped to assure that the sample was indeed representative of the population of small college counselors (Glass & Hopkins, 1984).
Non-Response Bias

Though the potential for a non-respondent bias always exists when fewer than 100% of the surveys are returned, three factors seemed to minimize the likelihood of a significant non-respondent bias in this study. First, the high response rate (72% overall) provided some basis for confidence. Babbie (1973) viewed any response rate over 70% as "very good" (p. 165). Also, the range of response rates in similar surveys of therapists' practices and attitudes is 29% to 55% (Pope et al., 1986; Borys, 1988). Second, the phone follow-up to the sample of non-respondents was also reassuring. It was important to determine if the non-responders did not respond to the surveys because they thought that their practices or opinions about ethicality were atypical or unethical. None of the non-responders contacted evidenced that their reason for non-response was due to fears of atypicality or unethicability.

A third reason why non-response bias may have been minimal in this study was because of the similarities between the non-responders and the responders. Two comparisons could be made between these two groups. First, since prior research established that gender is related to beliefs about and practices of certain dual relationships (Borys, 1988), the gender breakdown of the
non-respondents was compared to the gender percentages of the respondents. In the overall sample, for those whose gender could be identified ($n=282$), 54.8% were female and 45.2% were male. For the responders ($n=217$), 56.7% were female and 43.3% were male. For non-responders, ($n=65$), 49.5% were female and 50.7% were male. This difference is not statistically significant.

A second comparison was made between the region of residence of the sample as a whole and the responders, again because prior research has established a link between region of residence and certain counseling practices (Borys, 1988). In the random sample, 22.6% of the institutions selected were from the Northeast region, 31.1% were from the Midwest region, 35.5% were from the South region, and 10.8% were from the West region of the United States. The respondents' regions of residence had similar percentages with 21.0% coming from the Northeast, 34.7% from the Midwest, 34.2% from the South, and 10.7% from the West. No significant difference was found between the geographical distribution of respondents and the geographical distribution of nonrespondents.

For these reasons non-response bias did not appear to be a major factor in this study. However, as stated above, some non-response bias is always possible, particularly when some socially undesirable behaviors are a focus of the study.
Social Desirability Bias

A major concern of any study which seeks self-report information about potentially unethical behavior is the issue of social desirability response bias. Tests have been constructed to subtly determine if survey respondents are attempting to make themselves "look good" (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). In the current study, if a strong social desirability bias occurred, the attitudes and practices of controversial dual relationship behaviors could be underestimated or underreported. For this reason, it was important to find some way to assess the presence of any response bias in the survey respondents.

Two survey items used by Borys (1988) to assess social desirability bias were "Accepting a handshake offered by a client" and "Feeling sexually attracted to a client." Both of these behaviors were endorsed by a large percentage of Borys' subjects. Borys found that 99.5% of her respondents reported having accepted a handshake from a client, while 86.8% of her respondents reported to have been sexually attracted to at least one client. By comparison, in the current study, 96.9% of the respondents indicated that they had accepted a handshake from at least one client.

For a more controversial phenomenon, sexual attraction to a client, only 50.5% of the respondents in the
current study reported that they had been sexually attracted to at least one of their clients. This percentage is considerably smaller than the percentage (86.8%) found by Borys (1988) and the percentage (83.3%) found by Pope et al. (1986). It seems unlikely that such a large difference in reported sexual attraction would occur merely by chance between the counselors in small college counseling centers and mental health workers in other settings.

A complication in determining the reason for this discrepancy is that sexual attraction is primarily a covert activity while all of the other items in the survey described overt behaviors. Consequently, this particular covert behavior is in a different category from all of the other items in the survey. Several survey respondents in the current study (including over 10% of the respondents to the Ethics form) made comments which expressed their discomfort with the "fit" of this item in the survey. Comments by respondents included stating that the item was a "poor," "unclear," "funny" question; that sexual attraction was not a "behavior"; that it was "not an ethical issue"; and that "one's actions can be judged, not one's feelings," even though nothing was said in the survey about judging anyone's actions or feelings.
Additional evidence exists that respondents in the current study were uncomfortable with this question of sexual attraction to clients. Almost 13% of the respondents to the Ethics form of the survey chose not to rate the degree of ethicality of sexual attraction to a client, while all of the other items were rated by over 97% of the respondents. Also, a larger percentage of respondents (7.8%) stated that they were not sure about the ethicality of sexual attraction than on any other item in the survey. In her analysis, Borys (1988) did not report any such ambivalence or discomfort by her respondents to this item.

Though Borys (1988) did not report the percentage of respondents who viewed "feeling sexually attracted to a client" as never ethical, a study of psychologists by Pope et al. (1987) found that only 9.2% of their respondents viewed sexual attraction to a client as never ethical. This percentage compares to 34.0% of the respondents in the current study who viewed sexual attraction to clients as never ethical. It seems plausible, then, that sexual attraction to clients was viewed differently by the respondents in the current study (regardless of the form of the survey received) than it was by respondents in Borys' (1988) and Pope's et al. (1987) studies.

If it is true that the respondents in the current study viewed sexual attraction differently than did the
respondents in other studies, the question still remains as to why this difference occurred. Several possible explanations exist for the difference. First, of the respondents whose institution's religious affiliation could be identified \((n=218)\), 58\% of the respondents \((n=127)\) were employed at a religiously affiliated institution. It is possible that the current study had a larger percentage of respondents who had more conservative religious beliefs which viewed sexual attraction as "lust," and consequently, as sinful, than in Borys' (1988) study. A modest amount of evidence was found in the current study to support this hypothesis. In the Practice form of the survey, both of the respondents who wrote in "Biblical" or "Spiritual" as their primary theoretical orientation also reported that they had never been sexually attracted to a client. In addition, on the Ethics form of the survey, of the five respondents who wrote in "Biblical" \((n=4)\) or "Jesus' style" \((n=1)\) as their primary theoretical orientation, four of these five respondents rated sexual attraction to clients as never ethical. Thus, it is possible that the religious beliefs of a large percentage of the respondents made them less likely to recognize or report covert phenomena such as sexual attraction to clients.

Another possible explanation for the difference in
respondents' endorsement rates of sexual attraction is the different levels of educational attainment by the majority of the current respondents compared to other research. In Borys' (1988) research on psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers, she only included M.D.'s, Ph.D's, and M.S.W.'s or D.S.W.'s for the respective groups. In the current study, 55.5% of the respondents had a Master's degree of some kind. These Master's degrees varied in content from Master of Divinity degrees to Master of Education degrees. The diversity of the degrees represented in the current study and the lesser educational attainment may partially account for the difference in responses to sexual attraction.

Some evidence does exist that educational attainment may be a relevant factor. In a Chi-square analysis in which respondents with a Master's degree (n=56) or a Specialist's degree (n=2) were compared to respondents with a doctoral degree (n=31), a non-significant difference (p=.035) was found regarding reported sexual attraction to clients. Respondents with doctoral degrees were more likely to report sexual attraction to clients than were respondents who had not received a doctoral degree. While 26.3% of respondents without the doctoral degree endorsed the "NO CLIENTS" rating category, for example, only 3.2% of the respondents with a doctoral degree endorsed that rating category.
A final potential contributing factor to the low endorsement rate of any sexual attraction to clients that could be analyzed in the current study is gender differences in experiencing or reporting sexual attraction. A Chi-square analysis of gender differences in responding to the question of sexual attraction to clients yielded a statistically significant difference \( \chi^2(3, n = 97) = 21.235, p < .001 \). Females were considerably more likely to report either "NO OPPORTUNITY" or "NO CLIENTS" (64.9%) regarding sexual attraction to clients than were men, of whom only 26.3% endorsed these two rating categories. Because the percentage of female respondents was higher than that of males (60% to 40%) and since females (at least in the current study) were less likely to experience or report sexual attraction to clients, this may partially explain some of the differences between Borys' (1988) findings about sexual attraction and the findings in this study.

The differences between the percentage of Borys' (1988) respondents and the respondents in the current study regarding sexual attraction to clients may mean that sexual attraction to a client was seen as being much more repugnant in this study, and since sexual attraction is not always an overtly measurable phenomenon (like all of the other behaviors assessed in the study),
respondents may have simply suppressed or repressed their feelings of sexual attraction to clients.

Overall, it is troubling, though, that such a relatively small number of respondents in the current study reported sexual attraction to at least one client. Though some other explanations may exist to help explain why this percentage differed so significantly from research findings in prior studies (Borys, 1988; Pope et al., 1987), it seems safe to say that the respondents in the current study may at least have been partially affected by a social desirability response bias. It also seems quite likely that if the respondents in the current study were unwilling to admit to sexual attraction to clients, they would be much less likely to admit to any sexual involvement with current or former clients. This caution should be noted in evaluating the results of the study.

Questions

Research Question One

What are small college counselors' attitudes regarding the ethicality of dual relationships with clients? As can be seen in Table 7, only two dual relationship behaviors were considered "NEVER ETHICAL" by the majority of respondents: engaging in sexual activity with an
Table 7

Percentage of Respondents Endorsing Each Rating Category: Ethics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting from a client a gift valued under $10</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a client's invitation to a special occasion (e.g., wedding, funeral, graduation party)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming friends with a client after termination of counseling</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing counseling to a student employee</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in sexual activity with a client after termination of counseling</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a handshake offered by a client(^b)</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling sexually attracted to a client(^b)</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosing details of your current personal stresses to a client</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going out to eat with a client of the same gender</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going out to eat with a client of the opposite gender</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in sexual activity with an ongoing client</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inviting a client to a personal party or social event</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing counseling to a relative or friend of an ongoing client</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing counseling to a student you have in class</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing a client to enroll in your class for a grade</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in the decision-making process regarding campus disciplinary action for a client</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working on a committee or project with a client</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rows may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

\(^a\)5 = Always ethical; 4 = Ethical under most conditions; 3 = Ethical under some conditions; 2 = Ethical under rare conditions; 1 = Never ethical; NS = not sure

\(^b\)These two items were included to check for social desirability bias.
ongoing client (99.2%), and engaging in sexual activity with a client after termination of counseling (77.4%). On the other hand, none of the survey items (other than the social desirability item of "Accepting a handshake offered by a client") was rated as "ALWAYS ETHICAL" by the majority of respondents.

Five items in the survey had a greater percentage of respondents who thought that those particular behaviors were either "ALWAYS ETHICAL" or "ETHICAL UNDER MOST CONDITIONS" than the percentage of those who thought that the behaviors were "ETHICAL UNDER RARE CONDITIONS" or "NEVER ETHICAL." For example, 38.9% of the respondents thought that it was always or almost always ethical to accept a client's invitation to a special event in the client's life, while only 19.5% viewed this behavior as rarely or never ethical. A total of 38.3% indicated that it was always or almost always ethical to counsel student employees, while 32.2% saw this behavior as rarely or never ethical.

Regarding the practice of counseling a relative or friend of an ongoing client, 29.6% viewed this behavior as always or almost always ethical, while 28.0% viewed this behavior as rarely or never ethical. Over one-third (34.2%) of the respondents thought that it was always or almost always ethical to provide counseling to a student they had in class, while 31.6% saw this behavior as
rarely or never ethical. Finally, working on a committee or project with a client was viewed as always or almost always ethical by 26.5% of the respondents, while 23.1% regarded this behavior as rarely or never ethical.

Ten behaviors, including the aforementioned actions of engaging in sexual activity with a current or former client, had a larger percentage of respondents who viewed the action as rarely or never ethical than who viewed it as almost always or always ethical. These behaviors included accepting a gift valued under $10, becoming friends with a client after termination of counseling, disclosing details of one's current personal stresses to a client, going out to eat with a client (of either gender), inviting a client to a personal party or social event, allowing a client to enroll in one's class for a grade, and involvement in the decision-making process regarding campus disciplinary action for a client.

Half of the survey items on the Ethics form had a mean response average between 2.5 and 3.5 on a scale from 1-5 and standard deviations ranging from 0.9 to 1.3. This finding, coupled with the statistics already presented, indicates that a considerable range of opinions existed among respondents regarding the various dual relationships addressed in the survey.
Ethical Uncertainty

As seen in Table 7, four survey items elicited the most "NOT SURE" responses. Allowing a client to enroll in one's class for a grade had the highest degree of uncertainty with 7.7% of the respondents unsure about the ethicality of that behavior. Accepting from a client a gift valued under $10, accepting a client's invitation to a special occasion, and becoming friends with a client after termination of counseling all had over 5% of the respondents uncertain about the ethicality of those behaviors. All of the other survey items had under 3.5% of respondents expressing uncertainty about the degree to which they viewed those behaviors as ethical.

Research Question Two

How frequently do counselors engage in dual relationship behaviors with clients in small college settings? Of some concern in interpreting respondents' results was the degree to which the respondents may have misunderstood the distinction between "NO OPPORTUNITY" and "NO CLIENTS" as rating categories. For example, on the social desirability item of "Feeling sexually attracted to a client," 18.6% of the respondents claimed that they had had no opportunity to have that feeling. Obviously, the opportunity for sexual attraction to a client merely
requires the presence of a client. The large percentage (18.6%) of the respondents endorsing the category of "NO OPPORTUNITY" indicates some misunderstanding (or at least misuse) of this rating category.

From Table 8 it can be seen that the percentage of respondents who claimed that they engaged in the dual relationship behaviors with few or no clients was greater than the percentage of respondents who reportedly engaged in the behaviors with some, most, or all clients (with the exception of the social desirability item of accepting a handshake offered by a client). However, at least half of the respondents reported that they had engaged in four of the dual relationship behaviors with at least one client. The largest percentage of respondents (71.4%) reportedly provided counseling to a relative or friend of at least one ongoing client. A smaller number (60.8%) of the respondents reported that they had provided counseling to at least one student employee. Working on a committee or project with a client reportedly had occurred at least once with over half of the respondents (58.1%). Exactly half (50%) of the respondents also claimed to have become friends with a client after termination of counseling with at least one client.

Another five dual relationship behaviors had a larger percentage of respondents reportedly engaging in those behaviors with at least one client when compared to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a gift worth under $10 from a client</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a client's invitation to a special occasion (e.g., wedding, funeral, graduation party)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming friends with a client after termination of counseling</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing counseling to an employee</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in sexual activity with a client after termination of counseling</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a handshake offered by a client</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling sexually attracted to a client(^b)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosing details of your current personal stresses to a client(^b)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going out to eat with a client of the same gender</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going out to eat with a client of the opposite gender</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating⁵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in sexual activity with an ongoing client</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inviting clients to a personal party or social event</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing counseling to a relative or friend of an ongoing client</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing counseling to a student you have in class</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing a client to enroll in your class for a grade</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in the decision-making process regarding campus disciplinary action for a client</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in committee or project work with a client</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rows may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

⁵All clients; 4 = Most clients; 3 = Some clients; 2 = Few clients; 1 = No clients; No opp. = No opportunity

bThese two items were included to check for social desirability bias.
the percentage of respondents who had never engaged in the behavior. Almost half (48.5%) of the respondents had reportedly accepted a gift worth under $10 from at least one client, while a much smaller percentage (22.7%) claimed to have had the opportunity to engage in that behavior but had chosen not to do so. Being involved in the decision-making process regarding disciplinary action for a client had also been engaged in by close to half of the respondents (48%), while 36.7% reportedly chose not to engage in that behavior. Providing counseling to a student one had in class was reportedly engaged in by 45.8% of the respondents, while less than one quarter (22.9%) had reportedly opted not to do so.

Two other behaviors were reportedly engaged in by a smaller majority of respondents. Accepting a client's invitation to a special occasion had 42.9% reporting engagement in that behavior, while 35.7% stated that they had never done that. Finally, 30.2% reportedly allowed a client to enroll in their class for a grade, while 29.2% reported never allowing that to occur.

Comparing the respondents who reported going out to eat with at least one client of the same sex to the respondents who reported going out to eat with a client of the opposite sex yielded some interesting results. Sixty-two percent of those respondents who reportedly had an opportunity to eat with clients of both sexes did not
eat out with either sex. Of those who did eat out with clients (n=28), 32% ate only with clients of their own sex, while 68% had eaten with clients of both sexes. No respondents reportedly ate only with clients of the opposite sex. A Chi-square analysis of respondents' ratings yielded statistically significant differences in reported eating behavior of respondents with same-sex versus opposite-sex clients ($\chi^2 = 41.997; p < .001$).

Two behaviors had no respondents reportedly engaging in them. Engaging in sexual activity with an ongoing client and engaging in sexual activity with a client after termination of counseling reportedly had never occurred with any of the respondents. As discussed earlier, respondents in the current study reported a lesser percentage of sexual attraction to clients than has been found in prior research with other populations of mental health workers (Borys, 1988; Pope et al., 1987). Therefore, it is possible that respondents were unwilling to admit to a behavior that could be considered a much more serious ethical violation than sexual attraction.

Overall, the majority of respondents reportedly engaged in most of the target behaviors only rarely or never. However, for several behaviors, a large percentage of respondents reportedly engaged in those dual
relationship behaviors at least once.

**Research Question Three**

What are the similarities and differences between small college counselors' attitudes regarding the ethicality of dual relationships with student clients and the frequency with which small college counselors report engaging in these behaviors? For all of the behaviors addressed in the survey, the frequency of engaging in the behaviors was less than the frequency of situations in which the behaviors were seen as ethical. For example, 41.8% of respondents reported that they had never established a friendship with a former client, while only 10.3% of respondents viewed that behavior as never ethical. This discrepancy could mean that even though respondents viewed a particular behavior as ethically acceptable in certain circumstances, they still chose to refrain from engaging in that behavior. The discrepancy could also mean that they had simply refrained from reporting that they had engaged in that behavior. In comparing the responses on the Practice form of the survey to the Ethics form, it is important to note that the degree of self-disclosure sought by the two forms is different. It is less personally incriminating to indicate that a particular behavior is ethical under some conditions than to admit that one actually engages in
that particular behavior with some clients.

Overall, it was clear that respondents were more likely to endorse a particular dual relationship as potentially ethical than they were to either engage in or admit that they had engaged in that behavior (see Table 9). However, a significant correlation did exist between the frequency with which a particular behavior was reportedly practiced and the frequency with which that behavior was reportedly seen as ethical ($r = .902, p < .001$) (see Figure 1). Even though respondents were more likely to reportedly refrain from a dual relationship behavior with a client than they were to view that same behavior as unethical, the behaviors which were viewed as the least ethical were also reportedly engaged in with the least frequency, and, conversely, behaviors which were viewed as most ethical were engaged in with the greatest frequency.

Research Question Four

What is the relationship between nonsexual dual relationships and sexual dual relationships in small college counseling centers? This particular research question could not be answered in the present study. Prior research (Borys, 1988) had determined that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
<th>Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting from a client a gift valued under $10</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a client's invitation to a special occasion (e.g., wedding, funeral, graduation party)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming friends with a client after termination of counseling</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing counseling to a student employee</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in sexual activity with a client after termination of counseling</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting a handshake offered by a client</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling sexually attracted to a client</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosing details of your current personal stresses to a client</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
<th>Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Going out to eat with a client of the same gender</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going out to eat with a client of the opposite gender</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in sexual activity with an ongoing client</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inviting a client to a personal party or social event</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing counseling to a relative or friend of an ongoing client</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing counseling to a student you have in class</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing a client to enroll in your class for a grade</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in the decision-making process regarding campus disciplinary action for a client</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working on a committee or project with a client</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: "NOT SURE" and "NO OPPORTUNITY" rating categories were not included in analysis.

Figure 1. Scatterplot of Relationship Between Mean Responses of Ethics Form and Practice Form.
therapists who engaged in certain types of nonsexual relationships were most likely to engage in sexual relationships with former clients. Since no respondents in the current study had engaged in (or admitted to engaging in) sexual behavior with current or prior clients, an analysis of any statistical link between sexual and non-sexual relationships was not possible.

Research Question Five

What is the relationship between counselors' attitudes related to dual relationships in small college counseling centers and the attitudes of therapists in other settings? Since Borys (1988) asked many of the same questions to her sample of psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers that were asked to the sample in the current study, a comparison can be made between Borys' results with her reference group and the responses in the current study with small college counselors. Of the twelve dual role behaviors which were assessed in both Borys' study and the current study (see Appendix G), three behaviors were viewed as ethical in fewer circumstances in the current study than in Borys' (1988) study. Engaging in sexual activity with a current client (99.2% to 98.3%), engaging in sexual activity with a former client (93.1% to 91.6%) and accepting a gift valued under $10 from a client (31.3% to 16.0%), were all perceived to...
be rarely or never ethical more frequently in the current study than were these behaviors in Borys' study.

All other behaviors which were rated in both studies were more frequently viewed as rarely or never ethical by Borys' (1988) respondents than by the respondents in the current study. Some of the differences in perceptions of ethicality between the two groups were quite substantial. For example, counseling a student (as compared to "Providing therapy to a current student or supervisee" in Borys' study) was seen as never ethical by 9.4% of the respondents in the current study, while 44.3% of Borys' respondents saw that behavior as never ethical. A similar item, "Allowing a client to enroll in one's class for a grade," while worded identically in both surveys, had 39.3% of the current study's respondents claiming that this behavior was rarely or never ethical, while 67% of Borys' respondents viewed this behavior as rarely or never ethical.

Another large percentage difference between the two groups occurred with the item of going out to eat with a client. Though Borys did not make a distinction in her survey between the genders of the client (same or opposite from the therapist), her respondents saw "Going out to eat with a client after a session" as rarely or never ethical at a rate of 81.2%. Respondents in the current
study viewed "Going out to eat with a client of the opposite gender" (the less accepted gender with which to dine) as rarely or never ethical at a rate of only 53.9%.

At the other end of the ethicality spectrum, 26.5% of the respondents in the current study saw "Becoming friends with a client after termination of counseling" as ethical in most or all circumstances, while only 12.4% of Borys' respondents viewed "Becoming friends with a client after termination of therapy" as ethical in most or all circumstances. Another difference existed between the frequency with which respondents in the current study viewed "Providing counseling to a student employee" as mostly or always ethical (38.3%) and the frequency with which Borys' respondents saw "Providing therapy to an employee" as mostly or always ethical (2.3%). One must be careful in interpreting this large percentage difference. Even if wording differences between Borys' (1988) and the current study's items are minimal, it is possible that the difference in wording accounts for the differences in the respondents' ratings (see Appendix G).

Overall, on almost all of the similar items between the current study and Borys' (1988) study, a higher percentage of small college counselors viewed the behaviors as ethical under more conditions than did the mental health workers in other settings. It is important to note, though, that in the area of sexualized dual
relationships the counselors in the current study were slightly less likely to view these behaviors as ethical under any conditions.

**Research Question Six**

What is the relationship between counselors' practices related to dual relationships in small college counseling centers and the practices of mental health workers in other settings? Reported practices in small college counseling centers differed from reported practices in Borys' (1988) study. For the twelve items which were similar in Borys' and the current study (see Appendix G), respondents to the current study reportedly were more likely to have engaged in eight of the behaviors with at least one client.

The same three behaviors which were judged to be **ethical** in fewer circumstances by respondents in the current study were also less likely to be reportedly **practiced** by respondents in the current study. All respondents in the present study reported that sexual activity between current or former clients had never occurred while 3.9% of Borys' (1988) respondents reportedly engaged in sexual activity with at least one client after termination of therapy and 0.5% of her respondents reported sexual activity with an ongoing client. In
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addition, respondents in the current study were less likely to have reportedly accepted a gift worth less than $10 from a client (48.5%) than were Borys' respondents (85.3%). Finally, the respondents in the current study were reportedly slightly less likely to disclose details of their personal lives to clients (35.7%) than were the respondents in Borys' study (38.9%).

In all of the remaining eight overlapping items between Borys' study and the current study, the respondents in the current study reported a higher rate of involvement in these behaviors. For example, developing a friendship with a former client had reportedly happened at least once with 50% of the respondents in the current study, while only 30.2% of Borys' respondents had done so. Despite the fact that over 40% of the respondents in the current study (40.6%) and in Borys' study (47.7%) reported that they had never had an opportunity to allow a client to enroll in their class for a grade, of the remaining respondents, 30.2% in the current study had reportedly allowed at least one client to enroll in a class, while only 3.5% of Borys' respondents had reportedly allowed this behavior. On a similar item, 45.8% of the respondents in the current study reportedly counseled at least one student whom they had in class, while only 10.2% of Borys' respondents had engaged in therapy with one of their students.
Three behaviors that appeared in Borys' study and the current study showed large percentage differences in the degree to which the "NO OPPORTUNITY" category was selected by respondents. Over one quarter of the respondents in the current study (28.8%) reportedly had never had the opportunity to accept a gift valued under $10 from a client, while only 2.8% of Borys' (1988) respondents claimed that they had not had this opportunity. Forty percent of the respondents in the current study reported that they had no opportunity to engage in sexual activity with a client after termination, compared to only 14.4% of Borys' (1988) respondents. Finally, 14.4% of Borys' (1988) respondents reportedly had no opportunity to engage in sexual activity with a client during treatment, while 34.4% of the respondents in the current study made this claim. This large discrepancy in the degree to which the "NO OPPORTUNITY" category was selected in the different studies may indicate confusion on the part of respondents over what was meant by this rating category. This discrepancy, though, could also be due to some differences in the settings or characteristics of the respondents in the current study compared to Borys' (1988) sample of respondents. Perhaps more respondents in the current study had actually perceived that no opportunity existed in their settings to engage
in these behaviors than mental health professionals in other settings.

Overall, respondents in the present study were more likely than Borys' (1988) respondents to reportedly engage in the dual relationship behaviors addressed by both surveys. Four behaviors were less likely to be reportedly participated in by the current study's respondents, and all but one of these behaviors were also determined to be less ethical by the respondents in this study compared to the respondents in Borys'(1988) study.

Research Question Seven

Do counselors' attitudes and practices regarding each type of dual relationship behavior vary according to gender, theoretical orientation, educational background, number of counselors employed at the college, or membership in professional organizations? All of the above counselor characteristics were investigated in order to determine if any of these were related to dual relationship behaviors. For the purposes of statistical analysis, these counselor characteristics were considered to be independent variables. For this investigation, items in the surveys were reduced, through factor analysis, to four factors (see Table 1).
Ethicality of Dual Relationships

Gender. Contrary to predictions, no significant differences were found for any of the four factors for which gender differences were analyzed. This finding was surprising in light of the fact that Borys (1988) found significant gender differences in her respondents' ethical views, and Keith-Spiegel and Koocher (1985) identified gender differences in certain types of dual relationship behaviors engaged in by psychologists.

Education. Contrary to predictions, educational level was not a significant predictor of differences in the respondents' views of ethicality. It had been hypothesized that those respondents who had the most education would have been exposed to more relevant course work on ethics and, consequently, would have different views regarding the ethicality of dual relationships.

Theoretical orientation. A Duncan Multiple Range test revealed that respondents who rated the "Psychodynamic" orientation as their primary theoretical orientation were significantly less likely (p < .01) to view Dual Professional Role (Factor II) involvement with clients as ethical than were respondents who rated "Behavioral" as their primary theoretical orientation.
Number of available counselors. Some interesting statistically significant differences existed in views of ethicality when comparing respondents with varying numbers of referral options ($F(4, 113) = 4.22, p = .003$). A Duncan Multiple Range test revealed that respondents who had four or more qualified counselors to whom they could refer clients were significantly different ($p < .01$) from respondents with three counselors on Factor II (Dual Professional Roles). Respondents with four or more referral options were less likely to view Dual Professional roles as ethical than respondents with three referral sources. This finding is somewhat consistent with the prediction that the more counseling options a respondent had, the more likely he or she would be to view dual relationship behaviors as unethical. However, to be most consistent with the prediction, respondents with the fewest options (e.g. "0") should have been more likely than those with three options to be significantly different from the respondents with the largest number of counseling options, yet they were not.

Professional memberships. Contrary to predictions, no significant differences were found between respondents who belonged to various professional organizations. No differences were found in views of ethicality between APA and non-APA members, AACD and non-AACD members, ACPA and
non-ACPA members. In addition, when respondents with any professional memberships in organizations related to counseling were compared to those respondents who did not have any professional memberships, no significant differences were found for any of the four Ethics factors.

**Dual Relationship Practices**

**Gender.** As hypothesized, significant differences were found in the degree to which male and female respondents reportedly engaged in different dual relationship behaviors. On Conflict-of-Interest behaviors (Factor IV), males were significantly more likely \( (p = .0065) \) to report engaging in these behaviors than were females.

On two other factors differences were non-significant, but the direction was similar. For Social Involvement (Factor I), females were less likely than males to reportedly engage in these behaviors, though to a non-significant degree \( (p = .026) \). Also, females reportedly engaged in Dual Professional Roles (Factor II) to a lesser, though still non-significant, degree \( (p = .037) \) than did men. The only factor that did not yield any significant or near-significant differences between male and female respondents was Factor III (Personal/Sexual Involvement).
**Education.** Contrary to predictions, no significant differences in reported practices were found between respondents with different educational backgrounds. Respondents from the two largest educational groups, those with master's degrees and those with doctoral degrees, were similar on all factors related to respondent's dual relationship practices.

**Theoretical orientation.** As predicted, a significant difference was found in certain reported practices based on the primary theoretical orientation of respondents. For Factor III (Personal/Sexual Involvement) an overall significant difference was found among the different theoretical orientations ($F(5, 93) = 3.52, p = .0060$). Due to uneven cell sizes in the analysis, Duncan's Multiple Range test, however, did not separate (at $p < .01$) the various theoretical orientations into separate groupings. This means that even though significant differences did exist in reported practices by respondents based on theoretical orientation, none of the theoretical orientations was different enough from the other orientations to yield statistical significance.

**Number of available counselors.** Interesting and confusing results were obtained for this variable. Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated that respondents with no available counselors on campus to whom they could
refer clients were significantly less likely to report engaging in Social Involvement (Factor I) behaviors with clients than were respondents with three referral options ($p < .01$). Similarly, respondents were significantly less likely to report engaging in Factor IV (Conflict-of-Interest) roles with clients if they had no referral options on campus than if they had three referral sources on campus ($p < .01$). These counterintuitive results will be discussed in Chapter V.

Professional memberships. Contrary to predictions, no significant differences were found in the frequency of reported behaviors for any of the factors when analyzed according to memberships in professional organizations related to counseling. Membership in the American Psychological Association, American Association for Counseling and Development, and the American College Personnel Association were not associated with any significant differences in reported practices by respondents. Also, comparing respondents with no professional memberships to those with professional memberships yielded no statistical differences in the Practice form for any of the four dual relationship factors.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

Dual relationships between counselors and clients have come under closer scrutiny by various professional organizations in recent years (Schafer, 1990). Studies have been done to determine the extent of participation in and attitudes toward dual relationships of psychologists and other mental health workers (Pope et al., 1987; Borys, 1988).

A unique potential for dual relationships exists in small college settings. Counselors in these settings often have several different duties and roles (Richardson et al., 1985). Also, students in these small colleges often have few counseling options available to them (Grayson, 1986). A review of the literature revealed that no published study to date has addressed the attitudes and practices of small college counselors regarding dual relationships. Consequently, research on dual relationships in these settings was important to obtain.

This study has provided some answers to the following questions: What are the attitudes and practices of
counselors in small college counseling centers regarding dual relationships? What are the counselor characteristics that appear to affect counselors' attitudes and practices? How do the attitudes and practices of counselors in small colleges compare to other mental health professionals' attitudes and practices?

The sample for the study was drawn from the population of counselors in colleges and universities with enrollments of less than 2,000 students. Simple random sampling procedures were used to select 300 small college counselors for the study. A survey was constructed which sought information from small college counselors regarding dual relationships. Two forms of the survey were developed. The Ethics form sought counselors' views of the ethicality of certain dual relationships, and was sent to 150 small college counselors. The Practice form sought information about the dual relationship practices of the remaining 150 small college counselors.

After the surveys were mailed and a follow-up letter was sent to non-respondents, a response rate of 72% was obtained. Because respondents were guaranteed confidentiality, only group data were used for data analysis.

Conclusions

The principal purposes of this study were twofold. First, it was designed to provide some representative
data on the prevalence of and the attitudes about dual relationships by counselors in small college settings. Second, a comparison was made between the attitudes and practices of small college counselors and the attitudes and practices of other mental health professionals.

The issue of the representativeness of the sample is an important consideration in determining the degree to which one can make generalizations from the respondents in the current study to the population of small college counselors. As stated earlier, almost no normative criteria exist to which the respondents to the current survey could be compared. One potentially useful by-product of the current study is that due to the random selection of respondents and the good response rate (72%) to the survey, some representative norms may have now been established. These norms include attitudes and practices regarding dual relationships, but also information on the independent variables of the study (gender, educational background, primary theoretical orientation, number of available referral sources, and professional memberships of small college counselors).

Even if the sample for a study is representative, non-respondent bias can limit the generalizability and usefulness of a survey. As already discussed in Chapter IV, non-respondent bias did not seem to be a major
problem in this study. The good response rate, results of the telephone follow-up to non-respondents, and similarities between responders and non-responders on the variables of gender and region of residence all helped to justify the conclusion that a non-response bias, if present at all, was minimal in the current study.

A more justifiable concern in the present study was the issue of a social desirability response bias. Because the current study sought information about some behaviors which are socially undesirable and one behavior which is illegal in many states, the potential for a social desirability response bias was present. For this reason, two items in the survey were included to assess any response bias of this nature. One of the items, "Accepting a handshake offered by a client," demonstrated that respondents in the current study were similar to other professionals regarding the degree to which they saw this behavior as ethical and the degree to which they engaged in this behavior. Therefore, from respondents' reports on this item, no evidence exists for any social desirability response bias.

The other social desirability item, "Feeling sexually attracted to a client," however, yielded some disappointing results in that respondents to the survey were considerably less likely to report these feelings than were respondents in other studies (Borys, 1988; Pope
et al., 1987). Possible reasons why this difference may have occurred were discussed in depth in Chapter IV. Respondents in the current study were apparently less comfortable with this question than were respondents to Borys' (1988) study. Somewhat more conservative religious beliefs of the respondents in the current study compared to respondents in Borys' (1988) and Pope's et al. (1987) studies may partially explain the difference.

In addition, there was a higher percentage of female respondents in the present study compared to Borys' study who responded to the Practice form of the survey. In the current study, female respondents were significantly more likely than male respondents ($p < .01$) to report that they had either never been sexually attracted to any clients or had never had the opportunity to feel attraction to any clients. The lower reported rate of sexual attraction by females in the present study could be the product of a cultural bias against female sexual expression. The myth that women should not experience sexual feelings to the degree that men do, and the large number of female counselors who never had an understanding female practicum or internship supervisor with whom they could discuss issues like sexual attraction to clients may have contributed to the lower rate reported by female respondents in the current study.
Overall, though, it is still unknown whether respondents in the present study were less likely to experience sexual attraction to clients, or underreported this phenomenon because of a lack of self-awareness, denial, or dishonesty on the survey. It can be assumed, though, that respondents in the present study may have underrepresented their involvement in behaviors on this survey which they viewed as unethical or even immoral.

Research Question One

What are small college counselors' attitudes regarding the ethicality of dual relationships with clients? A number of conclusions can be drawn from the data regarding this question. First, a wide range of opinions exists among small college counselors regarding the ethicality of a number of dual relationship behaviors. With relatively few exceptions, small college counselors tended to differ from one another in their views of ethicality regarding the behaviors addressed in the survey. Second, most respondents were reluctant to view any behavior as "ALWAYS ETHICAL" or "NEVER ETHICAL." Only the two behaviors which involved sexual activity with a current or former client were seen by the majority of respondents as "NEVER ETHICAL" and the innocuous social desirability item of shaking hands with a client was the only behavior that the majority of respondents
endorsed as "ALWAYS ETHICAL."

A third conclusion is that the average small college counselor views the majority of dual relationships addressed in this study as unethical under most circumstances. Respondents were more likely to consider a behavior to be unethical than they were to see it as ethical on twice as many behaviors covered in the survey. By combining the rating categories of "NEVER ETHICAL" with "ETHICAL UNDER RARE CIRCUMSTANCES" and comparing these percentages to the combined rating categories of "ALWAYS ETHICAL" and "ETHICAL UNDER MOST CIRCUMSTANCES," it was found that ten behaviors were viewed as unethical by a higher percentage of respondents while only five behaviors were seen as ethical by a higher percentage of respondents.

A fourth conclusion is that a surprisingly small number of college counselors appear to be unsure about the ethicality of the dual relationship behaviors addressed in the survey. On only four items did more than 3.5% of the respondents endorse the "NOT SURE" rating category. This low endorsement rate for this category may be due to the fact that the "NOT SURE" rating category was not located at the midpoint of the 0-5 Likert scale. Instead, it was placed at the end of the scale (the "0" option). It is also possible that counselors
were reasonably sure of their ethical views regarding the dual relationship behaviors addressed in the study.

Fifth, despite the role blending that takes place for small college counselors, these individuals still maintain the view that sexual involvement with clients is unequivocally unethical. With only one dissenting opinion, all other respondents viewed sexual activity with an ongoing client as never ethical. A smaller, but still large percentage (77.4%) also saw sexual activity with a client after termination as unethical. If these responses are representative of small college counselors, then perceptions of sexual involvement between clients and counselors is not an area that is adversely affected by the changes in role boundaries inherent in small college settings. If anything, sexual involvement with clients is viewed as less acceptable by counselors in small college settings than it is by other mental health professionals. This point will be addressed more fully later in this chapter.

Research Question Two

How frequently do small college counselors engage in dual relationship behaviors with clients? As discussed earlier, underreporting of controversial behaviors may have occurred in this study. Respondents in the present study were possibly unwilling to report any feelings of
sexual attraction to clients. Based on that finding, it is possible that respondents were also unwilling to report participating in any other behaviors which they viewed as socially undesirable.

Another problem with interpreting the data regarding reported dual relationship practices involves the misuse of the "NO OPPORTUNITY" rating category. This may have limited the usefulness of the results of the Practice form of the survey. For 18.6% of the respondents to claim that they had "NO OPPORTUNITY" to feel sexually attracted to a client, some misunderstanding or misuse has occurred. Thus, possible underreporting and confusion by respondents may have skewed the results of the Practice form of the survey.

Despite the above problems in analyzing the Practice form survey data, several conclusions can still be made regarding the dual relationship practices of small college counselors. First, when dual relationships were practiced, none of these behaviors were reportedly engaged in more than rarely by a majority of respondents. This means that when respondents did report engaging in dual relationship behaviors, it was only in rare situations. Based on the earlier discussion, though, it is also possible that respondents simply underreported the frequency of their dual relationship practices with
clients.

Second, a total of four dual relationships were reportedly engaged in by a majority of respondents. Providing counseling to a relative or friend of an ongoing client, providing counseling to a student employee, working on a committee or project with a client, and becoming friends with a client after termination were all reportedly engaged in with at least one client by at least half of the respondents.

Third, small college counselors in this study did not report any sexual involvement with either current or former clients. Whether this declared lack of involvement was a product of accurate or of inaccurate reporting, respondents did not indicate any sexual relationships with clients.

Research Question Three

What are the similarities and differences between small college counselors' attitudes regarding the ethicality of dual relationship behaviors with student clients and the frequency with which small college counselors report engaging in these behaviors? Conclusions drawn for this question must be tentative. Even though the two forms of the survey (Ethics and Practice) were constructed to be as parallel as possible in order to allow for comparisons between forms, the information
sought and the way the information was categorized is not the same. For example, the "0" category on the Ethics form stood for "NOT SURE," while on the Practice form the "0" response indicated "NO OPPORTUNITY" to engage in the behavior. This difference renders any attempt to compare mean averages between the two forms relatively meaningless. When the "NOT SURE" option and the "NO OPPORTUNITY" option are eliminated and only rating categories 1-5 are used in calculating mean averages, a more consistent interval scale is obtained, but some information is lost, decreasing the value of the obtained results. Despite this drawback in comparing the two forms statistically, some general conclusions can still be made.

First, a significant correlation exists between the behaviors which were rated as least ethical and the degree to which respondents reportedly engaged in those behaviors. This correlation indicates that the respondents to the Practice form did not report engaging in behaviors which were viewed as clearly unethical by respondents to the Ethics form. Consistency between the ethical views of some small college counselors and the reported practices of other small college counselors is important information. Prior research has demonstrated that therapists are not always consistent between their ethical views and their behavior (Keith-Spiegel &
Koocher, 1985). Findings of the current study suggest that no dramatic differences exist between practices and attitudes regarding dual relationships in small college counseling centers.

Second, respondents were less likely to reportedly engage in a behavior than they were to view it as ethical. For example, only 10.3% of respondents in the current study viewed "Establishing a friendship with a former client" as never ethical. A much larger percentage (41.8%) reportedly had never engaged in this behavior. Though this finding is consistent with prior research (Borys, 1988; Pope et al., 1987), the potential underreporting of socially undesirable behaviors (as already discussed) could account for at least some of this difference.

Finally, variability was greater in ethical views than it was in practices. In other words, small college counselors were more likely to demonstrate a wide range of attitudes toward dual relationships than they were to demonstrate this same range of practices of those dual relationships. Comparing the variability of response ratings on Table 7 to the more restricted variability on Table 8 (in Chapter IV) demonstrates this point.

Research Question Four

What is the relationship between nonsexual and
sexual dual relationships in the counseling relationship? Prior research by Borys (1988) indicated that engaging in social activities with clients was predictive of sexual relationships with former clients. Since no instances of sexual activity with current or former clients were reported by any respondents, this question could not be directly addressed in the current study. If lower rates of sexual involvement do occur with small college counselors compared to other mental health professionals (as the results of the current study might suggest) it is probably not because they restrict social involvement with clients. Other barriers to sexual activity may exist in these settings. Because of the higher visibility and various interconnections within small college campuses, fear of discovery may be a major barrier to sexual involvement with student clients. This particular barrier may be more prevalent in small college settings than it is in other settings.

Research Question Five

What is the relationship between counselors' attitudes regarding dual relationships in small college counseling centers and the attitudes of mental health workers in other settings? Comparing the results of the current study to other prior studies was important in
order to determine if small college counselors were
typical in their practices and in their views of ethical-
ity. It was predicted in the current study that small
college counselors would be less stringent in their views
about ethicality because of the inevitability of certain
dual relationships in their work settings. This predic-
tion was based on the assumption that some dual relation-
ships are virtually unavoidable in small college set-
tings, which could cause those counselors to make adjust-
ments in the boundaries of the counseling relationship
with clients.

Even though twelve items in the current study sought
similar information to Borys' (1988) study, slight differ-
ences in wording limit the degree of precision with which
the responses can be compared. Despite this limitation,
several conclusions can be made. First, small college
counselors, as predicted, were more likely than Borys'
(1988) respondents to view as ethical the majority of
dual relationship behaviors which appeared in the current
survey and in Borys' (1988) survey. A consistently
higher percentage of respondents in the current study saw
most dual relationship behaviors as ethical in more
situations than did Borys' (1988) respondents.

Second, a few behaviors were seen by respondents in
the current study as ethical in fewer instances than did
Borys' (1988) respondents. Sexual activity with either a
current or a former client and accepting a gift worth under $10 were all viewed as ethical by fewer respondents in the current study compared to Borys' findings. This would suggest that counselors in small college settings may have different ethical standards than mental health workers in other settings rather than simply more lax ethical standards regarding dual relationships.

Research Question Six

What is the relationship between counselors' dual relationship practices in small college counseling centers and the practices of mental health workers in other settings? As with views of ethicality, it was predicted that small college counselors would be more likely to engage in dual relationship behaviors with clients than would counselors in most other settings. In testing this prediction, caution is in order in making comparisons between the current study and Borys' study because of differences in wording of different items (see Appendix G). In addition, respondents in the current study had a tendency to misuse the "NO OPPORTUNITY" category in responding to the survey. However, the degree of difference between Borys' respondents and the current study's respondents in the reported rate of some of the dual relationship behaviors, would seem to indicate the
presence of some other explanatory factor(s).

One conclusion, which can tentatively be made, is that small college counselors reportedly engage more frequently in most dual relationship behaviors than do mental health workers in the settings studied by Borys (1988). Just as they viewed the ethicality of most dual relationships less stringently than Borys' (1988) respondents, the current study's respondents were also more likely to reportedly engage in more dual relationship practices. In eight of the twelve overlapping items in the surveys (see Appendix G), respondents in the current study were more likely to report engaging in those behaviors. All four of the items that were reportedly less prevalent in the current study (sexual involvement with current or former clients; accepting a gift worth under $10; and disclosing details of one's personal stresses to clients) were all part of Factor III (Personal/Sexual Involvement) in the current study. All dual relationship behaviors from the other factors (Social Involvement, Dual Professional Role Involvement, and Conflict-of-Interest Involvement) were more likely to be reportedly engaged in by the respondents in the current study.

If a bias were present in the current study it was in the direction of underreporting the frequency of dual relationship practices (as predicted from the relatively low percentage of respondents who reported feeling sexual
attraction to at least one client). It would seem, then, that since the current study had a higher rate of reported involvement in most dual relationship behaviors than Borys' (1988) respondents, the direction (but possibly not the extent) of this finding can be assumed to be accurate.

A second conclusion is that with a few dual relationship behaviors, small college counselors were less likely to report engaging in them than were Borys' (1988) respondents. As already mentioned, sexual involvement with either a current or a former client was reportedly never engaged in by respondents. Though this may have been due to inaccurate underreporting because of a fear of discovery and censure, the other two behaviors reportedly engaged in with less frequency by small college counselors would not ordinarily be considered highly socially undesirable. Accepting from a client a gift valued under $10 and disclosing details of one's current personal stresses to a client are behaviors which are engaged in relatively frequently by mental health professionals (Borys, 1988). It would seem that less frequently reported involvement in these behaviors by small college counselors may be further evidence that small college counselors have different rules of conduct rather than merely less restrictive ones. In cases where dual
relationships are unavoidable, small college counselors may make adjustments in their role boundaries. However, small college counselors appear to be concerned about clearly destructive dual relationships (e.g., sexual ones).

Research Question Seven

Do counselors' attitudes and practices regarding each type of dual relationship behavior vary according to gender, theoretical orientation, educational background, number of counselors employed at the college, or membership in professional organizations? It was predicted that all of the above variables would be related to small college counselors' attitudes and behaviors regarding dual relationships. Because of the large number of individual items regarding dual relationship behaviors, for statistical purposes data were factor analyzed to narrow down items into fewer categories. Four conceptually meaningful categories emerged from the data analysis for the Ethics form of the survey (Social Involvement, Dual Professional Roles, Personal/Sexual Involvement, and Conflict-of-Interest Roles). These four factors were used in all data analysis with the independent variables (gender, theoretical orientation, etc.).

Several conclusions can be drawn regarding these variables. First, not all variables appeared to be
significantly related to the attitudes and practices of small college counselors regarding the dual relationships addressed in the study. Neither educational background nor membership in professional organizations appeared to be related to attitudes and practices of dual relationships by small college counselors in the present study. The only exception to this finding was that respondents with doctoral degrees were more likely to report sexual attraction to clients than were respondents without this degree, though this relationship was statistically non-significant (p = .035). Two possible explanations exist for this difference. First, master's level counselors, as compared to doctoral level counselors, may not have been as exposed to relevant courses and internship experiences in which they had addressed issues like sexual attraction. In other words, they may simply have been less aware of the normalcy of this feeling and were disinclined to report it. A second possibility is that doctoral-level counselors, through more extensive supervision and possibly through their own psychotherapy as part of their doctoral training, had enhanced self-awareness regarding their feelings (including sexual feelings).

Second, some variables were clearly consistent with previous research findings about dual relationships.
Males were significantly more likely to engage in certain types of dual relationships than were females. This finding is consistent with Borys' (1988) research. Borys (1988) found that men had a significantly higher frequency of social involvement and dual professional role involvement than women. In the current study, male counselors were significantly more likely to have Conflict-of-Interest Role Involvement with clients than were women ($p = .0065$). Gender differences approaching statistical significance were also found in Social Involvement ($p = .026$) and Dual Professional Role Involvement ($p = .037$), with men reportedly more frequently engaging in these behaviors than women.

Another similarity between Borys' (1988) findings and the findings of the current study relates to the variable of theoretical orientation. In both studies, significant differences were found between counselors whose primary theoretical orientation was "Psychodynamic" and those whose primary theoretical orientation was "Behavioral." In the current study, counselors who adhered most closely to a psychodynamic theoretical model rated Dual Professional Roles as significantly less ethical than counselors who adhered to a behavioral model. As for the Practice form, of the five major theoretical orientations, psychodynamically-oriented counselors were the least likely to reportedly engage in
Dual Professional Role behavior with clients, though this difference was non-significant \((p = .04)\). Because psychodynamically-oriented counselors tend to place theoretical significance on relationship boundaries with clients, it makes sense that these counselors would view dual relationships differently from counselors with other theoretical orientations.

A third conclusion regarding the independent variables examined is that some findings in the current study were not consistent with prior research. Regarding the variable just discussed, theoretical orientation, Borys (1988) found that psychodynamically-oriented therapists were consistently less likely to rate any dual relationships as ethical than other therapists. Though a consistent difference was found on the factor of Dual Professional Roles, an analysis of the other three factors yielded no similar significant differences. In fact, in all of the other factors (Social Involvement, Personal/Sexual Involvement, and Conflict-of-Interest Involvement) psychodynamically-oriented counselors were not the least likely group to view those behaviors as unethical.

Another example relates to the variable of gender differences in attitudes toward dual relationships. In the current study, no gender differences were found
related to any of the four factors. For Borys (1988), significant differences were found ($p < .0001$) between men and women regarding their views of the ethicality of social/financial involvement and dual professional role involvement between therapists and clients.

Some of the different findings between the current study and Borys' (1988) study could be accounted for by the fact that the current study had less "power" to achieve statistically significant results than Borys' due to a smaller sample size. An example is the finding in the current study, discussed earlier, where non-significant gender differences were found for two factors. It is possible that a larger sample size would have resulted in a greater likelihood of achieving statistical significance than occurred in the current study. Other differences, however, cannot be explained by this dissimilarity. The small college counselor's theoretical orientation did not appear to have a significant effect on most dual relationship behaviors. Though one significant effect was found, other factors appeared to contradict that finding. It could be that small college counselors have some unavoidable dual relationships. If this is true, the counselor's theoretical orientation will presumably have little or no effect on at least some dual relationship behaviors.

Fourth, though some variables yielded statistically
significant effects, the findings may only have been statistical artifacts. For example, when the number of qualified counselors to whom respondents could refer clients was analyzed as it related to dual relationship practices, respondents with no referral sources were significantly less likely than respondents with 1, 2, 3, or 4 referral sources to reportedly engage in Social Involvement (Factor I) or Conflict-of-Interest Involvement (Factor IV) with clients. This finding does not fit well with the prediction that counselors will be less likely to engage in dual relationship practices if they have a sufficient number of qualified counselors to whom they could refer those student clients with whom the potential exists for dual relationships. One possible explanation for this confusing finding is that counselors with fewer referral sources are especially careful to avoid all nonessential contact with clients. A more plausible explanation is that the finding is a statistical artifact and the wrong question was asked to the respondents. Several respondents who reported that they had no referral sources on campus, wrote on the survey that they could refer students off campus. The key question to ask small college counselors is "How easy is it to refer students to other competent professionals?" Whether that referral source is on or off campus is not important.
Limitations of Study

The purpose of the current study was to provide some normative data on the attitudes and practices of dual relationships in small college counseling centers. An effort was also made to compare these attitudes and practices to the attitudes and practices of other mental health professionals. No causality could be determined for any variable in the survey because the research design precluded any such determinations. Results of the study are comparative in nature.

Limitations inherent in survey research are also present in the current study. Efforts were made to limit some of these weaknesses. Methodological steps were taken to limit cognitive dissonance as an extraneous variable by constructing two forms of the survey which sought separate but related information on attitudes and practices of dual relationships. Social desirability bias was addressed in the study, as was non-respondent bias, but both of these biases may have been present in the study.

The representativeness of the sample for the current study is impossible to assess because so little is known about the population of small college counselors. The few comparisons that were made did not indicate any major differences between the sample and the respondents.
Nevertheless, some caution must be taken in generalizing from the respondents' attitudes and practices about dual relationships to the population of small college counselors in general.

Also limiting the generalizability of the results of this study is the probable large percentage of religiously-affiliated respondents. A considerable percentage of respondents (58%) worked at colleges with a religious affiliation. Since this study was not designed to analyze differences between respondents based on their religious beliefs, the degree to which the findings of the current study are generalizable to counselors who do not have religious belief systems is unknown.

Some limitations exist in comparing the findings in the current study to the findings in Borys' (1988) research. A potentially confounding difference in wording between the current survey and Borys' (1988) survey is her repeated use of the term "therapy" as compared to the use of "counseling" in the current study. Clear overlap exists between the meanings of these two terms, but "counseling" may be viewed as a more all-encompassing phenomenon (e.g., vocational, academic) than "therapy."

Though this problem was anticipated and each college was called to find out who was responsible for personal/psychological counseling on campus, the counselors...
themselves undoubtedly had their own perceptions as to what "counseling" was. As a consequence, perceptions of the role boundaries could be different among different counselors because of the type of counseling that they do and the degree of role differentiation that they feel is appropriate. These different perceptions could be a serious limitation in comparing Borys' (1988) findings to those of the current study's.

Implications for Future Research

The current study has provided some useful, nationwide information about the attitudes and practices of small college counseling centers and how these compare to the attitudes and practices of mental health workers in other settings. However, these normative data are only one informational building block in the knowledge base regarding dual relationships. Future research should remedy some of the weaknesses of this current study. The survey forms, in particular, could be improved. For example, using items which are overtly measurable and nonsexual to check for social desirability bias (rather than an item about sexual attraction) might help to answer some of the questions related to social desirability bias that were left unanswered in the current study. Finding a way to make the "NO OPPORTUNITY" rating category more understandable to respondents would also be
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helpful.

Assessing the degree of relationship of some other independent variables to dual relationships might be informative. Religious beliefs and types of counseling performed (e.g., primarily career counseling vs. personal counseling) are two such variables which could be related to attitudes and practices of dual relationships. Assessing the degree of availability of counseling referral sources (on or off campus) and the effect of this variable on dual relationship practices and attitudes might also provide useful information. Another interesting variable to explore would be the average number of sessions that respondents see their clients and what effects that may have on their attitudes about and practices of dual relationships.

Future research could also be more open-ended and counselors on small college campuses could be asked about the special risks of different types of dual relationships. More difficult, but potentially useful, would be a study in which the sample would be clients rather than counselors. Research on the expectations of clients in small college counseling centers related to dual relationships would be helpful, particularly as these compared to the expectations of clients in other settings. Also, research on the actual effects of different types
of dual relationships on counseling outcomes would be fascinating. Which types of dual relationships are most likely to interfere with an effective counseling relationship? Which dual relationship behaviors are not apparently countertherapeutic? Findings of this nature would move the knowledge about dual relationships and the debate about the ethics of dual relationship behaviors to a higher level.

Summary

Necessity may dictate that certain professional roles be blended in small college counseling centers. The number of roles played by counselors (e.g., teaching, academic advising) and the scarcity of trained counselors in these settings are just a few of the "small world hazards" (Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985) that increase the likelihood of dual relationships in small college settings. Possibly because of the role blending, counselors in small college settings are somewhat more likely to view many dual relationship behaviors as more ethical than do mental health professionals in other settings. Also, these small college counselors are somewhat more likely to engage in many of these same dual relationship practices than are mental health professionals in other settings.

Although it was found that small college counselors
tend to view many dual relationship behaviors as more ethical and engage in more of these behaviors than their counterparts in other settings, there was also found an apparent tendency to see some types of dual relationships as less ethical and engage in these behaviors less frequently than mental health professionals in other settings. Thus, it would appear that the "rules" may be somewhat different in small college settings, although roles and boundaries still exist. Even though some permeability in the boundaries appears to occur between small college counselors and their clients, professional role differentiation appears to be, for the most part, maintained.

Still, there is a need for an established set of norms for small college counselors. Almost all of the respondents in the study sent back a response card in order to express their desire to obtain results of the study. These small college counselors are apparently interested in the attitudes and practices of their colleagues regarding dual relationships. Thus, a direct benefit of the study will be that approximately 200 small college counselors will receive information that will help them to know some of the norms for their practice settings. In addition, normative data will be available for judicial and licensing boards in responding to
complaints about dual relationship practices in small college settings.

Small college counselors need assistance in identifying and coping with dual relationships which are potentially harmful to clients. Educational efforts by professional organizations (e.g., American Association for Counseling and Development, American College Personnel Association, American Psychological Association) are crucial.
Appendix A

Cover Letter for Counseling Practices Survey Form:
Ethics
Dear Counselor,

We are writing to ask for your help in surveying certain counseling practices which have received almost no attention in the research literature. The enclosed Counseling Practices Survey, which should take approximately 10 minutes to complete, asks for your opinion about the ethicality of certain counseling practices. This survey is being mailed to a randomly selected group of counselors in small colleges. We believe that the results of this survey will be useful to small college counselors in making decisions regarding their own counseling practices.

A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your use. If you want a summary of the study findings, please put your name and address on the enclosed post card. Because of the sensitive nature of some of the survey items, steps have been taken to guarantee your anonymity. First, your return envelope will be destroyed upon receipt and the surveys will not be examined until a later date. Also, the results of this survey will be analyzed only as group data. Thank you for your valuable time.

Sincerely,

Terry Darling, M.A.

Beverly Belson, Ph.D
Appendix B

Cover Letter for Counseling Practices Survey Form:
Practices

130
Dear Counselor,

We are writing to ask for your help in surveying certain counseling practices which have received almost no attention in the research literature. The enclosed Counseling Practices Survey, which should take approximately 10 minutes to complete, asks for information regarding your use of certain counseling practices. This survey is being mailed to a randomly selected group of counselors in small colleges. We believe that the results of this survey will be useful to small college counselors in making decisions regarding their own counseling practices.

A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your use. If you want a summary of the study findings, please put your name and address on the enclosed post card. Because of the sensitive nature of some of the survey items, steps have been taken to guarantee your anonymity. First, your return envelope will be destroyed upon receipt and the surveys will not be examined until a later time. In addition, the results of this survey will be analyzed only as group data. Thank you for your valuable time.

Sincerely,

Terry Darling, M.A.

Beverly Belson, Ph.D
Appendix C

Counseling Practices Survey Form: Ethics
PLEASE NOTE

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

pp. 133-135

University Microfilms International
Appendix D

Counseling Practices Survey Form: Practices
PLEASE NOTE

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

pp. 137-140

University Microfilms International
Please send a summary of the study findings to:

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY, STATE, ZIP
Appendix F

Follow-up Letter to Non-respondents
Dear counselor:

You were recently sent a copy of the Counselor Practices Survey. If you have already returned it, thank you very much for your participation. If you have not completed and returned the survey, please take a few minutes and do so. Your response would be thoroughly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Terry Darling
Appendix G

Corresponding Items Between Borys' (1988) Study and Current Study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wording in Current Study’s Survey</th>
<th>Wording in Bory’s Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Accepting from a client a gift valued under $10</td>
<td>• Accepting a gift worth under $10 from a client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accepting a client’s invitation to a special occasion (e.g., wedding, funeral, graduation party)</td>
<td>• Accepting a client’s invitation to a special occasion (e.g., his/her wedding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Becoming friends with a client after termination of counseling</td>
<td>• Becoming friends with a client after termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing counseling to a student employee</td>
<td>• Providing therapy to a then-current employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engaging in sexual activity with a client after termination of counseling</td>
<td>• Engaging in sexual activity with a client after termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disclosing details of your current personal stresses to a client</td>
<td>• Disclosing details of one’s current personal stresses to a client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Going out to eat with a client of the same gender</td>
<td>• Going out to eat with a client after a session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Going out to eat with a client of the opposite gender</td>
<td>• Going out to eat with a client after a session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engaging in sexual activity with an ongoing client</td>
<td>• Engaging in sexual activity with a current client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inviting a client to a personal-party or social event</td>
<td>• Inviting clients to a personal party or event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing counseling to a relative or friend of an ongoing client</td>
<td>• Providing individual therapy to a relative friend or lover of an ongoing client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing counseling to a student you have in class</td>
<td>• Providing therapy to a current student or supervisee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allowing a client to enroll in your class for a grade</td>
<td>• Allowing a client to enroll in one’s class for a grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Letter of Permission from Dr. Borys to Adapt Her Therapeutic Practices Survey
November 26, 1990

Terry Darling
401 Richard St.
Spring Arbor, MI  49283

Dear Terry:

Thank you for your recent letter. Congratulations on your outstanding return rate!

Please accept my apologies for forgetting to send you the letter you requested earlier. Please accept this letter as confirmation of my permission for your use of your adaptation of the Therapeutic Practices Survey (as included with your 11/15/90 letter) in your study of small college counseling centers.

Best wishes for a smooth and fruitful end of your study. I do hope you will be sure to send me a copy or summary of the final product.

Sincerely,

Debra S. Borys, Ph.D.
Appendix I

Letter of Clearance from the University's Human Subject Institutional Review Board
Date: July 3, 1990
To: Terry W. Darling
From: Mary Anne Bunda, Chair

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol, "A Study of Dual Relationships In Small College Counseling Centers", has been approved under the exempt category of review by the HSIRB. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the approval application.

You must seek reapproval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

xc: Beverly Belson, CECP (attachments: current HSIRB approval forms)

HSIRB Project Number 90-07-04

Approval Termination July 3, 1991
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