

This document has been approved by the Executive Committee of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc., Division 14 of the American Psychological Association. It does not necessarily represent the policy of the Association. Copies are available from the Society's office. The price schedule is:

\$5.00 each for 1-9 copies
\$4.00 each for 10-49 copies
\$3.00 each for 50 copies and up

Orders should be sent to:

Society for I/O Psychology, Inc.
Department of Psychology
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Copyright © 1985, by
Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc.

c/o Department of Psychology
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means without permission in writing from the publisher.

All citations from the American Psychological Association's *Ethical Principles of Psychologists* (*American Psychologist*, 1981a, 36, 633-638) are copyrighted by the American Psychological Association, 1981. Reprinted by permission of the publisher and author.

Citation: Lowman, R. L. (Ed.) (1985). *Casebook on ethics and standards for the practice of psychology in organizations*. College Park, MD: Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc., Division 14 of the American Psychological Association.

CASEBOOK ON ETHICS AND STANDARDS FOR THE PRACTICE OF PSYCHOLOGY IN ORGANIZATIONS

RODNEY L. LOWMAN, EDITOR

with

Associate Editors

Lorraine Eyde
Mannell London
Richard Reilly
R. D. Hedberg
Andrew Imada
Jarold Niven
Marilyn Quaintance
William Sauser, Jr.

Case Review Panel:

Douglas Bray

Raymond Katzell

Stanley Seashore

Table of Contents

Preface	4
Test Validation Techniques	6
Test Validation Strategies	7
Assessment Techniques	8
Inadequate Resources to Comply With Ethical and Technical Standards	10
Misuse of Assessment Procedures	11
Conducting Individual Assessments	12
Use of Management Development Results for Employee Assessment	14
Miskeyed Test Items on Commercially Marketed Tests	15
Personnel Screening for Emotional Stability	16
Misuse of Psychological Services	17
Misleading Reporting of Results	18
Accurately Reporting Research Results	20
Misrepresentation of Results in Test Validation	20
Disposition of Psychological Reports	22
Training Requirements in I/O Psychology	23
Practice of I/O Psychology By a Clinical Psychologist	24
Career Switching	25
Licensing and Credentialing	27
"Realistic Job Previews" and the Selection of Female Employees	28
Marketing Psychological Products	29

Advertising and Public Statements	32
Publicity and Advertising	33
Use of Copyrighted Material in New Instrumentation	34
Authorship and Publication Agreements	35
Publication Credit	35
Plagiarizing	36
Fairness in Book Reviews	38
Ethical Responsibilities of Reviewers	38
Evaluating Colleagues' Competencies	39
Confronting Unethical Behavior	40
The Right Not to Participate in Psychological Activities	41
Protecting Confidentiality	43
Confidentiality of Employee Interview Data	44
Confidentiality	45
Misuse of Data Obtained Through One's Employment	46
Dual Relationships	47
Conflict of Interest	48
Psychologists As Employers of Other Psychologists	50
Pressures to Prematurely Implement Psychological Programs	51
Sensitivity Training Groups	52
Referral to an Employee Assistance Program	54
Academia - Industry Relationships	55
Misuse of Attitude Surveys to Prevent Unionization	56
Bibliography and Reference List	58

Preface

This casebook was developed to guide the practice of psychology in organizational settings and to provide an educational tool for use in ethics and professional practice courses. Because existing case material (e.g., Sanders, 1979; Sanders and Keith-Spiegel, 1980), published by the American Psychological Association often has limited applicability to the work of psychologists practicing in industry, in 1982 the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology asked its Professional Affairs Committee to assume responsibility for developing this casebook of ethical problems in organizational research and practice.

The materials for this casebook were obtained by mail solicitations, announcements in various professional publications and from requests directed to senior members of the profession. Many of the cases are based on actual behavior in which only specific details have been altered to provide anonymity to the relevant parties. Other cases are composites based on several different cases, combined to eliminate duplication and to illustrate certain ethical issues. A few cases are fictional, created to highlight a particular ethical concern not adequately addressed by the materials sent to us.

Reviewing the material in this book will reveal that the cases are not consistent in the complexity of the issues they raise, in the obviousness of the ethical solution, or even in whether a consensus solution exists at the present time. This was intentional. Some cases based on actual behavior were eliminated because the ethical violation was so flagrant that the issues and solution were obvious. The ultimate goal was to have a mixture of cases in terms of issues, complexity, and ambiguity of solution.

Judging from the responses of those who previewed some of the case material in various forums around the country, it is likely that some of the cases will be subject to more than one interpretation. In some cases, alternative interpretations are provided to guide practitioners and students in applying the principles involved to their own particular situation. Although considerable effort went into the task of assuring that the interpretations of the ethical issues in these cases would be consistent with APA policy, it should be emphasized that the application of the ethical principles in a given situation is highly dependent on the specific facts of that situation and their relative importance. Moreover, a particular case may have more than one acceptable resolution. It is therefore probable that there will be differences of opinion on how the APA principles and standards apply to some of the case material. This is particularly true for the more ambiguous and controversial cases. Readers should consult the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists* (American Psychological Association [APA], 1981) for "official" APA policy.

It is hoped that this casebook will stimulate improved ethical practice. It is also hoped that this casebook will generate a new concern for the ethical practice of psychology in organizations among students and professionals alike.

This document will be modified over time as new ethical principles emerge and as examples of ethical and unethical behavior in complex social systems become more widely available. Readers are encouraged to contact the editor or the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology with suggested additions or with new case material for subsequent editions of the casebook.

This casebook was the product of many people's efforts. The names of the major contributors appear on the cover of this volume; in addition, Ed Cornelius and Dorothy Goodsell helped to review or prepare some of the cases. Special acknowledgment goes to the review committee established to evaluate the cases (composed of Douglas Bray, Raymond Karzell, and Stanley Seashore). This panel took its responsibilities very seriously and significantly improved the final product.

Additional conceptual, editorial, and advisory help was provided by Virginia Boethm, Milton Hake, Ann Howard, Daniel Ilgen, Mildred Karzell, Paul Sackett, Neal Schmitt, Frank Schmidt, Benjamin Schneider, James Sharf, and Paul Thayer. Thanks also go to the members of Division 14 and other professional organizations who supplied case material. Deborah Evans provided valuable administrative and clerical assistance. Finally, the costs of preparing the casebook were subsidized greatly by the Department of Psychology at North Texas State University, including fine secretarial support provided by Jean Holland and her associates, especially Cindy Andrews, for which sincere gratitude is expressed.

Rodney L. Lowman, Editor
North Texas State University
October, 1984

1. Test Validation Techniques

A. Statement of the Problem

A consulting psychologist developed a weighted application blank for a company for use in the selection of its sales personnel. The biographical inventory key was derived from a concurrent validation study by comparing responses of the 10 best performing sales personnel with those of the 10 poorest performing incumbents. The department only employed 37 people in the sales department. Using a very liberal criterion of significance, the consultant developed a scoring key for a brief inventory and recommended use of the procedure in future selection decisions. The consultant did include a caveat in the validity report that the sales department should cross-validate the scoring key in the future but did not explain to the company what "cross-validation" was or why it was important. Moreover, since the company did not employ a psychologist, the cross-validation study never occurred.

B. Applicable Policies

The following APA ethical principles* and standards apply:

Principle 1 (Responsibility). As scientists, psychologists accept responsibility for... the methods used in investigation, analysis, and reporting. They plan their research in ways to minimize the possibility that their findings will be misleading. They provide thorough discussion of the limitations of their data... (1-a)

Principle 8 (Assessment Techniques). In the development, publication, and utilization of psychological assessment techniques, psychologists make every effort to promote the welfare and best interests of the client. They guard against the misuse of assessment results... They strive to ensure the appropriate use of assessment techniques by others.

Psychologists responsible for the development and standardization of psychological tests and other assessment techniques utilize established scientific procedures and observe the relevant APA standards. (8-b)

Division 14's *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures* (Second Edition) (American Psychological Association, Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology [APSA-IO], 1980, pp. 5-6), state:

Anyone contemplating a criterion-related validity study must first determine whether such a study is feasible.

To conduct a criterion-related validity study which potentially lacks adequate "statistical power" may leave the issue of validity unresolved.

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

The consultant in this case assumed responsibility for developing a selection system for sales personnel. The validity study used, however, met neither the relevant technical requirements nor APA's ethical principles. It is likely that the consultant's validation strategy resulted in an overestimate of the actual validity by capitalizing on chance.

A major problem with the validity evidence for the biographical inventory provided by the consultant was the size of the sample in the concurrent criterion-related validity study. It is doubtful that the sample of 20 was sufficiently large to provide adequate statistical power. In conducting this study with so small a sample, the consultant apparently failed to make use of the research literature which has demonstrated that

biographical inventories have unstable validities (i.e., their validity deteriorates over time) if the initial sample size used to construct the key is not adequately large and if the key is not cross-validated. Further, use of extreme groups does not permit typical statistical tests to be used. Use of such tests would result in a distorted statistical picture.

While the psychologist correctly recommended cross-validation, it is entirely possible that the term "cross-validation" would be meaningless to the company officials. The consultant should have explained the concept in language which the client could understand, as implied by Principle 8 of the *Ethical Principles*. Further, it should have been anticipated that the company might never accumulate a sufficiently large sample to carry out this cross-validation, even if it had the appropriate technical expertise.

With these limitations, the suggestion that the biographical inventory be used immediately for selection purposes was misleading, in possible violation of Principles 1 and 8. The consultant should have described the limitations of the study more completely to ensure that the best interests of the client were served.

D. Educative Ramifications

Psychologists engaged in the construction and validation of selection procedures bear a responsibility to conduct validity studies that meet technical and professional requirements, such as those discussed above. Psychologists have an ethical responsibility to promote the welfare of their clients by complete and accurate reporting of validity study results and by the complete disclosure of limitations and reservations raised by the study expressed in terms that the client can understand.

2. Test Validation Strategies

A. Statement of the Problem

An industrial psychologist was hired by a plant manager to develop a selection system for MBA recruits in a large corporation. Company officials made clear in the preliminary meetings that they were only interested in funding the study if it could save the organization considerable money. The company employed a total of 250 such managers and hired about 15 new MBAs each year. In constructing the test battery, the psychologist asked company representatives to identify 15 of the best performing and 15 of the worst performing MBAs from the same age group (25-30 years old) as the typical applicant group. The psychologist then administered an extensive experimenter test battery under standardized conditions to this group. The test battery yielded 85 separate scores for each assessee.

After inspecting the results the psychologist picked the eight most discriminating scores, and then calculated a multiple R for what was then proposed as the selection battery. The resulting value was $R = .87$. In an oral presentation to the company's management, the psychologist showed a plot of points based on this result, and displayed an expectancy table. The expectancy table indicated that if the test battery were implemented, 95% accuracy of prediction would ensue. The client was enthusiastic about the results and implemented the new testing program within two months of the briefing.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). As scientists, psychologists... plan their research in ways to

*These and all subsequent citations of the American Psychological Association's (1981a) *Ethical Principles of Psychologists* are reprinted here by permission of the publisher and author.

minimize the possibility that their findings will be misleading. They provide thorough discussion of the limitations of their data . . . (1-a)

Principle 2 (Competence). Psychologists recognize the . . . limitations of their techniques. Psychologists responsible for decisions involving individuals or policies based on test results have an understanding of psychological or educational measurement, validation problems, and test research. (2-c)

Principle 8 (Assessment Techniques). Psychologists responsible for the development and standardization of psychological tests and other assessment techniques utilize established scientific procedures and observe the relevant APA standards. (8-b)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case concerns the type of research data appropriate to use to develop a selection system for a client organization. The psychologist in this case had responsibility for carrying out personnel research in such a way that the results were not misleading, which clearly did not happen. In addition, the psychologist had the responsibility for pointing out the limitations of the study to the client in terms that could be readily understood. Finally, the psychologist did not conduct the validation studies in accordance with acceptable professional standards and was either unfamiliar with or ignored the literature on validation methodology. Clearly, considering only the extremes of a sample to make generalizations and using the same sample for "validation" as for developing the battery would not be considered acceptable practice.

D. Educative Ramifications

Psychologists need to be aware of potential conflicts that may often be present in organizational research or practice between acting in accordance with sound scientific principles and handling pressures that may arise from clients to present impressive research results. Psychologists should make it clear to their clients before beginning projects such as validation studies that it is possible that their research findings will not support the prior expectations or desires for favorable results. When, despite careful job analyses and selection of relevant predictors, personnel validation studies still do not support the predictive efficacy of a test battery, or do so only partially, the psychologist has the ethical obligation to provide full disclosure of the results to the client. Finally, psychologists working on industrial selection projects must be aware of, and employ, appropriate scientific validation strategies.

3. Assessment Techniques

A. Statement of the Problem

An I/O psychologist was asked by a large manufacturer to develop a selection battery for jobs requiring unskilled employees in one of its plants. The management's goal was to select employees who were average, or below average, in intelligence. The presumption was that this would lead to less turnover. A battery consisting of three cognitive tests was recommended by the psychologist and implemented by the firm's personnel department. The battery was administered to applicants with the usual instructions.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). In providing services, psychologists maintain the highest

standards of their profession. They accept responsibility for the consequences of their acts and make every effort to ensure that their services are used appropriately.

Principle 8 (Assessment Techniques). Psychologists responsible for the development and standardization of psychological tests and other assessment techniques utilize established scientific procedures and observe the relevant APA standards. (8-b)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case involves the responsibility of the psychologist to maintain high standards of competence in the development and use of assessment techniques. The major issue raised by the case is the lack of validation, with almost certain, and possibly indefensible, rejection of potentially qualified applicants. No validation study was done. Rather, the psychologist recommended a procedure that only appeared, without evidence, to be relevant to the situation. To test the company's assertion that average or below-average candidates are less likely to quit would require the demonstration of a negative relationship between the test score and turnover.

Another issue, to which there is not an obviously "correct" answer, is whether the organization must explain to the applicants how the test will be used in the selection procedure. There is no question that employers may test applicants, and applicants certainly understand that the purpose is to select or reject them. An ethical dilemma concerns whether applicants have to be told that doing very well on the tests will be associated with not being hired.

Assuming that a validation study or validity generalization evidence had demonstrated the assumed relationship between the test and turnover, creating the appropriate test-taking "set" necessary for valid results would potentially mislead applicants into thinking that doing well on the test would lead to being hired. On the other hand, explicitly telling applicants that persons who do well on the test would be likely to leave the organization and so would not be hired would likely result in a test-taking attitude that would invalidate the results of the testing. A partial solution might be to tell applicants honestly that they are being administered a test of intellectual ability that has been found useful in selecting people who are likely to want to stay on the job (assuming that this was supported by the validation study), without specifying the direction in which the test would be scored. In providing feedback to an applicant who is to be rejected for being "too qualified", the relationship between costly turnover and overqualification might be explained to the applicant and other jobs in the company considered for which the applicant might be more suitable.

D. Educative Ramifications

Requests for selection procedures are often made without the full understanding by the requesting organization of the legal and technical issues involved. Psychologists should be able to communicate to clients the relevant legal and technical aspects of selection in terms they can understand. Second, the client organization must be aware of the psychologist's ethical responsibilities in personnel selection. When the demands of the organization create an ethical conflict, the psychologist should clarify for the organization the ethical position that is considered proper. Finally, psychologists must struggle with ethically ambiguous issues and attempt to resolve conflicts among ethical and technical standards in a way that minimizes harm to all parties.

4. Inadequate Resources to Comply With Ethical and Technical Standards

A. Statement of the Problem

A psychologist, serving as a test supervisor for a large municipal government, noted a greater demand for written examinations from the various operating departments. Because of a lack of financial resources, the supervisor had not been provided with additional staff to assist in job analysis and test construction activities. To meet the demands of the operating departments, the psychologist found it necessary to "pull old tests off the shelf" without taking appropriate steps to analyze the job or to document the tests' relevance to the job. The psychologist recognized that this practice was not consistent with professional standards and that the procedures might be difficult to defend legally if challenged. Nonetheless, the psychologist chose to disregard relevant professional principles and made no attempt to present the dilemma to management.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). As practitioners, psychologists know that they bear a heavy social responsibility because their recommendations and professional actions may alter the lives of others. They are alert to personal, social, organizational, financial, or political situations and pressures that might lead to misuse of their influence. (1-1)

Principle 3 (Moral and Legal Standards). In the ordinary course of events, psychologists adhere to relevant governmental laws and institutional regulations. (3-d)

Principle 6 (Welfare of the Consumer). Where the demands of an organization require psychologists to violate these Ethical Principles, psychologists clarify the nature of the conflict between the demands and these principles. They inform all parties of psychologists' ethical responsibilities and take appropriate action. (6-c)

Principle 8 (Assessment Techniques). Psychologists responsible for the development and standardization of psychological tests and other assessment techniques utilize established scientific procedures and observe the relevant APA standards. (8-b)

Psychologists recognize that assessment results may become obsolete. They make every effort to avoid and prevent the misuse of obsolete measures. (8-d)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

The test supervisor in this case had to produce a large number of written examinations with insufficient staff resources. The examinations that the psychologist provided to the operating departments for use in selection and promotion decisions altered the lives of the candidates by providing employment/advancement opportunities for some and not for others. The psychologist had the ethical obligation, when recommending the use of psychological assessment techniques, to ensure that they were utilized in accordance with relevant standards, e.g., *Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests* (APA, 1974) and Division 14's *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures* (Second Edition) (APA 1/O, 1980), and that the selection procedures were not obsolete. The psychologist also had responsibility for being familiar with government regulations concerning the use of written tests and for ensuring that the provisions of those regulations were met.

In this case, the psychologist was aware of the legal and technical requirements but did not comply with them due to managerial pressures and limited resources. Rather than simply giving in to the situational pressures, the psychologist might have confronted the appropriate superiors to assist them in reaching a decision as to whether legal, practical, and ethical aims would best be served by using the "off-the-

shelf" tests for jobs that had not been properly analyzed. In addition to the psychologist's own ethical codes, those of other professionals (e.g., personnel administrators and attorneys) might have been used to support the psychologist's position, assuming the ethical codes of these groups addressed related issues.

D. Educative Ramifications

Psychologists should assure that their superiors are aware of psychologists' ethical responsibilities to provide job-related assessment techniques. They should attempt to resist organizational pressures to increase test production without analyzing the job and assuring the job relevance or validity of tests. Additionally, psychologists should explain to their superiors the need to comply with relevant professional standards when using tests for selection and promotional purposes.

5. Misuse of Assessment Procedures

A. Statement of the Problem

Two I/O psychologists teaching at a large university were contacted for help with a selection problem in a manufacturing facility of a medium-sized company. A meeting was arranged with the officers of the company at their headquarters. All of the officers had recently been appointed in a reorganization of the company headquarters. The officers asked the psychologists to develop a new selection procedure to assist in developing a more competitive and aggressive managerial workforce. They expressed dissatisfaction with the managers they had inherited and told the psychologists that they would require both new candidates for managerial positions and the present managers to complete the assessment procedure. The psychologists, after further discussion, declined to participate in the project since they felt that the real intent was to use the selection procedures as an excuse to terminate the inherited managers.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). As practitioners, psychologists know that they bear a heavy social responsibility because their recommendations and professional actions may alter the lives of others. They are alert to personal, social, organizational, financial, or political situations and pressures that might lead to misuse of their influence. (1-1)

Principle 3 (Moral and Legal Standards). In their professional roles, psychologists avoid any action that will violate or diminish the legal and civil rights of clients or of others who may be affected by their actions. (3-c)

Principle 6 (Welfare of the Consumer). Psychologists respect the integrity and protect the welfare of the people and groups with whom they work.

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

A psychologist asked to develop a psychological assessment procedure has an obligation to assure that those who will be affected by the results of such a procedure are treated fairly. The psychologists in this case needed to determine the reason for developing the new selection procedure. If it were concluded that a primary motivation for the proposed selection plan was so that the new management team could rid itself of the old managers, simply using the selection results as an excuse to fire them, then the psychologists appropriately refused to become involved since psychological services would in all probability be misused. This would potentially have

damaged both the individual participants and the image of psychology. However, the psychologists' refusal would not have kept management from finding other ways to fire the managers if that was their goal. An alternative appropriate action by the psychologists would have been to try to work with management by pointing out the need to treat employees in a humane fashion and suggesting alternative procedures to dismissal, such as transfers or training. The psychologists could also have assisted management in identifying desired future directions for the organization and in minimizing the negative consequences associated with the changes.

The development of a new selection program for managers was not, of course, unethical per se, and the psychologists could appropriately have worked with the company in this regard so long as there was no intent to use the results as an excuse to fire the existing managers. Since management appeared to have had only a notion of what they wanted, the psychologist might appropriately have suggested that a proper needs analysis be conducted. It would also have been proper to alert management that it might be difficult to find valid selection procedures measuring aggressiveness or competitiveness.

D. Educative Ramifications

When approached by a potential client organization for consultation, I/O psychologists should make clear to the client that assessment procedures will only be developed according to professionally acceptable standards. Consulting I/O psychologists can be placed in a position where the demands of the client organization are in conflict with APA ethical principles. It is the responsibility of the psychologist to recognize these situations before agreeing to undertake a consulting assignment. If the psychologist determines that there is an ethical conflict, the nature of the conflict should be clearly explained to the organization. The I/O psychologist may be especially vulnerable to requests by organizational representatives to use psychological assessment devices for inappropriate purposes and should therefore be continuously alert to potential abuses.

This case also illustrates one of a number of ways that organizational change can be detrimental to individuals. In some cases the negative effects can be for the organization, not just individual employees, as when a decision is made to select more aggressive managers and this leads to unproductive organizational conflict. In addition to assuring that tests are used ethically, psychologists can also help organizations design change strategies that minimize undesirable (and unintended) consequences.

C. Conducting Individual Assessments

A. Statement of the Problem

A psychologist in private practice was asked by a corporation to examine one of their middle managers who was the leading candidate for the position of Regional Sales Manager. The only information the personnel director provided was that this job was a demanding one, and that it required a person with a good resistance to stress. The psychologist did not conduct or obtain an independent analysis of the position or request additional information.

The psychologist interviewed the candidate and administered a self-report inventory and a projective test. On the basis of these data, the psychologist advised that the candidate did not possess a good resistance to stress and would therefore not perform adequately in the regional sales position. Upon receiving this advice, the company promoted another individual into the position.

The unsuccessful candidate later asked the psychologist for a copy of the report that had caused the company to bypass him for promotion. The psychologist refused, indicating that the company was the client, and no authorization had been given for the report and recommendations to be discussed, much less for a confidential report to be released.

B. Applicable Policies

An obvious ethical issue in this case concerns whether or not psychologists have a responsibility for providing feedback to employees of a client company. A second set of issues concerns the appropriateness of the assessment procedure used in this case. Relevant ethical principles include:

Principle 1 (Responsibility). As practitioners, psychologists know that they bear a heavy social responsibility because their recommendations and professional actions may alter the lives of others. (1-f)

Principle 2 (Competence). The maintenance of high standards of competence is a responsibility shared by all psychologists in the interest of the public and the profession as a whole. Psychologists recognize . . . the limitations of their techniques.

Psychologists responsible for decisions involving individuals or policies based on test results have an understanding of psychological . . . measurement, validation problems, and test research. (2-e)

Principle 3 (Moral and Legal Standards). As employees or employers, psychologists do not engage in or condone practices that . . . result in illegal or unjustifiable actions. (3-b)

Principle 8 (Assessment Techniques). In using assessment techniques, psychologists respect the right of clients to have full explanations of the nature and purpose of the techniques in language the clients can understand, unless an explicit exception to this right has been agreed upon in advance. (8-a)

Psychologists make every effort to avoid misuse of assessment reports. (8-e)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

The psychologist in this case had a responsibility not only to the employing company, but also to the individuals being examined. Employment or contractual arrangements with a company do not remove the psychologist's social responsibilities. While legal and ethical precedents do not mandate release of the actual written report to an examinee, the requirement for meaningful feedback to the assessee is clear, unless explicit exceptions are agreed upon in advance.

In addition, individual assessments of the sort described in this case must be carried out competently. Assessments generally need to be based on job requirements. Because the psychologist had little information about the job, it would be difficult to demonstrate the validity of the assessment techniques according to accepted professional standards. This psychologist may not have realized the potential limitations of the data obtained for the job in question, and therefore may not have appreciated the subsequent burden these limitations created, especially regarding recommendations that could significantly alter the lives of employees in the company.

D. Educative Ramifications

Psychologists should inform client companies that, if they are hired to perform individual assessments, they are bound by the ethics of their profession to provide feedback to the assessee unless an exception to this is agreed on in advance, and to explain to the candidates the bases of their findings in terms they can understand.

Generally psychologists should not examine candidates or make "suitability" recommendations if the job in question has not been sufficiently analyzed to establish qualification requirements and personal characteristics necessary for successful job performance. All practicing psychologists should be aware of the legal, social, and personal consequences of making decisions on the basis of assessment techniques that do not comply with professional validation standards.

7. Use of Management Development Results for Employee Assessment

A. Statement of the Problem

A psychologist employed by a large company designed and implemented a management development program. In the early stages of the program, a non-validated in-basket exercise was used to diagnose difficulties in decision making experienced by employees. The program then used this information to identify areas of deficiency needing attention or strengthening. Participants were told that the information obtained in the exercises would not be seen by their supervisors.

After the program had been in use for some time, the psychologist received a call from an executive who had to choose between two managers for an important position. The position would represent a significant career advancement for the person chosen. The executive asked the psychologist for an assessment of the two managers based on their performance in the management development program and especially on the in-basket exercise. The psychologist checked the records and found that one of the two candidates performed much better than the other on the in-basket. The psychologist reported this information to the executive.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 5 (Confidentiality). Psychologists have a primary obligation to respect the confidentiality of information obtained from persons in the course of their work as psychologists. They reveal such information to others only with the consent of the person or the person's legal representative, except in those unusual circumstances in which not to do so would result in clear danger to the person or to others.

Principle 8 (Assessment Techniques). [Psychologists] guard against the misuse of assessment results.

In reporting assessment results, psychologists indicate any reservations that exist regarding validity or reliability because of the circumstances of the assessment or the inappropriateness of the norms for the person tested. (8-c)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Questions Posed by the Case

In this case, the data that were collected as a training aid became assessment data once the psychologist complied with the manager's request to release the information from the management development program. Since it had been promised that the results would not be seen by participants' superiors, the psychologist acted inappropriately in releasing the information. The psychologist should also have made the manager aware of the ethical issue involved in releasing such information.

A second ethical issue concerned validation. The psychologist had an ethical obligation to use only those psychological instruments which had been validated for

the assessment purposes intended. The psychologist could have pointed out that while in-baskets generally have been shown to be predictive of managerial success, their strength is in measuring administrative skills. There are other determinants of managerial performance, such as interpersonal skills or problem solving ability, that would not be well measured by the in-basket. It would not be clear whether the in-basket would be appropriate for selection into the job in question without a job analysis and supporting validity evidence.

D. Educative Ramifications

Before collecting information on employees, psychologists should consider the likely uses to which such data might be put. The potential uses of the data should be clarified with all concerned parties such as participants, their supervisors, and personnel officials. The psychologist should take an active role in establishing policy for the use of such data and should also outline any areas of ethical conflict with respect to the conditions under which data are collected and how the data will be used.

8. Miskeyed Test Items on Commercially Marketed Tests

A. Statement of the Problem

A psychologist, while reviewing a test developed and sold by a major test publisher, discovered that the intended correct answer to a test was incorrectly keyed. An expert panel concurred that the item was miskeyed. The psychologist called this error to the attention of a high-ranking psychologist employed by the test publishing company. Instead of being interested in improving the test, the official from the test publishing company verbally abused the test reviewer and subsequently failed to respond to a written request for a change in the scoring key. The publishing company did not make any changes in the test's scoring key.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). In providing services, psychologists maintain the highest standards of their profession. They accept responsibility for the consequences of their acts and make every effort to ensure that their services are used appropriately.

As practitioners, psychologists know that they bear a heavy social responsibility because their recommendations and professional actions may alter the lives of others. (1-f)

Principle 7 (Professional Relationships). Psychologists act with due regard for the needs, special competencies, and obligations of their colleagues in psychology and other professions. They respect the prerogatives and obligations of the institutions or organizations with which these other colleagues are associated.

Principle 8 (Assessment Techniques). Psychologists responsible for the development and standardization of psychological tests and other assessment techniques utilize established scientific procedures and observe the relevant APA standards. (8-b)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

The psychologist who developed the test and the highest ranking psychologist in the test publishing company bear the professional responsibility for providing test takers and test users with reliable and valid tests. They should provide procedures for

questioning the accuracy of the scoring key for individual items while making "... every effort to maintain the security of tests" (Ethical Principle 8).

D. Educative Ramifications

Psychologists employed by test publishers need to be alert to ways of upgrading the delivery of psychological services. They should seek to change company policies which might impair the quality of the products affecting the welfare of test takers. In addition, persons encountering such unethical behavior by psychologists should be encouraged to file formal ethical complaints when a resolution of the situation cannot be achieved through direct contact.

4. Personnel Screening for Emotional Stability

A. Statement of the Problem

An I/O psychologist employed by a state civil service agency received a request from the state correctional agency to develop a psychological screening procedure for use as part of the process of selecting correctional officers. The assessment procedures were to be used to weed out persons emotionally unfit for this high stress, emotionally demanding job. The I/O psychologist began work on the assignment by consulting a review of the research literature on personality assessment in employment settings (including correctional jobs) and by reading test reviews. The psychologist discussed the proposed screening program with more than ten psychologists located throughout the country. These psychologists were knowledgeable about the appropriate assessment of personnel in high-risk jobs such as correctional officers, police officers, and nuclear power plant operators.

The I/O psychologist then conducted a job analysis; in this process a dozen job-related, personal characteristics of correctional officers were identified and defined. Potential rejection indicators and possible job difficulties were also described.

The objective of the psychological assessment procedures was to screen out persons who were likely to be unstable, dangerous, or violent. Two objective personality measures, for which an extensive research history existed, were selected for use in the assessment process. In addition, evidence from background investigations and oral examinations was included among the selection components.

The I/O psychologist decided to work with clinical psychologists familiar with correctional officer jobs in order to interpret the evidence properly. The I/O psychologist established the policy that no applicant was to be screened out solely on the basis of scores on personality measures. The clinical psychologist played a key role in reviewing the evidence of desirable and undesirable applicant behaviors and in determining the need to conduct additional assessments before recommending the elimination of an applicant from the selection process. Before the screening process began, the I/O psychologist trained the clinical psychologists in the overall screening process and reviewed the results of the job analyses which led to the development of the rejection criteria.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 2 (Competence). Psychologists recognize the boundaries of their competence and the limitations of their techniques. They only provide services and only use techniques for which they are qualified by training and experience.

Psychologists responsible for decisions involving individuals or policies based on test results have an understanding of psychological or educational measurement, validation problems, and test research. (2-e)

Principle 8 (Assessment Techniques). Psychologists do not encourage or promote the use of psychological assessment techniques by inappropriately trained or otherwise unqualified persons through teaching, sponsorship, or supervision. (8-f)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This is an example of good, rather than bad, ethical practice. As demonstrated in this case, I/O psychologists in work organizations need to meet the objectives of their employers while maintaining the highest standards of the profession. They are aware of the boundaries of their competence and seek the aid of trained professionals competent in the delivery of clinical assessment services where appropriate.

I/O psychologists involved in personnel selection conduct job analyses and use the resulting information to formulate appropriate goals for psychological testing. They make sure that psychological test scores are used as only one of several types of evidence of the psychological characteristics of applicants when measurement of sensitive personality characteristics (such as emotional stability) are involved. One additional step the psychologist in this case could have taken was to plan follow-up research to assess the predictive validity of the screening procedures over time.

D. Educative Ramifications

I/O and clinical psychologists involved in personality assessment in employment settings need to obtain appropriate training and supervised experience required by the type of psychological services they deliver. Psychologists should deliver only those services which are within the boundaries of their competence. While I/O psychologists are typically well trained in job analysis and test validation procedures, few receive training in the individual assessment of personality deviations. Similarly, clinicians are seldom trained in the techniques of industrial/organizational applications. Psychologists obtain the services of other psychologists or professionals when projects require expertise beyond their competencies.

10. Misuse of Psychological Services

A. Statement of the Problem

A company had been experiencing severe union-management conflict. After a strike, management agreed to take steps to reduce the conflict. According to the agreement, one of these steps was to hire a third party to listen to the union grievances and recommend appropriate action by management. A psychologist was approached by the company executives to meet with the union. After talking with the executives, it became clear to the psychologist that the executives had no real commitment to addressing the identified problems. Rather, they seemed primarily interested in forestalling further strikes until new contract negotiations began, at which time they planned to announce the move of company facilities to a new state. The psychologist refused to take the assignment.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). In providing services, psychologists ... accept responsibility for the consequences of their acts and make every effort to ensure that their services are used appropriately.

Principle 6 (Welfare of the Consumer). Psychologists respect the integrity and protect the welfare of the people and groups with whom they work. When conflicts of interest arise between

clients and psychologists employing institutions, psychologists clarify the nature and direction of their loyalties and responsibilities and keep all parties informed of their commitments.

Where the demands of an organization require psychologists to violate these Ethical Principles, psychologists clarify the nature of the conflict between the demands and these principles. They inform all parties of psychologists' ethical responsibilities and take appropriate action. (Principle 6-c)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case involves a conflict between the apparent welfare of two different consumers. The company executives are the primary consumers in this case, since it is the company that would contract for the psychologist's services. However, the psychologist must also view the union members as consumers, since they would be directly affected by the psychological services provided.

The company in this case was attempting to use the psychologist's services in a way that was intended to be deceptive, and that could have compromised the ethical principles of the psychologist and the reputation both of the psychologist and of the profession of psychology. In this case, the psychologist was able to clarify the nature of the conflict between the organization's demands and the ethical principles of the psychological profession. The psychologist took appropriate action by refusing the assignment. However, it would have been equally appropriate to attempt to induce management to change its behavior toward the union.

D. Educative Ramifications

Psychologists have a responsibility to clarify with contracting organizations areas of potential ethical conflict. One clear area of concern is how the results of a psychological intervention or a set of research findings will be used. Even if the psychologist will not be directly involved in the implementation of an intervention or application of the results of a research study, there is still the obligation to assess carefully the potential for damage to relevant groups and persons in the organization before agreeing to undertake an assignment. If this is not possible, the psychologist should continually assess how the information provided is being used.

11. Misleading Reporting of Results

A. Statement of the Problem

An I/O psychologist working for a psychological consulting firm had prepared a number of test validation reports for clients. These validation reports were submitted to an examining board when the psychologist wished to become credentialed as an American Board of Professional Psychology (ABPP) Diplomate.

In the validity reports prepared by the psychologist there were typically large discrepancies between the technical reports, which averaged about 200 pages in length, and the executive summaries, which ranged from two to three pages. For example, in one case the executive summary suggested that 85 job incumbents were involved in the research sample. However, the actual statistical analyses described in the technical report were based on only 26 job incumbents. The plan had been to test 85. Additionally, the summary referred to the "high degree of validity" that was obtained; in fact, the validity coefficient cited in the larger report was only .11. ABPP rejected the candidacy.

B. Applicable Policies

While numerous principles, standards, and guidelines apply, the following represent the key issues in the case:

Principle 1 (Responsibility). As scientists, psychologists accept responsibility for... the methods used in investigation, analysis, and reporting. They plan their research in ways to minimize the possibility that their findings will be misleading. (1-a)

Principle 8 (Assessment Techniques). In the development, publication, and utilization of psychological assessment techniques, psychologists make every effort to promote the welfare and best interests of the client. They guard against the misuse of assessment results.

Additional relevant guidelines are provided by the *Specialty Guidelines for the Delivery of Services by Industrial/Organizational Psychologists* (American Psychological Association, Committee on Professional Standards [APA-COPS], 1981b) (Guideline 2.2), and by the Society for Industrial/Organizational Psychology's *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures* (Second Edition) (APA/I/O, 1980) which require full disclosure and prohibit misrepresentation of data.

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

Clearly the best interests of the client are not served by the preparation of report summaries which misrepresent the soundness of the test validation research supporting an assessment procedure. Such misrepresentations contribute to the misuse of the results and interpretations of the assessments, thus violating Principles 1 and 8 of the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists*. By claiming a high degree of validity when there was no validity evidence at all and by reporting planned as opposed to actual sample size in the summaries, the psychologist made fraudulent and misleading statements in violation of APA's *Ethical Principles* (e.g., the Preamble to the *Ethical Principles*). The summary was misleading in that it did not provide the full context of relevant facts with explanations for the sample size reduction. The psychologist is accountable under Principle 1 for the reporting methods used.

Not only did the research summaries violate the *Ethical Principles* by misleading and incomplete statements, they also violated Principle 8 by not acknowledging the limits and uncertainties of the particular research evidence in this case. Reservations regarding the validity and reliability of the assessment procedure were not acknowledged when, in fact, there were many.

The psychologist should also have been familiar with the requirements of the other APA documents cited above. Among other provisions, these standards require that samples employed in validity studies be described sufficiently for the reader to judge their pertinence to the client's situation. The requirement was not met. Furthermore, the requirements of Division 14's test validation *Principles* that (a) reports not be misleading, (b) research findings which might qualify the conclusions be reported, and (c) the impression not be given that an assessment program is more useful than it really is, were all ignored by the psychologist.

In this case, the executive summary should have reported the actual sample size as opposed to the planned research sample and explained that with a sample of that size, the results of the research are highly questionable.

D. Educative Ramifications

Whether by design or through negligence, inaccurate reporting of research findings can mislead those who, in good faith, make use of the results of test validation procedures. Since inappropriate use of assessment techniques can have severe

consequences in altering the lives of test taker, psychologists must use care in assuring that their validation studies are accurately represented.

Executive summaries should accurately represent and communicate the nature of the validity evidence. This is especially important in reports directed to a managerial audience, since they are often key decision-makers and may not have staff psychologists available to interpret the results.

Psychologists must also have adequate knowledge of educational and psychological measurement principles to interpret their research findings correctly in light of the actual circumstances of their studies.

12. Accurately Reporting Research Results

A. Statement of the Problem

An I/O psychologist was hired by a company to study predictors of absenteeism. The psychologist reviewed the literature, identified a large number of potentially relevant variables and prepared a study which required employees to complete a lengthy questionnaire. When the data were in, the psychologist conducted complex multivariate analyses which yielded only a small correlation with absenteeism. The psychologist felt that if all the results were reported, the inability to say anything conclusive would have been embarrassing. In the report, none of the correlations of the survey variables with absenteeism were reported. Instead, the psychologist organized the report around anecdotes from interviews with selected employees.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). In publishing reports of their work, [psychologists] never suppress disconfirming data, and they acknowledge the existence of alternative hypotheses and explanations of their findings. (1-a)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

The psychologist highlighted a small portion of the data which made the study seem worthwhile. Psychologists should make reasonable efforts to present all available data concerning a study in an objective manner, which did not take place in this case.

D. Educative Ramifications

Students in training should be taught that research does not always turn out as intended. The goal should be to design sound research which tests hypotheses or procedures adequately. Honest reporting of the results is mandatory, and the psychologist should certainly avoid creating a false impression (e.g., the idea that the results are important when in fact they are not, or when they reflect only selected parts of the overall findings).

13. Misrepresentation of Results in Test Validation

A. Statement of the Problem

A graduate student in psychology worked for a small consulting company which employed three Ph.D.-level psychologists. The graduate student was asked to calculate statistics for a predictive validity study of custom-designed written tests for which the

client had paid a considerable fee. The correlations between eight tests and job performance criteria were not statistically significant, despite the large sample size.

The graduate student's supervisor, a member of the American Psychological Association, decided to support the validity by reporting validity generalization data for the jobs in question, using other tests. The supervising psychologist reported the validity generalization findings to the client without specifying that actual correlations for the custom-designed test, the highest of which were .07, were neither practically nor statistically significant.

Before reporting to the client, the supervisory psychologist took the graduate student's validity report which contained the predictive validity evidence and secretly prepared another report for the client which cited only the validity generalization results.

B. Applicable Policies

This case deals with misrepresentation in reporting research results from a test validation study. Ethical principles 1 and 8 apply.

Principle 1 (Responsibility). As scientists, psychologists ... minimize the possibility that their findings will be misleading. They provide thorough discussion of the limitations of their data ... In publishing reports of their work, they never suppress disconfirming data ... (1-a)

Principle 8. (Assessment Techniques). In the development, publication, and utilization of psychological assessment techniques, psychologists make every effort to promote the welfare and best interests of the client.

Psychologists responsible for the development and standardization of psychological tests and other assessment techniques utilize established scientific procedures and observe the relevant APA standards. (8-b)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case contains an ethics violation not primarily because of the nature of the validity evidence that was ultimately used, but rather because of the misrepresentation of that evidence. The psychologist might have used a "validity generalization" strategy appropriately at the outset, though it would have been necessary in that case to ensure that the tests selected or constructed were valid measures of the relevant constructs. However, changing strategies in the face of disconfirming evidence in order to make the results appear more appealing to the sponsor is highly inappropriate. The deliberate misrepresentation of findings from a study when those results do not support the desired outcome is obviously contrary to the ethical principles of psychologists. Moreover, psychologists have an obligation to serve as role models to the students with whom they work. When supervising or working with aspiring members of the profession, they have special obligations to assure that their behavior is consistent with the ethical principles of psychologists.

D. Educative Ramifications

I/O psychologists who develop custom-designed tests for clients describe the results of their validity studies to their clients accurately, regardless of whether or not the results support the validity of the test. Predictive validity data collected during the validation process should be disclosed to the client, even if validity generalization data are also presented. To do otherwise would involve the suppression of evidence and would disregard the client's right to know the results of the validity study for which payment was made.

14. Disposition of Psychological Reports

A. Statement of the Problem

Upon completion of a comprehensive study, an I/O psychologist prepared a report containing confidential and sensitive information (including psychological profiles of key executives) in duplicate, giving one copy to the chief executive officer (CEO) of the client corporation for the executive's personal information and use and retaining the second copy for the psychologist's files. Although the report was marked "confidential", the psychologist did not discuss the storage or disposition of the report with the executive receiving it.

Several years later, after the company had been acquired by another firm, the psychologist was approached by the CEO of the acquiring firm with whom consultation was being provided on another matter. The CEO complimented the psychologist on the earlier report. The psychologist's own copy of the report had been retained in a locked file so the psychologist could not imagine how the new CEO had obtained knowledge of the report. Subsequently, the psychologist discovered that the former CEO, upon leaving the firm, had left the report in an unlocked file. The new CEO subsequently shared the report with other staff members.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 5 (Confidentiality). Psychologists have a primary obligation to respect the confidentiality of information obtained from persons in the course of their work as psychologists. They reveal such information to others only with the consent of the person or the person's legal representative, except in those unusual circumstances in which not to do so would result in clear danger to the person or to others. Where appropriate, psychologists inform their clients of the legal limits of confidentiality.

Psychologists make provisions for maintaining confidentiality in the storage and disposal of records (5-c)

C. Interpretations of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case is a good example of the problems faced by consulting psychologists in maintaining confidentiality in their work as consultants to organizations. The I/O psychologist involved in this case did provide the results of the study to an appropriate person and did maintain confidentiality of the file copy of the report. However, the psychologist neglected to formalize with the former CEO the manner in which such information should be stored or disposed of.

The case also illustrates that psychologists in consulting roles are likely to be in their positions on a more or less temporary basis and must therefore try to anticipate some of the things that can happen to confidential or sensitive information after their departure. Consequently, the psychologist should be very attentive to the possible misuse of reports by subsequent company officials and write reports in ways that will bring no avoidable harm to the subjects of the reports. When obtaining confidential information, the psychologist should have made it clear to the executives that a report about them would be prepared for the CEO.

Although the psychologist might have been more explicit about the disposition of the report, it should be recognized that once a report has been released to the CEO, it is outside of the psychologist's control. The content of the report should be written with this in mind.

D. Educative Ramifications

When releasing confidential information, particularly sensitive information that may be misused, it is in the best interests of all concerned to clarify what will happen to the

information after it has been reviewed by the contracting company representatives. This can be done most effectively by written communication. A statement as to the sensitive nature of the material could be included on the cover page of such a report, accompanied by specific provisions for storage or disposal of the information.

The psychologist is somewhat protected from future problems by the preparation of accurate reports which clearly separate speculation from factual findings and which specify the circumstances under which the report was prepared. Nevertheless, there are multiple opportunities for misusing psychological data (particularly concerning individual employees) in organizational contexts by laypersons, so the usual expectations of protection of confidentiality by the recipient of a report cannot automatically be assumed.

Even when psychological consultants function with the organization as the intended client, they must still respect the rights of the individuals who may subsequently be damaged by the information included in a psychological report. Moreover, if psychologists gather information from many parts of an organization but their reports will be provided only to a CEO, the participants might well be informed of this prior to their involvement with the psychologist. Finally, psychologists preparing confidential reports for high company officials need to anticipate that such individuals will not be in the organization forever and may therefore want to make explicit provisions for the disposition of their reports.

Training Requirements in I/O Psychology

A. Statement of the Problem

A professor in an industrial-organizational psychology program at a major university was visited by a graduate student from the experimental psychology program. The graduate student was in the final stages of a dissertation that involved learning experiments with hyperphagic rats. The graduate student was appropriately pessimistic about the job market in academia and generally dissatisfied with the career opportunities in academic psychology. The student therefore requested the names of people in industry who might provide consulting opportunities, expressing particular interest in developing training programs in stress management and interpersonal communication skills, as well as possibly doing work in testing and test development.

Rather than supplying the student with contacts, the professor pointed out the ethical implications of what the student intended to do and informed the student that psychologists must receive adequate training in the area for which they intend to practice. The professor recommended that the student apply for postdoctoral training or some similar advanced training experience in one of several I/O programs around the country. Since their university did not have such a retraining program, the I/O psychologist offered to make inquiries of several I/O colleagues regarding the possibilities of post-doctoral training at their institutions.

B. Applicable Policies

Relevant principles include:

Principle 2 (Competence). They [psychologists] only provide services and only use techniques for which they are qualified by training and experience.

Principle 7 (Professional Relationships). When psychologists know of an ethical violation by another psychologist, and it seems appropriate, they informally attempt to resolve the issue by

bringing the behavior to the attention of the psychologist. . . . If the violation does not seem amenable to an informal solution, or is of a more serious nature, psychologists bring it to the attention of the appropriate local, state, and/or national committee on professional ethics and conduct. (7-g)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case deals with the responsibility of psychologists to point out ethical violations by colleagues, and the responsibility each psychologist has to receive competent training in the areas in which practice is contemplated.

Principle 7 applies in this case even though the graduate student was not yet a professional psychologist and even though an ethical standard had not actually been violated. The fact that the student was considering a course of action that was unethical was sufficient to bring attention to the matter. The faculty member thus acted appropriately in two ways: first, by pointing out the ethical problems involved in attempting to practice personnel psychology when all the student's training and experience was in another area of psychology; secondly, by offering to help the student locate suitable training opportunities. This action was in keeping with the spirit of maintaining helpful professional relationships implied by Principle 7. Further, this action was consistent with the faculty member's responsibility as a teacher and advisor in a Ph.D. program.

D. Educative Ramifications

I/O psychology training programs should make clear to their students the limits of professional competence and advise students wishing to change or supplement specialties of the appropriate methods for doing so. Psychologists should be aware of the fact that psychologists trained in other areas may appropriately desire experience or training in I/O psychology. Faculty members in I/O programs should consider developing programs that might facilitate the acquisition of I/O competence by psychologists trained in other specialties. Academic psychologists should also be aware of appropriate educational and training opportunities around the country.

Ethical principles should be taught and emphasized by faculty members in all psychology Ph.D. programs (including non-applied areas) so that students are aware of the standards and responsibilities that psychologists must maintain.

Practice of I/O Psychology By a Clinical Psychologist

A. Statement of the Problem

A clinical psychologist offered services to an industrial firm and subsequently was hired as a consultant. The psychologist's responsibilities agreed upon with the firm included such activities as job redesign, development and implementation of compensation systems and incentive programs, and organization development techniques and procedures. The clinical psychologist had no prior training or experience in industrial/organizational psychology or in any of the activities to be performed.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 2 (Competence). Psychologists recognize the boundaries of their competence and

the limitations of their techniques. They only provide services and only use techniques for which they are qualified by training and experience.

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions posed by the Case

In this case the clinical psychologist assumed responsibilities for which prior training and experience had not been obtained and thus behaved unethically. The potential negative consequences of malpractice to a organization can be serious; the issues are analogous to those incurred if an industrial/organizational psychologist who had no clinical training began to see individual therapy patients. The fact that organizations may not have the competence to assess whether psychologists are trained in those specific areas of need does not remove psychologists' ethical obligations to seek and accept only positions or assignments for which they are qualified.

D. Educative Ramifications

I/O psychology techniques and organization development methods should be applied only by those individuals who have received appropriate training in such areas. In the absence of a degree in I/O psychology, such training may include formal coursework, continuing education, and/or supervised experience. In the event that such training has not been obtained, the psychologist should refrain from offering services in those areas unless supervised by an appropriately trained professional.

On the other hand, when clinical psychologists are hired by organizations to perform exclusively activities that utilize their clinical training, the situation is different. For example, a clinical psychologist's formal training may include coursework and experience in program design and evaluation. To the extent that these are generic skills, the psychologist should be able to perform similar duties without ethical violations. Such psychologists need to restrict their duties exclusively to the areas of competency, and to make known that their qualifications are as clinical, not industrial/organizational, psychologists.

Finally, in the case of innovative or emerging areas for which appropriate supervisors and/or knowledge are not yet available, psychologists need to proceed cautiously, with due regard for the needs and rights of clients. In such instances, appropriate assistance might be obtained from persons with related, if not exactly identical, experience.

Career Switching

A. Statement of the Problem

A graduate student who was ABD (all but dissertation) in school psychology surveyed the job market in school psychology and was disappointed with the career prospects. Starting salaries were reasonable but they were unlikely to increase much and there were few opportunities for advancement. Also, the student was tired of working with children and felt that the same problems had to be addressed over and over again. The student was beginning to doubt that school psychology had been a good career choice.

In discussing this with a family member who was an executive for a large company, the idea occurred that many of the student's skills would be applicable to a business setting. The salaries in industry were much higher and the student would be able to branch out into other areas as opportunities arose. The student went to the library to investigate what psychologists do in industry, and came across the *Handbook of*

Industrial and Organizational Psychology. A perusal of this book led the student to believe that several of the key activities discussed in the book, including assessment, selection, and training were within the school psychologist's proficiencies, but at the same time some experience in the business world would be helpful before entering the job market.

From the APA Directory, the student located an I/O psychologist who worked for a nearby company. Coincidentally, the psychologist was looking for someone to conduct interviews with managers about their attitudes toward the company and their jobs. The student was hired and did this work for about a year, part-time. During the same period, the student's dissertation research, the construct validation of a personality instrument for elementary school students, was completed.

In preparing a resume, the student emphasized the social science skills, such as multivariate statistics, evaluation research methods, assessment, and interviewing, without highlighting the setting—except for the work with the company. The student had several job interviews with organizations looking for an I/O psychologist, but they inevitably concluded that the student did not have sufficient experience or knowledge in the area. The student's attitude was that the Ph.D. in I/O psychology was essentially a union card and that the trained school psychologist could do whatever an I/O psychologist did. The student felt that it did not matter whether licensure or credentialing as an I/O psychologist was possible since the employment would involve working for a single company and the student had no plans to sell services directly to the public.

Three months after graduation, the student landed a job evaluating non-management employees for promotion to management. The job seemed ideal since it involved the use of assessment skills. Also, the former student would have considerable freedom because the job did not involve working for a psychologist. In fact, the former student would be the only psychologist in the company.

B. **Applicable Policies** The following principles apply:

Principle 2 (Competence). Psychologists recognize the boundaries of their competence and the limitations of their techniques. They only provide services and only use techniques for which they are qualified by training and experience.

Psychologists accurately represent their competence, education, training, and experience. (2-a)

I/O Specialty Guideline (APA-I/O, 1981) 1.3 (Providers). Professional psychologists who wish to change their specialty to I/O areas meet the same requirements with respect to subject matter and professional skills that apply to doctoral training in the new specialty. (1.3)

C. **Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case.**

This case involves a student seeking work in an area in which sufficient qualifications were lacking. After obtaining a degree in school psychology the student took a job working as an I/O psychologist. The organization which hired the student may not have been aware of the background a psychologist should have to do the work they required. Though not yet a member of APA, the student is still obligated to abide by the same ethical principles that guide the behavior of APA members. If the student wished to be an I/O psychologist, training in that area should have been pursued. The student's major professor, or the psychologist with whom the student worked in industry as a graduate student, should have provided guidance, assuming they were aware of the student's ambitions.

This is not merely a case of a school psychologist taking a potential job opportunity

from an I/O psychologist. There is considerable knowledge and skill associated with I/O psychology that does not overlap with school psychology. Also, the careers of numerous employees in the organization are affected by a psychologist's evaluations and decisions. This would not be an issue if the student did not wish to do I/O psychology work but still wanted a career in business (e.g., as a management trainee).

It should also be noted that a degree in I/O psychology, or its equivalent, is not per se required to perform I/O activities. The issue is whether the specific activities to be performed were ones in which the psychologist was competent. Since the psychologist had no training in the area, and since the employment was by an organization in which ongoing supervision by a relevant psychologist would not be available, it is likely that the individual was practicing outside of the areas of competence.

D. **Educative Ramifications**

Psychologists have an obligation to recognize the boundaries of their competencies. Students should be aware of the limits of their training and the boundaries of their specialty. This also applies to practicing psychologists who wish to work in other specialties.

Licensing and Credentialing

A. **Statement of the Problem**

An I/O psychologist started a consulting practice in a state requiring all psychologists to be licensed prior to providing any psychological services to the public for a fee. The psychologist was not licensed in any state. The psychologist's practice involved the administration of standardized group tests and interviewing for the purpose of personnel screening. The practice excluded personality testing and health service activities.

Upon applying for licensure, the psychologist was told that to be eligible to take the licensure examination, it was necessary to have worked under the supervision of a licensed psychologist for a period of two years after receipt of the doctoral degree. As the psychologist previously had been employed by a state agency as a personal psychologist reporting to the Director of Personnel (who was not a psychologist), it was not possible to meet the state's requirement without additional preparation and the psychologist was not permitted to apply for the state license. The psychologist decided to ignore the state requirement for licensure and to continue practicing using the label of "psychologist", which was controlled by law in the state.

B. **Applicable Policies**

Principle 3 (Moral and Legal Standards). As practitioners and researchers, psychologists act in accord with Association standards and guidelines related to practice and to the conduct of research. . . . In the ordinary course of events, psychologists adhere to relevant governmental laws and institutional regulations. (3-d)

The Specialty Guidelines for the Delivery of Services by Industrial/Organizational Psychologists (APA-COPs, 1981b) state:

Guideline 2 (Professional Considerations). All providers within an I/O psychological service unit are familiar with relevant statutes, regulations, and legal precedents established by federal, state, and local governmental groups.

Although I/O psychologists may be required by law to be licensed or certified, most I/O psychological services can be provided by persons who are not licensed or certified. (2.3)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

Principle 3-d of the APA Ethical Principles requires that psychologists act in accordance with APA standards such as the *Specialty Guidelines for the Delivery of Services by Industrial/Organizational Psychologists*. Those guidelines require all providers of psychological services to be familiar with relevant statutes, regulations, and legal precedents but also acknowledge that licensure may be unnecessary for many I/O activities.

Thus, by continuing the consulting practice, the I/O psychologist in this case was in the position of being in compliance with some aspects of APA policy, but not with state legislation. While the I/O *Specialty Guidelines* acknowledge that many I/O activities can be performed by persons who are not psychologists and that licensure may be unnecessary for many I/O activities, the psychologist in this case was technically in ethical violation. Although the I/O *Specialty Guidelines* might provide some protection were an ethics charge to be filed, the psychologist could still be in legal liability in the state where the unlicensed practice was occurring.

D. Educative Ramifications

Psychologists are expected to comply with state licensure requirements unless those laws are changed to exempt I/O psychologists from licensure. Options available to I/O psychologists unable to meet the requirements for licensure include: (1) arranging for the required supervision and re-applying for licensure at a later date; (2) using a title other than "psychologist" (such as "personnel consultant"); (3) attempting to change the state requirement for extensive post-doctoral supervision by a licensed psychologist prior to taking the licensing exam; and (4) practicing in a different state with alternative licensure requirements.

Even if exempted from licensure laws, I/O psychologists have the ethical obligation to practice competently and within the restrictions of their areas of expertise.

"Realistic Job Reviews" and the Selection of Female Employees

A. Statement of the Problem

A psychologist employed by a consulting firm was retained by a company to design a selection procedure for a job that had traditionally been filled by males. The manager for the company stated that it would be best for all concerned if the selection procedure included a "realistic preview" emphasizing how difficult the job was for females. According to the manager, the few females placed on the job so far had not worked out, because of the difficult physical nature of the job and the unpleasant working conditions.

The psychologist agreed to the project and made a videotape to be shown as an early step in the selection process. The film exaggerated features of the job likely to alienate female applicants. For example, it showed only one woman's restroom, located far from where the work was to be performed. Interviews were shown with two females who had tried and quit the job after one day, while those women who were still on the job were excluded from the film. The film also showed men performing manual labor which appeared to require high levels of upper body strength, yet no mention was made that these activities were only done once or twice a year and mechanical aids were available. The videotape had the "desired" result in that few women applicants who viewed the film accepted a job offer.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 3 (Moral and Legal Standards). As employees or employers, psychologists do not engage in or condone practices that are inhumane or that result in illegal or unjustifiable actions. Such practices include, but are not limited to, those based on considerations of race, handicap, age, gender, sexual preference, religion, or national origin in hiring, promotion, or training (3-b) In their professional roles, psychologists avoid any action that will violate or diminish the legal and civil rights of clients or of others who may be affected by their actions. (3-c)

Principle 6 (Welfare of the Consumer). Psychologists respect the integrity and protect the welfare of the people and groups with whom they work. When conflicts of interest arise between clients and psychologists employing institutions, psychologists clarify the nature and direction of their loyalties and responsibilities and keep all parties informed of their commitments.

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

The presentation of material describing negative features of a job is not objectionable as long as the material is not directed adversely or preferentially toward a particular group. In the present case, the job preview was intended to keep women from applying for, or accepting an offer for, the job. It portrayed the job unrealistically and was slanted toward isolated aspects of the job likely to be offensive to female applicants. The film contributed to few women accepting job offers.

In addition, there is a moral/legal issue involved in this case since the potential net result of the procedure was to cause adverse impact by increasing the number of women who voluntarily declined job offers. If the preview had portrayed physically demanding work realistically, the results, though possibly the same, might have been interpreted in a different light. The fact that the preview specifically targeted females meant that the preview and the selection procedure were no longer face-neutral.

D. Educative Ramifications

In considering whether an assessment procedure used for selection is in violation of APA's ethical principles, the psychologist should weigh all the components of the employment process. Psychologists should try to be sensitive to how the various components of a selection/assessment procedure might affect individual applicants and specific groups of applicants. When a psychologist is asked to target a particular group as part of a selection process, it should be determined by the psychologist whether the targeting is in violation of ethical principles.

Marketing Psychological Products

A. Statement of the Problem

A faculty member of an industrial/organizational psychology program and two doctoral level graduate students developed a supervisory training program to be used as an exercise in an undergraduate class. The program was to demonstrate the application of behavior modification principles in industry and to illustrate that some problems that business managers encounter can be helped by a knowledge of psychology.

One of the students in the course brought the training program to the attention of a relative, an economist by training, who was now a successful management consultant. The relative approached the psychologist about the possibility of marketing the program. The psychologist decided there was nothing to lose by signing a contract

giving the consultant exclusive rights to the program for a standard royalty. The psychologist would be allowed to continue using the program in classes and intended to do so. The psychologist felt that the program was not only a good teaching tool, but also a way of researching issues associated with supervisory practices.

The psychologist planned to conduct research with students, to write an article based on such research, and to use the data to demonstrate the value of the program. The relative proceeded to market the program as "an effective tool for changing organizations", despite the fact that its effectiveness had never been evaluated.

B. **Applicable Policies**

The following ethical principles are relevant:

Principle 1 (Responsibility). [Psychologists] ... make every effort to ensure that their services are used appropriately.

Principle 2 (Competence). Psychologists recognize ... the limitations of their techniques.

Principle 4 (Public Statements). ... psychologists base their statements on scientifically acceptable psychological findings and techniques with full recognition of the limits and uncertainties of such evidence.

Psychologists present the science of psychology and offer their services, products, and publications fairly and accurately, avoiding misrepresentation through sensationalism, exaggeration, or superficiality. Psychologists are guided by the primary obligation to aid the public in developing informed judgments, opinions, and choices. (4-g)

Several specialty guidelines (APA-COPS, 1981b) also are relevant:

Guideline 2 (Professional Considerations). Providers of I/O psychological services state explicitly what can and cannot reasonably be expected from the services. (2-4)

Guideline 3 (Accountability). [Psychologists have] ... the right and responsibility ... to withhold a procedure when it is not validly applicable ... (3-1)

There are periodic, systematic, and effective evaluations of psychological services. (3-2)

C. **Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case**

Many issues may involved here. Some are obviously present; others may or may not arise depending on how the program is used. The case concerns the psychologist's professional responsibilities in developing adequate materials and in controlling how they are used, and the psychologist's obligations to students as colleagues and research subjects.

The following questions arise:

1. Should the psychologist sell a training program such as this one given that it was devised as a classroom teaching tool and its effectiveness as a supervisory training aid is unknown?
2. Should the psychologist have involved the graduate students in the contract, e.g., to obtain their consent, or to share in the royalties?
3. What is the psychologist's responsibility for how the program is used by others who sell and implement the program?
4. Is the psychologist responsible for how the program is promoted, i.e., what claims are made for its effectiveness?
5. What are the ethical limitations on the use of one's own students as research subjects?

6. How should the psychologist deal with the limitations of the research, e.g., the program's generalizability beyond the classroom?

The psychologist should try to assure that a service or product developed by the psychologist is used appropriately. Since the technique in this case was not evaluated, the psychologist is limited in making claims for its effectiveness. This should be made clear to the consultant who wished to purchase the rights to the program.

The psychologist should encourage the consultant to evaluate the program before marketing it and to continue monitoring its effectiveness after its implementation. The psychologist should also be careful to specify in the contract how the program is to be used and advertised. The psychologist should be sure that the program is not misrepresented to prospective clients and that the psychologist's professional reputation is not used as the sole or principal claim for the program's effectiveness.

Regarding the graduate students' potential claim to rights in the program, the psychologist may argue that developing the program contributed to their professional development and this was the reason for their involvement. They may also have received reimbursement as assistants. The faculty member might claim ownership of the idea for the program and sole responsibility for supervising the program's development, so the students would have no right to benefit financially from the program.

The ethical principles do not deal directly with the issue of sharing financial rewards, but they do address credit for authorship. One ethical solution would be to have the students benefit in proportion to their agreed upon contribution. Another would be to give them a one-time "buy-out" payment. In any case, students' rights should be clarified in advance of any work.

If the psychologist conducts the intended research with classes, the data's potential limitations (e.g., degree of generalizability to work settings) should be considered and note should be made of this in any publications or reports. Students used as research subjects should be informed that the data will be used for research purposes and that the program is not intended to be used for selection purposes or their performance in the exercise used to determine their course grade. The degree of confidentiality to be maintained should be made clear to them. The results should not be revealed to others (e.g., prospective employers) as evidence of the students' managerial potential. The students should also have the right to withdraw from the study without its adversely affecting their grades in the course. (The psychologist could offer an alternative project to those who do not wish to participate.) The degree to which this issue is important in the case would depend partly on the potential harm, if any, to the subjects.

D. **Educative Ramifications**

Psychologist must guard against misrepresentation of their products by themselves and others. They must avoid taking advantage of students (whether they are in the role of subjects or colleagues). Psychologists should recognize the contribution of graduate students just as they should recognize the contribution of other colleagues. Psychologists should attempt to consider the various ways their products might be used as a guard against their misuse. This is especially important when a psychologist sells a product to a non-psychologist, who may not be bound by the same ethical principles. The psychologist's control may be diminished unless contractual agreements are made at the outset.

Advertising and Public Statements

A. Statement of the Problem

An APA member received a copy of a brochure offering a workshop on selection testing. The brochure included a statement guaranteeing positive results from attending the workshop. The APA member wrote to the I/O psychologist conducting the workshop reminding the psychologist that such a statement was a breach of ethical principles and gave a full explanation of the rationale. The I/O psychologist responded to the letter by saying that the guarantee was a business necessity in the competitive market in which the psychologist practiced.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 4 (Public Statements). [Public statements] do not contain... (iv) a statement intended or likely to create false or unjustified expectations of favorable results;... [or] (vi) a statement intended or likely to appeal to a client's fears, anxieties, or emotions concerning the possible results of failure to obtain the offered services... (4b)

Psychologists present the science of psychology and offer their services, products, and publications fairly and accurately, avoiding misrepresentation through sensationalism, exaggeration, or superficiality. Psychologists are guided by the primary obligation to aid the public in developing informed judgments, opinions, and choices. (4g)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case concerns the responsibility of a psychologist when making public statements, announcements of services, and advertising and promoting activities, to do so in a manner which helps the public make informed judgments and choices. The breach of the ethical guidelines occurred in offering a guarantee of benefit. Such a statement implies some degree of sensationalism and superficiality which could create false or unjustified expectations in those receiving the brochure. Further, such a statement may serve to limit the recipients' judgments and choices about attending the advertised workshop.

A second concern is the necessity of the complaining psychologist to have taken further action when it became clear that the offending psychologist was not taking appropriate action. Referral to a state ethics board or to APA's Ethics Committee would have been appropriate.

D. Educative Ramifications

This case highlights an issue faced by many consulting I/O psychologists. Services must be sold to the business world. Marketing techniques that are acceptable in business may well include such "gimmicks" as this guarantee. On the other hand, psychologists must adhere to professional rather than commercial standards in making known the availability of their professional services. In this way, psychologists protect the basic rights of those whom they serve. Competitive pressures in the practice of I/O psychology do not remove the responsibility of psychologists to adhere to APA standards.

Psychologists who believe that the rules concerning advertising and public announcements are unduly restrictive might appropriately bring their difficulties to the attention of relevant APA governance bodies and attempt to change or clarify existing ethical standards. Unless such changes are implemented, however, I/O psychologists have the ethical obligation to comply with existing APA standards.

Publicity and Advertising

A. Statement of the Problem

An I/O psychologist agreed to conduct one session in a multi-session training program for executives sponsored by a consulting firm. In accordance with the firm's request, the psychologist provided a copy of a resume and a photograph for promotional purposes. Subsequently, the psychologist received a letter and a copy of the firm's promotional brochure from APA's Committee on Scientific and Professional Ethical Conduct (CSPEC) indicating that the brochure published by the consulting firm violated ethical guidelines. The brochure described the psychologist in exaggerated and sensationalistic terms (e.g., "organizational miracle worker") and made unsubstantiated claims about the effectiveness of the program. The psychologist obtained a letter from the president of the firm stating that the brochure had been prepared without the psychologist's knowledge or approval and that the seminar had subsequently been cancelled due to poor enrollment.

Upon receipt of the letter, CSPEC chose not to pursue the matter further but did advise that psychologists are professionally responsible for any advertisements or promotional materials relating to themselves or their activities.

B. Applicable Policies

This case relates to the accurate and objective representation of a psychologist's qualifications, affiliations, and functions through public statements, announcements, and promotional activities. These principles apply:

Principle 4 (Public Statements). [Public statements] do not contain (i) a false, fraudulent, misleading, deceptive, or unfair statement; (ii) a misrepresentation of fact or a statement likely to mislead or deceive because in context it makes only a partial disclosure of relevant facts;... (iv) a statement intended or likely to create false or unjustified expectations of favorable results; (v) a statement implying unusual, unique, or one-of-a-kind abilities... (4b)

Psychologists associated with the development or promotion of psychological devices, books, or other products offered for commercial sale make reasonable efforts to ensure that announcements and advertisements are presented in a professional, scientifically acceptable, and factually informative manner. (4-e)

Psychologists... offer their services... fairly and accurately, avoiding misrepresentation through sensationalism, exaggeration, or superficiality. Psychologists are guided by the primary obligation to aid the public in developing informed judgments, opinions, and choices. (4-g)

A psychologist accepts the obligation to correct others who represent the psychologist's professional qualifications, or associations with products or services, in a manner incompatible with these guidelines. (4-i)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

The psychologist in this case neither published the seminar brochure, approved of it, nor had prior knowledge of its content. However, it is the obligation and responsibility of a professional psychologist to make reasonable efforts to examine such materials and to request the right of prior approval before distribution to the general public. If the promotional materials are incompatible with the guidelines, the psychologist should exercise the right to correct them.

The difficulty in interpreting the boundaries of responsibility and obligation in this case is probably associated with the clause "... to make reasonable efforts" in Principle 4-e. In this case, the psychologist failed to anticipate the question of promotional materials. Preventative actions, particularly if there was any reason to suspect the firm's advertising practices, could have helped avoid misrepresentation. Psychologists must take active responsibility for promotional efforts or publicity in which their services will be marketed.

D. Educational Ramifications

Psychologists who agree to participate in programs in which publicity and other marketing efforts will be outside their direct control must make reasonable efforts to anticipate the possibility of misrepresentation or misleading publicity. It remains the psychologist's responsibility, regardless of whether or not direct control is obtained, to make efforts to assure that public statements are made in accordance with APA's ethical guidelines. By insisting on a contract or agreement which gives the psychologist the right to review promotional materials, there is less likelihood of misleading advertising or inappropriate sensationalism.

Use of Copyrighted Material in New Instrumentation

A. Statement of the Problem

An I/O psychologist in the role of consultant developed a job analysis data collection form for use with clients. This instrument embodied significant features and numerous items from a well-known and widely used copyrighted instrument. No permission was obtained from the copyright holder to use the copyrighted material, nor was credit given to the original source.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 3 (Moral and Legal Standards). In their professional roles, psychologists avoid any action that will violate or diminish the legal and civil rights of clients or of others who may be affected by their actions. (3-c)

Principle 7 (Professional Relationships). Publication credit is assigned to those who have contributed to a publication in proportion to their professional contributions. . . . All contributors are to be acknowledged and named. (7-f)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

If this case constituted plagiarism of copyrighted material, then the psychologist's behavior was both illegal and unethical. There are, however, many examples of materials in the I/O field (e.g., performance appraisal forms) which may be quite similar even if developed independently, as may have been the case here. When a source is directly used as a "model", even if it is in the public domain, due credit should be given. When the material is copyrighted, of course, appropriate permission must be obtained.

D. Educational Ramifications

Psychologists should be made aware, beginning with their graduate student training, of the appropriate uses of copyrighted material and of acceptable professional practices in the utilization of the results from research activities and programs of their professional colleagues. Appropriate actions to confront and/or to report ethical violations by psychologists who plagiarize the work of others should be taken promptly by psychologists encountering such behavior.

Authorship and Publication Agreements

A. Statement of the Problem

Two psychologists co-authored a book on a highly specific topic. The co-authors agreed at the time that if one or the other was invited to prepare a chapter for another book on that topic, then that chapter would also be a collaborative effort, regardless of which psychologist received the invitation.

Later in the year of this agreement, an editor of a book of readings in psychology invited only one of the psychologists to write the summary chapter on the topic of joint interest. That psychologist began working on the chapter without involving the original co-author and without communicating to the co-author that assistance would not be sought for the chapter. The chapter drew heavily on the earlier work written jointly by the two authors.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). [Psychologists] accept responsibility for the consequences of their acts. . . .

Psychologists take credit only for work they have actually done. (1-a)

Principle 7 (Professional Relationships). Psychologists act with due regard for the needs, special competencies, and obligations of their colleagues in psychology and other professions.

Publication credit is assigned to those who have contributed to a publication in proportion to their professional contributions. Major contributions of a professional character made by several persons to a common project are recognized by joint authorship, with the individual who made the principal contribution listed first. . . . All contributors are to be acknowledged and named. (7-f)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

By not informing the co-author of the invitation to prepare a summary chapter based on the original work (as previously agreed) and by proceeding to work independently, the psychologist in this case clearly did not have the best interests of the colleague in mind (Principle 1), nor did the psychologist act with due regard for the needs of the colleague (Principle 7). Furthermore, by drawing heavily upon the original book on the specific topic in writing the summary chapter, the author became obligated to give appropriate publication credit to the co-author (Principle 7-f), which was not done. Even if there were extenuating circumstances which required changing the original agreement, the psychologist had an obligation to inform the colleague and solicit consent to the change.

D. Educational Ramifications

Psychologists should recognize their obligations to respect the interest and welfare of their colleagues. At all times, psychologists should only take publication credit for work that they have actually done. Others who have assisted the author directly and indirectly (e.g., through previous collaborative efforts which are extensively incorporated into the new publication) should be acknowledged appropriately.

A. Statement of the Problem

While still a graduate student, an I/O psychologist had participated as a member of a research team, along with other graduate students. The research was carried out in an

Publication Credit

industrial setting under the supervision of a member of the university's I/O psychology faculty.

In publications of this research by the I/O psychologist, appearing in print three to four years later, the psychologist failed to acknowledge the contributions of the supervisory faculty member and incorporated results obtained by other members of the research team without giving them credit. In doing so, the I/O psychologist assumed full credit for the research, which attracted considerable attention and served to enhance the psychologist's professional career. In reality, the research was a product of a joint effort of several students and a faculty member who were not recognized for their contributions and who had not consented to this use of their joint work.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). Psychologists take credit only for work they have actually done. (1-2)

Principle 7 (Professional Relationships). Publication credit is assigned to those who have contributed to a publication in proportion to their professional contributions. Major contributions of a professional character made by several persons to a common project are recognized by joint authorship, with the individual who made the principal contribution listed first. (7-1)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

In assuming full publication credit for research conducted while a graduate student, the I/O psychologist acted in an unethical manner. Psychologists have the obligation to obtain consent if others' data are to be used for personal advantage. The ownership of the data in this case was the research team's, not that of any one individual, unless prior agreements had been explicitly made. Although the psychologist publishing the work certainly deserved some publication credit, so did the faculty member and the other students who were part of the original research effort. The psychologist's status as a student at the time of the research does not remove the obligation to obey the ethical principles. The persons not credited in this case should have taken action to confront the unethical behavior, filing a formal complaint if necessary.

D. Educative Ramifications

Psychology faculty should take active steps to assure that their students are aware of the obligation to follow APA ethical standards and principles. If faculty or fellow students become aware of ethical violations such as those manifested in this case, they should take active steps to confront the issue, including the filing of formal ethical charges if the behavior cannot be dealt with on an informal basis.

Plagiarizing

A. Statement of the Problem

The dissertation of an I/O psychologist included substantial segments, using identical wording, from a colleague's dissertation completed several years earlier. The work of the colleague was never cited and the colleague was never mentioned in the body of the dissertation or in the reference list. After graduating, the I/O psychologist published a portion of the dissertation, including an introduction which was substantially similar to the colleague's earlier work. Again, no credit was given to the original author of the material.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 7 (Professional Relationships). Acknowledgment through specific citations is made for unpublished as well as published material that has directly influenced the research or writing. (7-1)

When psychologists know of an ethical violation by another psychologist, and it seems appropriate, they informally attempt to resolve the issue by bringing the behavior to the attention of the psychologist. . . . If the violation does not seem amenable to an informal solution, or is of a more serious nature, psychologists bring it to the attention of the appropriate local, state, and/or national committee on professional ethics and conduct. (7-2)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case involves two potential issues, one more complex than the obvious violation of ethical principles in the plagiarism. Clearly it is unethical for a psychologist to use materials involving the exact wording from another person's dissertation without appropriate citation. To have published the work of another professional involves potential violations of copyright laws as well as of ethical principles if the earlier work had been copyrighted.

The more difficult issue in this case concerns the individual's status as a student of psychology at the time of the unethical behavior. Although the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists* clearly apply to students of psychology as well as to practicing psychologists (see Footnote 2 to the *Ethical Principles*), the responsibility for dealing with unethical behavior of students rests at least partly with the psychology faculty members most directly responsible for the students' education. If the faculty members supervising the dissertation research in this case were aware of the plagiarism, they should certainly have confronted the issue and taken appropriate action in accordance with the rules of their university and psychology department where the breach occurred.

In the event that the supervising faculty were unaware of the unethical behavior, but discovered it after the student had graduated, action still should have been taken to confront the issue. (Some universities have revoked doctoral degrees when evidence of plagiarism is discovered after conferring degrees.) Appropriate action is particularly important since educational institutions have a special responsibility for modeling the principles and behavior which they are training. Failure to confront unethical behavior by students in training can have a decidedly negative effect on the morale of students, including those who were not enrolled at the time of the behavior. Finally, if the violation were discovered by a fellow graduate student or by the psychologist whose dissertation was copied, the same responsibility for reporting the ethical violation applies.

D. Educative Ramifications

Psychology departments should have operating rules for dealing with complaints of unethical behavior on the part of students. Graduate committees should also be sensitive to the possibility of ethical violations by their students, and, most importantly, be prepared to act when cases come to their attention. Only by doing so can psychologists contribute to the maintenance of the highest standards of the ethics of psychology.

Fairness in Book Reviews

A. Statement of the Problem

An I/O psychologist in the preparation of a book review described a training program in a very negative manner. The review speculated on the limited value of the program and failed to acknowledge any of the referenced, widely-available empirical studies which had demonstrated the effectiveness of this training program in a number of situations.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). As scientists, psychologists . . . never suppress disconfirming data, and they acknowledge the existence of alternative hypotheses and explanations of their findings. (1-a)

[Psychologists] maintain high standards of scholarship by presenting psychological information objectively, fully, and accurately. (1-e)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case concerns the professional responsibility of a psychologist when engaged in the preparation of a published critique of a colleague's work to consider and present objectively all of the evidence which supports or refutes this work. In this case, the reviewer-psychologist did not make sufficient efforts to assure objectivity in a review. While it is recognized that I/O psychologists have a right to their own professional opinions of the value of other psychologists' work and the right to evaluate empirical studies concerning their methodological soundness, they must make a reasonable effort to present all available data concerning such work in an objective manner.

This is particularly important in controversial areas in which psychologists may reasonably be expected to disagree. Suppression of competing evidence in a review is analogous to keeping data which conflict with one's desired research outcomes out of a research report; both actions suggest probable ethics violations. Moreover, even when reviewers believe that a work has faults, they should not fail to mention its merits as well, both as a service to the reader and out of fairness to the author and publisher.

D. Educative Ramifications

Editors soliciting and publishing reviews of psychological works should take steps to assure balanced and objective reviews based on the relevant body of research material consistent with the authors' purposes in writing. They should make clear to potential psychologist-reviewers that self-disqualifications are appropriate when reviewers are unable to be objective. Editors should also make efforts to secure other reviews, when feasible, in order to present all aspects of controversial psychological work.

Ethical Responsibilities of Reviewers

A. Statement of the Problem

In a review prepared for a periodical, a psychologist cited very low reliability coefficients from two different sources for a scale prepared and marketed by another psychologist. While in each case the original sources had contained eight different reliability coefficients, the author chose only to cite the two lowest of these coefficients, thus implying that the lowest coefficient was representative of the entire range of reliability coefficients.

B. Applicable Policies

Preamble. While demanding for themselves freedom of inquiry and communication, psychologists accept the responsibility this freedom requires: competence, objectivity in the application of skills, and concern for the best interests of clients, colleagues, students, research participants, and society.

Principle 4 (Public Statements). [Public statements] do not contain (i) a false, fraudulent, misleading, deceptive, or unfair statement; (ii) a misinterpretation of fact or a statement likely to mislead or deceive because in context it makes only a partial disclosure of relevant facts. (4-b)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

The author of the review, by citing only the lowest of the range of reliability coefficients presented in the original sources, made a misleading statement. The statement would be likely to deceive readers because it made only a partial disclosure of the relevant facts regarding the scale.

Additionally, the author's action was potentially damaging to the reputation and business interests of the psychologists who constructed the scale. This is in violation of the Preamble to the *Ethical Principles*, which requires that psychologists act with concern for the best interests of their colleagues.

D. Educative Ramifications

Psychologists should strive to be complete in reporting previous research findings such as those involving the scale in this case. They should not suppress information in an effort to support a particular point of view. By full disclosure of information, psychologists permit their readers to arrive at an independent evaluation of the data.

Evaluating Colleagues' Competencies

A. Statement of the Problem

An I/O psychologist who conducted individual executive assessments for a long term client was asked by the client for an opinion of the work of another psychologist who was being considered for an organization development contract with the organization. The first psychologist initially praised the reputation of the other psychologist, but then proceeded to give examples of the psychologist's working style that were phrased in such a way as to subtly raise doubts about the psychologist's appropriateness for the assignment in question. The company opted not to pursue the relationship and made no further contact with the second psychologist.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 6 (Welfare of the consumer). Psychologists respect the integrity and protect the welfare of the people and groups with whom they work.

Principle 7 (Professional Relationships). Psychologists act with due regard for the needs, special competencies, and obligations of their colleagues in psychology and other professions.

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case primarily concerns a psychologist's professional relationships with other psychologists and the welfare of the consumer of psychological services. The psychologist who had the long-standing relationship with the organization may or may not have behaved unethically, depending on the evaluation that was intended to be

communicated and the psychologist's motivation. If the first psychologist had legitimate reservations about the second psychologist's appropriateness for this assignment, that information was appropriate to communicate, even though the organizational representatives could still have been encouraged to use additional sources to evaluate the psychologist's work and reputation. If, however, the first psychologist acted primarily out of fear that the existing relationship with the client might be threatened, then the behavior was unethical.

The critical issue in this case was the motivation of the psychologist. It is ethical to evaluate for a client or employer the competence, style or approach of another psychologist. When such evaluations are governed by self interest, they are ethically questionable. Psychologists need to determine before making such evaluations whether they can be objective in making and communicating the assessment. The limitations of the psychologist's objectivity also need to be made clear.

D. Educative Ramifications

Psychologists must be aware that their views about the professional competencies of a colleague are often the primary basis on which a decision may be made by a prospective client. Psychologists asked to give their opinions on the worth or appropriateness of their colleagues must do so with integrity and not in a way primarily intended to further their own gain. Differences in style or approach should be explained, not evaluated, to the client. The subtle denigration of a colleague, made without legitimate cause, violates the spirit and intent of the "Professional Relationships" provisions of the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists*.

✱

Confronting Unethical Behavior

A. Statement of the Problem

Two I/O psychologists, working as a team, claimed that they had achieved validity coefficients in the .90's for a sales representative inventory validated against criteria of sales success. Their data were published in a well-known business journal. A scatter diagram, substantiating this high correlation, was included in the published article. One possibility for explaining the exceptionally high correlations was included in the published article. However, there was nothing particularly unusual about the sample items in the paper and pencil selection inventory, nor were the criterion measures unusual.

Several other reports examining the relationships between similar items and similar criteria had appeared in the published literature. Typically, the relationships found were substantially lower than those found in the business journal article. Since there was such clear agreement in the bulk of the reported research, it was likely that the data published in the article were faked or miscalculated. Those data looked "unreal." However, on the strength of that one report, the two I/O psychologists had been selling their test and services to numerous organizations for several years.

When queried about the article after its publication, the journal's editor, not a psychologist, remembered it well. The editor stated that something seemed not quite right about the claims made in the article, but that no real grounds or real evidence were available to refuse to publish it at the time. It was not the practice of this business journal to use outside professionals as reviewers. The editor added that if anyone in the profession wanted to prepare a relevant review of the literature or to report more recent data showing correlations between similar variables, or between the same sales representative inventory and similar criteria, the journal would be glad to publish the

material, making direct reference to the article containing the unusually high validity results.

While several I/O psychologists discussed the matter, each was too busy to prepare a follow-up article, so nothing was ever done.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 7 (Professional Relationships). When psychologists know of an ethical violation by another psychologist, and it seems appropriate, they informally attempt to resolve the issue by bringing the behavior to the attention of the psychologist. If the misconduct is of a minor nature and/or appears to be due to lack of sensitivity, knowledge, or experience, such an informal solution is usually appropriate. Such informal corrective efforts are made with sensitivity to any rights to confidentiality involved. If the violation does not seem amenable to an informal solution, or is of a more serious nature, psychologists bring it to the attention of the appropriate local, state, and/or national committee on professional ethics and conduct. (7-g)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case involves a possible ethical violation in the published literature. Several industrial/organizational psychologists were aware of the possible violation, but did not take any action. Principle 7-g suggests that these psychologists should either have attempted informally to resolve the matter with the authors of the article, or referred it formally to the appropriate ethics committee for investigation. Even though the journal in question was not an APA journal, psychologists were involved both in writing the article and in questioning its veracity. That the psychologists approached the journal editor with their concern suggests that they were aware of a possible ethics violation. Not to have taken action because of being "too busy" or because of not wanting to have risked an unpleasant confrontation did not remove the ethical responsibility. While the psychologists doubting the findings might well have been "too busy" to write a review article for the business journal, they could certainly have raised their concerns with the psychologist-authors or referred the matter to an ethics review board.

D. Educative Ramifications

Psychologists who have clear reasons for suspecting unethical behavior on the part of their colleagues have an obligation to pursue the possible violation formally or informally to protect the welfare of clients and others who may be affected by the unethical action. There is a one-year statute of limitations for complaints made by a psychologist through APA channels.

The Right Not to Participate in Psychological Activities

A. Statement of the Problem

A psychologist asked the president of a small firm for permission to conduct a series of interviews with employees at various levels of management for a research study of the psychologist's. In return, the psychologist offered to provide feedback of the results of the study, which had possible, but unproved, benefit to the firm. One manager declined to participate. The company's president, on learning of this, threatened to fire any individual who would not be interviewed since the president felt the manager was not being cooperative and was making the organization look bad. The manager then complied.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). As practitioners, psychologists... are alert to personal, social, organizational, financial, or political situations and pressures that might lead to misuse of their influence. (1-f)

Principle 6 (Welfare of the Consumer). Psychologists fully inform consumers as to the purpose and nature of an evaluative, treatment, educational, or training procedure, and they freely acknowledge that clients, students, or participants in research have freedom of choice with regard to participation.

Principle 9 (Research with Human Participants). The investigator respects the individual's freedom to decline to participate in or to withdraw from the research at any time. The obligation to protect this freedom requires careful thought and consideration when the investigator is in a position of authority or influence over the participant. Such positions of authority include... situations in which research participation is required as part of employment... (9-f)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case concerns the responsibility of the psychologist in conducting research and/or professional practice to protect the rights of participants, especially the right not to participate in a study or intervention project. The psychologist conducting research in an employment setting may find organizational decisions and policies in conflict with APA ethical mandates. Making involvement in a research project a condition of employment provides just one example of how participation in such psychological activities may be less than voluntary. It is true that managers have an obligation to participate in projects designed to improve the organization so long as the projects do not place them at personal risk. Nevertheless, involvement in psychological research or interventions in organizations should not be forced upon unwilling participants, particularly, as in this case, when the research was primarily for the benefit of the psychologist.

The professional practicing psychology in organizations must expect that there will be many pressures upon employees to participate in research studies or interventions. In the present case, the demands were direct and the consequences of non-participation obvious. The psychologist had the ethical responsibility to create conditions in which the right not to participate was possible.

The psychologist's ethical problems had two sources: first, not having anticipated that pressure might be placed upon employees to participate involuntarily, and second, not confronting the issue directly once the problem became apparent. The psychologist could have met with the manager to explore the objections to the study and could have attempted to reach some resolution. The psychologist could also have helped the manager understand the possible negative attributions that might result if the manager chose not to be part of the study. By the time the manager was effectively forced to participate in the project, the psychologist could still have helped by discussing the issue with the company president.

D. Educative Ramifications

When conducting research or change projects in organizations, psychologists must take an active role in formulating policy concerning consent to participate in psychological activities. It may be necessary to change existing organizational policies to assure conformity to APA ethical principles. Preventative measures will help minimize violations of the rights of employees.

Protecting Confidentiality

A. Statement of the Problem

Minutes of a psychologist's consultations with the top management group of a major corporation were kept by the secretary of that group. The corporation's files were subsequently subpoenaed by another corporation which was suing the first. The plaintiff sought to subpoena the psychologist to appear in a federal court for a hearing.

The psychologist was in a defenseless position. Psychologists have no privilege of confidentiality in federal courts. Furthermore, in the state in which the psychologist was practicing, there was no privilege of confidentiality except for a one-to-one therapeutic relationship. The psychologist could not protect the client, nor could the psychologist find self-protection from possible exploitation by the attorneys for the plaintiff. The psychologist could not refuse to testify in court without going to the expense of retaining a personal attorney and raising one or another defense of confidentiality. This case posed an ethical dilemma for the psychologist.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 3 (Moral and Legal Standards). In their professional roles, psychologists avoid any action that will violate or diminish the legal and civil rights of clients or of others who may be affected by their actions. (3-c)

Principle 5 (Confidentiality). Psychologists have a primary obligation to respect the confidentiality of information obtained from persons in the course of their work as psychologists. Psychologists make provisions for maintaining confidentiality in the storage and disposal of records. (5-c)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case does not illustrate an ethical violation by an I/O psychologist as much as an ethical and legal dilemma. In this instance, due to causes beyond the I/O psychologist's immediate control, the consultant was placed in a position which potentially could have damaged the relationship with a client and possibly the image of I/O psychology had court testimony been required. The I/O psychologist failed, however, in the early relationship with the client to establish an understanding of the need for confidentiality of records of their discussions and limits on their future distribution. There was no indication that any attempt was made on the consultant's part to clarify how the consulting relationship might influence others or how the consulting activities might be misused by others.

In general, I/O psychologists are responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of information about users of their services, whether such information is obtained by themselves or by those they supervise. All persons supervised by I/O psychologists who have access to records of psychological services, including nonprofessional personnel and students, should be required to maintain this confidentiality as a condition of employment.

The I/O psychologist does not release confidential information, except with the written consent of the user directly involved, or the user's representative. Even after the consent for release has been obtained, the I/O psychologist clearly identifies such information as confidential to the recipient. If directed otherwise by statute or regulation with the force of law or by court order, the psychologist seeks a resolution to the conflict that is both ethically and legally feasible and appropriate.

D. Educative Ramifications

The I/O psychologist should, as part of a consulting relationship with a client, consider how records of the relationship will be recorded and distributed. If

confidentiality of these records is required, the psychologist needs to take reasonable steps to assure this condition at the outset of the consulting relationship.

It is equally important that psychologists take seriously the ethical obligation to learn the laws concerning confidentiality in the jurisdiction in which they practice. Only by keeping current with both local laws and recent court decisions on confidentiality can clients be adequately advised of how best to protect themselves.

Confidentiality of Employee Interview Data

A. Statement of the Problem

A psychologist was retained by a company to help reduce conflict between management and labor. As a first step, the psychologist conducted a series of interviews with non-management employees. It was agreed that the content of all interviews would be kept confidential and that the psychologist would make only general programmatic recommendations.

During the course of these interviews, it became apparent that one supervisor in particular was the cause of considerable conflict. Shortly after finishing the interviews, the psychologist learned that one of the interviewees had been fired by the "problem" supervisor. This fired employee had asserted during the interview that the supervisor had been engaging in harassment. This assertion was corroborated by other interviewees. The fired employee filed a grievance through the union and a labor-management committee meeting was scheduled. The grievant asked the psychologist to come to the meeting to support the charge of harassment. The psychologist refused.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 5 (Confidentiality). Psychologists have a primary obligation to respect the confidentiality of information obtained from persons in the course of their work as psychologists. They reveal such information to others only with the consent of the person or the person's legal representative, except in those unusual circumstances in which not to do so would result in clear danger to the person or to others. Where appropriate, psychologists inform their clients of the legal limits of confidentiality.

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

The psychologist in this case had an obligation to respect the confidentiality of the information obtained during the course of the interviews and this obligation extended both to the interviewees and to individuals named during the interviews. The psychologist was also obligated to protect the rights of the consumer of psychological services. In this case, the company was the primary consumer, but the interviewees and those persons named during the interviews could also be considered to be consumers.

Although the agreement that the interview data would be kept confidential was primarily designed to protect the interviewees, in this instance confidentiality actually worked to the disadvantage of the fired employee. Nonetheless, the prior agreement had specified that the content of the interviews would remain confidential. If the interview data had been detrimental to the fired employee's case, the employee would rightfully demand that the data be kept confidential. On the other hand, the welfare of the supervisor was also involved, since a successful charge of harassment might mean dismissal. Finally, the primary consumer, the company, still had its original problem to be solved, in addition to a new problem.

The psychologist, by choosing to maintain the confidentiality of the interview, made

a difficult choice between the principle of confidentiality and the interests of consumers of psychological services. For the psychologist to use the interview data to support the employee's charges of harassment would likely undermine the credibility of both the psychologist and the company executives who represented the primary client. In making this difficult decision, the psychologist also took into account that the same information obtained during the interviews could be adduced in the hearing.

D. Educative Ramifications

Before undertaking investigations in which sensitive data are likely to be collected, the psychologist should establish clear ground rules as to how the data will be maintained and how results will be communicated. If confidentiality of data is agreed upon, this should be communicated clearly to all parties prior to the investigation. Psychologists should be aware, however, that data regarded as confidential may be sought by interested parties. They should therefore attempt to protect such data.

Confidentiality

A. Statement of the Problem

A state personnel department asked a psychologist to review its selection process and to advise the state agency as to the defensibility of its position. The psychologist accepted the consulting assignment, studied the materials involving the selection process and sent the agency a report.

Later, during EEO litigation involving the selection process, the psychologist was contacted by the plaintiff and asked for a copy of the report. The psychologist requested from state agency officials permission to release the report. As permission was denied, the psychologist did not do so. However, the plaintiffs, through legal procedures, were able to acquire a copy of the psychologist's report and they asked the psychologist to testify as plaintiffs' expert witness. The psychologist felt that it would not be ethical to testify for the plaintiff after having been hired and paid by the defendant to prepare the report. After discussing the matter with several colleagues, the psychologist decided to deny the request of the plaintiff to testify. The psychologist did this in spite of the feeling that the case represented a matter of truth and, whether serving the plaintiff or the defendant, the facts of the case would remain the same.

In spite of the psychologist's decision, a subpoena was served by the plaintiff and the psychologist was required to give testimony in the case.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 5 (Confidentiality). Psychologists have a primary obligation to respect the confidentiality of information obtained from persons in the course of their work as psychologists. They reveal such information to others only with the consent of the person or the person's legal representative, except in those unusual circumstances in which not to do so would result in clear danger to the person or to others. Where appropriate, psychologists inform their clients of the legal limits of confidentiality.

Guideline 2 (Professional Considerations) of the *Specialty Guidelines for the Delivery of Services by Industrial/Organizational Psychologists* (APA-COPE, 1981b) also states:

The I/O psychologist does not release confidential information, except with the written consent of the user directly involved or the user's legal representative. Even after the consent for release has been obtained, the I/O psychologist clearly identifies such information as confidential to the recipient of the information. If directed otherwise by statute or regulations with the force

of law or by court order, the psychologist seeks a resolution to the conflict that is both ethically and legally feasible and appropriate.

Users are informed in advance of any limits in the setting for maintenance of confidentiality of psychological information. (2.7)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

The case concerns the confidentiality of information contained in a report which was prepared under the sponsorship of a state agency evaluating a selection process. The consultant who wrote the report acted in an ethical manner when approached by the plaintiffs for a copy of the report. As recommended in Principle 5 and I/O Guideline 2.7, the psychologist requested permission to release the report from the state agency. When this permission was denied, the psychologist complied with the state agency's wish. In this case, there is no evidence of unusual circumstances that would result in clear danger to the plaintiff or to others. The psychologist also refused to accept a new consulting assignment to serve as plaintiff's expert witness because of ethical obligations to the defendant and the need to protect the confidentiality of the report's contents. When ordered by subpoena to testify about the report, the psychologist complied.

An omission by the psychologist in this case was failing to define for the state agency, prior to undertaking the consulting assignment, the legal limits of confidentiality as they pertained to the report to be produced in the state where the agency was located. This should have included a discussion of the possibility that such a report would become accessible to plaintiffs EEO litigation.

A final issue concerns what the psychologist might have done once subpoenaed to testify. The psychologist could have consulted with the client organization and/or the court, if the client wished the psychologist not to appear, to determine the applicability of confidentiality protections for privileged information. In states where psychologists have privileged communication by statute, the psychologist might have successfully avoided testimony in the case by claiming privileged communication between client and psychologist.

D. Educative Ramifications

Psychologists should attempt to protect the confidentiality of information provided by their clients as well as the documents prepared on the basis of that information. However, there are legal limits to confidentiality which vary from state to state which cannot be ignored by psychologists. These limits must be explained realistically in advance to clients (individuals and organizations). Psychologists must address such issues with clients at the outset of the consulting assignment so that the client may make informed choices.

Misuse of Data Obtained Through One's Employment

A. Statement of the Problem

An industrial/organizational psychologist was employed full-time by a business organization for which tests were developed for use in selecting its entry-level personnel. In the course of developing the tests, the psychologist collected normative data from applicants to the company and designed interpretative materials. On the psychologist's own time, and without consulting the employing organization, the

psychologist developed parallel forms of these tests, using the data from the business organization as the primary source for norms and interpretative materials. The psychologist then sold these tests to other organizations, primarily those in the public sector. The psychologist was aware that the outside activities were in violation of the company's policies.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). Psychologists clarify in advance with all appropriate persons and agencies the expectations for sharing and utilizing research data. They avoid relationships that may limit their objectivity or create a conflict of interest. (1-b)

Principle 8 (Assessment Techniques). Psychologists responsible for the development and standardization of psychological tests and other assessment techniques utilize established scientific procedures and observe the relevant APA standards. (8-b)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case deals with the psychologist's professional responsibilities, loyalties to an employer, and professional test standards. I/O psychologists who engage in professional practice activities outside of their primary employment review those activities in terms of company policies and discuss circumstances in which there may be conflict of interest with their primary employer. Conflict of interest, for example, exists when, in violation of company interests or policies, information obtained from a primary employer is used for personal gain in outside employment. Research data are included under the term "information", though when companies allow publication of the results of studies they have sponsored, such findings may be used in outside employment activities. The ethical issue illustrated in this case refers to proprietary or confidential company information, not to that in the public domain.

It is also good professional practice for psychologists who market commercial tests to have appropriate normative data based on samples similar to the ones to which the instrumentation is being directed. The psychologist erred in this case by not developing appropriate norms for the new populations addressed by the parallel test forms.

D. Educative Ramifications

Psychologists need to balance their loyalty to their employers and their interest in outside employment and money-making activities. Psychologists avoid conflict of interest situations and consult relevant APA policy statements when ethical concerns arise. They are aware of relevant organizational policies concerning outside employment activities, and discuss potential conflict of interest situations openly with their employers when there are ambiguities about the appropriateness of their proposed activities. Finally, psychologists are aware of and meet the demands of relevant APA policies and of legal requirements when they develop new tests.

Dual Relationships

A. Statement of the Problem

An I/O psychologist, while employed by an industrial firm, used the position to solicit business for a personnel private practice. Normal job duties brought the psychologist into contact with employees who were referred for counseling, especially related to stress. Using these contacts, while also urging managers with

"problem employees" to refer such employees, the psychologist soon had a thriving side business of "Stress Reduction Workshops" conducted in the basement at home. The psychologist further approached supervisors of the workshop participants to discuss their individual problems, which often were not job-related.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). As practitioners, psychologists... are alert to personal, social, organizational, financial, or political situations and pressures that might lead to misuse of their influence. (1-f)

Principle 5 (Confidentiality). Psychologists have a primary obligation to respect the confidentiality of information obtained from persons in the course of their work as psychologists. They reveal such information to others only with the consent of the person or the person's legal representative....

Principle 6 (Welfare of the Consumer). Psychologists make every effort to avoid dual relationships that could impair their professional judgment or increase the risk of exploitation. Examples of such dual relationships include, but are not limited to, research with and treatment of employees, students, supervisees, close friends, or relatives. (6-a)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

In using a role within a company to solicit business from employees, particularly when the psychologist was expected to resolve employee problems as a part of normal job duties, the I/O psychologist was behaving unethically. The conduct was compounded by revealing privileged information and by the blatant methods used to solicit business for the psychologist's private practice.

D. Educative Ramifications

The first requirement of a psychologist involved in for-profit work in addition to a primary employment is that it be consistent with the rules of the major employer. In addition, the psychologist must be especially careful to avoid "dual relationship" situations (Principle 6-a) or those which exploit personal problems for professional gain. In their graduate training, I/O psychologists should be made aware of what constitutes ethical practice in obtaining business for private practice, their obligations to employees, and the appropriate treatment of confidential information.

Conflict of Interest

A. Statement of the Problem

A department head of a psychological testing corporation invited an outside consultant to prepare a proposal for the development and validation of new test materials. The consultant was a psychologist who had previously prepared tests for the testmaker. The consultant was contacted as an individual on a sole-source basis, since the consultant's firm was not a competitor. The consultant was asked to prepare a multi-year proposal outlining work that could be accomplished for a specific contractual fee.

The consultant expressed an interest in preparing the proposal and requested a meeting with the corporation's director of testing to gather further information on the organization's testing needs. In an interview, the consultant obtained data on the corporation's markets, including previous marketing techniques and future marketing

strategies, as well as information regarding the nature of the desired testing products. The consultant indicated that the proposal would be prepared and submitted to the testing director.

One month later, the testing director contacted the consultant to inquire about the status of the proposal. The consultant informed the director that no proposal would be prepared as the consultant's firm had decided to market tests in direct competition with the testing corporation, that is, for the same kind of jobs. The consulting firm had actually made the decision to enter the market prior to the consultant's interview with the corporation's testing director, and the consultant had known of the firm's plans. Furthermore, from a review of the consulting firm's later marketing practices, it became evident that the firm used information obtained from the corporate testing director for its own competitive advantage.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 6 (Welfare of the Consumer). When conflicts of interest arise between clients and psychologists' employing institutions, psychologists clarify the nature and direction of their loyalties and responsibilities and keep all parties informed of their commitments.

Guideline 2 (Professional Considerations) of the I/O *Specialty Guidelines* (APA-COPS, 1981b) states:

Providers of I/O psychological services do not seek to gain competitive advantage through the use of privileged information.

... In the course of work with a user, I/O practitioners may become aware of the management practices, organizational structure, personnel policies, or financial structure of competing units. Since such information is usually revealed in a privileged context, it is not employed for competitive advantage. Similarly, practitioners may be called on to review the proposal of a competing unit. Information so gained is not used to gain competitive advantage. (2-5)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case deals with a conflict of interest between a consultant and a client organization. The consultant was aware of the consulting firm's intention to develop and market test products in direct competition with the corporation. By proceeding to meet with the testing director and receiving information regarding the nature of the corporation's desired testing products and marketing strategies, the consultant behaved unethically.

The primary cause of the ethical violation was the consultant's use of the privileged information to gain a competitive advantage in the same testing market. A second cause was the consultant's failure to inform the client in advance of a potential conflict of interest. The psychologist had an obligation under the *Specialty Guidelines* to make clear the nature of the consulting firm's potential involvement and not to use the privileged information to further the firm's competitive advantage. The ethical standards for psychologists also stipulate that they must clarify the nature of their loyalties in situations such as this, which the psychologist made no attempt to do.

D. Educative Ramifications

Psychologists consulting with industry who are employed by consulting firms may often encounter potential conflicts of interest as illustrated in this case. They should therefore be prepared to assess the ethical issues involved in such cases and above all must make clear to potential clients the nature of their commitments and loyalties. Not to do so is potentially to endanger the concept of privileged communication.

Psychologists As Employers of Other Psychologists

A. Statement of the Problem

A group of managers in a corporation were having persistent, unproductive conflict. They contacted the company's I/O psychologist for help. Because of being over committed, the psychologist contracted the services of a second psychologist from outside the organization. Although the second psychologist had no prior experience in industry, the individual had many years of successful experience as a therapist working with marital and family conflict.

After three months of weekly meetings, reports were received that the methods of the contracted psychologist were not helping. After several complaints, the contract with the psychologist was terminated. The hiring psychologist did not meet with the second psychologist due to time pressures and sent a letter indicating the services were no longer needed. The consulting psychologist then demanded full payment for the contracted services. This was refused. The second psychologist threatened to sue, at which point the company decided to pay the contracted amount rather than risk litigation.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 2 (Competence). [Psychologists] only provide services and only use techniques for which they are qualified by training and experience.

Principle 6 (Welfare of the Consumer). Psychologists respect the integrity and protect the welfare of the people and groups with whom they work.

Psychologists terminate a . . . consulting relationship when it is reasonably clear that the consumer is not benefiting from it. (6-c)

Principle 7 (Professional Relationships). Psychologists who employ or supervise other professionals or professionals in training accept the obligation to facilitate the further professional development of these individuals. They provide appropriate working conditions, timely evaluations, constructive consultation, and experience opportunities. (7-c)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case concerns the professional relationships between two psychologists as well as the welfare of the consumer. Psychologists should maintain high standards in their professional relationships. This includes the obligation to be aware of the competencies of other psychologists and to provide appropriate feedback when a colleague's performance creates more problems than it solves.

In terminating the contract with the consulting psychologist, the hiring psychologist was taking action believed to be in the best interest of the consumers of psychological services, in this case the organization and the project managers. However, the hiring psychologist may have made an error when evaluating the competency of the second psychologist before contracting for the project. The lack of prior industrial experience should, if nothing else, have suggested the need to monitor the activities closely from the beginning. When it became clear that the methods being used were counter-productive, the hiring psychologist possibly acted appropriately in discontinuing the ineffective relationship with the organization. However, adequate feedback was not provided on the nature of the problems, nor was any plan for remediation considered before taking the rather severe step of termination.

The hiring psychologist might argue that the contracted psychologist was an established professional with an excellent reputation and there seemed to be no reason for close supervision. If so, it may have been poor judgment on the hiring psychologist's part not to have investigated the consultant's expertise in this particular

area. The hired psychologist may also have behaved unethically by accepting a position for which qualifications were lacking, and by not seeking guidance and supervision when trouble with the project became evident. Principle 6 of the ethical code requires that psychologists themselves terminate a consulting relationship when it is reasonably clear that the consumer is not benefiting from it.

The resolution of the psychologist's insistence on payment for the full amount originally agreed upon would depend primarily on the terms of the contract (e.g., the rights of either party to terminate the contract, under what conditions, and the implications for payment), rather than upon ethical principles. However, settled, a relevant explanation and feedback should have been provided to the dismissed psychologist. Had the hiring psychologist recognized the obligation to guide and develop subordinates, the situation might have been avoided.

D. Educative Ramifications

When psychologists employ other psychologists, they must have regard for the welfare of the consumer. This implies the obligation of the hiring psychologist to assess the qualifications and competencies of the psychologist for the particular assignment involved. The roles of each psychologist should be fully clarified at the beginning of the project, including the expectations for performance. The employing psychologist also assumes the obligation to monitor the employed psychologist's performance and to provide feedback on a timely basis. The degree of supervision and evaluation that are necessary and the extent of a psychologist's need for professional development depend on the prior experience of the psychologist in similar projects and on the early results of the contracted psychologist's services.

Pressures to Prematurely Implement Psychological Programs

A. Statement of the Problem

A medium-size company had an extremely high failure rate among its sales personnel. A psychologist, a full-time employee of the company, developed a training program that somewhat reduced these failure rates in a pilot study. The study was a well-designed experiment with a control group. Although management wanted to implement the program immediately, the psychologist recommended that a larger study first be undertaken to replicate the findings of the pilot study. The manager charged with sales accused the psychologist of being unethical, since the psychologist would not help those in the control group or other members of the organization by allowing them to be in a training program that had been demonstrated to reduce failure.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). As scientists, psychologists accept responsibility for the selection of their research topics and the methods used in investigation, analysis, and reporting. They plan their research in ways to minimize the possibility that their findings will be misleading. (1-a)

Psychologists clarify in advance with all appropriate persons and agencies the expectations for sharing and utilizing research data. (1-b)

As practitioners, psychologists know that they bear a heavy social responsibility because their recommendations and professional actions may alter the lives of others. They are alert to personal, social, organizational, financial, or political situations and pressures that might lead to misuse of their influence. (1-f)

I/O Specialty Guideline 2 (Professional Considerations) (APA-COPs, 1981b). Providers of I/O psychological services state explicitly what can and cannot be expected from the services. (2.4)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

In this case an ethical issue arose because the results of the pilot study were not conclusive to the psychologist, yet the psychologist-employee was being pressured by the company to implement the training program without any additional evaluation or study. The psychologist had a choice of implementing a program with possible benefits to the organization and to individual employees or of continuing the research with the objective of obtaining more valid conclusions regarding the efficacy of the program.

It is reasonable to assume that in designing the research program, the psychologist assessed the costs and risks of implementing a program based on weak evidence. In doing so the psychologist had to consider ethical principles relating to both scientific and professional practice roles. Ultimately, psychologists must utilize their scientific training and experience in making judgments about when an organizational program of intervention should be applied. In making this decision, the psychologist should balance the potential benefits of early implementation against the risks of implementing an ineffectual program.

The ethical issues of this case depend in part on the potential harm to the participants and to the company. The training program may do no harm to the participants (although it also may not help them). The potential harm to the organization may be in spending money on a program of undetermined value. The participants' lost productivity when they attend the program should also be considered. Of course, many training programs are not designed or administered by psychologists and little attention may be given to determining their effectiveness. However, this does not relieve a psychologist from the obligation to follow APA's ethical principles. One strategy the psychologist should follow is informing the company of what can and cannot reasonably be expected from the program following Guideline 2.4 of the *I/O Specialty Guidelines*.

D. Educative Ramifications

It is not uncommon for psychologists in organizations to be placed in situations where early implementation of programs will be urged. It is the obligation of the psychologist to take an active role in educating managers in the company about the necessity of basing implementation decisions on methodologically sound research. In planning such research, the psychologist should be aware of the importance of statistical power and of the utility of the findings for the organization. The costs and benefits of Type I and Type II errors (utility analysis) should also be carefully considered. Psychologists must utilize their scientific training and experience in evaluating the effectiveness of programs. Since it is the nature of behavioral research to frame the answers to such questions in probabilistic terms, psychologists should recognize the risks involved in making decisions based on insufficient data, while considering the costs involved in collecting more data than may be necessary.

Sensitivity Training Groups

A. Statement of the Problem

A participant in a human relations workshop (T-Group) was singled out by the psychologist-group-leader as a "troublesome" member. The psychologist forced the

participant to be removed physically from the group, facing away from the group while the psychologist led a discussion of the negative aspects of the participant's behavior in the group. Upon returning to the group, the participant became an inactive group member through the balance of the workshop. The individual left the group angry, hurt, and with little meaningful learning having occurred. Many years after the experience, the participant bitterly recollected the treatment, suggesting that long term negative attitudes resulted from the experience.

B. Applicable Policies

Preamble: Psychologists respect the dignity and worth of the individual . . . they make every effort to protect the welfare of those who seek their services . . .

Principle 6 (Welfare of the Consumer). Psychologists respect the integrity and protect the welfare of the people and groups with whom they work.

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case.

The T-group leader, as a professional psychologist, has the responsibility to protect the dignity and welfare of the participants in the group. It is recognized that many sensitivity training and group dynamics programs such as the one in this case rely on the behavior of the members of the group as the basis for the participants' becoming aware of the impact of their behavior on others. When constructively analyzed by staff leaders and other group members, participants' behavior becomes the framework for attempting to improve interpersonal and managerial styles. However, the psychologist must assume responsibility for maintaining a group environment which is supportive rather than destructive and which appropriately handles situations which may be humiliating to participants or serve to lower their self-esteem.

The leader's responsibility for minimizing the likelihood of psychological casualties by the participant is especially important. In this case, the group leader, a psychologist, appeared to have ignored the ethical responsibility to protect a participant's psychological well-being. The participant might have learned a great deal from the effect the "troublesome" behavior was having on others; instead, the leader actively encouraged the group to isolate the individual. If negative feedback were essential, the psychologist should have helped the member understand it and deal with the member's emotional reactions to the criticism. The psychologist should also help the other group members understand the role they may be playing in precipitating the group behavior.

D. Educative Ramifications

Organizational development interventions such as sensitivity training present particularly complex cases since psychologists of several areas of specialization may, with appropriate training and experience, provide such services. Regardless of the psychologist's primary area of specialization, however, the T-group leader must conduct such experiences ethically and competently, making use of relevant research findings. Failure to attend to the needs of specific group members who are persistently being scapegoated or isolated from the group demonstrates limited understanding by the leader of the potential power of groups even on psychologically healthy individuals. Psychologists learning such techniques as sensitivity training should be fully trained, including supervised experience, to minimize the likelihood of their engendering psychological problems on the part of group participants.

Referral to an Employee Assistance Program

A. Statement of the Problem

An I/O psychologist with no training or experience in employee or personal counseling worked with the Medical and Labor Relations departments of an organization to develop a referral program for the treatment of employees who became addicted to alcohol or drugs. Anonymity was to be a key feature of this program. If a person asked for help, management was not to be told that the employee had entered this program. The employee was simply to be reported as being absent due to illness. A key member of upper middle management entered this program. The psychologist reported this to the company's Executive Vice President since the psychologist's responsibilities included keeping management informed of factors that could interfere with managerial effectiveness.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). As practitioners, psychologists know that they bear a heavy social responsibility because their recommendations and professional actions may alter the lives of others. They are alert to personal, social, organizational, financial, or political situations and pressures that might lead to misuse of their influence. (1-f)

Principle 5 (Confidentiality). Information obtained in clinical or consulting relationships, or evaluative data concerning children, students, employees, and others, is discussed only for professional purposes and only with persons clearly concerned with the case. Written and oral reports present only data germane to the purposes of the evaluation, and every effort is made to avoid undue invasion of privacy. (5-a)

Principle 6 (Welfare of the Consumer). Where the demands of an organization require psychologists to violate these Ethical Principles, psychologists clarify the nature of the conflict between the demands and these principles. They inform all parties of psychologists' ethical responsibilities and take appropriate action. (6-c)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

A central issue in this case is the question of the role of the I/O psychologist in this company. Since the psychologist, in developing the employee assistance program for victims of alcohol or drug abuse, also had a role to advise management of factors that could hamper executive effectiveness as well as to protect the anonymity of referrals to the treatment program, these two roles were in conflict in this case. Under these circumstances, the psychologist had an obligation to address and resolve this conflict of roles at the outset.

A possible solution might have been for the psychologist to inform management that matters of health would be excluded in advising on factors that could impair managerial effectiveness, but this is not fully satisfactory way out of the dilemma. If the treatment did not help the affected executive and the psychologist ignored this, the psychologist would not be fulfilling the role of providing counsel on factors that could interfere with executive effectiveness.

Psychologists have the responsibility to understand the demands that are made of them when acting in a professional role. When conflict, or potential conflicts with ethical principles can be identified, these matters should be faced before an actual incident occurs that could lead to an ethics violation. Psychologists need to acquaint employers with the ethical standards that govern their behavior as professional psychologists and to keep themselves informed of the ethics that may guide other professionals, such as physicians, with whom there may be involvement.

In this case, the assurance of confidentiality to users of the employee assistance

program would have to take precedence over the psychologist's commitment to keep top management "informed". Since employees had been led to believe that confidentiality was assured, the psychologist behaved unethically by informing the executive's boss of the participation in the program. The psychologist also failed to respect the ethical requirements of other professions (such as medicine) by potentially jeopardizing the confidentiality of the doctor-patient relationship.

Still another issue concerns the competence of the I/O psychologist to help set up an employee assistance program in the first place. For example, it is curious that anonymity was made a key feature of this drug and alcohol treatment program since some research has indicated fairly clearly that constructive confrontation of employees with substance abuse problems may be the most effective way of getting such persons into treatment. It is not demonstrated in this case that the I/O psychologist was sufficiently trained to participate in the development of this EAP program; if not, help should have been sought from persons with competence in the field.

D. Educative Ramifications

When a psychologist is employed in private industry, it is not unusual to find that job responsibilities are not clearly defined in a job description. Thus, it is important that the psychologist attempt to define more clearly all roles and accountabilities so that both the psychologist and management understand the professional responsibilities of the psychologist in the work situation.

When practicing in organizations, psychologists must be careful to minimize conflicts between the needs or desires of individual employees and the requirements of the organization as a whole. It is important for the psychologist to anticipate possible conflicts and to make known to employees the proposed resolution of such situations. While it will seldom be possible to have a perfect match between individual needs and organizational demands, making the parameters known to all parties will serve to minimize future misunderstandings.

Academia - Industry Relationships

A. Statement of the Problem

A university-based I/O psychologist developed a relationship with the director of a large organization. Because one of the divisions in the firm had some organizational problems, the director, at the suggestion of the psychologist, agreed to allow the psychologist and several graduate students to conduct a series of research studies. No specific agreements were made about feedback, but over a three-year period the results of these studies were fed back to the director, who continued to encourage the program of research. The organization provided no financial support to the students or the psychologist during this time. At the end of the three-year period, the director requested a comprehensive and detailed report of all research that had been conducted, but offered no remuneration. Because of other commitments, the psychologist was unable to provide the report and the relationship was ended.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). Psychologists clarify in advance with all appropriate persons and agencies the expectations for sharing and utilizing research data. (1-b)

Principle 6 (Welfare of the Consumer). Psychologists make advance financial arrangements that safeguard the best interests of and are clearly understood by their clients. (6-d)

Principle 7 (Professional Relationships). [Psychologists] are aware of their obligations to future research workers and ensure that host institutions receive adequate information about the research. . . . (7-e)

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

Although there was no monetary arrangement involved in this case, the relationship with the host organization did provide benefit to the psychologist and the graduate students in that a field setting was provided to conduct research. The time provided by the director and the employees of the division also had a monetary value. Moreover, the continued feedback of the results of the research studies to the organization created an expectation that this was part of the agreement. The psychologist erred by not making clear to the organizational representatives the mutual rewards and responsibilities to be obtained from the relationship. If the psychologist expected payment for feedback of the results of the studies, this should have been agreed upon in advance.

D. Educative Ramifications

Organizations that allow the use of their personnel and facilities for research studies should be viewed as clients. It is the responsibility of the psychologist, even if direct financial support is not involved, to provide feedback of the results of studies conducted with organizational personnel. The specific form the feedback is to take, and who is to bear the costs of it, should be clarified in advance and agreed upon by all relevant parties. In a psychologist-client relationship extending over many years, it may be necessary to renegotiate the terms of the agreement from time to time. The psychologist should take responsibility for initiating such negotiations where appropriate.

Misuse of Attitude Surveys to Prevent Unionization

A. Statement of the Problem

A non-union manufacturing firm, located in a heavily unionized state, was concerned about the possibility of employee organization and eventual unionization of the firm. In an attempt to retain its non-union status, management hired an I/O psychologist who was assigned the responsibility of administering attitude surveys. The surveys were administered to employees with the assurance that their individual answers would be kept confidential and that all summaries of data would be grouped so that individual respondents could never be identified. In fact, the surveys were constructed in such a way as to allow identification of possible union activists among the existing workforce as well as among job applicants. Upon the psychologist's reporting to management the names of alleged activists, subtle force was applied by management resulting in the eventual termination of current employees, or, in the case of job applicants, the refusal to hire. Eventually, the underlying purpose of the attitude surveys was detected by the employees and the I/O psychologist terminated employment with the firm.

B. Applicable Policies

Principle 1 (Responsibility). Psychologists have the responsibility to attempt to prevent distortion, misuse, or suppression of psychological findings by the institution or agency of which they are employees. (1-c)

Principle 5 (Confidentiality). Psychologists have a primary obligation to respect the confidentiality of information obtained from persons in the course of their work as psychologists. They reveal such information to others only with the consent of the person or the person's legal representative, except in those unusual circumstances in which not to do so would result in clear danger to the person or to others. Where appropriate, psychologists inform their clients of the legal limits of confidentiality.

Principle 6 (Welfare of the Consumer). Psychologists respect the integrity and protect the welfare of the people and groups with whom they work. . . . Psychologists fully inform consumers as to the purpose and nature of an evaluative, treatment, educational, or training procedure, and they freely acknowledge that clients, students, or participants in research have freedom of choice with regard to participation.

C. Interpretation of Policy Principles in Light of the Major Questions Posed by the Case

This case presents a clear violation on the part of the I/O psychologist of the obligation to protect confidentiality, in addition to the psychologist's collusion in the misuse of psychological techniques that may have jeopardized the reputation of the profession.

From the beginning of the affiliation with the firm and in the course of professional activities, the psychologist failed to inform management of the possible legal and ethical ramifications of the practice of secretly using survey data ostensibly collected for another purpose. In addition, the psychologist ignored the responsibility to uphold and protect the confidentiality of the information obtained from individual employees and applicants. It is assumed that the psychologist was fully cognizant of the fact that the professional psychological knowledge, skills and services were potentially contributing to discriminatory and exploitative, if not illegal, practices. (If the psychologist was not, this in itself suggests a possible ethical violation.) Moreover, through the misuse of survey techniques, the psychologist ignored the professional responsibility to maintain the highest professional standards and to avoid negative impact on the reputation of the profession as a whole.

D. Educative Ramifications

There is no question that unethical behavior such as that manifested in this case has potentially far-reaching consequences beyond the individual employees and applicants who may be adversely affected by the behavior described. Psychologists consulting to organizations need to take an active role in challenging practices inconsistent with APA's *Ethical Principles of Psychologists*. If psychologists are unsuccessful in changing behavior that is illegal or discriminatory, they have the right, and in many cases the obligation, to terminate their affiliations.

Bibliography and Reference List

- American Psychological Association. (1974). *Standards for educational and psychological tests*. Washington, D. C.: Author.
- American Psychological Association. (1977). Standards for providers of psychological services. *American Psychologist*, 32, 495-505.
- American Psychological Association. (1981a). Ethical principles of psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 36, 633-638.
- American Psychological Association, Committee on Professional Standards. (1981b). Specialty guidelines for the delivery of services by industrial/organizational psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 36, 664-669.
- American Psychological Association, Committee on Professional Standards. (1982). Casebook for providers of psychological services. *American Psychologist*, 37, 698-701.
- American Psychological Association, Committee on Professional Standards. (1983). Casebook for providers of psychological services. *American Psychologist*, 38, 708-713.
- American Psychological Association, Committee on Professional Standards. (1984). Casebook for providers of psychological services. *American Psychologist*, 39, 663-668.
- American Psychological Association, Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. (1980). *Principles for the validation and use of personnel selection procedures* (2nd ed.). Berkeley, Calif.: Author.
- Caplan, A. L., and Callahan, D. (Eds.). (1981). *Ethics in hard times*. Hastings-on-the-Hudson, N.Y.: The Hastings Center, Institute of Society, Ethics, and the Life Sciences.
- Eyde, L. D., and Quantance, M. K. (1983, August). *Ethical issues and cases in the practice of personnel psychology*. In R. L. Lowman (Chair), Ethical issues and dilemmas in the practice of I/O psychology: Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Anaheim.
- Hall, J. E., and Hare-Mustin, R. T. (1983). Sanctions and the diversity of ethical complaints against psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 38, 714-729.
- Hare-Mustin, R. T., and Hall, J. E. (1981). Procedures for responding to ethics complaints against psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 36, 1494-1505.
- London, M., and Bray, D. W. (1980). Ethical issues in testing and evaluation of personnel decisions. *American Psychologist*, 35, 890-901.
- Lowman, R. L. (1983, August). *Similarities and dissimilarities of ethical issues in applied psychology disciplines*. In R. L. Lowman (Chair), Ethical issues and dilemmas in the practice of I/O Psychology: Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Anaheim.
- Lowman, R. L. (in press). The ethical practice of consultation. Not an impossible dream. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*.
- Mirvis, P. H., and Seashore, S. E. (1979). Being ethical in organizational research. *American Psychologist*, 34, 766-780.
- Reilly, R. R., Niven, J. R., and Sausser, W. I., Jr. (1983, August). *Ethical issues and cases in organizational psychology*. In R. L. Lowman (Chair), Ethical issues and dilemmas in the practice of I/O Psychology: Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Anaheim.
- Sanders, J. R. (1979). Complaints against psychologists adjudicated informally by APA's Committee on Scientific and Professional Ethics and Conduct. *American Psychologist*, 34, 1139-1144.
- Sanders, J. R., and Keith-Spiegel, P. (1980). Formal and informal adjudication of ethics complaints against psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 35, 1096-1105.
- Walton, R. E., and Warwick, D. P. (1973). The ethics of organization development. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 9, 681-698.
- Warwick, D. P. (1980). *The teachings of ethics in the social sciences: The teaching of ethics VI*. Hastings-on-Hudson, New York: The Hastings Center Institute of Society, Ethics, and the Life Sciences.