DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 499 SP 032 034

AUTHOR Matthews, Janet R.
TITLE The Teaching of Ethics and the Ethics of Teaching.
PUB DATE 13 Aug 89
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (New Orleans, LA, August 13, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Ethics; Higher Education; *Moral Values; *Psychology; Social Attitudes; *Social Responsibility; Student Evaluation; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT

This presentation covers the topic of psychological ethics from two perspectives. One part of the presentation considers how ethics is presented in the classroom through both textbook consideration and specifically designed courses. The other part of the presentation considers ethical issues as they are related to the activity of teaching. Each of the basic 10 ethical principles established by the American Psychological Association is addressed as it relates to teaching. These principles are: (1) responsibility, (2) competence, (3) moral and legal standards, (4) public statements, (5) confidentiality, (6) welfare of the consumer (student), (7) professional relationships, (8) assessment techniques, (9) research with human participants, and (10) care and use of animals (research). Suggestions for future additions to these principles are provided. (JD)

The Teaching of Ethics and the Ethics of Teaching

Janet R. Matthews

Loyola University - New Orleans

Division 2 Presidential Address delivered at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, August 13, 1989.

The Teaching of Ethics and the Ethics of Teaching

When I first began to think about a topic for today's presidential address, I discovered that I had no particular subject in mind. Last year, our president Jim Korn chose to have a presidential debate rather than the more traditional formal address. For awhile, I considered some alternative panel discussions or programs rather than indulging myself in an individual presentation. Before eliminating the option of giving an address, I thought it might be worthwhile to consider potential topics. Not only am I completing my term as president of the Division of Teaching of Psychology but my career, and a great deal of my personal identity is, "teacher of psychology." I am no longer a novice in this position. What, then, are the issues which are currently of concern to me? Are any of these issues of wider scope than my own department or university? It was in trying to answer these questions that I developed the title for today's address.

A broad area of concern to me is "ethics." I have reviewed a number of articles on this topic for ToP and co-authored an article on it last year (Haemmerlie & Matthews, 1988). Our Division has a Task Force on Ethical Issues in Teaching and Academic Life. I therefore decided to try to gather some of my thoughts, as well as the

writings of many others, to form the basis for my presidential address. I was surprised when I surveyed the back issues of ToP to find that relatively little about ethics has been published there over the years. It does seem to have become more popular in recent times, however, than it was in the early years of its publication.

As a starting point for my investigation, I decided to make sure I had a definition of my topic area. According to the Random House dictionary (Stein, 1978), ethics is a "system of moral principles" (p. 307). The other meaning of ethics in this dictionary is "the branch of philosophy dealing with right and wrong of certain actions and with good and bad of such actions" (p. 307). If I were Freudian in my orientation, I might come to the conclusion that I am dealing with superego function. Since psychologists don't always use words in the same way as their common meaning within the culture, I then decided to turn to a dictionary of psychological and psychoanalytic terms (English & English, 1958) to discover how this source would define ethics. This time I found ethics defined as "the study of the ideal in human character and conduct" (p. 189). This source also makes a distinction between ethics and morality with the latter term being reserved for the culture's concept of good

behavior.

Regardless of which definition we use, these definitions make ethical behavior sound like a level of perfection toward which one strives but also allowing for the fact that "ideals" are not something which we expect to occur on a daily basis. Such a distinction gave me pause since my own education and training has been to think of ethical standards as something which one just does not violate. They are not some ideal principals but the rules by which I am expected to perform my professional and personal functions. There is the suggestion to me that as psychologists we are asking ourselves to attain a level of perfection in some aspects of our own behavior which we would probably not expect of anyone else. With this rather unsettling thought, I progressed in my own thinking to subdivide my exploration of ethics into the teaching of this subject within psychology and the application of ethics to teaching. Probably each of these areas deserves to be investigated more fully than I will do today. If nothing else, I hope that my remarks will stimulate some of you to think and write about both of these issues.

Perhaps before I look at the specifics of how we teach about ethics and raise some issues about the

ethics of teaching, I might consider how academic psychologists feel about the applicability of APA's ethical principles to their work. Earlier this year Patti Keith-Spiegel, the chair of the Division 2 Task Force on Ethical Issues in Teaching and Academic Life, placed a notice in our journal requesting information from readers about ethical concerns they have regarding teaching or anecdotes which could be used to illustrate such ethical issues. This material was to be used by the Task Force in the development of resource materials for our members. To provide some guidelines to our readers about the topics for inclusion, she and her task force asked four basic questions. One of these questions was personal knowledge of an incident in a teaching or academic environment which was an ethical dilemma. The task force was not asking for personal information which would permit the identification of the individual involved. They were not suggesting that they serve as a review panel about ethical behavior among academic psychologists. They specifically stated their purpose was to have a broad understanding of contemporary issues which are faced in academic settings. The second question asked about having a personal experience starting a conversation with a colleague about that person's possible unethical behavior. The task force was

interested in how such a conversation progressed and what was the outcome of such a meeting. The third question was a request for information about any references which deal with the ethics of teaching so that such material could be included in a bibliography which was being developed by the Task Force. Finally, this notice provided a call to the membership to propose projects which might be undertaken by the Task Force. According to Patti, the response to this request was not very good. Since there were questions about whether the announcement was placed so that it was noted by the readers, a second attempt will be made. I hope the lack of response was not an indication that Division 2 members don't feel this is an important topic.

In a 1981 article addressing this issue, Goodstein noted that he "expected that charges of ethical violations against academic psychologists would be very rare" (p. 191). In this article, he was writing from the perspective of being a member of the APA's Ethics Committee. His rationale for the statement was that academic psychologists live in a somewhat sheltered world with their tenure and lack of commercialism. In such a world, there would be less personal need to violate the ethical principles. To illustrate the occurrence rate of

such complaints, he cited data from one meeting of the committee which he indicated was representative of the complaints raised at other meetings. At that meeting, 36% of the cases involved academic psychologists. Goodstein provides sample cases to illustrate the types of complaints which were made. What concerns me more than the cases, however, was his description of the attitudes of the people being investigated by the committee. While practitioners tended to be concerned about the possibility of a negative judgment from the committee, the academic psychologists tended to resent the fact that they were being investigated at all. They were, as a group, much more resistant to responding to committee inquiries. If this meeting was, as Goodstein suggested, typical of the functioning of the ethics committee, I must ask whether part of the problem stems from our training in ethics and the relevance of APA's ethical principles to the practice of teaching. According to Mills (1984), the APA ethical "principles are intended to cover all ethics issues for all members of the association, who agree to subscribe to its provisions as a condition of membership" (p. 669). If there are areas of our work which are not addressed adequately within the current code, we should become more actively involved in its revision rather than taking the

stance that it is irrelevant to our world.

To explore my hypothesis about the adequacy of our own training in the ethical principles, perhaps I can start with the coverage which our undergraduate textbooks provide of this material. Perrotto and Culkin (1989) analyzed 23 introductory psychology textbooks, with publication dates ranging from 1983 to 1989, for ethics coverage. Three of these books (13%) included no discussion of the topic. An additional two books (8.7%) did mention ethics within the written material of the book but provided no listing of the term "ethics" in the index. Although 18 of the books, or 78.26%, not only mentioned ethics in the text but also listed it in the index, only 3 of these 18 found the term of sufficient importance to include it in the glossary. These researchers also noted that the vast majority of these texts addressed ethics as the topic relates to research while only a few of them discussed other areas of ethical concern.

Theirs is not the first study to suggest that our textbook coverage of ethics is not ideal. Korn (1984) investigated coverage of research ethics in textbooks used in either the introductory or undergraduate social psychology course. He selected the social psychology course due to his concerns about the use of deception in

psychological research and noted that such research is most likely to be conducted within the realm of social psychology. Korn considered 29 introductory psychology texts and 12 social psychology texts. He found no discussion of research ethics in 21% of the introductory texts. Although this number is higher than that found by Perrotto and Culkin, I cannot conclude that our books are improving on this subject. Korn was only considering research ethics and thus his data are not totally comparable to the other study. Happily, all 12 of the social psychology texts addressed research ethics. For me, however, happiness in this context is short-lived. Korn reported that only 2 of the 12 books actually provided a summary of APA's ethical principles. For that matter, only 7 of the 12 texts even mentioned the existence of APA's ethical principles. Although the other five discussed ethics, they did not include information about the fact that APA has an organized set of ethical principles by which all of .s members agree to abide. These studies provide a foundation for my suggestion that our undergraduate psychology students, from whom we hope future generations of psychologists will emerge, may not be getting an adequate introduction to the role which APA's Ethical Principles are expected to play in the

professional life of a psychologist.

Since the data tend to suggest that our students may be getting more exposure to ethics as they relate to research than other parts of the ethical principles, it might be interesting to determine whether or not the students are applying this area of learning to their research practices. Britton (1979) surveyed students who had participated as subjects in psychology experiments for course credit to evaluate some of the ethical aspects of this activity. One ethical concern was the possible psychological harm to participants. Except in cases where there is reason to expect such harm will occur, we may not be teaching our students to look for this variable. Students were therefore asked about their personal comfort following participation in a wide range of experiments. Although most of the students indicated comfort with the experience, 4% reported discomfort. Such data raise an ethical question about our research training. Thus Britton and his colleagues (Britton, Richardson, Smith, & Hamilton, 1983) decided to pursue this ethical issue to better understand the potential causes of distress among research subjects. In the second study, they found 8% of the subjects reported distress following participation in experiments. The major reason cited for this distress was

physical discomfort. Although these students indicated an understanding of the need for certain kinds of stress in psychological experiments, suggesting either good debriefing or good teaching about the importance of our experiments, the ethical question about whether this level of distress is outweighed by the data obtained remains unanswered. The current literature does not provide information about whether our students typically consider this question in their investigations. Perhaps requiring student researchers to read such studies might sensitize them to the possibility of negative responses by subjects in their studies which both they and their sponsors view as low risk for such discomfort.

The questions might then be raised about when, where, and how we might introduce the ethics of psychology into the undergraduate curriculum. When Swenson (1983) discussed the related topic of presenting legal concepts to undergraduate students, she suggested they could be covered within the context of current courses, they could be handled as a separate course, or they might provide the basis for an independent study course. These same suggestions appear applicable to ethics education. The information available in the literature to date suggests that current courses do not seem to be presenting th

ethical principles as a unified group. Courses in research domains of psychology seem more likely to address ethical issues related to the conduct of experiments. More applied courses, such as abnormal or industrial/organizational are more likely to cover issues such as confidentiality or appropriate use of assessment procedures.

If a special course were to be added to the curriculum, faculty who teach it are unlikely to have had a comparable undergraduate course to use as a role model. Many of the textbooks or other reading materials which might be used for such a course (APA 1981; APA, 1985; Board of Professional Affairs, Committee on Professional Standards, 1987; Carroll, Schneider, & Wesley, 1985; Corey, Corey, & Callanan, 1988; Schwitzgebel & Schwitzgebel, 1980; Steininger, Newell, & Garcia, 1984) seem to be written for graduate students or professionals rather than for undergraduates. Students who have had little or no exposure to professional issues could easily become confused or overwhelmed by these publications. It is also unlikely that such an independent course would attract large student enrollment since it is not a requirement for graduate school admission and not likely to help students prepare for such tests as the Graduate

Record Examination. Although there is an idealistic part of me that would like to see such a course routinely included in the undergraduate curriculum, I think it is more realistic to look at better ways to integrate this information into existing courses. Rather than the fragmented approach of covering only those principles which seem most closely related to a particular course, I would hope that some faculty would choose to cover the principles in their total form within one course.

Even on the graduate education level, there does not seem to be uniformity on how the ethical principles are taught (Tymchuk et al., 1979). Some programs offer individual courses in ethical principles while others report integrating the material into existing courses and teaching the principles on a more informal basis (O'Donohue, Plaud, Mowatt, & Fearon, 1989).

Abeles (1980) described a 10 week seminar for clinical psychology graduate students which is designed to meet APA's requirement that clinical students be trained in ethics if the program is to be accredited by them. Rather than talking about the ethical principles in general terms, Abeles (1981) recommended the use of critical incidents which involve ethical dilemmas. He noted that taking his approach to teaching ethics requires the faculty member to be familiar with more than just the

printed ethical principles. Issues which are related to the ethical principles as well as values which are connected to them are part of his course. Some faculty members may feel more comfortable keeping concepts such as personal values out of the classroom experience. I would suggest, however, that Abeles' approach has the potential to provide a transition from the written word to the real world. I applaud his efforts. The major problem for me with Abeles' course is that it is designed for only clinical and counseling students. Yes, they must have this training in order to qualify for licensure in most states. What about the rest of the graduate students in psychology? Don't they need this type of educational experience?

McGovern (1988) described a graduate ethics course which is required of all students in his university regardless of their area of specialization. He described a learning process moving from basic familiarity with the APA ethical principles to a more complex philosophical understanding of their meaning. Once again, we find a faculty member who has provided a model from which others might benefit.

McMinn (1988) suggested that an important component of teaching ethics on both the undergraduate and graduate

level is the use of case studies to illustrate the principles. Case studies allow the students to develop a better understanding of the application of the general concepts to the real world. A drawback of this method, however, is that cases are often written to explain a specific principle. Students may leave the course with the idea that each real world case can be handled by finding the correct principle rather than learning an ethical decision making process. To assist students to develop a broader picture of psychological ethics, McMinn (1988) developed a case-study computer simulation program for an upper division undergraduate psychology ethics course. He stated that an advantage of teaching ethics this way is that students go through a decision tree. They have the opportunity to go back in the decision-making process and discover what would have happened if they had made different decisions. Although I have not had the opportunity to see this program, I think it illustrates both the creativity of a faculty member and a realization of the importance of teaching ethics to our students.

If the literature is a bit lacking in the area of the teaching of ethics, it is really scarce on the ethics of teaching. According to Keith-Spiegel and Koocher (1985)

"Writings dealing with the ethics of instruction are virtually nonexistent" (p. 369). No one seems really sure why this is the case. Referring once again to Goodstein's article (1981), I might suggest that part of the problem lies in the attitude of some academic psychologists that the ethical standards are basically intended for clinicians and therefore do not really think about their applicability to the classroom. Another contributing factor may be that students are less aware than other consumers of psychological services about the applicability of these principles to their circumstances. If they are unaware of the principles, they could not be expected to initiate ethical complaints. Faculty peers may be unaware of many of the questionable circumstances which arise even in their own departments due to the individualistic nature of the work. It may also be that faculty colleagues hesitate to raise ethical complaints against each other or may be naive regarding the applicability of the principles.

In 1983, the APA published a set of ethical guidelines for those who teach psychology in the secondary schools. These guidelines include both research issues and topics which are more closely involved with personal and teaching issues. I wonder why we have been able to

develop such guidelines for the high school classroom and yet seem hesitant to develop more specific principles, or even guidelines, for the collegiate level?

By considering the current Ethical Principles of Psychologists (1981), I quickly discovered that many of them have relevance to the classroom. I admit that I really sat back and considered my own activities after rereading not only the Principles but also the sections in Keith-Spiegel and Koocher's (1985) book which specifically address teaching. I would like to share some of my thoughts with you about the ethics of teaching.

Let's start with Principle 1 "Responsibility." Principle 1e specifically addresses teaching. Although most of us hopefully acknowledge that a major reason for our employment is to stimulate the learning process in our students, I wonder how many of us actually present our material as completely and objectively as possible? It is easy to let personal biases enter into our lectures and discussions with students. Lecturing on theories and topics which are of personal interest, and in which we have the strongest training, is much easier than covering competing positions. Even giving short mention of these other positions may leave the students with the impression that they are really not important. After all, look at

the difference in the number of pages of notes they have on these alternative positions. Keith-Spiegel and Koocher cite several cases where the professor is charged with incompetence by students. Rather than talking about cases where only brief mention is made of certain theories and emphasis placed on others, they are addressing the more blatant issues of faculty members teaching subjects for which they do not have sufficient background or interest and faculty members who do not take the time or effort to plan what they are going to do with class time. I suppose we all have our "off days." There are times when we are just not feeling well, have overcommitted our time and not fully prepared for a specific lecture, or have our thoughts occupied elsewhere. I am not suggesting that professors be expected to be behavioral paragons. On the other hand, many if not all of us have experienced faculty in our own past who never seemed to have a purpose to their classes. They either rambled for the entire class period or expected the students to totally handle the teaching of the course with no direction for them. While there are seminar style courses where it is highly appropriate for students to be responsible for class discussion, the faculty member who provides no guidance to the students or the discussion may not be living up to

the ethical principles.

Some of the problems I mentioned are also related to the second principle, Competence. Principle 2b specifically requires that academic psychologists should carefully prepare their material. They must ensure that what they present is current and accurate. They must also present this material in a scholarly manner. I realize that there may be a range of definitions of "scholarly manner" but perhaps it is time to consider what are the limits of this range!

Principle 2c is extremely important given recent information from APA's Continuing Education Committee (personal communication). The CE Committee has asked each of the Divisions to respond to their proposal that APA should "endorse, in principle, mandatory continuing education requirements for licensed psychologists." According to Principle 2c, academic psychologists realize the need for continuing education. Of course, this principle does not specify how we are supposed to obtain our continuing education. The use of workshops and other such programs has long been associated with clinical practice. It is only in very recent years that we have seen the growth of the teaching conference as a way for academic psychologists to obtain practical information

regarding teaching techniques and issues. Reading journals may be an important facet of obtaining current information about the field, but journals are less likely than teaching conferences to provide information about innovative ways to present such information. Although Principle 2d states that we recognize people are different in regard to a number of factors and that when necessary we will obtain educational training to provide services to people with such differences, I wonder how many academic psychologists have considered the ethical issues involved in teaching students from different cultures, age groups, or academic backgrounds. Do we really vary our teaching styles to best meet the needs of these diverse individuals or request some form of continuing education so that we can do so?

Principle 3 addresses moral and legal standards. Principle 3a specifically mentions teachers. In this case, the issue centers on controversial material or topics. With the diversity of the student population and the nature of many of the topics within our discipline, this principle becomes a major one for consideration. If there is anyone here who has never offended a student, I congratulate you. There have probably been times when each of us has used an illustration which has been

distressing to at least one student in the class. Regardless of how objective we try to be in our presentation of material, value judgments are likely to become part of our presentation. As guidelines to help faculty adhere more closely to the ethical principles, Keith-Spiegel and Koocher (1985) made six suggestions. I have found their suggestions very useful and want to share them with you. At the beginning of a course which will address topics which have been found to be controversial or potentially offensive, faculty may want to make it clear to students that such content is part of the course. Depending on the nature of the course, the faculty member may wish to allow students to miss class on days when particularly sensitive material is being presented and give them some alternative assignment to cover the material if that is needed. Alternative related courses may also be suggested for students who feel they may have a problem with course content. If this is presented at the start of the course, the student will be in a better position to determine whether or not to drop the course.

Their second point is that it is important for faculty to make it very clear to students when they are expressing a personal opinion about the subject. It is best if other sides of any controversial subject are also

presented and this material is covered without prejudicial remarks attached to it.

If there is a scientific basis for a sensitive topic, it is probably best to remain close to that base when presenting lecture material. This requirement, of course, suggests that faculty members keep abreast of the literature and know when they have moved from opinion to a scientific base. If lecture material is based on opinions, that point should be made clearly to the students.

They suggest it is especially important when dealing with sensitive material to allow the students to express their opinions about the topic. They should be made to feel comfortable doing so. Even if the faculty member is supportive of such diverse expression of opinion, it may be that peers will not be. Thus, it is up to the faculty member to set the stage for this level of discussion and to see that others in the class do not ridicule students who express diverse opinions.

Some faculty members seem to feel that their obligation to interact with students ends when the students leave the classroom. Faculty members who teach about sensitive material might find that allowing students the opportunity to discuss it with them outside the

classroom setting will lead to students who are better able to master the material.

Finally, it is important to determine whether or not sensitive or controversial material is really needed within the context in which it is presented. If it is part of the course content or closely related to it, it belongs. On the other hand, faculty members who include material in their lectures just to get the students' attention are bordering on an ethical violation which may even have legal repercussions (Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985).

Principle 4 addresses public statements. Many of us in the academic community immediately think about the announcement of clinical services and just gloss over this principle with the assumption that it is irrelevant to our world. Principle 4h, however, specifically addresses teachers. How many of us really check the catalog description of the courses we teach to make certain it is an accurate reflection of what happens during the course. Perhaps the description was written prior to you joining the faculty or several people within the department teach the course and do so in a very different way. What kind of information is covered in the course syllabus? For many of us, the most important items in the syllabus are

the names of the texts the students are expected to buy and the dates of the exams. According to our ethical principles, the syllabus should also include information about the methods which will be used for evaluating student progress in the course and the kinds of experiences the students can expect to have. I realize the provision of detailed information about these points can lead to a rather long syllabus and therefore higher copy costs. On the other hand, it is possible that when such extensive information is provided in advance there may be fewer students confused at the end of the term about the reason for the grade received. It may also lead to some students dropping the course quickly because they have a clear picture of work they do not wish to do. I have taught at schools where the standard for a course syllabus is about 1 page and others where it is considerably longer. When I was first faced with the development of one of these long forms, I was a bit uncomfortable. Now that I have become more accustomed to it, I find that I am more in favor of trying to spell out as many of the course contingencies as possible in the syllabus. Admittedly, there are some students who still appear confused as well as those who just won't read a long syllabus or who lose it. Subjectively, however, I

feel the number of students seeking routine course information has decreased with increased specificity in the syllabus.

Principle 5, Confidentiality, also relates to teaching although it does not specifically mention teachers in the text. As a teacher whose specialty area is clinical, I find there are instances when I want to use patient information in my lectures to illustrate various points. This need occurs not only in my upper level specialty courses but also in my introductory course. The ethical principles specify that when such information is presented the patient must either have given prior consent or the psychologist must disguise the information sufficiently that those hearing it could not identify the person. Due to the moves I have made over the years as a result of job changes and doing a post-doc, I have clinical data from a number of different parts of the country. As long as I don't provide geographical information, my students don't even know from which of my background files I have taken a case. This decreases the possibility of being able to recognize the person. I also have the advantage of being in an urban area. Thus, there is a greater population base for my discussions than would be true in some other communities. I have found, however,

that when working with my practicum students in their discussion group, I have to explain this principle to them because they are discussing cases with each other to illustrate their current learning experiences. Their classmates know the particular facility involved. Many of these patients are local as are many of the students. Although I have not yet had an experience of one of my students having prior personal knowledge of one of the patients in the facility where they are placed, that possibility exists. It is important to prepare students for dealing ethically with such a possibility. In classroom discussions, it is also important to show them how to discuss their experiences without violating the confidentiality principle.

Principle 6, welfare of the consumer, does not specifically mention teachers. It does, however, call to our attention the fact that as teachers we are in a potentially influential position in relation to our students. It also warns about dual relationships. This is an area in which I have strong concerns and I do not feel it has been adequately addressed in the literature. Although the current principles specifically state that sexual relationships with clients are considered unethical, it does not address the issue of sexual

relationships with students. In a recent conversation with a friend who has had exposure to such questions from the perspective of a state licensing board, I was upset to learn that some university officials do not seem to feel there is anything unusual or "out of line" about a faculty member having a sexual relationship with a current student. Perhaps this is an area where academic psychologists need to request that our ethical principles be expanded to include not only clients but also students. Although the principle warns us about the fact that such dual relationships lead to the risk of exploitation or an impairment of our professional judgment, the definite distinction is made between a client and a student. I personally do not feel that such a distinction is warranted. This area is overlapped by Principle 7, Professional Relationships, and so I will consider these two principles together. Principle 7d states that we do not sexually exploit or harass students. It does not, however, deal with a willing relationship. In some cases it may be difficult to determine when the position of the psychologist is the major reason for this initial relationship. I was recently told by a colleague that in graduate programs such intimacies are quite common and that the student population is a standard place for

faculty to meet their future spouses. Perhaps because my teaching history has been in undergraduate education, I have been married throughout my career, and I attended a very conservative doctoral program in terms of such relationships I have not had the same history as others. Thus, I not have seen these issues frequently. I continue to believe, however, that these issues need to be addressed in our ethical principles.

A rougher area for academic psychologists is that of social or friendship relations with students or former students. Here I am referring specifically to nonsexual relationships. Such situations have the potential to lead to misunderstandings, at least with current students. With former students, there may still be the need for letters of recommendation. In my career as a student, I did have a social relationship with a couple of my graduate faculty. I feel that each of these cases worked out well. Both the faculty member and I made a definite distinction between social situations and the classroom. The faculty member was Dr. So and So in the classroom and addressed by a first name in social situations. Perhaps it was this differential form of address which called to our attention that we each viewed these situations differentially. In order to avoid problems with this form

of dual relationship, Keith-Spiegel and Koocher (1985) recommend that faculty "limit their social contacts with students to casual contact or to social events associated with the university until the student graduates" (p. 273). While some faculty may see this recommendation as highly conservative, it does decrease the possibility of misunderstandings.

Under this topic of the relationship which faculty have with students and possible problems which may occur is also the type of comments which we may make to a student within the classroom setting. At times students may become annoying with the type of questions which they ask in class. At issue here is how the faculty member handles such behavior. Students have a right to dignity, regardless of their comments to the faculty member. A quick retort about the student's psychopathology which led to this type of questioning may be clinically accurate but is also an ethical violation.

An area under Principle 7 which is often ignored by academic psychologists is 7a. This principle states that we are aware of the skills of our colleagues in related disciplines and make the most of those skills for our consumers. In this case, the students are the consumers of our services and our peers are faculty in other

academic departments. In many cases, we seem to have developed a sense of competition for enrollment rather than considering cases in which our students might be served better by changing to another major or taking a course in another department rather than our own. It seems that the financial pressures which are most often associated with clinical practice may be influencing the behavior of academic psychologists to the point of an ethical violation.

Principle 8, Assessment Techniques, is more likely to relate to graduate than undergraduate teaching. Here a major concern is that those who will be using these tools are adequately trained in both their use and their limitations. There is also the potential for misuse of assessment reports. This latter issue is an overlap of the confidentiality problem I discussed before in terms of classroom issues.

Principle 9, Research with Human Participants, invades the classroom most strongly in the area of 9f. Here I am talking about the student who is participating as a subject. Does this student "really" have the right to decline to participate? Although the correct words may have been said, the investigator needs to consider whether they are really meaningful to the student. Does the

student perceive any pressure from the investigator because the investigator is currently the student's professor, faculty advisor, department chair, or in some other power relationship with the student? Is this participation required in order to attain a certain grade level in a course? Such situations have an impact on both declining to participate and election to terminate participation.

Finally, Principle 10 is Care and Use of Animals. A major issue here is how well we teach this topic. Another issue in this case involves the role of teacher as supervisor of student research with animals. Ethically, we cannot just assume because we have taught the students these principles in class they are being followed in practice. This may require more time from the faculty member than the person would like to give. If that is the case, don't agree to supervise the research project!

An ethical concern about teaching which is not currently covered in the principles relates to textbook adoption. This particular concern has been addressed by Division 2 at the request of our Task Force on Ethical Issues in Teaching and Academic Life. The Task Force found that there are many grey areas related to textbook adoption. For example, what do you do with unrequested

complimentary textbooks which are sent to you for course consideration? Some faculty take the position that since they did not request such books they are acting appropriately when they sell them to one of the companies which frequent campuses purchasing such books. On the other hand, by increasing the number of used books on the market for which no money was earned by either the company or the author, the ultimate consequence is that students must pay more for the textbooks to cover such costs. Although many of us feel the best way to handle unwanted books is to donate them to student libraries or reading rooms for psychology student organizations, the Division did not believe we could set a policy about such behavior.

An issue that was raised by the Task Force and acted upon by the Division, however, was various forms of remuneration, often called "kickbacks", for textbook adoption. The Executive Committee and subsequently the the Division as a whole went on record as adopting a policy about such behavior. The Task Force reported that some forms of remuneration were quite obvious. Faculty members were offered specific sums of money if they agreed to adopt certain textbooks. In other cases, the offer was less obvious. The publisher might offer to donate a specific sum to the department's development fund if a

particular text were adopted. In all of these cases, Division 2's position is that not only is it inappropriate but we also ask that faculty discourage such practices within their departments as a whole. I hope that all of you are acting on this policy.

Despite our periodic feeling that as academic psychologists we are isolated from commercialism and from many of the demands faced by our practitioner colleagues, I think it is time for us to face the fact that we do have commercial facets to our work. We have a power relationship to our students which is analogous to that of the clinician and patient. As a result of our research, we are in a position to represent psychology within the media. I suggest that it is time for us to actively add to APA's Ethical Principles so that they cover these aspects of academic life. Such written guidelines would be helpful not only to the beginning faculty member but also to those who have been teaching for many years. These principles might serve to sensitize us to issues which we have not noticed in the past. At a time when academic and practice oriented psychologists within APA seem to be having communication problems, I find the general topic of ethics an area in which we certainly have common interests.

References

Abeles, N. (1980). Teaching ethical principles by means of value confrontations. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice, 17, 384-391.

American Psychological Association. (1981). Ethical principles of psychologists. Washington, DC: Author.

American Psychological Association. (1983). Ethical guidelines for the teaching of psychology in the secondary school. Washington, DC: Author.

American Psychological Association. (1985). Standards for educational and psychological testing. Washington, DC: Author.

Board of Professional Affairs, Committee on Professional Standards. (1987). General guidelines for providers of psychological services. American Psychologist, 42, 712-723.

Britton, B. K. (1979). Ethical and educational aspects of participation as a subject in psychology experiments. Teaching of Psychology, 6, 195-198.

Britton, B. K., Richardson, D., Smith, S. S., & Hamilton, T. (1983). Ethical aspects of participating in psychology experiments: Effects of anonymity on evaluation and complaints of distressed subjects. Teaching of Psychology, 10, 146-149.

Carroll, M. A., Schneider, H. G., & Wesley, G. R. (1985). Ethics in the practice of psychology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Corey, G., Corey, M. S., & Callanan, P. (1988). Issues and ethics in the helping professions (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

English, H. B., & English, A. C. (1958). A comprehensive dictionary of psychological and psychoanalytical terms. New York: David McKay Company.

Goodstein, L. D. (1981). Ethics are for academics too! Professional Psychology, 12, 191-193.

Haemmerlie, F. M., & Matthews, J. R. (1988). Preparing undergraduates for paraprofessional positions: What, where, when, and how are ethical issues taught? Teaching of Psychology, 15, 192-194.

Keith-Spiegel, P., & Koocher, G. P. (1985). Ethics in psychology: Professional standards and cases. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Korn, J. H. (1984). Coverage of research ethics in introductory and social psychology textbooks. Teaching of Psychology, 11, 146-149.

McMinn, M. R. (1988). Ethics case-study simulation: A generic tool for psychology teachers. Teaching of Psychology, 15, 100-101.

Mills, D. H. (1984). Ethics educatin and adjudication within psychology. American Psychologist, 39, 669-675.

O'Donohue, W., Plaud, J. J., Mowatt, A. M., & Fearon, J. R. (1989). Current status of curricula of doctoral training programs in clinical psychology. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 20, 196-197.

Perrotto, R. S., & Culkin, J. W. (1989). Coverage of research and professional ethics in introductory psychology textbooks. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Schwitzgebel, R. L., & Schwitzgebel, R. K. (1980). Law and psychological practice. New York: Wiley.

Stein, J., & Su, P. Y. (Eds.). (1978). The Random House dictionary. New York: Ballantine Books.

Steininger, M., Newell, J. D., & Garcia, L. T. (1984). Ethical issues in psychology. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

Swenson, E. V. (1983). Incorporating law into the undergraduate psychology curriculum. Teaching of psychology, 10, 119-120.

Tymchuk, A. J., Drapkin, R. S., Ackerman, A. B., Major, S. M., Coffman, E. W., & Baum, M. S. (1979). Psychology in action: Survey of training in ethics in APA-approved clinical psychology programs. American Psychologist, 34, 1168-1170.