

The contribution of ethical concepts to the development of professional applied psychology

CRANFIELD UNIVERSITY

Richard Kwiatkowski

The contribution of ethical concepts to the development of professional applied
psychology

The School of Management

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of PhD

Cranfield University

School Of Management

PhD by Publication

2009

Richard Kwiatkowski

Supervised by

Professor Kim Turnbull James

Professor Helen Muir

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of PhD 2009

The contribution of ethical concepts to the development of professional applied psychology

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my family: Kate, Samuel, Sofie and Marcus for their help, kindness, playfulness, love, support, interruptions and encouragement; my supervisors and respected colleagues Professors Kim Turnbull James and Helen Muir for their wisdom, professionalism and perseverance; the members of my review panel, Dr Colin Pilbeam, and Professors Keith Goffin and Susan Vinnicombe for their time, consideration, and thoughtful, incisive and helpful comments; my co-authors, fellow psychologists, colleagues and students, and the many many others who have helped my thinking (and ultimately) this synoptic thesis develop through papers, conversations and discussions over the last 20 years; and finally my parents Mieczyslaw and Krystina, who may be surprised that this doctorate has - at last - been completed.

CONTENTS

1	Synopsis	1
2	Introduction	3
3	Ethics: 'How We Ought To Live'	6
3.1	A RISE OF INTEREST IN ETHICS	7
4	Normative Ethics.....	11
5	Deontological Approaches to Ethics	12
5.1	THE FOCUS OF ETHICS IN APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY	13
5.2	THE BRITISH PSYCHOLOGICAL SOCIETY CODE AS DEONTOLOGICAL.....	14
5.3	SOCIALISATION: BECOMING A PSYCHOLOGIST	15
5.4	ETHICAL SOCIALISATION IN UNDERGRADUATE PSYCHOLOGY.....	16
5.5	THE CLINICAL INFLUENCE ON PSYCHOLOGICAL ETHICS	17
6	Utilitarian Approaches to Ethics	19
6.1	ORGANISATIONS' ETHICS AS BASED ON UTILITARIAN CONSIDERATIONS.....	21
6.2	INFLUENCES ON ETHICAL CONDUCT WITHIN ORGANISATIONS.....	22
7	How "Ought we to be Professional Applied Psychologists"?	24
7.1	THE UNDERLYING RESEARCH THEME.....	24
7.2	WORKING IN DIFFERENT ETHICAL SYSTEMS	25
7.3	SIMULTANEOUSLY WORKING WITHIN DIFFERING ETHICAL SYSTEMS : SOME EXAMPLES	26
7.4	THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE AUTHOR'S PAPERS.....	28
7.5	THE PURPOSE OF PROFESSIONAL CODES OF ETHICS	29
8	The BPS Code of Ethics	32
8.1	THE ORIGINAL BPS CODE OF CONDUCT (1985).....	32
8.1.1	<i>Commentary on the 1985 Code</i>	34
8.2	THE BPS CODE OF ETHICS AND CONDUCT 2006	35
8.2.1	<i>Commentary</i>	37
9	A comparison between The BPS Code of Ethics 2006 and the 1985 Code, with links to the Author's contributions.....	39
9.1	COMMENTARY	45
9.2	LIST OF RELEVANT PAPERS AND CONTRIBUTIONS.....	46
10	The Academic Contribution.....	49

10.1	LINKS BETWEEN THE PAPERS	49
10.1.1	<i>Contribution</i>	50
10.2	THE PAPERS SUBMITTED; SUMMARISING CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND, PROBLEM ADDRESSED, CONTENTS AND CONTRIBUTION	50
10.2.1	<i>'Paradigms lost?' - On the Usefulness of Occupational Psychology' (1988) (with P. Horncastle). BPS Occupational Psychology Conference</i>	50
10.2.2	<i>'On the Consumption of the Golden Goose' (Client practitioner relationships and ethics) (with P. Horncastle). BPS Occupational Psychology Conference, Windermere (1989)</i>	54
10.2.3	<i>Counselling psychology from an occupational perspective. British Psychological Society Division of Counselling Psychology, Occasional Papers (Vol. 2) (1996). In I. James & S. Palmer (Eds.), Professional therapeutic titles: Myths and realities. Leicester: British Psychological Society</i>	57
10.2.4	<i>Counselling and Psychotherapy: are they different and should we care? Quarterly Journal of Counselling Psychology No 2, (1997)</i>	60
10.2.5	<i>Emotional Aspects of Large Group Teaching (1998) (with Hogan, D.) Human Relations Vol 51 No. 11, pp. 1-18</i>	63
10.2.6	<i>Kwiatkowski, R. (2003b), Trends in Organizations and Selection, Journal of Managerial Psychology, vol. 18, no.5, pp. 382 –394</i>	67
10.2.7	<i>Kwiatkowski, R., Duncan, D.C. and Shimmin, S. (2006a) What have we forgotten and why? Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, vol. 79, pp. 183-201</i>	71
10.2.8	<i>UK occupational/organizational psychology, applied science and applied humanism: some further thoughts on what we have forgotten (2006b) (with David Duncan, Sylvia Shimmin having died)</i>	75
10.2.9	<i>Roots, relativity and realism: the Occupational Psychologist as 'Scientist-Practitioner' (2006c) (with Winter, B.) in The Modern Scientist Practitioner, Lane, D. and Corrie, S., (eds)</i>	78
10.2.10	<i>Inside out and outside in: the use of personality and 360 degree data in executive coaching (2006d) in Brunning, H., "Executive Coaching – a systems and psychodynamic approach"</i>	82
10.2.11	<i>Optimistic about ethics, People and Organisations at Work, Spring 2007, pp. 13-15</i>	84
10.2.12	<i>Psychological ethics or organizational ethics? People and Organisations at Work, Spring 2008, Lead Article in Special Issue on Ethics</i>	85

11 The author's professional contribution, and links to the academic 86

11.1	THE BPS ETHICS COMMITTEE	86
11.1.1	<i>The development of a code of ethics and conduct</i>	87
11.2	SOME ISSUES EXAMINED BY THE ETHICS COMMITTEE WHILST THE AUTHOR HAS BEEN CHAIR	87
11.2.1	<i>Psychology and sustainability</i>	88
11.2.2	<i>Psychological Ethics and National Security</i>	88

11.2.3	<i>Psychological Ethics and Reality Television</i>	90
11.2.4	<i>Psychological labelling</i>	92
11.2.5	<i>Ethics in Psychology Research</i>	92
12	Some Future Directions	94
12.1	IS THERE A RELATIVE LACK OF PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT WITH ETHICAL ISSUES AMONGST OCCUPATIONAL PSYCHOLOGISTS?	95
12.2	FUTURE THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS	97
12.3	THE BRITISH PSYCHOLOGICAL SOCIETY, THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS COUNCIL, AND STATUTORY REGISTRATION	98
13	Some Critiques of the Deontological and Utilitarian Positions	
	101	
13.1	LOGICAL CHALLENGES TO THE DEONTOLOGICAL AND UTILITARIAN POSITIONS	101
13.2	PSYCHOLOGICAL CHALLENGES TO THE UTILITARIAN AND DEONTOLOGICAL POSITIONS	104
14	Discussion, Summary & Conclusions	106
14.1	CONCLUSION.....	109
15	Personal Reflection	110
16	References	113
17	Bibliography	134
17.1	NOTE CONCERNING PRESENTATION IN TWO VOLUMES	145
18	VOLUME 2	Error! Bookmark not defined.
19	Papers & Publications presented in support	Error! Bookmark not defined.
19.1	1988 'PARADIGMS LOST?' - ON THE USEFULNESS OF OCCUPATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY' (WITH P.HORNCASTLE). BPS OCCUPATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY CONFERENCE, WINDERMERE	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
19.2	1989A 'PARADIGMS LOST? - ON THE USEFULNESS OF OCCUPATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY' (WITH P.HORNCASTLE). THE OCCUPATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST 1989	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
19.3	1989B 'ON THE CONSUMPTION OF THE GOLDEN GOOSE' (CLIENT PRACTITIONER RELATIONSHIPS AND ETHICS) (WITH P.HORNCASTLE). BPS OCC PSYCH CONF	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
19.4	1996 COUNSELLING PSYCHOLOGY FROM AN ORGANISATIONAL PERSPECTIVE COUNSELLING PSYCHOLOGY REVIEW OCCASIONAL PAPERS No. 2 ..	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

- 19.5 1997 COUNSELLING AND PSYCHOTHERAPY: ARE THEY DIFFERENT AND SHOULD WE CARE? QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF COUNSELLING PSYCHOLOGY No 2..... **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
- 19.6 1998 EMOTIONAL ASPECTS OF LARGE GROUP TEACHING (WITH HOGAN, D.) HUMAN RELATIONS VOL 51 No. 11, PP 1-18..... **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
- 19.7 2000 CONFLICT IN ORGANISATIONS, IN FELTHAM, C. AND HORTON, I. (EDS), HANDBOOK OF COUNSELING AND PSYCHOTHERAPY, SAGE, PP. 222-229,..... **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
- 19.8 2001A THE BEGINNINGS OF THE DOCTORATE IN OCCUPATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, (WITH LEWIS,C. AND SAGE,R.) IN THE OCCUPATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST DEC, P43-45 **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
- 19.9 2001B APPLYING ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOUR THEORIES AND MODELS IN LEARNING TEAMS (WITH HARRIS, KAKABADSE AND MAPES.) IN INNOVATIONS IN TEACHING BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT, HOCKINGS,C. AND MOORE,I.(EDS) **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
- 19.10 2003A TRENDS IN ORGANIZATIONS AND SELECTION, JOURNAL OF MANAGERIAL PSYCHOLOGY, VOL. 18, NO.5, 2003, PP 382 -394.. **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
- 19.11 2003B WE ARE NOT ADJECTIVES WE ARE PSYCHOLOGISTS; LETTER ON STATUTORY REGISTRATION PUBLISHED IN THE PSYCHOLOGIST, SEPTEMBER 2003
ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
- 19.12 2006A WHAT HAVE WE FORGOTTEN AND WHY?, (WITH DUNCAN, D.C. AND SHIMMIN, S.) JOOP, VOL. 79, PP 183-201. **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
- 19.13 2006B UK OCCUPATIONAL/ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, APPLIED SCIENCE AND APPLIED HUMANISM: SOME FURTHER THOUGHTS ON WHAT WE HAVE FORGOTTEN; RESPONSE TO COMMENTARIES, (WITH DUNCAN) JOURNAL OF OCCUPATIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY (2006), 79, 217-224 **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
- 19.14 2006C INSIDE OUT AND OUTSIDE IN : THE USE OF PERSONALITY AND 360 DEGREE DATA IN EXECUTIVE COACHING, IN EXECUTIVE COACHING – A SYSTEMS AND PSYCHODYNAMIC APPROACH, IN BRUNNING, H. (ED.) **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
- 19.15 2006D ROOTS, RELATIVITY AND REALISM: THE OCCUPATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST AS 'SCIENTIST-PRACTITIONER' (WITH WINTER, B.) IN THE MODERN SCIENTIST PRACTITIONER, LANE, D. AND CORRIE, S., (EDS) **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
- 19.16 2007A 'SCIENCE AND ETHICS UNDERLIE OUR ACTIONS'; INVITED PAPER IN 'SCIENCE AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS', BRITISH ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
- 19.17 2007B 'OPTIMISTIC ABOUT ETHICS' IN PEOPLE AND ORGANIZATIONS AT WORK, SPRING 2007, PP 14-15, BPS, LEICESTER, ISSN 1746-4188 **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
- 19.18 2008 ORGANIZATIONAL OR PSYCHOLOGICAL ETHICS – WHICH IS IT? PEOPLE AND ORGANISATIONS AT WORK, SUMMER 2008 ... **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
- 19.18 **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
- 19.19 LETTERS FROM CO-AUTHORS CONCERNING RELATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS TO JOINT PAPERS **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**
- 19.20 DAVID DUNCAN **ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.**

19.21	DAVID HOGAN.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
19.22	RUTH SAGE	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
19.23	PETER HORNCastle.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
19.24	BARRY WINTER	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
19.25	WINDY DRYDEN.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
19.26	CHRIS LEWIS	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
20	Appendixes.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
20.1	EXTRACT FROM BPS NATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL STANDARDS	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
20.2	OUTLINE OF POSSIBLE REASONS FOR AN APPARENT LACK OF INTEREST ON THE PART OF UK OCCUPATIONAL PSYCHOLOGISTS IN ETHICAL MATTERS.	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
20.3	OTHER ETHICS RELATED ACTIVITY	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
20.3.1	<i>Division of Occupational Psychology</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
20.3.2	<i>The OU Ethics Committee National Occupational Standards</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
20.3.3	<i>The Division of Occupational Psychology student prize</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
20.3.4	<i>The inaugural Occupational Psychology Practitioner of the Year Award</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
20.3.5	<i>EFPA.....</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
20.3.6	<i>Open University Ethics Committee....</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
20.3.7	<i>The Cranfield School of Management Ethics Committee</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
20.3.8	<i>The Association of Research Ethics Committees Working Group</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
20.3.9	<i>Statutory Registration of Psychologists in Malta..</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
20.4	HEALTH PROFESSIONS COUNCIL CODE ..	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
20.5	COPY OF THE 1985 BPS CODE OF ETHICS AND CONDUCT.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
20.6	COPY OF THE 2006 BPS CODE OF ETHICS AND CONDUCT.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
20.7	COMPARISON OF THE 1985 AND 2006 CODES IN FULL..	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
20.8	END.....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.

The contribution of ethical concepts to the development of professional applied psychology

1 Synopsis

In this PhD by publication, the author's work concerning what it is to be a psychologist operating - sometimes simultaneously - within different ethical domains will be examined using conference papers, journal publications and book chapters. This material, which spans a period of 20 years, demonstrates a fundamental concern with the normative ethical question of "what we ought to do" as psychologists in complex situations; it will be argued that this work has contributed to the academic debate and influenced policy and thus practice.

In order to position the body of work, and to introduce Codes of Ethics (which seek to operationalise ethics within prescribed domains), the thesis begins by introducing normative ethics. It is argued that psychology's stance is essentially deontological, whilst organisations are utilitarian in orientation. This implicit tension is addressed in the author's contributions, which are examined within their (historic) academic context using a comparison of the British Psychological Society's 1985 and the significantly revised 2006 Code of Ethics. These codes, rather than the more usual positioning within one specific literature, are used to provide a coherent narrative concerning the development of the author's thinking in this domain, though, necessarily, different overlapping academic literatures are accessed depending on context.

The cumulative academic contribution of the published work has been to advance ethical ideas in some areas of professional applied psychology. For example, in the 1985 code, the complexity of operating within organisational contexts was barely acknowledged; this has now significantly changed. The body of work examined here has emphasised how psychologists must consciously and deliberately coexist and act

within overlapping, and sometimes competing, professional and organisational ethical contexts, domains and philosophical positions.

In this synoptic piece, after the presentation, positioning, and examination of the contribution of extant published material, possible future directions for research and practice are indicated. For instance, preliminary material will be presented suggesting that, in occupational psychology, where complex differing ethical perspectives are present, public ethical debate appears to be relatively neglected; some hypothesis are presented.

More theoretically, areas for development include the extension of recent philosophical ethical ideas to these particular domains of applied psychology, including thinking that suggests that ethical considerations precede other kinds of social obligation.

Finally, and linking the academic more firmly to practice and policy, a brief theoretical examination of the possible impact of statutory registration on different branches of psychology is briefly attempted, and potential practical and philosophical ethical consequences for UK psychologists and psychology are briefly outlined.

2 Introduction

This synoptic piece seeks to position the authors work in a coherent narrative which demonstrates engagement with a range of issues related to the contribution of ethical concepts to applied psychology.

This synoptic paper begins by briefly defining ethics, and then establishes the author's work as located in the psychological domain, informed by normative ethics. It goes on to outline two major approaches to ethics; first the deontological where it argues professional psychology is positioned; and second the utilitarian, where it argues that organisations more naturally exist.

The piece then considers attempts to embody or incarnate such normative ethics in codes, particularly in relation to the professions, and specifically in relation to psychology. It first considers the British Psychological Society's 'old' Code of Conduct (BPS, 1985), who's introduction – in the run up to the creation of the first formal Register of Psychologists – was a stimulus for the author's interest in this area. This code had numerous implications, for example in employment, and thus adherence became important. It therefore became necessary to carefully examine the code, its implications, and possible consequences which led to a conference paper in this area (Kwiatkowski & Horncastle, 1989).

This synoptic paper uses the changes between the 1985 and the 2006 codes as a framework within which the author's papers are positioned; the paper relates the author's work to changes in thinking and consequent practice that culminated in the (major) 2006 revision. The paper delineates in detail the theoretical and practical contribution of the publications described in the development of an understanding of the ethics of professional applied psychology. The academic case for a doctoral level contribution (eg through contribution to the various academic literatures, through impact as indicated by citations and so forth) is concurrently made, and linked explicitly to (tabulated) ethical code changes over that period. It is argued

that links between practice and policy consequences, and the author's publications are visible, though causality is complex given that the author was a member of the BPS Ethics Committee from its inception (1999), and is currently its Chair. Finally, and reflecting the 'theory into action' theme some of the author's contributions to professional developments in psychological ethics mostly through the aegis of the British Psychological Society are mentioned.

Moving to a broader canvas, some critiques of the deontological and utilitarian positions are advanced, from both a logical / philosophical and from a psychological standpoint, which serve to illustrate that this is a complex and contested area. Returning to the theme of psychology being deontological and organisations being utilitarian, examples of potential conflict between the organisational and the psychological are examined, the potential difficulties that might arise given the complexity of working within differing ethical systems outlined, and the relative lack of discussion in this area touched upon.

Turning to potential new directions for the author in this arena, more recent developments in philosophy and ethics are referred to, particularly the work of Levinas which has recently created interest in the business and psychoanalytic domains. Levinas' potential implications for applied psychology are considered because his work firmly places ethical considerations as prior to any other social considerations in a relationship; this is particularly relevant because, it is argued, applied psychology is an essentially relational endeavour.

Finally the potential impact of statutory registration of Psychology by the Health Professions Council (HPC) is briefly examined, and some hypotheses advanced about possible consequences. This consideration is important in particular because many psychologists do not operate within a medical context, and the further one moves from that medical context, the more complex (in the sense of a potential – and possibly covert - lack of overlap of ethical positions between actors) and multifaceted the ethical domain becomes; the greater the potential conflict between different stakeholders and positions, and thus the more potentially problematic the

individual psychologist's relations with the HPC. This is very much an evolving issue and at present a matter for speculation, but there is an urgent need for theoretical clarity.

The synoptic paper finishes with some conclusions regarding the work and the area, and includes a personal reflection by the author.

The appendices in this volume contain copies of the 1985 and 2006 BPS Codes, and extracts from the (then) National Occupational Standards for psychology and letters from co-authors stating their view regarding the intellectual contribution of the author to jointly written pieces; the separate volume of appendices contains copies of the main papers and publications described, these are included in the PDF version where copyright rules allow.

3 Ethics: 'How We Ought To Live'

Perhaps the most straightforward definition of ethics is 'how we ought to live' (Singer, 1994, p 4). Having said that, in the West the study of ethics itself has a complex and rich tradition stretching back to ancient Greece; Plato and Aristotle were concerned with personal as well as societally directed ethical behaviour; Hippocrates introduced formal medical ethics, and the phrase 'first do no harm'; further afield Hammurabi famously codified the laws of Sumer and Mesopotamia. In non western traditions a variety of sources such as Buddhist, Hindu and Jain teachings in India, Confucianism in China and Japan, numerous local and shamanistic belief systems, and many implicit and explicit sets of laws and rules demonstrate an enduring human social concern with ethical behaviour. This is reflected in Rest's (1986) definition of what ethics is, namely a system for "determining how conflicts in human interests are to be settled and for optimizing mutual benefit of people living together in groups". The Western tradition continues to be significantly shaped by Judaism and Christianity, as well as more recent humanistic belief systems. In this text the focus will implicitly be embedded in the Western tradition because this most directly shapes our thinking, actions, and (for example) the legal system in the United Kingdom, as well as informing other domains such as free market thinking, capitalism, organisational studies and ethical codes.

This thesis is positioned within psychology informed by normative ethics, which is concerned with what should or ought to be done, and does not enter into distinctions between differing ethical meta positions; whilst of interest, these distinctions have not had a very significant impact on applied psychology. Therefore "how we ought to live" is practically examined below. But first, and reflecting some of the themes in this document and assisting in presenting the context, the increase of interest in ethics will be briefly considered.

3.1 A Rise of Interest in Ethics

There has been a significant rise in interest in ethical matters, particularly over the last 15 years. This has been true in the public and commercial as well as the academic and psychological spheres. For instance, in the UK the Nolan principles of public life were developed to address probity in the public domain (Nolan, 1995, 1996), and the Cadbury (1992) and Higgs (2003) reports made recommendations for appropriate behaviour at Board level in companies. Even more recently (2009) the various revelations concerning the misuse of allowances by some UK Members of Parliament has brought about significant public anger and demands for change leading to the Legg and Kelly recommendations. In parallel to these developments there has been an increase of interest in the academic arena, for instance in corporate social responsibility (CSR), with various new journals being produced (eg Journal of Corporate Citizenship first published 2001, Social Responsibility Journal, 2005, New Academy Review; The International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility, Leadership and Ethics, 2001 etc.), and of existing journals increasing in influence and prominence (eg In 20 years the Journal of Business Ethics increased in size from 320 pages in 1982 to 2800 pages in 2002) and numerous books, handbooks and articles have been generated. A number of bodies connected with ethics have been created, such as the European Council for Corporate Social Responsibility, and the Institute of Business Ethics (IBE) in the UK and the Ethics Research Center in the US all of which carry out regular surveys of ethics in organisations. To seek to encourage disclosure of unethical behaviour, laws to protect 'whistle blowers' have been established in the US, Canada and the UK (though personal consequences can still be significant). In the psychological domain, the American Psychological Association has produced a number of revisions of its code of ethics in recent years, with various taskforces looking at specific concerns, eg 'The Role Of Psychologists In National Security Related Work' (APA, 2005), followed up by a recent open letter to President Obama (2009); the Australian Psychological Association published a revised code in 2007. In the UK a

new British Psychological Society (BPS) Code of Ethics and Conduct was recently published (BPS, 2006b), (updated in 2009 to take into account statutory regulation) and interest in the statutory registration of psychologists increased (White Paper, 2007); culminating in legislation which has now been passed into Law, so the Health Professions Council (HPC) became the registration body for psychologists on 1 July 2009.

It is beyond the scope of this document to suggest why precisely interest in ethics may have increased; it may be partly to do with an increasing public unease that conspicuous power is not coupled with conspicuous morality; Politicians, Corporate Boards, Energy companies, Private Equity Firms, Hedge funds and Banks appear, at present, to cause particular concerns. Another factor may be the increasing potency of the media in the West, which alerts citizens to 'wrong doing' more immediately and in greater detail than ever before; or widespread information and communication technology which means that access to previously exclusive knowledge is now more generally distributed, and its capture, consumption, comprehension and use relatively easy and quick. Finally the ethical notions of 'sustainability' and 'stewardship' have been gaining ground (Grayson & Hodges, 2004).

The rise of the 'ethical consumer' is just one example of the ramifications of these more general ethical concerns; sales of 'ethical' goods such as 'Fairtrade' and of organic food (as certified by the Soil Association) are increasing (though still a small percentage of overall sales). If NGOs (as an example) 'denounce' commercial organisations for ethical transgressions, such as Nike and child labour, or BP and Brent Spar (Shaw and Shui, 2003) this will be taken up by the Press, and concerted direct action, a consumer boycott, or indeed, even a relatively unconscious negative consumer reaction can have a rapid and significant commercial impact. Conversely, confidence in the ethical goodness of organisations can actually lead to an increase in the value of an organisation (Spickett-Jones, Kitchen and Reast, 2003). Perceptions of unethical or immoral behaviour, even of corruption, aside from moral concerns, can lead to economics based market perceptions of a decrease in value

(eg bribery can be seen as an unnecessary overhead indicative of relative market inefficiency; Sampson, 2004, p. 323). The vast majority of FTSE 100 companies now have and use ethical codes (IBE, 2005), and so publicly visible transgressions may be viewed negatively by both consumers and investors.

Perhaps reflecting this broader societal concern, the professional, educational and research fields have also manifested an increasing interest in ethics. The increase in journal output in this area has already been noted. Another set of key stakeholders are the funding bodies and they have all addressed the issue of ethics in recent years; for example Wellcome (2003) and the ESRC (2005) have produced guidelines explicitly demanding high ethical standards in the research that they fund; university research ethics committees now have their own association (AREC), with its own journal (The Research Ethics Review); The Nuffield Trust has recently commissioned a report on University Ethics Committees (Tinker and Coober, 2004); the Learning and Teaching Support Network has produced a report on the teaching of ethics (Illingworth, 2004); the Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology (2005) has produced its own guidelines concerning the ethical scrutiny of research, as have the British Association for the Advancement of Science, and the Council for Science and Technology (2005), and the UK Government's chief scientist (2007). Turning specifically to psychology, up to the end of the year 2008 Psychinfo, a data base of psychological literature, had 53,366 items using 'psycholog*' and 'ethic*' as search terms, of which 35,715 were in peer reviewed journals.

Universities, long used to viewing themselves as naturally occupying the moral high ground, have found themselves increasingly scrutinised from an ethical standpoint. For example, the Council for Higher Education and Industry, with the Institute of Business Ethics, recently produced a report about the need for explicit ethical codes governing various aspects of University life entitled 'Ethics Matters' (IBE, 2005), and the Association of University Ethics Committees (AREC) currently seems to be seeking to extend its terms of reference, and, potentially its proposed monitoring powers. More recently Research Councils UK and the UK Research Integrity Office have each (separately) sought to develop meta codes of ethics for researchers and

others (2008), and the UKRIO published guidelines for dealing with misconduct before its own code defining that misconduct had been agreed – which itself followed in 2009.

However, not all actions or actors are considered equally dangerous or in need of regulation. The more closely one is working with people, and able to cause direct (physical) harm, the more salient and potentially important ethical concerns seem to be (Lefkowitz, 2003, p. 111); and as the potential for injury increases so a societal need for control and protection is more acutely felt: doctors' behaviour is more heavily regulated than plasterers; dentists are more carefully scrutinised than hairdressers, and osteopaths examined more closely than ticket collectors. Recent UK government proposals concerning re-accreditation of those within professions such as medicine are a case in point.

This increased interest has led to a reaction. For example, given that the ethical scrutiny of research has recently been taken much more seriously, some professions, particularly those associated with the medical field, are now complaining that an over 'obsession' with ethics is having an impact both on primary research itself, and the training of future researchers and practitioners (Cooper et al., 2005). Some authors have thus decried the increase in a 'small print culture' (Power, 2004) or suggested that the various negative consequence of 'defensive medicine, defensive research and defensive teaching' are partly the result of an ultimately maladaptive, overly bureaucratic, risk averse concern with ethics (O'Neill, 2002, 2008). They argue that a balance needs to be struck. There is thus a good deal of 'political' interest in the whole area of ethics and regulation, and this interest seems to be increasing.

4 Normative Ethics

This work is located within normative ethics. Normative ethics is concerned with how we should behave; as such it is part of 'applied' ethics. (Although meta ethical positions will not be considered here, it should be noted that philosophers have created a taxonomy of different sorts of ethics).

Two of the most fundamental approaches to ethics and ethical thinking are the deontological and the consequentialist / utilitarian, which will be summarised below. Challenges to these positions will be examined later. Deontological ethics will be examined first and the case made that psychology is fundamentally deontological. In subsequent sections the utilitarian perspective will be described and the case made that organisations are fundamentally utilitarian.

5 Deontological Approaches to Ethics

The deontological position is connected principally with the thinking of Kant (1780) and his followers. The root of the word 'deontology' concerns 'duty' and this approach suggests that rational rules that we are bound to follow can exist to guide our ethical actions, and by applying these rules people can tell if an action is ethically 'right' or 'wrong'; and, therefore, know how they should act. Further, once people are aware of these rules, it becomes beholden on them, a duty, if you will, to act according to those rules.

These rules are not like simple school rules, for example 'don't run in the corridor', or even like laws, such as 'do not travel over 30 miles per hour in a built up area', but rather they are superordinate principles that seek to develop a coherent system which will allow an individual to be able to decide appropriately between competing courses of action. When applied they will therefore allow an individual to act in the "best" way possible, across a wide variety of contexts and situations. This universality of application is an ambitious aim, and the deontological and utilitarian (see below) systems approach it, and the idea of how one might think of "best", in rather different ways.

This notion of "best" is perhaps one of the key differences between the deontological and utilitarian approaches; for Kant and his followers "best" means if universally applied, the "best" way to behave would ensure that society would function well. There may be implicit religious aspects to his position, in that part of the underlying reason why Kant wanted Society to function well was linked to his Christian view of the world as belonging to God, and therefore it was the duty of all people to ensure that it functioned as well as it could; this notion of 'stewardship', bestowed by God, extended to how people themselves behave within Society. This religious underpinning additionally informs his view of each individual as being important and precious – fundamentally to God. However, it is not actually

necessary to believe in a deity to accept the Kantian view of ethics as deontological as appropriate; at its heart it relies on a rational and logical position.

Kant's well known proposition states:

'The supreme principle of ethics (the doctrine of virtue) is: "Act on a maxim, the ends of which are such as it might be a universal law for everyone to have." On this principle a man is an end to himself as well as others, and it is not enough that he is not permitted to use either himself or others merely as means (which would imply that he might be indifferent to them), but it is in itself a duty of every man to make mankind in general his end.' (Kant, 1780, section IX)

So when carrying out an action based on a particular maxim, one should deliberately and consciously consider what the consequences for wider society would be if everybody in that society also used that particular axiom or underpinning proposition and acted upon it. An ethical action, therefore, is one based on a rule that, if it were adopted by everybody, would result in society as a whole functioning well or being or becoming 'better'. The classic example is the comparison of a society where everyone tells the truth versus one where everyone lies. It is easy to see that the 'liar' society would very soon cease to function well and perhaps even begin to break down.

The deontological perspective has been very influential over a long period and, it will be argued in the next section, directly informs the ethical position of psychology.

5.1 The Focus of Ethics in Applied Psychology

In this section it will be argued that psychology operates from a fundamentally deontological position, that this is acknowledged in the British Psychological Society Code of Ethics (2006b), and that this is influenced both by the socialisation process involved in becoming a psychologist, and through the key influence of clinical psychology on the wider profession.

5.2 The British Psychological Society code as deontological

The BPS Code (BPS, 2006b), despite claiming to be based on the 'British Eclectic Tradition' (p. 6), comes very close indeed to stating that the philosophical position that applies is deontological, in the preamble to the code:

"One example of a rational principle would be 'Do unto others as you would be done by'. Immanuel Kant gave expression to this in his Categorical Imperative: 'Act on such maxims as you could will to become universal law'. Our capacity to act on rational moral principles bestows on us the dignity of free moral agents and this leads to a further formulation of the Categorical Imperative: 'Treat humanity in your own person and that of others always as an end and never only as a means'. *This position forms the basis of the Code.*" p. 6 [italics added]

Thus the code is being positioned within the deontological perspective of Kant and his followers.

Further, in its Charter the BPS seeks to present a 'detached scientific' model of its behaviour in the world; and seems to seek to remain aloof from more utilitarian motives; "Its [the BPS's] principle object is to promote the advancement and diffusion of a knowledge of psychology pure and applied and especially to promote the efficiency and usefulness of Members of the Society by setting up a high standard of professional education and knowledge". There appears to be a clear emphasis here – but the emphasis is not on the common good (for example), but rather on the profession and what it can do in disseminating its special knowledge and enhancing the usefulness of its members. Currently the new BPS code of Ethics and Conduct, unlike that of the APA (2002), does not contain a section dealing with psychologists' duty to contribute to Society - though the APA position has itself been criticised as fundamentally aspirational and "reassuring" rather than reflecting reality (Leftkowitz, 2003). The word 'society' appears 43 times in the BPS code of ethics, but *each time* refers to the British Psychology *Society*.

5.3 Socialisation: Becoming a Psychologist

Groups of people, members of professions, of organisations, tribes, teams, or indeed any other collection of people inevitably develop their own internal culture (Morgan, 1986, p. 112). One of the aspects of culture, as Schein (1988) has observed, is that a set of implicit assumptions develops (often around values or beliefs) and comes to be taken for granted as "the way we do things around here". Similarly, a part of the development of a group culture (Tuckman, 1965), is the creation of shared group norms. These group norms will almost inevitably include an (implicit or explicit) ethical position, ie certain acts or behaviours will be judged as correct or good and others will be judged as incorrect or bad.

At that behavioural level there are a number of complex (and sometimes unique) cues and patterns of behaviour that an individual coming into any organisation needs to notice, recognise as being important, respond to, and perhaps even internalise; long term contact or immersion within an organisation leads to socialisation – the individual 'fits' the culture, they behave in ways that are recognisable and acceptable, they use 'correct' language, jargon and abbreviations, they dress 'appropriately'. An understanding of the tacit as well as formal rules that govern behaviour within an organisation is essential to skilled functioning within it (Schneider et al, 1998).

Psychologists have a firm foundation in the internal culture of psychology; they will often have had a long-standing interest in psychology before their first degree (eg A-levels or other experiences), and a strong socialisation process will have taken place during that first degree (which is often undertaken at an age and at a time where significant aspects of identity formation take place (Erikson 1956). After their first degree, psychologists aspiring to UK Chartered status will typically have pursued at least a Masters (and often a Doctoral) level qualification. In order to be accepted on to a Master's or Doctoral course it would be usual to demonstrate that one has a significant interest in the area, eg having worked in a related field, perhaps for a number of years; of undertaking a PGCE, of having been a teacher or

classroom assistant if you wished to become an educational psychologist; or having worked as a psychology assistant or nursing assistant in a psychiatric hospital for entry to the clinical route; or perhaps in HR or consultancy if interested in occupational psychology (and so forth). One might expect, therefore, on cognitive dissonance grounds alone (Festinger, 1957), that undertaking such effort over a prolonged period would create strong emotional and cognitive linkages to, and identification with, the idea of "being a psychologist".

On a postgraduate programme, putative psychologists will again be exposed to the (implicit or explicit) mores, rules, norms of behaviour and ethical stance of a particular branch of psychology; depending on the specialism they will additionally have had placements, or supervised practice, sometimes spanning several years, and in other cases they will have had to submit a post qualification logbook documenting supervised practice, again over a period of years. They will therefore have been effectively socialised into their particular field of psychology over at least five years, and often over seven or more.

5.4 Ethical Socialisation In undergraduate Psychology

Tying in with the deontological perspective, the ethical emphasis on undergraduate programmes in psychology is very much focused on not using people simply as a 'means to an end' (for instance viewing people as useful only in so far as they are sources of data in experiments, subsequently to be "discarded"), so psychologists would engage with a number of ethical issues in such a research context. For example, they might worry about whether, at a minimum, the "subjects" (now participants') time may be being wasted, and thus think carefully about the "goodness" of such actions before carrying them out.

Turning to the practicality of applying ethics, in many psychology programmes leading to first degree level qualifications, ethics tend to be focused on experimentation, including the ethics of deception, naturalistic research, obtaining informed consent and so forth (BPS, 2006a, p. 9). All psychology students will

therefore experience these aspects of practical ethics directly. All UK psychology departments have ethics committees, and psychology's important contribution to the development of this area has been acknowledged (ESRC, 2005, p. 19).

Similarly, in teaching about the therapeutic domain at undergraduate level, there is an emphasis on the autonomy of the individual, self determination, and respect for the person. These positions are deontological in their orientation and reflect an underlying system of beliefs and values.

As noted above, after research, the area of ethics most frequently considered on undergraduate courses tends to be that of ethics in therapeutics, broadly clinical and counselling psychology (BPS, 2006a p. 8, 40), and the potential ethical dilemmas and difficulties that may arise, eg the conditions required to breach confidentiality, the avoidance of inappropriate relationships, and so forth.

On the undergraduate degree, relatively little attention seems to be paid to the conflicts and difficulties that can arise when psychologists work for, and within, organisations (cf. BPS Qualifying Exam, 2006a).

5.5 *The clinical influence on psychological ethics*

In the UK, and elsewhere, the single largest specialist group of applied psychologists have, until relatively recently, been clinical psychologists, and even now one might argue that they are the most coherent and politically influential professional grouping. The particular ethical position that they have adopted (which has been very significant – and which could perhaps be characterised as deontological and quasi-medical though increasingly humanistic), is understandable: first because of both the context within which they train and work (overwhelmingly within the National Health Service in the UK, or in regulated and licensed, often quasi medical contexts in the US and much of Europe); and second because of the contemporary power that accrues to the medical profession and thus the underlying medical model (Dryden, Charles-Edwards, and Woolfe (1989), Kwiatkowski and Dryden, 1989).

For clinical and counselling psychologists, the underlying ethical position is deontological and increasingly explicitly places the individual at the centre of a care system. However, adoption of such a position often assumes that other people in those contexts (eg within the NHS) share certain core ethical assumptions. As will be explored below, organisations in the commercial sector have a different *raison d'être* to those set up (for example) on behalf of Society operating for "the common good". For instance they are not necessarily philanthropic, nor (except perhaps notionally) beneficent, nor explicitly wish to (or legally) exist to help people at all; nor have 'caring' as part of their mission, but may exist primarily, and indeed legitimately, in order to maximise long term shareholder value.

Whilst many actions carried out may look similar, underlying intent, motive or philosophical position may actually be somewhat different. However, this difference in underlying philosophical stance does have the potential to cause difficulties when working with others who do not share that particular underlying (and often implicit, implied, tacit and unstated) philosophical perspective, and this may well be the case for psychologists working within organisations.

Having suggested that psychologists are socialised into a profession that adopts a deontological position, it is time to consider the utilitarian position.

6 Utilitarian Approaches to Ethics

The deontological notion of adhering to universally applicable rules for the ultimate benefit of society is only one of many ways of approaching ethics. As J.S. Mill points out in the introduction to 'Utilitarianism' (1879), one could envisage a particular society that functioned perfectly well, but which considered certain actions and behaviours as universally applicable and right that other societies might consider wrong. For example, slavery might be acceptable in a society that in other respects functioned quite effectively, and in ways very similar to our own. Members of that society might show some consideration to slaves, and even treat them 'well', but in truth consider slaves not really to be 'people' or 'citizens'; and whilst the examples of ancient Greece or Rome come to mind, it is barely 200 years since slavery was abolished in England. More recently we have the example of Nazi Germany where, once defined as a Jew, citizenship and other rights (including the right to life) were compromised, curtailed and often ceased; yet, apologists for that regime might – perversely – argue that, overall, "society" functioned effectively. Thus bad rules might be created that still allow a society to function. If one were to deny both the societal and the "end in itself" propositions of the deontological school (as is implicit above) alternative ways of defining "right action" become necessary.

Building on the work of Bentham (Bentham, 1781) and of his own father, both of whom presented less elaborated versions of consequentialism, J.S. Mill developed and elaborated a profoundly influential position known as Utilitarianism. (Mill's position is technically part of 'consequentialism', though, primarily because of the impact, influence and longevity of his work; 'utilitarianism' is actually a better known term, and will be used here).

Put simply, J.S. Mill proposed that actions that were useful were 'good', and that the best sort of usefulness was to bring about happiness. Thus the greatest level of happiness could be achieved through the happiness of the greatest possible number of people, thus 'goodness' would be increased.

Mill states:

“The creed which accepts as the foundation of morals, Utility, or the Greatest Happiness Principle, holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. By happiness is intended pleasure, and the absence of pain; by unhappiness, pain, and the privation of pleasure. To give a clear view of the moral standard set up by the theory, much more requires to be said; in particular, what things it includes in the ideas of pain and pleasure; and to what extent this is left an open question. But these supplementary explanations do not affect the theory of life on which this theory of morality is grounded - namely, that pleasure, and freedom from pain, are the only things desirable as ends; and that all desirable things (which are as numerous in the utilitarian as in any other scheme) are desirable either for the pleasure inherent in themselves, or as means to the promotion of pleasure and the prevention of pain.” Mill (1879) Chapter 2, p. 10.

Mill’s work was and is still highly influential in various social movements, for instance in the repeal of slavery in England, and in support of universal suffrage, since if more people are happy (for instance by being free, or by being able to vote) then this is seen as good.

So, to contrast, paraphrase and simplify, whilst Kant might argue that an act *of itself* has to be ‘good’, and that one can judge that that is the case through applying a relatively universal maxim, Mill might suggest that an act is ‘good’ if its *consequences*, as far as they can, imperfectly, be predicted, are likely to increase the happiness of more people than they harm, or lead to the increased happiness of a greater number of people, or more pleasure than pain in the world. Philosophically these are very different positions.

6.1 Organisations' Ethics as based on Utilitarian considerations

The existence of organisations as separate entities, often with autonomous legal standing, is sometimes justified via a utilitarian argument. Since the time of Adam Smith (1776, 1829, p. 248, p. 467 etc.) through to Milton Friedman (1962), and beyond, an important part of the underlying rationale for the existence of organisations is the happiness and benefits they bestow for the 'greater good', be that society, shareholders or gross domestic product. Numerous writers have therefore explicitly or implicitly made the link between the existence of a free market populated by appropriate entities (usually organisations) that maximise profits and distribute those to stakeholders who are primarily shareholders but also include employees and the wider economy. Some organisations explicitly distribute profits to worthy causes. For instance Quarter (2000, p. 51) cites the Scott Bader Commonwealth as a long lived example. The argument, simplified, is that efficient organisations will create the maximum possible surplus value in an economy, and that that value will be available for distribution and so eventually will be distributed. In contrast, entities that are not concerned with maximising profit, it is argued, will (again to simplify the position) tend to be inefficient, produce little surplus, and use resources badly. There are, of course, various critiques of this position, including Marx (1887, 1992, p. 86 etc), but, nevertheless it is clear that as a position it is fairly widely accepted on all sides of the political spectrum in the UK (see recent party manifestos; e.g. Conservative Party Manifesto, 2005, p. 2, 4 etc., Labour Manifesto, 2005, p. 11, 17 etc.), as well as being acceptable to and readily accepted within organisations. Additionally, academic authors have explicitly referenced this view as underpinning organizational or managerial behaviour; for instance Preuss (1998) in examining the ethical underpinnings of accountancy, Singer (2001) examining managers' ethical positions, and Snoeyenbos and Humber (1999) in looking at utilitarian approaches to business ethics.

Preuss says "Utilitarianism has two advantages over alternative ethical theories for application in business. It links self-interest with moral behaviour, and a company is per definition self-interested. Secondly, the calculation of benefit and harm is similar

to profit and loss accounting and hence more likely to find acceptance with business practitioners than rival ethical theories.” Preuss (1998).

Thus in this formulation the existence of the firm ensures (through essentially economic means) that maximum utilisation of resources (be they people, property, natural resources, capital or other goods) will take place in a market system populated by efficient firms. The maximum amount of profit (or benefit) will be available for redistribution into the wider economy. Taking this further, the existence of a number of efficient firms within an economy ensures (i.e. has the consequence) that the maximum number of people will be in employment and this will lead to an increase in the Gross Domestic Product (GDP); greater employment will tend to lead to more people having money (and goods to purchase) and thus it will be more likely that more people are happy than if they were in a position (say) of unemployment or poverty – and, further, societal or national wealth will increase. For non profit making organisations (eg Hospitals, Schools and NGOs), the parallel argument becomes that their existence means that the greatest number of people will benefit from the good that they do – as opposed to the limited good that a number of individuals acting alone might achieve in these arenas; again the result of having these entities is that the greatest good can be created as a result of their actions. This issue will be explored in more detail later.

6.2 Influences on Ethical conduct within organisations

However, whilst behaviours can be observed, as already noted ascertaining the motives, beliefs, thinking and intent behind them is much more difficult. Thus ascribing motives to individuals or even more so to organisations is both psychologically and logically complicated. Nevertheless it is important to consider the impact of context on ethical behaviour.

An identical action may be the consequence of very different thought processes, or indeed of little thought at all (Langer, 1989, pp. 30-52); for example cultural assumptions may strongly influence how people perceive or think about things, and

in some cases may prescribe what is 'right' and 'wrong' behaviour in an organisation (Weick and Quinn, 1999). Similarly, organisational context may 'cause' people to behave unethically simply as a consequence of their presence at a particular place in an organisation (Joshua and Margolis, 2001) and the power of that organisational context. Indeed, Joshua and Margolis (2001) persuasively argue that complex organisations can insulate people from the perception that their actions may be unethical, thereby, they suggest, increasing the probability that such actions will in fact take place.

But ethical positions can be even more complex than this; different rules can apply *within* as well as between organisations. For instance accountants, research scientists, and doctors working within the UK National Health Service may view particular ethical issues in subtly different ways, in part related to their 'core' profession; though *from the outside* they may all be seen by others as adhering first and foremost to 'Health Service' behaviour and ethics. As this example illustrates there are distinctions possible between internal ethical positions, and their interaction with culture and hence socialisation are often complex. For instance, Zinkiewicz, Hammond and Trapp, 2003, p. 11 comment on psychological socialisation, and Singer, 1994, p. 115 on differences in ethicists' thinking); ethical thinking has been applied to a variety of situations (Singer, 1991, p. 544) and differences in ethical behaviour can be compared using a variety of tools (Helliard and Bebbington, 2004, p. 13). But when differences, no matter how subtle, exist, the potential for disagreement or conflict arises, and this may be particularly the case when individuals have to work across the boundaries of differing ethical systems. It will be argued that psychologists find themselves working across various boundaries, and many of the papers referenced in this synoptic piece (see section 6.2) examine what happens when awareness of these distinctions is increased.

7 How “Ought we to be Professional Applied Psychologists”?

Having described the two main approaches to ethics, and located psychology in the deontological and organisations in the utilitarian, and thus having contextualised the contribution, it is appropriate to focus more specifically on the underlying research theme and consider the contributions of the material cited in support of this PhD by publication.

7.1 *The Underlying Research theme*

The research theme is the exploration and consideration of how ethical thinking contributes to the understanding of how “we ought to be professional applied psychologists”. In other words in this work, over a period of 20 years, the author has sought to understand how the ethical can inform the professional, within the field of applied psychology; a field in which he is a practitioner, but also an academic (with certain consequences for the academic/practitioner divide – as suggested by Hodgkinson (2006) and Anderson et al. (2001). Of necessity, this work focuses on a small number of discrete areas. As will be shown later in this document, there seem to be definite overlaps between the work that the author has undertaken, and developments of his thinking, and aspects of the 2006 British Psychological Society Code of Ethics and Conduct.

One consistent theme that emerges from the author’s thinking about the overlap between ethics and psychology in the domain of application is the notion of *coexistence* within different ethical worlds. A number of the papers cited here indicate how different arenas carry with them differing modes of understanding and interacting with the ethical.

7.2 Working In Different Ethical Systems

Where people work within more than one system, or where underlying ethical systems differ, it follows that potential for disagreement or conflict may arise. The more different the underlying systems are from each other the more likely that 'what we ought to do', or indeed how we ought to be psychologists, becomes more difficult and may lead to both inner confusion and outward conflict.

An individual working either on the boundary, or interface of two organisations, or representing one organisation within another, faces potential difficulties as a consequence. These individuals inevitably carry some of their own implicit norms with them, including ethical norms. If that individual represents one organisation within another, for a variety of reasons, for instance through being selected on the basis of "fit" within that organisation's value system, socialisation through education, training and reinforcement, and so forth (Schneider et al, 1998), they will implicitly hold particular ethical norms, and these ethical norms may be different to those held by people working within the other organisation. As has been argued, a parallel situation applies in the case of psychologists working within an organisation; they are part of a profession with, as has been shown, particular values, beliefs and norms of behaviour based in the deontological, and the organisation within which they are working may in fact hold other norms to be appropriate.

A demonstration of difference in ethical position may occur and such a realisation of fundamental difference may be personally anxiety provoking. One might suppose that interest in and engagement with ethical concerns, on the part of people who come into contact with different ethical paradigms might thus be heightened; and if conscious awareness of these ethical differences exists within an individual then the 'right action' may well be felt to be more difficult to define and to undertake. It is in part these concerns that have motivated the creation of these particular papers, and the attempt to understand how ethical considerations can influence professional practice.

This thesis suggests that psychologists do sometimes occupy roles where they are exposed to differing ethical positions and systems, and do find themselves embedded within particular and overlapping professional, cultural and organisational contexts. Therefore the need to examine one's ethical position before the event, rather than react unthinkingly (and possibly without awareness; Langer, 1989) when subject to all sorts of internal and external pressures, is important. The material presented here shares that concern for applying prior "cool" thinking to these potentially complex situations.

7.3 *Simultaneously Working Within Differing Ethical Systems : some examples*

As discussed above because of the underlying differences in deontological and utilitarian positions, there are a number of potential challenges for the psychologist working within organisations, and in particular in the (entirely legitimate) commercial context of profit maximisation, so that a psychologist who is concerned with the (deontological) goodness of each individual *act itself* may actually be faced by ethical conflicts.

To consider some examples; selling psychometric tests to an HR department engaged in deselection is not an ethically neutral act: real people will become unemployed as a result, often causing anxiety and hardship, and having potential consequences for mental health. Persuading a client to buy an off the shelf and 'good enough' PC based training package has an ethical angle, even if the product is actually fit for purpose. Representing an organisation in an industrial tribunal as an "expert witness" to argue that 'reasonable' adjustments could not be made to a workstation used by a disabled employee has real human consequences, and an ethical dimension. Servicing an employee assistance programme that a high-pressure organisation has only put in place for fear of the possible cost of stress-related legal proceedings by staff requires careful ethical thought. Within an organisation, a person privy to 'commercially sensitive' data which may have a negative impact can be involved in a wide range of ethically "uncomfortable"

scenarios – for example knowing that redundancies are in the pipeline but being prevented by issues of ‘commercial confidentiality’ from telling an employee who is just about to take out a significant home loan (Lowman et al., 2006). Even being involved in the ubiquitous “bread and butter” process of selection (and not deselection as in our first example) or indeed assessment has an ethical dimension: some people’s happiness will be increased, but for many others (for instance those rejected) it may be decreased (Alderfer, 1998). Those few commentators who explicitly focus on ethics in selection, for instance Fletcher (1992), tend to wish the individual selection practitioner to be more aware of their various ethical responsibilities. Recent work by Billsbury (2007), who documents the often unpleasant and unethical experiences of many contemporary interviewees, indicates that Fletcher’s concerns are still current.

Other authors (surveyed in Voskuijl and Evers, 2007) have sought to develop specialised codes for selection practice across Europe; unfortunately these are, for the most part *technical* documents. Whilst they may, in passing, touch on notions such as competing rights, many implicitly accept an entirely utilitarian position, and more importantly they do not, in general, question the underlying ethics of selection itself, nor, as Baritz (1960) suggested some time ago, the managerialist assumptions and power imbalances inherent in the activity.

Of course, putting aside possible repressive mechanisms for a moment, it might be argued that in these complex contexts the individual psychologist may, over time, therefore move philosophically towards an act utilitarian position (ie adopting a utilitarian perspective on the basis of accepting ‘responsibility’ for a single discreet action’s possible consequences – versus rule utilitarianism, for example). But this very movement and difference in ethical perspective may one day bring them into conflict with their more deontologically inclined profession, which under some circumstances (eg a complaint being made) will demand (at least) an explanation and justification of their underlying thinking and behaviour. It may also be that the primacy of the ‘patient’s’ interests (as seen by the HPC) may make some of the

examples presented above somewhat problematic in the future, and actually require a different ethical position from that which currently seems to exist.

The existence of a psychological code of ethics and conduct, and of a disciplinary process that might (at a minimum) require a rather public justification of one's action should, one might suppose, cause psychologists operating in such organisational environments, and subject to all the contextual and other pressures that exist there, some anxiety – but even if it privately does, there seems to be a surprising lack of *public* debate in this area. This will be returned to later in this text when considering possible future research and publications.

7.4 *The Historical Context of the Author's Papers*

When considering the author's various contributions to the debate on "how we ought to be psychologists" (which directly maps onto the 'how we ought to live' stance of normative ethics) it is helpful to remember the wider social milieu within which the author's contributions took place; they arose at a particular time, and within a particular context, both of which will be touched on here.

Most of the author's professional life has been spent as a Psychologist operating under a code of conduct, and more recently a code of ethics. Such codes influence the boundaries of acceptable psychological behaviour and thinking as well as provoking reactions to and tests of their range of convenience (Kelly, 1955). Codes, overtly, are an attempt to operationalise a particular version of professional ethics. They attempt to provide a bridge between the normative and the practical, the abstract and the real, the aspirational and the actual. The philosophical and professional backdrop to the papers presented here was inevitably influenced by the ethical code then in place, and other events arising during that period. It is also true to say that in part the work was a reaction to a somewhat restricted notion of conduct as promulgated by the 1985 code. The genesis and content of the 1985 code of ethics will be examined, and referred to as part of the orientation and

context within which the author made some of his academic and professional contributions. This code will be compared with the 2006 code, changes noted, and links to the author's work indicated. Before that takes place, it may be useful to reflect, briefly, on the nature of professional codes of ethics, and to examine their purpose.

7.5 *The Purpose of Professional Codes of Ethics*

Professional codes of ethics are created in order to make explicit and concrete the underlying ethical position of a specific group of people (United Kingdom Intra Professional Group, 2002). They therefore essentially seek to operationalise the normative position of that group. Members of a group having a code of ethics are expected to behave according to that code, and the existence of a definite explicit code serves in part to define a profession (Kwiatkowski and Horncastle, 1989; UKIPG, 2002).

There have been debates about whether codes of ethics and codes of conduct are the same or different. If they are different, goes the argument, then the code of conduct expresses what the behavioural expectations or permitted actions are, and the code of ethics defines the principles or philosophical position or thinking underpinning it. Given that one should (in theory) be able to infer behaviours from principles, some bodies (eg BPS, 2006b; GMC, 2006) have chosen to combine the two explicitly or implicitly, except where confusion could arise as a result – for instance in the case of a overtly behaviour based prescriptive code of conduct. The notion of a 'code of ethics' will be used here to encompass both.

Codes vary in complexity and intent; they may include general advice or specific rules; they may include statements of underlying values or beliefs; they may specify a decision making process in case of dilemmas, conflicting views or differing stakeholder interests (or not); they may specify potential sanctions to be imposed in the case of transgression; or point to sources of advice in case of complaints. Some

codes are short and run to a few lines or points, or have been kept short deliberately, others are long and elaborate, and contain a large volume of very specific advice designed to cover or anticipate many different possibilities; some contain numerous vignettes and scenarios intended to promote ethical thinking; others none; some encourage ethical behaviour in a tightly defined domain, others are much more broad ranging.

For those who agree to be bound by them, ethical codes may serve other functions apart from the overt purposes of protecting the public through regulation of a profession. For example, they may act to simplify complicated decision making processes, to provide an appeal to authority, to protect the practitioner (through guiding action when faced with new or morally ambiguous situations), to provide a template against which the ability or action of peers can be judged, or, by protecting non experts, can actually assist in the laying of a claim (by a professional grouping) to particular skills and expertise, or finally may act through regulating a profession or delimiting boundaries of practitioners' competence, sometimes with legal force. Ethical codes can perform a number of valuable functions over and above seeking to make explicit the philosophical position or permitted range of action of a professional group, and can benefit that profession as well as the society within which it operates.

As already noted, protection of the public and the maintenance of high standards are often used as justifications for Professional Codes of Ethics by professions. However, some critics suggest, like Shaw, that 'professions are a conspiracy against the laity' (1911, act 1). Continuing in this vein, some commentators suggest that codes of ethics should themselves be questioned, since they are not as simple, neutral, or un-self-interested as they may sometimes wish to appear. For example, codes of ethics may be seen as part of the mechanism of control of an area by an elite group (Baritz, 1960, p. 194). This can take place either through a hegemonic process (Bocock, 1986), or perhaps more subtly, because whilst it can seem as though 'protection of the public' is occurring – in fact the acceptable veneer of community sanction, (preventing incompetent practice) hides the politically charged

claiming of an area for an elite. Thus, from this perspective, whilst codes of conduct may initially appear to restrict the actions that people adhering to a code can legitimately undertake, they may also serve in part to restrict to (exclusive) members of a particular profession a right to act within a particular socially prescribed and proscribed domain or to legitimately carry out certain actions. Once professional codes acquire statutory or legal significance, their importance to members of a particular professional grouping – and to society and the 'laity' – increases; with the recent statutory regulation of psychology, psychological ethics may acquire a different standing and significance; perhaps analogous to that which other statutory professions such as medicine currently enjoy.

8 The BPS Code of Ethics

Having suggested that psychology is essentially deontological and the organisational context utilitarian, and examined the various purposes of codes of ethics in general, it is appropriate to now become more specific. This section therefore examines the codes that psychologists in the UK have to adhere to, and moves to an inspection of recent BPS codes. It will be argued that reflecting the philosophical positions outlined above whilst continuing to be deontological in stance, the 2006 code is more aware of the complexity and ambiguity created by the organisational context within which psychologists operate. Links will be provided to the author's work.

8.1 The original BPS Code of Conduct (1985)

The first really comprehensive British Psychological Society Code was produced relatively late (1985), as compared, for example with the work of the American Psychological Association (APA) which began in the 1930s (though there had been previous attempts to produce comprehensive codes, and although they are referred to in meeting minutes, the BPS archivist has been unable to locate them). Whilst there were these earlier attempts at BPS codes, for the Society there was a very practical reason for producing a code in the mid 1980s, namely that the BPS had finally achieved Chartered status for its members, and this was due to be implemented (with a 3 year 'grand-parenting' period) in 1987. As the BPS had had its Royal Charter amended so that it could regulate the title 'Chartered Psychologist', certain governance aspects needed to be developed, such as admission criteria to that status, and a code to govern behaviour, and to allow disciplinary action (and therefore potential expulsion) to take place if need be. Thus a more formal code became a necessity.

The process was not straightforward; for example there were concerns at this time about the acceptability of 'Chartered' status, particularly amongst academic members (who were then a much more significant proportion of the entire membership, and were disproportionately highly represented on many of the Boards and Committees). Indeed, some of the curious anomalies that exist within the past regulation of UK Psychology, as opposed to many other chartered professions, arose from this very anxiety; for example a separate "practising certificate" was created so that academic psychologists could pay less than 'practitioner' psychologists, and also, by implication, be in a special category of their own where their services were classified as not being offered to the public (Kwiatkowski, 2003).

The 1985 code of conduct had bound in the same booklet a number of other guidance documents, which were referenced in the code, and so essentially formed part of the operationalisation – at that time – of the official view of how psychologists ought to behave in various domains. The code therefore operationalised the then ethical position of the BPS and translated it into behaviours that were deemed appropriate. A simple and crude marker (or indicator) of the relative perceived importance and complexity of a particular ethical issue might be considered to be the prominence that it received in the 1985 code of conduct, and the number of pages devoted to it in the document. For example, the fact that a concern with the proper ethical conduct of research seemed uppermost in the minds of many psychologists at that time was reflected in the amount of time, and discussion within various committees, given to these concerns, and similarly, it could be suggested, was reflected in the amount of space or prominence given to these issues in the 1985 document. Below (on one page for ease of reading) is a table of the page count of the 1985 code, followed by a commentary.

Table 1 A page count of the 1985 Code of Conduct

Topic	Pages
Code of conduct	4.5
Ethical principles for conducting research with human participants	7
Guidelines for psychologists working with animals	12
Guidelines on advertising the services offered by psychologists	3
Descriptions	7
Regulations for the corporate use of the title 'Chartered Psychologist'	2
Equal opportunities policy statement and policy	3
Sexual harassment at work and the ethics of dual relationships	4
A briefing paper on sexual harassment at work and the ethics of dual relationships	12
Guidelines for penile plethysmography (PPG) usage	1.25
TOTAL	55.75

8.1.1 Commentary on the 1985 Code

As can be seen from table 1, the Code of Conduct itself took up about 4 pages. In contrast, experimental issues concerning human and animal participants add up to 19 (7+ 12) pages; how one might describe oneself post chartering takes up 9 (7 + 2) pages; issues concerning sexual harassment at work and the ethics of dual relationships add up to 16 pages, (which, at the time reflected concern within the British Psychological Society, Higher Education and the popular press about academics having inappropriate "relationships" with or harassing or abusing their students); finally, penile plethysmography – a technique rather more in vogue in the 1980s had 1.25 pages; in particular it was used by clinical psychologists in assessing ('inappropriate') arousal or reaction to stimuli (eg in a clinical or forensic context). It is still used today.

Therefore the document reflects a preoccupation with what academic psychologists knew best, ie experimental psychology, including the then more common use of non human animals. At that time many psychology departments had an 'animal lab' housing invertebrates such as worms, snails or spiders, and mammals such as rats or even cats, dogs or monkeys. The document additionally reflects the British Psychological Society's collective anxiety about what might happen post-Chartering.

An intriguing linguistic marker is the title: 'A Code of Conduct for psychologists' as though somehow other equally appropriate or legitimate codes might also exist.

Further, this code does not explicitly mention ethics, and the introduction reads as though a set of rules for a club is being proposed. The process of Chartering and the setting up of a register of Chartered Psychologists was seen as a step towards statutory registration, and there was (an actually unfounded) concern that a proliferation of titles similar to 'Chartered Psychologist' or the use of unsanctioned descriptors might somehow 'bring the profession into disrepute'. When one considers the political climate, with Margaret Thatcher in power, and a governmental context where the "closed shop" and "protectionism" was anathema, and where professions were beginning to be seen as restricting possible governmental action, and certainly something to be challenged, one can understand the cautious emphasis; nevertheless, in hindsight, the emphasis of this document seems somewhat curious and some of the notions appear linked rather more to a political position than ethics or psychology.

8.2 The BPS Code of Ethics and Conduct 2006

The need for a more up-to-date, relevant and appropriate code of ethics was recognised in the late 1990s; once again an anticipated need to react to external conditions prompted the British Psychological Society to set up an ethics committee and examine the old code. The development of a new ethical code was seen as being essential should the BPS's aim of achieving statutory registration be realisable.

At that point, the expectation was that psychologists would have their own statutory body regulating their work, and if the BPS had developed a more elaborate, up-to-date, and relevant code of ethics then this would most likely be adopted by whatever legal entity was created to regulate the profession – possibly some offshoot of the BPS, but at least a body influenced by psychological ethical thinking via that code.

The new code is very different from the old. For example, it categorises professional ethics into four areas; respect, competence, responsibility and integrity, and prefaces each principle with an explicit statement of values that logically should lead to the subsequent statements. It has an introduction and commentary to the code, and suggestions for ethical decision making, recognising the complexity of context, stakeholders and so forth. It acknowledges that the 'client' could be an individual, but also a group, family, organisation or system. These and other differences will be explored in more detail later. As with the 1985 code, there will be a brief examination here, based on the volume of space given over to various topics, with a commentary considering some implications.

Table 2 A page count of the 2006 Code of Ethics and Conduct

Topic	Pages
Introduction, definition of terms	3
Decision making advice	2
Ethical principle: respect	4
Ethical principle: competence	3
Ethical principle: responsibility	3
Ethical principle: integrity	3
Conclusion (incl processes)	1
References	1
Thanks / acknowledgements to external advisors	1
Documents consulted	1
General information about the BPS	1
TOTAL	23

8.2.1 Commentary

What is immediately striking about the 2006 code is that much of the document concerns contextualising the actual code itself – the ‘surroundings’, despite the fact that the 2006 document was less than half the length of the 1985 version. For instance the introduction is concerned with defining what is meant by ethics, and what might be termed as the ranges within which the code should apply. The idea of decision-making is emphasised, therefore the notion of a simple set of rules that can be applied in a relatively unchanging world is effectively abandoned. The document is reflexive, eg it contains an explanation of the difference between “must”, “should” and “will” and reflects on why a particular word has been used. It is also clear that the writers of the code have taken external advice and consulted numerous external sources. Reflecting the notion of psychology as a science, there

is a lot of material within the code on research. The authors are not indicated, however, and therefore the impression is (perhaps unconsciously) given that this code has somehow arisen from a consensus of the whole profession rather than from a representative or delegated group. The fact that it has taken many years to develop indicates that this was actually the result of a complex, negotiated process with numerous iterations. Nonetheless the new code does seem to be more relevant to applied psychologists.

It is appropriate to compare the 2006 and 1985 codes more specifically, and to consider how the author's work both reflected the zeitgeist, and how his contributions may potentially have moved thinking forward. In the next section there will be reference to the 1985 and 2006 codes, and the author's academic contributions will be noted. In the following chapter, specific contributions will be examined in more detail, because much of the work concerned applied psychology, the applied aspects, and in particular some of the policy implications, of the academic 'contribution' will be explored in subsequent chapters.

9 A comparison between The BPS Code of Ethics 2006 and the 1985 Code, with links to the Author's contributions

In the following table, the 2006 code will be presented first and compared with the old code (1985); a brief comment will be provided concerning the changes, and finally the papers whose subject matter relates to these (selected) changes will be cited in the final column of the table. The relationship of each paper to the changes will be (tentatively) presented in the "contribution" section describing each paper in more detail in the next chapter. A detailed comparison table of all significant changes is presented in the appendix (since the table presented here focuses on papers by the author that seem to have some relationships to particular changes - please note that since not all the differences noted there are relevant to the argument and papers presented here, for ease of comparison the original numbering scheme is used here and in the text of this paper, thus some are omitted), and the author intends that that table will form the basis of another publication which will place changes in the BPS code of ethics and conduct within their historical, academic, professional, and psychological context. However, that more detailed paper is not for here.

Table 3: a partial comparison between the 2006 and 1985 codes, with commentary on the changes, indicating related papers by the author

SOURCE / TOPIC		Significance / Importance of change	Related / linked paper
2006 CODE	1985 CODE		
Introduction	<i>Introduction & General</i>		
i. Uphold the highest standards of professionalism(p4)	<i>Does not bring discipline into disrepute</i>	Use of ethics as a positive force promoted; rather than essentially a set of rules to be obeyed	(1988) (1989) (2006a) (2007b) (2008)
ii. Protection of the public (p4)	<i>Complaints of misconduct</i>	The rationale for the existence of the code of conduct is the protection of the public, rather than avoiding complaints	(1988) (1989)
iii. Range of contexts (p4)	<i>Not mentioned</i>	There is a realisation and acknowledgement of the importance of context in influencing ethical thinking and behaviour	(1988) (1989) (2003) (2006d) (2008)
iv. Focus on range of Roles that psychologists occupy (P5)	<i>Psychologists' Focus is on science and research</i>	"Colleague, consultant, manager, employer, supervisor" all included; an acknowledgement of the complexity of psychologists' roles	(1989) (1996) (1997) (2000) (2006c) (2008)
v. Basis for ethical consideration, difficult decisions under changing circumstances (p5)	<i>Minimum standards – required to comply</i>	A very different way of considering a code of <u>ethics</u> rather than a code of conduct; assisting with complex and difficult decisions versus a straightforward rulebook	(2003) (2006b) (2007a)

The contribution of ethical concepts to the development of professional applied psychology

<p>vi. Importance of professional relationships (p5)</p>	<p><i>Not mentioned</i></p>	<p>An understanding of the complexity of professional relationships demonstrated</p>	<p>(1989) (2005) (2006d)</p>
<p>vii. Underlying Philosophical position (p6)</p>	<p><i>Not mentioned</i></p>	<p>An understanding demonstrated that a code of ethics and conduct must perforce have some coherent philosophical underpinning</p>	<p>(2006a) (2006b) (2006c) (2006d) (2008a)</p>
<p>viii. Power disadvantage of clients (p6)</p>	<p><i>Not mentioned</i></p>	<p>The importance of power is raised many times, and an acknowledgement that power requires responsibility from the more powerful</p>	<p>(1989) (1998) (2000) (2008b)</p>
<p>ix. Decision-making (two pages)</p>	<p><i>No equivalent section</i></p>	<p>A set of rules needs little decision-making guidance associated with it, since one simply follows the rules, if we acknowledge that the context /situation is more complicated, then decision-making skills are essential</p>	<p>(1988) (1989) (1998) (2005)</p>
<p>x. Ethics pervades professional activity (p7)</p>	<p><i>Not mentioned</i></p>	<p>The code of conduct (1985) is presented as a set of rules rather than acknowledging the centrality of ethics in psychology</p>	<p>(2006a) (2006b) (2006c) (2007a) (2008)</p>
<p>xi. Overlap between ethics and psychology (p7)</p>	<p><i>Not mentioned</i></p>	<p>Since both psychology and ethics make statements about human behaviour there is a clear overlap in their interest areas</p>	<p>(2003) (2006d) (2007b) (2008)</p>

The contribution of ethical concepts to the development of professional applied psychology

1 Ethical Principle: Respect (p10)			
xvi. Statement of values (p10)	<i>Not mentioned</i>	The code of conduct (1985) does not have explicit value statements, the underlying values or their inference is apparently assumed; the 2006 code explicitly states these values	(2005) (2007b)
xiv. Rights (p10)	<i>Not mentioned</i>	The notion of people's rights (not specifically human rights which has a legal meaning) is acknowledged as a key determinant of ethics	(2003) (2006a) (2007a)
xv Self-determination of clients (p13)	<i>Not mentioned</i>	The code of ethics (2006) has a more humanistic stance towards the rights of clients	(1989) (1998) (2005) (2007b)
2. Ethical Principle: Competence			
xvi Statement of values (p14)	<i>Not mentioned</i>	The code of conduct (1985) does not have explicit value statements, the underlying values or their inference is apparently assumed	(1988) (1989) (2006d)
xvii Awareness of ethics (p14)	<i>Not mentioned</i>	New code states that part of being a competent professional psychologists it is being aware and applying this ethical code	(1988) (1989) (1996)(2003a) (2005) (2006a)

The contribution of ethical concepts to the development of professional applied psychology

xviii. Ethical decision-making (p14)	<i>Not mentioned</i>	Rather than a detached role for psychologists the centrality of decision-making in professional life is emphasised in the 2006 code	(1989) (1996) (2005) (2006a) (2006b)
xix Remain abreast of scientific ethical and legal innovations	<i>Not mentioned</i>	Code of conduct (1985) focuses on psychology, the new code (2006) broadens that to broader scientific, ethical and legal changes that impact on professional practice	(1998) (2003) (2006a) (2006b) (2008)
xx Be sensitive to developments in broader social political organizational contexts	<i>Not mentioned</i>	The code of ethics (2006) emphasises the embeddedness of psychological interventions, in social, political and organisational contexts	(2000) (2003a) (2006c) (2006d) (2008)
3 Ethical Principle: Responsibility.			
xxi Statement of values (p17)	<i>Not mentioned</i>	The code of conduct (1985) does not have explicit value statements, the underlying values or their inference is apparently assumed	(2006a)
xxii. Avoidance of harm (p17)	<i>Discussed in supplementary document on research</i>	However the code of conduct itself (1985) is silent on this fundamental aspect of many professional codes	(2007a)
xxiii Weighing of interests of clients (p17)	<i>Not mentioned</i>	The importance of professional judgment is emphasised (2006)	(1989) (1989) (1997) (1998) (2006b) (2006c)

The contribution of ethical concepts to the development of professional applied psychology

4 Ethical Principle: Integrity			
xxiv Statement of values	<i>Not mentioned</i>	The code of conduct (1985) does not have explicit value statements, the underlying values or their inference is assumed	(2006a) (2006b)
xxv Of avoiding exploitation and conflicts of interest (p21)	<i>Discussed in supplementary document on harassment</i>	The code of ethics (2006) presents a much more complex and sophisticated understanding of conflict of interests than the earlier code and supplementary documents which seemed to view it mostly in terms of sexual harassment	(1989) (1996) (2006d) (2008)
xxvi Multiple relationships (p21)	<i>Discussed in supplementary document on harassment</i>	As above: the new code (2006) understands and acknowledges a range of different relationships that need to be taken into account	(1989) (2003) (2006d)
xxvii Maintaining personal boundaries (p21)	<i>Not mentioned</i>	The new code (2006) demonstrates a more sophisticated understanding of the importance of maintaining personal boundaries, not just in a sexual arena	(1989) (1997) (2000) (2006d)

Conclusion			
xxviii Professional judgment (p23)	<i>Scientific basis of psychology emphasised</i>	The importance of professional judgment is once again emphasised in the 2006 code, as against a much more “detached scientist” model in 1985	(1989) (2006a) (2006b) (2006c) (2007b)
xxix Importance of reflection (p23)	<i>Not mentioned</i>	In accordance with its philosophy of “guide not punish” the 2006 code emphasises thinking (p6) and reflection	(2006b) (2006d) (2008)

9.1 *Commentary*

The 1985 code, which remained essentially unchanged until supplanted by the code of 2006, was inevitably a document of its time; as has been shown, it was elaborated by, and supplementary advice and guidance was offered in a number of other documents produced by the British Psychological Society; some of the statements contained in these supplementary documents would strike us now as unusual. For example, in the section on advertising, “The Society adopts a neutral position on the quasi-political issue of the desirability or otherwise of Members working in private practice and thus charging clients directly for the psychological services provided”. This reflects a UK context where, at that time, the vast majority of psychologists were employed by state related institutions such as the NHS, Educational services, Universities, Schools and so forth, and the number of psychologists in private practice was relatively small. This position has now significantly changed. Other statements are perhaps more surprising. For example, “... a psychologist offering occupational guidance ... should do nothing to encourage

a client to question his or her current level of job satisfaction"; it would now be seen by many occupational psychologists as an extraordinary injunction not to raise an issue which, in all probability, may well have brought a client into contact with psychologists offering such "occupational guidance" in the first place. One has the clear sense that the "status quo" or "establishment" view is being perpetuated, and that the document reflects a relatively conservative orientation to the world.

As can be seen, many of the changes in the code between 1985 and 2006 are related to themes and ideas existing in the author's work. This may reflect (or anticipate) the zeitgeist, though it may be argued that some of his, and his colleagues', ideas have added to the understanding of the contribution of ethical thinking to applied psychology over a long period, and perhaps continue to do so. Thus it may be that the awareness of the potentially problematic nature of coexistence within different ethical systems has been raised, and to some extent engaged with, and that this is reflected in the 2006 code. However, an important cautionary caveat is necessary; the author was a member of the BPS Board Of Trustees, The Membership and Qualifications Board, The Professional Practice Board, The Representative Council, and since its inception The Ethics Committee, (amongst various other BPS appointments). He naturally argued for the positions advanced in the papers cited; for this reason the professional/policy contribution of the work is not separated out as it would be very difficult to disaggregate the influence of the papers themselves with the embodied impact of the author himself (if any) within the BPS at the same time. However, this work is perhaps an example of where academic thinking and contribution has (possibly indirectly) had a policy impact. Through that policy impact the work has also potentially indirectly influenced the professional lives of many psychologists and their clients.

9.2 *List of relevant Papers and contributions*

The full reference list of the papers cited in the previous section is below: the papers that will be discussed in more detail are in bold: the others, whilst they are

concerned with similar themes are not central but are noted to illustrate the author's continuing interest in and contribution to this area. They are referenced elsewhere in this thesis.

REF	Brief Reference
1988	'Paradigms Lost?' - On the Usefulness of Occupational Psychology' (with P.Horncastle). BPS Occupational Psychology Conference, Windermere
1989a	'Paradigms Lost? - On the Usefulness of Occupational Psychology' (with P.Horncastle). <i>The Occupational Psychologist</i> 1989
1989b	'On the Consumption of the Golden Goose' (Client practitioner relationships and ethics) (with P.Horncastle). BPS Occ Psych Conf
1996	Counselling Psychology from an Organisational Perspective <i>Counselling Psychology Review Occasional Papers</i> No. 2
1997	Counselling and Psychotherapy: are they different and should we care? <i>Quarterly Journal of Counselling Psychology</i> No 2
1998	Emotional Aspects of Large Group Teaching (with Hogan, D.) <i>Human Relations</i> Vol 51 No. 11, pp 1-18
2000	Conflict in Organisations, in Feltham, C. and Horton, I. (Eds), <i>Handbook of Counseling and Psychotherapy</i> , Sage, pp. 222-229,
2001	What have we forgotten? Discussion paper presented at the BPS Centenary (Annual) Conference, Glasgow, April
2001a	The Beginnings of the Doctorate in Occupational Psychology, (With Lewis,C. and Sage,R.) in <i>The Occupational Psychologist</i> Dec, p43-45
2001b	Applying Organizational Behaviour theories and models in learning teams (with Harris, Kakabadse and Mapes.) in <i>Innovations in Teaching Business and Management</i> , Hockings,C. and Moore,I.(eds),
2003a	Trends in Organizations and Selection, <i>Journal of Managerial Psychology</i>, vol. 18, no.5, 2003, pp 382 -394
2003b	We are not adjectives we are Psychologists; letter on statutory registration published in <i>The Psychologist</i> , September 2003
2005	Ethics: The Future? Invited paper, part of the Ethics Symposium at the BPS Quinquennial conference, April 2005, Manchester
2006a	What have we forgotten and why?, (with Duncan, D.C. and Shimmin, S.) <i>JOOP</i>, vol. 79, pp 183-201.

2006b	UK Occupational/Organizational Psychology, Applied Science And Applied Humanism: Some Further Thoughts On What We Have Forgotten; Response To Commentaries, (with Duncan) <i>Journal Of Occupational And Organizational Psychology</i> (2006), 79, 217–224
2006c	Inside out and Outside in : the use of personality and 360 Degree data in executive coaching, in Executive Coaching – a systems and psychodynamic approach, in Brunning, H. (ed.)
2006d	Roots, relativity and realism: the Occupational Psychologist as 'Scientist-Practitioner' (with Winter, B.) in <i>The Modern Scientist Practitioner</i>, Lane, D. and Corrie, S., (eds)
2007a	'Science and Ethics Underlie our Actions'; invited paper in 'Science and Public Affairs', British Association for the Advancement of Science
2007b	'Optimistic about Ethics' in <i>People and Organizations at Work</i>, Spring 2007, pp 14-15, BPS, Leicester, ISSN 1746-4188
2008	Organizational or Psychological Ethics – Which is it? <i>People and Organisations at Work</i>, Summer 2008

10 The Academic Contribution

In the following papers an ethical reflection on how psychologists “operate” and their actions within particular ambiguous domains has been a constant theme.

In each case there is a questioning of what it means to be a psychologist, or to think psychologically, or to apply psychology, based on ideas of how a psychologist *ought* to behave in a particular situation. Recalling Singer's (1994) definition of ethics “how we ought to live”, it follows that a concern with and reflection on how psychologists “ought to behave” positions these concerns firmly within the ethical domain, and reflects the notion of “how we ought to be psychologists”, which is the common and developing thread in these papers.

It is argued that these contributions have helped to develop the academic understanding of the contribution of ethical concepts in the development of professional practice through an understanding of the complexity of having to co-exist within differing ethical domains. They have engaged with existing thinking in these domains and sought to take the debate forward.

10.1 *Links between the Papers*

A development in the author’s thinking over the past 20 years is visible when one considers the papers presented here. In order to examine that development it is necessary to refer to some conference papers as well as to journal articles and book chapters; in each case the context and background will be examined, the problems addressed discussed, a brief description of the content of the paper provided, and finally its academic and professional contribution noted. In the case of the academic contribution, advances in thinking and citations will be mentioned; as part of the professional contribution, reference will be made to changes in the BPS Code of Ethics as outlined above.

10.1.1 Contribution

The cumulative contribution of the published work presented here has been to advance ethical ideas within professional applied psychology.

Specifically these papers have emphasised the necessity of considering how, as a professional psychologist, one must consciously and actively coexist within overlapping, and sometimes competing, professional and organisational ethical domains and contexts - and in particular the deontological and utilitarian domains.

The papers start with a conference presentation in 1988 – some of the ideas put forward there have continued through many other papers, even through to two more recent publications (2007, 2008). Those ideas include the notion of the centrality of ethics to the endeavour of applied psychology, the importance of reflection on the ethical issue of how we 'ought to be' as psychologists, and the theme of (the often complex) need to coexist within overlapping ethical worlds.

10.2 *The papers submitted; summarising context and background, problem addressed, contents and contribution*

10.2.1 'Paradigms lost?' - On the Usefulness of Occupational Psychology' (1988) (with P. Horncastle). BPS Occupational Psychology Conference

Context, Background & Problem Addressed: this paper arose out of a growing realisation that applied psychologists have to operate and coexist within several different and overlapping worlds. Whilst psychological education emphasises "rigour" and "scientific caution" (Gale et al., 1988, p. 69), "pragmatic solutions" and "the bottom line" are often more important for those working within organisations (Yorks and Whitsett, 1985). Thus complicated multiple realities can exist within the same context or situation, a position that was not emphasised or acknowledged in

the then relatively new Code of Conduct (BPS, 1985). Presentation of these ideas, and a challenge to the implicit orthodoxy (that ethical behaviour by scientific psychologists was relatively simple and a-contextual), was given impetus by the introduction of Registration or 'Chartering' through a change to the Royal Charter and Statutes of the BPS approved by the Privy Council the year before (when the author was involved as a member of the BPS Membership and Qualifications Board). The paper was thus, in part a reflection on and a reaction to Chartering, and a drawing out of some relatively unexamined theoretical (explicitly linking a code of behaviour to philosophical ethical thinking) and practical implications of that process. If regulation of conduct was to be given more prominence then the complexity of ethical behaviour in more applied contexts had to be recognised. This paper questioned many assumptions embedded in being an (occupational) psychologist, and sought to move the argument away from the technical ("how can we ...?") to what might be considered the more philosophical and ethical ("should we?").

Content: the paper put forward the notion of coexistence, and suggested a paradigm shift was required concerning how applied psychologists saw themselves as being in the world. An example used was that a psychologist recommending a particular psychometric test would need to be aware of its reliability, validity, norm groups, validation studies, and so forth; however the phrase "and IBM use it" may actually be all that a client needs to hear, (despite the logical fallacy that it contains) and that for them this statement may (perhaps for good reason) be far more salient and convincing. Various ethical theories and positions were applied to the work of occupational psychologists and models advanced. The concept of coexistence therefore involves a shift away from a notion of psychologists as scientific experts, dispassionately providing objective advice to those less knowledgeable than themselves, to one where multiple ethical positions, and more complex power (and other) relationships and very different contexts, may coexist.

Contribution: this conference paper began the development of a set of ideas concerning how psychologists ought to be in the world - how we "ought to be" is fundamentally an ethical concern.

Specifically, the paper made a number of contributions

- It questioned the implicit (in the 1985 code) "scientific" notion of applied psychology as technique based, purely rational and dispassionate rather than complex, relational and contextual
- The paper drew attention to the fact that the position that applied psychologists could be objective and dispassionate 'scientists' outwith the systems within which they had to operate was in fact untenable
- It showed that psychologists' concerns (articulated or not) may not always be the same as those of their clients – and that this has significant ethical and professional ramifications
- It raised the notion of therefore having to co-exist within (not simply jump between, or select as convenient) differing frames of reference
- After the paper it became more apparent that educators of applied psychologists needed to explicitly approach the ethical nature of relations in their teaching – for instance the need to examine professional relationships as part of the Occupational Psychology MSc became clearer (and 'professional studies' or similar modules are now quite common on MSc programmes, whereas at that time they were rare)
- It questioned the BPS Code of Conduct – which was largely silent on the issue of multiple stakeholders, and multiple social or ethical realities, and implicitly appeared to assume a relatively straightforward 1:1 "doctor/patient relationship", or else a research relationship
- When the paper was presented, the first cohort of psychologists had received Chartered Status only a few months earlier, and so questioning a profession that had recently won a long hoped for new status was controversial. It provoked heated arguments in a conference room with standing room only.

The contribution of ethical concepts to the development of professional applied psychology

- It brought into the open certain largely unspoken consequences of Chartering, especially in the light of then soon hoped for possible statutory registration, which, some 20 years after that paper, is a (partial) reality.

Links to BPS Code of Ethics Changes (Table 3): i. uphold the highest standards of professionalism, ii. protection of the public, iii. a range of contexts, ix. decision-making, xvi statement of values, xvii awareness of ethics, xxiii weighing of interests of clients.

10.2.2 'On the Consumption of the Golden Goose' (Client practitioner relationships and ethics) (with P. Horncastle). BPS Occupational Psychology Conference, Windermere (1989)

Context, Background & Problem Addressed: this paper was presented to the Annual Occupational Psychology Conference in the year following the "Paradigms lost" paper; it built on the previous paper and arose from an increasing concern that working in complex organisational contexts where potentially conflicting ethical positions – namely the deontological and utilitarian – might be present was not being overtly addressed. Whilst it focused on ethics, an additional pragmatic concern was that if trust in occupational psychologists declined through their own lack of awareness of the complexities of organisational ethics (and through carrying out action that might be seen by one constituency or another as unethical behaviour) then psychologists would, in effect, be "eating the goose that laid the golden egg" (hence the title). In other words a significant possible reason for the employment of psychologists, namely a perception that a heightened ethical awareness informed their work, would be negated, with consequences for the profession, and for employment. Some ways that the (then relatively new BPS code) could be amended were suggested.

Content: initially in discussing what it means to be a member of a profession, the paper pointed out and examined the centrality of ethics. It raised a number of questions. For example, it explored the difference between personal and professional ethics, and posed the rhetorical question "how far will a psychologist go"? The paper challenged occupational psychologists to be aware and consider the centrality of ethics in their professional lives. It further divided questions into technical questions for example "how should we do this?"; societal ethical questions such as "should this be done?"; and personal ethical questions, for example "should I do it?" Most papers at the occupational psychology conference tend to be technical papers. This paper deliberately used a self-interest/utilitarian argument as one likely to appeal to the intended audience in making the point that an awareness

of ethics was crucial to how individual psychologists (and psychology) were seen, and if unethical behaviour took place or was seen to have taken place, and trust in psychology was therefore reduced, the practice of professional psychology in a business context, and hence individual psychologists' livelihoods, might be compromised.

Contribution:

- The paper raised awareness of the centrality of ethics in being a professional, over and above the application of technical expertise or scientific knowledge
- It explicitly teased out a multiple stakeholder view of occupational psychology – of ethical responsibilities to the individual that a psychologist was working with, to their employer, to their profession, and to broader society, and the possibility of conflict between these ethical requirements
- The paper showed that without awareness of the complexity lying behind apparently simple technical questions, the risk of acting unethically was significantly increased (and that post hoc 'rationalisation' of action was all too easy)
- Anecdotally, after the paper was presented a number of peers and colleagues spoke with the authors about previously undiscussed ethical dilemmas
- The then Editor of "The Occupational Psychologist" (The Division of Occupational Psychology's publication) asked that a paper be written on the topic
- The paper questioned whether the overtly deontological perspective and rule bound version of 'ethics' of the 1985 Code was appropriate and served psychology well – as noted above there have been changes in the 2006 Code, for instance incorporating the notion of organisations as clients, that reflect some of these themes
- The paper drew attention to the Morris and Bruce paper of 1978 regarding the need to update the 'Ethical Principles for Research with Human Subjects' guidelines. The author was subsequently a member of the working party that produced new guidelines (Velmans, Morrison-Coulthart, Colley, Foot, Foreman, Kent, Kwiatkowski, and Sloboda. (2004) and a current working group due to report in late 2009.

- It pointed to an area (ethical interfaces) that was relatively unexamined within the occupational psychology domain, and which, almost 20 years ago seemed rather a fringe interest
- The paper suggested changes to BPS statutes regarding preventing the resignation of those charged with misconduct – this became BPS policy in 2000
- The paper advocated the legal restriction of the title 'psychologist' (as opposed to other titles – the author had a letter in *The Psychologist* putting forward this view in 2003a) this became BPS policy in 2007.

Links to BPS Code of Ethics Changes (Table 3): i. uphold the highest standards of professionalism, ii. importance of protection of the public, iii. importance of a range of contexts, iv. the range of roles that psychologists occupy, vi. importance of professional relationships, viii. power disadvantage of clients, ix. decision-making, xv. self-determination of clients, xvi. explicit statement of values, xvii. awareness of ethics, xxiii. weighing of interests of clients, xxv. importance of avoiding exploitation, conflicts of interest, xxvi. multiple relationships, xxvii. importance of maintaining personal boundaries, xxviii. importance of professional judgement.

Perhaps due to the controversy stirred up by the previous year's paper, this paper was very well attended, with over half the people at the conference (est. > 200) present. An extension / development of the paper was published in "The Occupational Psychologist", where it gained a broader audience.

10.2.3 Counselling psychology from an occupational perspective. British Psychological Society Division of Counselling Psychology, Occasional Papers (Vol. 2) (1996). In I. James & S. Palmer (Eds.), *Professional therapeutic titles: Myths and realities*. Leicester: British Psychological Society

Context, Background & Problem Addressed: at that time (early 1990s), it was becoming apparent that many psychologists with a counselling background were undertaking work in organisational contexts, for example as part of employee assistance programmes, at the behest of Welfare, Personnel or Human Resource departments, or directly called in by line managers. Much counselling training at that time focused on the underlying philosophy of counselling psychology (and the differences between that and clinical psychology or counselling), practical skills, the "person" of the counsellor and the client, and sometimes on family dynamics. However, the impact of job or organisation received relatively little consideration (Murphy, 1995) and the consideration of organisational dynamics, system level dilemmas and conflicts was rare (Morgan, 1986) and, if included, took place from a counselling (often person centred) or clinical rather than an organisational perspective. This presented dangers to the professional work of the counsellor, but more so, ignorance of (the ethical problems of working in) organisational contexts and potential dilemmas posed could seriously disadvantage the client (eg by returning them to a 'psychotoxic environment'; Wolfe, 1994, p. 13, by ignoring issues of power and so forth.). Whilst occupational psychologists did seem to be aware of influences on aspects of behaviour in organisations, and in particular organisational politics, it seemed to the author (who was a founder member of the Division of Counselling Psychology, had served on its scientific and research committee, and has been an external examiner on a Masters Counselling Psychology programme) that it was important to indicate how the knowledge bases overlapped, and what particular groups of psychologists knew, and did not know. He therefore gave a paper at the Annual Counselling Psychology Conference entitled "Counselling psychology from an Occupational psychology perspective". This was subsequently substantially published in the Divisional Journal, in a special issue (1996). Using the example of 'stress' as a presenting problem it pointed to differing expertise and

knowledge, and argued that different levels of awareness of what psychology was able to contribute were necessary in order that counselling psychology techniques and principles could be appropriately applied within a complex organisational context. Once again, this echoes the theme of “how we ought to be psychologists”; ethical considerations around the notion of competence (one of the four key areas identified in the 2006 code), the ethics of the return of people to psychotoxic environments and the rightness or otherwise of the location of intervention at an individual rather than, for example, a system level, are important aspects of this paper.

Content: this paper raised many ethical issues directly (eg level of intervention, knowledge bases and competence, reinsertion of clients into a damaging system, ethical and technical issues raised by specific techniques, ethical issues raised by responsibilities to different stakeholder groups, the importance of considering various systems aspects, and so forth). It referred to, and built on, the earlier paper by Kwiatkowski and Horncastle, 1989, 1990; in other words the importance and complexity of co-existence within different (ethical) domains was highlighted. It pointed to the ethical issues involved in applying psychology in the workplace – it used the notion of coaching as one example of an arena where limits of competence were in danger of becoming blurred – and indicated that occupational psychologists might lack the skills to intervene at the individual level, whilst counselling psychologists might lack the skills to intervene at the organisational level.

Contribution:

- This paper made an academic contribution to several debates; for example the long-standing practitioner/academic debate in psychology, the ongoing debate about the boundaries between different psychological specialisms, and the debates concerning ‘competence’ as an ethical rather than a technical issue.
- If Counselling Psychologists treated their work with a client in an organisational / occupational context as a relatively simple 1:1 counselling endeavour, rather than part of an ethically more complex organisationally mediated process, that would be hard to justify (eg in a disciplinary context) after this paper

- In the old code of conduct, limits of competence are mentioned in general terms. This paper raised the impact of organisational dynamics, and the need to have competence in understanding their impact (which links to one of the four key areas in the 2006 code).
- This paper showed that Counselling Psychologists needed to be aware of a number of factors that their core training did not, at that time, typically, prepare them for, and that there were clear ethical issues associated with this (some of these issues are now being addressed on courses)
- Similarly, it showed that Occupational Psychologists moving into an unfamiliar domain (that of 1:1 work, eg coaching) also needed to be aware of their limits (the author was a proposer and founding member of the Special Group in Coaching Psychology in 2004, and had some input for the first constitution of that group. However, this is an 'ongoing' issue)
- It raised the 'unquestioning' nature of some interventions undertaken by psychologists, which again links to the central notion of the importance of professional self awareness as an ethical concern.

Links to BPS Code of Ethics Changes (Table 3): iv. the range of roles that psychologists occupy, xvii. the importance of the awareness of ethics, xxv, avoiding exploitation and conflicts of interest.

Citations: It has been cited by Davy (2002) a Clinical Psychologist who was considering issues that needed to be addressed in training.

10.2.4 Counselling and Psychotherapy: are they different and should we care?
Quarterly Journal of Counselling Psychology No 2, (1997)

Context, Background and Problem Addressed: this paper considered a range of issues concerned with a major area of applied psychological work, namely counselling and psychotherapy. The problem addressed was the debate about differences between counselling and psychotherapy, both within the academic domain (Elton-Wilson, 1994; Nelson-Jones, 1982; Patterson, 1974, 1986; Rowan, 1991; Thorne, 1992;) and amongst professional organisations (eg. The British Psychological Society, The United Kingdom Council for Psychotherapy, and the – then – British Association for Counselling (BAC)). It references an earlier paper by Kwiatkowski and Dryden (1989), and takes the themes further, though the ethical dimensions (and the political) are not as developed as they are in subsequent papers. As an example, it raises the ethical question that if the title of one's endeavour has an impact on efficacy should one simply use the most effective title? As already noted, partly for ethical, but also for political reasons (as was suggested in this paper) the British Psychological Society and the British Association for Counselling have both moved in this direction (see contribution, below).

Content: the data discussed was obtained from all providers of counselling and psychotherapy training in the UK, and the published views of UK regulatory bodies. It examined trends in the psychological literature, professional and academic writing and definitions. It argued that no real differences appear to exist between psychotherapy and counselling. On linguistic and political grounds, "psychotherapy" as opposed to "counselling" as "a paradigm and concept" was identified as being in the ascendant. Ethically, this was thought to have real consequence for practitioners and clients in that how one describes one's endeavour may therefore impact on efficacy. The paper suggested the title "counselling psychotherapist" as a possible way forward if "psychotherapist" was not adopted.

Contribution:

- The paper had contributed to the ongoing debate about the differences (if any) between counselling and psychotherapy. This is a long-running debate, which at that time was quite fierce, based in part on differing perceived value sets between the endeavours. This paper was unusual in that it sought to bring new empirical data into the debate.
- The paper correctly identified the rising potency of “psychotherapy” as a concept
- It brought in some new empirical, ethical as well as political arguments into an arena (what to call one’s endeavour) where they had largely been absent
- Partly for ethical, but also for political reasons (as suggested in the paper) the British Psychological Society and the British Association for Counselling have both subsequently moved in the direction suggested; with the BAC changing its name to the “British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy” (in 2001) and the BPS setting up a specialist register for “Psychologists Specialising in Psychotherapy” (2003). The paper at least anticipated these developments, and may have contributed to the debate that led in this direction.
- The United Kingdom Council for Psychotherapy now has 80 member organisations with over 6,500 registrants and is pressing for statutory recognition of the term ‘psychotherapist’. It seems probable that this will take place through the Health Professions Council. Thus on a policy level the paper seems to have been reasonably accurate in its analysis and conclusions.

Links to BPS Code of Ethics Changes (Table 3): iv. range of roles that psychologists occupy, xxiii. weighing of interests of clients, xvii. maintaining personal boundaries.

Citations: The paper has been cited by a number of significant authors: Chan (2005), Neimeyer and Diamond (2001), Schoenberg and Shiloh (2002), Trigo (2006), and Wosket (2002), in a variety of journals such as The International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, Counselling Psychology Quarterly, and the Portuguese Review of Clinical Medicine. These papers examine some of the issues raised in the original paper, and some empirically extend the debate to

include patients' views. The paper has been used on various UK counselling courses to stimulate debate. It is notable that authors from China, The United States and Portugal as well as the UK have cited this paper, and the citing authors' backgrounds range from psychiatry through counselling and psychotherapy to education.

10.2.5 Emotional Aspects of Large Group Teaching (1998) (with Hogan, D.) *Human Relations* Vol 51 No. 11, pp. 1-18

Context, Background & Problem Addressed: when this paper was published the UK context was one where class sizes in many Higher Education Institutions had been rapidly increased with large undergraduate groups typically containing hundreds of students instead of the tens of the 1980s (HEFCE, 1994; Phillips, 1995; Scott, 1995), where Polytechnics had been reclassified as Universities, though without parity of funding (Macleod, 2002); and where overall funding per student had decreased as numbers had gone up (Public Affairs Select Committee, 1998). It seemed to the authors that psychological difficulties associated with large class sizes were being denied or ignored; an ethical issue. In some organisational contexts, whilst psychological understanding is available, it is not used. This raises the complex question of whether unethical behaviour is occurring if what is known is not applied (what might be termed a 'sin of omission'). With Hogan (both authors made an equal contribution) the author suggested that in the rush to increase student numbers, (causing an increase in class size), human and in particular emotional aspects of the interactions had been ignored. Thus the paper examined the knowledge base of psychology as well as the ethical consequences of applying (or not) that knowledge base.

Content: the paper described the loss of the humanistic ethos of education (Knapper & Cropley, 1991) and the rise of technical 'solutions' to the problem of large group teaching at the expense of the psychological. This is an ethical issue since these difficulties are and were known, but had not been discussed or acted upon, and this involved ethical judgements by people in Universities. The danger was that an unquestioning "Fordism" (Watson, 1995) and a desire for control (Gibbs & Jenkins, 1992) was being applied to education. The paper critiqued the rise of technical solutions to what were, at least in part, emotional, psychological and ethical issues (for example individual students' increases in anxiety and alienation, as well as staff/faculty rises in stress). The paper showed how technical solutions did not address these fundamental underlying emotional dynamics of the new

context. Both students and lecturers may have had a range of emotions stirred up by the anxiety of the situation, which may have had an impact on learning and thinking; the nature of the institution may change; technological solutions may be sought rather than ever-increasing personal contact; and the individual may be unfairly blamed when the context or even the psychosocial milieu itself is actually creating difficulties. There are links here to the idea of 'psychotoxic environments' that were raised in 'Counselling psychology from an occupational perspective'; the ethical issue involves both exposure to those environments and also, as noted, the realisation (or knowledge) that harm may be done through **not** applying what is known.

Contribution:

- This paper extended the literature into an unexplored area
- It developed hypotheses about what might be happening and suggested an academic research agenda
- It drew attention to the limitations of technical solutions, and questioned 'Fordism' in education
- The central issue was an ethical one because it concerned two conflicting ethical systems: the essentially humanistic view of education – linked to an underlying deontological position, and the potential conflict with the utilitarian perspective of the organisation which under the circumstances described (perhaps understandably) tried to 'process' as many students as possible
- It suggested that a particular aspect of being professional was being either suppressed or denied, an ethical concern
- The paper increased the legitimacy of considering the emotional and psychological impact of teaching and learning; it claimed 'universality' for anxiety and stress in large group teaching; it therefore enhanced the awareness of these somewhat controversial issues, including the importance of the ethics of context
- It is notable (and laudable) that some of the significant authorities in this field, positively citing and quoting the paper (eg Gibbs) are people whose earlier approaches were criticised in this paper. This may indicate that the paper has had some influence on thinking.

- When an earlier version of the paper was presented at the Society for Research into Higher Education it led to a number of audience members describing – sometimes for the first time – their own difficulties with large group teaching. In itself the perceived inability to discuss these matters has ethical ramifications.
- Managers of learning institutions (if they read the paper) could no longer suggest that some of these problems of human interaction were easily solved using essentially technical solutions, or that individual responsibility was appropriate
- This paper brought out hidden difficulties related to the applied psychological professional arena of the Division of Teachers and Researchers in Psychology (the author was a founder member of the Division and served on its first elected Divisional Committee)
- This paper subsequently informed the development of a particular approach to teaching Organisational Behaviour, very much from a humanistic perspective, which led to a paper in 2001 (Kwiatkowski et al.), and, though causality is hard to establish, the Organisational Behaviour module at the Cranfield School of management – which was designed taking these considerations into account – has been rated several times by the Financial Times as being amongst the top ten in the world.

Links to BPS Code of Ethics Changes (Table 3): viii. power, ix. decision-making about ethics, xv. self-determination of clients, xix. the importance of remaining abreast of scientific ethical and legal innovations, xxiii. ethical aspects of weighing the interests of clients

Citations: The paper has been cited by several authors, for example by Amernic (1999), Bruneau and Langevin (2000), Constanti and Gibbs (2004), Craig (2000), Discenza et al. (2001), Howard et al. (2003), Langan-Fox, Armstrong, Balvin, And Anglim (2002), Martz and Shepherd (2004), Schneberger, Amoroso and Durfee (2006), and Stone (2000). It is also cited on the website of the China Academic Humanities and Social Sciences Library. As well as being cited in a text book, a variety of journals have carried these publications, for example Accounting Education, International Journal of Educational Management, The Australian

Psychologist, and the Proceedings of a Hawaiian Conference on Systems Science. As noted above, one of the foremost writers in the field, Gibbs, whose earlier work was criticised in the original paper has more recently quoted directly (and approvingly) from the paper (2004).

The work has also influenced practical developments in occupational psychology; in a short piece in *The Occupational Psychologist*, the issue of the ethics and ethos of occupational psychology is addressed directly in commenting on the rationale behind the first UK doctorate in occupational psychology which the author helped to set up:

“We do not need more “technicians” or “business psychologists” who will simply do the will of managers; there is simply no future in being a servant ... If we are to compete [with top consultancies] then we have to offer something additional; and perhaps it is the ability to question, as psychologists, what is happening at a level of psychological complexity ... that will differentiate us ...” (Kwiatkowski, Lewis, and Sage, 2001).

There are now a number of doctoral courses providing postgraduate training in the UK, and there has been much discussion within the BPS as to whether all postgraduate training leading to professional recognition should actually be at doctoral level. The author has been consulted by some of these subsequently emerging courses and asked to give advice on their structure and ethos. The British Psychological Society has argued that all professional training leading to Chartered practitioner status should be recognised as being at doctoral level, partly because a purely technical approach is inappropriate to professional development. Thus this paper may have had some wider influence, or anticipated some arguments. (The HPC has recently endorsed this position.)

10.2.6 Kwiatkowski, R. (2003b), Trends in Organizations and Selection, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 18, no.5, pp. 382 –394

Context, Background & Problem Addressed: this paper arose in part from a perception that psychologists were routinely relying on technical means in several aspects of their organisational work; for example that psychometric tests were being increasingly and habitually used by Occupational Psychologists in selection, often unquestioningly, and that this needed to be challenged, and new thinking and methods needed to be presented to practitioners. (The author co-organised a conference about this entitled 'beyond psychometrics' which was run twice). Part of the concern was how psychologists ought to behave, and in particular that the technical should not assume primacy over the psychological and the ethical. Part of this need was to try and predict future organisational level changes and the consequences for selection (which often focuses at the individual level). The author was invited to guest edit a Special Issue devoted to those issues in the *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, and took the opportunity to put forward some ideas linking organisations with selection in this paper. The paper was peer refereed.

Content: the paper examined how possible changes in organisations might have an impact on selection practice, particularly as practised by psychologists (Schmidt and Hunter, 1998). Selection is a process with clear ethical aspects, since it significantly impacts on people – at minimum it may affect their self perception, confidence and even, more concretely, their livelihoods. Whilst some people are successful and happy others are unsuccessful and disappointed; for each person selected there are many 'rejected' (Alderfer, 1998). The paper was wide ranging and addressed the implications of having "core" and peripheral employees, the blurring of the distinction between assessment and development (Barrick et al., 2001); issues of ownership of information, the outsourcing of selection, non-traditional methods of assessment (Aguinis et al., 2001); issues of privacy, genetic testing (HGAC, 1999); what is legitimate data, the use of head-hunters, motivation, emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995); actuarial versus clinical judgments (Mayes, 1997); team-working

ability, restriction of the individual's power (tribal aspects – unions, professions), impresarios, organisational fit (Schneider, 1987); remote working, no HR departments (Guest and King, 2001); assessment by line managers, bias, the primacy of face validity, networking ability, political ability, portable portfolios, integrity testing, human rights issues, the rise of technology, testing at a distance (Bartram, 2000); (issues of security, identity, fairness, access etc), underlying Western assumptions (MacLaclan and Carr, 1999); diversity (Ashkanasy et al., 2002; Kandola and Fullerton, 1998); the psychological contract, spiritual aspects, virtual organisations, and the rise of the importance of social corporate social responsibility to certain parts of the population. In each case possible implications for psychology, psychologists and organisations were indicated.

Contribution:

- The paper contributed to the literature by building on and extending the thinking in this area – especially in relating organisational analysis to psychological consequences
- It pointed out how macro organisational trends impact on the already ethically complex (but often instrumentally, technically or individually focused) field of selection (this built on some of the issues raised in a Special Issue of *The Psychologist* (1994) edited by the author (Kwiatkowski, 1994))
- Noting that multiple stakeholders will each expect their own version of organisational reality to be respected, and particularly if an outsourcing relationship exists, partnership may give way to service provision, with the danger that a Master-Servant (rather than a professional) relationship will arise (Baritz, 1960)
- The piece contributes to the ethical domain because it repeatedly questions what should be done in response to complex and changing external contexts; for instance how much is it legitimate to know about people? For instance, is genetic testing justifiable in selection? These questions are intimately bound up with important ethical issues such as human rights.
- This paper describes the increasing complexity of organisational life (and forms) and notes that challenges to a simple 'scientific' model of selection are multiplying – it questions what ought to be done – an ethical concern; and, once

again, moves away from a 'mechanical 19th century science' view of psychology, to one where professional psychologists must consider the *pressure of context* in deciding to adopt or operate within competing ethical paradigms, and in questioning what may be unexamined assumptions concerning the "goodness" of actions

- Linked to the notion of contribution, several of the hypotheses about future directions or tentative 'predictions' put forward in the paper seem to be coming about. For instance the increased use of virtual simulations (Pilbeam & Corbridge, 2006; Westerhoff, 2007), of the computer based verification of individuals portfolios (eg the rise of websites such as verifile.co.uk, verifycv.com etc.), the increasing availability of cheap genetic testing over the internet for genes (apparently) 'related' to depression and coping with stress, and of the desire for more information about potential employees leading some organisations to data trawl (eg on 'facebook', 'myspace' or 'twitter') with potential ethical (and possibly legal) consequences for organisations and individuals (Clegg, 2007; Cronly-Dillon, 2007; Strategic Communication Management, 2007).

Links to BPS Code of Ethics Changes (Table 3): iii. the range of contexts psychologists work within, v. ethical decision-making under changing circumstances, ix. overlap between ethics in psychology, xiv. rights, xvii. importance of awareness of ethical considerations, xix. remain abreast of scientific ethical and legal innovations, xx. sensitivity to developments in broader social, political, and organisational contexts, xxvi. multiple relationships.

Citations: A number of authors have cited the paper Cascio & Aguinis (2008), Carless (2007), Carless & Wintle (2007), Carless, and Imber (2007), Kwiatkowski and Duncan (2006), Kwiatkowski (2006), Pilbeam & Corbridge (2006), Steel, , Huffcutt and Kammeyer-Mueller (2006), Harper (2008) in books as well as influential journals such as the Annals of the Academy of Management, the Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, and The International Journal Of Selection Assessment, and the International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring with international authors from the UK, the US and Australia. It is

The contribution of ethical concepts to the development of professional applied psychology

recommended reading on the website of Monash University, Australia (accessed June 2006). (Cascio is one of the key international figures in this area).

10.2.7 Kwiatkowski, R., Duncan, D.C. and Shimmin, S. (2006a) What have we forgotten and why? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 79, pp. 183-201.

Context, Background & Problem Addressed: it had become apparent to the authors that a great deal had been forgotten from the early days of applied psychology. What seemed to be being neglected were not just the technical results of investigations, or advances in methodology – so some investigators were reinventing the wheel – but rather more subtly, a *raison d'être*, a humanistic spirit and the ethical values that underpinned, informed and drove much early work in British applied psychology. The genesis of the paper was a Symposium at the British Psychological Society Centenary Conference in 2001 that the author organised under the aegis of the DOP and the BPS History and Philosophy of Psychology Section; three of the presentations were subsequently combined, and with extensive rewriting and expansion resulted in this paper.

Content: the paper was a “target” piece and was published in JOOP with commentaries from academics of international standing (Ackers, 2006; Guest, 2006; Highhouse, 2006). It used the example of the National Institute of Industrial Psychology (NIIP) to show how some of the content and methodology utilised by the NIIP was quite radical and often forgotten (e.g. the emotional life of organisations, Bevington, 1928; Myers, 1920; culture, Miles, 1928; creativity at work, Brierley, 1920 etc.) It explored the political and values basis of the NIIP’s work, and identified several possible reasons for its contemporary neglect, “including a lack of institutional continuity, academic hegemony and ignorance, US domination of psychology, a worship of the new, and ambivalence about political influence” (p. 183). Importantly, as well as showing how an ignorance of history might have negative consequences and result in technical, factual, or methodological ignorance, the paper pointed to other dangers – for example that “a more subtle risk may be a move away from a shared humanistic orientation based on common values and principles”. These humanistic beliefs and deeply held underpinning ethical position may have stemmed from personal experiences both of the First World War and of

the Depression, of key early figures, especially C.S. Myers, (probably the most significant figure in early 20th Century British Psychology, Bartlett, 1965; Bunn 2001; Lovie, 2001). Within the NIIP, respect for individuals and their dignity was a key value (Adams, 1925), and the voice and experience of workers were awarded great status (Balchin, 1933; Crombie, 1928; Myers, 1920; Raphael, 1970). The paper went on to contrast the practical yet humanistic application that the NIIP represented, with the more behavioural position in psychology that held sway for a large part of the last century. "The NIIP's ... work was guided by humanistic beliefs, informed by psychological values and underpinned by a creative and vibrant, yet rigorous, approach to methodology" (p. 196). The paper, further argued that "If this ignorance is coupled with an unknowing move away from a humanistic orientation and shared methodological, political and philosophical principles and values, then the long-term consequences for applied psychology are troubling." (p. 197). The paper was unusually long for JOOP, at 11,200 words with 107 references.

Contribution:

- The paper sought to show that in its early days applied psychology was an essentially ethical concern, whose almost 'philanthropic' position was informed by deeply held personal – and corporate – ethical views; it demonstrated that concern and respect for the individual, a desire to make work better, the reduction of fatigue and consequent increase in efficiency (and consequent enhanced material well being for the workers) were some underpinnings of this early work; a position echoed today in aspects of the 'positive psychology' movement (which link directly to the four key principles of the 2006 code of ethics)
- It demonstrated that the work of the NIIP, and much early applied psychological work was driven by fundamentally humanistic ethical principles; these were quite explicit, and thought legitimate as motives, rather than the subsequent emphasis on psychology as embodying 'scientific' detachment (cf Eysenck, 1953, p. 225)
- It examined the problems of the interface of this fundamentally ethical position with commercial imperatives, such as the consequences of the development of the hugely successful "Black Magic" chocolate selection (the success of which led to the

ousting of Charles Myers as head of the NIIP, since Rowntree, a key financial contributor, didn't want the methodology to be used on his competitor's products)

- It demonstrated that the way in which a profession looks at the world and how it behaves reflects its internal map of reality, the focus of its concerns, and the reason it has for existing and doing what it does, which are all ethical concerns
- The paper showed that if the early humanistic values of applied psychology were lost then something significant about the profession of psychology was also lost
- To quote Ackers (2006), "by reclaiming a more critical, humanistic, ethical tradition of applied psychological research, Kwiatkowski et al. counter prejudiced ... and ill-informed view[s] of Occupational Psychology"
- The paper contributed to the ongoing debate about the nature of contemporary occupational psychology from a British perspective and also fed into the ongoing debate about the relationship between academic and practitioner in applied psychology
- The paper reminded occupational psychologists that their profession had a long, honourable (and neglected) history – it showed present day applied psychologists that their history encompassed the development of a range of innovative methodological techniques, and led to findings that are still relevant today, and that this was based on a humanistic and ethical ethos.

Links to BPS Code of Ethics Changes (Table 3): i. professional ethical conduct, vii. the underlying philosophical position, x. ethics pervades professional activity, xiv. rights, xvii. ethical decision-making, xix. keeping abreast of scientific ethical and legal innovations, xxi. value of responsibility, xxiv. explicit value of integrity, xxviii. professional judgement.

Citations: Ackers, P. (2006), Arnold (2007), Guest, D. (2006), Highhouse, (2006), Kwiatkowski and Duncan (2006), Silvester and Solvik (2007). The first three and the last of these are well known and internationally significant figures in occupational psychology and related disciplines. This paper is being used on a number of Occupational Psychology MSc courses, eg at the Universities of Leicester,

The contribution of ethical concepts to the development of professional applied psychology

City and Hull; thus part of its contribution is that it will influence the next generation of Occupational Psychologists. The authors have also received requests for reprints and correspondence from a number of people as a result, most notably the former Chief Psychologist at the UN International Labour Organization in Geneva.

10.2.8 UK occupational/organizational psychology, applied science and applied humanism: some further thoughts on what we have forgotten (2006b) (with David Duncan, Sylvia Shimmin having died)

Context, Background & Problem Addressed: this was a substantial reply (4,200 words, 33 references) to three commentators on the previous paper, one broadly in favour (Ackers, 2006) one broadly against (Guest, 2006) and one more positive than not (Highhouse, 2006). The problem addressed was to buttress the original position and to use the opportunity to both examine and develop it in the light of these critiques.

Content: the paper examined the ethical and philosophical position of applied occupational psychology, and especially the humanistic orientation of early psychology which the authors identified as having been lost, to some extent, as a driving force after World War Two. It vigorously engaged with Guest's arguments; in particular it rejected his notion of technique as almost being synonymous with intention. It returned to the notion of influence and power, and explicitly linked this to both history and values, and again indicated that a collective memory of these may have been lost (or perhaps not be known) in applied psychology. It raised the potential political importance of explicitly valuing psychology within wider Society (a link back to the concern of the Counselling / Psychotherapy paper of 1996 reflecting what might be termed the *ethics of potency*). It linked contemporary developments in positive psychology (particularly in the US) as having antecedents within a European view of psychology as a positive humanistic (rather than a more remedial) endeavour. An example would be the belief (backed up subsequently by evidence) at the NIIP in the 1920s and 30s that the removal of 'obstacles' will lead to improvements in people's well being, performance, and efficiency. The paper made a clear distinction between science and scientism, and argued that a critical realist position is helpful and necessary. It maintained that since history shapes the present, an awareness of history may reconnect psychology with its humanistic past; Europe may lead America here because of collectivist and human welfare orientated values, as opposed to, for example, an individualistic 'heroic' perspective.

There is a clear emphasis on ethical values in this paper, and the paper ends with the following

“ ... of course the profession must continue to develop and value its methodology, its data, its theories and most of all its beliefs and values, and not descend to a supine technical relationship serving those who (temporarily) happen to have power, influence or money. There is little danger of this whilst the majority of current practitioners and academics share important ethical and humanistic values – and so we believe that in learning from the past we can make the future better, not just for the profession but for Society. Doing good for people is, after all, why most of us went into psychology in the first place.”

Contribution:

- The academic contribution of this paper was partly that it defended the position of the previous (target) paper against professional academic peers, but also that it extended that position, perhaps more explicitly into the ethical domain (as can be witnessed by the additional references not used in the first paper itself). This paper therefore advanced the argument that ethics underpins applied psychology, refuted some contrary positions and engaged with three senior (and internationally known) members of academe.
- It demonstrated that the arguments originally put forward were robust, and could be defended when challenged
- It positioned psychology as having a role to play in “doing good for people”; an ethical position
- It challenged contemporary applied psychologists to reflect on their own awareness of what it means to be a psychologist by raising questions concerning how we ought to behave as psychologists, what we ought to do, and made a philosophical distinction (using an example concerning “efficiency experts”) between actions that on the surface may seem similar but, actually, are fundamentally different in their consequences because of the underlying values and intent of the professional psychological practitioner – what might be termed the *ethics of intention*

- It therefore advances the argument by explicitly looking at the link between methodology, intentionality, ethics, and what it means to be a professional.

Links to BPS Code of Ethics Changes (Table 3): v. basis of the ethical consideration, vii. underlying philosophical position, x. ethics pervades professional activity, xviii. ethical decision-making, xix. remain abreast of scientific ethical and legal innovations, xxiii. weighing of interests of clients, xxiv. ethical principle integrity, xxvi. importance of professional judgement, xxix. importance of thinking and reflection.

Citations: Arnold (2007) in JOOP, mentioned at the 2007 DOP annual Conference (Silvester).

10.2.9 Roots, relativity and realism: the Occupational Psychologist as 'Scientist-Practitioner' (2006c) (with Winter, B.) in *The Modern Scientist Practitioner*, Lane, D. and Corrie, S., (eds)

Context, Background & Problem Addressed: the basic issue addressed was how occupational psychology practitioners can conceptualise their endeavour (hence the link to the ethical "what we ought to do") and reconcile their position and action with being 'modern scientist practitioners'. The authors believe that both 'scientism' and 'post-modern' relativist positions are inappropriate; and so explore the question of what it means to be a psychologist acting as a modern 'scientist-practitioner' and therefore what version of science-in-action is possible for occupational psychologists.

Contents: this chapter argued that a critical realist position best encapsulates the modern occupational psychologist as scientist practitioner; it linked directly to the NIIP (and to previous papers) to illustrate the humanistic values and beliefs that underpinned much early work, and which, it suggested, could underpin contemporary psychological practitioners' actions. It cited papers by Myers (1923) amongst others to show that experimental psychology was a relative newcomer when applied psychology was being developed, but one in the ascendant (Myers, 1920) and it showed how the rise of a particular notion of 'science' (in part via the US) had a tremendous influence on psychology and on psychologists in the 20th century (Bunn, 2001). The past informs the present and again context is important; for instance, implicit American and European models of work are different. The chapter focused on the complexity of coexistence within different ethical, methodological and philosophical worlds "we must understand these worlds as far as we can and use language and thinking appropriate to each ... at the same time, we must be completely ethical and evidence based in our actions". It raised issues of identity within a profession, and the code of conduct and ethics. The chapter moved beyond a purist or relativist position to state "We cannot, therefore, conceive of an applied psychology separate from its application." It therefore challenged post-modern conceptualisations by suggesting that many practitioners implicitly, and necessarily, have a complex understanding of the multi dimensional world; "Whilst

an action undertaken may seem simple and technical from the outside, it may actually be a sophisticated response to a complex world and may belie an intricate and multifaceted understanding". It explicitly addressed the difficulties associated with co-existing within parallel worlds. It noted that (politically) psychologists operating within organisations are in a contest for influence, and that post Kuhn "a notion of science as logical, apolitical and somehow pure is no longer really tenable". The chapter finally suggested that psychologists need to contain their own anxieties and not feel obliged to expound to sometimes disinterested clients (to them) esoteric and technical aspects of psychology. Part of being professional is containing and working with anxiety, and especially your own uncertainty, and perhaps even processing anxiety on behalf of others. Using the example of 'emotional intelligence' the chapter raised the idea of appropriate limits and boundaries and examined ethical issues about how much an organisation is entitled to know.

Contribution:

- This chapter in an edited book that surveyed all the main branches of psychology made an academic contribution in that it positioned occupational psychology in the 'Boulder tradition' of psychologist as scientist-practitioner (the 1949 Colorado conference that cemented this view as a substrate for psychology education in the US) – however, and importantly, it positioned this within a critical realist framework linked to a humanistic ethical stance
- The chapter attempted to redraw the historic boundaries of occupational psychology and sought to position it explicitly within a critical realist perspective supported by a humanistic historical underpinning. It moved the debate forward by explicitly postulating the consequences of this epistemological position.
 - It showed that psychologists have to co-exist simultaneously within differing "real" worlds (ie that this is not "relativistic" or "negotiated" but actually exists) and that they need to be aware of these different (ethical) worlds, to understand them and be able to interact within them
 - It argued that the "critical realist" perspective is helpful, that occupational psychology is not based on naïve realism and actually functions "beyond" the

contemporary post-modern (and some would argue, almost quasi nihilistic) approaches

- The chapter suggested that humanistic values, based on a strong moral and ethical position, underpinned much early psychology, and should ('ought') to continue to inform psychologists today
- It showed that the "scientist-practitioner" model is equally subject to the pressure of context and thus has to be contextually responsive; and so awareness, as well as sophisticated and complex thinking, rather than habit, is necessary
- Finally, it suggested that apparently simple actions on the part of a psychologist may have a great deal of complex thinking underpinning them – this may be hard for the non psychologist to appreciate, or for the apprentice psychologist to be aware of (this builds on points made in the preceding papers)
- It develops some of the ideas presented in the very first conference paper of 1988 – it refines the notion of what one needs to say and what to keep in mind but perhaps not disclose – which also links to the ethics of potency and influence ideas discussed above and in particular related to the 1996 paper on Counselling and Psychotherapy
- It links to the "trends in organisations and selection" paper because it also touches on the interface between the private and public arenas, considering what an organisation should know.

Links to BPS Code of Ethics Changes (Table 3): iv. range of roles, vii. underlying philosophical position, x. ethics pervades professional activity, xx. sensitivity to developments in broader social political organisational contexts, xxiii. weighing of interests of clients, xxviii. the importance of professional judgement.

Citations: It has been cited by a number of influential psychologists, eg O'Broin and Palmer (2006); Stephen Palmer is perhaps the most influential Coaching Psychologist in the UK today, and has an international reputation. It has been quoted by Seider, Davis and Gardner (2007) in *The Psychologist*, the BPS journal with the highest psychologist readership (all 44,000 members of the BPS receive it). Howard Gardner, who is very influential in contemporary psychology, has been

interested in the notion of psychologists wearing various ethical 'hats' so it is interesting to note that he and his co-workers in the States have cited this recent chapter in a UK publication. They quote a part of the chapter

"Kwiatkowski and Winter (2006) observe: 'As soon as one moves beyond one's professional reference group to interact with others, it is extraordinarily important to know what you really know, what you thought you knew, what you imagined, where theory is informing or conversely biasing you, and the limits of your understanding' (p.163). Such self awareness is critical ...".

Thus we are brought nearly full circle to examine again some of the issues raised almost 20 years earlier in the first of the papers presented here (Paradigms Lost), which raised the challenge of coexisting within multiple ethical worlds, though this chapter does represent a sharpening of arguments and a more sophisticated analysis.

10.2.10 Inside out and outside in: the use of personality and 360 degree data in executive coaching (2006d) in Brunning, H., "Executive Coaching – a systems and psychodynamic approach"

Context, Background & Problem Addressed: the issue addressed was how to ethically, and within an essentially psychodynamic and systems perspective, incorporate personality instruments and 360 degree feedback into coaching, once again raising ethical issues about co-existing within different ethical worlds.

Content: this chapter was about using a model of personality (illustrated by the MBTI) and a generic competence-based 360 degree model in the coaching context. It explored various ethically related matters regarding such issues as ownership of data, confidentiality, the need for appropriate training, the desirability of mentoring and supervision, and the ethics of proper test use, and feedback. For ethical reasons, a hybrid and heavily disguised case was presented, and various aspects of applying psychology in a complex context – discussing the less than perfect nature of measurement, and the importance of self awareness – were discussed. Examples were given of co-existing in the client's world (for instance through shared networks, using a shared language and jargon, and even of being similar), as well as deliberately entering their world through tailoring communication to their MBTI "type" so that they could – hopefully – take in the information more easily. There are overlaps and developments of the earlier "Counselling Psychology from an Occupational Perspective" paper, in the coaching arena, where a large number of counselling psychologists and other members of the BPS are seeking to work.

Contribution

- Introduce notions of psychological rigour and evidence to a readership that, because of its predominantly psychodynamic bent, may not view these in the same way
- "Gives psychology away": not minimising difficulties or complexities, but raising challenging issues, being self reflexive, and modelling (hopefully) good ethical practice to psychologists and non psychologists engaged in coaching

- Demonstrating ways of co-existing in the others' world – showing an awareness of the importance of organisational context, as well as symbolic co-existence, eg using similar language, dress and other markers, but also, in this case, using a knowledge of personality to tailor communication so that it might be better received
- Emphasising the role of attentive ethical thinking in the coaching context
- The academic contribution of the chapter relates to the linkage, albeit in a practical way, of theoretically distinct areas; competence based 360 degree feedback, a psychometric (and theoretical) view of personality structure, the systems and psychodynamic tradition, and the as yet relatively poorly understood and ethically complex domain of coaching, particularly in the psychodynamic tradition.

Links to BPS Code of Ethics Changes (Table 3): iii. range of contexts, vii. philosophical position, xi. overlap between ethics in psychology, xvi. ethical value competence, xx. sensitive to broader developments, xxv. importance of avoiding exploitation and conflicts of interest, xxvi. multiple relationships, xxvii. maintaining personal boundaries, xxix. importance of reflection.

Citations: the chapter has been reviewed favourably as part of several positive book reviews, and has also been favourably discussed on the electronic forum of the ISPSO (International Society for the Psychoanalytic Study of Organizations) where one commentator said "I, along with others in the psychodynamically-oriented world, have sometimes thought that psychometric tests belong to a more direct, objective (simplistic) realm of methodology, but when I read the piece by Richard Kwiatkowski in the "Executive Coaching" book, I was very impressed how he describes an effective set of guidelines for use of the MBTI -- a way of using this instrument in thoughtful and non-objectify way to move the coaching process along faster and more effectively, the use of limited amount of time being an important practical consideration in most coaching engagements."

10.2.11 Optimistic about ethics, *People and Organisations at Work*, Spring 2007, pp. 13-15

Context, Background & Problem Addressed: this was a short piece in a publication of the Division of Occupational Psychology. It sought to position ethics as something positive and helpful individually and professionally, in contrast to some recent comments about ethics and ethical approval "getting in the way".

Content: the paper summarised the arguments already put forward in previous papers concerning the importance of ethical behaviour, using the example of an increasing incidence of ethical codes in FTSE 100 companies, the impact of Higgs and of Nolan, and of Corporate Social Responsibility on consumers. It then sought to contrast ethical principles from the 2006 code with what might be equivalent unethical principles in order to illustrate how fundamentally ethical an endeavour psychology was.

Contribution:

- The paper sought to present the notion of ethical behaviour as a fundamental aspect of psychology in the occupational and organisational domain
- It contrasted ethical and unethical behaviour, and in a humorous way illustrated how unethical behaviour was simply not a tenable approach to applying psychology
- Through that juxtaposition it sought to encourage thinking about a relatively neglected area within occupational psychology, and was the first article on 'ethics' in this relatively new DOP publication.

Links to BPS Code of Ethics Changes (Table 3): i. uphold professional standards, v. decisions changing circumstances, x. ethics pervades professional activity, xi. overlap between ethics and psychology, viii. power, xv. self-determination, xxviii. importance of professional judgement.

10.2.12 Psychological ethics or organizational ethics? People and Organisations at Work, Spring 2008, Lead Article in Special Issue on Ethics

Context, Background & Problem Addressed: this piece, written for a practitioner audience, examined notions of deontological and utilitarian thinking, positioning psychology as deontological and organisations as utilitarian. It sought to codify or make comprehensible some of the ethical dilemmas that practitioners may face by enhancing an understanding of how differing philosophical underpinnings can lead to differing conclusions.

Content: it put forward notions of having to coexist in overlapping ethical worlds, the deontological and utilitarian, the psychological and the organisational.

Contribution:

- 20 years after the original paper "Paradigms Lost" was presented at an occupational psychology conference, refinements of these same ideas have been presented once again to a practitioner audience
- The paper once again highlights the central importance of ethics to the endeavour of psychology in the complex domain of organisations.

Links to BPS Code of Ethics Changes (Table 3): i. ethics and professionalism, iv. range of roles, vii. underlying philosophical position, viii. power, x. ethics pervades professional activity, xi. overlap between ethics in psychology, xix. remaining abreast of scientific ethical and legal innovations, xx. be sensitive to developments in broader social political and organisational contexts, xxv. conflict of interest, xix. importance of reflection.

Citations: this piece has not yet been cited. However, it led to an invitation to be a keynote speaker at the Department of Work and Pensions 2009 Conference on Work Psychology (with a session on ethics, alongside one of the department heads of the HPC).

11 The author's professional contribution, and links to the academic

Because of the relational nature of applied psychology, it can be argued that much of psychological ethics is essentially applied ethics. As well as considering the specific academic contribution, it may be helpful to consider some aspects of the author's professional involvement and contribution over this period which has necessarily been influenced by the development of the academic thinking as already surveyed above.

As indicated, a range of challenges to what "ought" to be done in a variety of contexts by psychologists has been considered by the BPS Ethics Committee. Whilst the thinking already discussed, as expounded in the various publications, does seem to link to policy changes within the British Psychological Society, it must be emphasised that causality, influence, the zeitgeist and mere physical presence are difficult to disaggregate, though, of course, it could equally be argued that the publications have had some policy influence.

11.1 The BPS Ethics Committee

The author is the current Chair of the BPS Ethics Committee, a committee made up of senior psychologists representing all the Divisions of the British Psychological Society, as well as Board representatives and lay persons. This is a senior role within the Society.

As Chair of the Committee he represents the British Psychological Society in a variety of contexts, eg in discussions with the ESRC and the Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence, and attends various meetings, eg the European Federation of Psychological Associations, the launch of the new governmental Code of Ethics for Scientists. As part of his role he is invited to comment on various aspects of psychology and ethics, for example by the ESRC, and BBC, and has been asked to write ethics related pieces for publication, eg in response to letters in *The*

Psychologist, and by the British Association for the Advancement of Science (*Science and Public Affairs*, March 2007).

11.1.1 The development of a code of ethics and conduct

Since the beginnings of the BPS Ethics Committee, the author has been an active member, working in many of the subgroups, and co-writing sections of the code itself alongside various colleagues. As has already been noted, because of the author's involvement with the writing and rewriting of the new code it is very difficult to disaggregate his contributions (for example in committee) with his position as advocated in various of the papers discussed here: they tend to be congruent.

11.2 *Some Issues examined by the Ethics Committee whilst the author has been Chair*

On the British Psychological Society Ethics Committee a wide range of issues is routinely considered. For example at the moment the committee are considering how best to collect and codify the range of questions that are addressed to members of the Ethics Committee and by staff at the British Psychological Society's offices in Leicester. The Ethics Committee uses details of these queries, though for reasons of confidentiality none will be reproduced here; the majority concern issues of confidentiality, and of concerns regarding competence in fellow professionals, though numerous other issues are routinely addressed. As noted below there are plans to use this extant data to assess the impact of the HPC on psychology (especially as, anecdotally, the HPC rarely deals with matters of competence). For the purpose of illustration some broader recent issues are noted below.

11.2.1 Psychology and sustainability

Despite the recent economic downturn, it can be argued that global warming and the consequent ecological crisis is actually the most important factor facing humankind at this moment. It has been argued that this is a psychological issue, though one neglected by psychologists; an argument here is that the world is able to exist by itself in a state of equilibrium, but it is human beings' actions that are causing problems. Since human beings' aberrant behaviour is the topic of concern, then it follows that psychologists, as the 'experts' when it comes to human behaviour, should be involved.

With this and other arguments in mind, the Ethics Committee invited some of the foremost thinkers in the UK regarding sustainability and psychology to address the Committee, in order to see how it can be informed on these issues, and whether part of the notion of ethics, which necessarily contains respect for other people may include these sorts of issues. The notion of sustainability can be seen as an ethical issue, and the committee is at present working on how the British Psychological Society and psychologists in general can best engage with these issues from an ethical standpoint, whilst bringing specific scientific expertise to bear.

11.2.2 Psychological Ethics and National Security

The American Psychological Association recently (2005) published a statement concerning psychological ethics and National Security; this is because a number of psychologists have (allegedly) been directly involved in interrogating suspects (what has euphemistically been referred to as "close questioning") and they wished to clarify their position. In fact the opposite effect was achieved; with the American Psychiatric Association coming out firmly against any involvement whatsoever in interrogations in places such as Guantánamo Bay. It had been implied and even suggested that American psychologists could (ethically) be involved in giving advice

to those undertaking interrogation but (ethically) could not be involved in the interrogation itself, but could be present in order that things “do not get out of hand”. Of course, such ‘fine distinctions’ were seen by a number of American psychologists as hair splitting and avoidance of responsibility, and they suggested that it is highly unlikely that ‘psychologists in uniform’ would actually be able to intervene in interrogation. This has led to a number of high-profile resignations from the APA, an open letter to President Bush where this position is significantly amended, followed by one to President Obama where the position was clarified even further.

Some UK psychologists have suggested that the British Psychological Society come out with a statement about human rights in relation to national security, interrogation, and so forth. At the moment the Ethics Committee is agnostic in its response to the broader issue; on the one hand it believes that the new Code Of Ethics and Conduct actually covers these areas quite well, and indeed there is additionally a very clear BPS statement against torture, but on the other hand, it may be of assistance to certain psychologists working in this area to be able to point to very specific limits regarding what they can and cannot do.

An underlying issue here is that the committee do not really wish to emulate the American Psychological Association’s approach to professional ethics, which at times has adopted a quasi legalistic perspective that seems to try and anticipate almost every eventuality. Such a code is complex, hard to read or recall, difficult to understand, and because it is big and complex, and changes need broad negotiation, can fail to keep up with changes in society and in legislation; additionally it cannot hope to anticipate every eventuality, and finally, it is in danger of becoming so complex that it is impossible to keep in mind in any meaningful way (Williams and Droggin, 2004). In contrast the BPS code has statements of values, and principles that follow from those values, but, in general, does not seek to anticipate every context. Instead, it emphasises the importance of decision-making and thinking, taking into account the multitude of factors present, one of which must necessarily be context, or at times the pressure of context. The author has

made the Ethics Committee's position clear in the pages of *The Psychologist* (2007) and also in the British Association for the Advancement of Science publication *Science and Public Affairs* (2007).

11.2.3 Psychological Ethics and Reality Television

"Reality" television includes a number of programmes where members of the public are personally exposed to a greater degree than hitherto to the television audience. There are now a large number of programmes where members of the public can be locked in a house with "housemates", be given bizarre tasks, can go to a desert island, can compete for a job, can have their dogs or children trained, or be prepared for a secret mission or a robbery. Their every move is filmed, edited and transmitted. For psychologists there are a number of concerns with this process: for example, some participants may not realise that many of these shows are essentially entertainment, and need to keep the viewer interested – with consequent pressures on action and editing; other people underestimate the impact on them and their families of being on television; or they may find themselves (through psychologically understandable processes) to be behaving in ways that are rather atypical for them. Some of the techniques used and situations encountered would be viewed as very dubious by research ethics committees. There are concerns that vulnerable people may be increasingly used in this way, because it makes "good television". Whilst some programmes have scientific aims, for instance the recent recreation of Zimbardo's Prison study on television, many do not, and are essentially 'fun', though the producers in several of them might argue that they do have an educative purpose.

The British Psychological Society regularly receives complaints about these programmes, because members of the public consider that the participants are being 'abused' (especially when some element of coercion seems to be present, or where the participants are children or otherwise vulnerable people). In addition, there have been complaints about individual psychologists involved in the programmes, either as advisors, or as presenters.

There is little UK data on the effect of participation on individuals and it may be that the sort of people who nominate themselves for these particular programmes are atypical (for example they may be more extroverted than average). Some television companies have produced statements about good practice in this area, but others have refused to allow the British Psychological Society to use or circulate the statements, seeing them as part of their commercial property, and seeing them as giving those particular companies a commercial advantage in the marketplace.

A fairly common dilemma arises here; if the Ethics Committee produces specific, and reasonable, advice (as it has in draft form), eg emphasising the importance of psychological screening of participants, the necessity for proper feedback and debriefing, the right of privacy, the right of participants to withdraw and so forth, then this may actually militate against the involvement of psychologists; if properly qualified chartered psychologists refuse to participate in programmes unless there is (expensive) psychological screening, (expensive) proper debriefing and (expensive) follow-up support available, then production companies may be tempted to employ other sorts of "experts" in the interests of saving costs.

With all this in mind, the Ethics Committee recently held a session devoted to "reality television". We were pleased that a number of well-known psychologists who had been on television were able to attend, as well as representatives from OFCOM. Existing society guidelines in this area are quite elderly, and with the communications and publications board the Ethics Committee is now in the process of revising them.

Psychologists on television may seem a trivial issue in comparison, say, with psychologists being involved in torture or in climate change. However, a great deal of what the public knows about psychology comes from television. For example, television series such as "Cracker" led to a increased demand to study psychology at undergraduate level, but similarly "psychology" can be used (sometimes by people we would not recognise as being psychologists) in a superficial, trivialising and

potentially harmful way. This is a danger, because, again, many people will gain their understanding of “psychological ethics” through their depiction on television. The Reithian injunction about ‘educate and entertain’ comes to mind, but it is a naïve view to imagine that much of television is primarily concerned with the education of the public about psychology, let alone psychological ethics.

11.2.4 Psychological labelling

The Ethics Committee has recently engaged with the idea of “labelling” and the consequences this may have for the individual, for their care, for how others see them, for the family or wider social system. We examined this with regard to educational practice (eg the consequences of the label “dyslexic”) in clinical psychology (eg being labelled as “schizophrenic”) and occupational psychology (eg being labelled as having a “derailment factor”). This provoked a very illuminating debate, and possible next steps are currently being considered.

11.2.5 Ethics in Psychology Research

The author was a member of the group that produced the original *Minimum Standards For Undertaking Psychological Research* document, published by the British Psychological Society, which is widely used as a basis for both gaining ethical approval and structuring the process of gaining ethical approval at an institutional level (for instance it outlines the relationship of departmental and university ethics committees). This document has significantly influenced a number of universities as well as the ESRC in putting together its *Research Ethics Framework* (2005).

He has recently been invited to join the joint Research Board / Ethics Committee working party looking at revising these guidelines in order to bring them up to ‘best practice’ standards. (This was a working group set up partly in response to specific concerns expressed by the ESRC, and followed correspondence between the author and the Chair of the ESRC). He was recently approached by the Higher Education

The contribution of ethical concepts to the development of professional applied psychology

Academy to run training sessions for beginning psychology lecturers; these are to focus on ethics in psychology and especially research ethics.

12 Some Future Directions

Having examined the author's contribution in the arena of the development of professional applied psychology through the enhanced inclusion of ethical thinking and principles, the rest of this synoptic paper seeks to briefly introduce some current directions in his thinking and research.

In the area of the complexity of simultaneously operating within different ethical systems, a continuing area of interest is the apparent paradox of occupational psychologists seemingly being relatively uninterested in ethics. The traditional emphasis of ethics in psychology has been identified as stemming from the experimental and therapeutic traditions, and leading, as has been shown, to a deontological slant in the present code. This contrasts with organisational ethics, which operates from a utilitarian perspective. Occupational psychologists, despite this key difference, which might be expected to bring to the fore all sorts of dilemmas, seem to be relatively (at least in public) uninterested in ethics. Some hypotheses as to why this might be have been developed, making the case (in outline) that further research is needed in this area.

The work of Levinas is briefly examined as a recently revitalised philosophical approach which has been applied to business ethics and psychoanalysis, and which may be helpful to applied psychology since its focus is on the essentially relational nature of ethics and the notion that an ethical relationship arises prior to other relationships as soon as the 'other' is present.

Finally, some thoughts concerning the Health Professions Council's role in the statutory registration of Psychologists (due to commence in July 2009) are presented, and some possible challenges identified. This change will have numerous impacts on ethics in psychology, from the very practical matter of to whom the public complains, to other issues such as a requirement to revise the BPS Code of Ethics, to potential changes in the relationship between ethics and

psychology, ethics and individual psychologists, and in the academic understanding of psychological ethics.

This section will address each of these areas in turn

12.1 *Is there a Relative Lack of Public Engagement with Ethical Issues amongst Occupational Psychologists?*

If there is indeed a fundamental difference in underlying ethical positions held by psychologists and organisations, then one might expect that actions undertaken within the ethical framework used by organisations by a psychologist might at times be negatively evaluated by psychologists' professional peers and subject to sanction by the professional body; or, conversely, that action taken by a psychologist using a "psychological" ethical framework might be seen as inappropriate by the organisation. One might consequently suppose that the possibility that either of these positions could arise could create some anxiety.

As noted in the examples above, an area where this could be particularly apparent is the domain of occupational psychology where the majority of practitioners either work with or are employed by commercial organisations. However, there seems to be a surprising lack of evidence of engagement with the field of ethics in occupational psychology in the UK. The author has collected some data that seems to support the contention that occupational psychologists are relatively underrepresented in publicly discussing ethics and ethical dilemmas. This data consists of information about publications, articles and papers, where the occupational domain is relatively (proportionately) underrepresented, using both abstracting databases and more specific recent information from the editor of the *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*. Finally, if papers are not published in established journals then topics of current interest may nevertheless be presented at appropriate conferences. Perhaps the most relevant conference in the UK is the Annual Conference of the BPS Division of Occupational Psychology. Over

the last 10 years, only two papers explicitly concerning ethics have been presented, the author being responsible for one of them. (As an aside, the author presented a paper at the DOP conference in 2007 "Occupational Psychologists and Ethics; How Employers See Us". He was subsequently invited to run a symposium on ethics at the DOP conference in 2008, unfortunately this proposal was subsequently not accepted. He was invited to take part in an expert panel discussion on ethics at the 2008 conference, which coincided with the publication of the special issue of *People and Organisations at Work* already mentioned. That edition of *People and Organisations at Work* (2008) of which the author was co-editor is a relatively rare instance of professional practising occupational psychologists discussing the complex ethical positions in which they often find themselves).

An additional source of data concerns the number of complaints; whilst about 25% of chartered psychologists are operating in the occupational domain, only about 2% of the complaints received by the British Psychological Society relate to occupational psychology. This disparity is striking, especially where one might expect that in an arena where psychologists' views might impact (for example) on selection or de-selection, (in other words crucial aspects of people's lives such as jobs and income), that challenging the integrity of a psychologist (for instance by barristers or by Unions) would be much more widespread – but it is not. The chance of an occupational psychologist having an official complaint made against them is very slight.

Finally, applied ethics does not appear to be defined as a core aspect of the occupational psychology professional curriculum as taught on most MScs, though ethics is part of the National Occupational Standards, and now has a mention in the 2007 DOP Syllabus (BPS, 2007) where the word is used under counselling and within one of the subsections in assessment. When examining texts looking at professional psychological ethics, it soon becomes apparent that the majority of their concerns are focused in the clinical arena (eg Bersoff, 2003; Corey et al., 1998; Francis, 1999; Handelsman et al., 2002; Levinson, 2002.), Leftkowitz (2003) being an honourable – and well positioned and argued – exception, though

understandably having a US bias. The majority of publications in journals concern the 'therapeutic' or 'clinical' domain. In contrast to the occupational psychology curriculum, psychological ethics are explicitly a part of the clinical psychology training in the UK (Board of Assessors in Clinical Psychology, 2006, pp. 1.18, 4.6, 4.21, 4.24 etc.) and they are often a topic of discussion at clinical psychology conferences. This is a particular puzzle since some significant psychological thinking has taken place concerning the place of ethics in management research (for an engaging summary see Kakabadse et. al., 2002) and one might suppose that this would be readily transferred to the psychological domain.

This warrants further research. As an initial step, the author has written the first draft of a paper which puts forward this information in more detail, and presents a number of possible explanations for why this may be the case. A table is reproduced in the appendix that lists these arguments.

12.2 Future Theoretical Contributions

The field of ethics from a philosophical standpoint is vast; for example, fine distinctions between different types of utilitarianism abound, the Aristotelian notion of virtue ethics seems to be in the ascendant, and books and television programmes claim that philosophy can help solve life's ills (eg de Botton, 2004) or address dilemmas (Grayling, 2002).

In keeping with the author's position of the centrality of ethical considerations in the endeavour of applied psychology, it may be that the work of the French Talmudic philosopher Levinas can shed some light on the dilemmas present for psychologists who have to exist and operate within potentially competing ethical domains. Levinas suggests that ethical considerations exist prior to all other considerations – once one has any sort of relationship with another. His notion of relationship is complex, however, and the mere existence (and, indeed, perhaps an unrecognised existence) of another appears, in his formulation, to create a putative but nevertheless real ethical bond; indeed Levinas appears to suggest that the key

concern of philosophy should be about this 'relationship' with the 'face' of the 'other' rather than ontology or being. This is an intriguing approach that deserves greater scrutiny, particularly in considering its application to applied psychology.

Some authors have suggested that such phenomenological approaches may be a way of addressing some of the ethical issues in leadership (Ladkin, 2006) and the work of Levinas has been applied to psychoanalysis (Hutchens, 2007; Marcus, 2007) and to business (Bevan and Corvellec, 2007; Byers & Rhodes, 2007; Kaulingfreks and ten Bos, 2007); though opinions about what Levinas is actually saying and its practical usefulness are mixed. Whilst some authors have looked at Levinas within psychology they have tended to be rather more concerned with the social psychology domain itself (Gantt, 2001; Gantt & Williams, 2002), and it may be worth considering whether Levinas is helpful in applied psychology; in particular, as already noted, the current author's position concerning the centrality of ethics in applied psychology reflects that of Levinas in claiming centrality for ethics in philosophy.

12.3 The British Psychological Society, The Health Professions Council, and Statutory Registration

For many years, since his time on the membership and qualifications board of the British Psychological Society (1986-1992), the author has been concerned with the importance of protecting the public, and regulating the practice of psychology in the UK. He supported the earlier drafting of a Bill and the encouragement of Parliament to examine the legislation in this area. There have been a number of initiatives over the subsequent years.

The most recent initiative has been through the Health Professions Council. The author was part of the British Psychological Society response, via the Ethics Committee, but he also wrote, during the consultation period, to the Secretary of State directly. The Foster review did not address many of the issues raised, and was medically focused, which was understandable given the concerns surrounding

the then recent and still horrific case of Doctor Shipman. The HPC the regulator of psychology in the UK.

The relevance of this to the PhD is that there may well be a differential impact of a statutory and essentially health-related model adopted by the HPC (and operationalised in a specific language, code and set of procedures), on psychologists' understanding of how they ought to be psychologists (an essentially ethical concern). In particular it may well cause non hospital based psychologists, especially occupational and organisational psychologists, educational psychologists and others who do not operate in that sort of clinical context some difficulties. Some may choose not to be registered by the HPC, others to leave the BPS. It may additionally have an impact on developing areas such as Coaching Psychology, partly for philosophical and partly for pragmatic reasons.

As an illustration, the author wrote a letter which was published in *The Psychologist* (2003) arguing against the notion of "adjectival titles" which was BPS policy at the time; and the protection of the title 'psychologist' was adopted by the BPS Representative Council as the official position of the British Psychological Society (2007). Unfortunately this has not, up to now, been taken up by the Health Professions Council. This means that different ethical codes will apply (with different levels of State sanctioned force) to different categories of people calling themselves 'psychologists'.

The HPC code does refer to maintaining the ethical standards of the profession, so it seems likely that there will be some role for the BPS Ethics Committee in the future. (As an aside, the author has recently been appointed a panel member and visitor for the Health Professions Council).

As an initial thought, from the point of view of earlier comments in this thesis concerning the changes in codes over the years, an interesting linguistic marker is that the Health Professions Council's key document is entitled "Code of Conduct, Performance and Ethics". This is very reminiscent of the 1985 British Psychological

Society Code of Conduct and Ethics which essentially sought to delineate appropriate and inappropriate behaviour through a set of rules. It could be argued that a purely pragmatic "policing" role is therefore envisaged, and thus that the underlying philosophical ethical position of each profession is neither questioned nor incorporated. In a field such as psychology, where so many practitioners operate in non-health related contexts, the implicit assumption that an entirely isomorphous set of ethical behaviours exists across professions may be found to be somewhat contentious. This will be an area for much further research and thinking; much of it with ramifications for psychologists and the public.

13 Some Critiques of the Deontological and Utilitarian Positions

13.1 Logical Challenges to the Deontological and Utilitarian Positions

Despite, or perhaps because of, their ubiquity, a number of now rather well known challenges have been suggested that point to difficulties with both these main ethical positions. Some of these logical, rational and “thought experiment” based challenges are presented here; in the next section psychological difficulties are considered. It is useful to consider these here in order that one of the sets of potential limitations of the thesis can be examined.

To recap (and simplify), the deontological position depends on the notion of the adoption of a set of universally applicable principles that each is content with receiving as well as doing, and, if consistently applied allow society to function; they depend on the act itself being ‘good’, for instance not treating people as a ‘means to an end’.

To question the deontological position, various scenarios or thought experiments have been put forward. Examples include the question of whether one should kill a future tyrant as a child (assuming you had a time machine); the act itself is ‘bad’ but it might prevent worse (for example genocide); or of administering a drug to cure a serious (sometimes positioned as a fatal) illness, knowing that its side effects would significantly damage or kill (for instance) 1 in 10 (either at random, or sometimes of a specific – say a genetically related – group) but save the others; or whether you should always tell the truth (for example if a murderer asks you where their intended victim is hiding and you know), or whether a family in hiding and facing death if discovered should smother a crying baby (assuming it could not be quietened in a more benign fashion). Operating from a strictly deontological position these questions would be a challenge since the difficulty would be to raise

an argument against the 'greatest good' position versus the universal applicability of such actions. The parallels in psychology may not be quite so dramatic, but might involve the question of whether an illegal act disclosed in therapy should be communicated to the police, whether a psychometric test without ethnic minority validity data should be used in selection – where the alternative was managers' views, or if psychologists should become involved in deselection.

To once again recap (and simplify) the utilitarian position, an ethical action is considered "good" if the sum of human happiness is increased. As with the deontological position, there are challenges to utilitarianism, the case of whether it would therefore be right to take all the money away from the richest 5% and give it to the poorest in a society has been suggested as a problem or thought experiment here (the parallels with the reasoning employed to deprive the Jews in Nazi Germany of their property, or removing the nobility in Russia during the revolution are sometimes cited as concrete examples where an espoused rationale was 'redistribution'). In another well known hypothetical situation that questions (albeit somewhat bluntly) classical utilitarianism, it is asked if the humane killing of one person (sometimes presented as socially 'unworthy', perhaps a vagrant, criminal or wastrel) could be justified if their healthy organs would then save the lives of a large number of other people (who in some variations are very 'good' or very needy, or both). If one were to blindly accept a relatively primitive notion of utilitarianism, judicial execution which resulted in the donation of organs to those who needed them might be seen as perfectly acceptable. (And this has happened in China – Observer, 2000; BBC 2006). But instinctively many people would say that these suggestions are somehow wrong. Again to relate this to applied psychology, it might be questioned whether it would be seen as acceptable for an individual who "didn't fit" the culture of a firm or that was different from other workers (eg they were severely disfigured) to be excluded because the productivity and happiness of the others might be adversely affected. Or that deselection (on the grounds of competence) should actively involve psychologists since a greater concentration of correctly identified skilled people would mean that an organisation would be more likely to do well (say in a time of recession). Or that individuals' data should be

seen as 'belonging' to the organisation so that HR policies (for example) could be adjusted to maximise the 'package of benefits and rewards'. Or that drug users should be forced to see a psychologist for 'treatment' and 'help', on pain of going to prison. In each case the 'greater good' might be argued to be served, yet again to choose those actions seems somehow 'wrong'.

Therefore, whilst fundamentally underpinning much ethical discussion, there are objections that can be raised to both these philosophical positions; these test the positions and indicate that whilst powerful they are necessarily a partial picture – as already noted, ideas of competing rights, of stakeholders, of justice, virtue, and of implicit beliefs can all influence the ethical perspective one may take on a situation; and despite the pressure of context (including social context) individuals do have the potential to make complex, difficult and personally disadvantageous choices (for example in some cases of altruism). However, despite such objections and elaborations, these two fundamental positions, sometimes in disguised form, do underpin much ethical thinking. There have been various refinements of these positions, (as an example in the case of utilitarianism: 'act utilitarianism' which is contrasted with 'rule utilitarianism'). Nevertheless, the position of the '*goodness of the act itself: universal application*' or the importance of '*the greatest good for the greatest number: net increase in happiness*' are fundamental, but fundamentally different, underlying ethical stances, positions or standpoints.

These, and other ethical systems, are attempts to summarise or codify a philosophical position and allow application from that system's perspective; thus they attempt to be a-contextual (which raises its own set of questions). As well as influencing what is thought of as being ethical, they can also influence how decisions to act are arrived at, and what 'should' be done. As has been shown above, in the professional domain "what should be done" is often systematized in a code of ethics. Inevitably, both these models are imperfect in the form presented, and whilst there have been many attempts to either bolster their positions or reconcile their predictions with actual behaviour, it is reasonable to say that these have not been entirely successful. The author would argue, however, that most

current ethical positions depend on the deontological or utilitarian. However, as well as logical challenges there are also some psychological issues to be addressed.

13.2 Psychological Challenges to the Utilitarian and Deontological Positions

There are at least two psychological caveats that one must raise when considering ethics from a normative perspective. The first is that how people say that they will act is sometimes different from how they actually do act. From a psychological perspective a variety of factors can be postulated to provide partial explanations for this apparent discrepancy; for example different stages of moral development (Kohlberg, 1981), groupthink (Janis, 1972), self perception (Bem, 1972), misinterpretation of social contextual cues (Shachter and Singer, 1962), cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957), difference between declarative and procedural knowledge (Simon, 1978), poor decision making (Tversky and Kahneman, 1974) or the observation that 'espoused theories' and 'theories in use' are frequently different for individual (eg face-saving, win-lose positions) and collective (eg organisational defensive routines) reasons (Argyris, 1982). Thus for psychology there is an interest in how and why it is that people might say one thing and do another, but for many psychologists in the UK, this difference is approached more with curiosity than with any sort of moral condemnation. This dispassionate stance differs from the current societal position – for example on a socio-cultural level accusations of "hypocrisy" are often damaging, particularly to public figures (such as politicians); or, when religious or moral codes are involved, concepts such as 'moral weakness' or even, 'sin' may be invoked, again with potential negative consequences. So the first psychological caveat is that what people say they will do is sometimes not what they actually do, and this difference may have all sorts of explanations.

The second psychological caveat one needs to consider when discussing normative ethics is related to many psychologists' reluctance to be prescriptive regarding 'correct' human behaviour. By virtue of the nature of their science, their broader philosophical position, an awareness of the complexity of a multivariate universe

inhabited by sentient human beings, and a humanistic attitude, psychologists are nearly always concerned with trying to observe and to understand 'what is' (Kwiatkowski et al., 2006), and frequently, again for historic philosophical reasons, hesitate to move to a definitive or prescriptive 'should'. They may be very cautious – perhaps sometimes too cautious – about making such definite statements (Gale et al., 1988). Philosophically (or perhaps viscerally), for psychologists, then, 'should' is in many contexts, somehow attitudinally difficult. As such this caveat parallels a philosophical position, that of Hume (1777), who emphasised that one cannot logically get to 'should' from 'is'. Whilst Hume's point is that on logical grounds it is difficult to proceed to what 'should' be from an observation of what actually happens in a particular context, to an extent the later 'psychological' caveat (above) concerns the nature of psychologists themselves and (in general) their hesitation to say definitively (and perhaps judgementally) what should be, in particular when considering how human beings 'should' behave.

Having raised these two caveats; that people sometimes say and do different things, and psychologists can be hesitant in stating what 'correct' behaviour is, and notwithstanding the further work of Hume, who additionally suggested that irrational aspects (such as emotions, sentiments and passions) colour our selection of ethical processes (which does link in with some more recent psychological thinking), so that objective and rational ethics are essentially impossible, or even more recent phenomenological work (such as that of Levinas which has been mentioned), it is the case that applied psychologists do have to operate within a world where positions do have to be selected, opinions delivered, and actions taken, no matter how cautiously and how carefully surrounded with qualifications. Thus ethical and other professional judgements do have to be made.

Despite the logical and psychological caveats, in engaging with the real world, the two major 'classic' positions – the deontological and utilitarian, have been widely adopted in studying ethics, and they, or their derivatives, still hold sway today. Since, as has been argued, psychology has adopted a fundamentally deontological perspective, and organisations operate from a utilitarian stance, then whilst the

outward behaviours exhibited by adherents to these views may look similar, they will, equally, at times be different, and potentially hard to reconcile, because of this fundamentally different underlying ethical position. (One might also suppose that a relatively small movement in ethical position might expose the fundamental difference in thinking that this implies. To take an analogy from physics this might be thought of as a metastable state). Thus the underlying philosophical positions can be questioned both from a philosophical perspective and from a psychological one.

14 Discussion, Summary & Conclusions

As has been illustrated several times within this synoptic piece, over 20 years the author has sought to link aspects of practical professional applied psychology with its essentially ethical position. This debate inevitably continues, and whilst nearly all positions within Western ethics that represent any form of universality are linked to either the deontological or utilitarian positions, it is important in addition to understand how humanistic views within psychology (as for example indicated by the statement of values at the beginning of each section of the 2006 Code of Ethics) are nevertheless mediated by context; this may indicate that complex thinking around coexistence within potentially competing ethical domains is a necessary day-to-day part of being a psychologist.

The papers presented here, then, have made a contribution by linking the theoretical, the practical, and the policy aspects of being an applied psychologist. Since these papers have been written over a long period and the interest is ongoing and developing, a simple summary is problematic; the papers focus on “what we ought to do” as psychologists, and reflect a concern with the problem of coexistence within different ethical domains. The arguments have been developed, for instance through the inclusion of a critical realist perspective, reference to the work of Levinas, some data collection with HR practitioners, and so forth, though there have also been consistent themes.

Whilst a great deal has been written in this area there remains much to do. As well as exploring theoretical underpinnings, actual behaviour must be examined, and the meanings that psychologists and others assign to the sometimes morally complex contemporary environment also examined.

It will be important to follow up the potential paper outlined earlier concerning the apparent lack of engagement in ethical discussion by occupational psychologists with systematic work with psychologists working in organisations in order to understand their thinking in this area, the reasons for their apparent quiescence or at least public reticence about ethics, and the link between this and their actual behaviours.

A difference between the author's work and that of some other writers in this area is that whilst there has been a growth of interest in ethics and ethical thinking, much of this writing (perhaps linked to an empiricist bias) seems to be somewhat atheoretical, so for example Voskuijl and Evers (2007) do not significantly refer to philosophical underpinnings, and instead focus on presenting a taxonomy of European codes of ethics. The present author would view those codes as attempts to express, codify or make concrete underlying philosophical positions, and as relatively ephemeral. The position adopted by Voskuijl and Evers, however, is not at all unusual among psychologists; applied psychologists (to generalise) may be more interested in the practical and concrete, and therefore it may be more natural to look at the codes themselves rather than to examine what philosophical position the writers of those codes are implicitly adopting. For example, as already stated, the work of Levinas, if adopted, would mean that an ethical obligation to "the other" precedes all other forms of obligation, (for instance a 'stakeholder' or commercial relationship) and the mere existence of "the other" would place an obligation on psychologists to behave in a particular ethical way, acknowledging the centrality of "the other" in their work. Having said that, it is also the case that whilst some psychological authors have sought to engage with ethical thinking, few have emphasised the underlying difficulty of coexisting (as opposed to 'wearing different

hats', or 'boundary spanning', eg Howard Gardner) within different underlying approaches to ethics, ie the deontological and utilitarian, in the same way as the present author.

Some of the author's views about the relevance of philosophical positions and thinking as a precursor to considering codes of ethics, and secondly the examination of psychologists' behaviour, need expression in the literature. This will be the task of subsequent papers.

Additionally, it will be important to consider how virtue ethics fits into the picture; at present the author is concerned that context does not really have sufficient weight within this formulation, and a potentially dangerous individualistic perspective can be adopted that flies in the face of much empirical social psychology; nevertheless this position seems currently to be gaining increased attention, and it will be important to explore.

Finally, as noted above, the work of 'modern' philosophers such as Levinas is creating interest; both psychoanalytic ethics and business ethics have recently been examined with the lens of his writings. Results have been mixed, with some authors finding the writing 'gnomic' and 'contradictory', others embracing some of the ideas, if not always subscribing wholeheartedly to the assertions of primacy or universality of ethical obligations. The work is interesting and deserves examination both from a psychological perspective, and from the point of view that it may have something practical to offer applied psychology.

14.1 Conclusion

A theme in the synoptic paper, which reflects the published work, is the developing exploration of the importance of ethical awareness as central to the practice of applied psychology; and within this realisation the importance of the recognition of the complexity of operating in a context, which, while not necessarily morally ambiguous, nevertheless produces daily ethical dilemmas that can either be ignored or addressed.

The work presented here shows that over a period of years the author has made a contribution to ethical thinking within applied psychology. He has, alongside other colleagues, brought some ethical considerations explicitly to the attention of applied psychologists, and made a number of contributions to the field which have been recognised as advancing thinking academically and practically.

From an academic and theoretical perspective, the author's work has sought to reconnect aspects of psychological thinking within particular domains with a specific position regarding ethical thinking; it has shown how ethics was central to early applied psychology, and how a neglect of this understanding can impoverish current psychological thinking and practice, and how, conversely, engagement with the complex and ambiguous world of ethics can contribute to enhancing psychological thinking and action today.

From the earliest paper to the most recent, the notion of coexistence within overlapping ethical domains has remained a consistent theme. As a personal aside and recalling work on "embodying" theories, it may be that the idea of coexistence may have had some personal resonance for the author. There is much to be done; for instance, if the author is correct concerning the apparent under-representation of occupational psychological input into the ethical domain, numerous potential explanations may emerge; to pick two examples: cognitive dissonance may be of relevance or the notion of competing duties tied into ideas of stakeholders and

hierarchy. The reconciliation of the psychological and the philosophical within this domain presents a fascinating academic challenge for years to come.

15 Personal Reflection

Over the last 20 years the author has been involved in setting up, running, examining, and validating various academic programmes at masters and doctoral levels. Several of these have necessitated the production of dissertations or theses by the students. In each of these he has encouraged an element of self reflection, which has allowed the student to consider their personal role in the endeavour, limitations, their relation to it, and to perhaps speculate what they might have done differently. This reflexive aspect of psychology has been important in the author's professional life. It seems therefore fitting that he should describe some of his own personal thoughts and reflections concerning this present work, and for the purposes of this section (only) lapse into the first person.

Looking back over 20 years of work has been a surprisingly complicated process, partly because one's direction of travel through time is necessarily forward. Looking back and defining the key issues, with the help of numerous drafts, supervisors input, panel members comments, and discussions with colleagues, has been personally interesting and helpful, insofar as some of the thinking that was new then, and arose for a purpose, I now take for granted, which puts me in mind of the "ladder of inference". It is too easy to assume that other people also take this for granted and it has been interesting and useful to once again go back to first principles, for example to reread Kant, Bentham and Smith again after a gap of almost 20 years.

It has become obvious to me that the notion of ethics has been a part of my academic and professional life for some time, and the notion of how one ought to be in the world is clearly a profound interest. It would be trite, perhaps, to suggest that this may be linked to my own personal past, that of a first-generation immigrant, with all the issues of coexistence within two parallel worlds, the practical

need to understand how to behave and how to think (differently) in each, and the overlay of a 'psychological' interest in trying to understand people's behaviour that that implies.

Speaking personally about the contribution of the publications and papers, it has been gratifying to discover that they have had some influence. As a lecturer I am used to participating in personal change and the development of critical thinking. The fact that one's thinking – and presence - as written down – and so at a remove - has influenced colleagues thinking, at a distance, is thrilling.

"What would I do differently?" is a frequent topic for reflection. Often in theses, dissertations and reports it concerns the appropriateness of particular statistical analyses, or the sample size, aspects of methodology, a failure to gain entry to organisations, self reproach about not asking a key question in an interview or making a key observation. Sometimes the person confesses a personally related interest in researching a particular area.

For me, looking back, the regret is that I have not published more along the way. Yet I have given this area some thought. For example I currently have 54 different ethical dilemmas that I use in teaching research ethics that all too obviously lend themselves to wider distribution. Coupled to this, there is the ever present feeling – common to nearly all academic colleagues – that I have just not read enough and must have missed something.

Looking forward, I increasingly see ethics everywhere. My excitement has also been rekindled in considering the possible papers that I can publish in the future. Some will be in peer refereed journals, others designed for practitioners. I have been over 10 years at Cranfield University, and it seems to me that that balance between the theoretical and practical, and the idea of 'knowledge into action' suits this work, as well as suiting the ethos of this University.

Having sat on the 'other side of the counter' as an examiner this whole process has been a useful reminder of how it feels to be in the position of student again, with all the anxiety that being publically evaluated entails. It is reassuring that the papers have been published, and therefore have some legitimacy, and have had some impact. I therefore start in a different position from many attempting a PhD, but the process has led to much more apprehension than I expected. It has vividly reminded me of how difficult it is for part-time students to find space amongst all the demands of their lives, of growing and challenging work loads, with a young family and with the unpredictable impact of the 'real' world impinging on plans and thinking time.

Finally, though it may sound odd, thank you for reading this. There have been dozens of versions, of 'decisions and revisions', orderings and re-orderings in an attempt to make the thesis clear; and consequently the piece has grown. I look forward to hearing your views and questions, with interest and no little anxiety, when I am called to the viva voce to discuss, and defend, this work.

16 References

Ackers, P. (2006). The history of occupational psychology: A view from industrial relations. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 213–216.

Adair, J. G. (2001). Ethics of psychological research: New policies; continuing issues; new concerns. *Canadian Psychology*, 42(1), 25-37.

Adams (1925). Inter-departmental ignorance in hindrances to output, quoted in notes of a meeting of the National Institute of Industrial Psychology held in the rooms of the Royal Society of Arts on Friday May 1st at 5.30pm. *Journal of the National Institute of Industrial Psychology*, Q4 II(part 7, July), 291–299.

Aguinis, H., Henle, C. A. & Beaty, J. C (2001). Virtual reality technology: a new tool for personnel selection, *The International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, numbers 1/2, pp 70-83

Alderfer, C. P. (1998). Group psychological consulting to organizations: A perspective on history. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 50(2), 67-77.

Amernic, J. H. (1999). Commentary on 'Five ideas designed to rile everyone who cares about accounting education by Ralph W. Adler'. *Accounting Education*, 8 (3), 249–254.

Anderson, N., Herriot, P. & Hodgkinson, G. P. (2001). The practitioner researcher divide in industrial, work and organizational psychology: Where are we now, and where do we go from here? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 34(4), 391–412.

APA (2002). Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct. APA, US.

APA (2005). Report of the American Psychological Association Presidential Task Force on Psychological Ethics and National Security. APA, US.

Argyris, c. (1982) *Reasoning Learning and Action*, San Francisco, Calif, Jossey Bass.

Arnold, J. (2007). Current developments in policies, priorities and personnel, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* (2007), 80, 1-9.

Ashkanasy, N. M., Hartel, C. E. J. & Daus, C. S. (2002). Diversity and Emotion: The New Frontiers in Organizational Behaviour Research, *Journal of Management*, 28(3), pp. 307-338.

Balchin, N. (1933). The psychological difficulties of the institute's work. *The Human Factor*, 7(7 & 8), 257-265.

Baritz, L. (1960). *The Servants Of Power: A History Of The Use Of Social Science In American Industry*, Science Editions. John Wiley & Sons, Inc, New York.

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K. & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: what do we know and where do we go next?, *The International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Volume 9, numbers 1/2, pp. 9-30.

Bartlett, F. C. (1965). Remembering Dr. Myers. *Bulletin of the British Psychological Society*, 18, pp 1-10.

Bartram, D. (2000). Internet recruitment and selection: kissing frogs to find princes, *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Volume 8, number 4, pp. 261-274.

BBC 2006 "Organ sales 'thriving' in China". 27 September 2006. Accessed August 2009 at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/asia-pacific/5386720.stm>

Beck, C. & Martz, W. B. (2007) Distance Education: Some Differences in Course Type. *Proceedings of the 40th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences – 2007* © 2007 IEEE

Bem, D. J. (1972). Self Perception theory. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, volume 4, p2-62, Academic Press Inc., New York & London

Bentham, J. (1781). *An Introduction to the principles of morals, and legislation*. reprinted 2000, Kitchener, Batoche Books

Bersoff, D. N. (2003). *Ethical conflicts in psychology* (3rd ed.). American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US.

Bevan, D. & Corvellec, H. (2007) The impossibility of corporate ethics: for a Levinasian approach to managerial ethics. *Business Ethics: A European Review* Volume 16 Number 3 July 2007, pp 208 -219

Bevington, S. (1928). The Psychologists' background in How Psychology enters into the Institutes Factory Investigations – A Symposium. *Journal of the National Institute of Industrial Psychology*, IV(1), 3–17.

Billsbury, J. (2007) *Experiencing Recruitment and Selection*, John Willey, Chichester

Board of Assessors in Clinical Psychology (2006). *Candidate Handbook for the Statement of Equivalence in Clinical Psychology*. BPS, Leicester.

Bocock, R. (1986). *Hegemony*. Sussex, Ellis Horwood Ltd, and London, Tavistock Publications Ltd.

BPS (1985) "A code of conduct for psychologists" in *Code of Conduct, Ethical principles and guidelines*, Leicester, British Psychological Society

BPS (2006a). Regulations and Reading Lists for the Qualifying Examination. Leicester, BPS.

BPS (2006b). The Code of Ethics and Conduct. Leicester, BPS.

BPS (2007) Regulations, Syllabus and Reading Lists *for the* Postgraduate Certificate in Occupational Psychology Year 2007 Examination, Leicester, BPS

Brierley, S. S. (1920). The present attitude of employees to industrial psychology. *British Journal of Psychology*, 10, 210–227.

Bruneau, M. et Langevin, L. (2000) L'enseignement aux grands groupes : quelques balises pour la pratique ou mieux les comprendre pour mieux les gérer, Université du Québec à Montréal, accessed via website May 2006.

Bunn, G. C. (2001b). Charlie and the chocolate factory. *The Psychologist*, 14(11), 576–579.

Byers, D. & Rhodes, C. (2007). Ethics, alterity, and organizational justice. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, volume 16, number 3, July, pp 239-250

Carless, S. A. (2007) Graduate Recruitment and Selection in Australia. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 153-166, June 2007

Carless, S. A. & Imber, A. (2007). The Influence of Perceived Interviewer and Job and Organizational Characteristics on Applicant Attraction and Job

Choice Intentions: The role of applicant anxiety, *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Volume 15, Number 4, December 2007.

Carless, S. A. & Wintle, J. (2007) Applicant Attraction: The Role of Recruiter Function, Work-life Balance Policies and Career Saliency. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol. 15, Issue 4, pp. 394-404, December 2007

Cascio, W. F. & Aguinis, H. (2005) *Applied Psychology in Human Resource Management*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Chan, D. W. (2005). Conceptions of Counselling among Chinese Secondary School Teachers in Hong Kong. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 27(2), 311-322.

Clegg, A. (2007). Talent hunt in a virtual world. Employers who marry a personal touch with social network websites may have first pick of the best young brains, writes Alicia Clegg; *Financial Times*. London (UK): Jul 10, p. 16.

Conservative Manifesto (2005) *Are You Thinking what we're thininking: Its time for change*. Promoted by Gavin Barwell on behalf of the Conservative Party ,London

Constanti, P. & Gibbs, P. (2004) Higher education teachers and emotional Labour. *International Journal of Educational Management*, Volume 18, Number 4, pp. 243-249

Cooper, M., Turpin, G., Bucks, R. & Kent, G. (2005). *Good Practice Guidelines for the Conduct of Psychological Research within the NHS*, Leicester, BPS.

Corey, G., Corey, M. S. & Callanan, P. (1998). *Issues and ethics in the helping professions*. Brooks/Cole Publishing Co, Belmont, CA: US.

Craig, R. (2000) 'Postcard from the Podium': The ringing 'phone: "Theatre" in a large group lecture. *Accounting Education* 9 (2), pp 197–199

Crombie, N. (1928). Workers suggestions, (p111), in The attitude of employees towards the Institutes investigations, A symposium. *Journal of The National Institute of Industrial Psychology*, 4(1), pp 98–112.

Cronly-Dillon, M. (2007). Face Up To Rules On Researching Recruits Online. *People Management*. London: Vol. 13, Iss. 21; p. 20.

Davy, J. (2002). Discursive reflections on a research agenda for clinical supervision. *Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 75(2), 221-239.

De Botton, A. (2003). *The Art of Travel*. Penguin Books Ltd, London.

Disenza, R. , Howard, C. , Schenk, K. (2001)*The Design and Management of Effective Distance Learning Programs* . Pennsylvania, IGI Publishing

Dryden, W., Charles-Edwards, D. & Woolfe, R. (1989). *The handbook of counselling in Britain*, Chapter I, The nature and range of counselling practice in Britain. London: Harper and Row.

Elton-Wilson, J. (1994). Current trends in counselling psychology. *Counselling Psychology Review*, 9.

Erikson, E. (1956). The problem of ego identity. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 4: 56–121.

ESRC (2005). Research Ethics Framework. ESRC, Swindon.

Eysenck, H. J. (1953). *Uses and abuses of psychology*. London: Penguin.

Festinger, L. (1957) *A theory of cognitive dissonance*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press cited in Festinger, L. and Carlsmith, J. M. (1959) Cognitive

consequences of forced compliance, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, volume 58, pp 203-211

Fletcher, C. (1992) Ethical Issues in the Selection Interview, *Journal of Business Ethics*, volume 11 numbers 5-6, pp 362-367

Francis, R. D. (1999) *Ethics for Psychologists: A Handbook*. BPS Books, Leicester

Freidman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and Freedom*, University of Chicago Press, US.

Gale, A. (Chair of working Party) (1988). The Future of the Psychological Sciences: Horizons and Opportunities for British Psychology, A Report prepared for the Scientific Affairs Board by the Working Party on the Future of the Psychological Sciences, Leicester, The British Psychological Society.

Gantt, E. E. & Williams, R. N. (2002). *Psychology for the other: Levinas, ethics and the practice of psychology*. Duquesne University Press, Pittsburgh, PA: US.

Gantt, E. E. (2001). Rationality, irrationality, and the ethical: On saving psychology from nihilism. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 21(1), 1-19.

Gardner, H., Csikszentmihalyi, M. & Damon, W. (2001). *Good work: When excellence and ethics meet*. New York: Basic Books.

General Medical Council (GMC) (2006). *Good Medical Practice*. London, GMC.

Gibbs, G. & Jenkins, A. (1992) *Teaching Large Classes in Higher Education: how to maintain quality with reduced resources*. London, Kogan Page.

Goleman, D. (1995) *Emotional Intelligence; why it can matter more than IQ*, London, Bloomsbury

Grayling, A.C (2002) *The Meaning of Things*. London, Phoenix.

Grayson, D. & Hodges, A. (2004) *Corporate Social Opportunity*, London, Greenleaf.

Guest, D. & King, Z. (2001). Personnel's paradox, *People Management*, 27 September 2001, pp. 23-31.

Guest, D. (2006). In praise of contemporary occupational psychology: A response to Kwiatkowski, Duncan and Shimmin, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 207-211.

Handelsman, M. M., Knapp, S. & Gottlieb, M. C. (2002). *Positive Ethics*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY: US.

Harper, A. (2008) Psychometric tests are now a multi-million-pound business: what lies behind a coach's decision to use them? *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring Special Issue No.2*, November 2008 pp 40 - 51

Helliar, C. & Bebbington, J. (2004). *Taking Ethics To Heart: A Discussion Document* by the Research Committee of The Institute of Chartered Accountants of Scotland, , Edinburgh.

Higher Education Funding Council for England 6 February 1998. HMSO.

Highhouse, S. (2006). The Continental Divide. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 203-206.

Hodgkinson, G. P. (2006). Commentary: The role of JOOP (and other scientific journals) in bridging the practitioner-researcher divide in industrial, work and organizational (IWO) psychology. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 173-178.

Hogan, D. & Kwiatkowski, R. (1998). 'Emotional aspects of large group teaching', *Human Relations*, 51(11), 1402-1417.

Horncastle, P. & Kwiatkowski, R. (1990) On the Consumption of the Golden Goose: Ethics in occupational psychology, BPS Annual Occupational Conference, Windermere, January 1990

Howard, C., Schenk, K. & Discenza, R. (2003) Distance Learning and University Effectiveness. Pennsylvania, IGI Publishing (p 146, 179)

Human Genetics Advisory Committee (1999) *The Implications of Genetic Testing for Employment*, London, published by HGAC July 1999, Crown Copyright.

Hume, D. (1777, Reprinted 1912). *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, Religion Of Science Library, New York, Accessed Via Project Guttenberg Mirror Site, 2005.

B C Hutchens, B. C. (2007) Is Levinas Relevant To Psychoanalysis? *Psychoanalytic Review*. Vol. 94, Iss. 4; pg. 595 - 618

IBE (2006). *Ethics Matters*. London, Institute of Business Ethics.

Illingworth, S. (2004). Approaches to Ethics in Higher Education: Teaching Ethics across the Curriculum, Leeds, Philosophical and Religious Studies Subject Centre, Learning and Teaching Support Network (PRS-LTSN), Part of the ETHICS project : a partnership of the LTSN subject centres for Philosophical and Religious Studies, UKCLE, LTSN-01, Psychology, Bioscience and Health Sciences & Practice.

Janis, I. L. (1972). *Victims of Groupthink*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin.

Joshua D. & Margolis, A. (2001) Psychological pragmatism and the imperatives of aims: a new approach for business ethics, in Dienhart, J., Moberg, D. and Duska, R. (2001) *The next phase of business ethics: integrating psychology and ethics*,

Research in ethical issues in organisations volume 3, JAI, Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, pp 27 – 50

Kakabadse, N.K., Kakabadse & Kouzmin, A. (2002) Ethical Considerations in Management Research: A 'Truth' Seeker's Guide *International Journal of Value-Based Management* 15, pp 105–138

Kant, I. (1780) THE METAPHYSICAL ELEMENTS OF ETHICS (translated by Thomas Kingsmill Abbott)

Kandola, R. & Fullerton, J. (1998) *Diversity in Action; managing the mosaic*, London, Institute of Personnel and Development.

Kaulingfreks, R. & ten Bos, R. (2007) On faces and defacement: the case of Kate Moss. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, Volume 16 Number 3 July, pp 302-312

Kelly, G. (1955). *The psychology of personal constructs* (Vol. 1). New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Knapper, C. K., & Cropley, A. J. (1991) Lifelong learning and Higher Education (2nd ed.). London: Kogan Page

Kohlberg, L. (1981), *Essays on Moral Development, Vol. I, The Philosophy of Moral Development: Moral Stages and the Idea of Justice*, Harper and Row, San Francisco, CA.

Kwiatkowski, R. & Horncastle, P. (1989) Paradigms Lost, Paper presented to the British Psychological Society Division of Occupational Psychology Annual Conference,, Winderemere, January 1989

Kwiatkowski, R. & Horncastle, P. (1989) Paradigms Lost, *The Occupational Psychologist*, vol. 12, part 3, pp 16 – 20

Kwiatkowski, R. & Dryden, W. (1989). What is Counselling: some Discussion Issues, *Employee Counselling Today*, (4) 1989, pp. 1-12.

Kwiatkowski, R. (1994). Testing in the Workplace; guest editor's introduction to the Special Issue, *The Psychologist*, vol. 7 (January), p. 10.

Kwiatkowski, R. (1996). Counselling psychology from an occupational perspective. British Psychological Society Division of Counselling Psychology, Occasional Papers (Vol. 2). In I. James & S. Palmer (Eds.), *Professional therapeutic titles: Myths and realities*. Leicester: British Psychological Society.

Kwiatkowski, R. (1997). Counselling and Psychotherapy: are they different and should we care? *Quarterly Journal of Counselling Psychology*, No 2, 1997.

Kwiatkowski, R. & Hogan, D. (1998). Team Membership in Bayne, R. et al. *Counselling in Health care settings*, London, Sage.

Kwiatkowski, R. (2000). Conflict in Organizations, in Feltham, C. and Horton, I. (Eds), *Handbook of Counseling and Psychotherapy*, Sage, London, pp. 222-229.

Kwiatkowski, R. (2001) What have we forgotten? Discussion paper presented at the BPS Centenary (Annual) Conference, Glasgow, April

Kwiatkowski, R. (2003a). We are not adjectives, we are Psychologists, letter to the Editor, *The Psychologist*, vol 16, no 9, p. 456.

Kwiatkowski, R. (2003b). Trends in Organizations and Selection, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 382-394.

Kwiatkowski, R. (2005) Ethics: The Future, invited paper presented at the British Psychological Society's Quinquennial conference, April 2005, Manchester

Kwiatkowski, R. (2006). Inside out and Outside in : the use of personality and 360 Degree data in executive coaching, in *Executive Coaching – a systems and psychodynamic approach*, Brunning, H. (ed.), London, Karnac Books.

Kwiatkowski, R. & Duncan, D. C. (2006). Response to Commentaries : UK Occupational/Organizational Psychology, Applied Science and Applied Humanism: Some Further Thoughts On What We Have Forgotten, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* (2006), 79, 217-224.

Kwiatkowski, R. & Winter, B. (2006). Roots, relativity and realism: the Occupational Psychologist as 'Scientist-Practitioner' (with Winter, B.) in *The Modern Scientist Practitioner, A guide to practice in Psychology*, Lane, D. and Corrie, S., (eds), London, Routledge.

Kwiatkowski, R., Duncan, D.C. & Shimmin, S. (2006). What have we forgotten and why?, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 79, pp. 183-201.

Kwiatkowski, R., Harris, H., Kakabadse, A. & Mapes, J. (2001). Applying Organizational Behaviour theories and models in learning teams in *Innovations in Teaching Business and Management*, Hockings, C. and Moore, I. (eds), London, SEDA.

Kwiatkowski, R., Lewis, C. & Sage, R. (2001). The Beginnings of the Doctorate in Occupational Psychology, *The Occupational Psychologist*, December 2001, pp. 43-45.

Kwiatkowski, R. (2007a) Occupational Psychology and Ethics: how do employers see us?, paper presented at the British Psychological Society's Division of Occupational Psychology Annual Conference, April 2007, Leeds

Kwiatkowski, R. (2007b) Optimistic about ethics, *People and Organisations at Work*, Volume 2 part 1, Spring 2007, pp. 13-15

Kwiatkowski, R. (2008) Psychological ethics or organisational ethics? *People and Organisations at Work*, Volume 3, part 1, Spring 2008, 1-4

Labour Manifesto (2005), Labour Party, London, from Labour Website, accessed May 2005

Ladkin, D. (2006) When Deontology and Utilitarianism Aren't Enough: How Heidegger's Notion of "Dwelling" Might Help Organisational Leaders Resolve Ethical Issues. *Journal of Business Ethics* Volume 65, Number 1 / April, 2006 pp 87-98

Langan-Fox, J., Armstrong, K., Balvin, N. & Anglim, J. (2002). Process In Skill Acquisition: Motivation, Interruptions, Memory, Affective States, and Metacognition, *Australian Psychologist*, Volume 37, Number 2, pp. 104-117.

Langer, E. J. (1989). *Mindfulness; Choice and control in everyday life*, London, Harvill, Harper Collins.

Lefkowitz, J. (2003). *Ethics and values in industrial-organizational psychology*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, Mahwah, NJ: US.

Levinson, H. (2002). *Ethical problems and consulting guidelines*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US.

Lovie, S. (2001). Three steps to heaven: How the British Psychological Society attained its place in the sun. In G. C. Bunn, A. D. Lovie, & G. D. Richards (Eds.), *Psychology in Britain: Historical essays and personal reflections* (pp. 1–32). Leicester: BPS Books.

Lowman, R. (2006) *The Ethical Practice of Psychology in Organizations (2nd Ed)*, Washington, DC, American Psychological Association and Bowling Green, Oh, Society For Industrial And Organizational Psychology.

MacLaclan, M. & Carr, S. (1999). The selection of international assignees for development work, *The Irish Journal of Psychology*, volume 20, Number 1, pp. 39-57.

Macleod, D. (2002) Funding Crisis deepens. Education Guardian (Higher), *Guardian Newspaper*, September 3rd, 2002

Marcus, P. (2007) "You Are, Therefore I Am": Emmanuel Levinas And Psychoanalysis. [Psychoanalytic Review](#). [Aug 2007](#). Vol. 94, Iss. 4; 515 -529

Marx, K. (1887). *Capital, volume 1, A student Edition*, Edited by Arthur, C.J. (1992) London, Lawrence & Wishart.

Matthews, J. R. (2005). Understanding the nuances of the American psychological association's ethics code. *PsycCRITIQUES*, 50 (17).

Martz, W. B., Jr. & Shepherd, M. M. (2004). Perceived Performance in Internet Testing, *Proceedings of the 37th Hawaiian Conference on Systems Science*, Reference 0-7695-2056-1/04 \$17.00, © 2004 IEEE, accessed January 2006.

Mayes, B. T. (1997). Insights into the history and future of assessment centres: an interview with Dr Douglas W Bray and Dr William Byham, Assessment centres: research and applications (Special issue), *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, Volume 12, number 5, pp. 3-12.

Miles, G. H. (1928). The wide scope of psychology. In how psychology enters into the institute's factory investigations – a symposium. *Journal of the National Institute of Industrial Psychology*, 4(1), 3–17.

Mill, J. S. (1879). *Utilitarianism*, Reprinted From 'Fraser's Magazine', Seventh Edition, London, Longmans, Green, & Co., Accessed Via Project Guttenberg, January 2006

Morgan, G. (1986) *Images of Organization*. Chapter 6, 'Interests, conflict and power: organizations as political systems'. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Morgan, G. (1999). *Images of Organization* (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Murphy, L. R. (1995). Managing Job Stress: An Employee Assistance / Human Resource Management Partnership, *Personnel Review*, vol 24, part 1, pp. 41-50.

Myers, C. S. (1920). *Mind and work: The psychological factors in industry and commerce*. London: University of London Press.

Myers, C. S. (1923). The efficiency engineer and the industrial psychologist. *Journal of the National Institute of Industrial Psychology*, 1(5), 168-172.

Neimeyer, G. J. and Diamond, A. K. (2001). The anticipated future of counselling psychology in the United States: a Delphi poll, *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, vol. 14, no.1, pp. 49-65.

Nelson Jones, R. (1982). *The Theory and Practice of Counselling Psychology* (pp. 1-3). London: Holt.

O'Broin, A. & Palmer, S. (2006). The coach-client relationship and contributions made by the coach in improving coaching outcome, *The Coaching Psychologist* Volume 2, No. 2, pp. 16-21.

Observer (2000) *China sells organs of slain convicts* by Ian Williams in Malacca The Observer, Sunday 10 December 2000, accessed May 2005 at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2000/dec/10/theobserver1>

O'Neill, O. (2002). Trust, *Reith Lecture*, BBC Radio 4, Full text accessed via BBC Website in 2003.

O'Neill, O. (2008) Trust in Public Life British Academy Lecture 10 November 2008 accessed December 2008 at <http://britac.studyserve.com/home/Lecture.asp?ContentContainerID=135>

Patterson, C. H. (1974). *Relationship Counselling and Psychotherapy*. New York: Harper and Row.

Patterson, C. H. (1986). *Theories of Counselling and Psychotherapy* (4th edn). New York: Harper and Row.

Phillips, R. (1995) Appendix – Growth and Diversity a new era in colleges and universities, in Slowey, M. (ed.) *Implementing Change from within universities and colleges*, London, Kogan Page.

Pilbeam, S. and Corbridge, M. (2006) *People Resourcing - HRM in Practice*, London: FT Prentice Hall.

Power, M. (2004). *The Risk Management of Everything: rethinking the politics of uncertainty*, London, Demos.

Preuss, L. (1998). On ethical theory in auditing, *Managerial Auditing Journal* 13/9 pp. 500–508.

Quarter, J. (2000) *Beyond the Bottom Line: Socially Innovative Business Owners*, Quorum/Greenwood, London.

Rest, J. (1986) *Moral Development: Advances in Research and Theory*, New York, Praeger Press.

Raphael, W. (1970). NIIP and its staff 1921–1961. *Occupational Psychology*, 44(Jubilee Volume), 63–70.

Rowan, J. (1991) quoted in Thorne (1992). Psychotherapy and counselling: the quest for differences. *Counselling*, 3, pp. 244-248.

Sampson, A. (2004) *Who Runs This Place?: The Anatomy of Britain in the 21st Century*. London: John Murray

Schachter, S & Singer, J. (1962) Cognitive, social, and physiological determinants of emotional state. *Psychological Review*. Vol 69(5), Sep 1962, 378 -399

Schein, E. H. (1988). *Process Consultation, volume 1, Its role in organizational development*, (second edition), Massachusetts, Addison Wesley Publishing Co.

Schmidt, F. L. & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The Validity and Utility of Selection Methods in Personnel Psychology: practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings, *Psychological Bulletin*, Volume 124, number 2, pp. 262-274.

Schneider, B. (1987). The People make the Place, *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 40 (3) pp. 437-449.

Schneider, B., Smith, D.B., Taylor, S. and Fleenor, J., (1998) Personality and organizations: a test of the homogeneity of personality hypothesis. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 83, pp. 462–470

Schneberger, S. , Amoroso, D. L. & Durfee, A. (2006) Computer-Based Training and Assessments: An Exploratory Study of Social Factors, *Proceedings of the 39th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, pp 1 - 10, Accessed December 2007

Schoenberg, M. & Shiloh, S. (2002). Hospitalized patients' views on in-ward psychological counselling, *Patient Education and Counselling*, vol 48, pp. 123-129.

Scott, P. (1995) *The meanings of mass higher education*, Buckingham, SRHE & Open University.

Seider, S., Davis, K. & Gardner, H. (2007). "Good work" in psychology, *The Psychologist*, Volume 20, part 11 (November) pp 672 -676

Select Committee for Public Affairs 1998, Memorandum from the Higher Education Funding Council for England (PAC 97-98/146) <http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm199798/cmselect/cmpublicacc/558-i/55802.htm>

Shaw, G. B. (1911). *The Doctor's Dilemma*, Constable and Company, Ltd, London, England, accessed via Project Guttenberg March 2006.

Shaw, D.S. and Shiu, E. (2003) Ethics in consumer choice: a multivariate modelling approach. *European Journal of Marketing* 37(10), 1485–1498.

Simon, G. C. (1978). The psychologist as whistle blower: A case study. *Professional Psychology*, 9 (2), 322-340.

Singer, M. S. (Ed.). (2001). *Paradigms linked: A normative-empirical dialog about business ethics*. US: Elsevier Science/JAI Press. xxviii.

Singer, M. S. (2001). Paradigms linked: a normative empirical dialog about business ethics, in Dienhart, J., Moberg, D. and Duska, R. (2001) *The next phase of business ethics: integrating psychology and ethics, Research in ethical issues in organizations* volume 3, JAI, Elsevier Science, Amsterdam.

Singer, P. (1991). Afterword, in Singer, P. (ed.) *A Companion to Ethics*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Singer, P. (ed.) (1994). *Ethics*, OUP, Oxford.

Smith, A. (1776). *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, reprinted 1829, George Routledge & Son Ltd, London

Snoeyenbos, M. & Humber, J. (1999). Utilitarianism and business ethics, in Frederick, R.E. (ed) *A Companion to Business Ethics*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Spickett-Jones, J. G. , Kitchen, P. J. & Reast, J. D. (2003) Social facts and ethical hardware: Ethics in the value proposition, *Journal of Communication Management* Vol. 8, 1, 68–82

Steel, P. D. G., Huffcutt, A. I. & Kammeyer-Mueller J. (2006). From the Work One Knows the Worker: A Systematic Review of the Challenges, Solutions, and Steps to Creating Synthetic Validity. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 14 (1) March, 16-36.

Stone, M. A. (2000). The challenges of cross-cultural teaching of international marketing in Europe, *International Journal of Management Education*, vol1, no.1, 15 - 25

Strategic Communication Management (Anonymous editorial comment) (2007) Workers Naïve Over Online Presence. *Strategic Communication Management*. Chicago: Dec 2007/Jan 2008. Vol. 12, Iss. 1; p. 9.

Silvester, J. & Solvik, P. (2007) Old friends and new acquaintances: Research and practice in the Tavistock tradition, paper delivered at the 2007 British Psychological Society's Division of Occupational Psychology Annual Conference, January 2007, Bristol, p20 in the DOP Annual Conference Book of Abstracts, Leicester, BPS

Thorne, B. (1992). Psychotherapy and counselling: the quest for differences. *Counselling*, 3, pp. 244-248.

Tinker, A. & Coomber, V. (2004), *University Research Ethics Committees: Their Role, Remit and Conduct*, London: King's College London & The Nuffield Foundation

Trigo, M. (2006). Recensao do livro: Relapse prevention counselling workbook, *Rev Port Clin Cheral*, vol 22, pp. 51-55.

Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups, *Psychological Bulletin*, 63, 384-389.

Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgement under uncertainty: heuristics and biases. *Science*, vol 185, pp. 1124-31.

UKIPG (2002) United Kingdom Inter Professional Group.

Velmans, M., Morrison-Coulthart, L.M., Colley, A., Foot, H., Foreman, N., Kent, G., Kwiatkowski, R. & Sloboda, J. (2004). *Guidelines for Minimum Standards of Ethical Approval in Psychological Research*, Leicester: The British Psychological Society.

Voskuil, O. & Evers, A. (2007). Tensions between the Prescriptive and Descriptive Ethics of Psychologists, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 72, pp. 279-291.

Watson, T. (1995). *Sociology, Work and Industry* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Weick, K. E. & R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*. Palo Alto: 1999. Vol.50, pp. 361-287.

Westerhoff, N. (2007). Fantasy Therapy, *Scientific American Mind*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 70-75.

Williams, J. & Droggin, E. (2004) A comparison of the American and British Psychological Societies Codes of Ethics, paper presented to the BPS Annual Conference, London, 2004

Wolfe, R. (1994). Stress and Counselling in Organizations: The role of the Counselling Psychologist, *Counselling Psychology Review*, vol 8, part 1, pp. 10-13.

Wosket, V. (2002). *The therapeutic self: Counselling Practice, Research and Supervision*, London, Routledge (pp. 5 & 239).

Yorks, L. & Whitsett, D. A. (1985). Hawthorne, Topeka, and the issue of science versus advocacy in organizational behaviour, *The Academy of Management Review*, Jan; volume 10, pp. 21-30.

Zinkiewicz, L., Hammond, N. & Trapp, A. (2003). *Applying Psychology Disciplinary Knowledge to Psychology Teaching and Learning, Report and Evaluation Series No 2*, March 2003 LTSN Psychology, York.

17 Bibliography

Alvesson, M. & Willmott, H. (1992). *Critical Management Studies*. London, Sage.

Anon. (1949). Developing a code of ethics for psychologists; a first report of progress. *American Psychologist*, 4, 17.

APA (1964). Ethical practices in industrial psychology: A review of one committee's deliberations. *American Psychologist*, 19(3), 174-182.

Arnold, J. (2004). Editorial. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 1-10.

Bachiochi, P. D. & Weiner, S. P. (2002). *Qualitative data collection and analysis*. Blackwell Publishing, Malden, MA: US.

Beebe, J. (1999). Integrity in the analytic relationship. *Psychoanalytic Review*, Special Issue: The ethics of psychoanalysis: Philosophical, political, and clinical considerations, 86(4), 607-625.

Bersoff, D. N. (1995). *Ethical conflicts in psychology*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US.

Bersoff, D. N. (1999). *Ethical conflicts in psychology* (2nd ed.). American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US.

Betz, N. E. (2000). Contemporary issues in testing use. In C. E. J. Watkins, & V. L. Campbell (Eds.), *Testing and assessment in counselling practice* (2nd ed.); contemporary topics in vocational psychology. (pp. 481-516). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, Mahwah, NJ: US.

Beu, D. S., Buckley, M. R. & Harvey, M. G. (2003). Ethical decision-making: A multidimensional construct. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 12(1), 88-107.

Bion, W. R. (1961). *Experiences in groups*. London, Tavistock.

Bordow, A. (1971). Is the code of professional conduct responsive to the practices of contemporary industrial psychologists? *Australian Psychologist*, 6(2), 105-112.

Boundy, C. (2002). Media: Law: Keep it to yourself: what you have to do to keep a secret really secret, *The Guardian*. Manchester (UK): Nov 25, p. 10.

Bowie, N. E. (2001). Challenging the egoistic paradigm (pp. 145-163) in Dienhart, J., Moberg, D. and Duska, R. *The next phase of business ethics: integrating psychology and ethics, Research in ethical issues in organizations* volume 3, JAI, Elsevier Science, Amsterdam.

British Psychological Society (1987). Guidelines on advertising the services offered by psychologists. *Bulletin of the British Psychological Society*, 40, 172-173.

BPS (2004). The CPD process. BPS, Leicester.

BPS (2005a). Response of the British Psychological Society to the HPC. Leicester, BPS.

BPS (2005b). The 2005 Annual Report. BPS, Leicester.

Brett, G. S. (1921). *Influence and applications of psychology (1700-1800)*. George Allen & Unwin Ltd, London: United Kingdom.

Brinkmann, S. (2006). Questioning constructionism: Toward an ethics of finitude. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 46(1), 92-111.

Bromberg, J. I. (1996). A retrospective analysis of psychologists' experience being disciplined by the American Psychological Association's ethics committee. (Doctoral dissertation, //www.il.proquest.com/umi]). Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 57 (5-B), 3402.

Brotherton, C. (2002). Creating the healthy organization – well-being, diversity and ethics at work. *Psychology Learning & Teaching*, 2(2), 143.

Catano, V. M. (1994). Application of the CPA code of ethics: Towards integrating the science and practice of psychology. *Canadian Psychology*, 35(2), 224-228.

Cates, J. A. (1999). The art of assessment in psychology: Ethics, expertise, and validity. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 55(5), 631-641.

Choudhury, M. A. & Hoque, M. Z. (2004). Ethics and economic theory. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 31(8), 790-807.

Clark, R. W. & Lattal, A. D. (1993). *Workplace ethics: Winning the integrity revolution*. Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, MD: England.

Claxton, G. (1998). *Hare Brain, Tortoise Mind*. Harper Collins, London.

Computer-Based Training and Assessments: An Exploratory Study of Social Factors, *Proceedings of the 39th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences* - Reference 0-7695-2507-5/06/\$20.00 © 2006 IEEE, accessed January 2006.

de Keyser, V., Qvale, T., Wilpert, B. & Ruiz Quintanilla, S. A. (1988). *The meaning of work and technological options*. John Wiley & Sons, Oxford: England.

Dietz, P. E. & Reese, J. T. (1986). The perils of police psychology: 10 strategies for minimizing role conflicts when providing mental health services and consultation to law enforcement agencies. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*. Special Issue: Psychology in law enforcement, 4(4), 385-400.

Dunnette, M. D. (2004). Guidelines for practice, *PsycCRITIQUES*.

Ellickson, K. A. & Brown, D. R. (1990). Ethical considerations in dual relationships: The sport psychologist-coach. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 2(2), 186-190.

Eyde, L. D. & Quaintance, M. K. (1988). Ethical issues and cases in the practice of personnel psychology. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 19(2), 148-154.

Fine, S. A. (2006). Whistle Blowing and Industrial Psychology, *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, January, 43(3), 21-25.

Fischer, C. T. (2003). Infusing humanistic perspective into psychology. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 43(3), 93-105.

Flanagan, R., Miller, J. A. & Jacob, S. (2005). The 2002 revision of the American psychological association's ethics code: Implications for school psychologists. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42(4), 433-445.

Fowers, B. J. (2005). *Defining Virtue*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US.

Gorsuch, R. L. (1984). R. B. Cattell: An integration of psychology and ethics. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 19(2-3), 209-220.

Greene, J. (2003). From neural 'is' to moral 'ought': What are the moral implications of neuroscientific moral psychology? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 4(10), 846-849.

Gross, R. D. (1990). *Key Studies in Psychology*. Hodder & Stoughton Educational, London: England.

Gutheil, T. G., Bursztajn, H., Hilliard, J. T. & Brodsky, A. (2004). "Just say no": Experts' late withdrawal from cases to preserve independence and objectivity. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 32(4), 390-394.

Harrington, D. R. (Ed.). (2002). *A Levinasian psychology? perhaps*. Pittsburgh, PA, US: Duquesne University Press. ix, 266.

Harvey, J. H. & Smith, W. P. (1977). *Social psychology: an attributional approach*, St Lewis, The Mosby Company.

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the Nature of Man*, OH World, Cleveland, quoted in Leftkowitz (p. 255).

Heyman, S. R. (1990). Ethical issues in performance enhancement approaches with amateur boxers, *Sport Psychologist*, 4(1), 48-54.

Hobbs, N. (1948). The development of a code of ethical standards for psychology. *American Psychologist*, 3, 80-84.

Hollway, W. (1993). Efficiency And Welfare – Industrial-Psychology at Rowntrees Cocoa Works, *Theoretical Psychology* 3(3), 303-322.

Hosmer, L. T. (1995). Trust: The connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics, *Academy of Management Review*, 20(2), 379-403.

Huff, A. S. (2000). Changes in organizational knowledge production: 1999 presidential address, *Academy of Management Review*, 25 (2): 288-293.

Hughes, P. (1927). The normative in psychology and natural science. *Journal of Philosophy*, 24, 148-153.

Hutton, W. H. (1996). *The State we're in: Why Britain is in Crisis and How to overcome it*, Vintage, London.

Kitchener, K. S. (Ed.). (2000). *Reconceptualizing responsibilities to students: A feminist perspective*. Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association, xi, 285

Klein, N. (2001). *No Logo*, Flamingo, London.

Kline, T. J. B. (1994). Using the CPA code of ethics in I/O psychology. *Canadian Psychology*, 35(2), 220-223.

Knapp, S. J., & VandeCreek, L. D. (2006). Psychologists as teachers. *American Psychological Association*, Washington, DC, US.

Kottke, J. L. & Pelletier, K. L. (2004). Ethics and values in industrial-organizational psychology. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(4), 1044-1048.

Krout, M. H. (1954). Comment on "The use of human subjects in psychological research", *American Psychologist*, 9(9), 589.

Lemoine, C. (2000). The need for ethics in work psychology and organizational psychology/L'exigence déontologique en psychologie du travail et des organizations. *Bulletin de Psychologie*, 53(1) (445), 107-114.

Lowman, R. L. (1998). *Case 2: Validation efforts with small sample sizes*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US.

Lowman, R. L. (1998). *Case 13: The right not to participate in selection activities*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US.

Lowman, R. L. (1998). *Case 15: Survey reveals sexual harassment*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US.

Lowman, R. L. (1998). *Case 22: Misuse of psychological services*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US.

Lowman, R. L. (1998). *Case 28: Avoiding conflicts of interests and roles*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US.

Lowman, R. L. (1998). *Case 36: The ethics of reviewing and of being reviewed*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US.

Lowman, R. L. (1998). *Case 4: Avoiding potential misuse of assessment procedures*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US.

Lowman, R. L. (1998). *Case 45: Training requirements in I/O psychology*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US.

Lowman, R. L. (1998). *Case 8: Misleading reporting of results*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US.

Lowman, R. L. (1998). *The ethical practice of psychology in organizations*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, US

MacLaclan, M. & Carr, S. (1999). The selection of international assignees for development work, *The Irish Journal of Psychology*, volume 20, Number 1, pp. 39-57.

Malloy, D. C., Hadjistavropoulos, T., Douaud, P. & Smythe, W. E. (2002). The code of ethics of the Canadian psychological association and the Canadian medical association: Ethical orientation and functional grammar analysis, *Canadian Psychology*, 43(4), 244-253.

Margolis, J. D. (2001). Psychological pragmatism and the imperatives of aims: a new approach for business ethics, in Dienhart, J., Moberg, D. and Duska, R. (2001) *The next phase of business ethics: integrating psychology and ethics*, *Research in ethical issues in organizations*, volume 3, JAI, Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, pp. 27-50.

McCabe, C., Ingram, R. & Dato-on, M. C. (2006). The Business of Ethics and Gender, *Journal of Business Ethics* vol 64, pp. 101-116.

McMillan, J. J. (1976). Accountability among providers of psychological services. *Clinical Psychologist*, 29 (3), 7-13.

Messick, D. M. & Bazerman, M. H. (Eds.). (2001). *Ethical leadership and the psychology of decision making*. US: Elsevier Science/JAI Press. xxviii.

Mirvis, P. H. (1982). Know thyself and what thou art doing: Bringing values and sense into organizational research. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 26 (2), 177-197.

Moore, B. V. (1954). Amendments to the APA bylaws. *American Psychologist*, 9 (6), 261-262.

Newman, J. L., Robinson-Kurpius, S. E. & Fuqua, D. R. (2002). Issues in the ethical practice of consulting psychology. In R. L. Lowman, *Handbook of organizational consulting psychology: a comprehensive guide to theory, skills and techniques*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA: US.

Payne, A. (2006). Speaker from British American Tobacco at the Cranfield Corporate Social Responsibility Conference, Cranfield, August 2006.

Payne, S. L. & Giacalone, R. A. (1990). Social psychological approaches to the perception of ethical dilemmas. *Human Relations*, 43(7), 649-665.

Pearson, C. H. (1986). *Theories of Counselling and Psychotherapy* (4th ed). New York: Harper and Row.

Pettifor, J. L. (2004). Professional ethics across national boundaries. *European Psychologist*, 9(4), 264-272.

Pope, K. S. & Vetter, V. A. (1992). Ethical dilemmas encountered by members of the American Psychological Association: A national survey. *American Psychologist*, 47(3), 397-411.

Report of the Ethics Committee, (2002). *American Psychologist*. Special Issue: 2001 Annual Report of the American Psychological Association: Psychology Builds a Healthy World, 57(8), 646-653.

Richards, G. (1996). *Putting Psychology in its Place: An introduction from a critical psychology perspective*. London: Routledge.

Riker, J. H. (1991). *Human Excellence and an Ecological Conception of the Psyche*. State University of New York Press, Albany, NY: US.

Rogelberg, S. G. (2002). *Handbook of research methods in industrial and organizational psychology*. Blackwell Publishing, Malden, MA: US.

Ronan, W. W. (1980). Some ethical considerations in worker control. *American Psychologist*, 35 (12), 1150-1151.

Sabourin, M. (2004). Ethical questions in psychology/Questions éthiques en psychologie. *Canadian Psychology*, 45 (1), 120-121.

Schein, E. H. 1992, *Organizational culture and leadership*, Second edn, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Schmidt, L. D. & Meara, N. M. (1996). *Applying for Approval to conduct Research with Human Participants*. Sage Publications, Inc, Thousand Oaks, CA: US.

Seashore, H. (1949). Ethical problems of the industrial psychologist. *Personnel Psychology*, 2, 103-113.

Seashore, H. (1953). A code of ethics for the psychologist. *Personnel*, 30, 35-38.

Skorupa, J. & Agresti, A. A. (1993). Ethical beliefs about burnout and continued professional practice. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 24 (3), 281-285.

Snow, D. L., Grady, K. & Goyette-Ewing, M. (2000). *A Perspective on Ethical Issues in Community Psychology*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht: Netherlands.

Solursh, D. S., Solursh, L. P. & Williams, N. R. (1993). Patient[^]therapist sex: "just say no" isn't enough. *Medicine & Law*, 12(3-5), 431-438.

Stojnov, D. (1996). Kelly's theory of ethics: Hidden, mislaid, or misleading? *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 9(3), 185-199.

Swogger, G. (1999). Psychoanalysis and ethics in Organizations, in Gabriel, Y., *Organizations in Depth*, Sage, London, Chapter 10, pp. 232-250.

Takala, T. (2006). Editorial: An ethical enterprise – What is it? *Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organizational Studies*, p. 4, vol 11, no. 1.

Treviño, L. K., Butterfield, K. D. & McCabe, D. L. (Eds.). (2001). *The ethical context in organizations: Influences of employee attitudes and behaviors*. US: Elsevier Science/JAI Press. xxviii, 518 pp.

Treviño, L. K., Weaver, G. R. & Reynolds, S. J. (2006). Behavioural Ethics in Organisations: a review, *Journal of Management*, 32, pp. 951-990.

Valéry, P. (1931). Are mental sciences essentially different from natural sciences?/Les sciences de l'esprit sontelles essentiellement différentes des sciences de la nature? *Revue de Synthèse*, 2, 9-13.

Waterman, A. S. (1988). On the uses of psychological theory and research in the process of ethical inquiry. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103 (3), 283-298.

Watson, W.J. (2006). Review Essay, The Organization and Disorganization of Organization Studies, *Journal of Management Studies* 43:2, 367-382.

Weber, J. & Gillespie, J. (2001). In Dienhart, J., Moberg, D. and Duska, R. (2001) *The next phase of business ethics: integrating psychology and ethics*, *Research in ethical issues in organizations* volume 3, JAI, Elsevier Science, Amsterdam.

Weeks, W. A., Moore, C. W., McKinney J. A. & Longenecker J. G. (1999). The Effects of Gender and Career Stage on Ethical Judgment, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 20 (4), pp. 301–313.

Weinberger, L. E. & Sreenivasan, S. (1994). Ethical and professional conflicts in correctional psychology. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 25 (2), 161-167.

Weiner, J. (2001). Confidentiality and paradox: The location of ethical space. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 46 (3), 431-442.

Weissman, H. N. (1984). Professional standards from the perspective of the sociology of professions. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 15 (4), 471-472.

Welch, H. J. (1924). Human waste. *Journal of the National Institute of Industrial Psychology*, 2 (1), 5-8.

Western, C. B. (1991). Applied psychology and the law. *Community Mental Health in New Zealand*, 6 (1), 2-15.

Wicks, A. C. & Freeman, R. E. (1998). Organization studies and the new pragmatism: Positivism, anti-positivism, and the search for ethics. *Organization Science*, 9 (2), 123-140.

Williams, I. (2000). China sells organs of slain convicts, *The Observer*, Sunday December 10, 2000.

Williams, R. N., & Gantt, E. E. (Eds.). (2002). *Pursuing psychology as a science of the ethical: Contributions of the work of Emmanuel Levinas*. Pittsburgh, PA, US: Duquesne University Press.

Williams, R. N. & Gantt, E. E. (1998). Intimacy and heteronomy: On grounding psychology in the ethical. *Theory & Psychology*, 8(2), 253-267.

Woolfolk, R. L. (2003). The real and the good. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 23 (1), 1.

Wray-Bliss, E. (2007). Ethics at work in Knights, D. and Willmott, H., *Introducing Organizational Behaviour and Management*, London, Thomson Learning, pp. 506-533.

17.1 Note concerning presentation in two volumes

Cranfield University regulations require that a PDF of the Thesis is submitted so that it can be placed in an institutional depository and made freely available in electronic form. For copyright reasons the appendixes and copies of published papers, where available, were presented for examination in a second volume since the position on republishing electronically is currently complex and varies by publisher. If you are reading this in electronic format and wish to obtain a copy of a paper referred to here please contact the main library at Cranfield University.