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Peace & love are watching over you.

Shepard Fairey (2007)
Whilst the literature underpinning counselling psychology generally acknowledges that values and ethics are inherent in therapy\(^1\), the different ways in which they feature and to what effect are under-explored areas. Though therapeutic literature would seem to recommend that counselling psychologists take a critically reflexive approach to values and ethics, the extent to which counselling psychology training engenders this kind of thinking is unclear. This research project therefore set about examining the ways in which values and ethics were constructed in the talk of final year trainee counselling psychologists discussing values and ethics in counselling psychology training and practice. Four focus groups comprising a total of nineteen participants were conducted and transcribed. The transcripts were analysed using Willig’s (2008) six-stage approach to Foucauldian discourse analysis, identifying and exploring the ways in which participants constructed values and ethics in counselling psychology training and practice.

The analysis examined the implications of the different constructions identified for counselling psychology training and practice and the subjective experience of counselling psychologists within these contexts. Three discursive constructions of values and two of ethics were identified, drawing on four discourses. The use of each discourse produced its own effects, offering participants different subject positions with different consequences for their therapy practice and subjective experience. The relationship between contrasting constructions of values and ethics from within an institutional and a humanistic discourse dominated discussion and appeared to have greatest impact on participants’ practice and subjectivity. Tensions were experienced between the differing demands of the institutional and humanistic discourses, resulting in feelings of dissonance and discomfort, as participants tried to mediate between contrasting constructions in an attempt to forge a coherent sense of identity and practice involving both.

\(^1\) The term *therapy* will be used throughout to denote the practice of counselling and psychotherapy.
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INTRODUCTION

Questions concerning values and ethics are never far away when considering how human beings operate together and the political issues we face as inherently social animals (Bindé, 2004). The complex nature of values and ethics has made them subjects of ongoing thought and debate as far back as Ancient Greece and the writings of Socrates (Rogers, 1925), Plato (Irwin, 1995), and Aristotle (Kraut, 2006). From early civilisations to the 21st Century, values and ethics have been implicated in the lives of human beings in a multitude of ways, carrying various consequences for our functioning as individuals and communities. Counselling psychology positions itself as a self-reflexive community of professionals engaged in helping people examine the functioning of their lives and the problems they face (Frankland & Walsh, n.d.). Of central concern are the values and ethics of those presenting for therapy, those practising it, and those of the therapeutic endeavour itself (British Psychological Society (BPS), Division of Counselling Psychology (DCoP), 2005, n.d.).

However, the psychological theories and research underpinning counselling psychology often give little specific attention to exploring the different roles that values and ethics play within therapy (Palmer Barnes & Murdin, 2001). Furthermore, the extents to which counselling psychologists are trained to think about values and ethics in a self-reflexive way is unclear (Parker, 2002). This research project therefore set about exploring how values and ethics were spoken about by counselling psychologists in relation to their training and practice. The aim was to examine the different ways in which values and ethics were constructed, looking at how different constructions informed counselling psychologists’ training and practice and impacted their subjective experience within these contexts. In order to locate the project within the landscape of existing literature relating to values and ethics and counselling psychology training and practice, the thesis begins with a literature review setting the scene for investigation. The choices of methodology and methods underpinning the research are then outlined, before the analysis produced by the project is detailed. A discussion then reviews the suitability of the research methodology and methods, before the project’s analysis is examined in relation to existing literature on the research topic. Possibilities for future research are then offered, followed by some concluding thoughts on the issues raised by the project and the implications for counselling psychology training and practice.
Overview of the literature review

The first section of the literature review – *Values and ethics* – begins by looking at the role of *values in psychology research* since the profession's inception in the UK. The task of *defining values* is then considered and an approach to definition is offered that aims to ensure the concept remains open for thoughtful investigation. The subject of *values in therapy* is then explored, taking a look at some of the ways in which values might be involved in therapy theory and practice. Specific attention is then paid to the *ethical implications* of values being involved in therapy, and an approach to *defining ethics* is offered that aims to ensure open and flexible thinking about the concept. The subject of *ethics in therapy* is then examined before some final comments are given on the importance of *ensuring awareness of values and ethics in therapy*.

The second section of the literature review – *Counselling psychology training and practice* – begins by looking at the nature of some of the *values and ethics in counselling psychology*, paying particular attention to the *values of the scientist-practitioner model* and *humanistic values* as components of counselling psychology's value base. Consideration is then given to what it means for counselling psychologists to be *critically reflexive practitioners*, and the implications of locating *counselling psychology training within the university* are discussed. Attention is then given to ideas about *teaching and learning values and ethics* before the salient points from the literature reviewed are brought together in a *summary*. Some final *conclusions and questions* are then stated, which are taken forward as concerns for investigation.
VALUES AND ETHICS

Values in psychology

The creation of the BPS in 1901 marked the emergence of psychology as a profession in the UK (Bunn, Lovie, & Richards, 2001). Early professional practices were predominantly focused on psychological testing and research (Martinelli, 2010), which sought to gain knowledge about human psychology through the application of scientific rigour (Benjamin, 2007). Psychology positioned itself as a scientific discipline in which values were predominantly thought of as being based on irrational feelings that were psychometrically inaccessible (Kelly, 1990). Given psychology’s scientific epistemology, values were seen as factors to be kept apart from theory and research, with psychologists supposedly assuming the role of objective scientific technicians whose practices were not impacted by values (Bergin, Reed Payne, & Scott Richards, 1996). Within psychology, it was asserted that “The ‘pure’ scientist has traditionally prided himself on his concern for fact, his indifference to value” (Dukes, 1955, p. 24).

Psychology did not evolve to become an applied profession dedicated to psychological treatment until after the Second World War (Benjamin, DeLeon, Freedheim, & Vanderbos, 2003). In keeping with the ‘traditional’ construction of psychology, the dominant viewpoint was that “counselors and psychotherapists should be aware of their personal values in order to prevent these valuative beliefs from influencing treatment” (Beutler & Bergan, 1991, p. 17). It was widely assumed that therapists could remain a ‘blank slate’ by assuming the role of a non-evaluatory listener and facilitator, so their values did not impact on clients (Bergin et al., 1996). There was a general reluctance amongst psychologists to acknowledge the involvement of values in therapy, which discouraged empirical work on the subject (Ehrich & Wiener, 1961). As a result, the role of values remained an under-researched area within psychology until the 1950s and 60s, when pioneering humanistic theorists such as Abraham Maslow (e.g. 1954, 1962) and Carl Rogers (e.g. 1951, 1961) invigorated the discipline with new interest in how human life was conceptualised and valued.

The approach to psychological thought and practice put forward by humanistic theory lead the psychology profession to question traditional notions of pathology, which viewed psychological problems in terms of faults, disease, and dysfunctions (Martinelli, 2010). Literature addressing the role
of values in psychology practice began to appear in psychology publications (e.g. Dukes, 1955; Ehrlich & Weiner, 1961; May, 1953). However, it was not until the 1980s and 90s that a substantial body of literature emerged asserting that psychologists do not remain value-free in their therapy practice, even when they intend to do so, and that therapy cannot exist as a value-free enterprise (e.g., Arizmendi, Beutler, Shanfield, Crago, & Hagaman, 1985; Bergin, 1980a, 1991; Beutler, 1979; Beutler, Arizmendi, Crago, Shanfield, & Hagaman, 1983; Beutler & Bergan, 1991; Beutler, Crago, & Arizmendi, 1986; Jensen & Bergin, 1988; Kelly, 1990; London, 1986; Strupp, 1980; Tjeltveit, 1986, 1999; Weisskopf-Joelson, 1980). This influx of research led to the now accepted view that a psychologist’s response to a client in therapy will invariably represent some value-laden position (Tjeltveit, 1999). Ehrlich and Wiener (1961) state, “relatively few therapists would now take issue with the assumption that therapists’ values get communicated explicitly or implicitly to the patient” (p. 364), and Bergin (1980a) states “Values are an inevitable and pervasive part of psychotherapy” (p. 97).

**Defining values**

Whilst psychology literature now affirms that values play an integral role in therapy, the concept of values is difficult to define in order to examine what that role might be: “Values are difficult to define even though everyone recognises and uses the concept” (Patterson, 1989, p. 164). Difficulties in definition have beset psychological studies of values since research efforts began. In an early review of studies, Dukes (1955) stated, “Several psychologists, it is true, have included value as a principal construct in their accounts of behavior ... but their treatments are generally sketchy” (p. 24). In a later review, Ehrlich and Wiener (1961) stated, “In spite of the recognition of the prominence and role of values in the determination of large areas of human behaviour, the broadness and inclusiveness of value concepts have functioned to discourage research efforts in the area” (p. 360). Milton Rokeach (1967, 1968, 1971, & 1973) was amongst the first to take a pragmatic approach to defining and operationalising values within psychology (Mayton, Ball-Rokeach, & Loges, 1994). Rokeach produced a definition considered by many to be “both theoretically sophisticated and easily operationalised” (Kelly, 1990, p. 174), which is shown in Box 1.
Based on this definition, Rokeach (1973) developed the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS), which sought to measure individuals’ preferences for certain values over others. Research has shown support for the RVS as a measure that is “well defined, well researched, and psychometrically sound” (Kelly, 1990, p. 175), with over 350 published studies making use of the survey since its creation (American Psychological Association (APA), 2012). However, settling on a single definition of values and pursuing a line of research on this basis does not equate to working towards a definitive understanding of the concept (Tjeltveit, 1999). Almost 100 years ago, Ralph Barton Perry (1914) astutely highlighted the problem faced by Rokeach and others trying to delineate a succinct definition; a problem that remains for those investigating the concept today, as illustrated in Box 2.

Tjeltveit (1999) suggests that, rather than trying to deduce a single definition of values, the concept might be most usefully understood through a taxonomy of definitions, with different definitions placing different emphases on different aspects of the concept. Tjeltveit offers six categories of definitions, as shown in Box 3.
Box 3

Taxonomy of definitions of values

1. **Values as psychological**: A variety of psychological concepts are emphasised, including cognitions, affects, behaviours, attitudes, traits, motivation, and social influence, which are seen to determine what people value, judge to have value, think to be good, or desire.

2. **Values as ethical**: The link between values and ethical theory is emphasised, serving to address not just what is valued psychologically but the goodness or righteousness of these values, i.e. what has value, or is valuable, as opposed to what is regarded as valuable.

3. **Values as a means by which the powerful impose their will on the weak**: The power of values is emphasised as being a way to rationalise and justify discrimination. Values are seen as constructs imposed by powerful people, groups, or institutions through dominant discourses.

4. **Values as choices**: Human beings’ choice in values is emphasised. Values are seen as being chosen rather than determined and as such represent an expression of human freedom. A person is never seen to be coerced into holding a true value; instead it is human decisions that are seen to create values.

5. **Values as authentic expressions of an individual’s nature**: Values are emphasised as being authentic expressions of our individual nature, which is discovered within ourselves and emerges as a result of getting in touch with our authentic experiencing.

6. **Values as cultural and historical**: The cultural and contextual nature of values is emphasised. Values are seen as distinctive constructs particular to the cultures and periods of time that produce them. They are contextually determined sociohistorical phenomena, which are culturally and historically contingent.

(Tjeltveit, 1999)
These six categories are not presented as a definitive list but do provide a useful entry point into thinking about the broad spectrum of values definitions that have implications for therapy practice. Tjeltveit suggests that those involved in therapy practice need to move beyond recognising that therapy is not value-free, towards understanding the ways in which it is value-laden. Bergin et al. (1996) also suggest that therapists should strive for “a more open and more complete value-informed perspective” (p. 297). Consideration of some of the ways in which values are involved in therapy is therefore needed if greater understanding of the concept is to be gained.

Values in therapy

Jenson and Bergin (1988) suggest four dimensions of therapy in which values are inherent: the goals of treatment; theories of personality and pathology; psychotherapy models and techniques; and outcome. Whilst not claiming to account for all of the ways in which values are involved in therapy, these dimensions provide a useful starting point for exploring some of the ways they do feature and the implications of their involvement. Each dimension is elaborated upon below.

1. The goals of treatment

Jenson and Bergin (1988) suggest that the value-system underlying therapy constitutes a set of “orienting beliefs about what is good or bad for clients and how that good can be achieved” (p. 290). On this basis, questions arise about who decides what is good or bad for clients, based upon what and why. Many have conceptualised the therapeutic process as one of systematically attempting to alter ‘maladaptive’ or ‘destructive’ attitudes held by clients to improve mental health and psychological functioning, modifying client values as part of this process (Beutler, 1972). However, if the goal of therapy is ‘mental health’ and ‘improved psychological functioning’, what do these value-laden terms mean and what are the implications of attributing value in such a way? Furthermore, if the goal of treatment is to modify clients’ values, how should this be done and on what basis? As Shillito-Clarke (2003) states, “Therapy cannot be value free. The key issue thus becomes: who determines what is desirable and against which criteria?” (p. 619). Stiles (1993) suggests that therapy ‘stakeholders’ – “individuals or groups, therapists, clients, families, or others in society – may have different perspectives, interests, and values regarding psychotherapeutic outcomes” (p. 116). How then do therapists ensure that clients’ values are being served in therapy? Bergin (1985) argues that clients’
values and self-determination must be respected, and that therapists cannot improve ‘mental health’
by force feeding clients values to achieve goals that are not their own.

2. Theories of personality and pathology

Given the elasticity of the term values, it is likely that therapists will differ from clients, one another,
and other professionals in how they apply it to human experiences and how they value psychological
health (Shillito-Clarke, 2003). Jones and Wilcox (1993) suggest that psychological theories are
underpinned by metaphysical assumptions, which are in turn underpinned by value-systems:
“psychotherapeutic theories embody values, in that each includes explicit or implicit judgments about
the nature of human life that is ‘good’ (healthy, whole, realistic, rational) and that is ‘bad’ (abnormal,
pathological, immature, stunted, self-deceived)” (Jones & Wilcox, 1993, p. 42). In some instances,
matters of value may be perceived by therapists as representing an aspect of a client’s
psychopathology. As a result, the therapist may look to therapeutic theory for answers to perceived
problems that actually reflect clients’ values rather than dysfunction, causing them to deal with
situations defensively (Palmer Barnes, 2001). Christopher (1999) argues that assessment, diagnosis,
treatment goals, interventions, concepts of mental health, and underlying theories of personality and
development are all influenced by cultural values that equate to presuppositions about the nature of
human beings and what constitutes ‘the good life’. It is argued that counselling remains essentially
Eurocentric, ethnocentric, and individualistic (Moodley, 1999), with almost all psychotherapeutic
theory reflecting the values of white, Western psychology (Feltham, 1997).

3. Psychotherapy models and techniques

Glad (1959) suggests that therapists using different theoretical models and techniques differ
essentially in the values they teach their patients and the techniques employed to do so. He suggests
that therapists’ ideas about psychological health will be reflected in their personal and professional
value judgments, made through the lens of a particular theoretical model. Glad posits that the values
of a model will be conveyed via the therapist to clients over the course of therapy, influencing what
they obtain from the relationship. Parloff, Ilfund, and Goldstein (1960) suggest that the values of
different theoretical models guide therapists in their selection of therapeutically relevant material.
Similarly, Shillito-Clarke (2003) states, “the values inherent in preferred theoretical models determine
the kinds of therapeutic interventions made” (p. 619). If therapists view clients’ material within the value-system of a particular model, which is conveyed through their technique and selection of material, acculturation of clients’ values towards those of the model may occur (Odell & Stewart, 1993). Therapists may begin to lose sight of clients’ values and conduct therapy based on their own terms (House, 2003). Bergin et al. (1996) state, “Whether buttressed by phenomenology, humanism and existentialism, cognitive-behavioral thinking, or psychodynamic narratives, the valuing experience of each person remains a reality – determining and directing, to a large extent, both the essence of being human and the nature of change” (p. 318-319). Therefore, rather than enforcing the values of a particular model through its rigid application, Bergin et al. suggest that therapists should aim to honour clients’ individual integrity by providing “an ethical experience where growth and change can occur within one’s value framework” (p. 297).

4. Outcome

It seems conceivable that the way in which a therapist values the importance of a client’s material within therapy will become apparent to them over the course of treatment (Parloff et al., 1960). In keeping with this, Palmer Barnes and Murdin (2001) state, “As practitioners we understand that everything we do or say constitutes a form of suggestion and that our own value-system is bound to be communicated to clients” (p. 3). Beyond the therapist-client dyad, the value-systems of other therapy stakeholders may also play a role, exerting pressure on the therapist in a way that impacts their practice, resulting in the vicarious communication of third party values to the client (Carroll, 1996). Different stakeholders may have different expectations and value different outcomes. The communication of values to clients within therapy may mean they begin to adopt the values implied by their therapist’s practice, irrespective of whether or not the therapist aims for this to happen (Shillito-Clarke, 2003). There is considerable research suggesting that an assimilation of a client’s values towards those of the therapist over the course of therapy may be an integral part of therapeutic change and may be associated with ‘positive’ therapeutic outcome as rated by the client and/or therapist (e.g. Atkinson & Schein, 1986; Beutler, 1972, 1979, 1981; Beutler, Crago, & Arizmendi, 1986; Beutler & Bergan, 1991; Beutler, Pollack, & Jobe, 1978; Kelly, 1990; Kelly & Strupp, 1992; Kessel & McBrearty, 1967; Rosenthal, 1955; Tjeltveit, 1986). However, the exact nature of the relationship between client and therapist values and therapy process and outcome remains unclear.
Nevertheless, if therapists have the capacity to influence clients' values, they have a professional responsibility to reflect with great care on the values they hold and communicate, lest their influence be less than optimal (Tjeltveit, 1999).

**Ethical implications**

Therapists' communication of values to clients in therapy raises questions concerning the ethical dimensions of therapy (Corey, Corey, & Callanan, 2011). How do therapists avoid client coercion and preserve self-direction when they are communicating values with the potential to bring about value change? The importance of client autonomy is emphasised as a fundamental feature of ethical practice across therapeutic professions (American Counselling Association (ACA), 2005; APA, 2010; British Association of Counselling & Psychotherapy (BACP), 2010; BPS, DCoP, 2005; Health Professions Council (HPC), 2010; United Kingdom Council for Psychotherapy (UKCP), 2009). It is generally agreed that “Therapists should not impose their own values on patients, but respect their autonomy and choice” (Holmes, 2001, p. xv). Some professional bodies go so far as to provide directives on how therapists should manage the involvement of values in practice. For example, the ACA Code of Ethics (2005) contains a directive called “Avoiding Harm and Imposing Values” (section A.4.), which states, “Counselors are aware of their own values, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours and avoid imposing values that are inconsistent with counseling goals” (section A.4.b.). This statement raises its own questions about the values embedded in counselling goals. It would seem that where questions regarding values arise within therapy, questions regarding ethics are sure to follow. It would also seem that values and ethics are intrinsically linked across dimensions of therapy. Tjeltveit (1999) states, “it is never possible to sunder values from ethical theory. Indeed, on some accounts of values, ethical theory and values are inextricably bound” (p. 83). The ethical dimensions of therapy therefore require some examination alongside the role of values.

**Defining ethics**

The concept of *ethics* has been put to use by psychologists, sociologists, philosophers, and the general public in various ways to address a wide array of questions about what is good, right, desirable, virtuous, and moral (Palmer Barnes & Murdin, 2001). As with values, settling on a single definition of ethics is likely to close down ways in which the concept can be thought about, hindering
the breadth of its exploration. In light of this, Tjeltveit (1999) offers six distinguishable but intertwined dimensions of ethics that might be usefully considered when thinking about ways in which the concept features in therapy. Box 4 provides brief descriptions of each dimension, to which two amendments have been made for the purposes of this project. Firstly, the dimension Tjeltveit originally calls ‘theoretical ethics’ will be called philosophical ethics. Secondly, the dimension Tjeltveit originally calls ‘clinical ethics’ will be called applied ethics. These changes have been made to avoid connotations with psychological theory and the medical model respectively.

**Box 4**

**Dimensions of ethics**

1. *Professional ethics* addresses the standards that govern members of a profession in their interaction with those served by it. These standards are generated from within the profession and are represented in codes of ethics outlining the obligations of members of a particular discipline, and may also outline ideal behaviours to which professionals should aspire.

2. *Philosophical ethics* addresses the intellectual foundations of ethics. Based upon philosophical and theoretical reflection, it represents the systematic endeavour to understand moral concepts about good or bad, right or wrong, and to justify moral principles and theories. It seeks to discover value principles and the relationship between these principles.

3. *Applied ethics* addresses the decisions practitioners make in their therapeutic practice. These may be related to the process of therapy and/or its goals. A top-down approach would apply principles derived from philosophical ethics to provide universal answers to ethical issues across the board. A bottom-up approach would consider the appropriateness of principles derived from philosophical ethics in relation to context-specific situations.

(Continues)
These six dimensions are not presented as a definitive list of ethical dimensions but as a broad spectrum of ideas that offer food for thought when considering notions of ethics and the role of values in therapy. Tjeltveit suggests that by exploring the ethical dimensions of therapy, and their relationship with values, therapists might enhance their understanding of what it means to be ethical: “we need more sophisticated analyses of the ethical character of psychotherapy” (Tjeltviet, 1999, p. 13). Some examination is therefore needed of how ethics features in therapy and to what end.

**Ethics in therapy**

Ethics in therapy might seem like a straightforward topic: therapists should be properly trained; they should be members of a reputable professional organisation with a well-developed code of ethics; they should establish clear contracts with clients and demonstrate appropriate boundaries; their practice should be founded on defensible research as opposed to anecdote or charisma; and clients
should be safeguarded against harm, exploitation, and coercion (Holmes, 2001). However, the role of ethics in therapy is neither fixed nor simple (Shillito-Claire, 2003), it is filled with confusion, uncertainty, and mystery (Holmes, 2001). Whilst therapists might aim to behave ethically towards clients by being non-invasive and tolerant of different values, their own values are constantly being communicated through their actions, impacting clients in relatively unknown ways. Furthermore, showing tolerance of clients’ values and respecting their right to hold values different from the therapist's own does not mean assuming an ethically relativistic position. Bergin et al. (1996) suggest that such a position is problematic, since it implies that therapists should accept all clients’ values as equally good or valid, which is a value assumption in itself. Kitchener (1980) and Bergin (1980b) suggest that an ethically relativistic stance is inconsistent with the goals of therapy, since whenever therapists advocate or pursue specific goals of change, implicitly or explicitly, they cease to be relativists. Where the values held by a client appear to be having negative emotional or physical consequences, a relativistic stance would make it impossible for a therapist to challenge these values since all values would be assumed equal. Bergin et al. (1996) therefore advocate “An explicit and nonrelativistic therapist stance about values, along with a tolerance for differences” (p. 300).

Holmes (2001) posits three interrelated therapist qualities that might go some way to ensuring that therapists remain aware of what is occurring between themselves and clients and aim towards assuming an ethical stance in their practice. These qualities are shown in Box 5.

**Box 5**

**Therapist qualities**

1. *The capacity for self-reflection:* Therapists should have the ability to see thoughts, feelings, and actions as they arise in therapy and to think about them.

2. *The capacity to put thoughts, feelings, and potential actions into words:* Therapists should be able to articulate the thoughts, feelings, and potential actions arising within therapy, rather than being drawn into enactment.

3. *The ability to attend closely to boundaries:* Therapists should be aware of the potential pitfalls created by therapeutic intimacy and its limitations.

(Holmes, 2001)
Whilst values are not mentioned specifically in relation to these qualities, as part of the therapist’s processing of thoughts, feelings, and potential actions there is the potential for them to become aware of the values embedded in the material being reflected upon. The self-awareness Holmes emphasises seems central to therapists’ engagement in a process of ethical reasoning, whereby ethical decisions are made with an awareness of what is taking place, what is being responded to, what is going into formulating a response, and what the implications of this might be. Whilst Holmes’s qualities indicate self-awareness skills that might facilitate ethical reasoning, Shillito-Clarke (2003) offers a model of ethical reasoning based on Beauchamp and Childress’s (2001) model of moral justification. Shillito-Clarke’s model provides a useful heuristic for thinking about the ways in which ethical decisions are made in practice, as shown in Figure 1.

**Figure 1**

Model of ethical reasoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical-evaluative level</th>
<th>Theories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beneficence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-maleficence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fidelity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Intuitive level           | Individual conscience |

(Shillito-Clarke, 2003, p. 617)

Ethical reasoning can be seen to take place on two levels within the model: an *intuitive level* and a *critical-evaluative* level. The intuitive level constitutes an individual’s immediate response to a situation, which Shillito-Clarke equates to decisions made through the prism of an individual’s conscience. This response is the product of an individual’s upbringing and past experiences.
However, an individual’s intuitive response may be insufficiently resourced when facing complex and challenging situations. In such circumstances a therapist may need to engage in thinking at a critical-evaluative level to illuminate, refine, and guide their ethical reasoning. The critical-evaluative level comprises three hierarchical sub-levels, as detailed in Box 6.

**Box 6**

**Sub-levels of the critical evaluative level**

1. *Theories* are comprised of ideas about the nature and meaning of human existence, which are invoked and considered in relation to ethical issues faced by the therapist. Different ethical theories are underpinned by different systems of values, each saying something about the meaning and sanctity of life.

2. *Principles* are comprised of particular pre-established values or value-systems that are contingently applied to situations to guide behaviour. Five ethical principles are suggested that therapists should apply in their practice, these being autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, justice, and fidelity.

3. *Rules* are set in place through specific laws and codes of conduct to govern behaviour. Values are coordinated and sanctioned in a way that stipulates what should and should not be done. All therapeutic professions have codes of ethics setting out the standards of ethical practice acceptable to members, with which all members must comply.

*(Shillito-Clarke, 2003)*

The interrelated, hierarchical nature of these levels means that ethical problems are responded to on the basis of their complexity. By moving through the levels the therapist attunes their response to the issue being faced. Whilst this model provides structure to ethical reasoning, it is important to recognise that a therapist’s intuitive response and their thinking undertaken at a critical-evaluative level are both produced subjectively. Therapists’ values play a central role in managing the process, informing and influencing their perspective and decision making at all levels. Thus, it remains important for therapists to interrogate and reflect upon the values involved in their ethical decision.
making process if they are to exhibit the therapist qualities Holmes suggests, and lay claim to being ethically aware.

**Ensuring awareness of values and ethics in therapy**

Given that therapists are communicating an array of values to clients during therapy practice, which are linked to various ethical dimensions of therapy, it would seem important that they have a clear and explicit understanding of this process so they are aware of the values and ethics involved (Bergin et al., 1996). Palmer Barnes (2001) states, "The patient's values, whether we agree with them or not, need to remain present in the practitioner's mind and may challenge the psychotherapist's view of difference and change his or her perceptions and values. We learn from our patients and they learn from us, but only if there is a flexibility and willingness to learn" (p. 84). It would seem that counselling psychologists should be engaged in critically examining different notions of values and ethics, their own, those of others, and especially those of clients, in order to learn how they might best serve their clients' needs and practice ethically (Tjeltveit, 1999). Rowson (2001) states, "As professionals concerned to clarify our own ethical perspectives and understand those of clients and colleagues, we need to know not only what broad and general principles we each hold but also what particular interpretations we give to them" (p. 6).

By critically reflecting on the ways in which values and ethics are involved in therapy, therapists might avoid exerting undue value influence on clients and minimise the potential for force feeding them values under the rubric of therapy. As Tjeltveit (1999) suggests, "This means thinking about alternative analyses of values and ethics (including the best ethical answers from across the centuries and from other cultures), exposing one's own beliefs to rational scrutiny, and entering into dialogue with those holding other views" (p. 13). Ehrlich and Wiener (1961) emphasise how important it is that therapists are aware of their values and the ways they might impact clients: "it is crucial for the therapist to make his own values explicit, and to foresee and anticipate how they may affect the patient's value system" (p. 364). Similarly, Bergin et al. (1996) state, "it is essential that relevant values become explicit so informed choice is possible and autonomy remains a reality" (p. 298). The values involved in counselling psychology therefore require some examination if counselling psychologists are to garner increased awareness of those embedded in their practice.
Values and ethics in counselling psychology

The 1970s saw an increasing number of individuals gain a first degree in psychology and go on to do counselling training or helping work of some kind (Orlans & Van Scoyoc, 2008). However, there was no defined professional position for such individuals within the BPS at that time. In response to this, the BPS set up a Working Party in 1979 to consider the relationship between psychology and counselling (Nelson-Jones, 1999). The aim was to examine whether counselling was a legitimate activity for psychologists and the extent to which it could be supported by the BPS. Attention was directed towards examining definitions of counselling and how this activity could be distinguished from psychotherapy; training programmes for counsellors and related standards; professional and ethical guidelines for such work; the relationship between counselling in the UK and other countries; and the relationship between counselling and psychological research (Orlans & Van Scoyoc, 2008).

The Working Party's report supported the recognition of counselling as a distinct activity rooted in the understanding of psychological processes (Nelson-Jones, 1999). As a result, the BPS established an interest-based Section of Counselling Psychology in December 1982. In 1989, this became a Special Group with its own practice guidelines and the BPS concurrently established a Diploma in Counselling Psychology to provide trainees with a route to chartered status. Full divisional status was achieved in 1994 and psychologists with the Diploma or a statement of equivalence became eligible for chartered status. In 1996, the equivalence route was closed marking the emergence of counselling psychology as a profession, since everyone qualifying thereafter would have undertaken a formal training, either by completing a BPS accredited course or via the independent route (Strawbridge & Woolfe, 2003).

In an attempt to examine the construction of counselling psychology in Britain, Pugh and Coyle (2000) conducted discourse analysis on articles from the 1990 and 1996 volumes of Counselling Psychology Review addressing its construction, “to explore the extent to which counselling psychology has been constructed as a separate space for inquiry” (p. 86). Their analysis suggests that emphasis in the 1990 papers was on the construction of identity and legitimacy, achieved largely through representations of similarity and difference at a general level compared to related professions – particularly clinical psychology – whereas the 1996 papers had a greater emphasis on more fine-
grained constructions of similarity and difference, such as counselling psychology's unique phenomenological value-system. Specifically, Pugh and Coyle highlight allusions to the positioning of counselling psychology's value-system as 'alternative' to that of an experimental scientific paradigm. They suggest that other domains of professional psychology, such as clinical psychology, are implicitly represented as having been shaped by a traditional model of science, based on scientific values such as objectivity, and are portrayed as having evolved in a patriarchal context reflecting masculine attributes. In contrast to this, they suggest that counselling psychology, being a 'therapeutic psychology', is often portrayed as feminine in its construction, and it may be this discourse that is being invoked when attributing a 'different' value-system to it: "the use of the first person singular conveying something of the nature of that value system, i.e. an emphasis on subjectivity, reflexivity and ‘the inescapably socio-political character of practice’ and an abandonment of disinterested detachment" (Pugh & Coyle, 2000, p. 95).

In an attempt to place ‘counselling psychology in context’, Strawbridge and Woolfe (2003) suggest counselling psychology in Britain can be seen as a return of counselling to psychology: "The former is rooted in humanistic and existential-phenomenological psychology in which the search for understanding and meaning is central and in which the focus is upon an engagement with subjective experience, values and beliefs. The latter (in the United Kingdom and United States) has emphasised its roots in experimental behavioural science" (Strawbridge & Woolfe, 2003, p. 5). Counselling and psychology are thus seen as having different value-systems, brought together in counselling psychology. Strawbridge and Woolfe suggest that the difference between these value-systems is not unbridgeable but is greatly dependent on what is meant by the terms science and scientist-practitioner. They suggest that a reversal of the latter term to practitioner-scientist may help to stress practice and the values of practise-based research, as well as to distance counselling psychology from the dominant ‘rationality’ model of science: "At the very least we must address and seek to transcend the gulf that has existed between the dominant view of science as value-free and practice as grounded in humanistic values and characterized by uncertainty and value conflict" (Strawbridge & Woolfe, 2003, p. 7).
The values of the scientist-practitioner model

The scientist-practitioner model has been the most widely adopted model for organising the training of professional psychologists on university training programmes since it was proposed at the Boulder Conference on Graduate Education in Clinical Psychology in 1949 (Aspenson & Gersh, 1993). Whilst the original intent of the model was to train students in both research and clinical practice, the integration of science and practice in this way has been the subject of much controversy (Barlow, Hayes, & Nelson, 1984). Whilst the scientist-practitioner model is cited as “a cornerstone of counselling psychology identity” (Chwalisz, 2003, p. 497), the rationale for the model has been criticised as “spurious; the Boulder Model trains students as researchers, a role that is incompatible with their interests and abilities” (Frank, 1984, p. 417). Holland (1986) argues that practitioners and scientists are different personality types based on different value-systems and should not be forced into the mould of a monolithic training model within counselling psychology.

Corrie (2003) suggests that the extent to which counselling psychologists define themselves as being artists or scientists may reflect how they wish to position themselves within the evidence-based practice debate. Corrie (2003) asks, “Is it still appropriate for counselling psychologists to identify themselves with the scientist-practitioner model on those occasions when they are not actively producing evidence? Or is the scientist-practitioner model a philosophy of practice that has outlived its usefulness and which needs updating in the light of contemporary health care developments?” (p. 11). Questions surrounding the scientist-practitioner model have implications for counselling psychology training. If a traditional scientific approach to values differs from that of a reflective practitioner – the former emphasising objectivity and the production of knowledge, the latter acknowledging the role of values in human relationships and the unknown (Strawbridge & Woolfe, 2003) – how is this tension dealt with on a university training course?

Aspenson and Gersh (1993) employed qualitative and quantitative research methods to explore twenty-four graduate psychology students’ subjective experiences of the scientist-practitioner training model and its perceived viability for developing professional identities as psychologists. Participants were doctoral students on APA accredited courses, studying counselling, clinical, and school psychology. The Scientist-Practitioner Inventory (SPI; Leong & Zachar, 1991) was used to measure participants’ interest in work activities associated with the roles of scientist and practitioner in the field
of psychology. Semi-structured interviews were also conducted exploring participants' professional goals; perceptions of their ideal training program; perceptions of their current program; and perceptions of the scientist-practitioner model. Aspenson and Gersh found students' responses ranged from those with “an almost evangelistic zeal for the model” (p. 215) to those who considered it “impractical, unnecessary, and largely irrelevant to their own career goals” (p. 215). Participants were classified into three general groups, as shown in Box 7.

**Box 7**

**Students' responses to the scientist-practitioner model**

1. *Positive* students viewed the wedding of research and practice as a desirable goal for all psychologists, emphasising the need for them to draw upon each other. They were least ambivalent about the relevance of the scientist-practitioner model to their professional goals and interests. The *positive* group indicated stronger interests in science and research activities and weaker interests in practice and therapy activities on the SPI. Students in this group reported positive experiences that had shaped their views on the scientist-practitioner model and almost all had past experience in research and practice.

2. *Negative* students found it difficult to define the scientist-practitioner model without producing negative evaluations. They viewed science and practice as separate areas of professional activity and were most likely to advocate separate avenues for training. Whilst some saw merit in being a consumer of research, most viewed their research training as demanding more time and effort than preferred. The *negative* group indicated stronger interests in practice and therapy activities and weaker interests in science and research activities on the SPI. Students in this group reported little exposure to, and/or investment in, the scientist-practitioner model prior to their training programme.

(Continues)
Across the groups, most students viewed science and practice as distinctly separate components of the scientist-practitioner model, and most students equated science with research. Conceptualisations of the scientist-practitioner model that referred to the integration of science and practice were relatively rare. Furthermore, many students felt they had few faculty role-models on their training programme that functioned in an integrated manner as scientist-practitioners. Aspenson and Gersh suggest that students’ perceptions and feelings about the scientist-practitioner model are likely to be influenced by both positive and negative ‘shaping experiences’ in their environment. These experiences can take various forms, including contact with scientist-practitioner role-models, personal experiences integrating science and practice, and exposure to research relating to students’ practice interests. They also suggest that these experiences indirectly impact students’ perceptions of the scientist-practitioner model by influencing their definition of science and their career aspirations and interests.

### Humanistic values in counselling psychology

Born out of the cultural shift of the 1960s and 70s, emphasising the importance of human freedom and individuality, the epistemological stance of counselling psychology is commonly seen as being humanistic, eschewing the values of orthodox ‘value-free’ psychoanalysis and positivist behavioural
psychology (Ashley, 2010; Strawbridge & Woolfe, 2010). Instead, counselling psychology emphasises the importance of intersubjectivity and relational factors, and encourages an attitude of curiosity and questioning, working towards a tentative understanding of human life on this basis (Milton, 2010). The knowledge base underpinning counselling psychology draws on a range of therapeutic modalities. The major schools of thought – psychodynamic, humanistic, and cognitive behavioural – differ in how they construct and attend to human beings and psychology, and in doing so intimate different values and ways of valuing. Psychodynamic theory places value on the role of unconscious mental processes in understanding human psychology and behaviour, fostering “skepticism about the apparent self-evident meaning of surface phenomena” (Person, 1983, p. 623). In contrast to this, humanistic theory places value on a person’s ability to grow and achieve, or strive for self-actualisation (Maslow, 1954), in relation to conditions of their environment, fostering a holistic approach to human beings as relationally embedded, conscious, volitional individuals (Bugental, 1964). Different still is cognitive behavioural theory, which places value on observable behaviour as an indicator of a person’s psychology, fostering collaborative empiricism between a therapist and client who work together to test the validity of potentially maladaptive thoughts, assumptions, and beliefs that may underlie self-limiting or problematic behaviours (Beck, 2011).

Thus, whilst counselling psychology’s knowledge base draws on different therapeutic models that are not altogether congruent in the values they purport, these models tend to be viewed through a predominantly humanistic lens. This is a defining feature of counselling psychology that distinguishes it from other therapeutic professions, such as psychoanalysis and clinical psychology, which assume alternative epistemological stances and pursue different processes of training, enquiry, and practice on this basis (Strawbridge & Woolfe, 2003). This is not, however, to say that all counselling psychologists are humanistic practitioners, rather it is to say that people are understood and restored in relationship as counselling psychologists navigate different models in their practice, recognising that psychological distress has many causes and maintaining factors and that it is impossible for any single model to capture all of these” (Ashley, 2010, p. 125).

Martinelli (2010) utilises the process of ‘reflective judgement’ proposed by King and Kitchener (2002) to explore the philosophical development of counselling psychology from its inception to 2010, and in doing so touches upon some of the values involved in counselling psychology’s construction and
identity. Martinelli suggests that, whilst counselling psychology is “a broad church, marrying different practices often rooted in diverse if not opposite philosophical and epistemological systems” (p. 40), a coherent identity is achieved through a unifying set of humanistic values and ethics, as proposed by Cooper (2009). Cooper attempts to identify the ‘essential’ values of counselling psychology that make it distinct from other psychological professions, drawing on a range of counselling psychology texts (BPS Qualifications Office, 2008; Gillon, 2007; Orlans & Van Scoyoc, 2008; Woolfe, 1996) to offer six key principles, as shown in Box 8.

**Box 8**

*Key principles of counselling psychology*

1. A prioritisation of the client’s subjective and intersubjective experiencing, as opposed to a prioritisation of the therapist’s observations or ‘objective’ measures.

2. A focus on facilitating growth and the actualisation of potential, as opposed to a focus on treating pathology.

3. An orientation towards empowering clients, as opposed to empowerment as an adjunct to an absence of mental illness.

4. A commitment to a democratic, non-hierarchical client-therapist relationship, as opposed to a stance of therapist-as-expert.

5. An appreciation of the client as a unique being, as opposed to viewing the client as an instance of universal laws.

6. An understanding of the client as a socially and relationally-embedded being, including an awareness that the client may be experiencing discrimination and prejudice, as opposed to a wholly intrapsychic focus.

(Cooper, 2009)

Cooper suggests that the practice of counselling psychology constitutes the application of these principles, which in turn represents “ethics-in-action” (p. 120). Highlighting the congruence of these
principles with those of humanistic psychology, he notes that counselling psychology is often defined as having a humanistic value base (e.g. Joseph, 2008; Orlans & Van Scyoc, 2008; Walsh & Frankland, 2009; Woolfe, 1996). Cooper suggests that the principles underpinning counselling psychology share some ground with ideas about ethics expressed by the philosopher Emanuel Lévinas (1989). Drawing on Lévinas’s philosophy, Cooper suggests that counselling psychology’s humanistic value base “is most succinctly expressed in Lévinas’s concept of ‘Welcoming the Other’” (p. 119), in which Thou is given precedence over I (Dasey, 1999). In Lévinas’s writing on ethics, one’s ethical concern begins with one’s responsibility for the Other and the demand he or she makes of us when encountered: “The way the other imposes its enigmatic irreducibility and nonrelativity or absoluteness is by means of a command and a prohibition: You are not allowed to kill me; you must accord me a place under the sun and everything that is necessary to live a truly human life ... the other’s facing me makes me responsible for him/her” (Peperzak, 1993, p. 22). Translating this notion into therapy practice, Cooper suggests that a stance of welcoming the Other “in all their otherness” (p. 121) represents “an articulation of the essential ethic and politic that, for many of us, underlies counselling psychology” (p. 121).

However, in attempting to incorporate a notion of Lévinasian Otherness into counselling psychology, Cooper risks ratifying an instructed way-of-being that is theoretically defined. This might actually close down the potentiality of a human encounter by viewing the Other through a supposed Lévinasian lens. In terms of the ideas proposed by Lévinas, it is not through a Lévinasian lens or any other theoretical structure that we may ethically view the Other: “the ethical does not belong to any particular discipline or perspective at all; it is as originary as the most fundamental moment of theoretical philosophy because it precedes any possible scission between the theoretical and the practical or between description and evaluation” (Peperzak, 1993, p. 124). Presenting Lévinas’s work as ‘an ethics’ for counselling psychology, or an addition to phenomenology, is therefore misguided. Lévinas’s aim is far more radical than this: “practice and theory, metaphysics and theory have not yet separated ... vision and ethics as the source of all morality are still one” (Peperzak, 1993, p. 124). As Lévinas (1991) states, “Already of itself ethics is an ‘optics’” (p 29). The ethical relation that is commanded by the face of the Other is therefore not a theoretical exercise, since theories cannot contain the moral imperatives that ultimately drive them and give them sense (Cohen, 2003). The face of the Other is in and of itself a command to action without intervening theoretical structure. ‘Thou shall not kill’ is first
an immediate command before it is a theory (Cohen, 2003). The distinction between theory and practice is therefore broken down: "action no longer rests upon illuminating knowledge, upon preliminary reflection" (Wyschogrod, 2000, p. 102).

Lévinas calls conscious intentionality into question: “What is at stake here is the calling of consciousness into question, and not a consciousness of a calling into question” (Lévinas, 1964, p. 54). In Cooper's (2009) transposing of Lévinas's ideas about ethics into a stance, the client is acquired and appropriated as a property of the therapist’s conscious intentionality. The notion of ethics that Lévinas describes thus becomes lost. Cooper seems to come closest to illuminating the notion of ethics that Lévinas proposes when he writes, “welcoming the Other is not just a corollary to our therapeutic practice; it is its very essence” (p.121). However, Cooper still faces a conundrum, since, by stipulating the essence of counselling psychology, conscious intentionality once again comes into play and appropriation of the Other is inevitable. Whilst Cooper’s intention in trying to articulate counselling psychology's open and welcoming stance towards clients seems good natured, the problem he faces is one inherent in all theorising or structuring of ethics. In Lévinasian terms, by trying to stipulate ethics, ethics becomes consciously intentional, carrying with it the potential to do violence by appropriating the Other in the name of ethics. Thus, it would seem that one cannot speak of ethics without imposing a theoretical structure into which the Other is subsumed. The risk is that “Modern man is reduced to an object of sociology or psycho-analysis, a plaything of technology, a pawn of ideology” (Smith, 1983, p. 197).

Counselling psychology involves some degree of trying to comprehend the Other, although “The Other cannot be captured or grasped and is therefore, in the strictest sense of the word, incomprehensible” (Peperzak, 1993, p. 21). The notion of ethics described by Lévinas cannot, therefore, be subsumed into counselling psychology as a governing construct per se, but his ideas do hold provocative relevance for counselling psychology, its theories, training, and practice. It would seem that Cooper’s (mis)appropriation of Lévinas for counselling psychology provides weight to the argument that therapists should be explicit about the systems of values and ethics involved in their practice, so as not to miss seeing the different ways in which clients are appropriated into these systems. Whilst counselling psychologists might do well to engage in an ongoing process of critical
reflection that aims towards welcoming the Other in all their Otherness, they should do so based on the understanding that realising this aim will perpetually elude them.

**Counselling psychologists as critically reflexive practitioners**

Parks (2007) states, “With counselling trends today stressing the values and behaviours of the therapist, it is crucial that counsellors can look at, understand and accept themselves as well as their clients” (p.21). Postmodern and social constructionist appeals for reflexivity in therapy practice have encouraged therapists to critically reflect on their interventions and practices (Strous, 2006). Etherington (2004) offers a definition of reflexivity in research that can be thought of in relation to therapy practice. Etherington describes reflexivity as the process of “being aware in the moment of what is influencing our internal and external responses, while also being aware of what influences our relationship to our topic and our participants” (2004, p. 46). Within therapy, the topic comprises all of the issues faced by the therapist as part of their practice, including those relating to clients and their material, whilst participants includes clients and all other therapy stakeholders the therapist has involvement with. McLeod (2007) suggests that therapist reflexivity “reflects a critical dimension of what it takes to be a good counsellor” (p. 75). Strous (2006) argues that it is important therapists do not assume they have a monopoly on knowledge or believe that their practices are based on objective understandings. Instead they should critically reflect on their professional assumptions and their own socialisation to gain greater understanding of the factors affecting their work. If counselling psychologists are to be engaged in this process, does counselling psychology training within universities, commonly seen as institutions of modernity based around knowledge (Delanty, 2001), encourage and facilitate critically reflexive thinking?

**Counselling psychology training within the university**

What was previously a rapidly growing affiliative association between counselling psychology training and universities is now a well established relationship (Figlio, 2000; House, 2001), offering a pathway to statutory status with the HPC and chartered status with the BPS, both now prerequisites for practice as a counselling psychologist (BPS, 2009; HPC, 2010). House (2001) argues, “This is a major development whose causes, consequences and appropriateness have received far less attention in the literature – including the ‘anti-professionalization’ literature – than they surely warrant”
At a time when universities are facing governmental budget cuts and increased emphasis on auditing, throughput, and efficiency, it is surprising that there has not been more discussion about whether universities are appropriate places to teach counselling psychology, and if so how teaching should take place (Berry & Woolfe, 1997).

Berry and Woolfe (1997) question the extent to which the differing cultures and value-systems of counselling on the one hand and teaching and learning on the other can ever be congruent. They state, “Universities are institutions of learning whose commitment is to the overall development of knowledge” (p. 518), whilst “counselling training is more subtle and involves personal development and practical competence” (p. 518). Coren (2002) states, “There is a school of thought that believes the notion of teaching, whether it is a technique, skill or process, in the field of therapeutic counselling, is in essence a contradiction in terms” (p. 371). If, as Shillito-Clarke (2003) suggests, “Frequent questioning and reflection on the ethical implications of ideas and actions, both conscious and unconscious, are crucial” (p. 632), is a university setting conducive to engaging trainees in a critically reflexive approach to learning, whilst also teaching and assessing academic knowledge? How are values and ethics modelled and explored by a university within the content of a training programme, its delivery and assessment?

Coren (2002) suggests that “independent trainings (hearts) and university trainings (minds) have different underlying values and aims” (p. 372). Furthermore, he states, “Universities appear to be profoundly ambivalent about the notion of learning through process, evolving a host of strategies, procedures and protocols to manage that which it finds problematic” (p. 372). Coren argues that universities struggle where processes cannot be easily converted into a procedure or protocol that can be generically implemented and examined. The result, he suggests, is a linear, “theory-driven, or technocratic, method of learning and teaching” (p. 372), meaning “Therapeutic ‘knowledge’ then becomes a set of competencies and skills, something mechanical, which can be taught and applied rather than experienced” (p. 373). House (2001) suggests it is “plausible to argue that an overly-academic, over-theoretical approach in psychotherapy training will very likely detract from the kind of ‘being values’ (Heron, 1996) that surely lie at the heart of the best psychotherapeutic practice” (p. 384). Furthermore, Berry and Woolfe (1997) argue that the systematic evaluation of students knowledge and competency via structured assessments, an intrinsic part of the academic system, is
inimical to the ethical culture of counselling: “It is not easy to reconcile the notion of a student having the human potential to self-actualise with university assessment systems which emphasise clear pass/fail boundaries based on objective criteria” (Berry & Woolfe, 1997, p. 518). McLeod (1992) also suggests that “the academic performance of students ... probably has a minimal correlation with counselling skill” (p. 359).

The way in which Counselling psychologists view the therapeutic task is likely to be influenced by the context in which they have been trained (Coren, 2002). Thus, the nature of universities as institutions of learning and knowledge is likely to have some influence on how trainees learn to be counselling psychologists and conceptualise its practices in terms of values and ethics. Parker (2002) suggests that university training courses suffer from university temptations and institutional practices that are incongruent with the values and ethics of therapy, which “betray the ethos of good therapeutic work” (p. 332). He identifies four temptations, as outlined in Box 9, which he argues are “endemic in the structure of universities as masculine institutions” (p. 345), contrasting with the more feminine values of counselling psychology (Holloway, 1989; Pugh & Coyle, 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>University temptations</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. *Formalising* the work of therapy in such a way as to turn it into a predictable routine or set of procedures that govern the encounter. This can obscure the individuality of clients’ value-systems and close down opportunities for creative thought and reflexive questioning.

2. *Intellectualising* about therapy by formulating theoretical descriptions that neatly tie up what occurs in sessions. This can cover over and obscure what actually happens in practice, leaving little room for the unknown and placing clients within the value-systems of particular theoretical models.

(Continues)
Parker also identifies eight aspects of institutional practice, as detailed in Box 10, which, although not confined to universities, he suggests “define something of the shape of the problem of psychotherapy and counselling being taught in universities” (p. 343).

**Box 9** (Continued)

3. *Jargonising* in such a way that therapy work becomes inaccessible to outsiders. This may operate as an index of membership, excluding those who do not understand what jargon means whilst also indicating that they are lacking on this basis, thus alienating clients from therapists.

4. *Moralising* so that therapists give clients the benefits of their supposed knowledge about what makes people happy and unhappy. This may lead to prescriptions and proscriptions about what is good and bad for people, resulting in the imposition of value-systems that leave little room for clients’ values.

(Parker, 2002)

**Box 10**

**Institutional practices**

1. *Linearity*: The temporal shape of training programmes provides a structured trajectory along which trainees are seen to progressively accumulate knowledge over a fixed period, with a definite beginning, middle, and end.

2. *Evidence*: Universities operate on the basis of certain assumptions about what criteria should be used to evaluate the subjects being taught. These criteria tend to be grounded in empirical evidence, requiring trainees to demonstrate learning and skills accordingly.

3. *Standards*: By defining and evaluating standards according to particular paradigms of knowledge, normalisation to these standards is assumed and emphasised, potentially stifling opportunities to embrace difference and engage in creativity.

(Continues)
4. **Cognition:** An emphasis on logical reasoning within the university can result in a tendency towards rationalising thinking and experiences, translating phenomena into knowledge, objects, or skills.

5. **Regulation:** Universities are required to monitor and regulate trainees through various forms of assessment. The role of the university in monitoring and evaluating training and practice replicates broader social processes of observation and control.

6. **Class:** Historically, universities have served as institutions reproducing the middle classes, and the class character of therapy has typically mirrored the class character of universities. In this way, universities perpetuate hierarchies and systems of dominance.

7. **Identity:** The educational processes within universities propagate certain ways of thinking about what matters in life and certain ways of thinking about oneself. The identity achieved through university education is tied to competition and status hierarchies.

8. **Ethics:** Universities’ handling of ethics often turns it into something separate from the rest of the activity of the therapist, such that it is treated as a self-contained topic. The compartmentalization of ethics in this way does not encourage its integration into practice.

(Parker, 2002)

On the basis of these temptations and practices, Parker argues that “Universities are not a good place for psychotherapy and counselling training” (p. 345). However, responding to Parker, Horton (2002) argues, “It is not a matter of universities being unsuitable for counselling and psychotherapy training, but more a matter of being aware of the problematic aspects of institutional practice in universities ... and of finding ways of making them work to our advantage” (p. 384). Similarly, Jacobs (2002) argues, “While universities have their own difficulties as institutions, including bureaucracy and even similar standardization of theories in particular disciplines, they can also represent a challenging milieu for psychotherapy and counselling education, for accountability in selection, teaching and assessment, for student participation, and for a broader critique of ideas” (p. 347).
Peterson (1979) argues that traditional university practices and prejudices often cause problems for training programmes within the university, which are pitched against education and valued differently. Peterson suggests that education has traditionally been regarded as a higher form of learning that properly belongs in the university, whilst training has been seen as a poorer cousin that belongs elsewhere. Schön (1987) suggests that both staff members and students on university training programmes are faced with a conflict between having to meet the demands of the university based on the institution’s values, which to some degree involves accepting a technical-rational model of thinking and doing, and being able to respond to clients values from a tacit source of expertise, as described by Polanyi (1967). Schön refers to this conflict as a rigour-relevance dilemma, emphasising the presence of a theory-practice split within counselling and psychotherapy training in traditional higher education institutions.

Scanlon and Baillie (1994) also suggest that within traditional departments of higher education there is often a split “between those who view practice as the rigorous application of formal ‘science’ and those who see it as more holistically embedded in 'tacit knowledge' and artistry of the practitioner” (p. 407). They report on a study by Scanlon (1993) exploring students’ views on the extent to which postgraduate counselling courses within higher education adequately prepared them for future professional practice. Ten participants with experience of Masters level professional training courses in counselling were interviewed. Their views were gained on what it was to be a skilled practitioner in counselling, how such skills are developed, and how current educational practices could be developed to improve training in professional practice. The interviews produced three main data categories, as shown in Box 11.
In light of these findings, Scanlon and Baillie suggest that therapy training should be underpinned by a practice-led epistemology that supports the process of acquiring and developing integrated reflective practice skills, rather than a more formal knowledge-led epistemology. House (2001) also offers an impassioned argument in favour of this kind of approach to training, as shown in Box 12.

---

**Box 11**

**Students’ views on post-graduate counselling courses**

1. *The ‘academy’ and the ‘real world’ of practice:* Participants described their experiences of the relationship between the college-based activities and their clinical placement. Many participants had an ambivalent attitude towards their studies and expressed doubt about the relevance to their practice. Some expressed considerable resentment about feeling compromised by a perceived mismatch between their own internal value-system and the academic values embodied in their course.

2. *Training for practice:* Participants described their views of the processes through which clinical skills were actually acquired. A commonly held view among participants was that there was insufficient skills-training on the course. There was general agreement among participants that the counsellor’s personal development was integral to the process of becoming a counsellor, although there was no clear consensus about how this might be better achieved as part of their training.

3. *Student concerns with regard to the quality of course outcome:* Participants described their views on the extent to which the courses’ claims to be ‘clinical training’ could be considered reliable and valid. Most participants were concerned about the strategies employed to assess training outcome, particularly in relation to the assessment of clinical skills and competence.

(Scanlon, 1993)
In light of criticisms about the ways in which values and ethics are handled by universities, along with suggestions about how values and ethics should feature within therapy training, questions arise regarding the teaching and learning of values and ethics within counselling psychology: How are values and ethics handled and conveyed to trainees during training and with what consequences? Are values and ethics taught in way that is congruent with the values and ethics espoused by counselling psychology as a profession?

Teaching and learning values and ethics

In line with Parker’s (2002) suggestion that universities’ handling of ethics separates it from therapy practice, Pollard (2011) argues that “The ethics of practice are often taught as marginal concerns, and are only rarely debated or considered as central and defining aspects of psychotherapy” (p. 5). Clarkson (2001) also argues that there is a tendency for universities to approach the subject of ethics technically and procedurally, providing trainees with codes of ethics and ethical dilemmas to work through, which might be seen as constituting a process of ‘indoctrination and justification’ (Baier, 1973). Whilst studies have shown that the recognition of ethical dilemmas and the ability to resolve them improves with training (Gawthrop & Uhlemann, 1992), Clarkson (2001) argues that “the teaching of ethics by osmosis, ‘add ons’ or the introjection of ‘rules’ or group ‘norms’ without ongoing critical reflection is not enough” (p. 44). Shillito-Clarke (2003) argues that “ethics is about more than resolving dilemmas; it is about a way of being, of interrelating and of practising” (p. 617). Strong (2005) states,
“Practicing reflexively requires some element of social improvisation. Humans, after all, are different from the subjects of the natural sciences or their technological applications – they are alive and responsive in how they interpret their experience” (p. 96). And Guggenbühl-Craig (1995) argues that “ethical behaviour means one tries to do whatever seems to be the most useful and therapeutic action at the time, realising that our knowledge is never absolutely sure. There is always room for new information and insight ... it is our duty to question everything we are doing” (p. x).

Nussbaum (2010) argues in favour of a Socratic approach to thinking, questioning, and argument in education, “one that will stimulate students to think and argue for themselves, rather than simply deferring to tradition and authority” (p. 13). Firstly, Nussbaum suggests a lack of self-examination leads to a lack of clarity about goals, and whilst Socratic examination does not guarantee a ‘good’ set of goals it guarantees the goals pursued will be clear in relation to one another and hopefully crucial issues will not be missed. Secondly, Nussbaum suggests that a lack of self-examination may result in a susceptibility to be easily influenced, and that irresolution may be compounded by deference to authority and peer pressure, whereas Socratic critical inquiry is “utterly unauthoritarian” (p. 13). Thirdly, Nussbaum suggests that a lack of self-examination may lead to the disrespectful treatment of others, whereas a Socratic attitude would exhort that everyone, including oneself, needs examination and all are equal in the face of argument. Nussbaum proposes that Socratic thinking is a social practice and a discipline that can be taught as part of an academic curriculum: “It demands a great deal from faculty, depending as it does on intensive exchange with undergraduates, but its rewards are often correspondingly high” (Nussbaum, 2010, p. 13-14).

The extent to which a Socratic approach to teaching is seen on counselling psychology training programmes will vary amongst universities, departments, and teaching staff. Much of what is taught may go unchallenged because of the personal commitment and sacrifices trainees will have to make during their training (Palmer Barnes, 2001). Concerns arise where there is inadequate opportunity for trainees to question the theory being taught and to examine the values being communicated to clients through their work (Tjeltveit, 2000). Loewenthal (2006) emphasises the importance of developing a critically reflexive approach to values and ethics within counselling psychology, so that thoughtfulness is not replaced by “theories with fields of knowledge, territories, and ownership of subject disciplines ... which in turn attempt to control language and thought, appropriating difference sometimes in the
name of difference” (p. 144). Walsh and Frankland (2009) argue that counselling psychology is underpinned by an “ideographic epistemological and relational value base [that] cannot be tacked on to training; it has to be woven throughout training and development” (p. 41). In light of such arguments, it would seem that counselling psychologists should be actively engaged in examining their own values and those of others, and that self-reflexive thinking should be nurtured as part of training if they are to aim towards being ethically aware practitioners.

Summary

From the literature discussed, it would seem that values are a pervasive part of counselling psychology, affecting the profession and its practices in a multiplicity of ways. The communication of values to clients has important implications for the ethical dimensions of counselling psychology, which are central to its practice. Whilst therapeutic literature now acknowledges the communication of values from therapist to client during therapy (Kelly, 1990), the humanistic values emphasised within counselling psychology articulate a non-invasive approach to practice, where clients’ values are to be tolerated and respected (Cooper, 2009). A critically reflexive approach therefore seems important if counselling psychologists are to understand the ways in which values inform their practice and what the ethical implications of this might be (Tjeltveit, 1999). Each therapist’s ethical reasoning process is founded upon values that deserve examination if they are to gain a more open and complete value-informed perspective (Bergin et al., 1996). Differences appear to exist between the value-systems of theories and models within counselling psychology, with consequences for the way counselling psychology represents itself as a profession and how people are trained to become counselling psychologists (Aspenson & Gersh, 1993).

Conclusions and questions

The literature on values and ethics in counselling psychology would seem to recommend that counselling psychologists be actively engaged in examining the different values and ethics involved in their practices, and that critically reflexive thinking is crucial to being an ethically aware practitioner (McLeod, 2007). The literature would also seem to recommend that a critically reflexive approach to knowledge should be nurtured as part of counselling psychology training (Loewenthal, 2006), which should aim towards a Socratic approach to teaching (Nussbaum, 2010). What is unclear, however, is
the extent to which such recommendations are realised in counselling psychology training and practice. Is the involvement of values in therapy still a blind spot for counselling psychologists? Do counselling psychologists have a full awareness of the different ways in which values are involved in their practices and the resultant ethical implications?

In light of critiques highlighting the foibles of universities as institutions of learning and knowledge (e.g. Berry & Woolfe, 1997; Parker, 2002; Risq, 2007; Thorkelson, 2008; Waller, 2002), questions also arise regarding the suitability of universities for training counselling psychologists to be critically reflexive, ethically aware practitioners. Does university training engender this kind of awareness and equip graduates with critically reflexive skills? Does literature such as Cooper’s (2009) paper on ‘Welcoming the Other’ direct attention away from the ways in which values are involved in therapy, towards thinking that counselling psychologists might be able to “let the Other be in all their Otherness” (Cooper, 2009, p. 121) ahead of appropriating them into systems of values?

This research project was interested in looking at how values and ethics were constructed by counselling psychologists as a result of and in relation to their training and practice. What did these concepts mean to counselling psychologists? How had their training and practice shaped their understandings of values and ethics? And what consequences did these understandings have for counselling psychologists’ therapy practice and subjectivity?
METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

Introduction

In keeping with the recommendation that counselling psychologists take a critically reflexive approach to knowledge (Etherington, 2004), the researcher set about exploring the methodological assumptions underlying this research project in order to gain a clear picture of the ideas being drawn upon. In doing so, the researcher was guided by the research framework offered by Crotty (1998), which aims to provide ‘scaffolding’ (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976) to the formulation of social research by enunciating “one reasonably clear-cut way of using terms and grasping what is involved in the process” (Crotty, 1998, p. 1). Whilst Crotty’s framework is “in no way a definitive construction of the social research process” (p. 1), it provides a useful way of thinking about what goes into formulating and conducting a piece of research. Crotty’s framework is therefore outlined and worked through as a means of guiding the reader through the thinking behind the methodology and methods involved in this project.

Crotty’s (1998) Research framework

Crotty (1998) suggests that every piece of research is built around a framework of four ‘elements’: epistemology, theoretical perspective, methodology, and methods. Taken together, they constitute the assumptions on which the research is based, the theoretical lens through which it is formulated, the approach used to investigate the research topic, and the ways in which data is gained and analysed. Crotty defines these elements as shown in Box 13.
Crotty arranges these elements in an interrelated sequence, whereby each element represents a set of ideas predicated on the ideas contained within preceding elements. Thus, epistemology informs theoretical perspective, which informs methodology, which informs methods. Ontology does not feature as a separate element in Crotty’s framework, instead he states “Were we to introduce it into our framework, it would sit alongside epistemology informing the theoretical perspective, for each theoretical perspective embodies a certain way of understanding what is (ontology) as well as a certain way of understanding what it means to know (epistemology)” (p. 10). However, rather than positioning ontology alongside epistemology, Guba and Lincoln (1994) place ‘the ontological question’ before ‘the epistemological question’ when formulating research, since the latter will be constrained by the former; defining the nature of reality (ontology) will have consequences for what can be known about this reality (epistemology). It would therefore seem important that ontology be given some dedicated attention when planning a research project in order to be clear about the standpoint being taken, rather than having to infer this through its epistemology. Thus, ontology was added to Crotty’s framework, preceding epistemology, and was given explicit consideration in formulating this project.

---

**Box 13**

**Research elements**

1. *Epistemology*: the theory of knowledge embedded in the theoretical perspective and thereby in the methodology.

2. *Theoretical perspective*: the philosophical stance informing the methodology and thus providing a context for the process and grounding its logic and criteria.

3. *Methodology*: the strategy, plan of action, process, or design lying behind the choice and use of methods and linking the choice and use of methods to the desired outcomes.

4. *Methods*: the techniques or procedures used to gather and analyse data related to some research question or hypothesis.

(Crotty, 1998, p. 3)
The framework of this research project

With the addition of ontology, the elements shown in Box 13 were attended to in relation to this project. Firstly, the underlying ontological and epistemological assumptions were explicated, establishing the researcher’s beliefs about the nature of ‘reality’ and what knowledge could be gained of it. Based on these beliefs, the theoretical perspective was delineated, describing the theoretical lens through which the research would be conducted. The methodology was then formulated, setting out the approach to be taken towards investigating the research topic. Finally, the methods used to acquire and analyse data were decided upon and designed, detailing the procedures to be undertaken. Figure 2 illustrates the framework of this project, indicating the elements that will be explained in detail below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The framework of this research project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Critical realist constructionism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>Constructionism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical perspective</td>
<td>Positioning theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology - Data collection</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology - Data analysis</td>
<td>Foucauldian discourse analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods - Data collection</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods - Data analysis</td>
<td>Willig’s (2008) six stages of discourse analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ontology and epistemology

The meanings of ontology and epistemology have been alluded to above. However, in order to be clear about the researcher's understanding of these terms, definitions are provided in Box 14.

Box 14

Ontology and epistemology

- **Ontology** refers to “the study of being. It is concerned with 'what is', with the nature of existence, with the structure of reality as such” (Crotty, 1998, p. 10). Ontology seeks to answer the question, “What is the form and nature of reality and, therefore, what is there that can be known about it?” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 108)

- **Epistemology** refers to “the nature of knowledge, its possibility, scope and general basis” (Hamlyn, 1995, p. 242). It is concerned with what can be known about the world and what is considered ‘knowledge’. Epistemology seeks to answer the question, “How is it possible, if it is, for us to gain knowledge of the world?” (Hughes & Sharrock, 1997, p. 5)

The researcher’s ontological and epistemological beliefs will set the scene for what takes place within a research project. Different beliefs about what, how, and why research should be conducted are located within research ‘paradigms’ (Kuhn, 1970), based on particular ontological and epistemological assumptions (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). These assumptions constitute “a worldview that defines, for its holder, the nature of the ‘world’, the individual’s place in it, and the range of possible relationships to that world” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 107). Different research paradigms were therefore considered by the researcher in order to explicate the underlying assumptions of this project.

Research paradigms

Whilst a multiplicity of paradigms can be seen to exist within social research (Mantzoukas, 2004), Crotty (1998) outlines three that present distinctly different worldviews relating to ontology and epistemology: objectivism, subjectivism, and constructionism. ‘Strong’ and ‘weak’ versions of each
paradigm exist depending on the different emphases placed on the ideas therein. Thus, each paradigm can be seen as constituting a spectrum of ideas rather than a homogenous class. Whilst these paradigms are not definitive, and “are not to be seen as watertight compartments” (Crotty, 1998, p. 9), the ideas represented were usefully considered in relation to this research project to establish the ontological and epistemological beliefs on which it was to be based. In doing so, it was borne in mind that “few pieces of research are ever ‘pure’ examples of any one paradigm, fitting unequivocally into one category to the exclusion of others” (Candy, 1989, p. 8). Instead, it is more likely that a piece of research will emphasise the ideas of a dominant paradigm over others (Morrow, 2007). Each of Crotty’s proposed paradigms will be outlined below, before locating the standpoint of this project amongst them. Ideas pertaining to a constructionist paradigm were most strongly emphasised by this project and are therefore given most attention.

- **Objectivism**

Objectivism takes a realist standpoint in relation to ontology, positing that there is a ‘reality’ that exists irrespective of its apprehension through the operation of human consciousness (Crotty, 1998). On this basis, “an external world exists independently of our representations of it” (Nightingale & Cromby, 2002, p. 702), which is filled with inherent meaning that awaits discovery. Objectivism therefore also takes a realist standpoint in relation to epistemology, whereby knowledge is gained by studying the properties of objects in a way that can be objectively measured and quantified. In objectivist research, the researcher’s role is to map out the properties that objects and people contain and to discern their meaning, thus producing ‘knowledge’. Objectivism informs positivist schools of thought, emphasising that knowledge should be subject to impartial verification and criticism (Crotty, 1998). In this respect, the approach taken by objectivist social research is similar to that of the natural sciences (Diesing, 1966). Within objectivist research, “The golden rule for the scientist is *freedom from value-judgements* – or ‘objectivity’” (Mathieson, 1960, p. 2). Objectivist research is typically nomothetic (Ponterotto, 2005), aiming towards uncovering general patterns of behaviour that have a normative base (Diesing, 1966). The methodologies employed tend to emphasise the use of scientific methods relying on “publicly observable, replicable facts” (Diesing, 1966, p. 124). From an objectivist standpoint, knowledge about subjective phenomena can only be gained indirectly by examining overt behaviour.
• **Subjectivism**

In contrast to objectivism, subjectivism takes a relativist standpoint in relation to ontology, positing that “the essential, unique character of human behaviour is its subjective meaningfulness” (Diesing, 1966, p. 124). On this basis, no objective reality is seen to exist outside one’s subjectivity: “there are no grounds for necessarily postulating or investigating a reality independent of the knower” (Nightingale & Cromby, 2002, p. 702). The nature of reality is related to the given consciousness of an individual and is thus dependent on that individual’s consciousness (Farber, 1965). Subjectivism therefore also takes a relativist standpoint in relation to epistemology, whereby human beings are seen to acquire knowledge on an individual and subjective basis, meaning knowledge cannot be discovered objectively (Morgan & Smircich, 1980). In subjectivist social research, meaning is not seen to emanate from the interplay between an observer and an Other but is imposed on the Other by the observer (Crotty, 1998): “meaning comes from anything *but* an interaction between the subject and the object to which it is ascribed” (Crotty, 1998, p. 9).

Subjectivism can be seen to inform structuralist, post-structuralist, and postmodernist schools of thought, emphasising the individually constructed nature of reality. In this respect, the approach taken by subjectivist research stands in contrast to that of the natural sciences (Crotty, 1998; Diesing, 1966). Subjectivist research is typically idiographic, employing research methodologies such as ethnography and phenomenology that focus on providing a detailed account of the lived experience of individuals, deduced through the subjectivity of the researcher (Diesing, 1966; Farber; 1965; Ponterotto, 2005). Within subjectivist research, the researcher cannot distance themselves from the subject under study, nor the methods involved; research is seen to be inherently informed by the researcher’s values (Hughes & Sharrock, 1997).

• **Constructionism**

The constructionist viewpoint is that “Truth, or meaning, comes into existence in and out of our engagement with the realities in our world” (Crotty, 1998, p. 8), and that the only way human beings can access the world is through our representations of it, which are constructed by us (Burr, 2003). Since human beings are inherently social animals, these representations are not constructed in isolation but against a background of shared understandings, practices, and languages, which
comprise discourses (Schwandt, 2000). Discourses constitute different sets of meanings, metaphors, representations, images, stories, and statements, which come together to produce particular versions of the world (Burr, 2003). Thus, human beings mediate shared meanings through discourses, constructing versions of reality amongst themselves. Since this process depends on social interaction and shared intelligibility, the versions of reality constructed will be influenced by normative understandings held by a majority of people within a particular sociocultural population (Gergen, 1985). Constructionism posits that “the content of our consciousness, and the mode of relating we have to others, is taught by our culture and society” (Owen, 1992, p. 386). Human beings are seen to exist in a fluid ‘social reality’ that is constructed through the flow of discourse (Burr, 2003).

Constructionist ontology

The degree to which ‘social reality’ reflects ‘material reality’ is the subject of much debate within constructionism (Nightingale & Cromby, 2002). Different emphases are placed on realist and relativist ideas by different theorists (e.g. Burr, 2003; Gergen, 1985; Nightingale & Cromby, 2002; Parker, 1992; Sims-Schouten, Riley, & Willig, 2007). A continuum of ontological standpoints can be seen to exist, ranging from the postmodern relativism seen in ‘strong’ social constructionism, through to the post-positivist critical realism seen in critical realist constructionism (Nightingale & Cromby, 2002). The ontological standpoint taken within constructionist research will determine how the relationship between people and the world is viewed, and how research defines its purpose on this basis. Relativist and critical realist standpoints within constructionism were therefore considered in order to sketch out the different ideas represented and to locate the ontology of this project.

- Relativist ontology within constructionism

A ‘strong’ relativist constructionist standpoint would assert that, being as we can only access the world through our representations of it, the truthfulness of these representations cannot be judged against ‘reality’, which, if it does exist, is inaccessible to us. The categories with which we apprehend the world are not seen to necessarily refer to real divisions: “The way in which we experience the world does not in itself dictate the terms by which the world is understood” (Gergen, 1985, p. 266). There is no such thing as an objectively observable fact and “no fixed external reality to be ‘objectively’ known” (Burr, 2003, p. 75). As a result, “The rules for ‘what counts as what’ are inherently
ambiguous, continuously evolving, and free to vary with the predilections of those who use them” (Gergen, 1985, p. 268). The non-discursive world is positioned subordinately to the discursive (Sims-Schouten et al., 2007). Material objects and practices are ‘produced’ by discourse and are granted no ontological status outside their place in discourse. Language is seen to be fundamental to producing subjective realities: “When people talk to each other the world gets constructed” (Burr, 2003, p.8).

- **Critical realist ontology within constructionism**

A critical realist constructionist standpoint would assert that, whilst we are only able to access the world through our representations of it, a ‘real’ world does exist independently of these representations (Parker, 1992). Since the objects and practices in the world are likely to have different properties, discourse is seen to act as a referent system, discerning objects and practices on a differential basis, however imperfectly, partially, tangentially, or implicitly this might be (Nightingale & Cromby, 2002). Rather than the world being entirely inaccessible to human theorising, objects and practices might be accounted for to some degree, at least referentially (Sayer, 2000). Whilst referent systems are created by human beings, they concurrently shape our experiencing in accordance with the properties of the world to which they refer, constituting a “discursive accomplishment” (Sims-Schouten et al., 2007, p. 102). Observations and experiences are generated in accordance with underlying and relatively enduring conceptual, social, and material structures, which make some constructions of objects and practices more likely than others (Willig, 1999). As a result, the world is seen to be physically and socially organised in ways that constrain what it is possible to say or do. Based on this assertion, Parker (1992) argues that all aspects of our environment that influence action in this way should be granted ontological status.

**Constructionist epistemology**

Whether or not aspects of our environment “are given an ontological status that is independent of, but in relation with, discursive practices” (Sims-Schouten et al., 2007, p. 102), knowledge of the world is seen to be the product of social processes. Thus, knowledge cannot give a definitive account of the world, as different socially constructed understandings may also exist (Burr, 2003). The ways in which we understand the world are seen to be culturally and historically specific; they are relative and contingent. Knowledge is conceptualised as something people do together, rather than something a
person possesses (Gergen, 1985). Constructionism therefore takes a relativist standpoint in relation to epistemology, emphasising that there is no objective truth waiting to be discovered, instead all knowledge is constructed through human interaction: “all values, ideologies and social institutions are human made” (Owen, 1992, p. 385). Our representations of the world are contingent and open to alternative interpretation. However, the ideologies and social structures prevailing in socio-cultural settings are seen to play significant roles in perpetuating the meanings represented, influencing what is commonly considered as knowledge within these settings. The availability of discursive resources within a socio-cultural setting will largely influence the ways in which a topic can be meaningfully discussed and reasoned about, affecting “how our ideas are put into practice and used to regulate the conduct of others” (Hall, 2001, p. 72). Thus, Burr (2003) suggests, “the power to act in particular ways, to claim resources, to control or be controlled depends upon the knowledges currently prevailing in a society” (p. 68).

Constructionist research

The value of constructionist research might be seen as its ability to deconstruct the social world in order to show how things could be constructed differently (Willig, 1999). Doing so might demonstrate that what is considered as ‘knowledge’ is derived from looking at the world from a particular socially located perspective at the exclusion of others. This applies to social constructionist research itself, which constitutes only one way of looking things. Within constructionist research, “the search for clarity and simplicity of meaning is seen as illusory because there will always be other perspectives from which to interpret the material under review” (Humes & Bryce, 2003, p. 180). Since objectivity is considered impossible, the researcher’s values are seen to be inherent. Thus, ‘traditional’ methods of scientific enquiry associated with a nomothetic approach are rejected. Since meaning is seen as being mediated intersubjectively, constructionist research favours new practices focusing on language and other symbolic systems through which meaning is constructed and shared (Burr, 2003). The relativist epistemology within constructionism means research efforts are idiographic, looking at “specific elements, individuals, events, entities and situations, documents and works of culture or of art” (Jupp, 2006, p. 142). The focus is on what is particular to different constructions, whilst recognising that “the process of analysis is always interpretive, always contingent, always a version or a reading from some theoretical, epistemological or ethical standpoint” (Wetherell, 2001, p. 384).
Deconstructing for the sake of deconstruction

Constructionist research might be criticised as deconstructing for the sake of deconstruction (Jackson & Sørensen, 2003). If social science is value-laden, historical, cultural, political, and biased (Owen, 1995), there is no impartial standpoint from which to report constructionist research findings. Why then should constructionist research be carried out at all? What is the point if its endeavour is based on a relativist epistemology that undermines any claims to gaining applicable knowledge of the world? Why should a constructionist deconstruction be believed any more than the original construction? If every account of the world is arbitrary and value-laden, constructionism itself cannot be spared this critique. The risk is that (de)constructionism might deteriorate into nihilism, whereby discourses are deconstructed with nothing to take their place. Constructionists might thus become “estranged from the social and political world they seek to understand” (Jackson & Sørensen, 2003, p. 252), becoming so preoccupied with deconstruction that attempts to understand are rendered futile.

The aims of critical realist constructionist research

From a critical realist standpoint, constructionist research might go beyond deconstruction and aim towards social critique. Consideration might be given to why people draw on certain discourses, examining the conceptual, social, and material structures that make some discourses more available than others (Willig, 1999). This might stimulate debate around the constraints in place and the possibility of doing things differently. By affording ontological status to the structures constraining human action they might be challenged with the potential for reconstruction and social change (Parker, 1992). Sims-Schouten et al. (2007) suggest that recognising the social and material constraints people face is a matter of ethics, and that analysing a person’s talk “without considering their material existence” (p. 103) may not do justice to their lived experience. Whilst critical realist constructionist research might attempt to address this issue, the epistemology of such research remains relativist, laying no claims to identifying truths, offering only provocative suggestions about how the world is constructed. The ‘truth’ of the findings of critical realist constructionist research might only be judged subjectively by participants and readers, and on the basis of any change that comes about as a result of disrupting structures that constrain action. In such circumstances, a piece of research might be granted ontological status within a critical realist paradigm, as an artefact of social change and the structures born from it.
What ontology informed the theoretical perspective of this research?

This project did not seek to understand the objective ‘reality’ of values and ethics within counselling psychology, nor did it seek to provide a purely subjective, descriptive, or phenomenological account of how counselling psychologists experienced these concepts in training and practice. Values and ethics were considered social constructs rather than inherent qualities or subjective properties of consciousness. Counselling psychology was also seen as a social construction based on particular shared meanings, rather than an objectively verifiable entity or something purely subjective and immanent (Cross & Watts, 2002). Objectivist and subjectivist standpoints were therefore rejected in favour of a constructionist ontological standpoint. Within this constructionist standpoint, critical realist ideas were emphasised over relativist ideas. The ways in which values and ethics were constructed by counselling psychologists were to be explored, whilst also attending to the structures constraining counselling psychologists’ ways-of-being relating to these concepts.

What epistemology informed the theoretical perspective of this research?

The research did not aim towards establishing universal truths regarding the research topic: “truth is contingent upon the subjectivity of the reader and the fickleness of language” (Graham, 2010, p. 4). It sought to provide “theorising that rests upon complexity, uncertainty and doubt and upon a reflexivity about its own production and its claims to knowledge about the social” (Ball, 1995, p. 269). In light of this, and the literature emphasising the inherent role of values in psychology practices, a value-free objectivist standpoint was deemed unsuitable. The researcher’s values and subjectivity were seen to inform the research throughout. However, the research aimed to explore how values and ethics were socially constructed by counselling psychologists, rather than interpreting their subjective meaningfulness on the basis of the researcher’s subjectivity alone. A subjectivist standpoint was therefore also deemed unsuitable. Instead, a constructionist standpoint was taken up from which values and ethics were to be investigated as concepts made meaningful within the context of counselling psychology through shared understandings amongst counselling psychologists. The focus was on the disclosure of how values and ethics were constructed as social phenomena (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009).
Theoretical perspective

In formulating and conducting social research, the theoretical perspective represents “our view of the human world and social life within that world” (Crotty, 1998, p. 7). The perspective taken will be informed by the ontological and epistemological assumptions of the researcher and constitutes the theoretical lens through which these assumptions gain sharper focus in relation to the research topic. The theoretical perspective presents the contextual, theory-driven ideas that led to the research being conducted in a particular way. Explicating these ideas will lay the foundations for the chosen research methodology.

What theoretical perspective lay behind the methodology in question?

The researcher’s theoretical perspective was influenced by positioning theory. Positioning theory attempts to articulate a way of reading and understanding the dynamics of human relationships within a constructionist paradigm (Luberda, 2000). It is not a unified and complete theory, with various versions existing that are subject to ongoing modification (Willig, 2000). It can be seen as a group of evolving ideas and conceptual tools pertaining to “the cognitive psychology of social action” (Harré, Moghaddam, Cairnie, Rothbart, & Sabat, 2009, p. 5), which aim towards offering “a social psychology of selfhood” (Davies & Harré, 1990, p. 45). Presented below is a knitting together of some of these ideas, which were seen to provide a useful theoretical thread between the constructionist standpoint outlined above and the methodology which will be outlined below.

Positioning theory

The notion of a unitary ‘self’ is considered a misnomer within constructionism, as individuals are not seen to exist independently of their social context but are inherently in a world of others (Burr, 2003). Within this world of others, the notions of subject position and positioning are presented as dynamic concepts that can be used to describe the shifting multiple relations within a community of people and practices, which are located in and structured through discourse (Linehan & McCarthy, 2000). People are seen to place themselves and others in subject positions that exist in relation to one another, where one position can only be understood in relation to another, and positions themselves can only be understood within the context of wider discourses (Paulus, Stewart, Reece, & Long, 2009).
Fundamental to positioning theory is the proposal that discursive practices play a central role in organising human life and in constituting a person’s sense of self and subjectivity (Tirado & Galvez, 2007). People might be thought of as actors in an unfolding drama, with different subject positions being taken up by different participants as they seek to achieve certain goals (Barnes, 2004). The subject positions taken up are not fixed and may change from moment to moment depending on the discourses involved and participants’ positionings within them. Reciprocally, discourses may also change as participants respond to one another and pursue their goals. Participants are seen as single places of resonance within a field of discursive forces that pull and push them in different directions as they interact with one another (Owen, 1992).

**Passivity and activity within discourse**

Within the flux of discursive forces, individuals are both passive and active. On the one hand they “provide the energy required for meaning-making and articulation” (Wetherell, 1998, p. 12), in terms of drawing on particular discourses to construct and convey meaning. On the other hand, since they are drawing on already available discourses, the individual becomes ‘decentered’ (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985), since they are not the author of their own discursive activity “and not the origin point of discourse” (Wetherell, 1998, p. 12). It might therefore be argued that subject positions are determined by discourses; that they exist in a latent state waiting to be taken up and can be predicted from having knowledge of the discourses to which they belong. However, this perspective may be overzealous in emphasising the power of discourse at the expense of human agency. Wetherell (1998) argues that it seems “a misdescription to make discourse the active agent here” (p. 23). Instead she suggests that individuals have ‘accountability’ for the positions they assume within their settings, which should not be overlooked. A subject position is only partly the consequence of the discourse it can be assigned to, since the invocation of a position, and thus its significance and connotation, is “local, highly situated, and occasioned” (Wetherell, 1998, p. 23). Individuals are seen to have their own internal sense of an interaction (Schegloff, 1997), making the sense of an interaction dependent not only on its social intelligibility but also on what this means for the individuals involved, who will position themselves accordingly (Wetherell, 1998).
Cognition and subjectivity

Whilst the contingent nature of subject positions within the flow of discourse means many of them taken up by an individual will be transient, it is suggested that others are likely to become more permanent based on their perceived relevance and frequency of occurrence (Harré & Gillet, 1994). As a result, “what originates in the social reality of language use becomes an internal subjective orientation” (Willig, 2000, p. 557). Subject positions are not just taken up by individuals in order to achieve particular social goals but are seen to structure their private experiencing (Holloway, 1989). Harré and Gillet (1994) argue that much of what is considered ‘psychological phenomena’ should be “interpreted as properties or features of discourse, and that discourse might be public or private. As public, it is behaviour; as private, it is thought” (p. 26). Based on this, Harré and Gillet suggest that individual minds are created through the process of internalising discourse to produce cognition, and that our positioning within internalised discourse constitutes subjectivity. The repertoire of internalised discourses and subject positions a person holds is seen to impact what they are able to think, do, and feel, even when they are alone: “Discursive resources facilitate access to some ways-of-being but not others, including emotions and non-verbal practices” (Willig, 2000, p. 561).

A multiplicity of selves

Since human beings are variously positioned within multiple discourses, individuals are seen to be characterised by a discontinuous diversity of selves that change and adapt in response to the flow of discourse, as well as a continuous personal identity representing the sum of this process (Davies & Harré, 1990). It is one and the same person who is variously positioned within a network of discourses, whilst also experiencing and displaying “that aspect of self that is involved in the continuity of a multiplicity of selves” (Davies & Harré, 1990, p. 47). Positioning theory therefore attempts to provide “a way of accounting for the continuity of ourselves as selves” (Willig, 2000, p. 557). By internalising discourses and subject positions within them, a person is able to think about themselves “as a choosing subject, locating ourselves in conversations according to those narrative forms with which we are familiar and bringing to those narratives our own subjective lived histories through which we have learnt metaphors, characters and plot” (Harré and Gillet, 1994, p. 53).
The limitations of positioning theory

The notion of a discursive selfhood and the proposal that “discourses constitute subjectivities” (Willig, 2000, p. 557) can be critiqued as implying a mind/body, discursive/non-discursive split relating to subjectivity, emphasising discourse and cognition over more holistic ideas about human experiencing. Discursive theory alone cannot adequately theorise subjectivity as it does not account for the non-discursive experiencing of human beings, nor the possible unconscious or existential motivations behind our meaning-making. Positioning theory overlooks important notions relating to subjectivity that do not pertain to discourse and cognition in the same way, such as embodiment (Merleau-Ponty, 1970), affect (Blackman & Cromby, 2007), and tacit knowledge (Polanyi, 1967). Nevertheless, it offers a useful approach to thinking about how people position themselves and others within discourse, and how subjectivity is articulated and expressed through the learning and use of discursive practices (Davies & Harré, 1990).

Applying positioning theory to this research

Positioning theory looks to reveal the explicit and implicit patterns of reasoning underlying peoples’ actions by attending to the discursive features of the local context in which action is taking place (Harré et al., 2009). It therefore seemed to offer a way of thinking about how and why counselling psychologists might position themselves in relation to different constructions of values and ethics within the context of counselling psychology. This could be explored by examining the discourses drawn on by counselling psychologists when discussing both terms, looking at how they located themselves within discourse and to what effect. Exposure to different discourses over the course of training and practice might lead counselling psychologists to construct values and ethics in particular ways and to adopt particular subject positions with consequences for their practice and subjective experience. Over the course of training, particular constructions of values and ethics might “become internalized and reified, thus defining (and constraining) possible ways-of-being” (Willig, 2000, p. 558).

Methodology

Founded upon the ontological and epistemological standpoints of the researcher, and informed by the theoretical perspective taken, the methodology of a project will define how the phenomenon under
study is to be examined in line with the research aims (Silverman, 2006). Methodology constitutes “the research design that shapes our choice and use of particular methods and links them to desired outcomes” (Crotty, 1998, p. 5). The methodological choices made within this project will be explained below, describing the approaches taken towards studying and analysing the research topic and explicating the rationale behind the choice of methods.

What methodology governed the choice and use of methods?

It was speculated that particular discourses would be disseminated to counselling psychologists over the course of their training, which would affect the ways in which they came to construct values and ethics and the subject positions available to them as a result. In order to explore how counselling psychologists understood and experienced values and ethics in counselling psychology training and practice, the research set about examining how values and ethics were constructed by final year trainees who were about to finish their training. Data from this subject group was therefore required for analysis. Since discourse was conceptualised as the force through which different understandings of values and ethics were constructed and mediated, discursive data was deemed most appropriate for the research to focus on. The rationale behind the methods chosen for collecting and analysing data will be outlined below, before attention is turned towards the methods that were put into practice.

The rationale behind the method of data collection

Since it was the shared knowledge resources and intersubjective meaning-making of counselling psychologists that were of interest to the researcher, an approach to generating and capturing their discussion was sought. The aim was to gain the accounts of final year trainees discussing values and ethics in relation to counselling psychology training and practice so the discursive resources drawn on and the subject positions taken up could be examined. A suitable method for engendering a situation where discussion could take place was therefore needed. Focus groups were chosen as the method of data collection on the basis that they would enable the researcher to gain discursive data from a number of participants at once, which might allow for a number of constructions, subject positions, and subjectivities to emerge. A brief description of focus groups as a method is provided below, giving consideration to the ethical implications of their use, followed by a description of the assumptions
underlying focus group methodology. Details of the focus group method used are outlined under the
Methods section of this chapter.

Focus groups

Focus groups are a popular interview method for obtaining qualitative data and are widely used in research across the social sciences (Wilkinson, 2008). Conducting a focus group generally involves engaging a small number of people in a carefully planned group discussion that is ‘focused’ on a particular topic (Kreuger, 1994; Vaughn, Schumm, & Sinagub, 1996; Wilkinson, 2008). Focus groups are used to elicit and explore the perceptions, feelings, attitudes, and ideas of participants in an in-depth fashion, within a permissive, non-threatening environment (Kitzinger, 1995; Kreuger, 1994; Vaughn et al., 1996). Discussion is usually based around a series of questions constituting the focus group ‘schedule’, with the researcher acting as group moderator by posing questions to keep the discussion flowing and to encourage participation (Kreuger, 1994; Vaughn et al., 1996; Wilkinson, 2008). The purpose of a focus group is not to build consensus on a topic, rather it is to obtain a range of opinions (Vaughn et al., 1996). Focus groups “provide an opportunity to get a sense of a group’s way of thinking and expressing those thoughts, its own language” (Lederman, 1990, p. 126).

Ethical considerations

Interview research, whether group or individual, is filled with ethical issues arising from the complexities of investigating private experience and placing accounts in the public arena (Mauthner, Birch, Jessop, & Miller, 2002). Issues around privacy and confidentiality require careful consideration if safe and non-exploitative participation is to be ensured (Rapley, 2004). Informed consent must be gained from prospective participants prior to participation, making certain that they understand what the research is about, what their taking part will involve, and the extent and consequences of doing so (Kvale, 2007). The nature of the interview and its structuring also requires careful consideration, giving thought to the role of the researcher and how their conducting of the interview might impact participants and what is elicited from them (Fontana & Frey, 2005). Interviews may touch upon issues that are personal, sensitive, and emotionally intense, and the researcher must seek to preserve participants’ integrity, safety, and well-being throughout the research process (Kvale, 2007).
The use of focus groups brings with it particular ethical concerns (Smith, 1995). Given the group setting, participants’ anonymity cannot be maintained from one another and attention must therefore be given to trying to ensure confidentiality regarding participants’ identities and the information shared during discussion, which should not be shared outside of the group. Whilst the researcher’s ability to ensure confidentiality is limited due to the group setting, they must instil in participants their responsibility for ensuring confidentiality as part of their participation (Kreuger & Casey, 2009). Participants should also be asked to protect the identity of any individuals, agencies, or organisations they discuss in order to ensure the confidentiality of others. Participants should be advised to look after themselves and others in what they choose to disclose and to maintain safety at all times. It is imperative that the researcher do their utmost to create a safe space in which participants can discuss the research topic without fear of incurring or causing harm. Thus, the group must be moderated to ensure that participants do not make themselves unduly vulnerable, that all participants’ contributions are respected, and that discussion does not become hostile or aggressive where differences of opinion occur (Smith, 1995). The moderator must therefore erect and maintain appropriate boundaries surrounding the group to keep it safe, as well as managing boundaries within the group to keep individuals safe.

The moderator must also erect and maintain appropriate boundaries between themselves and participants in order to provide suitable leadership (Liampittong, 2011) and adequate emotional containment (Lamman, 1998), gaining and honouring participants’ trust and fostering a safe relationship for discussion. The nature of the relationship between the moderator and participants, such as whether they are known to each other and how they are positioned in relation to each other, may affect participants and the information elicited from them (Packer-Multi, 2010). The role and style of the moderator may also impact participants depending on how they manage the power they hold as moderator and the ways in which they guide discussion and intervene (Rapley, 2004). In this project, the researcher was known as a fellow trainee counselling psychologist to 70% of participants and it was hoped that this would encourage an egalitarian relationship; facilitating participants’ candid thoughts on the research topic without the need for too much direction or intervention from the moderator. Thus, the researcher set out to engender a safe relationship and environment that encouraged participants’ sharing of thoughts and ideas with openness and honesty, without fear of punitive judgements or harm. The researcher also sought to ensure that participants were clear on the
rationale for participation, what this would involve, their right to withdraw at any time, and how their information would be treated and used.

Focus group assumptions

Lederman (1990) highlights a number of assumptions underlying the use of focus groups, which are considered below to explicate the thinking behind their use in this project.

- **People are a valuable source of information, including information about themselves, and are capable of being good reporters of the information they have.**

This assumption predicates that people are able to recall and articulate their perceptions and feelings. It assumes that people have the desire and ability to be honest and will share information if asked the right questions. These assumptions are subject to the weaknesses associated with any interview; that people may or may not be willing and/or able to report their thoughts, feelings, and behaviours with accuracy (Lederman, 1990). However, Puchta and Potter (2004) query the very notion of ‘accuracy’ in relation to the accounts produced in a group. They critique the ‘social psychological inheritance’ of focus groups, arguing that ‘traditional’ social psychology is underpinned by the concept of ‘attitude’, and that attitudes are generally seen as having a number of core features, as detailed in Box 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The concept of ‘attitude’ within ‘traditional’ social psychology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They are located in the individual where they are subjectively experienced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They can be observed in verbal, behavioural, or physiological reactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They are (generally) static.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Individuals differ regarding their evaluative reactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reactions can be measured using attitude scales.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Puchta & Potter, 2004)

Citing the work of Michael Billig (1991), Puchta and Potter suggest that, rather than attitudes existing as fixed entities, people express views in particular contexts and produce evaluations where there is
at least the possibility of argument. Referencing Potter and Wetherell (1987), they suggest that attitudes are performed rather than preformed and the issue of whether individuals accurately report their ‘inner attitude’ is an incoherent notion. They suggest that attitudes are better viewed as evaluatory practices occurring in interaction with others, rather than as fixed inner constructs. This line of argument suggests the suitability of focus groups for conducting constructionist research. Wilkinson (2008) posits that focus group research conducted within a constructionist framework does not assume pre-existing knowledge located inside people’s heads, rather it posits that meaning-making is produced collaboratively over the course of social interactions.

- **People need help ‘mining’ the information they have.**

Information gathering is thought to be enhanced by a moderator who poses questions aimed towards elucidating information related to the research topic. Openness from the moderator and group members is paramount if an atmosphere is to be created in which people feel free to give their sincere thoughts, feelings, and attitudes, rather than voicing socially desirable responses (Lederman, 1990). Whilst the moderator is typically guided by a schedule of questions related to the topic, flexibility is required to allow discussion to uncover unanticipated yet relevant issues (Vaughn et al., 1996).

- **The group dynamic can enhance the ‘ferreting out’ of valuable information, fostering honesty rather than socially desirable responses.**

By engendering a permissive atmosphere, a range of attitudes may be cultivated and a more revealing understanding of the discussion topic might be obtained (Vaughn et al., 1996). This assumption rests on the ‘therapeutic’ assumption that people who share a common issue will be more willing to talk amid the security of others facing the same issue (Lederman, 1990). Group members may feel able to share more honestly with others whom they perceive to be like themselves, rather than those they don’t feel could understand them (Lederman, 1983; Merton, Fiske, & Kendall, 1956). Homogeneity in relation to the topic is therefore an important prerequisite for meaningful exploration to take place (Kreuger, 1994; Lederman, 1990; Vaughn et al., 1996).
• The group interview provides a synergy that results in more than the sum of that which individuals alone could create.

Group processes may help participants explore and clarify their views in ways that would be less accessible in a one-to-one interview (Kitzinger, 1995; Morgan, 1988): “Individual interviews strip away the critical interactional dynamics that constitute much of social practice and collaborative meaning making” (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p. 902). Focus groups generate interactive data that cannot be gathered in individual interviews. They provide more than multiple, simultaneous interviews, producing “a synergistic output; a ‘voice’ of those who have participated as they intone information which they share; and interactions among the participants” (Lederman, 1990, p. 120). Kamberelis and Dimitriadis (2005) suggest that the synergy and dynamism generated within groups can often reveal unarticulated norms and assumptions, going “beyond the bounds of individual memory and expression to mine the historically sedimented collective memories and desires” (p. 903).

Summary

Focus groups appeared to offer a way of generating rich discursive data. The co-constructive nature of discussion within groups seemed well suited to serving the needs of constructionist research, whereby participants would respond to each others’ contributions, constructing values and ethics amongst themselves, drawing on particular discourses, and taking up particular subject positions. The researcher as moderator would be responsible for engendering safe and confidential discussion, guiding what was spoken about to ensure it was related to the research topic and asking questions to mine participants’ contributions to see what discursive resources were drawn upon when responding. The discursive data produced would be well suited to analysis that could deconstruct what had been said and provide social critique on this basis. Attention is therefore turned towards the rationale behind the method chosen for analysing the data produced by the focus groups.

The rationale behind the method of data analysis

The research aimed to explore the discursive constructions of values and ethics emerging from the talk of final year trainee counselling psychologists in relation to their training and practice. An appropriate method for analysing discourse was therefore needed. Two different types of discourse
analysis are described below, followed by a brief description of Foucauldian discourse analysis, this
being the approach considered most appropriate for this project. Details of the Foucauldian method
used are outlined under the *Methods* section of this chapter.

**Discourse analysis**

Discourse analysis constitutes “the study of language-in-use” (Gee, 2011, p. 8). Whilst there are many
different approaches to discourse analysis, broadly speaking two major types exist (Gee, 2011; Willig,
2008). Approaches such as linguistics and conversational analysis examine language at a ‘micro-
level’ (van Dijk, 2008), looking at “the performative qualities of discourse” (Willig, 2008, p. 95). These
approaches examine the structure of language and how this structure functions to make meaning in
specific contexts (Gee, 2011). Approaches such as Foucauldian discourse analysis examine
language at a ‘macro-level’ (van Dijk, 2008), looking at the role of language in the constitution of
social and psychological life (Willig, 2008). These approaches examine the content of language and
how discourse is used to construct subjectivity, selfhood, and power relations (Gee, 2011; Willig,
2008). The two types of analysis address different sorts of questions. Micro approaches are primarily
concerned with discourse practices (how people use discursive resources within social interactions)
whereas macro approaches are primarily concerned with discursive resources (what ways-of-being
are made available to people by the discourses available to them). This project aimed to examine the
discursive resources available to counselling psychologists when discussing values and ethics,
looking at the ways-of-being made available to them as a result. A Foucauldian approach to discourse
analysis was therefore chosen.

**A Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis**

Based on the philosophy of Michel Foucault (e.g. 2000a, 2000b, 2002a, 2002b) regarding power,
knowledge, and discourse, Foucauldian discourse analysis focuses on the availability of discursive
resources within a given culture, looking at what this implies for those within it. The basic premise is
that “the social world and the relations of power that characterize it are determined by the discursive
formations that exist at a moment in time” (Phillips, Lawrence, & Hardy, 2004, p. 637). Power is seen
as “the capacity to ‘articulate’ and to make those articulations not only stick but become hegemonic
and pervasive” (Wetherell, 1998, p. 12). Power serves to make certain articulations of the world more
socially recognisable and acceptable than others within certain contexts. Articulations may exist as
accepted representations for some time, as they are perpetuated through peoples’ use of them in
discourse and adherence to them in practice. Language structures are therefore historical in nature,
since they change over time and in their changing shape and reflect social practices (McKinley &
McVittie, 2008).

Discourses are intrinsically tied up with social processes that legitimise power through their ability to
constrain and control different ways-of-being (van Dijk, 2008; Willig, 2008). Dominant discourses are
seen to privilege versions of reality that maintain existing power relations and social structures
(Chimbombo & Roseberry, 1998). This ‘contextual force’ (Pearce & Cronen, 1980) is administered by
social structures that propagate discourses which set out a particular social order based on shared
meanings. Thus, discourses are not simply conceptualised as ways of speaking or writing but are
bound up with social practices, “with ways of organizing, regulating and administering social life”
(Willig, 2008, p. 113). The positioning of people within and in relation to social structures is therefore
also explored in Foucauldian discourse analysis (Phillips, et al., 2004). Foucauldian discourse
analysis examines the consequences of being positioned in certain ways within and in relation to
social structures; what people may say and do, how people may think and feel, and the conditions
within which different experiences may take place (Willig, 2008).

**Critical ideas within Foucauldian discourse analysis**

The analysis in this project hoped to shed some light on the dominant ideologies regarding values and
ethics in counselling psychology training and practice, as reflected in the language of trainees. The
aim was to expose some of the ways in which the structures coordinating counselling psychology
training and practice constructed values and ethics for counselling psychologists to internalise,
looking at the implications for therapy practice and subjective experiencing. In this respect, the
Foucauldian approach taken by this project shared concerns with critical discourse analysis (McKinley
& McVittie, 2008), which focuses on “the relationship between a particular discursive event and
institutions and social structures that frame it” (Willig, 2008, p.123). Counselling psychology training
and practice were seen as ‘discursive events’, and the relationships between these events and the
institutions and social structures coordinating them was to be examined. It was hoped that by
explicating any oppressive structures and practices relating to values and ethics within counselling psychology training and practice they might become subject to challenge and possible change.

**Methods**

Crotty (1998) defines research methods as “the techniques or procedures used to gather and analyse data related to some research question” (p. 3). Suitable techniques and procedures were therefore required to conduct focus group discussions with final year trainees and to analyse the discourse produced in line with a Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis. Details of the methods used are given below.

**Focus Groups**

The design and running of a focus group need to be carefully thought out if it is to run smoothly and successfully. The following outlines how the focus groups in this project were designed and run by the researcher. Details will be given regarding the preparation that went into the groups, along with their composition and moderation. The focus group approach will be explained, followed by details of the number of groups, group size, recruitment methods, sample, duration, and setting. Information will also be given on how the focus groups were conducted and transcribed.

- **Preparing for the focus group**

Vaughn et al. (1996) state, “establishing the purpose of the focus group is essential to its success because the purpose lays the ground work for all subsequent decisions” (p. 38). The guidelines in the chapter ‘Preparing for the Focus Group’ (Vaughn et al., 1996) were therefore followed to produce a *general purpose statement* (see Box 16), a *refined purpose statement* (see Box 17), and to set out the *goals of the focus groups* (see Box 18), which paved the way for what took place.
**Box 17**

**Refined purpose statement**

What the research wants to know:

- The ways in which participants construct values and ethics.
- How participants construct values and ethics in relation to their training.
- How participants construct values and ethics in relation to their practice.
- How participants construct values and ethics in relation to themselves, clients, other therapy stakeholders, therapy theory, counselling psychology, and society.

What the research does not want to know:

- How participants rate different university training programmes in relation to one another.
- Details of specific client case examples.
- Details of case-specific issues regarding members of teaching staff, supervisors, placement or practice managers, peers, or other therapy stakeholders.
- General issues regarding training and practice unrelated to the research topic.
Focus group approach

Calder (1977) draws on a philosophy of science perspective to explore three different approaches to focus group practice that can be utilised to explicate the approach employed by this project. Calder states, “For social scientists the real world is the full physical complexity of objects and behaviors. But the real world is much too complex to be understood in and of itself” (p. 354). As a result, much social science research is built around the process of conceptualisation, which seeks to represent the real world in a simple enough way to allow understanding by producing constructs. However, Calder argues that scientific constructs represent only limited aspects of the world in abstracted form: “If scientific constructs mirrored the full complexity of the real world, one could no more understand science than one can directly understand the real world” (Calder, 1977, p. 354). Based on this assertion, Calder produces Figure 3.

**Box 18**

**Goals of the focus groups**

- Goal 1 – What are the focus groups being used for?

  To generate discussion amongst participants regarding values and ethics in counselling psychology training and practice that can be transcribed and subjected to discourse analysis.

- Goal 2 – What are the specific outcomes hoped for in conducting the focus groups?

  To generate discussion amongst participants that demonstrates the discursive resources made use of when discussing values and ethics in counselling psychology training and practice, and to gain information about the consequences of utilising these discursive resources for their practice with clients and their subjective experiencing.
Calder asserts that, although scientific explanations have traditionally been heralded as having advantages over everyday explanations because of the supposed rigour of scientific research methods, they should not automatically be deemed superior. Calder suggests that the advantages supposed by scientific explanations are often more assumed than real. The explanatory concepts of everyday knowledge, which Calder terms first-degree constructs, are seen to be based on the social construction of reality: “they are imparted to a person as a consequence of socialization within a culture” (Calder, 1977, p. 355). Second-degree constructs are seen to belong to the realm of science and are supposed to be highly abstract. However, as Calder points out, second-degree constructs are no less a construction of reality than first-degree constructs. Based on this perspective, Calder defines three types of focus group approach, each of which seeks to obtain a different kind of knowledge, as shown in Box 19.
The purpose of the focus groups in this research was exploratory, since the aim was to allow participants to generate first-degree constructs relating to values and ethics that could then be subjected to discourse analysis to produce second-degree constructs, such as discursive constructions, discourses, and subject positions. In moderating the focus groups, the researcher aimed to encourage participants “to explore the issues of importance to them, in their own vocabulary, generating their own questions and pursuing their own priorities” (Kitzinger, 1995, p. 299). It was therefore important that a relatively open discussion schedule was employed, with limited structured questions coming from the researcher, to allow participants to produce first-degree constructs amongst themselves and to avoid the experience being like a within-group survey (Stewart,
Shamdasani, & Rook, 2007). The researcher’s stance was investigative and curious, posing questions to elicit participants’ views and encourage self-reflection (Puchta & Potter, 2004).

- **Number of focus groups**

Vaughn et al. (1996) suggest there should be an adequate number of focus groups to encompass the range of participants who need to be interviewed to explore the topic in suitable breadth and detail. This will depend on the purpose of the group, the topic of discussion, the diversity of participants’ experiences, and the way in which data is to be analysed (Kreuger, 1994; Krueger & Casey, 2009). There should be a sufficient number of groups to allow repetitive themes to emerge, which typically requires between two and four groups (Calder, 1977; Kreuger, 1994; Vaughn et al., 1996). Since the groups in this project aimed to generate exploratory data on a complex topic that was directly relevant to participants, which could then be subjected to discourse analysis, it was important that enough information was gathered to allow a variety of discursive constructions and subject positions to emerge, with the possibility for commonalities to be identified. Four groups were therefore conducted.

- **Group Size**

Opinions vary regarding the ‘ideal’ size for a focus group, with literature pointing variously to an ‘optimal’ or ‘average’ group size of between four and twelve participants (Frey & Fontana 1991; Morgan, 1997; Tang & Davis, 1995; Wilkinson, 2008). Peek and Fothergill (2007) describe their experiences of conducting focus groups of two to fifteen participants as part of three separate projects (Fothergill, 2004; Fothergill & Peek 2006; Peek, 2003). They report that groups including three to five participants ran more smoothly than larger groups and worked better due to time constraints and the amount of information participants wanted to discuss. They recommend that researchers include a smaller number of participants to maximise discussion yet maintain order. Krueger (1994) states, “the size must be small enough for everyone to have an opportunity to share insights and yet large enough to provide diversity of perceptions” (p. 27).

Reviewing a range of focus group literature, Tang and Davis (1995) suggest ‘critical factors’ to consider include the nature of the research project, the sensitivity and complexity of the topic, the diversity, ability, expectation and needs of the group members, and the group skills of the moderator.
They recommend that, where focus groups are to be exploratory, the researcher should run more groups of smaller sizes in a less structured manner, since the objective is to obtain the maximum amount of information on the research topic. The focus group approach taken by this research was indeed exploratory. Participants were located within the context of the topic and it was hoped they would be able to speak about it at length. The researcher was relatively inexperienced in group skills and wanted to allow discussion to emerge amongst participants as much as possible. A more open schedule was therefore employed rather than a rigorously structured one. It was decided that each group would consist of up to five participants, with five being the desired number. It was hoped that this would be small enough allow the moderator to hear from all participants and maintain control, whilst being large enough to allow for rich discussion to be generated amongst participants.

- **Recruitment**

A number of recruitment methods were employed to gain participants, as shown in Box 20.

**Box 20**

**Recruitment methods**

- **Recruitment via university:** The programme administrators at five different universities sent emails to counselling psychology trainees in their final year of study inviting them to participate in the research. The researcher did not have access to these potential participants' details, thus preserving their anonymity.

- **Recruitment via direct contact:** Direct email contact was made with potential participants known to the researcher who were eligible for participation.

- **Recruitment via word of mouth:** Participants were recruited via word of mouth by the researcher and by other participants.

- **Recruitment via the BPS:** The research was advertised on the BPS DCoP website and in an email sent to those subscribing to the DCoP mailing list.
• **Ethical research practice**

Ethical approval to carry out the research project was sought from Roehampton University. An application was submitted giving details of the project and the procedures to be put in place to ensure participants’ safety and wellbeing (see Appendix 1). On this basis, Roehampton University granted approval to go ahead with the project and conduct the focus groups (see Appendix 2). Only the researcher had access to recruitment information pertaining to potential participants and those recruited, so as to protect their anonymity and confidentiality. Participants received details of the project and its requirements prior to agreeing to participate. They were asked to read and sign a consent form giving a description of the research project and stipulating the confidential nature of their participation (see Appendix 3).

Participants were assigned a Participant ID on recruitment that was used to identify them on all documentation to ensure anonymity regarding their contributions. Participants were advised that all information relating to them would be treated as strictly confidential by the research team, comprising the researcher, research supervisor, and director of studies, who abided by the BPS Code of Ethics and Conduct (BPS, 2009). Participants were assured that information would not be shared by the research team with others unless this was necessary to ensure an individual’s safety. The limits of the researcher’s ability to ensure total confidentiality due to the shared group setting were made clear to participants. Participants were told that they had the right to withdraw from the project at any time by notifying the researcher or another member of the research team, either in person or using the contact details provided, and that all information relating to them would be destroyed in this case. On completing the focus group, participants were given a debriefing form providing further information on the project, reiterating their right to withdraw, and offering information on sources of emotional support should they be needed (see Appendix 4).

• **Sample**

Twenty practising final year trainee counselling psychologists were initially recruited from three different universities to form four focus groups: A, B, C, and D. One participant in group D was unable to attend the group on the day, bringing the number of participants in this group down to four and the total number of participants down to nineteen. Sixteen of the participants were female and three were
male. Participants ranged in age from 25 to 51, with an average age of 32. A number of nationalities, races, and ethnicities were represented across the participants, though the sample was predominantly white and half of the participants were British. As part of their training, all participants had been required to participate in therapy, as clients and therapists, to read about therapy theory and practice, to write about it and reflect on it. It is acknowledged that those recruited, whilst being purposive in relation to the research topic, were not necessarily representative of the entire target population.

Kitzinger (1995) suggests that the use of pre-existing groups, or groups in which individuals are already acquainted to some degree, may mean participants are able to relate to and challenge one another more easily. Rai Bee (2004) states, “when exploring very sensitive and personal issues the use of pre-existing groups might be advantageous, as there is already an extent of trust amongst the members of the group, which will encourage the expression of views” (p. 656). Each group therefore contained participants from the same university. In groups A, C, and D, all participants knew each other. In group B, four participants knew each other; the fifth did not know the other four prior to the group.

- **Duration**

The duration of a focus group will be influenced by the discussion topic, group composition, and number of participants, with focus groups typically lasting around 1.5 to 2 hours (Vaughn et al., 1996). Given the small group size and the parameters of the discussion topic in this project, it was decided that 1.5 hours would be a suitable length of time for each group.

- **Setting**

Focus groups should be conducted at a convenient location that is easy for participants to find and get to (Kreuger, 1994; Vaughn et al., 1996). Focus groups were therefore conducted at the university that participants attended, in a private room away from other people where discussion would not be interrupted or overheard.
• Conducting the focus groups

The focus group sessions were devised to incorporate the ‘activities’ Wilkinson (2008) suggests take place at the beginning and end of a focus group session. It also drew on the ‘session guidelines’ set out by Litosseliti (2003) and the ‘moderator’s guide’ proposed by Vaughn et al. (1996). The researcher created a focus group schedule and script to assist with briefing participants and running the groups (see Appendix 5). By following this script the researcher ensured that all important points regarding safety and confidentiality were covered before the group commenced. Participants were asked to maintain the anonymity and confidentiality of members of the group, as well as people, agencies, and organisations featuring in their discussion. They were asked to show respect for themselves and others during discussion by considering what they chose to speak about, avoiding making hostile or negative comments about others or their ideas, and ensuring confidentiality by keeping all information within the focus group. Participants were advised that the goal of the groups was not to build consensus and that encouraging others to share the same ideas was unnecessary. It was hoped that pre-existing relationships between participants who had participated in classes, groups, and discussions together on their training course, would create a safe and supportive environment. The researcher monitored participants’ involvement and was ready to intervene should a situation arise where individuals were seen to start to become distressed or uncomfortable.

The researcher prepared three questions to facilitate the group discussion, as shown in Box 21. Question 1 was used to get discussion started and questions 2 and 3 were deployed at subsequent points during the focus groups to facilitate further discussion relating to these issues specifically. Other questions were posed by the researcher in response to participants’ contributions as each focus group progressed.

Box 21

Focus group questions

1. What do the terms values and ethics mean to you in relation to counselling psychology?

2. How do you think your training experiences have shaped your views on values and ethics?

3. How do you think your practice experiences have shaped your views on values and ethics?
Transcription

Transcripts of the focus group discussions were produced by the researcher to contain a level of detail suitable for a ‘macro-level’ (van Dijk, 2008) Foucauldian discourse analysis to be conducted on them (see Box 23, p. 191, and Appendices A, B, C, and D). Any identifying information given during the focus group discussions was erased from the audio recordings and was not transcribed.

Foucauldian discourse analysis

The transcripts produced from the focus groups constituted the text to be analysed using Foucauldian discourse analysis. Parker (1999) defines ‘text’ as “any tissue of meaning which is symbolically significant for a reader” (p. 4). Conducting discourse analysis on a text “is not a hard science” (Morgan, 2010, p. 4), rather it is a deconstructive reading and critical interpretation. As a result, there is no strict formal procedure for ‘doing discourse analysis’ (Morgan, 2010). Foucault (1991) was explicit in his dislike for prescription, stating “I absolutely will not play the part of one who prescribes solutions” (p. 157). Much of Foucault’s writing served to disrupt notions of certainty whereby people are told how to be and what to do (Graham, 2010). However, guidelines to Foucauldian discourse analysis are offered by a number of theorists to facilitate the process of analysis (e.g. Kendall & Wickham, 1999; Parker, 1992; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Willig, 2008). Such guidelines typically lead the researcher through a number of steps that identify and deconstruct the subjects and objects constructed within a text, examining the ways in which discursive constructions reproduce power relations and with what consequences (Morgan, 2010). Whilst guidelines might be criticised as falling into the positivist trap of standardising Foucault’s philosophy into a prescribed method, which Foucault’s ambiguity strove to avoid, they provide a useful way in to Foucauldian discourse analysis, furnishing the researcher with pointers for what might be attended to. The guidelines followed by the researcher in this project were those offered by Willig (2008), which are outlined below.

Willig’s (2008) six stages of analysis

Willig (2008) sets out a six-stage approach to Foucauldian discourse analysis that allows the researcher “to map some of the discursive resources used in a text and the subject positions they contain, and to explore their implications for subjectivity and practice” (p. 115). Willig’s six-stage
approach does not constitute a full Foucauldian analysis, as it focuses on isolated texts and ignores “the more fundamental precepts of Foucauldian method, those of power/knowledge, historicity and governmentality, ignoring also the broader ‘tissues of meaning’ that make up a particular discourse” (Morgan, 2010, p. 5). It does not venture to include ‘archaeology’ (Foucault, 2002b) and ‘genealogy’ (Mahon, 1992) as Foucault did, which explore the ways in which taken for granted knowledge came into being by attending to the socio-historical nature of different constructions of objects and phenomena (Parker, 1997). Nevertheless, Willig’s approach is informed by the Foucauldian assumption that “no version of the world remains dominant forever because the social construction of reality through discourse is characterized by change and transformation” (Willig, 2008, p. 126). Willig’s approach was seen to offer a useful set of guidelines to mobilise the researcher’s analytic attention. The six stages of analysis are outlined in Box 22.

**Box 22**

Willig’s (2008) six-stage approach to Foucauldian discourse analysis

1. *Discursive constructions:* This stage is concerned with the ways in which a discursive object is constructed. Which discursive object is focused upon will depend on the focus of the research question. Analysis involves identifying the different ways a discursive object is constructed in the text, highlighting all instances of reference, both implicit and explicit. The search for constructions of a discursive object is therefore guided by shared meaning rather than lexical comparability.

2. *Discourses:* Having identified all sections of the text that contributed to the construction of a discursive object, the differences between constructions are focused upon. The same discursive object can be constructed in different ways and this stage of analysis aims to locate the various different discursive constructions within wider discourses.

(Continues)
3. **Action orientation:** The discursive contexts within which different constructions of an object are deployed are then given closer examination: What is gained from constructing the object in this particular way at this particular point within the text? This stage aims to explore what is achieved as a result of constructing a discursive object in a particular way within a particular discourse.

4. **Positionings:** Having identified the various constructions of a discursive object within the text, and having located them within wider discourses, focus is then turned towards the subject positions they offer. Discourses construct subjects as well as objects, making positions available within networks of meaning that speakers can take up as well as place others in. Subject positions offer discursive locations from which to speak and act.

5. **Practice:** This stage aims to map the possibilities for action contained within the discursive constructions identified, exploring the ways in which discursive constructions and the subject positions contained within them open up or close down opportunities for action. By constructing particular versions of the world, and by positioning subjects within them in particular ways, discourses limit what can be said and done. As a result, certain practices are given legitimacy by particular discourses and the undertaking of these practices in turn serve to reproduce and ratify the discourses that legitimate them. Speaking and doing thus support one another reciprocally in the construction of subjects and objects.

6. **Subjectivity:** The final stage explores the relationship between discourse and subjectivity. Discourses make certain ways of seeing and being in the world available; they construct social and psychological realities. Having taken up a particular subject position, a person will see the world through the lens of that position and its associated discursive accoutrements. This stage traces the consequences of taking up various subject positions for participants’ subjective experiencing, examining what can be felt, thought, and experienced from within various subject positions.

(Willig, 2008)
The six stages were used to deconstruct the constructions of values and ethics produced by participants in relation to counselling psychology training and practice. The analysis aimed to explore what was implied by the constructions, looking at the ways-of-being made available to counselling psychologists. Particular attention was paid to the role of institutions within counselling psychology, looking at how the dominant discourses purveyed by institutions might constrain action and maintain power-relations. The analytic process was seen as being inherently interpretive and contingent, representing a reading of the text from the ontological, epistemological, theoretical, and ethical standpoint of the researcher (Wetherell, 2001).

**Summary**

A research project constitutes one value-laden construction of the investigative process, drawing on various other value-laden constructions to substantiate its endeavour. Since the process can always be traced back to the researcher's meaning-making, it might be argued that all research is phenomenological. Lévinas (1998) states, “Out of the thematization of the human, new dimensions are opened that are essential to reflecting meaning [sens pensé]. All those who think in this way and seek these dimensions in order to find this meaning are doing phenomenology” (p. 88). Thus, whilst a constructionist standpoint was taken by the researcher in relation to the research topic, the project itself might be seen as constituting the researcher's phenomenology.

The path trodden by the researcher should be viewed with some ‘irreverence’ (Cecchin, Lane, & Ray, 1993) when regarding the completeness and correctness of its trajectory and the ground covered. Where transparency might be seen in relation to methodology and methods, it is important to notice what is absent from the picture. Whilst a researcher might strive to present the ‘elements’ comprising their project clearly and transparently, the confusion and chaos present in any research endeavour should not be overlooked. All research hinges on the intentionality of the researcher, which will drive their meaning-making as they appropriate ideas and theories for the purposes of their project. In light of this, Lévinas (1998) disputes the notion of transparency altogether, stating “I do not believe that there is a transparency possible in method. Nor that philosophy might be possible as transparency. Those who have worked on methodology all their lives have written many books that replace the more interesting books that they could have written” (p.89).
Nevertheless, this chapter has attempted to explicate some of the philosophical and methodological resources drawn on by the researcher, which fuelled the approach taken towards investigation. Fundamentally, the constructionist standpoint taken by the project invokes an unending loop of critical and deconstructive thinking that can be reflexively applied to the research endeavour itself, exposing it as little more than a way of trying to distil the flux based on the researcher’s terms and conditions (Caputo, 1987). With this in mind, attention will now be turned towards the researcher’s attempt at doing just this, which involved conducting Foucauldian discourse analysis on the transcripts produced from the focus groups in line with Willig’s (2008) six-stage approach to discourse analysis.
ANALYSIS

Stage 1: Discursive Constructions

The first stage of Willig’s (2001) six-stage approach aims to identify discursive objects in the text, looking at how these objects are constructed through language. Since the research did not aim to explore differences across university training courses, the transcribed focus group discussions were considered together as one text. The research was interested in how participants constructed values and ethics in relation to counselling psychology training and practice. Values and ethics were therefore focused upon as discursive objects, identifying all implicit and explicit references to them in the text. Whilst counselling psychology, training, and practice could also have been investigated as discursive objects, the choice was made to foreground values and ethics and to consider them within the discursive context of counselling psychology training and practice.

Values

The term values was seen to be more difficult to understand and define than the term ethics, as illustrated in Excerpt 1.

Excerpt 1

I’m not really sure I understand the word values, I mean I know I think I understand the word ethics but the word value doesn’t really, seems for me to unders- to be undst- understandable, erm, I did try to look in the dictionary

(D5, line 2-4)

Values were constructed as the “drives” (C2, line 94), “beliefs” (D2, line 26), or “principles” (C2, line 698), giving rise to perceptions (e.g. A2, line 801-802), “preferences” (A1, line 504), “expectations” (A2, line 540), and “certain behaviours” (D4, line 535). Values were seen to be “intangible and maybe not easy to identify” (A1, line 529-530). Based on these assertions, three discursive constructions of values were identified as follows:
- **Institutional values**

Values constituted a "socially constructed" (D5, line 89) "system" (A3, line 572) of "principles" (A1, line 260), assigning objects and behaviours with particular shared meanings relating to social institutions and practices. Values could be shared on a "micro" (D2, line 31) level, such as "family values" (D3, line 48-49), through to "a macro level in terms of cultural and social" (D2, line 31) values. There was some expectation that people should uphold certain values in certain settings to function effectively as social beings, as illustrated in Excerpt 2.

**Excerpt 2**

*there are cultural, social, legal, you know, err all of these things have particular expectations*

(A1, line 688)

People were subject to the values emphasised by different institutions and practices, which were seen to be dependent on "the general zeitgeist of the time" (A1, line 249).

- **Personal values**

Values constituted an "internal motivational set of beliefs" (C2, line 93-94). Values were considered to be "personal" (A1, line 518), "part of us" (C3, line 1621), and "very much part of who I am" (A3, line 589). They were conceptualised as "inner" (D4, line 18), "organic" (C3, line 1687), and "embedded in us" (B4, line 31-32). They were "shaped by your experiences" (C2, line 1635-1636) and "your relationships" (B5, line 368), as illustrated in Excerpt 3.

**Excerpt 3**

*my values are more, I was going to say through my experience ... I think values for me feels more like my kind of lived experience*

(B5, line 4-6)
Values were “assimilated” (D2, line 749) and “absorbed” (B2, line 372) through “being with others talking about things” (B5, line 6-7). They were conceptualised as “subjective and personal” (A2, line 808), whilst being contingent on others, such that “they do involve people around me” (D3, line 57).

- **Unconscious values**

Values constituted an “instinctive” (B2, line 35), “innate” (A1, line 530) motivational force underlying human behaviour, as illustrated in Excerpt 4.

**Excerpt 4**

*If I ask what your value instinct is ... how you react ... your values tell you what you feel about it really*  
(C2, line 1085-1086)

Values were seen to be latent in a person’s behaviour, with values outside their conscious awareness influencing actions, as illustrated in Excerpt 5.

**Excerpt 5**

*I don’t think sort of in the moment I actually think of, this is a value ... it’s looking back and reflecting and thinking, ooh I was actually drawn in there*  
(D3, line 469-471)

By observing or interacting with another person it was seen to be possible to “get the sense of their values” (A2, line 544).

**Ethics**

Ethics constituted “something that’s socially constructed” (D5, line 69) that was informed by values – “ethics actually comes from values” (D5, line 445) – and served to “protect and promote those values” (D2, line 112). In some instances values and ethics were seen to be difficult to separate in trying to provide definitions, as illustrated in Excerpt 6.
The two concepts were distinguished most clearly based on their relationship with behaviour. The role of values in behaviour was “more fluid and flexible” (B4, line 80) than that of ethics. Ethics were seen as constituting “something more than values” (B2, line 182), deciding what values were to be enacted and what action took place, as illustrated in Excerpts 7 and 8.

Thus, ethical conduct constituted “Something that you have to do, or being cautious about things that you shouldn’t do” (B3, line 8). The subject of ethics was conceptualised as “like ethical dilemmas or, so it feels like something I need to think through a bit more” (B5, line 23-24), with particular ethics representing “the right way of doing something” (B1, line 25) or “that kind of idea of what you should be doing” (B5, line 813). Ethics were constructed in personal and professional terms, such that “you have your own ethics ... and then there are the professional ethics as well” (D2, line 183-185). Based on these assertions, two discursive constructions of ethics were identified as follows:
• Professional ethics

Ethics constituted the “guidelines, boundaries” (C1, line 9), “principles” (C2, line 698) or “rules” (C2, line 98) comprising an “ethical agreement” (C2, line 104), “code of conduct” (A4, line 49), or “code of ethics” (A2, line 919). The basic purpose of ethics was conceptualised as being to “maintain safety” (D3, line 109) and to “protect self and others” (D3, line 142). The subject of ethics was seen as coming from “the body that governs our profession” (C2, line 958), serving to “guide your behaviour” (C2, line 98) by indicating appropriate and inappropriate actions, as illustrated in Excerpt 9.

Excerpt 9


In some instances, ethics and rules were seen to be indistinct from one another, as illustrated in Excerpt 10.

Excerpt 10


• Personal ethics

Ethics constituted an individual’s personal “standards” (C4, line 873) of behaviour and their “moral standpoint” (A1, line 66). The subject of ethics was concerned with “the whole philosophy of what it means to relate to the other” (B5, line 362-363). A person’s ethics were seen to be based on their values, such that “my values inform my ethics” (B2, line 2). Thus, a person’s values, “things like
respect or ... equality” (B5, line 22), were integral to their ethics. Reciprocally, a person’s ethics were seen to influence their values, as illustrated in Excerpt 11.

Excerpt 11

my values inform my ethics, I’m just trying to think if it goes the other way as well, yes it must do

(B2, line 2-3)

Since a person’s values were derived through experiences, so too were their ethics. Ethics were seen to vary amongst people, meaning that what was considered to be ethical was “totally subjective” (C5, line 328).

Summary

Three different discursive constructions of values and two of ethics were identified within the text, each offering a different way of thinking about the concepts as discursive objects. Table 1 summarises these discursive constructions.

Table 1
Discursive constructions of values and ethics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discursive object</th>
<th>Discursive constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>- Institutional values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Personal values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unconscious values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>- Professional ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Personal ethics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Stage 2: Discourses**

This stage aimed to locate the discursive constructions within wider discourses. The purpose was to examine the broader implications of participants’ talk by looking at the discourses invoked when speaking about values and ethics. Analysis sought to identify discourses at a level of abstraction appropriate to the research topic, without them being too localised and subject to higher-level discourses, or too abstracted and tangential to participants’ actual accounts. Participants drew on four discourses to produce the five discursive constructions of values and ethics as follows:

**Institutional discourse**

- **Institutional values**

By constructing values as the socially constructed principles of institutions, organising behaviour on the basis of shared meanings, participants drew on an institutional discourse about the assumptions, concerns, and vocabularies of socially organised settings and the ways they interact. Institutions were seen to be organised by, and comprised of, people with shared or “common” (D2, line 453) values. Values were seen to vary amongst people, with some being more commonly shared than others, as illustrated in Excerpts 12 and 13.

**Excerpt 12**

maybe more people share erm a personal value of an abhorrence of err sexual abuse

(D4, line 536)

**Excerpt 13**

I think no one can have a problem with peace

(C1, line 1542)

Institutions of differing sizes and natures were seen to exist based on different sets of common values held by different groups of people, with each institution having its own assumptions, concerns, vocabularies, and practices, as illustrated in Excerpt 14.
Membership of an institution, or adherence to an institutional practice, was predicated on an individual subscribing to its values, which were often seen to be formalised into a “code of ethics and values” (A1, line 919) that governed members’ behaviour.

- Professional ethics

By constructing ethics as the guidelines and rules “tied up with a profession” (C2, line 924), which served to protect and promote that profession’s values, participants drew on a discourse about professions as institutions with institutional practices. The subject of ethics was conceptualised as “something that belongs to a professional context with consequences for me as a professional” (C2, line 927-928). Having a code of ethics was seen as being integral to the constitution of a profession, as illustrated in Excerpt 15.

Excerpt 14

*maybe it’s all about job markets and erm sort of Marxist, capitalist sort of ideas about different groups defining themselves*

(D2, line 903-904)

Each profession was seen to be governed by a “professional body” (C2, line 1077) responsible for coordinating “a kind of external set of beliefs, rules, etc. that’s supposed to guide your behaviour” (C2, line 97-98). These beliefs or rules constituted “things that you’re in a way, you are told to, to do” (B3, line 9-10). Where rules were broken, the body and/or its associated institutions “could dish out punishments” (D4, line 1272). Ethical conduct was therefore concerned with “my professional erm duty and responsibility” (C4, line 238), with a professional’s primary responsibility being to ensure safe
practice; to “maintain safety again in a way whether it’s self-protection or protection of others” (D3, line 109-111).

Humanistic discourse

- **Personal values**

By constructing values as constituting a person’s developmentally derived belief system, driving their behaviour, participants drew on a humanistic discourse emphasising the implicative force of individuals and their capacity for growth in relation to conditions of their environment, as illustrated in Excerpt 16.

**Excerpt 16**

people are good and the only reason why they’re doing bad things is because there was a difficult experience, they were hurt, they were, erm you know, they’re, they’re, they’re harmed in some way

(A3, line 878-881)

Having values was considered fundamental to “being human” (B4, line 1138), such that “we’re not machines, we’re not robots” (C2, line 1629). A person’s values constituted their “lived experience” (B5, line 6), meaning values were “learned” (B2, line 372) and “developed” (C2, line 633) through one’s “subjective experience” (A2, line 359) of “being with others” (B5, line 6); “they will just develop and grow” (C3, line 1688). Values were predicated on a person’s “background” (D3, line 473) and “upbringing” (D3, line 49), making people “unique and different” (D2, line 965), each person having their own “value-system” (D2, line 242). Values were integral to a person’s “identity” (C5, line 1291) and sense of “self” (C3, line 266). People were seen to make choices “based on what appeals to me or what I value” (D4, line 695-696), resulting in a hierarchy of values for each person, ranging from those that “aren’t as important for you” (B2, line 697), to “fundamental” (C4, line 40) or “core ones” (A1, line 523) located at a “deeper level” (C4, line 56). Fundamental or core values were considered “final” (A2, line 782), these being values that “there is no crossing” (A2, line 783).
• **Personal ethics**

By constructing ethics as the standards of a person’s behaviour, participants drew on a humanistic discourse regarding one’s “responsibility about being with another human being” (D2, line 273-274) and “the position you take to another human being” (B5, line 95-96). Central to this were notions of “trust and respect” (B1, line 127) and the premise that one should treat others as one would like to be treated: “do as you will be done by” (B1, line 383). Since a person’s values were conceptualised as subjective and idiosyncratic, so too were a person’s ethics, making it “hard to define and say that was unethical” (B4, line 1070). People were seen to be responsible and accountable for their actions, the ethics of which were subject to interpretation. Ethics was therefore seen as being “a vague subject” (C5, line 312) and “a grey area” (C2, line 465) that was “totally subjective” (C5, line 328).

**Psychodynamic discourse**

• **Unconscious values**

By constructing values as constituting an unconscious motivational force that was latent in a person’s behaviour, participants drew on a psychodynamic discourse about the relationship between conscious and unconscious motivation. As in psychodynamic therapy, a person’s behaviour could be explored to discover “what it’s really about” (B1, line 785) in terms of the unconscious values underlying it. It was suggested that, by “looking back and reflecting and thinking” (D3, line 471), we can “make our unconscious values conscious so that we are more aware of it” (A4, line 940-941).

**Moral discourse**

• **The right or wrong of values and ethics**

By constructing ethics as constituting “the right way of doing something” (B1, line 25) based on a person’s values, participants drew on a moral discourse about “right or wrong” (C4, line 813). Values and morals were seen as being similar in nature – “I can’t really see a difference between morals and values” (C3, line 807-808) – whilst ethics were concerned with “behaving the right way” (B1, line 812) on the basis of having “good values” (D3, line 474).
Summary

Participants drew on four discourses to produce the five discursive constructions of values and ethics identified in Stage 1. Table 2 summarises the discourses identified and shows how they related to each of the discursive constructions. The moral discourse was used to speak about right or wrong in relation to constructions of values and ethics across discourses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Discourses drawn on to produce discursive constructions of values and ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourses</td>
<td>Discursive constructions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Institutional discourse | - Institutional values  
- Professional ethics |
| Humanistic discourse | - Personal values  
- Personal ethics |
| Psychodynamic discourse | - Unconscious values |
| Moral discourse | - The right or wrong of values and ethics |

Stage 3: Action orientation

This stage involved closer examination of the discursive contexts in which different constructions of values and ethics were used. Through the research question, ‘counselling psychology training and practice’ was introduced to participants as the overall discursive context. Broadly speaking, within this context, values and ethics were conceptualised as “the very foundation ... of what it is to be a counselling psychologist” (D2, line 1208-1209). They were seen to play “A very large role” (A1, line 898), with values constituting “the basic, basic, basic principles” (D5, line 1213) and ethics providing “a structure to work in ... in terms of how we work with others and the responsibility that we have in working with other people” (C3, line 4-5). On this basis, analysis set out to examine the more specific effects with which different constructions of values and ethics were deployed within the discourses identified in relation to counselling psychology training and practice.
Institutional discourse

- **Counselling psychology as a professional institution**

By constructing values as the socially constructed principles of institutions, including professions, values were seen as the principles organising counselling psychology as a profession. Common values were therefore seen to exist amongst counselling psychologists, meaning “everyone who’s going into this profession should have some common personal values” (D5, line 446-447); “We do have a common profession, we do have a common value” (D2, line 453). Participants described being attracted to counselling psychology based on their values, such that “my values did kind of drive me towards this ... career” (C3, line 73-75). Common values within counselling psychology were seen to be predicated on those of broader social institutions, as illustrated in Excerpt 17.

**Excerpt 17**

I’m learning counselling psychology in England with their values, erm, which I tend to share because of a kind of a shared history to some extent and because I’m here learning it but I, I am very aware of the fact that if I had to go to Africa let’s say to do therapy or whatever, the concept would completely change

(A3, line 579-582)

Counselling psychology was seen to have “values that are okay to be part of the profession and there are ones that aren’t” (C1, line 1541-1542), with counselling psychology’s “professional body” (C2, line 1077) formalising those that should be common to counselling psychologists into “a very strict kind of code of ethics and values that we adhere to” (A2, line 919-920). Counselling psychology’s ethics were seen to be synonymous with “BPS guidelines” (B1, line 30), as illustrated in Excerpt 18.

**Excerpt 18**

the BPS err code of conduct and ethics, err where it’s kind of clearly written how erm psychologists don’t want, you know, what you should look out for and what’s important, and to kind of adhere to the standards, for example when we do research or when we are with clients, so that was the first thing that came into my mind when I heard ethics

(A4, line 49-52)
By constructing ethics as “this set of rules” (C2, line 275) that “seems external to me” (C2, line 275), ethics were seen as “belonging to the body, whoever that body is, it was BPS in year one, now it’s HPC” (C2, line 956). Thus, participants abdicated responsibility for deciding the nature of the ethics involved in their practice, which were seen as “something they put on me” (D5, line 78) rather than ideas or standards that were self-generated. Ethics were seen as applying to the behaviour of counselling psychologists rather than clients, as illustrated in Excerpt 19.

Excerpt 19

ethics don’t apply to clients but that just shows how I’m understanding and interpreting ethics, I’m seeing it as something that belongs to a professional cont- context with consequences for me as a professional

(C2, line 926-928)

Ethics were seen as serving to “help guide us” (C1, line 1680) and existed “For safety” (D3, line 73) to avoid people coming to harm. Ethics were conceptualised as important protective factors for counselling psychologists, clients, and the profession itself, as illustrated in Excerpt 20.

Excerpt 20

it’s so important that we are ethical, I think it protects us, it protects the client, it protects the profession and whatever service we work in

(C3, line 617-618)

The values and ethics underlying counselling psychology were seen to be drawn from a range of theoretical models and epistemologies, providing “different models of thinking” (A1, line 276), with “different values and boundaries and things like that between different models” (A2, line 723-724). Broadly speaking, counselling psychology was seen to be constructed around two epistemologies, a “scientist side” (B2, line 1184) and a “humanist side” (B2, line 1184). Counselling psychology’s ‘scientist side’ was founded on the values of “theory and research” (D4, line 892), constituting “the psychology part” (D4, line 889) of its identity, which was concerned with “evidence” (D4, line 971) and “generalisability” (D2, line 957). Counselling psychology’s ‘humanist side’ was founded on person-
centred values concerned with the importance of “subjective experience” (A2, line 359), “valuing difference” (D4, line 741), assuming a “non-judgemental stance” (A1, line 704), and “not imposing your own beliefs” (A3, line 725-726). The values of both epistemologies were institutionalised to some degree, through their formalisation into directives stating how counselling psychologists should behave, as illustrated in Excerpts 21 and 22.

### Excerpt 21

*I have to work in a certain way, erm, according to what the evidence says*

(A1, line 245)

### Excerpt 22

*that humanistic rule of counselling psychology, of not imposing your own beliefs, is quite an important one*

(A3, line 725-726)

- **Universities as institutions of teaching, learning, and assessment**

Values and ethics within the university were seen to be based around teaching, learning, and assessment, in accordance with “institutional requirements” (A1, line 69) stipulating “what you have to show and do” (A1, line 256) “within the learning outcomes of your training” (A1, line 258-259). Values and ethics were conceptualised as being “taught” (A1, line 237) through “teaching” (B5, line 326). They were seen to feature at a “philosophical” (B2, line 346) “higher level” (B5, line 358), focusing on “the thinking around what the models are trying to say or why they’re you know, their argument ... how you are with a client ... your way of being” (B2, line 353-355), and at a more “practical” (B2, line 345) level, focusing on “practical application” (D2, line 1125), whereby participants “had lectures on storage of material and things like that” (B2, line 342). In some instances, values and ethics were conceptualised as having been “explicit” (B2, line 357), as illustrated in Excerpt 23, whilst in others they were conceptualised as having been communicated through “a lot of unspoken messages” (A2, line 820), as illustrated in Excerpt 24.
Teaching was seen to provide trainees with initial guidance on values and ethics within counselling psychology, along with language to speak about the subject, which was seen to be “really useful ‘cause we needed some kind of guidance or otherwise we were just floundering” (B5, line 327-328); “the university really helps us name things ... gives us language or discourses or narratives” (D5, line 1080-1081). Some participants, however, described an absence of teaching about values, as illustrated in Excerpts 25, 26, and 27.

**Excerpt 23**

*I feel that ethics and values have been quite explicit all the way through our course*

(B2, line 355-357)

**Excerpt 24**

*where do you hear these kind of boundaries and rules well, you know what some things we’ve not actually been told there’s, there’s an unspoken let’s say, you don’t talk about what happens in your, with your clients with anyone outside. Well who really said that you can’t go and share, I know that there’s a thing confidentially but who said within your, say your family, that you can never go to your family and tell them, oh I had a really upsetting experience, someone was talking about being abused. Who said that?*

(A2, line 821-826)

**Excerpt 25**

*I don’t recall much about values*

(C3, line 626)

**Excerpt 26**

*nothing on internal values, nothing on how to develop an internal supervisor, nothing on how to use your own moral compass*

(C2, line 637-638)
In such instances, trainees’ were seen to have developed their understandings of values pertaining to counselling psychology on another course (e.g. C2, line 633), through personal study (e.g. D3, line 733), or through interactions with supervisors, colleagues, and on placements (e.g. B1, line 625-627), as illustrated in Excerpt 28.

Excerpt 28

*I think I learned more in the placement than I did here, erm, within, within the uni, erm because I don’t think at the time that our teaching was partic- particularly great, erm, so there it was, it was more working in that placement over time and yeah learning, learning myself, updating through books, whatever, erm and being with that client and working with that client but it didn’t come in, the training here didn’t particularly come in to that*

(D3, line 730-734)

The subject of values was therefore given consideration by participants over the course of their training but was not part of teaching within the university, as illustrated in Excerpt 29.

Excerpt 29

*it’s stayed on the agenda for me, but I don’t think that’s as a result of anything university’s done per se, I think a lot of the, the good stuff I’ve got out of placements is the placement and the supervisor*

(C2, line 837-839)

Where particular values and ethics were seen to feature in training, the extent to which they were taught and modelled in line with humanistic theory was seen to vary. The humanistic ideas being taught were not necessarily reflected in the approach to teaching, as illustrated in Excerpt 30.
In some instances, teaching within the university was conceptualised as “just throwing knowledge at us” (B3, line 583), allowing little space for discussion and reflection, such that participants felt that “all these things could be discussed more thoroughly on erm, on this training” (B3, line 956). In other instances, there was seen to have been “an opening up emphasis, rather than sort of, this is how it’s done” (D4, line 883-884), which “created a lot of space for us to be able to discuss freely” (A3, line 910).

- **Placement organisations as institutions of training and practice**

Placement organisations represented another group of institutions responsible for coordinating counselling psychology training and practice in line with particular values and ethics. Different organisations were seen to have their own values and ethics that trainees were required to follow, which were “completely determined by the context” (C2, line 538) in which practice took place; “what I can do and I can’t do ethically” (C2, line 539-540). The values and ethics involved in trainees’ placements were also seen to be contingent on those emphasised and enforced by supervisors and organisational staff members, as illustrated in Excerpt 31.

**Excerpt 30**

*a certain lecturer at this course as well always kind of banged into us that erm, with the training, that kind of model comes second and relationship and connection and that comes first*

(B4, line 544-546)

**Excerpt 31**

*it just showed me how much your supervisor can impact, kind of the value placed in your supervisor, them as the expert you know you’re really wanting to take their advice and guidance*

(A2, line 311-313)
Humanistic discourse

- The idiosyncratic nature of human beings

The unique, individual nature of human beings within a humanistic discourse meant all parties involved in counselling psychology training and practice were seen to have their own values and ethics, which were variously in accord with one another’s. Counselling psychology was seen to be concerned with recognising the idiosyncratic nature of each person and responding openly and flexibly to their values: “valuing diversity and erm, that each person’s different, valuing difference” (D4, line 740-741). The ‘humanist side’ of counselling psychology was seen to privilege a client’s unique subjective experience above generalisable textbook understandings of people. This was seen as a central tenet of counselling psychology’s humanistic epistemology: “Start with the person, the individual and their context. That for me is the primary one” (B2, line 656). Within counselling psychology, “humanistic values, the core values of the importance of the person” (A1, line 269) were “very much emphasised” (A1, line 269-270). These values were associated with the practice of “counselling or healing” (A3, line 193), centring on “the human to human relationship” (B5, line 101-102), which provided “that base from where you heal” (A3, line 198-199). The institutionalisation of values and ethics was therefore seen to be unhelpful – “sometimes it I don’t think it does help” (D3, line 134) – since counselling psychology’s “fickle guidelines” (C2, line 1083) were deemed “so vague that anything you could do seems to be potential to get you into, into deep shit” (C2, line 307-310). Professional guidelines were seen to be of limited use on the basis that “you can’t account for every possible scenario” (C2, line 527); “I don’t think it’s possible to have an, set of ethical guidelines to cover everything” (C2, line 545).

- Assimilating and absorbing values and ethics

Values and ethics were seen to develop and evolve through a person’s subjective experiences, meaning they could not be taught and learned “in a sort of bullet point you know sort of points way” (B5, line 367); “you can’t teach it per se” (C2, line 830). Instead they were “assimilated” (D2, line 749) and “absorbed” (B2, line 372), as illustrated in Excerpt 32.
Values and ethics were “taken on more implicitly” (B5, line 329) through “the doing and the interacting” (B5, line 375) with others, such as “supervisors, lecturers, colleagues” (B5, line 329-330), who “modelled” (B1, line 644) particular values and ethics. This process was described as “implicit learning” (B2, line 380). Experiential components of training were seen as the most useful aspects for developing values and ethics, as illustrated in Excerpts 33, 34, and 35.

Excerpt 32

it’s felt more, that I’ve assimilated and integrated things that have been far more, you know values and ethics around counselling psychology from lots of different, lots of different places, which are harder for me to, to grasp if that makes sense, in the sense of where that actually comes from specifically

(D2, line 748-755)

Excerpt 33

what’s much more important has just been what I’ve taken on more implicitly from supervisors, lecturers, colleagues here, just how they, how they are, what they think is important and it feels much more erm, yeah just kind of gradually absorbing that from, from people how they are rather than what they, what this particular lecture did, said that we did

(B5, line 328-332)

Excerpt 34

personal therapy is a flipping gem ... at the start I was thinking yeah I’ll just do the thirty, forty hours whatever it is and it’ll be a breeze and I’ll just talk about blah blah blah, but actually that’s probably been the space where I’ve explored values and conflicts

(C2, line 724-735)
Trainees felt they developed their own understandings of the values and ethics taught by the university through their practical experiences with clients, as illustrated in Excerpt 36.

**Excerpt 36**

_They've set a framework ... then you apply those in your practice as you get more experienced, 'cause for me it's in practice where I've worked these things out_

*(B1, line 1248-1249)*

The duration of training was criticised for not allowing participants enough time to develop values and ethics through experience, instead focusing on the acquisition of knowledge, as illustrated in Excerpt 37.

**Excerpt 37**

_It was three years and it feels now it's not enough in terms of experience, in terms of knowledge or information maybe it's too much you know, but in terms of experience, and it's kind of, because you can experience something but you need time to process this, and this is what for me wasn't enough, and obviously I still have a life outside our profession etc. etc. but maybe I would like more time ... I'd probably think that this programme should be about five years, just for processing things_

*(D5, line 1085-1092)*
- **Becoming a counselling psychologist**

Trainees’ values and ethics were seen to have changed to varying degrees over the course of training. In some cases they were seen to have been “shaped as a result of this training course” (C4, line 35-36), leading participants to ask “do we become slightly different people?” (D3, line 994); “Perhaps we create a new narrative for ourselves” (D2, line 1006). In other cases, training was not seen to have changed their values and ethics but stimulated reflection, as illustrated in Excerpt 38.

**Excerpt 38**

*I’m not saying that my values have changed or I was different, I had different values, but I think it made me think a lot on a deeper level about my fundamental values and also yeah the ethics of my work*

(C4, line 53-58)

On the whole, training was seen to have brought trainees closer to their values, highlighting what was important to them, as illustrated in Excerpts 39 and 40.

**Excerpt 39**

*sometimes this course even also brings, reaffirms and brings you closer to your own values*

(C4, line 818)

**Excerpt 40**

*it really makes you work out what’s impo- what, what really matters, what ones you’re sort of more flexible on or aren’t as important for you*

(B2, line 696-697)
Psychodynamic discourse

- **Making unconscious values conscious**

By constructing values as constituting an instinctive, unconscious force underlying human behaviour, values were seen to be latent in the actions of counselling psychologists and clients. Training was conceptualised as being helpful in making “our unconscious values conscious” (A4, line 940). Trainees were set exercises geared towards raising conscious awareness of their values, as illustrated in Excerpt 41.

**Excerpt 41**

we did an exercise here ... you know, erm about our own personal values and we had like maybe a hundred values to pick from and you're, you know, kind of looking through and trying to think, well what the hell are my values, you know?

(A1, line 517-520)

Becoming aware of one’s values was seen as a complex task, since “they're not always so easy to identify or, or know, or be aware of” (A1, line 524). Clients’ unconscious values could be inferred from the material they presented in therapy, as illustrated in Excerpt 42.

**Excerpt 42**

I would expect or assume or learn from my clients with what they bring whether, where their values, or in terms of boundaries and expectations and values of life let's say in working with a client, if I was working with a client with erm, who enters into abusive relationships, well that tells me something about her values

(A2, line 538-542)

They could also be deduced from the way a client interacted with the counselling psychologist, as illustrated in Excerpt 43.
In both instances, values were seen to feature implicitly rather than explicitly, as illustrated in Excerpt 44.

Excerpt 44

I'm not necessarily thinking about whether my client has the value of wisdom or the value of, but I would expect or assume or learn from my clients with what they bring

(A2, line 537-539)

Participants were seen to “get a sense” (A2, line 536) of clients’ values “in a kind of un-, non-explicit way” (A2, line 536-537), rather than asking about them directly. This ‘sensing’ was analogous to the process of decoding transference feelings to gain an understanding of a client’s experiencing, described by one participant in Excerpt 45.

Excerpt 45

I had a client who err, he- I realised pretty early on that we had different values of erm, of relationships and of erm the role of men and women in a, in a marriage, erm, so I had to sort of process that, how to, yeah how to respect his, erm, his values about that, which were influenced by his cultural background, erm, that was an interesting client because I think it was also complicated, I had a very strong, to use a psychodynamic term, a psy- a countertransference with him

(D4, line 392-396)
Separating values and ethics from therapy models

The ideas contained in therapy models were differentiated from values and ethics based on the suggestion that “it’s not about ethics it’s about approaches” (C1, line 1154-1156). By separating values and ethics from therapy models, participants distanced themselves from the prospect of making value judgements about clients: “I’m not sure judged is the right word here” (D5, line 627); “it’s a label of feelings, it’s not a judgement” (D5, line 604). Whilst it was acknowledged that “there’s a err implicit value in, in each decision we make” (D4, line 632), it was emphasised that decisions made in practice were not judgements of a client’s whole life, as illustrated in Excerpt 46.

**Excerpt 46**

I don’t know this person for long time, so I base it on what’s going on right now between him and, or her, and me, and I’m definitely not gonna applying this to whole his or her life because I have no idea, it’s just this particular moment

(D5, line 649-651)

A counselling psychologists' response to a client was not seen to be made on the basis of personal value judgements, as illustrated in Excerpt 47.

**Excerpt 47**

I’m not in a court, I’m not a judge there ... I’m in a different role, erm I choose a different profession, I’m not there to explain or to see, it’s right, it’s wrong, this is not my duty and it’s not what I wanna do in this world, you know, in front of me is a person with his own, you know, understanding, his own problems, his own issues etc. etc. etc. whatever is there, and I don’t really question, do I like it or not, this is not why I’m there

(D5, line 546-555)

Instead, decisions were made on the basis of different concepts within therapy models, such as countertransference within a psychodynamic model, which was seen as a separate process to that of making decisions based upon values, as illustrated in Excerpts 48 and 49.
Moral discourse

- **Objective morality in an institutional discourse**

  Within the institutional discourse, right or wrong was seen to be determined by the professional body and its associated institutions on the basis of whether thinking and behaviour was in accordance with professionally approved values and ethics, as stipulated by professional guidelines and counselling psychology's theories and research. Counselling psychologists' therapy practice was judged to be correct or incorrect based on these terms, and was seen to be wrong wherever it strayed from following institutional values and professional ethics and had the potential to cause harm to others, especially clients, as illustrated in Excerpt 50.

Excerpt 48

*I'm not thinking in terms of values or judging. I am working with feelings most of the time but I think I predominantly work psychodynamically*

(D5, line 592-593)

Excerpt 49

*I found it very difficult to work here because of these countertransference feelings etc. etc. but this is not question of values or ethics*

(D5, line 556-559)

Excerpt 50

*I guess there are certain things that are quite clearly highlighted in terms of not having a romantic relationship with your client, that's, you know obviously if you do that then, then you're not in a good place*

(C4, line 350-356)

In light of guidelines stipulating correct practice, counselling psychologist's had to be able “to justify your work” (A1, line 253), showing that they had acted in “the best interests of the client” (C2, line...
Where guidelines were contravened without justification, it was suggested that “there are serious consequences” (C2, line 596), whereby punishment would be incurred from counselling psychology’s institutions. Counselling psychology’s theories and research also intimated what might be considered right or wrong in terms of thinking or behaviour amongst clients by setting out what was valued as mental health, as illustrated in Excerpt 51.

**Excerpt 51**

you have different models of thinking like the medical model, you know which may be more symptom-based or, err, I guess pathologising

(A1, line 276-277)

The code of professional values and ethics explicitly judged clients’ behaviour to be wrong where it was seen to have the potential to cause harm to themselves or others, as illustrated in Excerpt 52.

**Excerpt 52**

there are final ethical or values that are just there is no crossing, so one of them would be self harm or harm to others as we say in your first session, that would be something straight away breaches our confidentiality

(A2, line 782-784)

- **Subjective morality in a humanistic discourse**

Within the humanistic discourse, right or wrong was determined subjectively on the basis of whether something “Stood up to your values” (C5, line 815). A person was seen to “have a sense of wrong or right ... where you lose your curiosity about the other person’s perspective or erm value” (A1, line 709-10), which was determined by their conscience, as illustrated in Excerpt 53.

**Excerpt 53**

my conscience will only kick in if I feel I’ve bent a r - if I feel I’ve done something wrong, or haven’t managed it in a way that I could be proud of

(B2, line 928-930)
A person’s sense of right or wrong was subjective and “trans-theoretical” (A1, line 713), meaning it was not determined by the values and ethics extolled by different theoretical models or institutions, as illustrated in Excerpt 54.

**Excerpt 54**

*I would still struggle with charging someone just because some kind of strongly held belief by most other people, I don’t think it’s gonna be in a kind of ethical, under any kind of ethical guidelines, yes you must charge, but, so I think it’s a different kind of thing and that’s why I think it doesn’t matter, that would be my values, that I think that would be wrong*  

(C1, line 1121-1129)

Thus, a person may interpret their own behaviour and others’ as right or wrong on the basis of their personal values and ethics, as illustrated in Excerpts 55 and 56.

**Excerpt 55**

*for some people I think the idea of treating someone according to the medical model would just be sort of ethically wrong, erm, like the position you take to another human being that’s a kind of ethical thing isn’t it*  

(B5, line 94-98)

**Excerpt 56**

*I had a cli- a client who erm was talking about erm in all her relationships she’s been cheating, so I know that, myself I think that’s extremely unhelpful for a relationship and you can’t possibly be in a good trust, unless you’re in an open relationship which she wasn’t in, that my personal value is that’s so destructive for yourself*  

(A2, line 785-788)

Since a person’s values and ethics were seen to be subjective, right or wrong was seen to be interpretive and open to debate, meaning each person had their “own ethical and moral standpoint” (A1, line 66).
Summary

Participants deployed the different constructions of values and ethics identified in Stage 1 within the discourses identified in Stage 2 to various effects when discussing both discursive objects within the context of counselling psychology training and practice. Table 3 summarises the different action orientations of each discourse.

Table 3
Action orientation of discourses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Action orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional discourse</td>
<td>- Counselling psychology as a professional institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Universities as institutions of teaching, learning, and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Placement organisations as institutions of training and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic discourse</td>
<td>- The idiosyncratic nature of human beings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Assimilating and absorbing values and ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Becoming a counselling psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychodynamic discourse</td>
<td>- Making unconscious values conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Separating values and ethics from therapy models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral discourse</td>
<td>- Objective morality in an institutional discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Subjective morality in a humanistic discourse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 4: Positionings

This stage looked at the subject positions offered by different discursive constructions of values and ethics within the context of counselling psychology training and practice. Since participants were trainee counselling psychologists, analysis focused on their positionings as counselling psychologists in training and practice within different discourses. Within the institutional and humanistic discourses, participants invoked the moral discourse to speak of right or wrong in ways that were contextual to these discourses. The positionings offered by the moral discourse in terms of right or wrong were
therefore considered within the context of the institutional and humanistic discourses, rather than looking at participants’ positionings within the moral discourse separately.

Institutional discourse

- Professionals subject to professional values and ethics

The institutional discourse positioned counselling psychologists as professionals who were subject to upholding the values and ethics of the counselling psychology profession, as illustrated in Excerpt 57.

**Excerpt 57**

you take that professional role on and you're meant to be seen, if someone looks at you that’s what they will see, they will see that professional, the counselling psychologist, and you’re meant to uphold the values and ethics

(C5, line 1348-1353)

Participants were positioned as having values and ethics “forced upon us” (C3, line 1688) by “some faceless body that will dictate how we’re meant to be” (C3, line 1616-1617). Clients were also subject to counselling psychology’s values and ethics, which counselling psychologists’ were required to uphold in their practice with them, as illustrated in Excerpt 58.

**Excerpt 58**

what am I gonna do if there’s a legal requirement you know, to say this is not right or, you know with risk and safety as well, er there are ethical, there are cultural, social, legal, you know, err all of these things have particular expectations, guidelines, rules, like with some there are fewer boundaries, wherever you’re from this is where you are, there’s, this is the culture, this is the law and I have a requirement according to that law to do certain things if you tell me about these things or I become aware of them

(A1, line 684-691)
A counselling psychologist was positioned as “a social control agent” (A1, line 684), since practice involved bringing about some degree of alignment between clients’ values and those ratified by counselling psychology’s institutions. Counselling psychologists were placed in a position of “responsibility” (C3, line 5), with an obligation to protect clients from “self-harm or harm to others” (A2, line 783). Clients were positioned as “the person who is vulnerable, very vulnerable” (B3, line 1153-1154). Clients were positioned as a potential danger to themselves, as illustrated in Excerpt 59.

Excerpt 59

_I had another client who was quite impulsive, wanted to go to the tube line, wanted to kill herself_

(C5, line 1262-1263)

Counselling psychologists were also positioned as a potential danger to clients, as illustrated in Excerpt 60.

Excerpt 60

_you don’t have sex with your clients, right? You know people do, unfortunately_

(A1, line 701)

Clients were positioned as a potential danger to others, including counselling psychologists, as illustrated in Excerpt 61.

Excerpt 61

_there was this one lady who got stabbed to death in her private practice by a client_

(B4, line 289-290)

Counselling psychologists were also positioned as a potential danger to themselves, in terms of acting in a way that might incur punishment from the profession’s governing body, as illustrated in Excerpt 62.
Within the institutional discourse, the moral discourse positioned counselling psychologists as subject to institutional interpretations of right or wrong, as illustrated in Excerpt 63.

**Excerpt 63**

I definitely took some rules as more straight down the line this is just, you know you cou- you, there’s no flexibility, you cross that you’re wrong

(B2, line 892-894)

They were positioned as subject to punishment from the professional body should their behaviour be found to have contravened professional ethics, as illustrated in Excerpt 64.

**Excerpt 64**

with the HPC if you, if you break any ethics then you’ll be struck off

(D4, line 1263-1266)

- **Trainees subject to the university’s values and ethics**

The institutional discourse positioned trainees as subject to the university’s teaching, assessment, and enforcement of values and ethics, which was seen to shape them as professionals, as illustrated in Excerpt 65.
Trainees were positioned as the passive receivers of information in relation to the university's teaching, as illustrated in Excerpt 66.

**Excerpt 66**

> It's leaned more towards erm being the receiver, or a passive receiver ... of information

(D4, line 1055-1059)

Trainees were positioned as children in relation to the university, who was conceptualised as a domineering parent whose voice was internalised as a controlling “superego” (B5, line 873), telling trainees what they should and should not do, as illustrated in Excerpt 67.

**Excerpt 67**

> it's something about, now, erm, sometimes it's something about, you know, I'm the father and you are the child who is acting out and I will show you how it's done, and for me I don't know, it seemed like a projection, to me, to us, of other people's values

(B3, line 640-642)

Trainees were positioned as subject to meeting the university’s requirements, “in terms of training and knowing you need a certain amount of hours and knowing that we need to do CBT or knowing that we need to do this ECS study or whatever” (B4, line 430-432), which was pitted against trying to serve the humanistic values being taught, such as not-knowing and being client-led, as illustrated in Excerpts 68 and 69.
The institutional discourse also positioned trainees as subject to the values and ethics of placement organisations and associated staff members, which they were required to follow irrespective of the degree of alignment between them and their own, as illustrated in Excerpts 70 and 71.

- **Trainees subject to placements’ values and ethics**

Excerpt 68

> when you’re with a client you know you’re recording ... with a view to doing an assessment on them, it totally affects the way you are ... I had this client I knew f- for ages I was going to use her and I, then I when I went to find the actual ten minute session, I listened to all the sessions I’d thought were good where I’d been really trying to keep in the model and all of that and they were terrible and I went right back to the beginning and ended up using a session before I’d even thought about it ‘cause it was so much more natural and less sort of pushy with her

(C2, line 118-121)

Excerpt 69

> there can be conflict of interest between what you have to show and do next to what you may feel would be helpful to do or to your practice are kind of helpful at times, so you can flexibly try out a bit more so, erm, in being curious and being willing to be versatile, I think it’s harder to do that now, like, within, within the learning outcomes of your training

(A1, line 255-259)

Excerpt 70

> the receptionist gave me an instruction which I followed, my supervisor was saying that that’s not what you should do, under any circumstances, if you are not at work, if you’re not well enough to see the client, you shouldn’t even be engaging in a phone conversation

(C2, line 118-121)
Humanistic discourse

- People subject to personal values and ethics

The humanistic discourse positioned counselling psychologists as people who were “unique and different” (D2, line 965) and subject to their own values and ethics derived through their experiences. Thus, participants were seen to have “my own identity as a counselling psychologist obviously based on my values” (A2, line 338). Whilst counselling psychologists’ values and ethics were conceptualised as being contextually responsive, they were not determined by those extolled by counselling psychology’s institutions or theoretical models, as illustrated in Excerpts 72 and 73.

Excerpt 71

one client, she gave me a card but she had a, a gift voucher with ten pounds in, and my line-manager said, no you have to give it back and I felt I had to send it back to her ... I felt like I was rejecting her

(C2, line 368-377)

Excerpt 72

it doesn’t matter to me what I’m called, I don’t think my values and ethics change, if I was to go and do another course and be called something else, it wouldn’t, it wouldn’t impact

(C2, line 995-997)

Excerpt 73

my values would be, I think they would be operating whatever, whatever the model was I was going to use, I think they’d be a kind of baseline from which I would work

(B1, line 137-139)

Counselling psychologists were positioned as people outside counselling psychology as well as people within it. Different values and ethics were seen to be appropriate to each context, as illustrated in Excerpt 74.
In some instances, the distinction between the values and ethics involved in each context seemed clear to participants, as illustrated in Excerpt 75.

**Excerpt 75**

*I have particular ethics that are associated with being a counselling psychologist, and then I have my other ethics that are about being who I am as separate from being a counselling psychologist*

(D2, line 237-239)

In other instances, the distinction seemed less clear, as illustrated in Excerpt 76.

**Excerpt 76**

*I would hope that those, whatever I did is guided by my values, personal and professional values. Yeah where one stops and the other begins I don’t know*

(C2, line 195-198)

This led some participants to ask “is my whole being now just a counselling psychologist? Should my values and ethics match up to this profession?” (C5, line 1296-1298). The values and ethics appropriate to each context were distinguished most clearly based on the type of responsibility involved. Being a counselling psychologist was seen to involve “a different type of responsibility, there’s still responsibility about being with another human being but there is, it’s different, different quality to it” (D2, line 273-276). This difference was attributed to clients’ being positioned as “particularly vulnerable” (D2, line 288), due in part to the inherent “power imbalance” (D3, line 344)
between them and counselling psychologists, since they were the ones who had “sought psychological help” (D2, line 287-288).

- **Non-experts subject to clients’ values and ethics**

Counselling psychology’s humanistic concern with recognising difference and subjectivity positioned counselling psychologists as non-experts in the lives of others, as illustrated in Excerpt 77.

**Excerpt 77**

I cannot think or pretend that I know something about this person, I have no idea

(D5, line 652-653)

Individuals were seen to have “expertise in their own experience” (A1, line 511) and were responsible for their own behaviour and the consequences of their actions. Within the humanistic discourse, the moral discourse positioned counselling psychologists and clients as subject to their own sense of right or wrong, which was governed by their conscience. Thus, if a client was seen to possess full information and sound judgement and wished to commit suicide, they were seen as having the right to do so, as illustrated in Excerpt 78.

**Excerpt 78**

some people erm would see it as, as an option if they’re thinking rationally, would with their rational minds see euthanasia or suicide as a legitimate behaviour and this session with the client we actually spoke about our values and I, I had to address this cause we were just wrestling with it and I said, professionally this is where I stand on suicide, however let’s just talk about it and she ended up disclosing that she was at a point in her life where she really didn’t want to go on, there was a history of suicide, it was a legitimate way out and I left that session kind of thinking, well she may well go off and do it, and that’s her choice

(C2, line 898-906)
• Active agents in training and practice

The humanistic discourse positioned counselling psychologists as subject to formulating their own understandings of values and ethics, including those of professional guidelines. Certain ethics were understood as “hard and fast rules that you don’t bend” (B2, line 992-994), whilst others were seen as “soft rules ... which can be bent” (B4, line 1006). Counselling psychologists determined which were ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ on the basis of their own values, as illustrated in Excerpt 79.

**Excerpt 79**

*we haven’t been told which ones are soft rules or which ones can be bent in experience, it’s just that we’ve all figured it out, and maybe there’s all differences among us depending on our values*

(B4, line 1006-1008)

Thus, counselling psychologists were positioned as subject to choosing which values and ethics from different models, epistemologies, and guidelines they wanted to emphasise in their practice on the basis of their own values, as illustrated in Excerpt 80.

**Excerpt 80**

*there’s something about choosing approaches based on what appeals to me or what I value, what I can relate to, my own, what as a person I relate to, which approach, more in a b- err in a better way*

(D4, line 695-697)

Within a humanistic discourse, counselling psychologists’ sense of self and integrity depended on being active in this process, rather than being forced to do something. Some alignment between personal and professional values, or some mediation between the two, was therefore necessary in order to function effectively as a counselling psychologist, as illustrated in Excerpts 81 and 82.
Those involved in the training and practice of counselling psychologists were seen to place different emphases on different values and ethics depending on their own, as illustrated in Excerpts 83 and 84.

**Excerpt 81**

*if we’re not being true to our values as a person then how can we really be true to ourselves as a professional?*

(C1, line 280-282)

**Excerpt 82**

*if we work in an unethical way it places us as professionals at risk. If we work in a way where we’re not congruent with our values it places the self at risk*

(C3, line 265-266)

Trainees were positioned as being responsible for reflecting on the material encountered during training and developing their own values and ethics, as illustrated in Excerpt 85.

**Excerpt 83**

*I have a notion that d- also depends upon given lecturers as well, erm and their emphasis*

(D2, line 755-756)

**Excerpt 84**

*each supervisor’s different as well, you, they tell you completely different things*

(C1, line 546-548)

**Excerpt 85**

*they acknowledge that we’re D-level and huma- you know we’re like thinking minds and stuff and can think through that for ourself I think. They’re not just printing rules on us*

(B4, line 837-838)
They were seen to actively respond to the values and ethics encountered during training, creating their own personally derived professional identity, as illustrated in Excerpt 86.

**Excerpt 86**

*I think about values and I think of it on a very personal level, you know, what are the psychological values I’m learning about and what are my values and how are these kind of either contradicting each other, battling for space to some extent, or kind of amalgamating and what you, I don’t even realise now that they’re one in a sense*  

(A3, line 584-587)

Trainees were positioned as children that grew into adults over the course of training, moving from interlocutors whose practice replicated the knowledge taught to them within the university, to active agents who decided for themselves how practice should take place, as illustrated in Excerpt 87.

**Excerpt 87**

*I see it as an, a becoming of an adult in, of sorts, erm a trainee to erm not just being received knowledge but sort of, what do I th- where is my stance on this? Rather than, you know, rather than answering questions about, about my work as, well I’ve been taught this and that*  

(D4, line 833-839)

The university was positioned as a nurturing parent that provided trainees with information to respond to and experiences through which to learn and develop, as illustrated in Excerpt 88.

**Excerpt 88**

*I have in my mind a, a small toddler being taken by the hand and learning certain things and then being allowed out to play, erm, and that’s how it feels, that, yeah go and play in the sand and see how it feels and erm then later you can build a sandcastle erm, something like that, learning a few, learning some rules, before, and then being allowed to develop that*  

(D3, line 1160-1165)
Psychodynamic discourse

- **Human beings subject to unconscious motivations**

The psychodynamic discourse positioned counselling psychologists and clients as subject to unconscious motivations that might cause them to behave in particular ways without awareness of underlying values. Counselling psychologists were subject to their own process of self-reflection to ensure they were conscious of their values and the ways they might impact practice, as illustrated in Excerpts 89 and 90.

**Excerpt 89**

*as counselling psychologists we’re supposed to be more aware of ourself and our reactions to the client and what relationship is happening between us*

(D4, line 866-868)

**Excerpt 90**

*whatever we do, it’s being mindful of your values, the values of your profession, your identity, your development, how these things are changing, clients values, erm, you know, dilemmas and all that stuff*

(A1, line 901-903)

Clients were positioned as subject to counselling psychologists’ ability to interpret unconscious values and bring them into awareness. Clients were seen as being potentially unaware of the values underlying their behaviour, particularly those causing them problems.

**Summary**

The discourses identified in Stage 2 offered participants a range of different positionings within the context of the research topic. Table 4 summarises the subject positions taken up by participants within the different discourses when discussing values and ethics in counselling psychology training and practice. The moral discourse was drawn on within the institutional and humanistic discourses to give discourse-specific positionings in terms of right or wrong.
Stage 5: Practice

When constructing the world in different ways, the discourses involved constrain what can be said and done from different subject positions. This stage examined the opportunities for action in counselling psychology practice afforded by the different subject positions available to participants.

Professionals subject to professional values and ethics

- Practising according to guidelines and rules

By positioning counselling psychologists as professionals they were required to practice in accordance with the values and ethics stipulated by counselling psychology’s professional body or face punishment: “they’ve got this practice disciplinary, err procedures or board, the HPC” (C3, line 599). Counselling psychologists were required to “behave in a certain away, you’re expected to behave in a certain way” (C3, line 1312); “you’re meant to uphold the values and ethics” (C5, line 1351-1353). Adherence to professional ethics was seen as a foregone conclusion, such that “ethics is a given for us” (A2, line 932), “we’re obliged to be ethical” (C3, line 23), as illustrated in Excerpt 91.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Subject positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional discourse</td>
<td>- Professionals subject to professional values and ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(incl. use of moral discourse)</td>
<td>- Trainees subject to the university’s values and ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Trainees subject to placements’ values and ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic discourse</td>
<td>- People subject to personal values and ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(incl. use of moral discourse)</td>
<td>- Non-experts subject to clients’ values and ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Active agents in training and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychodynamic discourse</td>
<td>- Human beings subject to unconscious motivations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ensuring safe practice meant “following different kind of, I suppose ethical rules” (B4, line 55-56) and “following the ethical codes ... i.e. following the ethical safety thing” (B4, line 681-682), as illustrated in Excerpt 92.

**Excerpt 92**

*I mean ethical frameworks obviously we’re all, should be following a set, you know boundaries, confidentiality*

(B4, line 76-77)

Adhering to rules, maintaining boundaries, and ensuring confidentiality were seen as being necessary “to keep us safe as well as erm the client” (B4, line 304), as illustrated in Excerpts 93 and 94.

**Excerpt 93**

*we’re working with people, so we have to be able to protect them and protect ourselves, erm because it’s very easy to slip through those boundaries*

(D3, line 146-147)

**Excerpt 94**

*you need certain boundaries in order f- to protect that profession to protect those people in it and out of it*

(D3, line 456-457)
Certain behaviours were seen as “good ethical practice” (B2, line 39-40) that served to ensure safety, such as “setting out the contract, the confidentiality” (B2, line 38). Part of the counselling psychologist’s role was “to create the right sort of environment to do the work” (B1, line 126-127). This meant they were to establish “boundaries and keep maintaining them” (B5, line 878) in practice with clients, and to “try and respond individually to how they’d like to manage things, as far as is possible within the boundaries” (B2, line 405-407). Breaching boundaries was seen to be potentially harmful to clients, as illustrated in Excerpt 95.

Excerpt 95

*going over time sometimes with a client, you could say, going over time erm it’s, the boundaries aren’t as firm so the client isn’t as contained, is that doing harm to the client? Which is an ethical thing*

(D4, line 1231-1235)

Following ethical guidelines was also seen as serving to ensure that counselling psychologists remained safe by setting out the limits of their relationship with clients, as illustrated in Excerpt 96.

Excerpt 96

*There’s something isn’t there though about the nature of the work that we do that we do get very close to people, I suppose that’s why there’s ethical frameworks ‘cause you, you end up knowing possibly more about that person than anybody else does and because of that they, you know can, you know, create something with you that may not exist as far as you’re concerned, I mean to stab somebody suggests that you have pretty strong feelings about them*

(B1, line 312-319)

- **Practising scientifically and practising humanistically**

Counselling psychologists were expected to practice in accordance with the ‘scientist side’ and the ‘humanist side’ of counselling psychology. Practising in accordance with the ‘scientist side’ meant “I have to work in a certain way, erm, according to what the evidence says” (A1, line 245). Thus,
counselling psychologists were supposed to “have a research focus and to value, to value theory and research” (D4, line 882) and to have “a large knowledge base” (D3, line 929). Practising in accordance with the ‘humanist side’ meant focusing on “what is going on in the moment, working in the moment, in the here and now” (D3, line 859-860). Thus, counselling psychologists were supposed to focus on “going with [clients’] subjective experience and not imposing but kind of trying to also help them” (A2, line 359-360). Counselling psychologists were therefore tasked with being able “to hold generalisability to populations of people” (D2, line 963) in one hand and “that people are unique and different in the other hand and taking those two things into the room” (D2, line 965-967).

**Trainees subject to the university’s values and ethics**

- **Demonstrating competence and being assessed**

By positioning trainees as subject to the university’s values and ethics in terms of teaching and assessment, they were required to gain experience and demonstrate a level of competence in their practice in order to meet training requirements, as illustrated in Excerpts 97 and 98.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt 97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>there’s particular learning requirements you have to demonstrate</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A1, line 64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt 98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>I have to show my work in a certain way, I have to work in a certain way</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A1, line 244-245)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different models of practice were seen to be emphasised by the university’s teaching and assessment at different points during training, affecting how trainees interacted with their clients and valued their material, as illustrated in Excerpt 99.
Practice was seen to be affected by having to focus on fulfilling the university’s training requirements, as illustrated in Excerpts 100 and 101.

**Excerpt 99**

trying to put in lots of deep and meaningful insights, because I was, it was psychodynamic, erm use the right words or, I don’t know, I mean I try not to use jargon in the therapy room as a general rule erm because I think it does something to the power balance but erm, I dunno really push fo-fo-for them to say meaningful things

(B2, line 499-502)

**Excerpt 100**

as a trainee you need to do things that progress your own career and your own development ... it really interferes with that interaction

(A2, line 32-35)

**Excerpt 101**

when you, like you were saying, you’ve got a piece of work and you need to show that it’s CBT it’s so easy to get caught up and actually do really bad therapy

(B4, line 549-552)

When under pressure to fulfil certain requirements, participants valued their clients differently to when this pressure was absent, as illustrated in Excerpt 102.

**Excerpt 102**

when I’m tight for hours I see the client as an hour, unfortunately, not as the client and if the client doesn’t come the first thing that comes to mind is, I’ve lost an hour, not what’s, you know, like what’s up with the client ... it’s very different when I, when I have enou- you know when I’m ok, when it’s that point in the year when I have enough then I notice I’m very different

(A5, line 117-122)
Thus, having to fulfil training requirements had the potential to impact the ethics of trainees’ practice, as illustrated in Excerpt 103.

**Excerpt 103**

> what am I willing to do, possibly, in order to, you know would I breach my own ethical and moral standpoint on what I feel would be coercive or maybe leading or, you know erm something like that with a client in order to get, you know consent to, to present their work, err, or the work we’re doing together

(A1, line 65-68)

**Trainees subject to placements’ values and ethics**

- Practising in accordance with the values and ethics of others and the context

By positioning trainees as subject to the values and ethics of placements and associated staff members, they were required to practice in accordance with these values and ethics, as illustrated in Excerpt 104.

**Excerpt 104**

> I’m a trainee and I sort of have been, worked within the confines of the different placements

(D4, line 821-822)

Trainees might be required to adhere to different values and ethics within different organisations or contexts, as illustrated in Excerpt 105.

**Excerpt 105**

> I have two placements and one of them you, you don’t have to give your mobile number but it makes life considerably easier if you do ‘cause the central system is only staffed every sort of four days or something, it varies, and the other one erm they’re not super strict on not giving your mobile number but it’s more of an ethos not to and so I have become very strict with that one about not giving my mobile number

(B2, line 201-205)
Occasions were seen to arise where trainees were forced by a placement to behave in a way that was discordant with their own values, as illustrated in Excerpt 106.

**Excerpt 106**

*I think there’s sometimes the organisation that you may work for will make you do something that will go against your value*

(C5, line 1182-1183)

In some cases, the values and ethics involved in one placement might affect trainees' to the extent that they then followed these values and ethics in other contexts, as illustrated in Excerpt 107.

**Excerpt 107**

*it imposes on your other kind of settings and contexts where I feel, erm, yeah like the kinda basic ethical or boundaries or whatever that might be okay in different contexts ha-th-ar- I’ve been influenced by it*

(B4, line 253-255)

**People subject to personal values and ethics**

- **Practising according to personal predilections**

By positioning counselling psychologists as people who were subject to their own understandings of values and ethics within counselling psychology, they were seen to be responsible for mediating the involvement of different values and ethics from different guidelines, rules, theories, and research in their practice, described by one participant in Excerpt 108.
Counselling psychologists’ personal values from outside counselling psychology were also seen to inform practice. Thus, practice was seen to be “guided by my values, personal and professional” (C2, line 195), as illustrated in Excerpt 109.

**Excerpt 109**

> I think our practice is shaped by our own value, definitely I think in my opinion, my own values and my values coming from counselling psychology

(A5, line 906-907)

- **Flexibly responding to clients**

Counselling psychologists were seen to make in-the-moment decisions about what might be helpful to clients based on their own understandings of values and ethics, rather than deciding how to proceed based solely on predetermined values and ethics from guidelines, rules, theories, and research, as illustrated in Excerpt 110.

**Excerpt 110**

> like somebody tells you they’re Catholic and someone might find that, oh so I might be able to bring the, you know religion more in and my values might be more part of that and I might disclose more of those

(A1, line 924-926)
Thus, in practice with clients, counselling psychologists were seen to “respond to them first and then think about what model I’m using to do that or, you know how I’d try and fit it in just, to a theoretical idea that I have, but that, I think that has to be second” (B2, line 541-543). This was conceptualised as “putting the client in front of the model” (A2, line 355), whereby “model comes second and relationship and connection and that comes first” (B4, line 545-546). Based on their values, the ethics involved in practice represented the counselling psychologist’s contextual response to the client and the task at hand, as illustrated in Excerpt 111.

**Excerpt 111**

you construct your, your ethical, or not, maybe not ethical, you say rules but they are kind of ethical rules in a way, or, or you know, what you feel would be the way people should treat each other, or be with each other, or for this particular group, for this moment in time, whatever, it changes

(A1, line 867-870)

The subjective and contextual nature of values and ethics meant what constituted ethical behaviour was open to debate, leading participants to ask “what basis do we really have for anything?” (C1, line 1284). Thus, ethical practice was seen to be interpretive, as illustrated in Excerpt 112.

**Excerpt 112**

you could say, I did this in the best interests and these are my reasons why but someone else could say, well no that’s unethical practice, but you did it from the belief, this was ethical, this was right for my client in these circumstances, and you could still defend it but someone else could turn around and say, no, and so we have two different interpretations of the same thing

(C5, line 314-326)

- **Communicating values through practice**

Values were seen to be implicit in the choices made by counselling psychologists in practice, such that “every decision we make is a weighing up of different things and so there’s a err implicit value in,
in each decision we make” (D4, line 631-632). Values were seen to be communicated to clients “by what you say, by how you are with them and what you do, how you think about them” (A1, line 515-516). As a result, counselling psychologists were seen to be at risk of influencing clients with their values on the basis that “it’s easy to be swayed by people” (D3, line 464-465) and “the things I say could shape them to my values” (D4, line 525-526). This was seen to go against “that humanistic rule of counselling psychology, of not imposing your own beliefs” (A3, line 725-726). Where disparity was seen to exist between the values and ethics of a counselling psychologist and a client, the counselling psychologist was seen to be at risk of being “prejudiced” (D2, line 485) towards the client, described by one participant in Excerpt 113.

Excerpt 113

we’re saying values about everything but perhaps some of it we’re actually talking about, it, you could argue is prejudice in some way or other

(D2, line 481-482)

Non-experts subject to clients’ values and ethics

- Not knowing in practice

By positioning counselling psychologists as non-experts in the lives of others, uncertainty and not knowing were seen as inevitable and integral parts of practice, as illustrated in Excerpt 114.

Excerpt 114

what is a counselling psychologist? Erm, it’s that uncertainty and that’s what we always have with our clients

(D3, line 781-782)

It was suggested that “dealing with uncertainty maybe, erm, and actually that’s okay, it’s okay to be uncertain” (D3, line 857-857), and “being okay with not really knowing in the room” (D3, line 924), were integral to counselling psychology. A fundamental value and aim of practice was “to connect to a client and be on equal level rather than being the expert” (A4, line 482). Practice was conceptualised
as a collaborative and reflexive process between counselling psychologist and client, with the counselling psychologist “asking them what they want, for example they want to gain from therapy erm, why they are there to kind of, collaboratively working on goals, what they would like to achieve” (A4, line 492-494). It was considered important “for the client to know that they have the position of influence and power over what happens there ... that they have expertise in their own experience ... that they are valued by you” (A1, line 509-512).

Active agents in training and practice

- Managing values and ethics in practice

Values were seen as something that needed to be managed in practice in order to avoid harming clients or coercing them to change their values to match the counselling psychologist’s. Thus, there was “something about our own values maybe not getting in the way” (D3, line 458), such that each counselling psychologist should be “aware and careful not to impose my views on, and the way I see things and my values, on the client” (A5, line 661-666). Professional values were seen to mitigate the involvement of personal values, as illustrated in Excerpt 115.

Excerpt 115

*I think the counselling psychologist will always take over, I will never say, 'no you shouldn't be doing that', I will always try and understand why, but behind that there's a value of no you shouldn't be a racist*  
(A3, line 737-739)

This process of mitigation was one that counselling psychologists were active in, asking “Do I bring in my own values in to the room with a client?” (D4, line 342-343). Where a counselling psychologist’s personal values were seen to be superfluous to practice, according to institutional values and professional ethics, they were to be kept outside therapy, described by one participant in Excerpt 116.
However, where involving personal values in therapy was seen to be potentially valuable to a client they may be brought to bear upon practice, as long as the purpose of doing so was in keeping with counselling psychology’s approved values and ethics and could be justified in professional terms. Thus, personal values could inform practice “as long as I feel that, that it’s valuable for them, not just my own perception” (A2, line 801-802), as illustrated in Excerpt 117.

**Excerpt 116**

*I have a value that’s probably quite healthy within your relationship to keep just frivolous speech about your sexual life, I think it’s quite useful to keep it within, within, like gossip, I wouldn’t necessarily gossip with all my friends about my sexual relationship. I would talk about it if there’s anything constructive or I was curious, or I’d talk about it in a constructive way but not just to like, just for the sake of chit-chat but try and find a different topic, that’s a value of mine. I would never ever impart that on my client because I really see that’s very s-subjective and personal*

(A2, line 803-808)

Where a counselling psychologist had strongly held personal values that differed from a client’s to the extent that a non-judgemental stance was deemed impossible, it was likely to be difficult for them to work with that client, as illustrated in Excerpt 118.

**Excerpt 117**

*my personal value is that’s so destructive for yourself but I, but I understood that was my own value but I understood for her that it was all about self worth and her lack of self worth that, that’s how she feels that she’s entitled to cheat on others and they cheat on her. So I felt that it was okay to share my personal value ... I was able to use my own feelings of how unhealthy it is, so that’s just more towards what you were saying about where you step in with your own, how you kind of manage your own kind of views and beliefs and how you will let it affect therapy*

(A2, line 788-796)
Where such situations arose, it was suggested that there might be “an ethical consideration to refer on” (D2, line 712).

**Human beings subject to unconscious motivations**

- **Value-conscious practice**

By positioning human beings as subject to unconscious motivations, counselling psychologists and clients were vulnerable to being inadvertently influenced by values outside their awareness. Unconscious values might interfere with a counselling psychologist’s ability to assume a non-judgemental stance towards a client, making them less psychologically available to help. Thus, it was seen as important for counselling psychologists to bring their values into conscious awareness for examination through supervision and personal therapy, so their involvement in practice could be managed, as illustrated in Excerpt 119.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt 118</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a homosexual couple came before him and he refused to counsel them because according to his Christian values that was wrong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C5, line 1571-1572)

Counselling psychologists’ values were allowed to affect therapy where this was seen to be of benefit to the client “but always with a lot of conscious thought, never unconsciously” (A2, line 796-797).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt 119</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>some of our values, well I wouldn’t be, say they’re dangerous but as, as counselling psychologists I think because perhaps we look, well I’d like to say, and I’m saying we now, but, but that I try and look at my own stuff and that’s where personal therapy and supervision comes in to it, erm and perhaps that’s why supervision is so important, but I think it’s easy to be swayed by people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(D3, line 461-456)
• **Interpreting values**

Counselling psychologists were seen to be engaged in a process of sensing latent values in clients’ material and exploring them with the client. This involved decoding the nature of unconscious values and their hidden meaning, as illustrated in Excerpt 120.

**Excerpt 120**

> she would give things and then she would sort of diminish them and say that they were worthless you know, which she thought, making a comment about the therapy, or gave us a chance to talk about that or about herself, that she wasn’t worthy of having err therapy that was of any value, I think that’s what was really going on

(B1, line 793-798)

Counselling psychologists had to decide which unconscious values might be potentially problematic for clients and should be brought into awareness through interpretation, as illustrated in Excerpt 121.

**Excerpt 121**

> if I experience something hidden there, which is, which is not explicit yet and I feel that it’s right moment to bring into the room, because client perhaps might be ready for hear this, I might bring it as an intervention or as interpretation

(D5, line 609-611)

Sensing and interpreting clients’ values was predicated on the counselling psychologist’s countertransference feelings relating to the client, as illustrated in Excerpt 122.

**Excerpt 122**

> I’m trying to allow myself to acknowledge my feelings of hate and erm disgust and erm to then say okay, that’s what I feel, this person, that’s my reaction to that person and what can I, what, what can I do with that

(D4, line 572-579)
Summary

Being located in different subject positions was seen to have consequences for participants’ therapy practice with clients, with some actions being more or less available than others depending on the subject position taken up. Table 5 summarises the implications for practice relating to the different subject positions identified in Stage 4.

Table 5

Implications for practice within different discourses

**Institutional discourse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject positions</th>
<th>Implications for practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionals subject to professional values and ethics</td>
<td>- Practising according to guidelines and rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ensuring safe practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Practising scientifically and practising humanistically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainees subject to the university’s values and ethics</td>
<td>- Demonstrating competence and being assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainees subject to placements’ values and ethics</td>
<td>- Practising in accordance with the values and ethics of others and the context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Humanistic discourse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject positions</th>
<th>Implications for practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People subject to personal values and ethics</td>
<td>- Practising according to personal predilections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Flexibly responding to clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Communicating values through practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-experts subject to clients’ values and ethics</td>
<td>- Not knowing in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active agents in training and practice</td>
<td>- Managing values and ethics in practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Psychodynamic discourse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject positions</th>
<th>Implications for practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human beings subject to unconscious motivations</td>
<td>- Value-conscious practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interpreting values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 6: Subjectivity

The final stage of analysis explored the relationship between discourse and subjectivity, examining the experiential consequences of taking up different subject positions within different discourses. Since the text contained participants’ direct accounts of their experiences, the analysis was able to identify and report their thoughts and feelings directly, rather than having to speculate on what these might be. Participants’ accounts were largely based around tensions and conflicts experienced in their training and practice, arising from ongoing attempts at reconciling different constructions of values and ethics from institutional and humanistic discourses. These tensions and conflicts were identified as follows:

Counselling psychologists as professionals vs. counselling psychologists as people

Participants felt “detached” (C2, line 1355) from the “external” (C2, line 97) values and ethics stipulated by counselling psychology’s professional body, which could conflict with their own “internal” (C2, line 93) values, making them feel uncomfortable, as illustrated in Excerpt 123.

Excerpt 123

for me that creates some discomfort really, that there are times when my values don’t fit with the profession

(C3, line 67-68)

The pressure participants felt under to adhere to institutional values and professional ethics could leave them feeling like they were rejecting clients’ needs in favour of following approved models and guidelines, as illustrated in Excerpts 124 and 125.

Excerpt 124

I know that the theory is don’t accept them but sometimes it feels rejecting, you know if they’ve brought you a card or something, like one client brought me a hand-made card and I just thought the value of me rejecting it for the sake of me being all smug about my ethics was not worth it

(B2, line 766-771)
Having to justify their actions in relation to professional guidelines could make participants feel “dehumanised” (C2, line 276), and having to follow institutional values and professional ethics could leave them feeling like they were “not acting in a human way” (C2, line 276), which was “completely at odds with the values of the profession” (C2, line 277), as illustrated in Excerpt 126.

Excerpt 126

There are times, or there have been times, when I’ve felt as though in being ethical I haven’t been human as such, or I haven’t, you know I’ve, I’ve, it’s taken away so much of who I am because professionally I need to treat this person in a certain way, and I think that that at times makes, well has done in the past, has made me kind of resentful towards the profession and made me resentful towards the work actually

(C3, line 221-226)

Participants felt some anger towards the profession: “I kind of think fuck the profession at times” (C3, line 271). Some participants felt the professional body expected them to behave in accordance with institutional values and professional ethics at all times, inside and outside counselling psychology, which detracted from the reality of “being human” (B4, line 1138), as illustrated in Excerpt 127.

Excerpt 127

it’s almost like your whole identity is now a counselling psychologist you know if I decide to go out on a Friday night and get really pissed and start dancing on tables, someone can see that and you know I could be brought in because my behaviour was unethical, it’s just like, is my whole being now just a counselling psychologist?

(C5, line 1291-1298)
Participants struggled to reconcile being a professional with institutional values and professional ethics and being a human with idiosyncratic values and personal ethics, asking “Should my values and ethics match up to this profession when I’m also human” (C5, line 1298-1300); “it’s like you have to be a certain way but where, where or when can we be human?” (C3, line 1421-1423). Participants felt the identity of counselling psychologists purported by the profession was falsely “based on a professional mystique” (C2, line 1411), as illustrated in Excerpt 128.

**Excerpt 128**

*If we were city bankers it would be expected we might go out and get trashed on a regular basis but because we have this professional mystique, which is false, it's a false perception that counselling psychologists or any therapists are perfect human beings, it seems that we're set up to be in ethical trouble at some point sooner or later because we’re not perfect human beings*

(C2, line 1411-1414)

Personal values were seen as the most important and genuine factors in participants’ practice, reflecting their humanness rather than the constraint of institutionalisation which they saw as being reflected in the values and ethics of the profession. Excerpt 129 shows one participants’ account of the relationship between the values and ethics of individual counselling psychologists and the values and ethics of the profession, suggesting the relative importance of each.

**Excerpt 129**

*we’re human first, we’re not caught up in this mystique of the profession, that we’re human and that for me comes before any expectation set by some faceless body that will dictate how we’re meant to be when those ethics will change over time, those ethics will not, guaranteed will not be the same in 10 years time, yet we will still hopefully be here and how we are comes first, as people, so our values are important*

(C3, line 1615-1619)
Practising according to guidelines and rules vs. flexibly responding to clients

On the one hand, participants liked “the holding stance of having an ethical framework” (D3, line 1248), on the basis that “it makes us feel safe” (B2, line 892). On the other hand, constructing ethics around safety caused participants to feel anxious that their safety and that of others might be at risk should professional ethics not be adhered to, as illustrated in Excerpts 130 and 131.

Excerpt 130

my anxiety kind of runs away with me and I think, oh I can’t do this I can’t erm reveal this ‘cause then they might track me down

(B4, line 255-256)

Excerpt 131

you’re there to aid the person, possibly against what they may wish, if, if they tell you about something even if you’ve given them prior information that you will have to act, you know, err, like inform social services, inform the police, erm, or somebody’s in danger if they’re threatening to kill them, err, you know as the case may be, you may have to do those things

(A1, line 692-696)

Participants felt that the expression of their personal views had the potential to harm clients, as illustrated in Excerpts 132 and 133.

Excerpt 132

you know a kind of irrelevant self disclosure might be really erm harmful, so I guess when ethics come to harm

(B3, line 1154-1155)
The subject of ethics was feared as something dangerous and scary – “It’s all about fear and ethics” (D2, line 1288) – with participants facing potential punishment should their behaviour be judged to have contravened professional ethical guidelines, as illustrated in Excerpt 134, 135, and 136.

**Excerpt 133**

> whilst I might argue with it in a personal capacity, outside of the err therapeutic room or in a different sort of encounter, I would still have my personal value around respecting someone’s err religious beliefs erm but in the, in the therapeutic setting there’s something else in there around to, around potentially that being quite harmful to try to challenge that belief system, whether I agree with it or not

(D2, line 261-267)

**Excerpt 134**

> ethics scare me ... It feels like ethics, how to adhere to them, or not, feels dangerous

(D4, line 1262-1263)

**Excerpt 135**

> it’s been three years of fairly intense study, expensive study and it could all go because I make a ethical mistake and I think that’s a scary cloud to work under

(C3, line 610-613)

**Excerpt 136**

> I don’t think about them ‘cause I think if I did all the time I would, it would make me anxious about the erm, you know, the, the, erm, the regulatory bodies that could dish out punishments if I break ethics

(D4, line 1269-1276)

Whilst adhering to professional guidelines was seen to ensure safe practice, it also left participants feeling restricted and confined in what they were able to do, as illustrated in Excerpts 137 and 138.
Participants felt dictated to by counselling psychology’s institutions, and professional guidelines were experienced as limiting factors that hindered their ability to respond to clients flexibly, creatively, and with the full scope of their humanity, as illustrated in Excerpt 137, 138, and 140.

Excerpt 137

*there’s a real sense of imprison - imprisonment for me*

(C4, line 1468)

Excerpt 138

*it kind of keeps us quite confined in the way which we work*

(C3, line 7)

Excerpt 139

*ethics are there kind saying you know don’t be naughty, don’t like do anything that’s kind of spontaneous, natural, human thing*

(B5, line 772-775)

Excerpt 140

*if you’re fearing being erm, I shouldn’t do that because I don’t wanna put a foot out then can I be creative or risk, risk taking?*

(D4, line 1290-1295)

Excerpt 141

*you sort of think, you know this is the, the framework. So then it’s something more than values, it’s about a framework and about a protocol, which changes things for me*

(B3, line 181-183)
Rather than focusing on possibilities for action in practice, participants could become preoccupied with “being cautious about things that you shouldn’t do” (B3, line 8). Excerpt 142 shows one participant’s account of the constraint they felt from institutional values and professional ethics.

**Excerpt 142**

*there’s a lack of flexibility, possibly, that’s in there, or erm, there’s a kind of course of nature to what, what the different systems that you’re in, kind of place upon you so here I have to show my work in a certain way, I have to work in a certain way, erm, according to what the evidence says, which makes sense but there’s, there’s less flexibility, in, in, in how you can think about it and what you can do, in, in terms of the relationship in some way, erm, and I think that applies in the NHS, it applies in the university, it applies possibly, erm in any organisational setting where you have to work with other people with particular policies and procedures*

(A1, line 243-249)

Behaving contrarily to the values and ethics of counselling psychology’s models and guidelines resulted in feelings of “guilt or naughtiness” (B3, line 960-961), as if participants had misbehaved in the eyes of the profession and its institutions, as illustrated in Excerpts 143, 144, and 145.

**Excerpt 143**

*there is some, for me at least, a bit of guilt*

(A2, line 826-827)

**Excerpt 144**

*times when I’ve done that I’ve kind of felt, oh I’ve been a bit naughty*

(B5, line 867-868)

**Excerpt 145**

*rather than seeing it as rules and unethical, I don’t know, maybe it would’ve reduced some of the guilt, or these feelings, that actually you’re not being naughty it’s, erm, you’re human*

(B4, line 1132-1134)
Acquiring knowledge, demonstrating competence, and meeting assessment criteria vs. not knowing, assuming a non-expert position, and being client-led

Participants felt scared by the way professional guidelines were presented to them during training; being strict enough to carry the threat of punishment should they be breached, yet vague enough for participants to feel prone to breaching them unintentionally, as illustrated by Excerpt 146.

**Excerpt 146**

> the training just, has kind of, scared the hell out of me in terms of, you know, the guidelines are vague, we know that if we breach guidelines we’re in deep shit, that’s the kind of message we get, however it’s so vague that anything you could do seems to be potential to get you into, into deep shit

(C2, line 303-305)

Participants felt confused and overwhelmed by the different values and ethics presented to them, as illustrated in Excerpts 147 and 148.

**Excerpt 147**

> as a trainee as well it’s harder for us to maybe even know our values because we’re getting overwhelmed by all these different approaches

(B4, line 184-185)

**Excerpt 148**

> we do need to bring in our own values or our own ideas about ethics, whatever we want to call it, because, yeah it can get very confusing

(C1, line 552-554)

Some participants felt that “all the training stops the being you, you’re so afraid that you’re not listening and reflecting or making, you know, the right interventions that you stop being yourself” (B1,
line 570-571). This left them feeling shaken, as if their values and ethics should change and they should become a different person through their training, as illustrated by Excerpt 149.

**Excerpt 149**

*I felt quite clear you know about the values that I had from the first year about being, trying to be warm and empathic but I felt shaken by, you know, having to stick to something and I almost felt that I shouldn’t be myself any more or that it wasn’t acceptable*  
(B3, line 192-194)

Being subject to the university’s training requirements was experienced as “a horrible, horrible feeling” (A1, line 70), leading participants to feel “so wrapped up and anxious about that and getting recordings and everything” (B4, line 433). Participants felt they had to mould themselves to demonstrate competencies and meet criteria, which could detract from attending to clients’ needs, as illustrated in Excerpts 150 and 151.

**Excerpt 150**

*there’s a real tension there because we do have the things like our needs in that situation, we can’t just ignore that and pretend they’re not there, so it, it does mean you kind of go into a situation and it feels like you can’t just be in a way that’s totally about what, what their needs are*  
(B5, line 445-448)

**Excerpt 151**

*I think training courses need to consider that, I think erm they’ve been quite rigid in requirements and erm, must be this many sessions, must be this must be that, and I think to be more flexible about that might release some of the tension on us and make practice a bit more ethical or allow us to be a bit more true to our values rather than kind of squeezing into these boxes*  
(B4, 475-480)

Participants felt “a real conflict of interests” (A1, line 61) between the needs of clients and “the level of dependency and needs that I feel in relation to, erm, particular clients” (A1, line 62-63). This led to
fear and anxiety regarding the potentially harmful nature of participants’ needs, which might cause them to behave unethically according to their personal ethics, as illustrated in Excerpt 152.

Excerpt 152

there’s a real fear and anxiety around that and what am I willing to do, possibly, in order to, you know would I breach my own ethical and moral standpoint on what I feel would be coercive or maybe leading or, you know erm something like that with a client in order to get, you know consent to, to present their work ... I’ve been fearful that I would be driven to do something like that by institutional requirements

(A1, line 65-69)

Participants were “anxious of my need getting in the way” (A1, line 84-85), causing them to feel “really worried, that I, I’d be like my desperation would be coming across or something” (A1, line 81-82). Participants could feel selfish, worried, manipulative, and coercive in having to gain clients’ agreement to use their material for university assessments, as illustrated in Excerpts 153, 154, and 155.

Excerpt 153

as a trainee you need to do things that progress your own career and your own development ...
but it’s actually quite a selfish experience for me

(A2, line 32-34)

Excerpt 154

I remember there being a debate about how this student felt she sort of press-ganged this client into agreeing to taping when actually it probably wasn’t the sort of, it wasn’t the sort of situation where actually recordings were a desperately good idea

(B1, line 452-461)
Having their practice assessed made participants feel “really self conscious about what you’re doing” (B2, line 498). Having to demonstrate certain competencies in practice caused participants to feel fake with clients, which was considered unethical on the basis that “to be fake in the room must be the th- least ethical thing” (B2, line 520). In trying to fulfil their own needs in terms of meeting assessment criteria, clients’ needs could become neglected, with participants behaving in ways that were not therapeutic or could be unethical, as illustrated in Excerpts 156 and 157.

**Excerpt 155**

```
there’s always that conflict and tension between, erm, getting consent for, for erm, your, your own progression, or for your, or for your, erm, experience, but also for the client to actually, how true, how, how kind of ethical is it for the client, and how, how, yeah. I think it actually, erm, is against my value as a therapist, asking for consent for your own progression or for your, erm, qualification, so it doesn’t, yeah it conflicts my value
```

(A2, line 19-23)

Some participants experienced the feedback they received from staff members involved in their training as forceful and “intimidating” (B3, line 633), which left them feeling attacked. This conflicted with the values they were being taught to follow in practice with clients, as illustrated in Excerpt 158.

**Excerpt 156**

```
when you, like you were saying, you’ve got a piece of work and you need to show that it’s CBT it’s so easy to get caught up and actually do really bad therapy
```

(B4, line 549-552)

**Excerpt 157**

```
you’re trying to show an ethical kind of piece but by doing that you’re being unethical
```

(B4, line 515-517)
In such circumstances, participants felt “like the goal is to prove who is wrong and who is right” (B3, line 600), which left them feeling deskilled and “very shaken and kind of useless I guess” (B3, 604). Though participants were supposed to demonstrate a certain level of competence in practice in order to pass assessments and be considered ethical practitioners, they did not necessarily feel competent, as illustrated in Excerpt 159.

Where the subject of values was seen as being absent from the university’s teaching, participants felt some anger towards the university: “thatannoys me a hell of a lot” (C2, line 633).

**Doing as you are told in practice vs. developing oneself through experiences**

Being positioned as subject to the values and ethics of different placement organisations and associated staff members led participants to feel anxious about what they should and should not do in practice, as illustrated in Excerpt 160.

---

**Excerpt 158**

* I think erm if we are kind of attacked in supervision and research presentations then what is the message that this sends, that the relationship with a client is about attacking them? Because I frequently feel attacked by the way that the feedback is given

(B3, line 628-630)

**Excerpt 159**

* we’re supposed to, acting ethically, provide the most appropriate erm therapy for a particular client in that context, erm, but ... I don’t feel competent in a number of approaches even though I’ve been taught here a number of approaches

(D4, line 692-694)

**Excerpt 160**

* I was very anxious at the start, thinking, I need to know what I can do and I can’t do ethically

(C2, line 539-540)
They felt uncomfortable when forced to do something that went against their values, as illustrated in Excerpt 161.

**Excerpt 161**

_the demands placed on me by my manager, perhaps shifts me away from my own values sometimes and that’s uncomfortable_

(C3, line 85-87)

Participants experienced a sense of conflict where the values and ethics of a placement clashed with those of counselling psychology’s theories, models, and guidelines as taught by the university, making it difficult for them to develop their ideas about counselling psychology through their practice, as illustrated in Excerpts 162 and 163.

**Excerpt 162**

counselling psychology values and ethics have clashed with the ethics of my kind of placement or my context and that’s been a constant challenge for me I think during the training

(B4, line 673-675)

**Excerpt 163**

there’s a whole ‘nother ethical code that you’ve gotta follow and it doesn’t necessarily always err fit nicely with the, the therapy kind of code, so a constant tension

(B4, line 677-679)

Participants also experienced a sense of conflict and confusion where their own values and ethics differed from those of supervisors and other placement staff members, requiring them to manage the values and ethics of multiple stakeholders, as illustrated in Excerpts 164 and 165.
Excerpt 164

I was thinking about supervision in the context of this whole thing and ethics and different supervisor’s attitudes to things, and then it can get very confusing

(B1, line 170-171)

Excerpt 165

another kind of conflict between your own personal identity and your supervisor’s identity and how you can kind of manage that and the university

(A2, line 328-329)

Scientific values vs. humanistic values

Participants saw the joining of counselling psychology’s ‘scientist side’ and ‘humanist side’ as “an uneasy marriage” (D2, line 930). Practising in accordance with the values of both was experienced as “a constant challenge” (D2, line 967). A “kind of dialectical conflict” (D5, line 976) was seen to exist between the two epistemologies, resulting in tensions and conflicts in practice and in participants’ sense of professional identity, as illustrated in Excerpts 166 and 167.

Excerpt 166

taking someone as they are, as they appear to you in the room and not knowing stuff about them beforehand, might be good for some people and other people might find that it ignores certain parts of them they consider really important, but you can’t know that until you’ve met them. So it’s a paradox

(B2, line 1222-1228)
Participants experienced “some kind of confrontation or conflict within” (D5, line 1018) as they tried to reconcile values from the two epistemologies, resulting in feelings of ambivalence, as illustrated in Excerpt 168.

Excerpt 167

*it is quite an uneasy marriage isn’t it, in the sense that, sitting with the, if you’re talking about tensions and conflicts, and err, I remember being told in the first year that I was here that, you know, you’re a psychologist first and a counsellor second, that you are a psychologist who counsels ... I understood that to mean, and it stayed with me for s- for a number of years, clearly, that, that I would use my understanding of psychology, which is about generalisability isn’t it, to counsel individuals, that’s an un- that’s, that’s it in a nutshell and that’s, that’s an uneasy marriage that is, because to hold generalisability to populations of people and holding that people are unique and different in the other hand and taking those two things into the room is a, is a constant challenge*  

(D2, line 942-967)

Whilst participants experienced conflict or ambivalence as they wrestled with counselling psychology’s ‘scientist side’ and ‘humanist side’, they also felt that “that’s where my learning really is, in trying to struggle, the struggle, and trying to find my answers” (D2, line 1143-1144). Counselling psychology training was seen to “teach us to learn how to you know tolerate these two opposite things” (D5, line 988-989); “you kind of learn to be with this uncertainty and this unknown in the room but at the same time we have a background of knowledge” (D5, line 976-978).
Summary

Participants’ accounts of their subjective experiences centred on the tensions they felt when trying to reconcile different discursive constructions of values and ethics from contrasting institutional and humanistic discourses. Table 6 summarises the tensions experienced between conflicting aspects of the two discourses that were seen to require some attempt at mediation from participants.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tensions experienced between discourses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional discourse</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling psychologists as professionals vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practising according to guidelines and rules vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring knowledge, demonstrating competence, and meeting assessment criteria vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing as you are told in practice vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific values vs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Values and ethics were seen to feature in the text as complex interwoven concepts inherently involved in one another’s constructions. Participants predominantly spoke of the profession, the university, and placement organisations as institutional structures propagating particular constructions of values and ethics within particular discourses. Three discursive constructions of values and two of ethics were identified (see Table 1, p. 76). These different constructions were seen to draw on four
different discourses (see Table 2, p. 81). The use of each discourse fulfilled a different action orientation producing its own effects when discussing values and ethics in counselling psychology training and practice (see Table 3, p. 98). The different discourses offered participants different subject positions (see Table 4, p. 111) with different consequences for their therapy practice (see Table 5, p. 125) and subjective experience. The relationship between contrasting constructions of values and ethics from within the institutional and humanistic discourses appeared to have greatest impact on participants’ practice and subjectivity. Tensions were experienced between the differing demands of the institutional and humanistic discourses (see Table 6, p. 141), resulting in feelings of dissonance and discomfort, as participants tried to mediate between contrasting constructions in an attempt to forge a coherent sense of identity and practice involving both. The implications of this analysis in relation to the existing literature on values and ethics in counselling psychology training and practice is discussed in the next chapter, but first the suitability of the research methodology and methods that produced the analysis is reviewed.
DISCUSSION

Introduction

The research project set out to explore the different ways in which values and ethics were constructed by final year trainees within the context of counselling psychology training and practice. It looked at the dominant discourses purveyed by counselling psychology’s institutions and examined how they constrained action and impacted subjectivity. Four 90 minute focus groups comprising nineteen participants in total were transcribed to produce a text that was analysed using Willig’s (2008) approach to Foucauldian discourse analysis. The suitability of the research methodology and methods drawn on to gather data and produce the analysis is reviewed below, giving some evaluation of the use of focus groups and Willig’s six-stage approach to Foucauldian discourse analysis. Discussion of the analysis in relation to the literature on values and ethics is then given, paying particular attention to how the institutional and humanistic discourses came together in constructing values and ethics in counselling psychology training and practice and with what consequences. Possible avenues for future research into values and ethics within counselling psychology are then offered, before some final thoughts are brought together in a conclusion reflecting on some of the issues raised by this project and how counselling psychology’s institutions might address them moving forward.

The suitability of the research methodology and methods

Focus groups

Focus groups proved to be effective in obtaining rich, exploratory, discursive data from participants, who discussed a range of ideas relating to the research topic over 90 minutes without running out of things to say or discussion being cut short. Four focus groups produced a detailed range of ideas and experiences whilst allowing common discursive constructions, discourses, and subject positions to emerge. The small group size enabled the researcher to maintain order within each group, keeping discussion on-topic whilst allowing participants to generate their own discussion as much as possible. The open discussion schedule allowed the researcher to flexibly respond to participants’ contributions, mining them for more information where it seemed there might be something of further
interest to be explored and challenging participants on their ideas to examine the discursive resources employed when defending points they had made. Even with the small group size and the majority of participants knowing each other, some participants seemed more inhibited than others and there was a tendency for certain group members to dominate discussion. The researcher responded to this by probing quieter group members for their contributions and encouraging participation, and all participants contributed to the discussion.

In accordance with Potter and Wetherell’s (1987) suggestion that attitudes are performed rather than preformed, and Wilkinson’s (2008) emphasis on collaborative meaning making within focus groups, the interactive nature of the groups allowed participants to collaboratively construct and explore their ideas about the research topic. The lack of definition of the terms values and ethics that participants received from the researcher meant they engaged in negotiating and debating different constructions of both concepts amongst themselves. Participants queried and clarified their own and each other’s ideas as they responded to one another, producing different discursive constructions and taking up different positions. This interaction, along with the researcher’s questions, appeared to help participants reflect on the research topic, to which they had given various degrees of thought prior to the group. Values and ethics did not emerge from within individuals as coherently formed concepts but were constructed between participants who spent time sharing and negotiating their understandings, speaking about them in relation to counselling psychology training and practice.

The interactive nature of discussion carried the risk of ‘groupthink’ (Janis, 1972) occurring amongst participants, who might have become preoccupied with how they responded to one another’s contributions rather than offering their own opinions, which may have differed from what was said. Participants’ contributions may have spurred one another on to produce more or less extreme opinions than might have occurred in individual interviews or alternate circumstances. In some of the groups, participants appeared to become increasingly fired-up by each other’s contributions, becoming more extreme in their constructions and critiques of counselling psychology’s institutions as domineering regimes of control and oppression. Whilst this group process may have explicated an accurate reflection of participants’ views, it may also have reflected a secondary process demonstrating something other than information about values and ethics in counselling psychology
training and practice, skewing the nature of information relating to the research topic. This level of group dynamics was not analysed by the researcher.

As suggested by Kamberelis and Dimitriadis (2005), the synergy of participants’ different contributions seemed to reveal sedimented norms and previously unarticulated assumptions within each group. Participants questioned and deconstructed ideas about the research topic that had apparently been taken for granted or gone unconsidered prior to the group. Thus, taking part in the group provided participants with the opportunity to engage in critical reflection on values and ethics in counselling psychology training and practice, which was something many of them said they would have liked more of as part of their training. After the group, many participants stated how valuable it had been for them to engage in this kind of discussion and that they had gained a deeper awareness and understanding of issues relating to the research topic as a result. This feature of the group was in keeping with the critically reflexive approach to knowledge that the researcher hoped to engender by conducting the research project.

On the whole, participants appeared relaxed and open when discussing the research topic, showing little difficulty in constructing and critiquing different ideas and offering accounts of their experiences. However, the artificiality of the focus group setting may have meant the discussion produced was different to that which might have occurred in a more natural setting. Discussion may also have been different amongst different groups of participants or different configurations of the same participants. Nevertheless, common constructions of values and ethics were identified across the groups and participants offered examples of contingent and contextual experiences demonstrating the implications of these constructions in their training and practice. Thus, whilst it might be argued that focus groups only show what people say they think or do, not what they actually think or do (Lederman, 1990), participants’ provision of real life examples describing in detail the involvement and impact of different constructions of values and ethics in their training and practice provided some hope that their accounts might have borne at least some resemblance to their experiences.

Sample

Whilst the research sought to investigate the discourses drawn on by participants when discussing values and ethics in relation to counselling psychology training and practice, participants’ values and
ethics outside of this context were not examined. This would have necessitated defining and operationalising values and ethics so they could be measured and profiled, which the research did not seek to do. Instead the decision was made to investigate participants’ constructions of both concepts within the context of counselling psychology training and practice. It is acknowledged, however, that participants will have brought ideas about values and ethics into the research from outside this context, the nature of which is likely to have related to personal-historical and demographic factors that were not studied.

The researcher did not shape or configure the demographics of the sample through the recruitment process to provide a particular cross section or weighting of demographics. Particular demographics were prevalent amongst participants, who constituted a predominantly white and female sample, clustering in age around 30, with 50% of the sample being British. This configuration might have been due to chance or might have reflected demographic trends within the counselling psychologist population. This was not analysed by the researcher. Either way, it is possible that particular preconceived ideas about values and ethics relating to these demographic factors might have existed amongst participants prior to their training and their participation in the research. Furthermore, the particular configuration of demographics represented by the sample might have affected the nature of discussion produced by the focus groups and the discourses that emerged. A different configuration of demographics may have produced discussion of a different nature and the emergence of different discourses. Thus, the sample was not necessarily representative of all counselling psychologists and the discourses that emerged may have been influenced by existent ideas about values and ethics relating to demographic factors beyond the context of the research topic.

Foucauldian discourse analysis

Foucauldian discourse analysis allowed the researcher to examine some of the discursive resources available to counselling psychologists when speaking about values and ethics in training and practice, looking at how social processes and institutional structures constrained these resources, and how practice and subjectivity were affected as a result. However, as already noted, the extent to which discursive theory can theorise subjectivity is limited, as it does not account for the non-discursive experiencing of human beings, nor does it explain people’s emotional investment in the subject positions they take up within discourse (Willig, 2008). Psychosocial, psychodynamic, existential,
spiritual, and embodiment factors are just some of the possible extra-discursive constituents of human experiencing that cannot be fully examined and accounted for by analysing discourse alone. Within discourse analysis, participants’ talk is treated as a straightforward reflection of what they are thinking and feeling, though what is said may actually be a more complicated and limited source of information. In emphasising the role of discourse in constituting human subjectivity, the risk is that discourse analysis becomes a neo-behaviourist endeavour. Language and language use may be studied as if this equates to studying human psychology, constructing functional relationships between input and output, or stimulus and response, in discursive terms (Phillips, 1976). This strips the person out from subjectivity and eradicates the qualities of personal meaning and affective experiencing, which are fundamental to being human.

The limitations of discourse analysis are therefore noted in relation to this project, which did not venture beyond analysing participants’ use of discursive resources to examine their possible motivations for doing so. By examining participants’ talk, the analysis did however try to account for participants’ subjective experiencing in relation to the discursive resources they used. Analysis could have been conducted on training course materials, the DCoP professional practice guidelines and other texts propagating particular constructions of values and ethics within counselling psychology. However, this would have rendered participants entirely passive in their use of discourse and the implications for practice and subjective experiencing would have had to have been more tacitly inferred. Instead participants were conceptualised as active agents engaged in a reciprocal relationship with discourse, as opposed to discourse being positioned as the sole active agent constituting participants’ reality in a closed and determinate way. Thus, whilst analysis constituted the researcher’s subjective reading of the text, it was a subjective reading of participants’ direct accounts of how values and ethics were implicated in their training and practice. The hope was that analysis might be more closely related to participants’ experiencing than would have been achieved by inferring this through examining abstract texts.

However, critical and political approaches to discourse analysis, such as that employed by this project, have been criticised as being loose and ungrounded, in that they risk departing from investigating participants’ experiences in favour of pursuing the researcher’s concerns (Schegloff, 1997; Speer, 2007; Wetherell, 1998). Schegloff (1997) argues that such approaches allow the
researcher to “deploy the terms which preoccupy them in describing, explaining, critiquing, etc. the events and texts to which they turn their attention” (p. 167), leaving little room for the endogenous orientations of participants. In this project, bringing trainees together to talk about values and ethics in counselling psychology training and practice engineered a situation where participants were oriented towards talking about particular discursive objects and structures that the researcher was implicitly suggesting might affect them. The researcher’s questions embodied assumptions about the research topic and set the agenda for discussion. Participants were then seen to orient towards discussing these assumptions in their responses. Participants’ accounts may therefore be criticised as constituting little more than justifications designed to deal with the perceived demands of the researcher’s questions, rather than being accounts that participants oriented to themselves.

Speer (2007) suggests that if critical and political approaches to discourse analysis want to do justice to participants’ lived experience “and understand why they choose one discursive construction over another, they need to analyse the interview as an interview, and as an occasion for interaction in its own right” (p. 132). Consideration might also be given to the nature and implications of ‘critique’ as a posture and technique within such social research and the precarious positioning of the analyst as critic (Kendall & Wickham, 2006). In an attempt to foreground participant orientations and background analysts’ concerns, Schegloff (1997) suggests that critical and political approaches to discourse analysis should be empirically grounded in the ‘technical’ discipline of conversation analysis, which examines how utterances are designed to do tasks and how replies to utterances indicate subjective understanding (Wetherell, 1998). According to Schegloff, undertaking conversation analysis to examine how discursive procedures are employed in building the local particulars of situated social practices allows the researcher to identify the emerging discursive objects and structures oriented to by participants. Subsequent analysis employing a critical or political approach can then focus on these objects and structures, which are grounded in the data and based on participants’ meaning making, rather than being imposed upon them by the researcher.

This project did not conduct such preliminary “molecular observation” (Schegloff, 1997, p. 180). The methods used by the project were recognised as shaping the nature of the discussion. ‘Values and ethics in counselling psychology training and practice’ was introduced to participants as the focus of discussion by the researcher and the researcher’s concerns regarding this topic were accepted as
inherent in the research endeavour, including analysis. These concerns were based on the literature reviewed above, alongside the researcher’s own first-hand experiences as a trainee counselling psychologist. Whilst it might be argued that these concerns represented the intellectual hegemony of the researcher, they constituted more than casual vernacular observation, constrained neither by the discipline of interactional participation nor by that of systematic empirical enquiry” (Schegloff, 1997, p. 180). Furthermore, the institutional structures that participants oriented towards speaking about in relation to the research question – the profession, the university, and placement organisations – emerged from their discussion and were not introduced by the researcher. Whilst taking a more fine-grained approach might have provided more detailed information on how and why participants used discursive materials and procedures to perform certain tasks, this kind of approach is more suited to analysing smaller pieces of text in detail (Wetherell, 1998). Focusing on a fragment of conversation would have blinkered the analysts’ gaze from examining the broader implications of wider discourses in which the fragment was located. In any case, the researcher’s selection of a piece of text to analyse would still have been defined by their concerns.

Schegloff’s recommendation that conversation analysis be conducted on a piece of text before critical analysis is impractical in relation to this project, as there are potentially thousands of conversational turns that could be analysed within the text. Furthermore, Schegloff’s notion of producing an analytic description of participants’ use of language that is uncontaminated by the researcher’s imposition of ontological categories is untenable. As with all approaches to discourse analysis, conversation analysis is a subjective process and categories are still used by the researcher to identify patterns in talk to create an ordered sense of what is going on (Wetherell, 1998). Thus, the claim that conversation analysis might enable the researcher to gain closer proximity to participants’ internal sense of an interaction is questionable, since the researcher’s attempt to grasp participants’ subjectivity will inevitably be shaped by their own subjective processes and the categories that are of interest to them. Whilst Schegloff’s suggestions are seemingly impractical and questionable in their efficacy, they raise important issues about the level to which discourse analysis can be operationalised and empiricised. Attention is therefore turned towards examining Willig’s (2008) attempt at operationalising Foucault’s ideas to produce the approach to discourse analysis that was employed as a method by this project.
Willig’s (2008) six-stage approach

Willig’s six stages provided the researcher with directions about what to attend to within the text in accordance with Foucauldian ideas about the roles of power, knowledge, and discourse in human life. However, concerns have been raised about the viability of structuring Foucault’s ideas into a method, and whether doing so is un-Foucauldian (e.g. Graham, 2010; Harwood, 2000; Meadmore, Hatcher, & McWilliam, 2000; Tamboukou, 1999). Harwood (2000) argues that Foucault’s ambiguity in prescribing a method for ‘doing’ discourse analysis was “an intentional strategy, for if Foucault had prescribed a specific methodology, he would have fallen foul of his own critique of truth and science” (p. 42). Similarly, Olssen (2004) states that Foucault’s concepts “cannot be integrated or decoded simply as an application of a uniform and universal regularity. In this non-unified sense, the analytic of discourse effects a non-unified method” (p. 466-467). On this basis, researchers might eschew declaring the particulars of an analytic method altogether in order to remain open to postmodern “undecidability” (Derrida, 1988, p. 145) and avoid any restrictions on thought from the “hegemony of theory” (Thomas, 1997, p. 76). However, research attempts that circumvent describing their methods are vulnerable to being criticised as constituting little more than unsystematised speculation (Graham, 2010; Schegloff, 1997). Such criticism is likely to be compounded by the “neoliberal malaise” (Graham, 2010, p. 2) currently affecting universities, which privileges evidence-based research methods and problematises ambiguity (Parker, 2002; Thorkelson, 2008).

The formulation of method has traditionally served to standardise research practices and assist with generalising results (Graham, 2010). Within the social sciences the aim has often been to attribute ‘scientific’ credibility to areas of study characterised by the inconsistency of human behaviour (Reid, 1994). This, however, is an inappropriate ambition when it comes to Foucauldian discourse analysis, which views meaning as inherently unstable, contingent, and always subject to scrutiny (Foucault, 2002b). Viewing social scientific investigation as a detached, truth-seeking process is incompatible with Foucault’s philosophy, which cannot be standardised into an analytic method based on these terms (Graham, 2010). This does not, however, mean that methods for Foucauldian discourse analysis cannot be developed. Prescribing a ‘scientific’ method that aims towards generalisable results is not the same as developing guidelines that aim to facilitate a researcher’s own subjective analysis. It is unlikely that Foucault intended for his reticence to prescribe an analytic method to
paradoxically become a postmodern straightjacket, rendering researchers unable or unwilling to make an intellectual commitment to methodological possibilities (Graham, 2010).

According to Foucault, there is no such thing as the ‘correct’ way of doing discourse analysis. This does not, however, mean ‘anything goes’, but that discourse analysis is predicated on an appreciation of the complex nature of discourse and its analysis (Cheek, 2004). The underlying philosophy of Foucault’s approach is that “the reader has ultimate authority over interpretation and therefore meaning – not, in fact, the author” (Graham, 2010, p. 4). Acknowledging such contingency constitutes a profoundly ethical standpoint. All that Foucauldian methods can do, therefore, is strive to make their objectives and limitations clear, explaining what they are and are not trying to do, how, and why. Foucauldian discourse analysis is precariously positioned as making no claim to establishing truths through ‘scientific’ or ‘precise’ methods, though it may be evaluated based on these terms should one be inclined to do so. This final point is important. Methodological issues do not arise from operationalising Foucault’s ideas into a method per se, but become an issue where operationalisation is associated with positivistic notions of empiricism, evidence, and generalisability, which serve to assess and control, as is often seen in contemporary academic institutions (Davies, 2005). Thus, to evaluate the ‘correctness’ of a Foucauldian method, Foucault’s ideas must be viewed from within a positivistic paradigm that stands in contrast to Foucault’s relativism. Only then can analytic attempts qua Foucault be evaluated as being ‘correct’ or ‘incorrect’ based on these terms.

Willig’s development and stipulation of an approach to Foucauldian discourse analysis therefore represents an awkward tension between ‘doing’ poststructural work and trying to satisfy the institutional conventions of academic writing (Graham, 2010). This tension is intrinsically linked to the issues raised by this research project regarding the institutionalisation of values and ethics in counselling psychology. Counselling psychology’s professional guidelines and university training courses seem to struggle to cope with ambiguity, reflected by their need to moderate and assess based on prescribed terms and conditions. As highlighted by this project’s analysis, counselling psychologists are required to demonstrate their knowledge and practices in accordance with particular values and ethics that serve to substantiate and justify their work. This requirement extends to this research project, which has been formulated and formatted to demonstrate the researcher’s understanding and control over the research process in accordance with an institutionally approved
template for an academic thesis. Willig’s six stages can therefore be read as part of this template, offering a structured method against which the analytic activity of this project can be evaluated. At the same time, the stages can also be read as set of resources for an interpretive art, offering the researcher a starting point from which to embark on their own creative thinking about a text. Thus, Willig’s approach forms part of the canon of value-laden guidelines, rules, theories, and research evidence underpinning counselling psychology, offering guidance and direction for fulfilling a particular kind of task, whilst its application hinges upon the subjectivity of the researcher.

Willig is clear about the limitations of her approach, stating that the six stages “do not constitute a full analysis in the Foucauldian sense” (Willig, 2008. p. 115), since they do not include practices relating to ‘archaeology’ (Foucault, 2002b) and ‘genealogy’ (Mahon, 1992), focusing only on isolated texts without venturing to analyse extra-discursive factors (Hook, 2001). Considering Willig’s approach within the context of this project, the linear structuring of the six stages might be criticised for appearing to show participants’ discourse about values and ethics as being comprised of separable components, rather than being a complex mixture of the features focused upon at each stage, which were concurrently at play during any one moment within the text. Whilst the researcher allowed each stage to guide analytic attention towards focusing on the textual features considered relevant to a Foucauldian deconstruction according to Willig, trying to distil discourse into separate components and functions was challenging. Trying to keep the features of each stage apart from one another could feel forced and artificial. In its compartmentalisation, the approach might be seen as constituting Foucauldian discourse analysis by numbers, albeit fewer numbers than seen in some other approaches (e.g. Parker, 1992, 1994). Willig’s method therefore treads a fine line between constraining analytic attention to focus upon particular features of a text in accordance with Foucauldian ideas as delineated by Willig, and allowing the capacity for creativity and freedom of thought to play their part in reading and deconstructing a text based on the researchers’ own subjective understanding of discourse, discourse analysis, and the writings of Foucault.
The analysis in relation to the literature on values and ethics

Defining values and ethics

Consistent with Perry’s (1914) highlighting of the difficulty in capturing a definitive definition of values (see Box 2, p. 6), participants appeared uncertain about the exact nature of the concept, what their values were, and what and how values should feature in therapy. Values were embedded in various counselling psychology structures and practices in ways participants had not necessarily thought about prior to the focus groups but which emerged over the course of discussion. The groups therefore seemed to assist participants in gaining a more open and complete value-informed perspective, as recommended by Bergin et al. (1996), allowing them to construct and explore the concept in various terms.

The different constructions of values produced spanned Tjeltveit’s (1999) taxonomy of definitions (see Box 3, p. 7), with different emphases being placed on different aspects of the concept at different times. Values were predominantly spoken about in institutional and personal terms, drawing on an institutional and humanistic discourse to do so. Within the institutional discourse, values were constructed as the socially constructed principles underlying counselling psychology as a profession, which should be shared by counselling psychologists. Here participants emphasised the ‘cultural and historical’ nature of values as suggested by Tjeltveit, as well as positing values as ‘a means by which the powerful impose their will on the weak’. Within the humanistic discourse, values were constructed as an internal motivational set of beliefs derived through a person’s life experiences. Here participants emphasised the ‘psychological’ nature of values as suggested by Tjeltveit, positing values as an individual’s ‘choices’ as well as representing an ‘authentic expression of an individual’s nature’. Thus, whilst individuals were seen to have their own idiosyncratic values arising from their differing life experiences, some values were supposed to be common to individuals within counselling psychology. Particular common personal values were therefore likely to have attracted individuals to train as counselling psychologists. However, on taking up the subject position of counselling psychologist the relationship between personal and institutional values became more complex.

There was confusion surrounding where personal and institutional values were separate and where they overlapped, and where personal and professional identity began and ended within and outside
counselling psychology. Some distinction between the two contexts was made based on how different values related to different constructions of ethics. Within the institutional and humanistic discourses, values were intrinsically linked to ethics, as Tjeltveit (1999) suggests. Within the institutional discourse, counselling psychologists were positioned as professionals who were required to uphold the values of counselling psychology as a profession. These values were formalised into a code of professional ethics by the professional body, corresponding with the 'professional' dimension of ethics Tjeltveit suggests (1999; see Box 4, p.12). Here ethics were constructed as the rules set in place to promote and protect the institutional values of counselling psychology, which counselling psychologists must adhere to. The professional dimension of ethics was seen to preside over the other dimensions highlighted by Tjeltveit, taking the thought out of these dimensions by stipulating how counselling psychologists should behave and thus how they should orient themselves in relation to them. Professional ethics was seen to regulate the behaviour of therapists and clients by stipulating what was acceptable and unacceptable, with the threat of punishment looming should behaviour not be aligned with the profession's formalised values.

Within the humanistic discourse, however, counselling psychologists were positioned as people with their own unique set of values informing their behaviour. Here ethics were constructed as an individual's personal standards of behaviour based on their idiosyncratic values. Thus, ethics were subjective constructs that may vary between individuals, rather than being objective principles that could be codified and generalised. This opened up the dimensions of ethics suggested by Tjeltveit for reflexive thinking, as he and others argue should be the case (e.g. Rowson, 2001; Tjeltveit, 1999, 2000). Being positioned as people and professionals, individual counselling psychologists were tasked with reflecting on the institutionally defined values and ethics set out by the professional body and integrating them with their own in order to engender some sense of personal-professional identity and practice. This did not appear to present a problem where the institutional values and professional ethics of counselling psychology were congruent with participants' own, but tensions were raised where personal and professional values and ethics clashed, causing anxiety and unease amongst participants as they tried to reconcile the different demands of both.
The values and ethics of counselling psychology

Consistent with the structuring of the scientist-practitioner model (Frank, 1984), counselling psychology’s value base was seen to be oriented around contrasting scientific and humanistic values, as described by Strawbridge and Woolfe (2003). On the one hand, humanistic values were hailed as the key principles of counselling psychology, as suggested by Cooper (2009), whilst on the other, scientific values were emphasised as crucial factors underpinning the theories and research upon which counselling psychology is based, as described by Chwalisz (2003). Participants viewed the wedding of these two epistemologies with at least some ambivalence, as seen by Aspenson and Gersh (1993) in their study of students’ views on the scientist-practitioner model. The joining of humanistic and scientific values was experienced as an uneasy marriage, filled with tensions and opposites, which left participants feeling confused, anxious, and uncertain about what their values should be and how they should behave.

The emphasis placed on humanistic values, as integral to counselling psychology’s identity, seemed to imbue them with an institutionally endorsed sense of virtue, which meant the possible shortcomings of humanistic theory’s ‘ego-centric’ (Schweder & Bourne, 1984), ‘individualistic’ (Pearson & Podeschi, 1999) approach to values seemed to go unnoticed. Humanistic values were seen as the values that all good counselling psychologists should display in practice, providing the basis for ‘healing’ to take place. The privileging of clients’ subjectivity associated with humanistic values seemed to be interpreted as a relativistic stance in relation to clients’ values. This appeared to distract participants from seeing humanistic theory as constituting a particular value-system in itself, which does not offer a value-free approach that privileges clients’ values above all else, as the therapist’s privileging of humanistic values will always come first. Furthermore, as Bergin et al. (1996) point out, a relativistic stance in relation to values gives no basis for intervention to try to help clients, since it suggests that all values are to be considered equal.

In contrast to humanistic values, scientific values were seen to provide a basis for therapeutic intervention by emphasising the importance of theories and research that enabled counselling psychologists to understand, explain, and justify their practice. This was seen to make participants feel safe and effective, rather than leaving them exposed to the anxiety that accompanied not knowing what to do. The scientific emphasis on generalisable knowledge was seen to jar with the
humanistic emphasis on subjectivity, individuality, and context. Scientific values were positioned as a force for objectivism that seemed to counter the supposed relativism arising from humanistic values, providing value-systems into which clients’ values could be subsumed and evaluated. Thus, therapists were able to make decisions about how and when to intervene to ‘help’ clients based on the valuative recommendations of institutionally approved theories, research, guidelines, and rules.

The juxtaposition of humanistic and scientific values was seen as an integral characteristic of counselling psychology and a hallmark of its professional identity. Counselling psychology was seen to place increased emphasis on the importance of humanistic values in comparison to clinical psychology, as suggested by Pugh and Coyle (2000). However, counselling psychology’s identity was seen to have become closer to that of clinical psychology in recent years, with increased importance being placed on the value of research in response to the political trends towards professionalisation and evidence-based practice described by Parker (2002) and House (2001). Counselling psychology’s concern for research was seen to differentiate it from psychotherapy, which was seen to have less concern for evidence-based practice.

Counselling psychologists were therefore tasked with the challenge of upholding opposing humanistic and scientific values concurrently. Whilst counselling psychology’s humanistic values were seen to recommend that therapists be client-led and not impose values on clients, the values of science were seen to undermine this ethos in their desire to categorise and control. Participants were subject to an overriding dialectic between humanistic self-actualisation and institutionalised scientific control, resulting in confusion, tension, and discomfort in their sense of identity and practice. This dialectic was compounded by the formalising of particular humanistic and scientific values into a code of professional ethics that must be adhered to or punishment would be incurred. The formalising of humanistic values into a code, stipulating dos and don’ts, was seen to undermine the intent of the humanistic values themselves. Furthermore, the code of ethics was seen to be unrealistic in its expectations and open to interpretation, since codified values and ethics could not account for contingent and contextual factors surrounding therapy and the stipulations therein were ambiguous.

The code of professional ethics was seen to be least ambiguous in stipulating counselling psychologists’ professional duty to ensure the safety of those involved in practice. It was their responsibility to prevent clients, themselves, and others from coming to harm. The institutional
discourse positioned counselling psychologists and clients as potential dangers to themselves and each other, placing professional ethics between them as protective factors that served to prevent harm as long as these ‘rules’ were followed. The importance placed on adhering to these ethics emphasised the dangers of therapy work, making it appear fraught with hazards. The result was fear and anxiety amongst participants about what might happen if professional ethics were broken, in terms of the harm that might be caused and the punishment that might be incurred.

Participants experienced professional ethics as being imposed upon them by counselling psychology's institutions, rather than being generated through their experiences, and struggled to reconcile being human with being professional. Where the humanistic values of counselling psychology were seen to value compassion, diversity, difference, and autonomy, the institutional values were seen to value discipline, duty, conformity, and obedience. The freedom to integrate different values into counselling psychology was limited on the basis that those involved must accord with counselling psychology’s institutional values and professional ethics. Participants felt subject to a confusing double standard, resulting in feelings of ambivalence and resentment towards the profession, which could be experienced as dictatorial, dehumanising, contradictory, and stifling.

**Values and ethics in training**

The degree of control that participants had in choosing the integration of values and ethics comprising their identity and informing their practice was seen to vary according to the competing forces of institutional and humanistic discourses, which came together in training. Whilst the institutional discourse emphasised the acquisition and assessment of particular values and ethics, as ratified by the professional body and taught by the university, the humanistic discourse emphasised the personal development of values and ethics through trainees’ subjective experiences. The two competing discourses seemed to parallel the theory-practice split within higher education therapy training courses that Schön (1987) describes. This split was seen to constitute the difference between a technocratic approach to teaching and learning counselling psychology theory and practice, as described by Coren (2002), and an experiential approach to ‘becoming’ or ‘being’ a counselling psychologist, as described by House (2001). Training involved a dynamic relationship between institutional and humanistic constructions of values and ethics, which participants were required to
manage as they concurrently occupied subject positions within institutional and humanistic discourses carrying different implications.

Within the institutional discourse, trainees were positioned as being subject to the university's teaching and assessment, which served to guide practice if not determine it by emphasising a particular integration of values and ethics. The university demanded that trainees acquire and demonstrate their understanding and practice of particular values and ethics by completing written and practical assignments assessing their competence based on these terms. Thus, whilst trainees were being taught not to impose their values on clients in line with humanistic theory (a value in itself), they were also being furnished with value-laden knowledge that they were required to learn and follow. Whilst counselling psychology literature recommends that counselling psychologists critically reflect on value-laden knowledge (e.g. Etherington, 2004; Loewenthal, 2006; McLeod, 2007; Nussbaum, 2010; Palmer Barnes, 2001; Parks, 2007; Strous, 2006), the extent to which such reflection was encouraged as part of university training was seen to vary. Some participants felt very little space was allowed for critical reflection, whilst others felt critical reflection had been actively encouraged.

On the whole, participants felt the onus was on them to conduct their own critical reflection independently, with teaching largely focusing on the provision and assessment of knowledge, rather than on engendering Socratic debate as recommended by Nussbaum (2010). The university's teaching and assessment was seen to institutionalise trainees to some extent into possessing a mixture of values and ethics that shaped their identity and practice, as suggested by Coren (2002). Values were taught and assessed in theoretical terms, whilst ethics were seen to be synonymous with professional rules and guidelines to be considered in relation to 'ethical situations'. Thus, in spite of the literature emphasising the importance of explicit, integrated, reflexive thinking about values and ethics as concepts woven throughout therapy (e.g. Clarkson, 2001; Güggenbuhl-Craig, 1995; Parker, 2002; Pollard, 2011; Shillito-Clarke, 2003; Strong, 2005; Walsh & Frankland, 2009), it seemed values and ethics were taught and modelled by the university in fairly restricted and didactic ways. Many of the values embedded in counselling psychology's structures and practices went unexplored and unquestioned as part of training, whilst ethics was conceptualised as a self-contained topic,
concerned with rules, dilemmas, and boundaries, to be learned and applied rather than investigated and interrogated.

Within the humanistic discourse, however, trainees were positioned as being subject to their own understandings of the values and ethics presented to them through their training, integrating ideas on the basis of their subjectivity to generate their own sense of identity and practice. Here values and ethics were not concepts that could be taught and assessed objectively but were subjectively assimilated through contextual life experiences. In keeping with this construction, participants found the experiential components of their training most useful in facilitating their understanding and integration of values and ethics, providing support for Scanlon and Baillie’s (1994) suggestion that therapy training should be underpinned by a practice-led epistemology. It was through their experiences practising with clients that participants felt they learned most about being a counselling psychologist and the role of values and ethics within this; by experiencing first-hand how they informed and impacted therapy in ways that were helpful and unhelpful.

The subjective nature of values and ethics within the humanistic discourse meant each person involved in training and practice might have different understandings of both concepts, such that supposedly common values and ethics may not be common at all. Trainees were required to manage the different values and ethics of various stakeholders involved in their training and practice, whilst developing a humanistic approach to therapy that aimed to privilege clients’ values. This was a complicated and confusing process for participants, with different stakeholders exerting different value pressures to various effects. Trainees tried to make sense of the values and ethics encountered, absorbing and developing their understandings through experiences with different people. This process was contingent on time being allowed for experiences to occur and processing of these experiences to take place, with some participants arguing that their training had fallen short in both respects. Whilst participants felt their values had changed to varying degrees in response to their training experiences, on the whole, training was seen to have helped participants gain a deeper understanding of their values whilst developing their own personal integration, which constituted their identity and practice as a counselling psychologist.

At best, university training was experienced as useful and helpful in providing trainees with guidelines, rules, knowledge, and experiences that gave a foundation upon which they could build and develop
their practice, along with language to speak about values and ethics in counselling psychology. In such circumstances participants felt the university had respectfully parented them through their training, feeding ideas to them that helped them grow into counselling psychologists as they explored these ideas in training and practice. At worst, university training was experienced as intimidating and dehumanising, forcing trainees to adhere to particular values and ethics with little reflection or explanation as to why this should be so, even when the values and ethics to be followed went against participants’ own. This left trainees feeling dictated to, deskilled, incompetent, anxious, and attacked by the university, with the university’s approach to teaching standing in stark contrast to the humanistic qualities they were being told they should possess in their practice with clients. As a result, participants felt some anger towards the university, which could be experienced as a domineering parent or a punitory superego. As noted by Berry & Woolfe (1997), it is not easy to reconcile the concept of self-actualisation through training with institutional practices that serve to control and assess based on fixed terms and conditions. Many of the ‘university temptations’ and ‘institutional practices’ Parker (2002) describes (see Boxes 9 & 10, p. 28-30) were seen to prevail within the university in ways that closed down thought and constrained action amongst trainees, with knock on effects for their practice with clients.

**Practice**

The ways in which values and ethics were constructed within the institutional and humanistic discourses ruled in certain behaviours and ruled out others, shaping how clients were thought about, valued, and responded to by participants in their therapy practice. Tensions were seen between the different actions allowed for and recommended by each discourse. The institutional discourse required that counselling psychologists practice according to the values and ethics stipulated by the professional body alongside the theoretical models and research evidence taught and assessed by the university. As a result, counselling psychologists were positioned as social control agents whose practice served to bring clients’ values into line with counselling psychology’s institutionally approved theories, guidelines, and rules. However, the humanistic discourse required that counselling psychologists remain open to the unknown and privilege clients’ subjective experiencing above preordained values and ethics. Thus, counselling psychologists were concurrently positioned as non-
experts whose role was to facilitate each client’s process of self-discovery and self-actualisation based on their values.

A paradox was therefore seen between the demands of the institutional and humanistic discourses. On the one hand, counselling psychologists were supposed to be client-led, such that they did not profess to know what was best for clients, who were experts in their own experiencing. Clients were seen to know what was best for them and were responsible for their actions and the consequences incurred. Here it was the counselling psychologist’s responsibility to keep their own values outside therapy so as not to influence the client. On the other hand, counselling psychologists were supposed to base their practice on the values and ethics set out by counselling psychology’s institutions, which intimated what would be helpful and unhelpful for clients. Clients were not necessarily seen to know what was best for them on the basis that they were seeking help by presenting for therapy. Here it was the counselling psychologist’s responsibility to intervene to help clients understand what might be best for them and to prevent them from causing harm to themselves and others.

The humanistic and institutional discourses therefore placed different emphases on personal and professional responsibility within counselling psychology practice. Participants were tasked with trying to work out when and where the demands of institutional values and professional ethics obliged them to intervene in clients’ thoughts, feelings, and behaviours, and where clients had personal responsibility for their own lives, which should not be intruded upon. Since practising any therapy model inherently involves the imposition of that model’s values on a client, actively or passively (Shillito-Clarke, 2003), the humanistic ‘rule’ that therapists must not impose values on clients seemed only to apply to the therapist’s personal values. Basing therapy practice on personal values alone was seen to carry the risk of harming clients by exerting undue, uncontrolled influence. Conversely, basing therapy practice on institutional values and professional ethics alone was not possible, since their application to a given situation was contingent upon the counselling psychologist’s subjectivity, which inherently involved their personal values and ethics. A dynamic relationship was therefore seen between personal and institutional values. Institutional values and professional ethics served to mitigate the involvement of personal values and ethics in practice, which should only feature where the therapist subjectively judged that this would benefit the client based on counselling psychology’s institutional values and professional ethics.
Participants therefore deferred responsibility for imposing values and ethics upon clients to counselling psychology's institutional structures, which furnished them with approved values and ethics to be followed. Counselling psychology's institutional values and professional ethics were seen to provide a legitimate basis for intervening in clients' lives and thus constituted an exception to the humanistic rule of non-imposition, or were seen as being concerned with something other than values. The goals, theories, techniques, and outcomes of therapy were typically described using terminology from therapy models, rather than speaking of the values to be instilled in clients, what values were desirable, what value-change might occur, and what constituted successful therapy in valuative terms. The more the values involved in practice could be defined by reference to a theoretical model, the more insulated they appeared to be from the controversial suggestion that a therapist's values might impact a client during therapy. As long as the values being imposed were drawn from institutionally approved theories, guidelines, and rules, and were not the therapist's own, participants could seemingly claim to be practising according to counselling psychology's humanistic value base, despite this being a contradiction in terms.

The perceived role of values in therapy therefore seemed to remain close to the 'traditional' viewpoint described by Beutler and Bergan (1991), that “counselors and psychotherapists should be aware of their personal values in order to prevent these valuative beliefs from influencing treatment” (p. 17). Participants' awareness of the many other covert ways in which values were involved in practice seemed limited, whilst the mitigating effect of institutional values and professional ethics seemed limiting in terms of the behaviours that were made available to them. Whilst having a code of values and ethics made participants feel safe and protected in their practice, it also restricted their range of actions. As a result, participants felt unable to respond to clients with the full scope of their humanity. As Robbins (2000) writes, “When I enter into formal, bureaucratic systems, I find that my freedom to serve the Other is often usurped” (para. 13). Certain behaviours were not allowed by professional ethics, which served to keep counselling psychologists at a safe distance from clients by maintaining a professional relationship over a personal one.

Consistent with this, ‘the ability to attend closely to boundaries’ was by stressed by participants as an integral part of ethics and ethical practice, this being one of the ‘therapist qualities’ Holmes (2001) describes (see Box 5, p. 14). The other qualities Holmes describes – ‘the capacity for self-reflection’
and ‘the capacity to put thoughts, feelings, and potential actions into words’ – were also spoken about in relation to ethical practice but seemed to be seen as constituents of the process of attending to boundaries, rather than being important ethical factors in and of themselves. There was the potential for participants’ reflexivity about the institutionally approved values and ethics they were supposed to be practising to get lost in their preoccupation with whether or not they were practising according to these values and ethics, and not just their own, so as to meet institutional requirements. Participants could become focused on what they should not do, so as to remain professional according to institutional values and professional ethics, rather than focusing on what they might do to help clients based on their personal ethical response to them.

Personal ethics was equated to human conscience by participants, which constitutes the ‘intuitive level’ of Shillito-Clarke’s (2003) ‘model of ethical reasoning’ (see Figure 1, p. 15). In keeping with this model, participants seemed to accept that their conscience alone was inadequately resourced to guide them towards practising ethically, and counselling psychology’s theories, principles, and rules were thus positioned as providing guidance and governance. The role of clients’ ethics in guiding ethical practice, however, is absent from Beauchamp and Childress’s model. Whilst the model captures how rules, principles, and theories preside over a therapist’s conscience in practice, it is unilateral in representing the therapist’s ethical reasoning process in isolation from the client’s. It presents a framework that clients are subsumed into, offering a model for responding to clients rather than a model for responding with clients, giving no consideration to how clients’ ethics might be incorporated into ethical reasoning. This unilateral focus was largely paralleled in participants’ discussion, with attention predominantly focusing on meeting and managing the ethical concerns of therapists and the profession, and far less consideration being given to how clients’ ethics might be incorporated as part of an ethical reasoning process within therapy.

Participants’ investment in the values and ethics of the theories, principles, and rules they employed seemed to be taken for granted as long as they did not strongly clash with their own and/or a client’s. Should such dissidence occur, tension, struggle, and discomfort were likely to be seen as participants were faced with two choices. On the one hand, they could contravene institutional values and professional ethics in favour of acting in accordance with their own and/or a client’s, which risked incurring punishment and was likely to result in anxiety, fear, and guilt. On the other hand, they could
accede to institutional values and professional ethics at the expense of their own and/or a client’s, which would ensure professional approval but was likely to result in feelings of anxiety, anger, and guilt. Based on their personal-professional integration of values and ethics, participants were challenged with balancing the demands of their personal and professional responsibility, which could at times pull them in different directions, either towards meeting the demands of their own values and ethics in relation to a client, or towards meeting the demands of institutional values and professional ethics. At times participants felt forced into doing things that they did not want to do in order to gain institutional approval, rather than responding to a client’s values based on their own and what they thought would be most helpful. In such circumstances participants could feel dehumanised, depersonalised, deskilled, anxious, coerced, coercive, and uncomfortable about what was being asked of them as professionals, which was seen to detract from their values and ethics as people.

Summary

The analysis revealed how the institutions coordinating counselling psychology training and practice propagated dominant institutional and humanistic discourses that constructed values and ethics in particular ways, and how these different constructions affected participants’ therapy practice and subjectivity. Whilst the implications of constructions within the humanistic discourse were seen to run counter to those within the institutional discourse, the humanistic discourse was co-opted by the institutional discourse as an integral part of counselling psychology’s professional identity. The institutional constructions of values and ethics presided over the humanistic constructions, such that becoming a counselling psychologist meant becoming a professional with professional values and ethics, including humanistic values and ethics, which superseded being a person with personal values and ethics. Professional values and ethics therefore determined the involvement of personal values and ethics in practice. This relationship was set up on the basis that counselling psychologists had increased responsibility for the well-being of others in their role as professionals. Professional values were institutionally approved as helpful and safe, whilst personal values needed to be controlled as they were seen to be potentially dangerous in their capacity to create confusion around relationship boundaries and cause harm through coercion.

Thus, despite humanistic values being heralded as the key principles of counselling psychology, emphasising the subjective nature of human values and the emancipation of people from limiting
conditions of worth, the potential of such ideas was limited by their institutionalisation within counselling psychology training and practice. Counselling psychologists and clients were supposed to aim towards self-actualisation but only within the confines of the terms and conditions set out by counselling psychology’s institutions. The quest for human emancipation was therefore turned against itself, becoming an institutionalised system of control in the name of human liberation. Whilst the humanistic discourse within counselling psychology professed a way-of-being for counselling psychologists and clients that was supposedly free from imposed value pressures, counselling psychology’s institutions concurrently instructed and evaluated behaviour in ways that exerted value pressures that constrained actions and ways-of-being, with the threat of danger, harm, and punishment keeping behaviour in check.

Possible avenues for future research

Future research might take a closer look at the different aspects and polarities of counselling psychology’s value base and ethical identity, as a profession and a way-of-being. The various sources of values and dimensions of ethics underpinning counselling psychology’s structures and practices might be examined in order to further map out the tensions, conflicts, and incongruities therein. This might be considered as an ongoing concern for those involved in coordinating, teaching, and practising counselling psychology if an increasingly clear, current, and explicit view is to be gained about the ways and means in which values and ethics feature, the power structures and struggles at play, and what this means for counselling psychology training and practice. Research might examine the valuative constructions of knowledge, assessment, and competency within counselling psychology training courses, exploring how different discourses around these notions open up or close down opportunities for creative and reflexive thinking, and how different practices and ways-of-being are made available or constrained for counselling psychologists and clients as a result. The ways in which values and ethics are constructed and dealt with in non-university settings might be examined and compared to the constructions and practices seen within universities, looking at the potential benefits and shortcomings of each setting and what useful cross pollination might occur between the two.

Research might look to discover ways in which creative and reflexive thinking can be given central roles in the processes, theories, and models underpinning counselling psychology practice. Thought
might be given to the ways in which therapy can be ‘democratised’ (Orbach, 2007) so that the nature of therapy’s structures and practices is shared and co-constructed between therapists and clients, making the fabric of therapy dependent on the coming together of the values and ethics of both parties. Research might look at the impact of different constructions of values and ethics on clients’ experiences in and of therapy. A fine-grained analytic approach might look at the ways in which different constructions of values and ethics are communicated, mediated, and negotiated between therapists and clients during therapy. The effects of different value systems and ethical standards on clients’ values and ethics might be examined, looking at the ways in which clients’ values change over the course of therapy in relation to the different values impacting the therapeutic encounter, such as the personal values of the therapist, the values of the theoretical models and techniques employed, and those implied by the context in which therapy is taking place.

**Conclusion**

It would seem that counselling psychology’s scientific and humanistic value base presents a dichotomy of conflicting epistemological and ontological standpoints to be served in practice, which may lead to tensions, confusion, and discomfort amongst counselling psychologists as they try to mediate between the two. This might be seen as constituting an ethical position from which to practice, requiring ongoing reflexive thought about different values and ethics, rather than subscribing to a single dogma. However, the degree to which reflexive thought is encouraged and allowed by counselling psychology’s institutions appears to vary depending on the structures and practices put in place to moderate and control behaviour. The professional body’s formalising of values into a code of ethics that serves to guide practice has the potential to limit reflexive thought about the values and ethics contained therein, since they are to be followed or harm will supposedly be caused and/or punishment incurred. Furthermore, trainees are required to demonstrate their knowledge and practice of particular values and ethics to the university in order to qualify as counselling psychologists, which can focus attention on acquiring and exhibiting particular values and ethics rather than interrogating and reflecting upon them.

Attempts to ensure that therapy is not based on the whims of therapists and that individuals retain their human rights and are free from coercion are understandable. However, the emphasis that counselling psychology’s institutions appear to place on demonstrating institutional values and
professional ethics seems driven by an anxiety that therapists will do something wrong and will cause harm unless they are instructed on how to behave. The issuing and assessment of institutional values and professional ethics therefore constitutes the imposition of a predetermined system of control, regulating counselling psychologists’ behaviour by stipulating correct practice. Ethical practice might thus come to be viewed as a conservative matter of restricting what occurs inside and outside therapy in ways that are limiting for both therapist and client, which may actually be unethical, amounting to ‘paradoxical counter-productivity’ (Illich, 1976).

Similarly, structuring counselling psychology training around the acquisition and assessment of therapeutic knowledge, within fixed boundaries and timescales, may focus attention on the ‘correct’ formatting and application of values and ethics from counselling psychology’s approved theories, guidelines, and rules, leaving little room for reflexive thought or for clients’ values to inform practice. Robbins (2000) argues that the responsibility a therapist holds for the Other in therapy “is bestowed not just for the other but by the Other” (para. 1) and that the institutionalisation of therapy risks therapists losing sight of this. By developing a formalised code of values and ethics, alongside procedures for the selection and training of counselling psychologists based on these terms, counselling psychology preserves itself as a professional institution, whilst risking inertia in the face of clients’ values and ethics. The result may be that “It becomes much more difficult to respond to the ethical call of the Other in the face-to-face” (Robbins, 2000, para. 2).

The institutionalisation of values and the professionalisation of ethics therefore exert power over counselling psychologists in ways that risk closing down opportunities for critically reflexive thinking and may also relegate clients’ values and ethics to a subordinate role in guiding therapy. This is not to say that counselling psychology should abolish its code of values and ethics, leaving therapists to practice as they please, nor should it change its value base in an attempt to achieve a state of internal value alignment and congruence. Instead counselling psychology should strive to be congruent and ethical by being explicit about the different ways in which values and ethics are constructed and feature within counselling psychology. The implications and limitations of these constructions should be explicated, examining the consequences for counselling psychology training and practice, exposing the power relations that are set up as a result. The power relations inherent in counselling psychology cannot be eradicated. As Foucault (1988) states, “The problem is not of trying to dissolve
them in the utopia of a perfectly transparent communication, but to give oneself the rules of law, the
techniques of management, and also the ethics, the ethos, the practice of self, which would allow
these games of power to be played with a minimum of domination” (p. 18). Those involved in
counselling psychology would therefore do well to examine the ways and means through which power
is exerted in relation to values and ethics within counselling psychology training and practice, aiming
towards gaining greater understanding and management of the different power relations at play.

It would appear that the multiplicity of ways in which values are involved in counselling psychology
may remain somewhat of a blind spot for counselling psychologists, requiring further attention if
practitioners are to gain a more open and complete and value informed perspective, as Bergin et al.
(1996) suggest. It would also seem that a broader perspective on ethics and ethical theory may be
needed to widen the horizons of counselling psychologists beyond focusing solely on codes of ethics,
as Shillito-Clarke (2003) suggests. The various valutative and ethical dimensions of therapy should be
addressed and explored as open and expansive topics running throughout all aspects of therapy
(Palmer Barnes & Murdin, 2001; Tjeltveit, 1999). Counselling psychology training has a fundamental
role to play in this, and the institutional university structures, practices, and temptations that Parker
(2002) highlights as being inimical to therapy require remedial attention if the potential limitations on
creative and egalitarian thought arising from them are to be avoided. University training programmes
might provide a more ethical experience by aiming towards a Socratic approach to teaching and
learning, as Nussbaum (2010) suggests. Training should not only teach trainees the values and ethics
of counselling psychology, it should also teach them to question what they are being taught if critically
reflexive skills are to be engendered (Loewenthal, 2006; McLeod, 2007; Palmer Barnes, 2001; Parks,
2007; Strous, 2006). Concepts from systemic therapy might be incorporated into counselling
psychology training and practice, such as ‘circularity’ and ‘irreverence’ (Cecchin, 1987; Cecchin et al.,
1993) that aim to ensure curiosity and reflexivity amongst therapists.

Trainees might benefit from university training programmes being structured around a practice-led
epistemology, as suggested by Scanlon and Baillie (1993), within which a broader perspective might
be taken on what constitutes ‘knowledge’ within counselling psychology. More attention might be
given to exploring notions of tacit and experiential knowledge within the university, rather than these
dimensions of training and practice being ensconced in the experiential activities taking place off-site.
at practice placements. Subjectivity and ambiguity might receive greater emphasis on university training courses as crucial factors relating to values and ethics, rather than presenting values and ethics in the guise of theoretical structures, procedures, guidelines, and rules to be learned, performed, and assessed. Notions of competency might be re-evaluated alongside the ways and means by which trainees are assessed. Consideration might be given to the very notion of assessment within the context of counselling psychology, looking at what this implies and the consequences for trainees and clients. Those involved in coordinating counselling psychology training might give greater consideration to the aspects of therapy that cannot be theorised, taught, and assessed, and encourage reflexive thinking and exploration amongst trainees on this basis.

In conclusion, it would seem important that counselling psychologists be engaged in ongoing exploration of values and ethics as part of their training, their continuing personal development, and especially in their practice with clients, so as to be clear about the values and ethics involved in what they are doing. If counselling psychologists are to aim towards being humanistic, ethical, practitioner-scientists, they must critically reflect on the values and ethics involved in their practice, their shortcomings and limitations, whilst striving to incorporate clients’ values and ethics into the processes informing therapy wherever possible in ways that are egalitarian, reflexive, and explicit. The institutional structures within counselling psychology should encourage counselling psychologists’ learning from clients (Rogers, 1961), whilst also facilitating the ‘giving away’ (Gendlin, 1984) of counselling psychology’s knowledge base and value-system to clients and society at large in ways that are open, negotiated, responsive, empowering, creative, and supportive. Counselling psychology might thus aim towards providing an ethical response to the Other that propagates a sense of mutuality, community, and connectedness (Robbins, 2000), rather than institutionalising values and professionalising ethics on the basis of fear and restraint in ways that perpetuate the power of the profession and keep therapists and clients distanced from one another.
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**Box 23**

**Glossary of transcript symbols**

( ) Empty parenthesis indicate speech that the transcriber was unable to ascertain

(word) Parenthesised words indicate the transcriber’s uncertainty about what was said

[ ] A left bracket indicates the start point of overlapping speech

} A right bracket indicates the end point of overlapping speech

MOD Indicates the moderator’s contributions

A1 to D5 Indicate each participant’s contributions
**Appendix 1 – Ethical approval application**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE OF PROJECT</th>
<th>Values and Ethics in Counselling Psychology Training and Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT DETAILS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of the proposed investigation</strong></td>
<td>The research will explore the way that university trained Counselling Psychologists talk about the role of values and ethics in their practice and how their university training shaped this. Did their university training allow adequate exploration of their values, those embedded in theory, those of others, their clients, and the profession? How did they come to develop and understand their own values, ethical philosophy and identity, in relation to their practice as a Counselling Psychologist during their training? Has their training encouraged the exploration and discussion of ethics and values in relation to their practice, or has this area been formalised into theory and codes of ethics that contain unquestioned ethical and evaluative judgments? What are the contemporary discourses amongst university trained Counselling Psychology graduates regarding values and ethics in relation to their work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outline of project</strong></td>
<td>Twenty practising university-trained Counselling Psychologists will be recruited from a number of universities and randomly allocated to one of four focus groups so that each group contains five participants. An hour and a half semi-structured group discussion will be facilitated by the researcher with each of the focus groups at a convenient time and location to be arranged with participants. The discussions will be audio recorded and transcribed. The Researcher will facilitate the group discussions using a relatively open discussion schedule, asking participants to reflect on, and discuss amongst themselves, issues pertaining to the role of values and ethics in Counselling Psychology training and practice. Questions from the facilitator will be reactive to each group’s discussion and guided by the research topic. The following are examples of questions that may be used to get discussion started and generate further discussion as necessary:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What role do values and ethics play in Counselling Psychology training and practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How do you think your university training shaped your views on values and ethics in relation to: clients and therapists; theory and practice; training and the profession; you and others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcribed discussions will be analysed using discourse analysis, which will attempt to understand the discourses available to participants when discussing values and ethics in relation to their training and practice, and how these discourses may influence how they think, feel, and behave; how they may enable and/or constrain them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The participants</td>
<td>Participants will be given an ID code on recruitment, which will be used to identify them in all correspondence and on all documentation. All participants will be anonymised and all information will be treated as strictly confidential. Any identifying information given during discussions will be erased from the audio recordings and will not feature in the transcripts. This also applies to the names of universities mentioned within the interviews, which will be erased from the audio recordings and will not feature in the transcripts. Participants will be made aware that they are free to withdraw at any point by notifying the Researcher, either in person or using the contact details provided, stating their research ID code. Should this situation arise, all contributions made to the focus group discussion will be erased from the recordings and transcripts, although others’ surrounding comments will remain intact. Withdrawn participants’ data will not be analysed and will not be published. Surrounding data from other participants, including responses to withdrawn participants’ comments, will be analysed and may be published as part of the results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The focus group

All information disclosed in the focus groups will be treated as private and confidential and will be disclosed at participants’ discretion. Participants will be advised that what is discussed must not be shared outside of the focus group and will sign a consent form agreeing to this (see Appendix 3). Access to raw data from the focus group will be restricted to members of the Research Team: the Researcher, Research Supervisor, and Director of Studies. Information will only be shared outside of the Research Team in the following circumstances: where legally compelled to do so; where the Research Team has reason to believe that someone is at risk of serious harm; where disclosure is permitted by law and required to protect the interest of the Research Team. Should the need to share information outside of the Research Team become absolutely necessary, discussion with the participant(s) involved will take place prior to sharing wherever possible. Identifying details of participants unrelated to the need for sharing will be removed from the shared information.

Confidentiality

Whilst every effort will be made by the Researcher to ensure that participants’ contributions are treated as confidential by group members, due to the group nature of the study confidentiality cannot be guaranteed by the Researcher in respect of information that participants share outside of the research setting.

Discourse analysis

This approach assumes that there is no one version of the world and that no version of the world remains dominant forever because the social construction of reality through discourse is characterized by change and transformation. The proposed research does therefore aim to provide a definitive deconstruction of Counselling Psychologist’s discourses on the role of ethics and values in their training and practice; rather it hopes to illuminate some local and contingent discourses and discursive constructions in respect of this research topic, which may stimulate further thought and discussion.

Ethical Issues

The researcher abides by the BPS Code of Ethics and Conduct. Information disclosed in the focus groups will be treated as private and confidential and will be disclosed at participants’ discretion. Participants will be advised that what is discussed must not be shared outside of the focus group and will sign a consent form agreeing to this. Whilst every effort will be made by the Researcher to ensure that participants’ contributions are treated as confidential by group members, due to the group nature of the study, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed by the Researcher in respect of information that participants share outside of the research setting. This limitation will be communicated to participants. Participants will be asked to be mindful and respectful of themselves and others in what they disclose, and to observe confidentiality when mentioning client or sensitive material. They will be asked to maintain the anonymity of individuals, agencies or organisations they mention. Participants will be provided with debriefing information once the focus group has been conducted (see Appendix 4). If participation evokes any unpleasant or uncomfortable emotions in participants, or if they have concerns about any aspect of their participation or any other queries, they will be encouraged to raise this with the Researcher. Participants may arrange a meeting with the Researcher where their concerns can be discussed in confidence and assistance will be provided in finding them further support as necessary. Details of how to find a counselling psychologist or therapist via the BPS or BACP will be provided.

SECTION 3: USE OF PARTICIPANTS

Give details of the method of recruitment, and potential benefits to participants if any

Recruitment via university: The Counselling Psychology Programme Administrator at five universities will be contacted, asking if it is possible for them to send an email to Counselling Psychology trainees in their final year, or who finished their training in the past three years, inviting them to participate in the research. A follow up telephone call will be made to each Programme Administrator if nothing is heard in response to the email sent. Since potential participants will be contacted by their university Counselling Psychology Department, the Researcher will not have access to their details, thus preserving their anonymity. Permission will also be sought from the Programme Administrator at each of the universities to display posters asking for participants on the notice board(s) within each of the university Counselling Psychology Departments.

Recruitment via direct contact: Direct email contact will be made with potential participants known to the Researcher to be eligible for participation.

Recruitment via word of mouth: It is hoped that participants may also be recruited via word of mouth, either directly by the Researcher, or by other participants/potential participants.

Recruitment via the BPS: An advertisement for the research will feature in the BPS Division of Counselling Psychology monthly email, which is sent to subscribers.
**SECTION 5: PUBLICATION OF RESULTS**

**How will you disseminate your findings?**  
Findings will be included in a doctoral research thesis. Papers based upon this thesis and its findings may be submitted to academic journals for publication.

**How will you ensure the anonymity of your participants?**  
Participants will be allocated an ID code on being recruited, which will be used to identify them on all documentation, including results. Any identifying information given during the group discussions will be erased from the audio recordings and will not feature on the transcripts or results. This also applies to the names of universities and any members of staff mentioned in the interviews. Access to raw data from the focus group will be restricted to members of the Research Team: the Researcher, Research Supervisor, and Director of Studies. All information provided will be treated in confidence by the investigator and other group members, and participants’ identity will be protected in the publication of any findings.

**STORAGE OF DATA**

**How and where will data be stored and kept secure?**  
All electronic data will be stored on a password protected computer and encrypted using a password protected data encryption programme. All hard copy data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in a locked office at Roehampton University. Data will be stored for 10 years and then destroyed.

**EXTERNAL GUIDELINES**

**Are there any relevant subject-specific ethical guidelines?**  
The research will adhere to the following British Psychological Society codes:  
- Code of Ethics and Conduct (August 2009)  
- Ethical Principles for Conducting Research with Human Participants  
- Professional Practice Guidelines for Counselling Psychologists
Appendix 2 – Ethical approval confirmation

Email From: Lemady Rochard
Sent: 21 July 2010 15:22
Email To: Tom Graham
Subject: Ethics Application Ref. PT10/047 - GRAHAM, Tom

Dear Tom,

Ethics Application (Research Student)
Applicant: Tom Graham
Title: Values and Ethics in Counselling Psychology Training and Practice
School: HALS

I am pleased to confirm that the above application has been approved by Chairs Action on behalf of the Ethics Board. We do not require anything further in relation to this application.

Many thanks,

Lemady

Lemady Rochard
Research Policy Officer
Research and Business Development Office
208 Grove House, Froebel College
Roehampton University
Roehampton Lane
London
SW15 5PJ
Appendix 3 – Participant consent form

Values and Ethics in Counselling Psychology Training and Practice

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Brief Description of the Research Project:

This research will explore the way that university trained Counselling Psychologists talk about the role of values and ethics in their practice and how their university training shaped this. An hour and a half discussion amongst a group of up to five Counselling Psychology trainees/graduates will be facilitated by the Researcher. This group discussion will be audio recorded and transcribed and the transcriptions will be subject to discourse analysis. All information will be treated as strictly confidential and any identifying information given during the discussions will be erased from the audio recordings and will not feature in the transcripts.

An open discussion format will be employed, asking participants to reflect on, and discuss amongst themselves, the role of values and ethics in their Counselling Psychology training and practice:

- What do the terms values and ethics mean to you in relation to Counselling Psychology?
- What role do values and ethics play in Counselling Psychology training and practice?
- How do you think your training and practice experiences have shaped your views on values and ethics?

Confidentiality Statement:

Participants should be mindful and respectful of themselves and others in what they disclose, and should observe confidentiality when mentioning client related or sensitive material. Participants should endeavour to maintain the anonymity of individuals, agencies, or organisations they mention, including the university they attend/attended. All information disclosed by participants must be treated as private and confidential and must not be shared outside of the focus group, including the identity of other participants. Due to the group nature of the study, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed in respect of information participants share outside of the research setting. Access to raw data from the focus group will be restricted to members of the Research Team (Researcher, Research Supervisor, and Director of Studies) and may be reviewed by an external examiner. All parties abide by the BPS Code of Ethics and Conduct. Raw data will be stored electronically as a password protected encrypted file on a password protected computer by the Researcher. Information will only be shared with others in the following circumstances: where legally compelled to do so; where the Research Team has reason to believe that someone is at risk of serious harm; where disclosure is permitted by law and required to protect the interest of the Research Team. Should the need to share information outside of the Research Team become absolutely necessary, discussion will take place with the participant(s) involved prior to sharing wherever possible. Identifying details of participants unrelated to the need for sharing will be removed from any shared information.
**Consent Statement:**

Please read the statements below and indicate your consent by ticking the box beside each one:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Ticked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have read and understand the brief description of the research project and the confidentiality statement above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I will partake in an audio-recorded group discussion with other trainee/recently qualified Counselling Psychologists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that all transcripts and data drawn from the recordings will be anonymised by the removal of all identifying information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that the audio-recordings and transcripts will be kept for 10 years and will then be destroyed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that the anonymised data drawn from the transcripts will be used in a doctoral research thesis and potentially in future publications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that all information discussed is confidential and must not be shared with others outside of the focus group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed by the Researcher in respect of information participants share outside of the research setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had the opportunity to ask any questions I have about my participation in the research project and am satisfied with the responses given.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I agree to take part in this research and am aware that I am free to withdraw at any point by notifying the Researcher, either in person or using the contact details below, stating my research ID code. Should this situation arise, all contributions made to the focus group discussion will be erased from the recordings and transcripts, although others’ surrounding comments will remain intact. Withdrawn participants’ data will not be analysed and will not be published. Surrounding data from other participants, including responses to withdrawn participants’ comments, will be analysed and may be published as part of the results. I understand that the information I provide will be treated in confidence by the investigator and other group members, and that my identity will be protected in the publication of any findings.

Participant ID .................................................

Signature ..............................................

Date ..................................................

If you have a concern about any aspect of your participation, or any other queries, please raise this with the Researcher. However, if you would like to contact an independent party please contact the Dean of School or you may also contact the Director of Studies as shown below:

**Researcher:** Tom Graham. Email: grahamt11@roehampton.ac.uk. Tel: 07733103988

**Dean of School:** Michael Barham. Email: m.barham@roehampton.ac.uk. Tel: 020 8392 3617

**Director of Studies:** Dr. John Rae. Email: j.rae@roehampton.ac.uk. Tel: 020 8392 3612

School of Human and Life Sciences
Roehampton University
Whitelands College
Holybourne Avenue
London SW15 4JD
Appendix 4 – Participant debriefing form

Participants debriefing form

Participant ID ___________

Values and Ethics in Counselling Psychology Training and Practice

PARTICIPANT DEBRIEFING FORM

Brief Description of the Research Project:

Thank you for participating in this research project. The information you have provided will be analysed using discourse analysis, which will attempt to understand the discourses available to participants when discussing values and ethics in relation to their training and practice, how these discourses are constructed, and how these discourses may influence how you think, feel, and behave. This approach assumes that there is no one version of the world and that no version of the world remains dominant forever because the social construction of reality through discourse is characterised by change and transformation. The proposed research does not therefore aim to provide a definitive deconstruction of Counselling Psychologist’s discourses on the role of values and ethics in their training and practice; rather it hopes to illuminate some local and contingent discourses in respect of this research topic, which may stimulate further thought and discussion.

If you would like to be informed about the outcome of this research, please let me know so that a Summary Report can be prepared for you. For later requests you may contact me directly using the contact details below.

You remain free to withdraw at any point by notifying me, either in person or using the contact details below, stating the Participant ID Number given at the top of this form. Should this situation arise, all contributions made to the focus group discussion will be erased from the recordings and transcripts, although others’ surrounding comments will remain intact. Withdrawn participants’ data will not be analysed and will not be published. Surrounding data from other participants, including responses to withdrawn participants’ comments, will be analysed and may be published as part of the results.

If your participation in this research has evoked any unpleasant or uncomfortable emotions, or if you have concerns or queries about any aspect of your participation, please do not hesitate to raise them with me. Should you wish to contact an independent party from Roehampton University in relation to this research, please contact the Dean of School or you may also contact the Director of Studies as shown below:

Researcher: Tom Graham. Email: grahamt11@roehampton.ac.uk. Tel: 07733103988
Dean of School: Michael Barham. Email: m.barham@roehampton.ac.uk. Tel: 020 8392 3617
Director of Studies: Dr. John Rae. Email: j.rae@roehampton.ac.uk. Tel: 020 8392 3612

School of Human and Life Sciences
Roehampton University
Whitelands College
Holybourne Avenue
London SW15 4JD
Appendix 5 – Focus group schedule and script

Focus group schedule

1. Thanks and welcome
2. Information about the study:
   a. outline of schedule of events
   b. what is being investigated
   c. how the group discussion will be facilitated
   d. ground rules for participation
   e. confidentiality policy
3. Signing of consent forms and opportunity to ask questions
4. Warm up - participants asked to introduce themselves, stating:
   a. their name
   b. (optional) where they are at in their training
   c. (optional) where they are currently practising
   d. (optional) any other information they feel it is necessary to disclose that is relevant to
      the focus group discussion and/or research topic
5. Research recap - purpose of study and what is being investigated
6. Opportunity to ask questions
7. Question posed to begin focus group discussion
8. 90 minutes discussion (incl. further questions)
9. Debriefing:
   a. reiteration of confidentiality policy
   b. further information about the study and sources of support
   c. opportunity to ask questions
10. Feedback
11. Ending
Focus group script

1. Thanks and welcome

“Thank you all for giving up your valuable time to be here today to take part in this focus group.”

2. Information about the study

   a. Outline of schedule of events

   “This is an outline to the schedule of events so that you can see where we are throughout the course of the session:

   - First I will give you some information about the study
   - Then I will ask you to read and sign the consent forms you have been given
   - Then I will recap on the purpose of the study and what is being investigated
   - There will then be the opportunity for you to ask any questions you might have
   - Then I will pose a question to the group to begin discussion
   - We will then have up to 90 minutes for discussion
   - Which will be followed by a debriefing and the opportunity for questions
   - After this the session will be brought to a close
   - If you have travel expenses you would like reimbursing I will give you a travel expenses form to complete, otherwise you are free to go”

   b. what is being investigated

   “The purpose of this focus group is to explore your perceptions, definitions, and attitudes regarding notions of values and ethics in relation to your training and practice experiences. I am particularly interested in the ways in which notions of values and ethics have featured as part of your training and if and how you have transferred these notions into your practice. I am interested in any tensions you might have experienced between different conceptualisations of values and ethics within different aspects or contexts of counselling psychology. I am interested in your views on the values and ethics of counselling psychology; what this means to you, and how you speak about values and ethics when reflecting on your training and practice experiences.”

   c. how the group discussion will be facilitated

   “You will have up to 90 minutes for an open discussion on the research topic which I will facilitate. I will pose a question to the group to get discussion started, after which you are encouraged to generate discussion amongst yourselves by responding to each others’ contributions. I may occasionally pose further questions to the group as discussion progresses, either to clarify something that has been said, to open up an area that might be interesting for further discussion, or to bring the focus of discussion back to the research topic. I will bring discussion to a close after around 90 minutes and there will then be a debriefing period and an opportunity for you to ask any questions. I would also welcome any feedback you might have on your participation experience: the way in which the group was conducted; how it felt to participate; which areas were most interesting to you and which were least; which questions were clear and which were confusing etc. All comments are welcome and will be useful to me so please speak freely. If anything occurs to you after the session that you’d like to discuss with me further, or you think might be useful to me, please feel free to contact me via email or telephone using the contact details provided.”

   d. ground rules for participation

   “During the focus group discussion, please be mindful and respectful of yourselves and others in what you choose to disclose, and please observe confidentiality when mentioning any client or sensitive material. Also please try to maintain the anonymity of any individuals, agencies, or organisations you
might mention, including your university. The research does not intend to engender discussion comparing different university courses or practice settings but instead seeks to gain some insight into each participant's unique experiences of their university training and practice. It is your opinions that are important to me and there are no right or wrong answers when considering the research topic or any of the terms used such as "values" and "ethics", it is your definitions and the way you talk about such terms that I am interested in. Don't worry about trying to build consensus amongst yourselves as a group; I'm interested in all the various comments you might have. You are not required to draw contrasts or comparisons between your experiences, although this may naturally emerge as part of the group discussion. You do not need to agree or disagree with what others in the group say, but you do need to state your point of view without making any negative comments or 'put downs' about others. Please don't talk over each other, or at the same time, and observe each others' right to contribute and offer thoughts and opinion."

   e. confidentiality policy

“All information disclosed by participants must be treated as private and confidential and must not be shared outside of the focus group, including the identity of other participants. All information disclosed by participants will be treated as private and confidential by myself and the research team, and will only be shared with others where the Research Team has reason to believe that someone is at risk of serious harm, or where legally compelled to do so.”

3. Signing of consent forms and opportunity to ask questions

“Please now take a moment to read the Participant Consent Form, paying particular attention to the confidentiality statement, and feel free to ask me any questions you might have. If you are happy with the content of the form and the confidentiality statement, and agree to the terms and conditions stated, please check the boxes and sign the form on page 2.”

4. Warm up

“Some of you may already know each other and some of you may not, so please can we go round the group and have some brief introductions. If you could please state your name, and if you'd like to, where you are at in your training and practice, and any other information you feel it is necessary to share with the group that is relevant to the focus group discussion and/or the research topic.”

5. Research recap

To recap, the purpose of this focus group is to explore your perceptions, definitions, and attitudes regarding notions of values and ethics in relation to your training and practice experiences. I am particularly interested in the ways in which notions of values and ethics have featured as part of your training and how you have transferred these notions into your practice. I am interested in any tensions you might have experienced between different conceptualisations of values and ethics within different aspects or contexts of counselling psychology. I am interested in your views on the values and ethics of counselling psychology; what this means to you, and how you speak about values and ethics when reflecting on your training and practice experiences.

6. Opportunity to ask questions

“Does any have any questions before I pose a question to get discussion started?”

7. Question posed to begin focus group discussion

“What do the terms values and ethics mean to you in relation to counselling psychology?”
8. 90 minutes discussion (incl. further questions)

“How do you think your training experiences have shaped your views on values and ethics?”

“How do you think your practice experiences have shaped your views on values and ethics?”

9. Debriefing

a. reiteration of confidentiality policy

“Thank you all very much for your contributions. Please remember that all information disclosed by participants must be treated as private and confidential and must not be shared outside of the focus group.”

b. further information about the study and sources of support

“The information you have provided will be transcribed and analysed using discourse analysis, which will attempt to understand the discourses available to you when discussing values and ethics in relation to your training and practice, how these discourses are constructed, and how these discourses may influence how you think, feel, and behave. I hope that you found the group discussion interesting and that it didn’t raise anything too distressing for you. Should any of you have any concerns, you may wish to raise them with me and the group now or you may prefer to raise them with me in private. Should you wish to, you can arrange a meeting with me where your concerns can be discussed in confidence, and I will endeavour to provide you with assistance in finding any further support you might need.

c. opportunity to ask questions

Does anyone have any concerns or questions they would like to raise now?”

10. Feedback

“I would welcome any feedback on your participation experience should you have any, but please do not feel obliged to comment if you don’t wish to. Does anyone have any feedback on participating in the group: the way in which the group was facilitated; how it felt to participate; which areas were most interesting to you and which were least; which questions were clear and which were confusing?”

11. Ending

“Thank you for your participation today, it is very much appreciated. Please remember the confidentiality statement you have each signed and be mindful of what you share with others on leaving the group today. Does anyone have any final questions?”
What do the terms values and ethics mean to you in relation to counselling psychology?

Hmm.

Remember there’s no right or wrong answers.

What do values and ethics?

Yeah what do those two terms mean to you when, when t-

In terms of counselling [psychology ]

[In relation to counselling psychology]

[In terms of counselling psychology] yeah.

That’s the difficult part of the question.

I would say the rules by which you conduct your practice, you view yourself, erm, as a practitioner and, err, the way you conduct your therapeutic encounters, the way you conduct yourself outside those therapeutic encounters in terms of your relationship with the clients, what you, kind of, obviously the ethics in terms of how, how you run the sessions and boundaries and also outside, kind of what you, what you do with that material, who you share it with, erm, confidentiality, things like that I would say. When you say ethics that for me is like one of the main things, confidentiality, erm, kind of making sure that, I guess as a counselling psychology trainee you’re, you need to always get consent, so there’s always that conflict and tension between, erm, getting consent for, for erm, your, your own progression, or for your, or for your, erm, experience, but also for the client to actually, how true, how, how kind of ethical is it for the client, and how, how, yeah. I think it actually, erm, is against my value as a therapist, asking for consent for your own progression or for your, erm, qualification, so it doesn’t, yeah it conflicts my value but I guess you do it ’cause it’s an ethical-

So for you there’s something about a conflict between your personal values as a counselling psychologist and

And erm, ethical boundaries, so in terms of training as a counselling psychologist you need to get consent from your clients in terms of presenting their, their, their problems and case studies and etc. erm, and, and, oh sorry I’ve lost my train of thought but, yeah, basically that it conflicts, as my value as a therapist is to keep everything within the context of the room, or maximum to supervision or to personal therapy, things that progress the therapeutic encounter, the relationship, and erm, as a trainee you need to do things that progress your own career and your own development and it’s actually, it’s err helpful for the client in that you spend a lot more time thinking about them but it’s actually quite a selfish experience for me and it makes my desire and neediness of the client very different and it really interferes with that interaction, the first session of therapy I’m always thinking, I’m always anxious about, oh my god which point is good for me to ask for consent? Should I ask now? Do you think now? Do you think he’s gonna say yes? Will she say yes? How do they feel? Oh my gosh, do they think I’m, do they think I’m good or bad, has it, has it gone well? Did, did they just give it to me smooth? Am I clear? Can I, can I get, get this for my course? And it’s really really not where I wanna be because all I wanna really be is containing and safe and with their, and with them and their stuff and I’m, kind of, conflicts constantly thrown back in that first session to my own stuff. It really only really affects that first session or at whatever point
I have the guts to ask them for consent so it really interferes, so in terms, well the first thing that comes to my mind when you say ethics and values is that conflict and that difficulty I’m currently facing as a third year trainee, finishing, needing to get consent for different course-works and, and that, and also kind of really, at this point, having a much more formed sense of my identity as a psychologist and what I would think is appropriate and not appropriate. What about you guys?

<Laughter>

I was thinking more about the erm, for example the BPS err code of conduct and ethics, err where it’s kind of clearly written how erm psychologists don’t want, you know, what you should look out for and what’s important, and to kind of adhere to the standards, for example when we do research or when we are with clients, so that was the first thing that came into my mind when I heard ethics and values, erm, and yeah I guess from what you were saying as well, erm, I wa- I feel more that’s err sort of something about, erm, erm o- obviously it’s selfish because you also progress your career but it’s also important, erm, to learn and to kind of err be a good therapist for clients and in order to be that you need to erm, to learn and you need erm, the c- err the consent of of clients to be able to do that, so in that sense I don’t really feel selfish in that respect because it is important to, erm for other clients you have in the future, and also for that client because you were saying that you think a bit more about it and you have more time to reflect on, on issues with that client. So yeah, I don’t really share I think this sort of tension so much.

Mmm, I would say like, I’ve got a real conflict of interests though, that I would relate with in what you’re describing, we’ve even talked about it before that, the, the level of dependency and needs that I feel in relation to, erm, particular clients, if you don’t have much choice or there’s a time limit or, erm, there’s particular learning requirements you have to demonstrate and maybe, you know? Err there’s a real fear and anxiety around that and what am I willing to do, possibly, in order to, you know would I breach my own ethical and moral standpoint on what I feel would be coercive or maybe leading or, you know erm something like that with a client in order to get, you know consent to, to present their work, err, or the work we’re doing together, yeah? And, erm, like I’ve been fearful that I would be driven to do something like that by institutional requirements like this training and, erm, it’s a horrible horrible feeling because the more I would question myself the more I’d be like, oh my god like, you know maybe I, I might do that if I really really really really had to, and I wouldn’t, I mean, the thing is, if I had to face a year, repeating a year because I couldn’t get a piece of consent, right, that’s gonna be anonymised and confidential and the whole lot, err you know it’s a little like, oh shit who is going, who would wor- I don’t know, I mean you , I, is it like an alcoholic kind of going through the motions of, gee you know I fancy a drink but I shouldn’t have a drink, you know I have the a real angel and devil on my shoulder, and I’ve been close to that with, you know, one of my pieces of coursework where, I mean I, what I did was, to protect myself, was to ally myself with my supervisor and say, look I’m really worried that I might do this, you know, I might, you know be overly, maybe erm, coercive in trying to recruit the, the mother and daughter I’m working with here so maybe he’d think with me, if we come up with a script of how I might put it to them, that would, you could verify that it’s not overly leading you know? ‘Cause I was actually really worried, that I, I’d be like my desperation would be coming across or something, erm, and so he went through it kind of with me about what would be like a, a reasonable thing to, to say, erm, and that way I followed that and, I mean it was kind of prescriptive but it, I was that anxious of my need getting in the way or what I would do if, you know, they, they didn’t want to agree or whatever, erm, that it, it ca- it came in between me and like how I was in the first session with them, the therapeutic relationship, the balance of power, the conflicts of interest, my own anxiety and my
own morals, like where do, what am I willing to do? You know am I willing to possibly compromise the trust of the, the very basic trust that you have to have in a relationship like that and possibly misuse my power in order to gratify my needs and concerns, my training requirements, erm, I really really struggled with that and, erm, I was lucky that it worked out, you know? And I like to think that, I wouldn’t, I wouldn’t have been leading or I wouldn’t have you know, erm, somehow fudged things or something you know but, it’s a horrible feeling to have to have and those questions are very difficult, you know?

Yeah, I guess I always ask every client, every single client I have, with the first initial contract, I always ask them for permission so I never, erm, have this sort of, I, I choose a particular client for a particular piece of coursework, so whenever I have a client I try to get the c- their consent and ask them so sort of as a standard question, so I don’t really f- have such a, make such a big deal out of it because I, I do it just a re- on a regular basis? And then that also feels that I don’t let clients, err, on this sort of particular, you know I’m seeing them I think, oh they might be interesting so I’m asking them, so it’s more about I’m asking everyone and decide afterwards what, which might be useful for coursework,

Yeah [the mental stress pressure I think is much less.] [so in that sense maybe that helps.] Mmm, yeah.

I could, I, I totally get what you’re saying, it’s not the asking my clients for permission, it’s just, it’s like, I’m fine with that, like in my first second and third year I, I asked maybe a third of my clients sometimes more, just so I have enough material whatever, but I guess it’s when, basically erm, it’s a bit like if you have a big pond or a small pond to choose from yeah? And with my, yeah my systemic placement I only have two possible people I could choose from, err, for the particular module that we’re at here, whatever, so that’s when it becomes more of an issue, it’s not, not the asking it’s the, the need or the level of dependency, erm, no matter ( ) the individual or you know err clients or client, you know, erm, ( )

How do you two feel about this kind of tension, I feel like there’s a bit of a slight difference between you two, maybe?

I think the tension comes out in a number of areas of training especially when it comes to getting the, the right, like, coursework and the right amount of hours that are required, I mean I experience that tension, when I’m tight for hours I see the client as an hour, unfortunately, not as the client and if the client doesn’t come the first thing that comes to mind is, I’ve lost an hour, not what’s, you know, like what’s up with the client and my instinct to call would be to see, to if he- if he could come, you know as soon as possible so I don’t lose the hour, not to see, you know and then it’s very different when I, when I have enou- you know when I’m ok, when it’s that point in the year when I have enough then I notice I’m very different, you know and a client not coming, obviously it’s how I would like to be and what where I feel my values as a counselling psychologist are and should be, it would be more about, erm, you know what’s up with the client and how is this, does this tell me anything about what’s happening in our relationship, does it tell me anything about what’s happening in their lives etc. So I think there is quite a, a conflict, I, I can identify very much with the issue of consent as well, I think not just that I think it’s ([trust].)

[Yeah I think it’s important] what you were saying about the hour is also related if you’re working and getting paid for it as well, so you, you know if you were in a private practice later or if you get paid for a session as a sessional worker, then you also have this, oh I’ve just lost £25 <Laughs> so that’s something that’s just really horrible, horrible to think err about I guess as well if you, but that’s sort of kind of a natural response I guess if you also have to live from what you are doing
Mmmhm, uhuh [uhuh.]

[and you know] if that’s ethically, I don’t know, or is that appropriate or politically correct to think that way obviously [[    ]].

[I don’t, I mean, I (guess) not really but.]

Also leaving the therapy going on longer in duration than possibly (they need).

A1

I think this is a very very common thing, not just for trainees, I think especially even for people in private practice, where if you’re in the NHS people will be shoving, shoving you to like push them it’s out too soon and you’re like, oh no we I wanna hold on to them for longer, erm, because I don’t feel like it’s enough, and you might be putting them out too late if you have a, an incentive that you’re

A5

[That’s true, yeah.]

[gonna gain, erm] from actually holding on and, erm, and again that’s where, where do you have your ethical and moral standpoint as to what you feel is helpful because, erm, a person could be in therapy for life if you leave them, you know, there’s always something coming up err but, why are you there for, you know, who are you, whose needs are you serving, and it’s a it’s a mutual need thing, so there is, there’s motivations on both sides for you to, to be there, and not just for the therapeutic value of it but in an actual monetary way ‘cause it’s a business as well, like and that’s a fact of life, I don’t feel guilty, down the line I’m getting paid for doing the job you know? Erm, but I would, if I thought I was using them, s- more for my purpose than for what they’re, their, you know what I mean?

Hmm.

It’s interesting what you say about whose need are you serving, because I often find, besides maybe I don’t know, I’m not yet in the money situation so it’s not about money or NHS times, that I kind of tend to actually fight that if, if someone tells me to do something because that’s the standard I tend to want to bend the rules but sometimes for example I worked with this couple where yes I had to present the case and was not, that worked that worked fine with regards to consent but I felt like I was not yet fit in the sense that I was still getting used to working with couples and I, and I didn’t offer them enough, so I wanted them to come longer so that we could actually do something that in my eyes was good and useful and something came out of it but I’m not sure if that was their need or my need to prove that I can do it, you know what I mean? Or it’s some sort of err unrelenting standards kind of situation but not unrelenting just wanting a certain amount of things to come out of it. So in that case, as well.

So could you say a bit more about if, if there is some sort of notion of, of there being different kinds of values or ethics of the university or the institution, to use your word, and then there are different kind of ethics and values of either whether you term that being a practitioner or something personal, what are those two different sets?

I think for me this was quite evident this year, ‘cause I’m working in a very short term therapy setting and six sessions is what it is, erm, and I’m asked to kind of literally churn people out of the system and th- that for me, even just that sentence which I, it was actually said to me, erm, really kind of gets me going, I, I can’t, I feel very strongly about that and I mean I understand to some extent the restrictions of err money and time and whatnot but my entering counselling psychology had something to do with wanting to focus on the individual and understanding that individual and if that individual can do it in six sessions, in four, fine, if they can’t then you need to work with that somehow, you can’t go on forever, that’s ok, because there are limited resources, but you know, there is an amount of flexibility that needs to be there in my opinion, erm and within the setting
there isn’t this flexibility absolutely, so I find myself, I don’t even know how I reconcile that, it’s, it’s an ongoing process, I, I it’s difficult for me, I find myself thinking, ok then I need to make the changes as a therapist I need to be more efficient, more, maybe a bit more directive I need to be, you know, stepping up on my game in a sense, I don’t know if that’s the right English expression, erm, but, I don’t know, I don’t know ( ) thing, but it’s been something that I’ve been battling over this year I think, erm, out of

I mean I’m in a similar setting where you only have six sessions and I f- I find that quite challenging as well but then I, I think I kind of justify it in the sense of giving them a flavour of therapy, of how a therapeutic relationship might be like, so if they enter at a, err later on again they know it is possible and they’ve, they have some valuable experience even though it might have not changed a lot in that present moment but at least they had some, yeah good experience about it, but I guess that’s sort of for me about justifying why it is six sessions so in, in order for me to be able to work in a setting like that, rather than actually thinking so much about the client it’s just about, for me, finding an excuse that sounds good so I can, I can continue working there, you know, so yeah it’s a, quite a tension I find that as well.

I, I think it goes against my basic value of what counselling or healing is in effect because the whole idea of it being through a relationship, that you have a different sort of relationship to maybe outside relationships which are difficult or whatever, erm, a- and that requires a certain setting and a certain amount of time which will differ from person to person, so if they’re coming to six sessions for you then three months later they’re coming for six sessions for me, that relationship is not there, so for me, maybe not ultimately but nearly, that kind of healing base, that that base from where you heal cannot really occur and it’s the whole, the whole system that is pushing this, they’re pushing you know CBT, they’re pushing let’s let’s reduce erm symptoms, let’s make people seem like they’re better, work, function better, ok, work, function but err wha- what’s underlying that you know?

Feel better, it’s not necessarily the same

Yeah, feel better or be better.

be better, what’s the difference between that?

Mmm. Erm, I- every time this this thing comes to mind, a book comes to mind, err A Brave New World by someone Huxley, I can’t remember his name, erm, I think it’s Adolf or something actually

That’s the one. I think it’s, like, we’re on a production line, we’re trying to get, churn people out, I was actually, it was actually used, the sentence, erm, go through the motions kind of thing and I find it very difficult because then I tend to want to, yes the motions are important but let’s give them meaning and sometimes it’s not very easy to do that in six sessions.

And I guess that links with err antidepressants as well, ‘cause most of the clients, or lots of the clients I’m seeing, are from GP- referred by GPs and they, most of them are on antidepressant in some form, low dosage or whatever and that’s a similar approach to, okay just give them a pill and they’ll get better, or give them six sessions they get better, just get them, you know, get them going again, get them working again, so we can err, erm, err improve our statistics and reduce our waiting lists and yeah, it can be quite cynical, I think, and that’s something, yeah.

Well even clients in a way that’s what they want

[Mmmhmm. Yeah. Quick fix.]

[they want to have their symptoms reduced they can keep] going on kind of living life on the surface
of it, maybe it’s a bit judgemental of me but, you know, the whole idea of the unexamined life is not worth living is probably exactly why I’m into psycho- counselling psychology or psychology in general because that’s the examined life, more examined than that I don’t think you’re (going to get), anyway I don’t know what you think

<Laughter>

A3 I’m monopolising this thing.

A1 You’re fine.

A3 So, yeah, that’s what I, that’s what’s going on in my head.

A1 Mmm, I, I was thinking about like, ‘cause this is a quite broad sectored thing, you have the university

A3 Mmmhmm.

A1 demonstr- demonstrable err, kind of needs, okay, for fulfilling your educational requirements, for justifying err certain things, right? Now, in terms of where and what I have learned err the university has provided with me lots of thought and consideration and a place to develop you know, but the competency sometimes can be in conflict with the principles, or the values, or the ethics that you’re also being taught in, you know, in terms of erm, err, the practice, I guess that we spoke a bit earlier about conflict you know and so, erm, in order to show something you have to like get evidence for it, so like when, you know it’s kind of like ethos, so there’s a lot of overlap like evidence-based practice, then you have practice-based evidence as well so it tells you that maybe six sessions for this person in this particular moment and treating the clients as a unique individual, erm, I, I would say following our assessment err that, y- you know, it might be helpful for a bit longer, right, but there’s a lack of flexibility, possibly, that’s in there, or erm, there’s a kind of course of nature to what, what the different systems that you’re in, kind of place upon you so here I have to show my work in a certain way, I have to work in a certain way, erm, according to what the evidence says, which makes sense but there’s, there’s less flexibility, in, in, in how you can think about it and what you can do, in, in terms of the relationship in some way, erm, and I think that applies in the NHS, it applies in the university, it applies possibly, erm in any organisational setting where you have to work with other people with particular policies and procedures and the general zeitgeist of the time and at the moment there’s erm, a very specific way that people are supposed to work even if their training models might have been different, erm, you know, so, like, some people worry about having a job if they’re existential, err, you know, therapist or, err, you know person-centred or whatever you have to justify your work and sometimes things aren’t that easy to justify. You may, you may have a feel or you may kind of know or sense it or put up a good argument for it but you may not be quite so easy to, to justify what you’re doing, erm, I think like, there can be conflict of interest between what you have to show and do next to what you may feel would be helpful to do or to your practice are kind of helpful at times, so you can flexibly try out a bit more so, erm, in being curious and being willing to be versatile, I think it’s harder to do that now, like, within, within the learning outcomes of your training and possibly within the settings that your practicing, you know, erm, and I think the universities have to go by the same kind of principles ‘cause they’re regulated, err as well, you know, an- and all of that makes sense but if you’re the individual developing and you’re trying to think for yourself, you’re trying to, you know, see how do I fit in with all of this? Like my personal value is if I don’t respect the individual and their needs and what, you know, really would help them the most then I’m not, I’m not really doing my job, I’m not really doing what I’m saying I’m doing, erm, and I’m not necessarily comfortable with that, so

MOD So how do you think your training has shaped your views on what these terms mean values and ethics?
| A1 | I think in terms of ethical responsibility, like, the values of the therapeutic relationship, the kind of humanistic values, the core values of the importance of the person, erm, I think they’re all very much emphasised, err how- however, it isn’t in a vacuum so they do also let you know, or you know kind of show that there is an evidence-based practice culture and you do have to have specific requirements as to what you’re gonna demonstrate and things so, erm, they can be in conflict with each other and that’s kind of something that has been discussed relatively openly, I think that’s kind of helpful but, erm, the nature of counselling psychology values and identity is also evolving and like clinical psychology and counselling psychology now are becoming slightly more intermingled and then you have different models of thinking like the medical model, you know which may be more symptom-based or, err, I guess pathologising, possibly, than maybe err looking at the individual and systemic or constructio- social constructionist kind of ideas, so the philosophy of thinking as well is kind of something that’s important in terms of your approach to thinking about your work, err what you value in it and how you go about it, you know, erm, [I don’t know.] [And do you feel that’s something] that’s, that’s come out through your course, that’s been kind of encouraged and |
| MOD | Yeah to think, to be aware, to consider, you know all sorts of different ways of thinking, you know, theories of knowledge, ac- acquiring, you know, erm, difficulties or, or presenting issues, err, how you may treat them, the different ways that they all seem to work, like the common factors idea that, you know, it doesn’t really matter which therapy you go for it seems that the outcome is pretty much similar err in most, some slightly better than others you know but, I mean there’s no glorifying, there’s no complete denial, you know, erm which is helpful I think, but also, you know I remember the first year when I was hearing about the dodo, you know, effect or whatever and I was thinking, what the hell am I training in like field depth for these two things, you know, but there is a real good sense of identity you know, having a sense of grounding like a formulation you know? It may not be the way of understanding the person but it’s a good way to frame how you work or the way you’re understanding and you can add in new stuff so, in the same way like, my identity as a counselling psychologist has been very much shaped by what I have learned, the specific models of therapy that I’ve learnt, with consideration that others would work possibly just as well too, erm but, you know, you can’t do everything at, at once, so it takes a long time to get any specific skills, erm, you know kind of developed really to be have any expertise if there is possible to have expertise in what we do outside of gaining experience you know? You know I think I’ve gone on a waffle, I don’t know. |
| A2 | I think another value is that of supervision, that the course has kind of erm instilled in us this value of having good supervision and always taking things to supervision and utilising supervision and I think another, again another kind of conflict is when your supervisor has a different model or way of practising than you and therefore kind of encourages you to maybe break ethical boundaries that, erm, that fit with your theoretical approach but don’t necessarily fit with theirs, for example consent, my psychodynamic supervisor says that in all the psychodynamic books, in all of the literature, there’s never any consent been asked for, and it’s all changed but she completely felt it was completely unethical and inappropriate and how difficult that ma- made it for me I ended up not being able to get consent from that placement because I think the conflict that arose in me was too, I couldn’t really manage it with my clients I couldn’t really justify, I couldn’t get it out I couldn’t ask in this service, I’ve gone to my other services that I work for but it just showed me how much your supervisor can impact, kind of the value placed in your supervisor, them as the expert you
know you’re really wanting to take their advice and guidance but when it actually comes into conflict with your training and your needs and your own ethical boundaries and how I wasn’t really willing to project that on to my client, I wasn’t really willing to let that get in the way of the therapeutic relationship and I, it just, it was very difficult for me ‘cause she said, my supervisor said to me, you can ask, do what you want, but just so you know I think it’s completely unethical, no psychodynamic therapist would ever ask for consent and erm, and it then kind of led err feeding quite a lot of my own insecurities, erm about say being a trainee, being young, all these different things, erm she managed to bring up for me that probably her psychodynamic thing brings up all my anxieties but erm, just how much that kind of you have this value of using supervision to enhance your practice and I’m sure this experience will enhance my practice in the future, I think while I’m going through it it’s quite challenging for me to, to value what she’s saying and also to find myself and the confidence within myself to stick to what I believe in and stick to my own kind of, my own e-experience which has shown me that let’s say CBT is very helpful, so even if it doesn’t fit what, what she feels it’s used for it fits with me and also that it doesn’t always break the, the therapeutic relationship if you ask for consent or if you, if you are directive or certain things like that so I think there’s that, again another kind of conflict between your own personal identity and your supervisor’s identity and how you can kind of manage that and the university, it, the university identity almost, so all the different types of influences shaping your values and how to kind of come up with your own.

A1 Mmm.

MOD So you’ve said a bit about personal identity and you’ve also said personal values

A2 Mmm.

MOD and personal ethical boundaries

A2 Mmm.

MOD so could you say a bit more about what they are?

A2 So my own identity as a counselling psychologist obviously based on my values, so value of the client, whatever they bring, going with what they bring, putting the client in front of the model I’m using and not the model in front of the client, which I think in training is quite hard, you wanna use your CBT, you wanna put it in to practise and feel successful and if you haven’t done your thought record effectively or you haven’t checked in on the homework task properly then you feel like, shoot I’m a crap CBT therapist, but actually you’ve actually gone with what the client has brought, and quite hard to stick to an agenda but knowing the value of sticking to an agenda and that’s really if the client has come for CBT they, and you’ve, you’ve discussed and given them education properly about what CBT is, you’ve kind of made the commitment that you will be guiding them and trying to help them get back on track when they don’t do their homework and, you know like, keeping them focused on the, on the things, erm, and then kind of, how easy it is to veer away from that with them, sorry I’m trying to go back to your, the question you’re asking me, I keep, it’s hard to like, erm, stick with the values and ethics ‘cause I think that it just, that word really brings, I can see it with all of us, it’s not really, it’s very hard to stay with it, it seems like I just wanna go on other, other avenues because maybe that, what my values are, is kind of really a load of experience that kind of informs my values, so back to the CBT aspect

<Laughter>

A2 so the value of erm, yes, putting the client in front of the model

A1 Subjective experience kind of thing?

A2 yeah that
Right.

put the, yeah, and, and going with their subjective experience and not imposing but kind of trying to also help them, so if you’re sticking to using a certain therapeutic model it’s not always so beneficial if you continue with their, with their kind of thought processes and their tangents and you kind of go in to their resistance instead of challenging it, so trying to always weigh that up and balance between, between what the client is bringing, going with their subjective, subjective experience but also knowi- going with what, what the research has taught and what you kind of have, know is useful, there’s no point in intro-

And formulation also.

yeah, introducing say like a thought record and then not helping them understand what automatic thoughts are and understanding and trying to become a better observer of their thoughts if they don’t stick with it, it’s easy for them to go off, so that’s one value, I’m trying to get it, I guess erm, another value would be, erm, an ethical, I said something about you know keeping the material in the, in the room and kind of always discussing with the clients at the beginning the fact that this is their confidential space and I, I kind of try to say that if there’s, I do meet with a supervisor weekly, I say to them so if there’s anything you really are, you know intent that I don’t repeat, as long as it’s not a risk to yourself or others around you please do indicate that to me, so there’s that kind of that, I want them to know that there is that safety and trust and even though I do share things that I, I’m willing to, to, to keep things within, within the therapeutic room and that’s I guess something ethical for me about not breaking any risk barriers but also, erm, being true to my client.

I think there’s something about that though like you you mentioned at the beginning rules, I mean there’s rules and there are guidelines and there’s kind of a mixture of the two, it’s not so strict, because that’s the moral or ethical grey area, you know it’s why it’s a whole area of kind of research or, or, you know, well, it exists kinda, like in terms of disclosing sometimes that can be helpful and sometimes it’s not, depending on how much you do it and your motivations for it and possibly even you know the individuals ( ), it’s very difficult to say with these things, certain things that are risky can potentially be helpful and potentially be unhelpful, or damaging or, you know, erm, ethically, you know, possibly questionable, you know, erm, but it’s not always easy to say, you know? Erm, and I was thinking about competency when you were talking like so we were, we were, you know part of the university erm requirements is that you evaluate your own competency throughout, as does your supervisor, and you shouldn’t work with someone who you don’t feel competent to work with. However, when I first started seeing clients in my very first year I had zero competency in practicing CBT when I saw my first client and that would be ethically, you know, probably extremely questionable and also in terms of the university, erm, I would wonder that, why are they allowing me to practice without necessarily having taught me how to do CBT to a high enough standard before I start to practice? And I, I wondered about that myself, I, I thought, I questioned my own ethics at that time, I felt like, mmm I’m supposed to practice ‘cause I need to do the hours but I’m also not supposed to practice until I’m competent to practice with this individual, erm and there’s a time limit to this and I know that if I wait around until I feel like good and ready...

whenever that may be, you know

You fail here.

erm, I’m fucked, you know?

So what am I gonna do?
| 403 | <Laughter>  
| 404 | A1  
I’m gonna, I’m gonna try my best, you know, erm within my competencies as a person, as someone  
who’s worked with people who are very distressed and all sorts before, erm, I, I, I, I have a good  
sense of a therapeutic relationship without training, specifically I’d done counselling courses before  
anyway but in terms of what I’m provided here, erm, if I was presenting myself as a CBT therapist I  
thought, no way could I justify that at this point you know? But erm, it can you know, it’s like  
competency’s really hard to evaluate too because every time you, you change model and you’re  
encouraged to train or, you know do your practice in more than one model during your training,  
erm, and I’ve done four, each time I’m starting at the beginning I’m like that individual back in first  
year because, totally different skills, got totally different learning requirements, erm, environment,  
context, population, complexity, the whole lot, it’s totally different and, erm, and the same issue  
keeps coming up for me I feel like deskilled, incompetent, questioning my ethical stance on, you  
know, err am I fit to practice with this person, would they be better off with someone more  
experienced in training? I have to be relatively direct about, you know, being a trainee but saying  
how much experience I have could undermine their trust in, or belief in, the therapeutic relationship  
and the placebo effect is a big part of their efficacy, so I, I shouldn’t be undermining the one thing  
that I have going for me, erm, you know, or, you know that it would be ethically important for them  
to have, but at the same time without disclosing my lack of experience am I being ethically immoral,  
erm, or not immoral, but ethically questionable I’ll put it that way, erm, but it’s a very interesting  
thing competency, ‘cause I’ve, I’ve done some research as part of my research, err into supervision  
and expertise and how it’s developed and how long it takes, and it takes about ten years for  
someone to become kind of an expert in a particular skill, not particular model, skill, one skill, like  
say intervention even or, err, you know, anything, right? Erm, so I’ll wait around ten years, how will  
you get to that ten year period by practicing the skill, right? Erm, you can’t practice a skill or become  
competent, err, you have to be incompetent while you’re becoming competent if you know what I  
mean, so you have to practice the skill while getting to where you’re going. The very principle they  
have here is, you do not practice until you are competent, is an oxymoron, or it’s contradictory in  
terms you know? You can’t become competent without being incompetent going towards  
competency, practicing the skills which you do not fully have the, you know, experience or  
knowledge to do to that required competency level to say that yes now I’m good to practice, or kind  
of reach a point in time where I feel like, you know I met the requirement that they have for  
working, you know? Erm, I I just find it, it’s a, I don’t know I find it kind of funny but it’s an ethical  
dilemma of a sort like, amongst the many, err  
| 405 | A1, I, sorry, I, I like what you said about the first year, I completely agree with that, that you- we  
started seeing clients even before having started lectures in CBT, I think I did at least, and totally  
agree with you, but what you’re talking about now, you know, fit to practice, duty of care comes up,  
I, I don’t know if you’re interchanging the two ‘cause fit to practice, I don’t know if that’s to do with  
the model or to do with your own personal situations, let’s say if you, I don’t know, err, just been  
through a separation of sorts let’s say, you- it’s difficult maybe to work with someone who’s going  
through a separation of sorts because it’s way too close to home for you to be able to, to help  
effectively, erm, whereas duty of care, you know there is, there is also the concept of being good  
enough, you don’t have to be skilled completely, ten year kind of guarantee thing, erm, you can be  
good enough, I guess.  
| 406 | A1  
I totally agree but what I was saying was that if you look at what they actually have written here as  
part of the requirements for the model, for the module, erm, placement module, you cannot
practice unless you feel competent to do so and you should refer to someone who is if you’re not, you know?

That’s our institution you say?

This is [Not HPC or]

[this is] yeah our placement module, our training programme, the institutional [requirements]

[I wasn’t even aware of that.]

and I find that that’s ridiculous in, i- no I mean it makes sense, like in terms of how- am I good enough, right? But it’s not how they put it.

Mmm.

Do you understand what I’m saying?

Mmm.

Right.

Because another value that is stressed and is an important value for me is the idea of practice, the idea of making mistakes but, you know and I think it’s, it’s been my impression that it’s been, you know discussed here as well, the idea that even when we present a case or we discuss a case that it doesn’t need to be, erm you know, perfect, to the contrary, it’s important to reflect and discuss where your challenges were and also what you can improve on and that’s the only way you can improve, by practicing, making mistakes, going over those mistakes, I think for me it’s

You can learn by making successes and seeing what worked well too like

<Laughter>

Yes that’s true

there’s two ways.

but I don’t think you can learn just on success.

Yeah, I agree.

For me, it’s, my value is that, the fact that I have to make m- I have to make a mistake but I’ve learnt a lot from my mistakes

Sure.

I guess.

And I guess that’s also when you are with a client and have a th- good therapeutic relationship that’s something that you are working with as well, of seeing what works with the client and what doesn’t work with the client and be kind of open and honest about it, which I think I like about CBT that you have this erm, quite, quite team-like err relationship with the client where you don’t have to pretend to know ev- everything and to be the err fantastic at everything, so I, I think that makes it quite, erm, good to connect to a client and be on equal level rather than being the expert, which maybe sometimes when you have erm, it’s a generalisation but if you have a psychodynamic erm therapist which I find it’s a bit more in that way, that you feel that the counsellor has the o- the expertise and the client is sort of recei- on the receiving end in a sense, so err, you know, that’s maybe (                  ).

So do the client’s values feature somewhere in there?

Erm you mean when, with the sort of what they, what do you mean by that?

Well, I guess I’m conscious that you’re all talking about your values and counselling psychology and the institution and placements and theory, and I’m wondering where the clients’ values might feature?

Mmm, well I guess that’s when I’m asking them what they want, for example they want to gain from
therapy, why they are there to kind of, collaboratively working on goals, what they would like to achieve, in that sense that comes in of what they expect—expectations are, asking them for feedback, asking them for what they wanna achieve and what they want to, have differently, things like that so, kind of constantly asking for feedback and erm, yeah, taking their erm, you know, side into consideration so, erm but I guess it’s also but if clients want a, erm, someone who is more, err maybe directive or more erm, sort of err, I don’t know maybe more like a teacher, I guess this is also something that maybe a therapist can erm adopt too as well, in that sense so if, if one senses that a client erm would benefit from a bit more of a teacher stance maybe that’s something that erm one can consider, I don’t know.

A1 [I, mmm]
A2 [Yeah I think], oh.
A1 I was thinking about client preferences like what you were saying, so listening to what the client wants is very important, err allowing them to feel empowered as well so they have an influence over what happens and what you’re doing and where you’re going and that they’re considered very carefully, erm, and what outcomes you’re going for so, they have to be shared to some like you’re talking about collaboration, you know, erm, how much, how much do you allow yourself to be err let’s say guiding or facilitating, directing or erm, you know, what influence you have, so for the client to know that they have the position of influence and power over what happens there, that they’re considered, erm, and that they have expertise in their own experience, so in terms of the subjective experience we were talking about earlier on so, that they are valued by you, by hopefully the setting and the place you are in and that they’re respected, so we were talking about confidentiality earlier that the information they provide is respected and valued and considered and it’s very important and erm, I guess that’s all part of the relationship though, you communicate that much by what you say, by how you are with them and what you do, how you think about them and how they feel in relation to those things, erm, ‘cause client values are very difficult and intangible I think it’s like, we did an exercise here, part of (ACT), you know, erm about our own personal values and we had like maybe a hundred values to pick from and you’re, you know, kind of looking through and trying to think, well what the hell are my values, you know? Erm and like wisdom and like erm, I think like family and relationships and err, like what what you invest in, like all of those things, for some people it’s creativity or erm religion or like their belief system, err like people have all sorts of different types of values and they can change, possibly, but we, we generally have core ones and they’re not always so easy to identify or, or know, or be aware of, you know if I’m asked to kind of, k- kind of tell someone what’s wrong with their grammar if they’re a foreign language speaker I find it very hard to tell them, I can tell them you, you, you could probably say it this way I just kind of know it, you know, erm, but I don’t know it’s, you know, the past tense subjective whatever, you know I can’t really describe that, I just kind of have a sense of it, you know and I feel like the values for yourself and a patient the- there’s something that can feel intangible and maybe not easy to identify but kind of have an, an innate sense of them and in that way it’s hard for us probably to say exactly what they are right here right now, erm, for here, for us, for counselling psychology, erm, I don’t know.

A2 Yeah, no I was just gonna say that when you said that my first initial thought was kind of, oh god I don’t think about their values, but then when you said that you’re right it’s, I don’t use that word, I don’t necessarily use their word ‘cause, do I think, I get a sense of all of these things in a kind of un-, non-explicit way but I don’t necessarily, I mean it depends what values but I’m not necessarily
thinking about whether my client has the value of wisdom or the value of, but I would expect or
assume or learn from my clients with what they bring whether, where their values, or in terms of
boundaries and expectations and values of life let’s say in working with a client, if I was working with
a client with erm, who enters into abusive relationships, well that tells me something about her
values of boundaries and you know then her kind of, so that would be a, I think the way I would,
would get a sense of values, not in like a, I’ve never really asked a client what their values are and
erm I think you get the sense of their values if they’re a religious person or are not, you know that
kind of thing, the other thing that came to mind was erm something about, I don’t know why this
popped in to my head but something about when your client asks you erm personal questions and
how much you’re willing to share or impart, erm I don’t know what really, why that came up when
you said that but maybe something to do with how much erm, well maybe that’s something a, well
that’s more a desire of theirs but when they want to, when maybe they want more from you or
want to know about you or whatever and something about values of your own boundaries with your
clients or erm ethics, it also brings up ethics for me, what’s ethical to share what’s not, how do you
feel in terms of different situations, erm something also about making yo- decisions, choosing to,
sorry I’m not being very clear, kind of err, I can’t really explain what I mean but erm that came up
for me when you, you brought it up something about what I’m willing to share and not share.

And that’s informed by your values, or
Yeah that would be informed by my values but I’m not sure why it came up when you said, what
about your client’s values? I guess I have this image of my client wanting to know more about me?
Erm, and me not really wi- willing to, to always kind of go towards that.
Is there something there about how the client values you?
Erm, how the client values me? It wasn’t really.
Okay.
No it wasn’t, it, more, their desire to have a different type of relationship perhaps and my lack of
willingness to go down that route, let’s say they want to know more, more of, have more of a
friendly chat, know a bit more about me and my personal life, fair and valid etc., how willing I am to
do that, how willing I’m, willing, wi- willing I am to kind of cross my own values for them, for their, if
that is a value of theirs. [It’s not really]
[Their benefit, no?]
Yeah, [it’s it’s not really it’s not really the word value]
[That by giving you this it might help you] but it would compromise my
Mmm. I don’t know why that popped into my head ‘cause I don’t know if it fits with that term value.
I think that for me comes up mostly when I’m working with different cultures now, I am a different
culture right ‘cause technically I’m not British and I’m working within a British system and I think
that is quite, erm evident, or becomes more evident when I’m working with someone, mostly from
the south of the world, erm, let’s say if I’m working with an African woman which happened once,
err sh- the concept of therapy and kind of that boundary between therapist and client or whatever,
it doesn’t exist for her, if she is asking for help she is coming for advice she’s not coming for trying to
figure things out together or whatever else we create or understand to be therapy.

Mmm.
Erm, and so that comes up really strongly, I am very aware of the fact I’m learning counselling
psychology in England with their values, erm, which I tend to share because of a kind of a shared
history to some extent and because I’m here learning it but I, I am very aware of the fact that if I had
to go to Africa let’s say to do therapy or whatever, the concept would completely change, so, so
what, erm <Laughs> this thing about values for me, not so sure about ethics which is interesting 'cause I, I don’t often think about ethics I think about values and I think of it on a very personal level you know what are the psychological values I’m learning about and what are my values and how are these kind of either contradicting each other, battling for space to some extent, or kind of amalgamating and what you, I don’t even realise now that they’re one in a sense, that comes up mostly with regards to my religion I think because there are values within my religion which are very personal to me and very much part of who I am, erm, but then what psychology teaches is quite, sometimes, not always, actually sometimes very similar but erm, sometimes even that’s different, err to give an example I guess, err, it’s difficult, erm, ‘cause lots of things come up, but erm, let’s say my religion will talk about very much about relationship being mostly about compassion about forgiveness about erm being there for the other person and all of that and then through psychology ( ) okay, but if you’re too compassionate, you’re always putting others in front of yourself and all of that, that might be damaging to who you are, so that kind of thing, you know there’s that kind of conflict, so what’s healthy? On one hand you have this that supposedly is good for you, good for community, good for life, on the other hand it’s saying no, not so good maybe, so that sort of thing.

I think that’s simplifying religion a little.

Oh yes.

You know like it’s an attitude towards life, it doesn’t say like subjugate your needs, don’t forget about yourself, it’s supposed to be reciprocal (most of it) so

Mmm.

if you’re, if you’re just investing investing investing I don’t think religion is encouraging you to do that it’s saying, you want a fulfilling and healthy relationship then these are the attitudes you have with each other as people, as community, erm, human beings or whatever.

Mmm, but that’s what I mean

Yes that’s

although they might not be at loggerheads in a sense but they’re to some extent artificially or superficially, not artificially, conflicting and then you kind of need to do the whole looking in to what it means, maybe on a different level, I don’t know.

Oh yes and now I see, I don’t want really want to get in to it ‘cause it’s a whole thing about religion and not but I see what she means there is that element of, not complete subjugation but yes, you know putting others

Mmm.

totally before you

That’s, that’s it, yeah.

<Laughter>

It is definitely a value that I get from my religion yes.

And you were saying that contrasts with psychology?

Yes to a certain extent, I mean in the sense as she mentioned, I mean if you have a client who they would signal a problem, might signal a problem if you have a client who puts everybody else before him or herself.

And my question there is, is that a value of psychology or is the value of psychology in Britain, which tends to have quite an individualistic point of view? Because in other places if we’re talking about community that com- kind of comes first, no, that’s the value, the value is, through putting other

[other people]
[people ] before me
your needs are met
I am meeting my needs
Yeah.
exactly, whereas here no, you know, and now I am, I, I really feel because of where I come from but
also because of this, I’m in between ‘cause I understand this and I experience this whole community
thing and I understand and and value also the whole individual stance that yeah you need to take
care of your own needs, you need to take care of yourself to be able to function in society, [so]
[But I] guess it’s again about adapting that to erm the client’s needs, so if you have a client from a
non-western err society, err you probably take that into account that err having the community is a
protective factor and it’s important for them.
Well how do you draw the line right? How do you draw the line between what is functional and
what isn’t from, with regards
[how]
[to putting people]
I mean if you, [yeah]
[in front of you]
[And how distressing it is for them perhaps.]
[What, what effect it has.]
[and they are a foreign] person, let’s say, within this
[culture]
[community]
Mmm
so they need to also adapt to this
Mmm.
if they want to survive, if they want to function whatever that means, so
And where does the word ethics feature in what you’ve just said there do you think?
That’s a good question I don’t know. Erm, I don’t even know to be honest what the word ethics
means, ‘cause I, I mix it up with rules in a sense and for me, as I said
You, y- say that again, you?
I mix it with rules? Not I mix it, I, it, for me it, it gets confused, you know there is e-e-e- maybe what
you were saying a bit, ethical rules, ethical guidelines, ethics, for me they’re three, not distinct but
quite different things.
Mmm, for me I would think ethics would come in to this as a therapist being aware and careful not
to impose
Mmm.
my views
Exactly.
on, and the way I see things and my values, on the client.
And is that a rule?
Err, it’s an ethical principle that I adhere to, it’s possibly a rule, I mean I’m sure it’s a rule as well but
And where do you think that’s come from?
I mean it’s definitely
How, how do you think that’s been informed by both your training and your practice?
its definitely been something brought up in training
Yeah.

I think mostly in training. Erm, it’s also something I you know find important myself it’s, it’s a value I, I, or whatever you want to call it

<Laughter>

a principle, whatever, I had before, but I think mostly in erm, in training, I don’t really think in practice. In a sense I’ve been made aware of it and I implement it in practice because of erm the training. I don’t think I’ve had any

So, how, how about practice then, how do you think your practice has shaped your views on values and ethics?

I can give you an e-, example

<Laughter>

like erm, being a social control agent is what it’s kind of about like so, erm, what am I gonna do if there’s a legal requirement

Mmm

you know, to say this is not right or, you know with risk and safety as well, erm there are ethical, there are cultural, social, legal, you know, err all of these things have particular expectations, guidelines, rules, like with some there are fewer boundaries, wherever you’re from this is where you are, there’s, this is the culture, this is the law and I have a requirement according to that law to do certain things if you tell me about these things or I become aware of them, erm, err, and that’s where there’s like a, a very delicate thing because you’re there to aid the person, possibly against what they may wish, if, if they tell you about something even if you’ve given them prior information that you will have to act, you know, err, like inform social services, inform the police, erm, or somebody’s in danger if they’re threatening to kill them, err, you know as the case may be, you may have to do those things and they may even in full knowledge tell you they don’t want you to, tell you about it and know you will have to and then tell you they don’t want you to, or tell you because they feel they have to share it with somebody and then not want you to tell anyone even though they know you ha- they ha- you have to. There’s the, i- it can become very complicated but as a therapist you, you live within that environment too where you know there are certain things you have to do, you don’t have sex with your clients, right? You know people do, unfortunately, err, but you know that that’s a legal as well as an ethical, moral thing, misuse of power the whole lot, err, there’s certain things that are just black and white, you kind of know where you are, whatever culture you are but the non-judgemental stance in humanistic values, which is very tied in with counselling psychology, erm, is very much a part of the not imposing your own judgements, your own values, upon the other, it doesn’t mean ignore them or do not consider them, or be thinking about similarities and differences and how that informs you and if, if you’re not aware of those then you’re like useless to act in a particular way that would kind of let the person know that you are different, you would have a different, like you have a sense of wrong or right, you know, where you lose your curiosity about the other person’s perspective or erm value.

Where does the model do you think feature in what you’re saying? The approach, values or ethics of the approach.

This is a trans-theoretical model, I think, some of these issues

Yeah.

and values, personally speaking.

CBT might make it more, if your, are you talking about models in CBT?

Yeah, or a, yeah, whatever approach you’re using.
Err, mmm, I think maybe it depends what model you’re using, will it give you flexibility or not, erm if 
you’re using a CBT model then you may be e- able to be more flexible in terms of, you know sharing 
your values or directing the client that kind of thing whereas with a psychodynamic model, if you’re 
coming from a psychodynamic model it would be, you’re values would be very different you’d be 
com-, you’re much more erm, you abstain a lot more, much more neutral, sharing of yourself is just 
not, not a part of it so I think very different values and boundaries and things like that between 
different models I would say, if that’s what you’re getting at.

For me the, that ma- that humanistic rule of counselling psychology, of not imposing your own 
beliefs, is quite an important one. At the same time in the back of my head there is the idea of, erm, 
social justice let’s say or, or, if I believe something’s not quite going, how I can, how can phrase, 
issues like racism maybe gender roles erm, that sort of thing. Erm, my personal value is that if I can 
bring a change I will and if I can say something I most definitely will, that’s always a personality thing 
but erm as a counselling psychologist then, then, then mmm, then what, you know? The way we’re 
taught, the model, it kind of tells you to take a step back, look at underlying stuff, look at the wider 
picture, but how wide can you get before you lose sight of the fact that there is an injustice or a 
problem there, that you’re not talking about, that you’re not addressing?

So if you were sat opposite somebody and they were being very very racist, a personal part of you 
would want to speak out against that but another part of you, the counselling psychologist, would 
be thinking, I need to consider this in a particular way.

I, I think the counselling psychologist will always take over, I will never say, no you shouldn’t be 
doing that, I will always try and understand why, but behind that there’s a value of no you shouldn’t 
be a racist.

You know so I will be asking questions in a way of then maybe directing the person towards 
realisation that, racism may be important because of certain situations that happened in your life 
but maybe looking at the bigger picture you could be a bit less racist, I don’t know, you know what I mean?

Yeah.

So you would never say, your particular behaviour with me right now is something that, you know in 
terms of countertransference

If it’s about me yes.

yeah it’s affecting me in this particular way, I feel this about what, the way you’re talking about, you 
know, these people or, you wouldn’t do that?

I think you’d have to put a lot of thought into it

Mmm.

a lot, I don’t, I don’t know in this particular situation

if they were being racist to me?

[no he’s not saying that]

[I would definitely say] but if they’re being racist in general, no not really because, it depends I mean 
if they’re going out hitting people and I don’t know burning people at stakes <laughs> then that’s a 
different situation but if it’s just maybe on a daily basis I understand that there are issues in racism 
just like there are issues in families or whatever, in group out group blah blah blah.

So what’s different about that situation, I know you laughed when you said it, but what is different 
about that situation?

Which one, the one with the ra-
Where they, yeah, yeah. The one with what, sorry?

> [Burning people at stakes]

‘Cause they’re crossing your rules, sorry. Erm well maybe because we value, of self, err harm to others maybe I don’t know but because that’s erm

But racism is being harmful to others possibly, to upsetting them, hurting their feelings. But you said something about err which, at which point do you lose your curiosity?

Mmmhmm. And I think that’s a very extreme point. I think the moment you lose your curiosity you lose your counselling psychology, erm, whatever you want to call it, stance, and erm, so before I jump into a reaction I would keep being curious. The whole thing of behaviour then, depending on what they’re doing, if they’re causing serious harm to others, well

That would be crossing a specific rule and boundary. Exactly.

so your rules would be, your like, I think maybe it’s like you kind of have rules that are

or like your own values are that but they’re not as, there are final ethical or values that are just there is no crossing, so one of them would be self harm or harm to others as we say in your first session, that would be something straight away breaches our confidentiality, so I think there’s two different, it’s like two different things, like for example I had a cli- a client who erm was talking about erm in all her relationships she’s been cheating, so I know that, myself I think that’s extremely unhelpful for a relationship and you can’t possibly be in a good trust, unless you’re in an open relationship which she wasn’t in, that my personal value is that’s so destructive for yourself but I, but I understood that was my own value but I understood for her that it was all about self worth and her lack of self worth that, that’s how she feels that she’s entitled to cheat on others and they cheat on her. So I felt that it was okay to share my personal value, not, I didn’t share it as a personal value but in part that kind of, yeah it’s, it’s completely unhealthy, I asked her if she’s in an open relationship and i- what works for her what her value is and once getting a sense that that was her value I was able to use my own feelings of how unhealthy it is, so that’s just more towards where you step in with your own, how you kind of manage your own kind of views and beliefs and how you will let it affect therapy but always with a lot of conscious thought, never unconsciously, something you once w- wisely shared with me but erm

So is there something in there about how you value well-being, the other’s well-being or

Mmm.

to use a more loaded term kind of mental health?

Is it about the other’s mental health? Yeah, as long as I feel that, that it’s valuable for them, not just my own perception, so if I know that other values I have, let’s say personal values, religious values, erm, let’s say I have a value that it’s probably quite healthy within your relationship to keep just frivolous speech about your sexual life, I think it’s quite useful to keep it within, within, like gossip, I wouldn’t necessarily gossip with all my friends about my sexual relationship. I would talk about it if there’s anything constructive or I was curious, or I’d talk about it in a constructive way but not just to like, just for the sake of chit-chat but try and find a different topic, that’s a value of mine. I would
never ever impart that on my client because I really see that’s very subjective and personal. Sorry I forgot your question. <Laughter> Well maybe how, I suppose maybe I was curious as to how we are trained to value the other’s well-being, or the [other’s mental health?] [Oh yes the other’s well-being], so that wouldn’t affect their wellbeing, so therefore it wouldn’t, if they’re sharing that kind of material that’s completely irrelevant and it wouldn’t be, it’s only when it kind of affects, as you say their wellbeing, it’s only when something calls into question their actual mental state and health there and really have to think more about what, what we can, I’m very confused when I speak but [I’m clear inside.] [And where do you think], where do you think you draw on from that, that decision that you’re talking about making?

Personal erm values I guess. Lines that, I think there’s a lot of unspoken messages you get in your training, when you said that about where do you hear these kind of boundaries and rules well, you know what some things we’ve not actually been told there’s, there’s an unspoken let’s say, you don’t talk about what happens in your, with your clients with anyone outside. Well who really said that you can’t go and share, I know that there’s a thing confidentially but who said within your, say your family, that you can never go to your family and tell them, oh I had a really upsetting experience, someone was talking about being abused. Who said that? But there is some, for me at least, a bit of guilt. I like to share it when I feel the need but there’s a bit of like, please don’t, obviously my family wouldn’t, the person who I was to share these things with would never ever share but I feel bad crossing a boundary but did my university ever say it was something if I never mentioned a name, a place, a location, that it was unethical? So interesting about, sometimes I think there’s a lot of unspoken rules that we’ve kind of all maybe got I don’t know. Mmm. Well it’s kind of spoken isn’t it though? Anything you tell a- tell me is co- err confidential [Yeah it is spoken.] [Yeah but who]

[Maybe I’m being pragmatic.] but who says that you can, you can, no I agree with you, that you have But that would be the same as giving a con- giving them a consent form, err in the sense of speaking about them in an anonym- anonymised form.

Mmm. I thought what you were saying was perhaps you hadn’t had the why explained to you. It’s something that’s written down and it’s an unspoken or stated rule but the why is maybe, I don’t know. The conditions under which Yeah. there’s a (reason)? You know, or like The rationale then maybe is a better word, the rationale for that. Well it’s a grey area, Mmm. you know you cannot be too prescriptive about it. It makes sense, I think, there is a clear rationale but And we have discussed the rationale, [we know the rationale]
[If anyone can only tell] who this person is in my opinion.
whether they’re vaguely aware or very aware then, then you know, like there’s just kind of implicit
descriptions of, you know what you may or may not say, now what that maybe is sometimes hard
for you to figure out because you may not know, someone may pick up on one word and go, oh I
think I already know that other person, I’ve heard of people describe where they’ve recognised erm,
even in group supervision like either a therapist, or a place, or a person, or god knows what, from
what they thought was very anonymised material, erm so it can be a very, it can be a tricky business.
But I’m gonna go back to your, your racism right?
<Laughter>
To give you an example right? So if you’re in a group say and you have
What you mean as a therapist?
Mmm mmm, yeah, and you have a multi-racial group and you have one really racist person in the
group like, the, what you said earlier on, it might change because of the context and the people
in it and, and you construct your, your ethical, or not, maybe not ethical, you say rules but they are
kind of ethical rules in a way, or, or you know, what you feel would be the way people should treat
each other, or be with each other, or for this particular group, for this moment in time, whatever, it
changes
Okay I have an answer <Laughs>
Okay, right.
Erm, I think, erm it would depend as you say. If, if it’s, if I see that it’s harming someone in the group
I would bring up the fact that I’m noticing that it might be harming someone in the group but I
would encourage, now again it’s easier said than done but in principle right, I would encourage the
group to do it with me, to try and understand why that person is being racist, what is their
experience of it? Where did they learn these things? W- w- you know, where’s it coming from?
Because my maybe ultimate assumption or value is that, which just might be wrong as well, people
are good and the only reason why they’re doing bad things is because there was a difficult
experience, they were hurt, they were, erm you know, they’re, they’re, they’re harmed in some
way. That is my ultimate assumption which I am very aware could be completely wrong but that’s
the one I, I work by automatically and so in a situation like that I would try and get the group to be
as understanding as I would, possibly, hopefully, naturally be <Laughs> erm but then again
depending on, did you understand did you (                              ) <Laughs>
So even in such a situation you’re still not imparting your beliefs, basically, on to the, because
Well I’m imparting the one belief that maybe that person who is racist is, is a poor soul,
[But your racist]
[a poor soul and] we need to understand him.
the idea of racist being, racism being bad is not coming across in any way.
It will all come across if I bring up into the group that, look this is causing some harm this is causing
some tension you can see it in the group that this is what’s happening, erm, is this gonna help us get
to our goal of whatever we’re working on as a group?
Mmm.
We’ve just got a couple of min- two or three minutes left so I just wanna erm see if anybody else has
any kind of, anything else they wanna say. I mean I’ll just go back to my original question and just if
there’s anything else that comes out of that, so the original thing was what do, what role do values
and ethics play in counselling psychology training and practice?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>898</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A very large role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Mmm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Err but a subjugated one to a lot of other things, for me it’s like, it’s in the background but always present you know? Erm, my feeling anyway, like whatever we do, it’s being mindful of your values, the values of your profession, your identity, your development, how these things are changing, clients values, erm, you know, dilemmas and all that stuff comes up right? Discussion with your peers is very important, you know like how we all differ or debate and, and think about these things is like, even this year has been very helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>905</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>I think our practice is shaped by our own value, definitely I think in my opinion, my own values and my values coming from counselling psychology and ethical principles as well, I think that’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>908</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>I think training gave me, but I think us, I can speak for us, gave us the space to talk about it, to explore it and kind of in a, there are the rules of what you have to do and what you have, don’t have to do, that yes, but within that I think they created a lot of space for us to be able to discuss freely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>I think also we do actually have very much when you say it but erm specific values and ethical boundaries and we’re all very aware of them. I don’t think it’s something that we don’t think of, maybe we don’t use the actual, I don’t think we ever really use the word value, so I think that maybe throws us a bit in this conversation every time we came back that word it was like bleurgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>but really it’s something very much and even at, in my personal life when I’m talking about, oh this is this with a client, or I can’t do this, my erm, my erm, erm experience is that I often get, why are you all so anal all of you therapeu people -py people, you know you’ve all got these like, this that and the other, and I think it d- very much reflects that there is a very strict kind of code of ethics and values that we adhere to when it comes down to it but whether we term it that I don’t know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>I would say there’s, there’s like people who work in say Christian counselling organisations, they can work with prayer in therapy, they can bring in religion err or, you know particular err value systems which are associated with, with this err, you know group or organisation or whatever, like values can be brought in and ( ) they’re kind of designated as okay to do, or like somebody tells you they’re Catholic and someone might find that, oh so I might be able to bring the, you know religion more in and my values might be more part of that and I might disclose more of those, or sexuality or, or whatever err, like these things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>928</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>I'm, I'm interested that you just said that you don’t think the word values perhaps is talked about so much and it feels, I don’t know how you feel, but it feels to me that you’ve talked about values a lot more than ethics. Ethics seems to have been talked about in terms of rules and in terms of boundaries specifically but values seems to be something that you’ve talked a lot more about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>932</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Maybe because ethics is a given for us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>933</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>934</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>That we’ve less, the only ethical thing that I feel we all kind of experience is the consent, the issue with consent. Apart from that I think we all have very clear ethical boundaries, there’s no, as you say, when you brought up the thing with sexuality, don’t have sex with a client, it’s not even, it’s not even something I’d bring in here because that’s just, and not wanting to belittle it at all, but you were like, I was like, oh yeah that’s an ethical rule, well I wouldn’t have even thought of it because it’s very clear to us where our ethical boundaries lie.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 940  | A4      | I g- I guess also the cl- err training helped us to make our unconscious values conscious so that we are more aware of it and maybe that had a bigger impact, err at least on me in the training than on the ethics, ‘cause that’s sort of quite, quite clear I guess and quite a boundaried whereas ethics is
something that maybe through training you find out more about, your own values and not to impose those. And that comes with experience I suppose once you’re in a situation and you have to work it through, or think about it you know when something comes up. That’s where experience really helps in developing, it, it’s not as fixed, it’s fixed but then an experience can, you can re-evaluate what you thought was a rule into a guideline, or you know maybe a guideline in to a rule you know erm, I don’t know.

Okay, thank you very much we’ll stop.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOD</strong></td>
<td>What do the terms values and ethics mean to you in relation to counselling psychology?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>I think that my values inform my ethics, I’m just trying to think if it goes the other way as well, yes it must do. I mean I, I think for me they’re quite overlapped in lots of ways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>I think maybe for me my values are more, I was going to say through my experience whereas my ethics are more things that I’ve thought about but, erm, yeah I think values for me feels more like my kind of lived experience, things I’ve kind of gained more implicitly through being with others talking about things whereas erm ethics is a bit more sort of higher level than that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Something that you have to do, or being cautious about things that you shouldn’t do, from the way I perceive it, and I’m referring to what you say you know things that you’re in a way, you are told to, to do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>I was thinking, I think about a value or I think one of my values it would be something like respect and respecting the client and I think then I would apply that when I was thinking about an ethical dilemma, you know about whether it was somebody that I should see or have been seeing as a client and might need to stop seeing for some reason, so I think, I would think I would apply values in looking at ethical issues around client work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Yeah that’s what I meant, that one informs the other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>What did you mean when you said higher level?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Erm, it yeah it feels like something that I might, I think you were talking about in particular dilemmas it’s something that maybe is a bit more complicated I might need to think through whereas I feel that my values are more, erm, bit more straightforward for me to think, well what are my values, things like respect or, erm, I don’t know, equality or addressing power differences in relationships, erm, yeah I think of ethics more as like ethical dilemmas or, so it feels like something I need to think through a bit more. Yeah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>I suppose that I think when I think of ethics I think about the right way of doing something? I don’t know about using the word right but the kind of appropriate way to behave to protect somebody, to protect, maybe yourself, maybe your own professional reputation but also how to deal even handedly with a client. That’s what it makes me think about you know what’s the right way to behave in order to do that and I think obviously about the guidelines as well that I’m sure we’ve all read &lt;Laughts&gt; you know which are the counselling psychology, you know BPS guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>So maybe you meant erm, I dunno thinking maybe something about values being more embedded in us, in the therapy or in practice and ethics or ethical fr- being more of a framework or something that we know’s there but we don’t, we refer to anyway our dilemmas or, maybe when you said higher level that it’s like that whereas our values seem embedded with us when we’re</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>More instinctive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>in the therapy, more instinctive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>I don’t think I think of ethics as having to be dilemmas necessarily like I think all the stuff you say at the beginning of seeing a client you know setting out the contract, the confidentiality, that, you know that’s boundaries I guess is the bigger word for that, that’s all, you know good ethical practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>I don’t know how much that’s to do with counselling psychology or psychology in general though I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43-49</td>
<td><em>don’t know what, I don’t know what say a psychotherapist might say at the beginning I imagine it’s something pretty similar.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td><em>Yeah I wanted to pick that up because I know the way you’ve framed it is for counselling psychology but I don’t really, to me I don’t see there’s an obvious difference about the way a counselling psychologist would behave in tha- in a particular situation and the way a psychotherapist or a, any- anybody who ‘s working in a one to one or a group situation with people who have come for some sort of help or therapeutic intervention, so the counselling psychology bit for me is a bit of a diversion, I’m not sure how much</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-53</td>
<td><em>it makes a difference.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-56</td>
<td><em>Yeah I don’t know I suppose it, you’re meaning ethics ‘cause I mean value-wise I could see there being quite a clear difference between those kind of ar- three areas that you mentioned but erm you know sort of if it’s a clinical psychologist or ps- psycho-therapist they might be following different kind of, I suppose ethical rules as well like BACP, BPS, they might have slightly different values, erm so I think maybe eth- did you mean, ‘cause I can see values even within counselling psychology (people) could be quite diverse but</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-58</td>
<td><em>See that’s where I differ I</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-60</td>
<td>B5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-62</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-65</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>B5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-71</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73-75</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-78</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-80</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-82</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-85</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are more the well-being side of things

[Mmm.]

B2 [focus] on prevention or erm positive mental health. So I, that’s something that I need to do more reading on and more work on to work out where I am within that

Mmm.

B2 ‘cause I’ve just been sort of blindly ignorant, I’m a counselling psychologist as if that says it all.

B5 I think that comes with ethics as well ‘cause I mean for some people I think the idea of treating someone according to the medical model would just be sort of ethically wrong, erm, like the position you take to another human being that’s a kind of...

Yeah.

[Yeah.]

B5 [ethical] thing isn’t it, erm, and certainly it feels for me like counselling psychology, it feels it’s quite divid- there’s quite sort big debates or, and there’s certainly this perception of, particularly maybe more in the past but clinical psychology as being much, much more medical model, let’s differentiate ourselves by kind of moving away from that and saying we’re about the human to human relationship, erm, and then now it feels we’re a bit on the kind of cusp of a bit more kind of, I don’t know, medical model, IAPT, erm, jobs being available and how we kind of work in that kind of context.

It’s interesting what you say ‘cause you’re focusing on the relational erm aspect of our training and then contrasting that to possibly the clinical training where that might not be, might not be central.

I’m just now trying to think what might that lead to in

[Mmm.]

B5 [Mmm.]

B1 [terms] of a, a difference in ethical rules or ethical approach. It’s difficult to know isn’t it without having done the clinical training?

Mmm.

Mmm.

B2 But you hope that as psychologists still that they have

Yeah.

B2 you know I’m sure they do, ‘cause I think the difference, for me the difference we’re talking about here is that’s a value judgment- not value judgement that’s how you’ve differen- you value the person or you value, the value you put on the way you approach the work but hopefully the ethical stuff is still there regardless of that.

Is there something about setting in what you’re talking about?

B5 Mmm, yeah I was just thinking about sort of different placements and where I feel maybe I’m kind of trying to learn a particular model, whether that’s CBT or psychodynamic and I sort of think, well am I being that human here, am I sort of just doing something that the model would kind of say would be the right thing to do but it doesn’t quite feel like the right thing to do at this point in time?

So that’s my own kind of internal erm uncertainty sometimes.

This may not be what you’re getting at or thinking about but I was just thinking if you were sitting with any client, for me the first thing is obviously to create the right sort of environment to do the work and, and in doing that I would be thinking about the things we’ve said, trust and respect and trying to generate, may- maybe not something that’s relationa- relationally equal because I think that is quite hard to achieve if you are a psychologist and you’re working with a, with any client you know and with some clients even more difficult, you know I do some work with adolescents, I don’t think they would ever see it as an

[heh]
but there’s something about creating a kind of dynamic between the two of you so that you can
then do the work and that could be CBT it could be psychodynamic (that type of work) depending on
what you think is right for them, erm but my values would be, I think they would be operating
whatever, whatever the model was I was going to use, I think they’d be a kind of baseline from
which I would work.

It does influence you sometimes though the model that you’re using. I remember for example
erm the psychodynamic model, that you couldn’t do certain things and there are very sor- strong
attitudes about certain things, for example receiving gifts, or replying to texts or whatever.

So that is when I was thinking, erm, am I still the same person? Something, you know, erm in the
previous year it was just enough to just listen to the person and in this year I, I have to, to tick
certain boxes and I have to come up with some interpretations which are very insightful erm and I
did struggle with that.

So is, is there something about having to do certain things there, by the sound of it, is that what
you’re saying there are certain

Yeah.

you said something about ticking boxes?

Yeah.

And also sticking very rigidly it sounds to the sort of, certainly the psychoanalytic model, but I
certainly know plenty of psychoanalysts even who reply to texts and receive emails from their
clients

Yeah.

so I think it, that depends on you and how you

Mmm.

what you think that would do to the relationship if you didn’t, and how do you set your boundaries
at the beginning do you say, it’s okay to

[Yeah.]

Yeah.

This is quite, I mean I didn’t set these kind of boundaries with my clients

Mmm.

but in the training I found that there was a st- strong erm opinion about it. So then I thought, is it
ethically wrong? You know, because erm, and this wasn’t very clear from the beginning of the
training it just came up in the supervision erm group.

Within the training?

Yeah.

Right. ’Cause again I was thinking about supervision in the context of this whole thing and ethics and
different supervisor’s attitudes to things, and then it can get very confusing but it sounds like you’ve
had a very specific strong messages, which is don’t deviate

Yeah.

and don’t ever accept a gift, well I can tell you that I’ve done all of the things that you’ve said I
shouldn’t have done

<Laughter>

and I’ve disclosed it <Laughts> to anybody that wanted to know, erm including writing it in some of
my final year work but, so I’m interested then that y- you received that message as

B3 [Yeah.]

B1 [you] may not deviate from this.

B3 And I didn’t agree to that but just erm hearing it I get the impression of values ( ) because you

sort of think, you know this is the, the framework. So then it’s something more than values, it’s

about a framework and about a protocol, which changes things for me.

B4 Do you think maybe as a trainee as well it’s harder for us to maybe even know our values because

we’re getting overwhelmed by all these different approaches and you, sounds like maybe you were

taking on your supervisor’s values ‘cause, I don’t know I’m not

B3 [Mmm.]

B4 [saying you] were I’m just questioning

B3 [Yeah.]

B4 [’cause it] seems like, erm, you were unclear of your own, because we are in training and we’re

doing different approaches and gets quite confusing so

B3 I was, I felt quite clear you know about the values that I had from the first year about being, trying to

be warm and empathic but I felt shaken by, you know, having to stick to something and I almost felt

that I shouldn’t be myself any more or that it wasn’t acceptable

B4 Mmm.

B3 but yes it was my own anxiety and the way I interpret it, you know not the intention of the training I

guess.

B4 Mmm.

MOD But I guess that is a question to all of you. How do you think your training has shaped your view on

the role of values and ethics?

B2 I have two placements and one of them you, you don’t have to give your mobile number but it

makes life considerably easier if you do ‘cause the central system is only staffed every sort of four
days or something, it varies, and the other one erm they’re not super strict on not giving your

mobile number but it’s more of an ethos not to and so I have become very strict with that one about

not giving my mobile number and I did sit down about six months after I started the second one and

think, well what’s the difference? Why am I so much more worried about these clients having my

erm mobile number than these clients? ‘Cause you know you take them out of the setting I see

them and they’re still just people that are coming to see you for the same thing, erm so I had to

have a long think about it, erm, I still don’t know the answer and I still keep, I’m still keeping to the

same rules, more probably out of habit than anything, erm, but yeah that’s completely shaped by

the context.

B4 Yeah I was gonna say maybe because it’s the context like you brought up isn’t it because I, i- I think

it really depends I mean knowing kind of where I work in a secure setting erm I’ve never kind of

given my mobile, you’re not supposed give any personal information, you know even your surname

is questionable whether we should give that, erm , and I think that that’s kind of influenced my work

at another kind of erm placement that’s not so, well it’s not, obviously it’s not a prison or a secure

setting but I still have that same kind of feeling of, oh I don’t wanna, them to have m- my mobile or

anything, I think I’ve been influenced by the other context

MOD [Mmm.]

B4 [but now] I’m getting to the stage now where I’m thinking, well actually, like you were saying, what,
you know, erm there is issues with the receptionist, they never get my messages, there’s all these

things that keep happening, why don’t I just give my mobile number, which would sort it out? But I
[Yeah.]

B2 [think that] kind of, erm the ethics of the kind of prison imprinted on me, so it’s affected I think from how I feel about it in the context, I don’t know.

B2 But I think with that as well there’s a danger that, that they’ve taken account of in the prison setting of, of, of, the, them knowing information about you and I think it must be quite hard, and I’m obviously making an assumption here ‘cause I don’t know, to separate that from clients having that slight edge of you know your safety being at risk or that being at least something you have to think about.

B4 Mmm.

B2 ‘cause again it’s s- you’re seeing people for the same purpose from your point of view, you’re there to be a counselling psychologist

B4 Mmm.

B2 and yet, so how do you switch off the safety concern?

B4 Mmm.

B2 I think I def- I think it would definitely hang over for me.

B4 Yeah I think it’s a big anxiety, mmm.

MOD So there’s something about ethics and safety.

B2 Erm, well it, the ethics of how you, I think it’s the ethics of how you contact clients and how you are with them in terms of personal information, I’m talking like the minimum of personal information here like telephone number and

B5 [Mmm.]

B2 [surname], erm, but y- err, so not ethics and sa- well ethics, safety in terms of at the prison she has to keep all that information quiet for her own safety, possibly, I mean I don’t want to make any assumptions about the

B4 [Mmm.]

B2 [prisoners ] but, and then she comes to another placement where then it’s not a secure setting but you’ve got that safety, I think it would still be there, about your personal safety, you know if they had personal information it would be that much easier to track you down [I mean that’s]

B4 [Mmm.]

B2 how I’m thinking about it.

B4 Yeah and it does it imposes on your other kind of settings and contexts where I feel, erm, yeah like the kinda basic ethical or boundaries or whatever that might be okay in different contexts ha- th- ar- I’ve been influenced by it and I s- do st- my anxiety kind of runs away with me and I think, oh I can’t do this I can’t erm reveal this ‘cause then they might track me down and, but I acknowledge that’s an extreme view but that’s

B5 Mmm.

B4 erm so I think it’s really shaped the way at the moment I maybe operate with some of my ethics and

B1 Well I was going to ask you what do y- and you may not have thought forward to this but how do you think that will impact you if you have a private practice [because]

B4 [Yeah.]

B5 Mmm.

B1 you’ve obviously [got to give them a number to contact you on]

B2 [Especially if it’s in your own home yeah.] 

B1 and yes and potentially in your own home, erm

B4 [Yeah.]
[because that] comes up with all the disclosure issues about personal, you know anyone

[Mmm.]

[they see your house], they maybe see, you know things in your house

Yeah.

they feel much closer to you.

yeah it’s something that has come up, I didn’t think about it at the start but now more and more

after a few incidences at the kind of prison I’ve erm, I think about it more in terms of private

practice and erm wonder whether I’ll be able to do that because at the moment where I’m at with

kind of ethics and safety I guess erm I, it doesn’t feel like I c- I could do it yet but maybe it will take a

number of years away

Yeah.

[from] that setting and I’ll feel comfortable but yeah I do think about that

Mmm.

them knowing that, where you live like, I don’t know it’s quite, I find it quite, yeah.

Well th- yeah the ethics around private practice in your own home are,

Yeah it’s difficult.

Yeah really tough. I think it was someone was telling me the other day about being sued because her

washing machine was on and the client could hear it.

Well this is extreme and this is probably going off the track

<Laughter>

but also you know you hear s- well one erm, this book I was reading erm around kind of anger-

angry clients and erm there was this one lady who got stabbed to death in her private practice by a

client and so

<Laughter>

again it’s

[A cheery thought.]

[extreme but yeah] this has kind of put me off

<Laughter>

so it can happen you know they

[Right.]

[were all shocked] and it was on a training course so it was like, say it was just like us and there was

the colleague that was training so she was still in, they were at the end of the training or something

and erm got stabbed to death by a client who erm they didn’t really realise the risk or something so

So it sounds a bit like what maybe some of you are saying is that ethics and in terms of safety, which

you, some of you have used, is there to keep us safe.

Yeah.

Yeah, keep u- yeah to keep us safe as well as erm the client but

Has to be, well in the same what that you try to make it an equal relationship as much as is possible

you’ve got to be equally as concerned for your own safety. I think you’d be pretty naive to ignore it.

But you can get stabbed anywhere I suppose, it doesn’t have to be in a

[private practice]. I mean any- anywhere that you’re working I mean a client could bring a knife to a

doctor’s surgery.

Yeah that is true.

There’s something isn’t there though about the nature of the work that we do that we do get very
close to people, I suppose that’s why there’s ethical frameworks ‘cause you, you end up knowing possibly more about that person than anybody else does and because of that they, you know can, you know, create something with you that may not exist as far as you’re concerned, I mean to stab somebody suggests that you have pretty strong feelings about them

And that relationship that had been formed.

MOD So to go back a, a bit to w- what B3 was saying then, how do you think these notions values and ethics have been dealt with or spoken about on your training course? I was thinking about th- the training here and I think, I remember doing some like really kind of almost like teaching about ethics and values, I think it was in the second year, I remember at the time thinking that was really useful ’cause we needed some kind of guidance or otherwise we were just floundering around a bit, and now I feel like I’ve kind of forgotten all of that and what’s much more important has just been what I’ve taken on more implicitly from supervisors, lecturers, colleagues here, just how they, how they are, what they think is important and it feels much more erm, yeah just kind of gradually absorbing that from, from people how they are rather than what they, what this particular lecture did, said that we did.

B2 I remember th- yeah that was the foundations of professional practice.

B5 [Yeah.]

B2 [It was in first] year. I looked up, I looked up that file the other day because I wanted to check something. So yeah I think you’re right, I think I’ve done the same but it’s nice to have that as a, a re- a reference I guess.

B5 Do you remember what you thought of it when you looked at it? Did you think it was helpful and Yeah it was, I mean, I think it makes a lot more sense to me now than it did then when I sort of barely knew what I was doing

B5 Mmm.

B2 erm, but yeah like we had lectures on storage of material and things like that, that, dunno why that’s the one I remember but

B5 <laughs>

B2 ‘cause it’s so practical like y- you know this training course is sometimes so high level and philosophical, and actually you need to know how you store things and where you keep recordings and how long you keep them for. You can’t ignore that side I think. It’s, ‘cause it’s just as ethical, it’d be just as unethical to leave the recordings lying around for anyone to listen to as it would be to, I don’t know, tell your client your middle name or, you know whatever.

MOD So if they feature in that practical side of things and you’re saying there’s a- there’s another higher level philosophical side of things, how do they feature in that part of the training? The philosophical side? Erm, I guess it depends what you include in philosophy, if you include the sort of erm the thinking around what the models are trying to say or why they’re you know, their argument, erm then yes because they all sort of say something about how you are with a client, what, how much of yourself you share, your way of being. I feel

B5 [Mmm.]

B2 [that ethics] and values have been quite explicit all the way through our course.
I was going to say it sounds like what you’re saying but that that higher level it’s kind of you can’t really separate it out any more because it’s much more, erm, yeah about the way that you’re learning that particular, whether it’s person centred whatever, it’s that kind of the whole philosophy of what it means to relate to the other.

Exactly, yeah, of being with them.

And is that something you learn?

Yeah, erm I mean no necessarily learn as in a sort of bullet point you know sort of points way but learn from being with others, your relationships and through I guess what we’re, what we’re taught on the course, the philosophies, the way that we’re challenged in supervision if we’re kind of, I don’t know, being defensive and not encountering ourselves or the other person in, in s- in some way, erm, so yeah I think it’s learned.

Learned and absorbed.

And absorb- yeah, yeah.

Through the doing is that what you were saying? Through

Through the doing and through the interacting with, erm, colleagues, lecturers, supervisors, it’s, yeah, and your own reflecting, yeah that’s kind of important as well, so

And eth- I would say experiential group was quite interesting from that point of view. It was my first experience of group at all and you, you know I learned a lot very quickly about how I wanted others to behave with me ho- what in turn therefore I, how I expected to behave with them in terms of like confidentiality and respect and, erm, yeah in terms of implicit learning I think that was really important for me. Feels like a long time ago now.

I suppose as the way you say it’s almost like that kind of do as you will be done by isn’t it and I guess all of you have seen erm therapists, so you know how you would like to be treated

[Yeah.]

[or] what you would like to have respected about your information or anything you say and, yeah how you want to be treated so, I think turn that the other way round and

Yeah.

that’s a good, a good way of learning how you want to be, having a model of it maybe.

Yeah I can’t think of anything worse than being a therapist to a trainee, you know the amount of studying I did of my therapist to like work out what he was doing and how he behaved in certain situations. I’d be very self conscious.

So what about that, what about then the client’s values? ‘Cause I, I think what you were giving an example there where you were the client but you were also being reflective because

[Yeah.]

[you were also] a therapist so, is that something that you think about, clients’ values, or clients’ ethics?

Ooh that’s a really good question. I’m not sure I think about their ethics that much but you pick up things from clients about the way they like to behave, like even from the first telephone call when you’re booking the appointment, I had, I spoke to a lady the other day who wanted to know on the phone what my training was, erm where she sh- where exactly she would be when I met her, the
time, she wanted all that information beforehand, erm, and so I responded with a, quite a lot of
written stuff for her ‘cause it felt like that’s what, how she liked to manage things, erm, so yeah
maybe not I’m explicitly thinking, these are their values or ethics, but I’m definitely, I definitely try
and respond individually to how they’d like to manage things, as far as is possible within the
boundaries I guess. I don’t know what anyone else thinks about that?

B3 I feel that the message I got from the training sometimes was just take a step back and think about
it and reflect and I’ve recently started thinking that clients, err in terms of the client’s values, they
would like you to be more involved, more active, and I’ve started thinking of that because of my
personal therapy where, erm, in which there are elements of CBT, and I found it really helpful. So
erm there has been a shift in me. It was like what the training says and what the client find helpful
are two different things, because in the training there is too much thinking and reflecting and, you
know, trying to produce something verbally, whereas the clients want you to be, I find, want you to
be there, erm, for them and be affected by them, that’s, because I find that in, in my therapy this is
helpful, in my personal therapy.

MOD So is there a tension there between the two? Between

B3 The training you mean? Erm I feel so yeah. I mean erm, I haven’t, erm up ‘til now, seen a model, a
role model, of a therapist, which refers to, to the humanity t- to being there with a person. I’ve seen
mostly how things are, erm, explored, or reflected mentally, and, yeah.

B5 So that, your therapist kind of provides that new kind of model for you, you know?

B3 Yeah. It’s like a role model for me. Not to the extent, like my previous therapist who would walk
around the room, not that, that is not even therapy for me but, you know, to sort of, being human
and, exactly, thinking of the client’s values as well, because you might be caught up in, you know,
thinking your values and your requirements of the course and the essays

B5 Mmm.

B2 Mmm.

B3 you know not take into consideration the client’s needs I guess.

B4 I think that’s a big thing on training that you’ve just mentioned about erm getting so caught up in
your kind of needs and erm values and things in terms of, maybe not values so much, but in terms of
training and knowing you need a certain amount of hours and knowing that we need to do CBT or
knowing that we need to do this ECS study or whatever, and i- hhh you know personally I found
myself getting so wrapped up and anxious about that and getting recordings and everything that I
think, erm, I’ve lost sight of the client, or I did lose sight of the client

B2 [Mmm.]

B4 [and] erm, it just felt really unethical to me like, what am I doing erm, it was all about kind of getting
recordings and making sure they’re okay and erm, yeah it felt really, not very good I think, and we
are under so much pressure I think, especially in the last year, that it becomes a bit more like
survival rather than

B5 Yeah.

B4 erm anything else.

B5 [Yeah.]

B4 [I dunno, that’s what it’s felt like with my clients lately and I kinda had to shake myself and remind
myself of kind of my values and the ethics and

B5 But it’s a real like there’s a real tension there because we do have the things like our needs in that
situation, we can’t just ignore that and pretend they’re not there, so it, it does mean you kind of go
into a situation and it feels like you can’t just be in a way that’s totally about what, what their needs
B4: Feels quite restricting
B5: [Yeah.]
B4: [I'd say.]
B1: The thing you’re talking about I, it wasn’t me but I remember somebody specifically saying that they had a client that they wanted to use for the erm the extended case study but it was a ver- they were a very vulnerable client and actually I remember there being a debate about how this student felt she sort of press-ganged this client into agreeing to taping
B5: [Mmm.]
[Yeah.]
B1: [when actually]
B4: Mmm.
B2: [Yeah.]
B1: [it probably] wasn’t the sort of, it wasn’t the sort of situation where actually recordings were a desperately good idea
B5: Mmm.
B1: because some of it was really sensitive
B2: Yeah.
B1: and so there is a real
B4: [mmm]
B1: [tension between], this is a fantastic client <Laughs> you know this is
B2: <Laughs>
B1: [a really] interesting person to use for the
B4: [Mmm.]
B1: [case study], yet actually ethically it probably wasn’t right to even think of using, because of what it then did in the room as well as having got
B2: [Yeah]
B1: [consent] to tape.
B4: Yeah and I think training courses need to consider that, I think erm they’ve been quite rigid in requirements and erm, must be this many sessions, must be this must be that, and I think to be more flexible about that might release some of the tension on us and make practice a bit more ethical or allow us to be a bit more true to our values rather than kind of
B5: [Mmm.]
B4: [squeezing] into these boxes, I think that that’s a
MOD: So they could model it [almost.]
B4: [big] issue, erm, yeah.
B5: Mmm.
B3: Or help us inte- integrate the two, because you know as you said you can’t really forget that you have needs and go to (some) sacrifices, or the opposite, but it’s difficult to, to integrate these two.
B2: Plus when you’re with a client you know you’re recording f- with a- with a view to doing an assessment on them, it totally affects the way you are and I
B4: [Mmm.]
B2: [I list-] I had this client I knew f- for ages I was going to use her and I, then I when I went to find the actual ten minute session, I listened to all the sessions I’d thought were good where I’d been really trying to keep in the model and all of that and they were terrible and I went right back to the beginning and ended up using a session before I’d even thought about it ‘cause it was so much more
natural and less sort of pushy with her.

Mmm.

And I was so ashamed afterwards, I’m so pleased I don’t have to hand in all the sessions, erm because it was t- I wa-I couldn’t have done it, it would’ve been too embarrassing.

And w- and what was it about the difference? Can you say a bit more about that?

Hhh, something about being really self conscious about what you’re doing and everything and saying, about like trying to put in lots of deep and meaningful insights, because I was, it was psychodynamic, erm use the right words or, I don’t know, I mean I try not to use jargon in the therapy room as a general rule erm because I think it does something to the power balance but erm, I dunno really push for- for them to say meaningful things and, I think self conscious is the best w- is the best way I can describe it because you stop being about them s- su- to the same extent as you are when you’re not worrying about something else, erm

And w- and what was it about the difference? Can you say a bit more about that?

Hhh, something about being really self conscious about what you’re doing and everything and saying, about like trying to put in lots of deep and meaningful insights, because I was, it was psychodynamic, erm use the right words or, I don’t know, I mean I try not to use jargon in the therapy room as a general rule erm because I think it does something to the power balance but erm, I dunno really push for- for them to say meaningful things and, I think self conscious is the best w- is the best way I can describe it because you stop being about them s- su- to the same extent as you are when you’re not worrying about something else, erm

And so what was it that you were worrying about?

Err well having a good, a good, very psychodynamic recording that I could type up and present as me being a good psychodynamic practitioner, erm, and actually I think any exam marker or essay marker worth his salt would realise that it’s more important to be real and authentic than to have good psychodynamic interventions in there, at least I hope that’s what they’re looking for.

So there’s something about you demonstrating a kind of competency that you thought Yeah.

[they wanted to see?]

And I, and I think in retrospect I got it wrong, or at least I hope, yeah like I say, I hope what they’re looking for, I got it wrong.

So in a way you’re trying to show an ethical kind of piece but by doing that you’re

You [become unethical.]

[being unethical], mmm.

‘Cause nothing [

[yeah I relate to that.]

to be fake in the room must be the th- least ethical thing.

44 B4 Mmm, mmm.

Actually I’ve heard some people say they do that after supervision as well, in fact one of our lecturers who we had this morning said erm, you know you can always tell when someone has been to supervision ‘cause they come and sort of bash you over the head with something that’s obviously come up.

Yeah yeah yeah I remember that was TUTOR’s comment.

So what, what was, what in that situation is the model getting in the way of?

Erm.

Or the assessment getting in the way of?

Well it’s a, I mean it’s, it’s a really tough question that isn’t it ‘cause if you’re using a model erm, and I don’t mean in the purist, purist sense, but you’re trying to work along the lines of one model, you, I think you should have that in your mind, or at least be trying to sort of relate what you’re saying or doing, erm, but not if that gets in the way of responding genuinely to the person, in the m- in that moment, hhh see I get so caught up ‘cause I hate these words, sometimes they sound so like you’re just using them because they’re all the right psychology words but, erm, I guess so they say something and you respond to that, I think sometimes when I was trying really hard to f- to focus on the model they’d say something and I’d say something back but it wouldn’t quite be back at them
it’d be slightly off, ’cause I’d be trying to fit in my own something. I’m probably not explaining this very well.

No.

Erm, so I think, I guess what I’m saying is that my value on being with a client is to respond to them first and then think about what model I’m using to do that or, you know how I’d try and fit it in just, to a theoretical idea that I have, but that, I think that has to be second.

I think that’s what erm a certain lecturer at this course as well always kind of banged into us that erm, with the training, that kind of model comes second and relationship and connection and that comes first. When you were speaking it reminds me of certain supervision that we had in second year, erm around that.

Do you agree?

Yeah, but it’s easy to kind of get caught up in the model when you, like you were saying, you’ve got a piece of work and you

[Yeah.]

[need to] show that it’s CBT it’s so easy to get caught up and actually do really bad therapy and then be like, mmm. Yeah. I do agree.

And also I suppose it’s only a model like you might find certain parts of it don’t fit with your ethics, like the idea of like, I dunno in the more traditional psychodynamic work that real neutrality, that might feel like it kind of goes against what you’re trying to do, so it’s I suppose building your relationship with the model and kind of working out your position with it and then using it rather than having it there as a model that you’re trying to squash into yourself kind of a thing.

Mmm.

I think you said something interesting earlier about not feeling like you were being yourself and, and I can remember a supervisor saying to me a psychodynamic a Jungian psychoanalytic supervisor saying that, you know when you have kind of, you will, you’ve kind of got there, it’s when you’re in the room and you feel like yourself.

Mmm.

That you’re not actually thinking of the model or thinking should I say that

Mmm.

but there’s something about actually just being you.

Mmm.

I think all the training stops the being you, you’re so afraid that you’re not listening and reflecting or making, you know, the right interventions that you stop being yourself

[Yeah.]

[for a] while.

And I think this could be communicated erm through the relationships in the training between the lecturers and the students and the way they teach.

You’d like some modelling of the way to be would you?

Err yeah [and apart from that]

[I would also have liked] that.

I would like more dialogue and, you know because if it’s about the relationship then it becomes, then it’s not about theorems and knowledge of the lecture it’s about trying to, it’s about focusing on the implicit knowledge and about trying to get, for example like in the conversation that we have now, or through dialogue, I think for me this is the real knowledge.
So do you feel that sometimes it was just throwing knowledge at us

[Yeah.]

[rather than] actually relating to us?

Yeah that’s what I feel and I think this happens in education in general, but in a relational course I think the relationship should be something that is more valued. Even in the relationships you know when we have meetings and they don’t want to meet us because they don’t have time or

you know, and and how sensitive they are towards us.

Insensitive did you say?

Yeah.

<Laughter>

No I said sensitive but

Oh.

<Laughter>

Yeah, because I feel, you know, supervision is about, you did this wrong, whereas if we are relational therapists it should be something more implicit, you know not so explicit <Laughs>

or, sometimes it’s like the goal is to prove who is wrong and who is right and I think that’s o- for me is off the track of our field.

And so what happens then in practice when you go, when you come from your training and you go into practice and how does it, how have your experiences in placements and in practice shaped your

That’s a good question. Erm, sometimes I feel very shaken and kind of useless I guess, useless? And then when I have supervision I talk with my supervisor, my placement supervisor, about what I had in the training trying to sort that out, trying to feel more conf- confident so that I’m, you know, I can be with a client in a more meaningful way.

What about others in terms of your placement experiences practice experiences how do you think that’s shaped your views on those two terms, values and ethics?

A lot I’d say well it’s what, like you were saying earlier about that sort of implicit learning through absorbing and, I had group supervision, still do for one of my placements, and that was a massive learning experience, ‘cause there were people who were older, I mean older in terms of training, erm and you definitely learn from, even from the way they talk about their clients.

For me I’ve learned more I’d say from working in, you know, in hospitals or on a placement, about the way to be and the, the, the right way to be with clients, I’ve definitely picked up on when you were saying I’d like it to be modelled in a way, that for me is most, has been the most important, to see others do things and to

Yeah.

Think, mmm yes I, I like that, that’s fits with how I, I feel about those things. So not really the training and certainly not in terms of values or ethics. I wouldn’t say, I learned almost nothing from my training about values and

[Really]

[ethics] I

Mmm.

learned it much more from supervisors

Mmm.

and, and colleagues working in a, qual- qualified colleagues, working doing the job.
And I think erm if we are kind of attacked in supervision and research presentations then what is the message that this sends, that the relationship with a client is about attacking them? Because I frequently feel attacked by the way that the feedback is given to us. I know the good, I mean I know there is a good intention and it’s about learning and in order to learn you have to listen to the opposite, you know side of it but it’s something about the way that’s being done, sort of like, you didn’t really think of that and, what is that? It’s, I don’t know, it seems quite intimidating to me. It feels like you’ve had some really bad experiences.

Erm, well I’ve had a couple, of times, there, there were a couple of times where I perceived erm things as attack but it’s also what I say about others students too, I mean when they deliver their presentations for example.

Yeah.

I can see they’re learning and that we don’t know everything and we need to listen to the opposite, or to different opinions but it’s something about, now, erm, sometimes it’s something about, you know, I’m the father and you are the child who is acting out and I will show you how it’s done, and for me I don’t know, it seemed like a projection, to me, to us, of other people’s values then, you know. I mean it could happen in a different way, that’s, that’s what I say. I don’t only err, I mean for, I feel for other people, I don’t I don’t feel but I think, why does it have to happen that way? It’s all about the relationality and, you know, I don’t know. We’re not in the parliament or someth-

So what do you think the values and ethics of counselling psychology are? I know you’ve said that you don’t think it’s necessarily [a]

Distinctive identity for you perhaps.

(I’m not sure I could increase it more than like that though but erm.)

Start with the person, the individual and their context. That for me is the primary one of counselling-well, that, I think of it as counselling psychology but I’m fully prepared to see that it could be other people as well.

For me it’s something about erm, which I’ve taken on from various readings and things, about sort of recognising difference, because there is that thing of, when you’re trying to be empathic, you sort of think that maybe your experience can tell you something about someone else’s experience, and trying to sort of almost walk in someone else’s shoes and, and that’s kind of like one of the things that I’ve learned and that’s been quite good on this course I think is actually acknowledging, yeah the difference of another person, kind of, erm, always just, yeah being aware of that I don’t know if there’s another way of putting it but

So is that like saying that empathy can only go so far?

Yeah or empathy doesn’t mean you can ever completely get it, you’re always trying to kind of, I suppose, sounds all kind of wishy washy ( ) but just kind of meet someone through, I suppose, the way that you are who the words that you’ve got

Yeah.

erm, yeah.

I suppose for me thinking of an example, and again might, mine might be quite unique ‘cause of the
setting but where my erm, counselling psychology values and ethics have clashed with the ethics of my kind of placement or my context and that’s been a constant challenge for me I think during the training, and being on the training and course and them kind of saying, counselling psychology kind of ethical code and that and then seeing in practice in the reality of somewhere like a prison, because you know counselling psychologists do work there, erm that, err you ki- there’s a whole ‘nother ethical code that you’ve gotta follow and it doesn’t necessarily always err fit nicely with the, the therapy kind of code, so a constant tension you know like breaking confidentiality if they mention err anything to do with security, or safety, or drugs and I know that that kind of is the same but erm it’s a lot more, I mean supervision for me there is mainly just around ethical, i.e. following the ethical codes of the prison, i.e. following the ethical safety thing, so it’s turned into that, so we never discuss the client erm, you know it’s, it’s turned to that which is, is quite difficult for me to focus on the client when the supervision is focused on the ethical framework. So that’s kind of an extreme form where I think it’s turned, yeah it’s not really

B5 [Mmm.]

B4 [necessarily] a good thing erm because my supervisor completely misses the clients and

B5 Mmm.

B4 I don’t necessarily that m- means I do, I mean I do reflect and stuff at home but yeah it shows how that environment can completely, well it’s, yeah, they don’t, it’s not a therapeutic environment I guess, that’s the values and ethics of the prison, punishment and safety and, but yeah that’s been a challenge for me where they’ve clashed.

B2 Maybe it’s those kind of situations that actually help delineate your values and ethics, you know when they’re challenged or when it’s difficult to keep them

B4 [Mmm.]

B2 [there], it really makes you work out what’s impo- what, what really matters, what ones you’re sort of more flexible on or aren’t as important for you.

B4 Mmm.

B2 I work in a GP’s surgery and quite often my clients announce themselves to the receptionist, which they don’t have to do but it’s obviously a sort of almost Pavlovian reaction to tur- walking into a doctor’s surgery, erm and I always make a point of saying you don’t have to because of confidentiality reasons but that’s, it’s sort of a half hearted effort really because erm the receptionists have access to the counselling diary, if they really wanted to know it would be very easy for them to find out who was coming for counselling

B4 Mmm.

B2 erm and you know it’s all me- medical records which are all typed up and receptionists have access to so

B4 Mmm.

B2 you know I’ve had to really consider how much of my sort of need for confidentiality is, comes from me wanting to be really strict on that for my own sense of I’m doing

B5 [Mmm.]

B2 [this right]

B4 Mmm.

B2 but where, in a situation where it’s actually not possible t- to maintain that.

B4 Mmm.

B2 You know it the must be same in the prison like people must know.

B4 Yeah a big thing for me is kind of walking on the wings and saying, i- it’s quite hard sometimes
‘cause people kind of yell out to you, where are you from where are you from, and you’re going to see a client and you know if you say, oh I’m from the counselling department, then the whole wing know that someone at PRISON WING is seeing a counsellor and like

B2 [Yeah.]
B4 [that’s] quite hard because that’s, makes me feel like, oh god what do I do, do I lie and say I’m not a cou- like from a couns- like I’m not a counsellor? But then if they want to refer and it’s a- gets all really messy ‘cause

B2 [Yeah.]
B4 [I’m] trying to think of the client’s values of the stigma in a male prison of having therapy and then also, erm yeah well I guess it’s more the cl- the client in that

B5 [Mmm.]
B4 [situation than] my own but, so yeah, like it’s the same with doctor’s surgery, I think it’s really, I find that really challenging sometimes, and I know, you know, it’s happened to a colleague and they’ve complained, prisoners have complained about that so

B2 Right.
B4 erm it’s obviously stuff they pick up on.
B2 Yeah.
B1 Have any of you had that situation where you’ve met a client out of situation?
B4 A what sorry?
B5 Mmm.
B1 Where (you’ve met either) a client you’ve been working with
B2 [Mmm.]
B1 [or your] still working with or have work- worked with and then you see them again, somewhere else. ‘Cause that’s I suppose an ethical thing as well it’s about identifying

B4 [Mmm.]
B2 [Yeah.]
B1 [them as a client or], and it’s something that I, you know talk to people about, particularly working with young people ‘cause you, they might think it rather odd if you, well met them in the high street, that you didn’t go over and say

B4 [Mmm.]
B2 [Yeah.]
B1 [hi how are you] but you wouldn’t do that, that’s
B2 I think it’s one of those things that’s going to happen to all of us eventually in some form or another.
B5 Mmm but I remember my first supervisor I ever had, she was erm humanistic existential and she would describe, you know seeing a client erm after a few years and going up, giving them a huge hug and having this whole in depth conversation and I kind of felt like, that to me feels like a sort of, just a really like nice human response at that time and then it was, and there still is a part of me that sort of thinks, well actually, erm, that it, it feels something, especially if someone kind of expects that kind of warmth and that conversation for you to then kind of not do what

B1 [Mmm.]
B4 [Yeah.]
B1 [Yes.]
B4 [they expect] it does, it does feel quite [non-human.]
B5 [I think it’s one s-] something that I’ve s- we will- that has been talked about for that reason because
B1 it might seem really quite rejecting and
B4 [Mmm.]
Yeah it’s the same thing with you were talking about presents earlier, like sometimes, you know I know that the theory is don’t accept them but sometimes it feels rejecting, you know if they’ve brought you a card or something, like one client brought me a hand-made card and I just thought the value of me rejecting it for the sake of me being all smug about my ethics.

Mmm.

But it’s weird ‘cause we’ve got this idea that ethics are there kind saying you know don’t be naughty, don’t like do anything that’s kind of spontaneous, natural,

Yeah [Yeah.]

[human thing]. It’s a bit warped.

Is that ethics or values though? That thing about, erm sorry my mind’s gone blank, erm that thing that you just said, erm accepting a present and stuff.

Err, I don’t know what, I guess the question is what would be unethical but I mean why do we get so worked up about presents?

Yes I don’t know why you’ve been definitive, why, why you definitively think you can’t accept a present. My understanding is you can if it’s appropriately but you work with it.

Right.

I had one very present heavy client.

<Laughter>

And did it, was it helpful in terms of the work?

Actually it was, it was helpful, in lots of ways, about wha- I mean I could talk a bit about it but maybe not, maybe not for this, err yes it was because she would give things and then she would sort of diminish them and say that they were worthless you know,

Right.

which she thought, making comment about the therapy, or gave us a chance to talk about that or about herself, that she wasn’t worthy of having err therapy that was of any value, I think that’s what was really going on, and I don’t think, I’d agree with you, I wouldn’t say, you know take that away.

[Mmm.]

[Yeah.]

[that would be]

Well I don’t I tend to accept them and then to s-

Keep quiet about it.

Yeah.

<Laughter>

At least this is anonymous.

Yeah you feel like, you know, actually I have been pretty honest about it with my supervisor, ‘cause
she’s pretty open to that sort of thing, erm but again it’s about managing it, you know if they’d turned up with something completely inappropriate.

But there’s some connection between ethics and being naughty.

Well this is what you seem to be saying yeah.

Yes and not behaving the right way.

Yeah so that kind of idea of what you should be doing and if you’re kind of

Maybe it’s not what you want to be doing that seems to be the suggestion.

and that maybe comes from the model again like, I’m thinking maybe, I don’t know ‘cause we did, we did do a whole thing on kind of the specific example of presents, and not necessarily accepting things. I can’t remember but the, [the]

[We watched] that video with the guy with the silk pyjamas.

Yeah but it, it kind of almost, I think we understand it sometimes as like a rule, that we shouldn’t, I should not accept [presents.]

[Yes.]

Yeah it depends if

It does depend but I’ve certainly been on placements where it’s been like the, you know, or jobs where the rule is do not accept presents because it, various sort of reasons.

So do you think you’ve ha- found space either on training course or in placements to reflect on the rationale for these rules?

Most of them I’d say, clearly not the

We worked through them didn’t we like on the silk pyjamas video and stuff.

Yeah .

<Laughter>

Looked at why silk pyjamas might not be appropriate or how you could work with it, the client, like you were just saying like use it, so I think there has been, it hasn’t just been like, you can’t do this. Mmm.

I mean they acknowledge that we’re D-level and huma- you know we’re like thinking minds and stuff and can think through that for ourself I think. They’re not just printing rules on us.

[No.]

[Are they-]

[But that] does seem to be how we’ve interpreted them so, doesn’t it, or I, you know, I definitely felt naughty for it the first time, I’ve got better at it now, the first time I accepted a present it definitely felt the bad thing to do or the wrong thing to do

Mmm.

Were you just saying that you’re left to think it through yourself?

Err

That it’s presented to you and you’re left to [think it-]

[I think] to a certain degree I think, err, I think B5 mentioned it, it’s, it’s about, depending on the context and depending on what it is and, you know, I feel that you should be able to kind of think it through yourself and know your client, know what work you’ve done, how long you’ve been working with them rather than thinking, right they’ve got me like chocolates after this long I can’t, so
In that sense you should be thinking it through yourself that’s what I meant I guess, rather than them, er, you know rather than it being of a set strict rules that we must follow and, that’s how I interpret it anyway, I do- I don’t know.

No no I think you’re right I do remember, you know you go through particular examples and then from that you kind of think, okay what might I do in this situation or that

I do I don’t know.

No no I think you’re right I do remember, you know you go through particular examples and then from that you kind of think, okay what might I do in this situation or that

Mmm, [I think]

[‘cause I know] the rule is about those kind of, you know, boundaries basically.

Mmm.

So when you do do what you think is a bit naughty, where do you think you’re operating from?

I suppose in psychology terms I sort of think of maybe like superego kind of, this is a rule, so it’s kind of me telling myself that, I suppose that, is that what you kind of meant?

But where do those rules come from kind of thing?

Oh from er, I suppose this training really

[Maybe-]

[so] you know particularly around boundaries and keep maintaining them, why you do that, it’s kind of

So the training would say that some of these rules need to be thought about flexibly, is that what you mean?

But but some of them need to be put in place er, rigidly so that you’re creating a safe therapeutic space to do the work. So for example a rule would be to make sure you do err confidentiality and stuff in the first session so that you, you know, establish a safe co- so there are some sort of rules that are more fixed I’d say and that would include confidentiality and also timing really, like [you were saying about]

[I guess] I’m interested in when you’re saying you being naughty I’m wondering who you feel you’re being naughty in the eyes of or, if you’re, [if you-]

[Yeah] probably UNIVERSITY.

Right.

I wonder if sometimes at the beginning, especially in training, we take rules more, as more fixed than they are because it makes us feel safe, and because it, it means that you’ve got I f- I, I think I definitely took some rules as more straight down the line this is just, you know you cou- you, there’s no flexibility, you cross that you’re wrong, because it meant I knew more, I felt I knew more what I was doing, and where the lines were, and actually as you get more experienced you know that it can be bent a bit and you can use your
[professional] judgement

[to assess] how far. I don’t think, I’m just trying to think of rules that I feel UNIVERSITY have been like, there is no debate on this, and there are very few.

Maybe they knew that they kind of had to give the certain rules, like you were saying fixed, but then they knew that, from their own experience or something, that it is a process of erm, which we’ve all kind of touched on, erm learning like through our, through our practice and learning these things rather than, learning that they can be flexible as we

[Yeah.]

[get more] experienced, ‘cause I certainly feel like that now knowing

MOD And for you that’s something about professional judgement, that’s, maybe that’s what I was, my question was, if you’re not operating following UNIVERSITY’s rules or the rules that they’ve said and that makes you feel naughty, I was wondering, whose rules you were un-operating under in a way, I mean

[B5] [Oh I see.]

[I guess that-] it sounds like

[jus-]

[you’re s-] you’re saying that you’d be operating from a place of your own professional judgement.

Yeah, I think, which is, my professional judgement is probably strongly influence by where I trained, you know because, you know we all know the sort of stereotypical differences between this university and others in CITY but yes I think you take in the bits that are important, you know you internalise it, it, yeah, because in the end when you’re at your placement it’s just you, and you have to make the decision for yourself

[B4] [Mmm.]

[and you have to live with yourself] afterwards.

Yeah I guess I’m still interested in when you’re operating in erm opposition to a rule

My conscience.

[Would you be-] your conscience.

Yeah. Well but then that’s where the professional judgement comes in because, erm my conscience will only kick in if I feel I’ve bent a r- if I feel I’ve done something wrong, or if I haven’t managed it in a way that I could be proud of.

When you were saying that I was thinking where I have bent the rules if that’s what you want to call it, erm I don’t think I mean necessarily ethical things but, like boundaries, like extending the session, or like letting somebody call me or text me, it’s because I judge that they needed that

[B2] [Mmm.]

[that] that was the right thing to do therapeutically and the right thing for our relationship, and for that, it was okay for that reason and

Yeah.

you know that was an exception to the normal rule that you wouldn’t ever do that, and it was set up like that, that this is because, you know if you’ve got a suicidal client well what do you do? Do you tell them no contact between sessions or do you say that’s okay? I think it would be unethical to

[Yeah.]

[leave them], you know to their own devices if that’s how they, how they are.
Well I think you also have a responsibility as a human being sometimes.

Yeah it comes back to being human.

[Yeah.]

[doesn’t it], mmm.

which I think is what you’re saying [isn’t it?]

[Yes]. kind of responding on a human to human

[Yeah.]

[level] and not saying these rules are going to kind of prevent that.

Yeah. ‘Cause if you walk passed someone sobbing on the street holding a gun, you wouldn’t walk passed. Whereas if it’s your client suddenly you’re expected to say no it’s out of the therapy hour, as if to leave you there effectively.

Mmm.

But yeah I mean it’s, that’s one of the things we have to, judge it for yourself on the situation.

I feel all these things could be discussed more thoroughly on erm, on this training, could have been discussed, thinking that this is a relational training, because in the first year it was explicit that it was relational, in the second year, on the second year it was forgotten, and now it is brought up again, you know like people saying erm, it’s not, forget what you learned and to kind of be yourself in the, in the room. So it was quite vague, you know, and we have to erm, to contain the feeling of guilt or naughtiness and try and figure things out, where it, it could happen in, within the training for me.

But I think I do think that you have responsibility to think things through for yourself. I mean it, part of what you said about being at doctoral level. I don’t think I would expect to be spoon-fed things, especially not in a, a in- an industry or business that is so unpinable downable as this one.

Yeah. I mean what, what we are doing now doesn’t feel like anybody’s feeding anybody, it’s just a discussion and, things that are inside the relational-ity, that have not been discussed for me.

Oh I see so you think we could have groups like this on the course where we

Yeah and

[Yeah that’s not a bad good.]

[things be considered] more.

So, is there like there hasn’t been a space to consider things that you think are really important?

Yeah, and I think, and I felt they know it kind of, because now they said, forget about everything we have been very rigid. If they didn’t, if they weren’t aware of it then they wouldn’t say that now in a way.

I was just thinking, ‘cause it sounds as though you were talking about being given the rules from which you will not deviate initially, maybe because maybe you are too worried to, you know, you follow everything because you don’t really know what else to do, and then I was just thinking are there, is that, is that related to ethics though, because I’m not sure that my experience would change how I would behave in an ethical sense. It’s different, it sounds like it’s a different thing but is that, do you think it’s a different thing we’re talking about?

The experience and the ethics on

Yeah I’m, I’m thinking I might learn to bend rules because I think it’s better for the client the more experienced I was but I don’t think I would look at an ethical situation differently because I was more experienced

Mmm.

I think I would still you know think confidentiality and would still think

Yeah.
you know if you’re seeing a husband you don’t start giving therapy to his wife, you know you, you don’t talk about a client you know to their mother

Mmm.

all of those things that wouldn’t, my experience would make no difference to that.

No but I think those are some of the hard and fast rules that you don’t bend.

Okay.

I don’t think it, yeah, well I, yeah.

Alright, those are like the things you said, the setting the contract the, setting the rules with a client.

I guess we’re saying there’s like hard rules and soft rules and

We’ve said but how, we’ve kind of, obviously we’ve just taken it depending on our values then because we haven’t been told those

Mmm.

[Within ethics, yeah.]

how do we learn, learn that, how do we figure it out? Erm, I mean present giving is one of them that we’ve said but how, we’ve kind of, obviously we’ve just taken it depending on our values? [I don’t know]

[Can I ask what] you think about self disclosure then, ‘cause that sounds like that might fall in the same.

Yeah.

Someone in our group is doing research on that [funnily enough.]

[Yeah.]

Mmm. I think that yeah falls in the same [Yeah.]

[kind of] thing as a value thing erm, I don’t, yeah I guess it depends how you define self disclose and what’s the situation and

How much of it <laughs>

Yeah s- it’s dependent on a, but

I think my general rule is avoid it, that, and that’s a general rule, stay away from it as much as possible.

See I see it as more of a soft rule in that, err, depending on what, you know self disclosure could be anything and it could just be, oh I can’t think now but, erm, it doesn’t mean opening up and saying, oh well I was suicidal as well like I was

<Laughter>

but you know like just a tiny little thing and relating that to a client might be really helpful in the moment [so]

[Yeah] well I think I’m [that’s]

[softer] on opin- my opin- my opin- oh I don’t think opinion is the right word but like factual details about me, absolutely not.

Mmm.

But I think, I think some self-disclosure happens sort of without you trying.
Yeah, it’s like a natural thing.

Yeah, or how you react to things and, oh I don’t know.

If somebody asked you something about yourself how would you, ‘cause not disclosing is one thing but actually

Yeah it de- [well it depends.]

B1 [in response] to a question is more difficult sometimes.

B2 I the one that comes up for me most often is sort of say things like, how was your holiday, when you, when they know you’ve been on a break, and I tend to just go with, fine thank you, erm, but I’m always interested in why they’ve asked a direct question, so I think you know you can work with that. A c- a client of mine Googled me two weeks ago and then came in and said good luck with this talk I was doing

<Laughter>

erm yeah, so it’s actually, yeah, we’ve actually ha- we’ve had to work on it quite a lot since then, and then he came back the next week and apologised, ‘cause he thought he’d done it deliberately to frighten me, erm, so yeah we’ve had a whole thing about that, but it, you know that’s the most explicit for me it’s ever been and it was, it was frightening, or shocking anyway.

B5 I was thinking about how it comes into ethics, like are there times we think it would really be unethical, or I suppose not just in a theoretical way but like in our own experience.

B4 I guess if it took the client away from, if it was done in the wrong way and the client was vulnerable and took the client away from their kind of, where they were, erm, for example my therapist self disclosed erm, my personal therapist, and I was kind of in something quite difficult and it took the experience, it took the moment away from my

[Yeah.]

B2 [Yeah.]

B4 [experience] and I started just, probably because we’re therapists and we, we think like this, maybe a normal client wouldn’t, but then I started worrying about her and thinking, oh what must her upbringing have been like, and then getting really curious and so it took me away as a

[Yeah.]

B2 [Yeah.]

B4 [client] completely from my experience and now I always wonder about that thing that she’s

[Yeah.]

B2 [Yeah.]

B4 [disclosed] so, maybe that was unethical I don’t know, maybe she should have thought about the self-disclosure more but it had s- it’s had such an impact on how I view her now and the therapy and stuff so

Mmm.

B5 Mmm.

B4 I think, I think if you do self-disclose

Mmm.

B5 [Mmm.]

B4 [it has] to be really well thought about.

B2 Do you think that’s, yeah, what, unethical is, are t- eth- such a hard [thing to say like]

B4 [But then it’s hard to define] and say that was unethical

[Yeah.]

B2 [Yeah.]

B4 [as well] isn’t it but

B5 I think it’s when it’s that thing of if, like of something suddenly seeming like it’s a jerk from one thing to another, like if someone is never like that and then they

Mmm.

B4 [Mmm.]

B5 [suddenly] self disclose it’s like, you just feel a bit kind of like it’s not what you expected from them and, erm, yeah. It feels like something’s suddenly shifted I’m just thinking of erm my therapist and
she wouldn’t normally sort of disclose anything but the time when she did I sort of, erm, yeah I didn’t really want her to.

It almost feels, like selfishly, a bit like your space

[Yeah.]

[Yeah.]

[and like], I have to listen to all my clients all the rest of the time, like this is my hour in the week to be selfish and it was a bit like, uhh, you know, now I have to worry about her and, it did

[Mmm.]

[feel] a bit like that so yeah. Whether it’s unethical or, yeah, that’s a hard, that’s a subjective thing I think but

Yeah and the- and there could’ve been an instance where hi- or your therapist saying that to you or to someone else would’ve been a really helpful

[Would’ve been that yeah.]

[positive experience], yeah.

I don’t know if it’s unethical but it can be very stressful sometimes when they disclose things.

Mmm.

I remember a therapist erm always said, went on and on about when he was in India, he had spent, he had spent twenty years in India, and it was really irritating.

Mmm.

I suppose it then depends how you, I’m just thinking of my example with my therapist, I was then able to get angry about that and that was really useful therapeutically so

[Mmm.]

it might be, it might feel like a jolt it might feel untherapeutic, even unethical at a point, but then if you can between you use it in some way then it can

[Mmm.]

Yeah and it can sort of shift you from maybe, well it can just shift you into a new space, do something a bit different which was qui- yeah which was helpful in my experience.

‘Cause a rupture or a boundary break or something can often be the best work

[Yeah.]

[cannot it]

[Mmm.]

[I know that sounds], but erm, yeah a lot of the time that, in my work that’s produced some of the most in-depth work, after a rupture, you know from the ma- or something’s happened then

[Mmm.]

[they get angry] you see the kind of real them and, so, so yeah I don’t necessarily

[Yeah.]

[think] it has to be a, as long as yeah like you say you can use it, erm, but I don’t think that’s been explicitly talked about in the training really, using rupture- ruptures or
Yeah not much.

I think that’s something I kind of figured out and was discussed in supervision I guess here but it’s not been discussed explicitly in like lectures or anything, and that, and I think that’s quite an important, like boundary ruptures and how can they be worked with in the therapy.

Mmm.

I dunno I think that’s.

Maybe a bit where we were talking about transference and countertransference

Mmm.

but not, yeah.

Just so maybe that would’ve reduced, you know rather than seeing it as rules and unethical, I don’t know, maybe it would’ve reduced some of the guilt, or these feelings, that actually you’re not being naughty it’s,  erm, you’re human, mistakes happen and you

[Yeah.]

[can] work with them

Mmm.

which keeps linking back to this kind of concept of being human that, yeah

I think from th- I think what I was trying to say before was the word unethical for me somehow suggests that you don’t have any principles and that you’re just doing something willy nilly without thinking about it at all, and actually, what, what, what like you’re describing, or when we’re talking about self-disclosure or all these things

Yeah [that’s a good point.]

[consider it] unethical.

Yeah like if us as clients find something irritating and stressful, the person who is vulnerable, very vulnerable, you know a kind of irrelevant self disclosure might be really  erm harmful, so I guess when ethics come to harm.

Mmm. I guess another thing that comes to my mind about the split between counselling psychologists and psychotherapists and stuff that you were thinking erm, in my experience I tend to see psychotherapists that have this kind of ethical or value code or whatever,  erm, of being, going into the client as a blank slate,  erm, and maybe we have it as well I don’t know but I suppose I see, and again maybe this is my context that influences me, but needing to know certain risk issue- i-in

[formation] and issues and having the assessment, whereas psychotherapists tend to want to go in with no,  erm as a blank slate and take the client as they come and,  erm, they’re talking about doing that with kind of severe offenders and things, which I suppose ethically is, I don’t know if it’s about counselling psychology or what but,  erm wondering if there’s a difference there, I don’t know, about, because we’re psychologists does that mean we’re more trained to look for risk and assess-do full assessments and stuff I don’t know.
Well what do you think it does mean to be that you are psychologists?

Erm I guess we’ve been talking about the whole human side of it and the relational side and I guess it brings in that science-practitioner side of it and, erm, just, yeah like I said for, for that example they’d be more on the human side without the other side, whereas we’ve got the other side and maybe, maybe that’s the other side kind of tapping us on the shoulder going yeah. 

you’re being naughty, you have to follow these rules or, erm 

Yes.

B4 [you’re] a psychologist this is

B2 <Laughs>

B4 you know so it’s like

B2 Yeah.

B4 a tension between the two.

B2 Yeah can you straddle them both

B4 sides yeah

MOD Can you straddle?

B2 Them both, the both sides, the scientist side and the humanist side sss.

MOD What do you think about that?

B2 Ohh, that’s, that’s what my research is about, so give me thirty five thousand words and I’ll get back to you.

<Laughs>

B2 I don’t know, I think, I think you can, I think you have to, I think if you’re realistic, but hhh

B5 And also to me someti- oh sorry

B4 No no, keep going.

B5 You’re not supposed to interrupt, that was a rule.

<Laughter>

B5 Erm.

B4 Anyway, humanistic

<Laughter>

B5 Erm, what was I going to say, scientist side humanist side

B2 Why can’t, yeah why can’t you be a humanist scientist?

B5 Yeah sometimes it’s almost less human to not, erm, take on the reality of someone’s situation whether that’s like a prison situation of risk, or someone with a very severe diagnosis, you know not taking into account their actual, what’s actually going on for them and you’re sort of almost trying to say well it’s more ethical or more human just to relate to them as though none of that stuff was there, and to me that’s kind of, well actually you’re missing big things

B2 Yeah.

B5 that are

B2 And you’re

B5 [important]

B2 [ignoring their context] as well.

B5 Yeah you’re ignoring the context, you’re ignoring the risk, or the diagnosis that, whatever you think about diagnosis that might be important to

B4 Mmm.

B5 to work with it in some way so I don’t see them as kind of really necessarily split.
Yeah. Maybe that’s the fundamental bridge you can’t cross is that you can’t decide what’s right for that person until you’ve met them, but you have to have some things in place before you’ve met them. So you can’t win, so you’re thinking.

Yeah like they have to have the hard rules in place, before you meet them, like we were saying there are some rules we can decide as we go along.

Yeah, but the hard rules might be better, different for different people.

Yeah.

Sorry were you going to say something then?

No I was going to say if she can say that again because I kind of lost it <Laughs>

Yeah like they have to have the hard rules in place, before you believe in taking someone as they are as they appear to you in the room and not knowing stuff about them

[Laughs]

Yeah <Laughs>

So it’s a paradox.

But you feel that the kind of scientist-practitioner thing fits quite well for you, I think were you saying.

I don’t know if I was going, I mean I think there’s definite tensions in certain areas of that for me but I think the bit about, erm, kind of bringing in knowledge or understanding about certain things like risk or, let’s say someone has bipolar disorder and um understanding what that might mean, that to me seems a really important part of being human and ethical and all that, so I don’t get the argument that to sort of treat someone according to that is kind of non-human or unethical and all that kind of stuff, ‘cause I think well, I always think that, you know if, if it was my child I would want them to see someone who had an understanding of what that issue was, that’s kind of sometimes a benchmark that I’ll use to sort of think well what would I, how would I want to be treated, or how would I want my child to be treated?

Okay, well, erm, just finally then I’ll just repeat the question and if you’ve got any closing comments on it then would be good, or if not then that’s also fine, so, how do you think your training and practice experiences have shaped your views on values and ethics?

What was that again sorry how’s your?

How do you think your training and practice experiences have shaped your views on values and ethics?

I would say that if nothing else they make me think about it. Like I’m not saying they say what I should think but they have prompted the thought.

I think that they’ve set a framework (               ) and then you apply those in your practice as you get more experienced, ‘cause for me it’s in practice where I’ve worked these things out, but that’s ‘cause it’s quite hard isn’t it to follow rules without having something to apply them to?

Yeah.

You know just in the abstract.

Yeah, I absolutely agree.

Yeah and also just about the context again as well, erm, how it changes and how, erm, err in our training maybe that’s not made so clear I don’t know, maybe they are seen as fixed rules and maybe a lot of us have, we’re, yeah. I’m getting tired

<Laughs>
but erm yeah, just that they change.

I think a kind of diversity helps me to, to think about it. A diversity of opinions and models.

And maybe there are times when erm maybe a comment’s been made or an idea’s been put across and that’s really kind of just, kind of rocked what I’ve thought about something and that’s kind of made me reflect more, erm, not (usually) going to say, well this is what I do now, but kind of think about it more and then see what I think when I’m working with clients.

Okay, thank you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MOD</th>
<th>What do the terms values and ethics mean to you in relation to counselling psychology?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>It’s a big question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>If we start with one or the other, ethics seems easier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Mmm. I guess I think it means that it gives us a erm, a structure to work in I guess, in terms of how we work with others and the responsibility that we have in working with other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>erm, yeah it kind of creates, it kind of keeps us quite confined in the way which we work, in the field and, and I guess the responsibility that that we have, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>So guidelines, boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Mmhmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>It’s interesting ’cause we recently had a class around this with our lecturer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>So ethics are a set of, I think internal guidelines that, that guide how you work erm in a safe way with the people that you’re working with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Mmmhmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>That’s interesting, as you’re talking I’m thinking to myself, is there a difference between values and ethics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Well values, I think, should drive ethical behaviour, but then it becomes a bit circular doesn’t it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Mmm.] but I wonder if the, if ethics, we’re obliged to be ethical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>yet the values are maybe more kind of optional in terms of how, how we kind of integrate our beliefs and our own values. With ethics they kind of seem quite rigid to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Mmhmm, interesting, but wouldn’t, well say, I don’t know, say your value is to be ethical, I don’t know it’s hard to see the distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Mmmhmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[for me anyway]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[For me I think it], sorry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Go on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>yeah, I think for me it reflects, just thinking about the word ethics and values, erm, it reflects I suppose the seriousness and the level of responsibility as a trainee counselling psychologist, erm that I have in this field, erm I’m also thinking how my values may have, I suppose shaped as a result of this training course, erm, and in the way that I relate to the ethical aspects of my training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Do you think values come from the course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Erm, I think they can shape it in a certain exte- I think maybe sha- yeah it makes you think reflect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>erm but I think that you have your fundamental values but, erm I think this course may give you a different kind of perspective on, on things and maybe stimulates, yeah the, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[See I would] say that I probably became interested in the course partly kind of linked to my values
but
Mmm.
Mmm.
Mmm, [[in a sense]]
C1 [my], but the kind of ethics, hhh I dunno they might have kind of helped guide me along the way as
well.
Yeah I think I, I, that’s why I was asking ‘cause I think I would agree that values, my values probably
haven’t changed that much through the course, values that I have, yeah, but ethical responsibilities
have been definitely shaped and shifted by the course.
I guess yeah definitely that, I’m not saying that my values have changed or I was different, I had
different values, but I think it made me think a lot
Mmm.
[on ]a deeper level about my fundamental values
Mmm.
and also yeah the ethics of my work, because yes we all have values and ethics but being in this field
I think it really, I suppose yeah sha- reflects the kind of real I suppose seriousness of what you’re
doing
Mmmhmm.
and the responsibility that you have as a professional.
Mmm, and I wonder if part of that is how our values fits with the profession
Mmm.
Mmm.
as well
Yeah.
if, ‘cause yeah I think for me that creates some discomfort really, that there are times when my
values don’t fit with the profession
Mmmhmm.
C3 that I work in
C4 Mmm.
Mmm.
they don’t fit with my ideal way of being I guess, but my values did kind of drive me towards this
C4 [Yeah.]
C3 [career] but now that I’m in it, there are some times I find it uncomfortable, that’s quite vague
without giving a specific but I guess I can’t really think of a specific right now
C4 Mmmm.
but I know that there are parts of the field that we work in that I find are uncomfortable with, to, in,
in regards to, yeah, kind of if I need to, kind of mould my values to fit working practically
Mmmhmmm.
as a psychologist
Mmm.
I guess a specific of that would be, in terms of work, in terms of work, in terms of the demands
placed on us, where I think I would prefer to work in quite, in a certain way to be ethical, to be
therapeutic, and with my own values kind of mixed in there too, but perhaps the demands placed
on me by my manager, perhaps shifts me away from my own values sometimes and that’s
uncomfortable
Mmmhmm, mmmhmm.

and as a trainee for me it’s quite difficult to perhaps dictate the terms

Mmm.

so yeah. So what do you think are the main differences between ethics and values?

I was just thinking that actually as you were saying that, well (are there) the difference? ‘Cause to me I think, I feel confident in my values and, so values is something internal. It’s an internal motivational set of beliefs for me that drives

Mmmhmm.

my behaviour, so I guess it allows me to rationalise my behaviour. So if I were to differentiate values and ethics, erm, if that’s values then what is ethical ethic - ethics are a, a kind of external set of beliefs, rules, etc. that’s supposed to guide your behaviour

Mmmhmm.

so I guess the main conflict I have is the external versus what I think I’m doing <Laughs> and whether that’s okay, erm, and as you were talking I was thinking of an, of an example when I called a client, I withheld my, my own number from the mobile but I was, I had to take time off work unexpectedly, erm the receptionist told me, you need to cancel your own client list, so I withheld my own mobile number and I called everybody, which is a complete breach of the ethical agreement set up with my supervisor but to me the value of letting the client know that I wasn’t gonna be there was much more important

Mmmhmm. Can I ask about that phone call that you made, how that kind of broke the ethical agreement that you had?

That

Was it ‘cause of the model that you work or?

Well it’s the service that I work in so what my supervisor said to me, I was, I couldn’t get hold of my supervisor because she was in her own sessions and the receptionist gave me an instruction which I followed, my supervisor was saying that that’s not what you should do, under any circumstances, if you are not at work, if you’re not well enough to see the client, you shouldn’t even be engaging in a phone conversation, and what she said was luckily you hit the answer-phone, what if you’d managed to get hold of the patient? What if the discussion had got drawn out into a, a long kind of conversation, semi-therapeutic session over the phone, and, and I heard where she was coming from, and I accepted her reasoning actually, but if I reflected back on it, would I still have contacted the client rather than knowing that they would probably rock up and be annoyed and be sent back?

Mmmhmm.

That’s where I think values and ethics can sometimes conflict. I would have liked to have think that I would’ve been boundaryed enough to make it a very short conversation

And, [and ]

[but] the rules say that I shouldn’t really, if I’m not at work I shouldn’t contact them

So who, who would contact them (if you’re not to tell )? They won’t get contacted?

Well it would, should and would have been done by admin but, it’s almost like saying right that’s not
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>my responsibility that’s theirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>C3 Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>C5 Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>C2 and that to me is not a value that I hold, I can’t, does that make sense?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>C5 [Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>C3 [Mmmhmm], but I, I guess I’m struggling to see how that fits in with ethics, I guess, I can see how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>that would fit in with a preferred way of working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>C2 Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>C3 I can how that would fit in with perhaps working in a certain model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>C2 Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>C3 but I just wonder if, say if, if you were working in a private practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>C2 Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>C3 and if you didn’t have a receptionist or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>C2 [Mmmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>C3 [someone] else to make those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>C2 [Mmmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>C3 [calls for] you, if you couldn’t make it in to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>C2 Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>C3 if you couldn’t meet an appointment it would be up to you to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>C2 [Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>C3 [contact the] client and I think regarding ethics maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>C2 But is that, I guess that, it’s just an example, it’s not the best example, it was an example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>C3 [Okay.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>C2 [to throw up] what would happen if you were in private practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>C3 Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>C2 [If you’re not well]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>C3 [Because the ethics change?] Sorry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>C2 Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>C5 ‘Cause I was just thinking that is there different sets of ethics then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>C2 [Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>C3 [Mmmm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>C5 depending on the context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>C3 [Mmmhmm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>C5 [or is there just] one broad ethics for everything, or depending where you work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>C2 [Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>C5 [and do] they set up their own ethical guidelines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>C3 Yeah, because I do see ethics as quite rigid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>C2 Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>C3 and ethics as being kind of quite trans- transferable, and perhaps I could be shot down in flames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>here, but I kind of see ethics as being transferable between work settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>C5 [Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>C3 [Yeah], but another thing that kind of came to mind when you were speaking is, are there times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>when our values supersede ethics? Are there times when, or vice versa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>C2 [Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>C3 [Maybe], are there times when one needs to come before the other, if there’s a conflict does one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
come before the other?

C2 Mmm. That’s where I think the, the definition’s really important and I still don’t know if I can separate them out enough to, to know that.

C3 Mmmhmm.

C2 Erm, depends if you have unethical values I suppose <Laughs>.

MOD So you’re not sure how distinctly different these two things are then

C2 [Yeah.]

MOD [or where] they meet

C4 [No]

C5 [That’s what I said.]

MOD [or where they overlap.]

C5 Mmm.

C2 I guess it was a summary that erm we talked about in the lecture, when we did the lecture on ethics, that to me it’s ethical if I feel that it’s in the interests, if I can rationalise it without waffling, so if I can justify and provide a sound rationale for why I have done something, then I think I’ve acted ethically

C3 Mmmhmm.  

C2 and I would hope that those, whatever I did is guided by my values, personal and professional values.

C4 Mmm.

C2 Yeah where one stops and the other begins I don’t know.

C4 [I think for me erm]

C5 [That’s a], go on.

C4 sorry, I think for me, erm, my values would have to, I suppose I, if I would act upon something that I would think is hhh, erm, unethical for example, if, if that is not, if that’s incongruent with my values then I wouldn’t feel comfortable with, with doing that, so if my values say no then I wouldn’t do something because it would be, someone’s telling me that that

C1 [Mmm.]

C4 is ethical to do that is not congruent with what I fundamentally believe.

C1 Mmm.

C4 So that would make me very uncomfortable, so.

C1 But I guess sometimes our values, I can’t think of an example now, but sometimes our values do go against ethics, especially because like you say they are rig- quite rigid at times, and then, we have to think about are we acting as a person or are we acting as an ethical practitioner

C3 [Mmmhmm.]

C1 [I don’t know] I’m kind of just thinking, and which do we, what do we go with and

C3 Mmm.

C1 what’s correct, what would be to co- correct to go with, ‘cause obviously there’s what we feel is right

C4 Mmm.

C1 but is that necessarily right

C3 Mmmhmm.

C1 just because it feels right.

C3 There are times, or there have been times, when I’ve felt as though in being ethical I haven’t been human as such, or I haven’t, you know I’ve, I’ve, it’s taken away so much of who I am because
professionally I need to treat this person in a certain way, and I think that that at times makes, well
has done in the past, has made me kind of resentful towards the profession and made me

[Mmm.]

[resentful] towards the work actually.

And I guess, sorry to

[Mmm.]

erm and I guess that brings me to think, you know how in our profession we do tell our own clients
that if you know they talk about harming themselves or suicide, then we have to act upon that and,
and take it further

[Mmm.]

err but what if, if you know my fundamental values thinks otherwise,

[Mmmhmm.]

[thinks that], what if someone do really want to, what if someone really, I guess maybe they have
the right to, to end their lives

[Mmmhmm.]

but my professional erm duty and responsibility is, I can’t do that, and that’s I think something that
is, I suppose

Yeah.

very incongruent

[Mmm.]

but something that I have to do [and act upon.]

[Mmm, exactly]. I guess ‘cause if you weren’t to act upon it

Then that’s unethical.

and that would place you

Yeah.

at risk

Yes.

and I guess if we don’t work in a eth- ethical way

Yeah.

it places us as a practitioner at risk.

That’s the constant thing that I battle with when I think about that, that what if someone really, of

course there are times when maybe someone, when they come out of that state they realise that

they, that’s not what they wanted to do but

[Mmm.]

what if someone really genuinely want, does [not want to live]

[Mmmhmm]

Yeah.

[and I don’t think])

[So there’s a battle] between personal and professional.

Yes, you got it, yeah, yeah.

Yeah ‘cause I, I guess if we work in an unethical way it places us as professionals at risk. If we work in

a way where we’re not congruent with our values it places the self at risk as such, and to be honest

I’m not really sure which one erm I’d prefer to maintain.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>If I'd prefer to maintain the self, if I'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[prefer] to maintain the profession. I, I kind of think fuck the profession at times to be honest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Mmm, I agree with you which is why I get into troubles of ethical natures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[quite], quite regularly because it, I feel it comes back to the fact that we have to be, I have to be able to justify why I've done something, and this set of rules seems external to me because if what we're saying is that it makes you feel erm dehumanised or not acting in a human way then that to me is completely at odds with the values of the profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Mmmhmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>so the values come first for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>And I guess if we're not, if we're not kind of being true to our values as a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>[person] then how can we really be true to ourselves as a professional? How can we even</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>[be] a professional without that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>And how can we be ethical then?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>That if we're kind of donning a role, or carrying out a, a task, or performing a therapy, you know with a capital P, we're just performing it not, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>How do you think your training experiences have shaped your views on values and ethics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Oh God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>&lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>For me I think regarding the training and regarding our training being ethical, especially you know one particular lecturer kind of comes to mind, is if you don't you'll be in trouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>&lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>It's a bit [scaremongering, like, yeah]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[and, yeah, it really is, it's a case of you have] to work in a ethical way, you need to be able to defend yourself and, which is right but at the same time it's a case of, well you do it or else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[But yet] we don't know what it is, and that's my dilemma that we're, when we're looking through the handbook, the ethical guidelines, it's so vague. So, for me the training just, has kind of, scared the hell out of me in terms of, you know, the guidelines are vague, we know that if we breach guidelines we're in deep shit,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Mmmhmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[That's the kind] of message we get, however it's so vague that anything you could do seems to be potential to get you into,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Mmmhmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[into deep shit]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[deep shit]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[But I feel it's], I feel it's very, it's a vague subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>It’s, mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>because like I said, you could say, I did this in the best interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[and these] are my reasons why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>but someone else could say, well no that’s unethical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[practice], but you did it from the belief, this was ethical, this was right for my client in these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[circumstances], and you could still defend it but someone else could turn around and say, no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>and so we have two different [interpretations]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[interpretations]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>of the same thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Exactly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>It’s totally subjective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Mmm. Like I said it jokingly in class, they said erm, can we accept food from our clients? And she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td>didn’t give a yes or a no actually, but it’s that kind of thing, is it a gift if someone bakes a cake and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td>brings it in for you at the end of twenty sessions? Is that an ethical breach? Well, I know the answer,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td></td>
<td>technically yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Is it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Well you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[shouldn’t] accept things [from]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[I s-] I mean, I mean,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Clients &lt;Laughs&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[maybe not accept, if they give you] one hundred pound gift then that’s not, you know you probably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
<td>should say no but if they maybe bring in a little candle with a card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>But that comes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[it’s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[back to your] value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[-ues, yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[doesn’t it, of how] you interpret it and I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[I’m not disagreeing with you I completely agree with you in fact.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, but I’m, yeah], I suppose in terms of the ethic you know being in deep shit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td></td>
<td>maybe one &lt;laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[&lt;laughs&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[wouldn’t be in deep shit if you], I suppose, or you know not having, erm I guess there are certain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
<td>things that are quite clearly highlighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[in terms of] not having a romantic relationship with your client, that’s, you know obviously if you do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td></td>
<td>that then,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[then you’re] not in a good place, erm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>and just</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
but then again that
[Mmm.]
[goes back] to your values as
[Mmm.]
[as well and], erm
There’s so many, like you said
Little things
[subject-], so many shades
[Mmmhmm.]
[Yeah.]
of greys and stuff, and it’s hard to see, ‘cause I remember one client, she gave me a card but she had
a, a gift voucher with ten pounds in, and my line-manager said, no you have to give it back
Yeah.
and I felt
Really?
I had to send it back to her. I said
[Yeah.]
[sorry I can’t] accept this and that, like my reasons why
Yeah.
but I felt, I felt like I was rejecting her
Yeah.
but then I heard of someone else and they were like, oh yeah they don’t care and then, their clients
have taken them out to dinner which I’m just like
<Laughs>
Wooooo!
<laughter>
Okay then
Yeah, that’s true.
[That’s extreme.]
[that’s just seems], to me that just seems a little bit O.T.T.
But, but perhaps, to throw through a kind of third thing in to the mix of ethics and, in, and our own
beliefs, perhaps regarding like gifts, for example, maybe it’s about being therapeutic, and thinking,
okay well I’ve received a gift, perhaps they’ve kind of dropped a gift off the day
[Mmmhmm.]
[after] the ending of the session, which I’ve had before, a card and wine, and I’ve decided to keep
the wine, to keep the card, but not contact the client
[Mmmhmm.]
[not to contact] the client to say thanks
[Mmm.]
or contact the client to say, I can’t accept this, but to not contact the client at all ‘cause we’ve ended
Mmm.
and for me that’s being therapeutic, that may cross the line regarding ethics and I’m not particularly
sure if it does or not to be honest, I don’t really think it does but perhaps
[Mmm.]
it does], but I think therapeutically I did the right thing, I considered what that gift meant, I also
considered that we had ended therapy and for us to not have any contact. So I think that there’s a
balance actually between being ethical, being therapeutic,
[Mmm.] and our own values.
[Mmm.] Mmm, see for me like I said I felt like I was rejecting her, ‘cause she considered and gave this gift
[Mmm.] [and then] the organisation say, no, I have
to give it back to her.
Do you think it would’ve been the same if it was a actual
[An item, yeah] an item that she gave, like flowers, that cost ten pound to buy
See, yes I could see
do think that would’ve been the same?
No I don’t think, I don’t know, [it’s hard to say]
[Do you think you would’ve been] asked to give back flowers like you were the [voucher?]
[Voucher], probably not ‘cause I’ve had a client give me a plant before
Mmm
and I kept that, I’ve had chocolate before and I kept that.
I was told as long as you interpret it it’s okay.
<Laughter>
But the voucher sounds a bit, they gave you a voucher?
Yeah.
That’s interesting.
So, but I know someone else
[But that, that is]
[their client gave them cufflinks]
[That’s so interesting]
But I find it interesting that we, we do place a value on what the gift is even, that’s where our values
come in.
Mmm.
Agai- I’m not disagreeing with anything I
Yeah
[but like]
[like you said] though [if it’d been ten pound bunch of flowers]
[if it was ten pounds of flowers] it’s very different to giving someone ten pounds, as in ten pounds
cash, ten pounds vouchers, it’s almost like, .hhh money oh my god no
But what, [yeah]
[but we] can accept stuff.
Yeah, no I, I, I see what you’re saying but then I’m also thinking giving a voucher is almost, you know
if you, if you give someone a flower or a candle or something, you could probably make an
interpretation of that and, and look at what it stands for, what its symbol is but a gift voucher is, is
interesting, because it’s not really, it’s offering you something but
Mmm.
I don’t know it’s quite a
I don’t understand what you mean when you said you can interpret it.]
[That’s why we think there’s a grey area.]
Yeah, no I see what you’re saying.
It sounded like what you were saying was that values comes in there because you then have to decide
[what’s]
[what] value something holds for you
[Yeah.]
[or what] the values of that are.
Yeah, and so it’s as you said you do interpret, but
[Mmm.]
[you] interpret it
[Mmm.]
[subjectively], you
[Mmm.]
yourself, interpret that ten pound’s not okay, or cake is, or this isn’t
[Mmm.]
and that’s where we think it, it’s a grey area ethics, I, I worked in a place for five years which was a community based charity, which was heavily psychotherapeutic, we were not allowed to retain anything
[Mmm.]
so, and you just, the director had such a blanket statement of, he would actually say to, to families we were working with long-term, cause we’d work for them up to three months, and he would like make us say in the last few weeks that, tell your families if they’re thinking about giving you a gift that you’re not allowed to accept it, and I found that really like, oh god, but yeah
[Mmhmm.]
and so then what families would, this was interesting cause it was a home based therapy, what’s somebody going to do after three months of going into their home if you can’t give them a gift?
Cook for you.
They’re gonna cook for you
<Laughter>
and to me that was, that was even more of a kind of, [.hhh oh my god]
[Well it’s very personal isn’t it]
Yeah.
to cook, but I just [want to]
[I’d rather have the plant]
<Laughter>]
[I was thinking, you know], than be, [sit here and be cooked for and]
[Have a box of chocolates or something]
And have to eat.
Yeah, but <Laughs>
But at the same time, I think even to tell a client, or a client’s family, if you are thinking of giving me a gift
Don’t bother.
don’t but they, they might think, shit I wasn’t thinking of it
[<Laughter>]
I wasn’t thinking it, now what do I do?

[<Laughter>]

Yeah.

Yeah.

You know and, I, I think, if that’s a, a interpretation of being ethical, I would question that

[Yeah.]

[<Laughter>]

[<Laughter>]

[<Laughter>]

Yeah.

Yeah.

Yeah.

I would question it, I’d question the gift as well, about returning the gift

<laughs>

as what I thought they were.

Mmm.

But yeah, I, I guess my values and how I

Mmmhmm.

erm value being a psychologist, questions those

[Mmm.]

[Mmm.]

[Mmm.]

[Mmm.]

that we bring our values into our profession

[Mmm.]

[Mmm.]

and perhaps it is important that we question

[Mmm.]

[and our] identity as a professional, to question these ethics rather than just accept them.

Is there something in setting and context that you were just talking about then?

Oh definitely, erm, like I said 5 years I did home-based therapy, home-based family therapy, which

was an ethical minefield actually. You’re in people’s homes, you’re, you’ve got multiple clients,

you’re working, all the family dynamics come into it, boundaries get blurred, you’re there when

things outside of the therapeutic setting are coming in, other people, so, err some families I worked

with wouldn’t let neighbours or people know that I was a therapist. It’s really tricky, what they hell

do you do when somebody unexpected knocks on the door and I’m sitting in the lounge with mum

or dad or whoever, ethical minefield, and that’s why I left that job thinking that I can’t be dictated

by a set of twenty rules, it’s just, you can’t, I think you have to develop your own values and have

some confidence in what you’re doing, is ethical or not ethical and where you’re starting to slip into

a grey area, erm because you can’t account for every possible scenario.

And whose rules were they?

In that context? That I was working in?

You said I, I left because I couldn’t abide by a set of twenty rules and

No I was saying in that context it would be difficult to ascribe to a set of rules that were kind of

predetermined on gifts or

Right.

Out of hours phone-calls

So they were

‘cause we had an on-call phone
determined by the context.
completely determined by the context, by the family we were working with at the time, and it made me realise, I was very anxious at the start, thinking, I need to know what I can do and I can’t do ethically, and what I realised was that you just kind of have to figure it out as you go along ‘cause there can’t be a rule book, each scenario is different

Which is probably why the guidelines are so vague

And each supervisor’s different as well,

Each supervisor’s [different, yeah.]

[you, they tell] you completely different things

Yeah.

<Laughs>

<Laughs>

so in some ways we do need to bring in our own values

Mmm.

or our own ideas about ethics, whatever we want to call it, because, yeah it can get very confusing. I think it’s gonna get more confusing the more independent we become

Mmm.

after this course. It’s funny cause you were talking about erm someone leavi- after finishing therapy them leaving you, erm, a gift, after finishing therapy someone left me erm a, a month later, cause we ha- we used work phones, she text me a message saying that she’d been in quite a serious accident, everything was going really bad for her, almost quite, like a

[Oh gosh.]

[fatal accident]

[Oh gosh.]

Mmm.

[she was fine] but it was the, erm, trauma of it I guess, and she just text me this message, and I told my supervisor and he said, you [can’t respond]

[can’t send anything back], you can’t

[can’t respond] at all, and I guess, I understand his reasons, personally I found them quite harsh

Mmm.

but then when you think about, imagine if that person committed suicide or something

Mmm.

huh, why didn’t I reply to the text? You know, imagine, I don’t mean personally but that might be your question

Mmm.

maybe they were s- that was a cry for help or
[I don’t know], so, I don’t think we’ll ever have the answers, like that twenty
Mmm.
Mmm.
I just don’t think it can be done.
But it sounds like your training, to go back to something you said, was, the message was, you have
to follow this, follow some rules or else, sort of
Mmm.
[Yeah as such]
As if, there was a], there was a warning in there somehow.
Mmm, well
<Laughs>
I, I took it
Okay.
Yeah, [there are serious consequences]
[as a warning,]
[yeah, fitness to practice innit?]
[that they’ve got this practice disciplinary], err procedures or board, the HPC and
Right.
that sh- heh, she’s involved in that and she
<Laughter>
she had a case this week and it went like this and she had a case the other week and
<Laughter>
you know so
<Laughter>
[Beware of the message.]
[it was, yeah]
[Right.] [and it’s a case of], shit it’s been three years of fairly intense study, expensive study and it could all
go because I make a ethical mistake
Mmm.
and I think that’s a scary cloud to work under
Mmm.
I think it
Mmm.
I, I think it’s so important that we are ethical, I think it protects us, it protects the client, it protects
the profession and whatever service we work in, I think it’s so important to be ethical, but at what
cost do we need to work ethnically?
Mmm.
And I think that there, there’s a cost to it sometimes
Mmm.
and it depends if that cost is worth it.
Were there any other ways that your training dealt with these two terms or notions, values and
ethics?
I don’t recall much about values
No.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>C3 I don’t know if other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>C4 About what sorry?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>C2 [Values.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>C3 [Values.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>C4 Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633</td>
<td>C2 And that annoys me a hell of a lot because I think my value base probably developed on my masters which was like, feels like a million years ago now, and given the nature of the subject we’re studying, no I agree nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>C3 [Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>C2 [nothing] on internal values, nothing on how to develop an internal supervisor, nothing on how to use your own moral compass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639</td>
<td>C3 Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>C4 I guess that’s what I was trying to get at at the beginning when I was saying how values, the kind of values that maybe you, yes your personal values but also the professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>C2 Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>C4 aspects of it as well and how it makes you kind of reflect on your personal values but also on, on the things that you pick up on the course as a psychologist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645</td>
<td>MOD Do you mean the values of the course, is that, is that what you mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646</td>
<td>C4 Erm yes. I think, the values of the course, I don’t know how to phrase myself but erm, the, the things that you, I suppose learn and, and practice and how that I suppose stimulates your, the, the fundamental values that you have and how you can, I suppose in some ways I wonder whether it makes you become more in touch with, with your values? I don’t know. I guess that was what I’m trying to say, erm, I don’t know if I’m making much sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>C2 What do you mean, like experience of being on the course itself or something in particular on the course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652</td>
<td>C4 Yes the experience of, of being on the course and, erm, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654</td>
<td>C1 Do you remember that module that we had, erm, err first year it was like the last term, yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>C2 [Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656</td>
<td>C1 [and I can’t] remember what it was called, context something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657</td>
<td>C2 Diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658</td>
<td>C4 Diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>659</td>
<td>C1 diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>C2 Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>C3 [Mmmhmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662</td>
<td>C1 [something], erm, I’m sure I had a reason for bringing it up &lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>C2 Yeah we touched on ethics in that one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665</td>
<td>C1 [Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666</td>
<td>C2 [that’s why] I think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667</td>
<td>C5 I can’t remember it [(seems like yonks ago).]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td>C2 [but I don’t, I’m sure we didn’t]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669</td>
<td>C4 [We did talk about] ethics, values, and morals didn’t we?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>C2 Did we? &lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671</td>
<td>C5 &lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672</td>
<td>C3 Was it just the one lecture, was it just</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Covered the
I think it was just one lecture on that
[that covered the three <Laughs>]
[which was values, ethics, and morals] but that was a
Okay. [Yeah I (                           )]
[[                           ]]
[Yes.]
[Cause I remember we had to do a journal article]
[Yeah.]
[and] mine was on, kind of, I can’t remember what it was properly now, but it was kind of about
having to give erm therapy to people who were forced by the courts to have it, you know people on
probation, and whether that is ethical or not, and, and, erm, so we obviously did cover it in some
way but
[As if, as if], it was, it wasn’t very sufficient I don’t think
[Yes.]
[Values, ethics, and morals.]
There was another term used there, so it was values, ethics, and morals.
Yes.
<Laughs> don’t bring morals into this it’s even more confusing.
Don’t complicate it even more <Laughs>
Well I suppose I’m interested that it’s set aside as a third party there.
[Mmm.]
[Mmm.]
Oh, I think it’s just word play bleurgh <Laughs>
[Yeah.]
I think I, in fact all three of them, call it something else it’s, you know, internal supervisor, moral
compass, guiding principles, ethical values, every one, it’s just
I think my struggle was, what I was trying to communicate is are, do our values also, can they shift as
well as a
[result] of this course?
[Mmm.]
That’s what I was, I suppose it took me fifteen minutes to get to this
<Laughter>
but that’s what I’m trying to say.
That’s a question you’ve got or you think?
I’m thinking it, it’s, it’s something that, I’m not sure, but this, this is what I’m kind of trying to make
sense of.
Have you felt a shift do you think?
If I’ve felt a shift? Erm, I don’t know if I’ve, if there’s been a shift but it’s definitely made me think a
lot about my own values and I, how I relate to the course, erm, and how I, yeah ethically act.
So it’s stimulated reflection.
Yes, yeah, definitely.
Which perhaps is quite expected seeing that we’ve experienced so much
[Mmm.]
[Yes.]
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>718</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[on the course and]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>we’ve had this requirement of personal therapy and, the amount of reflection needed as well, and I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721</td>
<td></td>
<td>guess just through the experiences that we’ve had there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Definitely yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[(they’ve made us shift)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Actually personal therapy] is a flipping gem, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>It’s a flipping gem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Flipping gem, sorry, no I’m just thinking about how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Such strong language there.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[I was like oh yeah] &lt;Laughs&gt; at the start I was thinking yeah I’ll just do the thirty, forty hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730</td>
<td></td>
<td>whatever it is and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[it’ll be a] breeze and I’ll just talk about blah blah blah, but actually that’s probably been the space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td></td>
<td>where I’ve explored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>735</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[values] and conflicts and all these kind of, yeah, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>So what about space on the course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>I’m still feeling like no, blanket no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Not to the extent I would want, or wish, or hope, or anticipate, no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>But is it not all part of the course anyway? Isn’t the therapy part of the course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Isn’t the things that we do at placement part of the course? The training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Oh I suppose yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>the training’s perhaps the umbrella term, that we’re trainees and it comes as part of the training,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>745</td>
<td></td>
<td>and, but then we’ve got the academic, we’ve got the professional, we’ve got the therapy, so the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746</td>
<td></td>
<td>development, personal development, but I think, I think the course is, it’s just embedded in it all as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747</td>
<td></td>
<td>well, [and, and]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>748</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Mmm, yeah], but sorry I’m interpreting it as the teaching when you say course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[I’m thinking] of the teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>752</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Well I kind of wonder if you interpret the course as being the taught element of our training?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>753</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>I, I dunno like you say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>754</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>So it’s down to our interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[(    )]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Oh, okay, yeah]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>[It is down to you, yeah, yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>But I guess, I guess, you know to answer that from my opinion, I think although yeah we do gain a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
<td>hell of a lot from everything else, at the same time if there aren’t certain key areas covered on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>761</td>
<td></td>
<td>course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>763</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>then how do they know they are covered like let’s be real, our own experiences through training are completely different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>My own experiences from placement to placement are completely different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Mmmhmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>767</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>So how do they know that we know how to get the right things?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>768</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>769</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Mmmhmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>And I, yeah, that’s yeah, if I think, I agree with you actually, if I think about the course as a whole there’s scope, and the therapy element, yeah, and the placements, yeah, but then placements are completely dependent on how you arrange them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>And I guess they don’t actually check out the placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[They don’t check out the placements]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Either they], it kind of seems as though as long as it works to a certain model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>and as long as the supervisor has gone through a similar process, then there’s a assumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>There’s a massive assumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>that okay you’re going to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>778</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>779</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>be covered regarding, err I don’t know, taught how to work ethically and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>to, how to manage the process and your own values and, and whatever else, there’s just, yeah, a assumption, I think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[I think it’s a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>783</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[They assume] ethical practical practice, they assume our supervisors are ethical,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>784</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[&lt;Laughs&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>785</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[they assume that the organisation that we work in is ethical &lt;Laughs&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>786</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Mmmhmm, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>787</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>it’s a massive assumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>788</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>They assume it exists [to some extent.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>789</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[They assume it exists.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>&lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>You’ve both used the word, you just used the word taught, and you said you’d been interpreting as a teaching perhaps and, so what do you think about that? Is this something that is taught or?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>792</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>If the ethics are taught do you mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>If these notions, values and ethics, are things that are taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Erm, I think the ethics are taught, I think the values develop, they’re there already, I think they continue to evolve and continue to develop, erm, I can’t remember the third word you mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Well I mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>you know, just values and ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Okay.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>799</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>[and], [morals came in]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 800 | C3 | [and morals], mmm, and I think they develop too I guess, they are in place through early experiences and they develop through our own experiences too, much the same as values, I can’t
really see a difference between morals and values.

[Mmm.]

[Mmm.]

I’m not sure if there is one, but I can’t see a difference.

Is- isn’t morals like things that it’s, it’s either right or wrong, I think some things

[Mmm.]

Stood up to your values?

No I don’t think it’s black white like that.

I guess in terms of having maybe had experience of perhaps, in some ways I guess what I’m trying to say sometimes this course even also brings, reaffirms and brings you closer to your own values, for, example if, if you’ve had an experience with someone, either a supervisor, yeah let’s say your supervisor who’s really not acted in a very ethical way towards you or, or just completely done things that were out of proportion for example, that may, has, has made me to, I suppose think that that’s, I would never do that, that is not in any way congruent with the way my values are, or ethically I would, I would never, I suppose hurt someone in the way that I have been treated, if that makes any sense, so in that perspective [I think it]

[So it’s like] an experiential learning.

Yes, definitely.

So I suppose like being taught is, is again a vague word, it’s how, how are you taught, how do you learn? How do we let the experience across the 3 years, has taught me to, perhaps to reflect more on ethics and values but you can’t teach it per se, and I’ve had good placements and good supervisors so, I just feel that’s almost like a pot-luck, because I could’ve equally’ve had a, a situation that didn’t allow me to erm, didn’t allow me to learn how to work in an ethical way, or in a way that I felt kind of comfortable with.

So how do you think your practice experiences have shaped your views on values and ethics?

I’ve had 3 supervisors in three years and all three, individually, personally, place it quite high on the agenda as a discussion point, so maybe it’s the way I work, maybe it’s, I bring it up also as a, err I know we’re supposed to do this but <Laughs> so it’s stayed on the agenda for me, but I don’t think that’s as a result of anything university’s done per se, I think a lot of the, the good stuff I’ve got out of placements is the placement and the supervisor.

Could you just repeat that question that you just posed about the placement and yeah, how do you think your practice experiences have shaped your views on values and ethics?

I dunno it’s difficult, I’m not sure. I think for me my placement experiences have erm, have I guess kind of highlighted the need to be ethical. There’ve been times when I’ve perhaps crossed the, crossed the line maybe, erm, I haven’t slept with any clients

<Laughter>

[I haven’t, I haven’t stepped that far]

[Just to clarify]

[[but you say you’ve been close to].]

<Laughter>

I haven’t.

<Laughter>

Erm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>853</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>Where is the line? Is there a line?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>854</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Is the line]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[The way you erm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>856</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>[Where is it?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>857</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[left the (                         )]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>858</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Yeah I, I’ve just,]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>859</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[makes me think that maybe you did.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>You have not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Erm &lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>862</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Only accepted gifts, yes we know that &lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Anyway, err where’s the line? I th- erm, just trying to think of an example but, dunno actually, I don’t know where the line is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Can I jump in, [sorry]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>866</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Please do] cause I’m, [I’m struggling.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[no, as I] mentioned before maybe the issue of, of suicide, erm, is just, you know something that you continuous-, you know that when you assess your clients you do ask them have you ever had thoughts about killing yourself and if, you know if they say yes and they’ve got plans and then you have to act ethically as I said before, erm, but that's something that in terms of the ethics and how the, my practice have shaped maybe the way I think ethically, erm it’s challenged my own kind of personal ethical erm standards but then I still have to act upon my professional, err so it’s I guess posed a real challenge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>868</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>876</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>But values I think they’re a bit harder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>877</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>So what about the client’s values?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>878</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Yeah, erm, you mean in this instance if, if for example they?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>879</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Just generally I suppose these two terms, values and ethics, do you think about what they are to the clients?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>What the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>882</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>883</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>[client’s] values are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>885</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>886</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>887</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>[their] ethics might be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>888</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>I guess that would make me even feel worse if their values and ethics were different than that of mine, but on a personal level I would relate to that but then would have to act differently because, erm, I have to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>891</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Mmm, there’s a conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>892</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>893</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[a real] conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>I’m thinking about the suicide example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>897</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[that] you used actually, I’m thinking about a client who, our values were in conflict, I mean,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
personally I don’t believe in suicide but that’s just my personal value but I also accept that some people erm would see it as, as an option

if they’re thinking rationally, would with their rational minds see euthanasia or suicide as a legitimate behaviour and this session with the client we actually spoke about our values and I, I had to address this cause we were just wrestling with it and I said, professionally this is where I stand on suicide, however let’s just talk about it and she ended up disclosing that she was at a point in her life where she really didn’t want to go on, there was a history of suicide, it was a legitimate way out and I left that session kind of thinking, well she may well go off and do it, and that’s her choice, and ethically I’ve done everything I needed to do, blah blah blah, risk, der der der, given her information but, so the client’s values and my ethics I think as a professional you can do what you need to do ethically and still have a client whose values are going to be in conflict with yours if that makes any sense. The client doesn’t necessarily have to agree with your value base

and if they act unethically, there’s no real consequence for them, there’s only a consequence for us if

but, so the client’s values and my ethics I think as a professional you can do what you need to do ethically and still have a client whose values are going to be in conflict with yours if that makes any sense. The client doesn’t necessarily have to agree with your value base

Mmm.

if

[we] act unethically. So in that way it doesn’t seem as complex, that’s where it, that’s one example where ethics might help <Laughs> in a way.

But unethically means, in, that you’re contravening what?

What do you mean?

I guess I can’t, yeah sorry, I can’t, [what I meant was] [You used the word profession there] do you mean, sorry

Yeah it’s, to me the ethics are tied up with a profession that I don’t see ethics as applying almost, or ethics don’t apply to clients but that just shows how I’m understanding and interpreting ethics, I’m seeing it as something that belongs to a professional context with consequences for me as a professional

And what are these ethics of the profession then?

That we must not, in this example, allow our clients to commit suicide.

Not to abuse your power.

Not to abuse power, and to act in the, the best interests of the client which

that’s why we’ve just had a chat about suicide, I’m like

[you know?] Because it wouldn’t be in her best interests for me to talk her out of it, and I wouldn’t do that, so I guess that’s what I meant by, I have to act ethically, my values tell me that you can’t stop somebody killing themselves if they really want to do it, my ethics say that you have to cover certain ground, but does the client have an ethical code? Not in the same way that we as therapists do I don’t think.

And where do you think counselling psychology fits into that?
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>943</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>It doesn’t for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>944</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Can you be a bit more specific? Or in terms of?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>945</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Well I’m wondering when you talk about, talk about the profession erm do you mean counselling psychology or do you mean the BPS code of conduct or do you mean something, I, I’m wha- what do you mean? ‘Cause it sounded like you were configuring it as your personal values, the client’s personal values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>949</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Can you be a bit more specific? Or in terms of?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>952</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>erm standard or framework, and I’m wondering whether within the profession is subsumed counselling psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>954</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>955</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>or whether counselling psychology is something else in there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>956</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>I just see ethics as belonging to the body, whoever that body is, it was BPS in year one, now it’s HPC, I don’t see it as a, as split between counselling, clinical, psychotherapeutic practitioners or anybody else, I just see it as something that belongs to the body that governs our profession, whoever that may be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>So what does it mean to you all to be counselling psychologists then? Or does it? Is that not, does that mean something to you or not really, what do you think? Counselling [psychology.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[No.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>What does it mean to us to be counselling psychologists?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>964</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>966</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>That’s, that’s such a [broad]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>967</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[Profound] question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>968</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Question, erm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>It means to be a healer, perhaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>status &lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>971</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>&lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>972</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>A lot of study &lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>973</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>974</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>I’d be happy with just the psychologist. I mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>975</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>976</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>counselling, clinical, fff, doesn’t make a difference to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>977</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>It’s all about the, being a doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>978</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>979</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Yes it’s the two letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[you called a doctor.]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>981</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>[What does it mean to be] a psychologist then, erm I’m, I guess I’m trying to find a place for these words in the configuration, in terms of the values and ethics of being a counselling psychologist, I don’t feel like I’ve heard you say that, describe that, unless when you say profession that’s what you mean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>985</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Mmm, [yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>987</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yes, referring to the [(profession)]

[So when you say] profession you mean being a counselling psychologist.

‘Cause that’s our profession.

Yeah.

Right, but then what you were just saying was that it, for you, erm, it sounded like what you were saying was that it wasn’t distinct.

No for me it’s not distinct and that’s probably because I spent five years wearing the hat of a f- what would be called a family therapist, so it doesn’t matter to me what I’m called, I don’t think my values and ethics change, if I was to go and do another course and be called something else, it wouldn’t, it wouldn’t impact, so the profession to me is as a psychologist, as somebody working with people, erm in a psychological capacity.

But perhaps ethics would change if say, I dunno, say if you work in the profession of being a counselling psychologist compared to say working in the profession of being say a care-worker.

Yeah, no I guess I mean within the field of psychology, so if you were to go and wear another hat

Mmmhmm.

let’s say be a trained CBT practitioner and then call yourself that or erm go on and do psychotherapy.

Okay

So the profession like encompass-

Of being a therapist or

all of it, just, yeah therapist a

Mmmhmm.

whatever we, we might call ourselves in 10 years time.

Mmmhmm.

And others? What do you think? Would you agree that say psychotherapy and counselling psychology share the same values and share the same notions of ethics?

I don’t know that they necessarily do but I think they’re very very similar, and I agree with C2 it doesn’t really matter what my title is it would be more about erm where I’m, it wouldn’t, it wouldn’t change that for me basically.

Mmm. Cause I guess that there could be changes in how you would work therapeutically

Mmm.

that may create conflicts ethically, so many long words

<Laughs>

where for example say if you’re a CBT therapist

Mmm.

compared to a psychoanalyst, where perhaps a CBT therapist would actually leave the therapy room with the client to do a behavioural experiment

[Mmm.]

[Yeah.]

and go out to do some kind of exposure work or something, yet a psychoanalyst, I’m kind of making a assumption here, I think would very much just be in the room

Mmm.

where that time is the client’s time and it’s up to them. Erm, ethically is it okay to accept money from clients, say psychoanalysis, if you have a appointment, if you can’t attend you still pay the money.
You might miss a month’s worth of appointments, you pay the money for every single appointment ‘cause that time is still yours. As a CBT therapist, if a client cancels a appointment the day before or something would you still charge the money? Would it be ethical to still expect that money to be paid? You know, so I think that it, perhaps it [does change], even though they’re the, they’re all, working, they’re both working in the psychological field perhaps the ethics do change through the professions [But would you think] that that would change, I’m just thinking about myself and if I was, ‘cause you know when I work psychodynamically, or when I work using CBT, I don’t think, I don’t think there would be a difference in the way I would charge people, I think it would be the same [In terms of] [and I], well I mean if, you know private practice like you were talking about your example Mmmhmhmhm. I don’t think it would be different based on [working] one way or another. Okay so but, whereas, say, now, now I’m, I’m a member of an analytic group, which meets every week, if I can’t make a week I may tell the group two weeks prior, I cannot make this date, I’m still expected to pay for that time regardless. I may say I cannot make the appointment in a month’s time, if the group’s running I’m still expected to pay. [In saying] [Mmm.] [Mmm.] Now when I’ve had CBT therapy before or I’ve had integrative err personal therapy in the first year, if I cancelled a appointment we would just rearrange the appointment, I wouldn’t pay I’d just rearrange for another time. Now is it ethical to expect that [person] to pay money for a appointment that they’ve cancelled? I guess, I agree both with C1 and you <laughs> on these points, I think agree with what you’re saying, if you’re working in private practice regardless of the model, the payment thing is kind of in a s- it’s up to you, but I also hear what you’re saying and I think that’s what I meant when I said that whichever hat you wear, you just adopt the ethical rules of that professional body.
Mmmhmm.

That, that, that’s exactly the example you gave is spot on.

Mmm.

that, you know for a psychoanalyst that’s ethical

[Mmmhmm.]  

[C3] [Let’s open], there are fickle guidelines, that’s, that’s fine

[Mmmhmm.]

and that’s why, that’s why I’m more erm, if I ask what your value instinct is in that, how you react that that <Laughs> your values tell you what you feel about it really.

Yeah, I, I kind of feel as though if I wasn’t okay with it

[Yeah.]  

[I would] leave that

[Mmm.]

[analytical] group. However, maybe the therapist has to be aware

Yeah.

at the same time whether it’s exploitative

Mmm.

as well, if they’re exploiting the client.

[Mmm.]

If the client has some relate issues

[Yeah.]  

[ethical] for the cli- for the therapist not to be aware of that?

Mmm.

Well would it ever be ethical though if we think about it like that because, especially if you’re thinking in that kind of, with that kind of model, you know, everything means something there’s

[Mmmhmm.]

you know there’s, they’ll always interpret erm non-attendance as something so in that case then it’s completely unethical to charge

[Mmmhmm.]  

[when someone’s] not there, and what if they’re not there because of that? What if they actually had child care problems or

[Mmm.]

they’ve got some problems with their job and they’re kind of overworked at that time, that’s unethical too

[Mmmhmm.]  

[but that’s] what I was saying about my values because

[Mmm.]  

[I think] even if I worked like that I would still struggle with charging someone just because some kind of
Mmm. strongly held belief by most other people, I don’t think it’s gonna be in a
kind of] ethical, under any kind of ethical guidelines, yes you must charge, but, so I think it’s a
different kind of thing and that’s why I think it doesn’t matter, that would be my values, that I
[think that would] be wrong and I would find, I would really struggle with that
and would probably have to argue it with the manager or whoever else is around
So the different approaches might have different forms of ethics or different frameworks?
That are ethical in some nature, but your values would be something that remains more consistent
I just, I don’t know if it would be ethical or unethical, I mean in terms of the different approaches or
whether it’s just the bod- the, the model of that specific person, ‘cause if you’re an analyst
then it’s, it’s within that model it’s not specifically up to me if, if someone, let’s say if you’re charging
erm a client even though they haven’t turned up whether that raises issue of ethical concerns or
whether that has more to do with the way that you erm think within that model, if that makes any
sense
Go on, can you say a bit more, you’re nodding? I think I misunderstood you before, so
What do you mean?
Well I’m not sure that when I said back to you that approaches have different con-, different ethical
Well I don’t think that’s, like C4 is saying, I don’t think whether you charge someone or not is ethical,
I think it can become ethical if you’re charging them incorrectly
[Yeah.]
[Yeah.] [Yeah.]
[Yeah.] [Yeah.]
[Yeah] approaches
[Yeah.]
[Mmm.]
It’s like, it’s like my supervisor was saying you
[Yeah, yeah.]
[know you] interpret the gift
[Exactly.]
[whereas another person] might just [take it or not take it.]
[Whereas maybe] a CBT therapist is not, they’re maybe, there’s not gonna be interpretations into
that, you know the
[In the same way.]
a picture], you when you draw a picture and give it to your therapist, the analyst is obviously going
to look at the colours and the shapes and the forms and the, you know symbols, what it represents,
but a CBT therapist is probably just

so is that something about the way the model values what goes on then?

Mmm.

To me yeah.

Right. So psychodynamic would value interpretations

over something else whereas CBT might place more value on

Something different

Mmm.

Is that what you mean?

Yeah.

What are your thoughts C5?

<Laughs> Erm, I dunno. Said it, like I said that it’s, it’s very subjective, I think there’s sometimes the
organisation that you may work for will make you do something that will go against your value.

C3 Mmmmm.

So there’s sometimes you know you think, well, do you have to go along with it? Like I had one
client who when she was referred her husband was very sick but the time her referral came to me
for the assessment he had died, and he’d died two weeks prior to my first appointment

Shit.

so she was very isolated, erm, very lonely ‘cause she was erm white British Muslim so she converted
to Islam, but it was, and her family was up north but she felt, was very isolated, she couldn’t go to
the mosque and stuff ‘cause the languages and stuff was different, so for me it was just a matter of
just hearing her out, giving tea and sympathy, my organisation were like, no you have to discharge
her because the bereavement has not been long enough, and even to this day it still bugs the hell
out of me ‘cause that went against my values. She just needed someone just, she was

isolated, just someone to talk, just to hear her out, I’m not doing therapy, bereavement therapy
per se, tea and sympathy if you want to call it that, but I felt that was valuable for her and I felt like I
had to chuck her out because you didn’t fit this neat little box

Mmm.

and to this day it still bugs me

C3 Mmmmm.

still annoys me, ‘cause that totally went against my values but the organisation, this

C4 [Mmm.]

[big body] is saying, no

C5 [isolated], just someone to talk, just to hear her out, I’m not doing therapy, bereavement therapy
per se, tea and sympathy if you want to call it that, but I felt that was valuable for her and I felt like I
had to chuck her out because you didn’t fit this neat little box

Mmm.

C5 it’s not long enough, and they’ve changed it now, anyone comes with bereavement it has to be six
months, which I can understand, you do have that recovery process but if someone’s really isolated
and they’ve got no one else to talk to, is it not therapeutic just to have someone to come and talk
to? Or should that be left to, I don’t know, the Samaritans or whatever, I don’t know, it does

That’s really interesting, that raises the ethics about what they call watchful waiting.

C4 C5 Yeah.

You know, that the distress will be at peak
Mmm. leave it alone and see what happens, whether it’s bereavement or it’s the same approach in kind of trauma work where, yeah, they’re in distress but leave them there for a bit, because it may just erm be okay in a few weeks

Mmm.

or it may need intervention but just wait, so there’s all sorts of ethics tied up in what we do constantly.

And I guess with, with erm watchful waiting, I guess risk can

[Mmm.]

[raise] from that as well, that yeah, if they’re up here

Mmm.

regarding their distress, if they’re high regarding their distress, that could be when they’re at the most risk

Mmm.

and to discharge someone who is so isolated

Mmm.

I can

[Mmm, (horrible)]

[completely understand how] uncomfortable that could’ve been actually and

[Mmm, (totally).]

I guess, I guess I agree and I would find it hard in your position in that situation but I’m just thinking about, how ethical is it to actually give someone therapy

Mmmhmm.

when we know that it is a process

Mmm.

bereavement is a process, and if we, all we are able to offer them is kind of sympathy or a space, so they feel less isolated, is that ethically going to be enough, I mean could you, would that, if it was private practice and they were coming to you, would it be right to charge them fifty pounds an hour when all you are giving them is that sp- I’m not saying i-

[Mmm.]

[I’m not saying I don’t], I don’t know where I stand on that, it’s just, it, I guess that’s the thing though, there aren’t straight lines with

[Mmm, ( ).]

[ethics, although] they can be so rigid that’s not realistic to life because

Mmmhmm.

[it wouldn’t fit into it]

[It’s constantly your call] isn’t it?

Yeah, so it’s really subjective.
I had one, another client who, her son had died suddenly and in her, talking about the bereavement she was sometimes feeling really low and sometimes had thoughts of being better off dead

‘cause she wanted to be with him, and my organisation’s like, right right right you have to write to the GP, tell her about this blah blah blah blah, and I had another client who was quite impulsive, wanted to go to the tube line, wanted to kill herself, she had four young, she had four boys, all young, the youngest was about 13 and stuff, and the dynamics there, I thought she was more at risk than

[Mmm.]

[than the other one] and they were like, no, you know it’s not important, it’s just like

I had another client who was quite impulsive, wanted to go to the tube line, wanted to kill herself, she had four young, she had four boys, all young, the youngest was about 13 and stuff, and the dynamics there, I thought she was more at risk than

[Mmm.]

how do you see the difference when they both are expressing suicidal tendencies and to one, to me a, an external supervisor was just part of the bereavement process

[Mmm.]

[expressing] suicidal tendencies and to one, to me a, an external supervisor was just part of the bereavement process

[Mmm.]

another one was, seemed very impulsive, even almost manipulative

[Mmm.]

with her boys and stuff, and it’s just like, but no that one wasn’t as important as that one, and how did they draw the lines and stuff and it’s just, ‘cause then it’s, to me it’s, it’s, because the guidelines are vague and interpretive I guess that it’s subjective.

It’s very subjective

[Mmm.]

and erm, if you think about those supervisors and trying to understand their decisions behind, you know why they don’t agree, they don’t see it the same way you do, is that based on their own previous experience of people that they’ve worked with? And how can we kind of judge based on that? What, what basis do we really have for anything?

[Mmm.]

It is all quite subjective, which is quite scary when we can do something very small and get

[Mmmhmm.]

Yeah.

[pulled up on it, [(you know )]]

[Mmmhmm.]

[(you know )]

[Mmmhmm.]

[Yeah.]

[you know] if I decide to go out on a Friday night and get really pissed and start dancing on tables, someone can see that and you know I could be brought in because my behaviour was unethical, it’s just like, is my whole being now just a

[Mmmhmm.]

[you know] if I decide to go out on a Friday night and get really pissed and start dancing on tables, someone can see that and you know I could be brought in because my behaviour was unethical, it’s just like, is my whole being now just a

[Mmmhmm.]

[counselling] psychologist? Should my values and ethics match up to this profession

[Mmmhmm. [Which I, yeah]]

[when I’m also human], I don’t know

[Mmm, yeah]

[( )]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1303</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[which I guess], and if you think about things like Facebook for example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1304</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1305</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>photographs on there, comments on there, I’m not really sure if this is still kind of connected but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>I mean that, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1308</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>but how that kind of need to, or that expectation that you’re always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1309</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>a counselling psychologist,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[That’s]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[you must] behave in a certain way, you’re expected to behave in a certain way, if you don’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1313</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>It’s not normal. It’s what you were saying about what do you sacrifice, do you sacrifice a bit of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1314</td>
<td></td>
<td>professionalism to keep the self intact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1316</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[you know], and I’m very much of, yeah, you know? I’m, I’m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1317</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[Me too.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1318</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[of course I’m] gonna go out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1319</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[It’s so extreme]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[course I’m gonna, you know] do stuff that I wouldn’t want my clients to see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>&lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>of course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1323</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>You’re still human.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>yeah, I’m not gonna pretend that I’m gonna be a flippin’ therapist twenty-four-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Mmmhmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[seven] ‘cause it’s just not gonna happen [but]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1327</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[but] it is, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1328</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Go on sorry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1329</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>But then you’ve got to be careful someone doesn’t see that and take offence, isn’t it [and then you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td></td>
<td>get]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1331</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Yeah but then] the, [that’s the thing]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1332</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[(What about)] freedom of speech,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1333</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[thy- this] is where I kind of, that’s where my struggle is, like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1336</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[can I] not write, can I not update my status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1337</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>&lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1338</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Yeah &lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1339</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>and write something that I just feel in that moment without being, you know someone catching me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340</td>
<td></td>
<td>and then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1341</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1342</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[pulling] me up against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1343</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[Mmmhmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[the HPC] for, I mean it, it’s just getting out of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>&lt;Laughs&gt; [proportion a little bit &lt;Laughs&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[But then is that, is that you take that professional role on and] you’re meant to be seen, if someone looks at you that’s what they will see, they will see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[that professional], the counselling psychologist, and you’re meant to uphold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[the values] and ethics but err [say when (                ), exactly, yeah]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[But who dictates them, that’s my big question], that who dictates them, that’s why I say I feel detached from it, ‘cause it’s the body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Mmmhmhm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[Yeah and who, who is the body?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[And you know when I], when I’m before the body and I have to explain why I was on an anti-war march or whatever whatever then so be it, but I think, you know, it’s so far removed it feels to me that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1357</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>It’s like this looming sense of, you will be called into the head-teacher’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[Yeah &lt;Laughs&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[you know &lt;Laughs&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[Or kissing your boyfriend &lt;Laughs&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1362</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[It’s like this looming sense of, you will be called into the head-teacher’s office but you’re not sure what it will be about? Is that what you mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>If, it feels to us, and I think this comes from the course, the, the taught element, that you must be aware of all dimensions of your life, and because the guidelines are so vague, I have a sense that it could be absolutely anything, it could be pot-luck, I don’t know, I’m having an argument with somebody on the street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[Or kissing your boyfriend &lt;Laughs&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[and a client walks past, I could be kissing somebody on the street, I could be peeing on the street], I don’t know but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>And what do you think that would mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>That</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Well we know what that means don’t we?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Yeah &lt;Laughs&gt; the message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>[What?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[we’ve been] given is that it’s a question mark over your professionalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>It’s an ethical issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>So professionalism means what then in that, what, what’s that message that’s been given to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Sticking to the ethical guidelines,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[to] know what you do.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[so] going on, going out getting trashed and being seen doing something that is not what you would expect, and that’s the grey area, what would one expect?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>See yeah, was someone who’d go out, got a bit pissed and flirted with the waiter, they could get called in &lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>So what is, so what somebody might</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Hopefully not there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1393</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Not for just flirting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1394</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1395</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>I think flirting’s allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1396</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Not just flirting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1397</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1398</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>So what one might expect is a grey area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1399</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Hmm?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>What, what one might expect, of a professional,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1402</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1403</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>[is a grey] area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1404</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1405</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>and is perhaps, what you’re saying, is very [subjective]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1406</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[Subjective.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1407</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1408</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>[like] who knows what one person might think of, expect of a profession, to another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1409</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1410</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Because it’s based on a professional mystique. If we were city bankers it would be expected we might go out and get trashed on a regular basis but because we have this professional mystique, which is false, it’s a false perception that counselling psychologists or any therapists are perfect human beings,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1412</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1413</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1414</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Yeah (it’s good).]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>’cause it really is, it’s like you have to be a certain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1416</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1417</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>[way] but where, where or when can we be human?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1418</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1419</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>You know] when, and I kind of just think about whether, whether it’s ethical to be a psychologist involved in the media in any role apart from as a psychologist, kind of, there was erm that Pamela Stevenson on the Strictly Come Dancing show, I don’t know, you’re all completely blank I see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1420</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1421</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>No I, I know what you’re talking about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1422</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Yeah?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1423</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>She’s a clinical psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Uhh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1426</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>on a dancing show who would’ve had a wealth of clients who she’s seen in the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1427</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Ohh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1428</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>past present and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1429</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>[Oh yeah.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[in the future], now she’s presenting herself on the dance-floor every Saturday night, Friday night behind the scenes footage at her home and family and the client get, gets to see her home, gets to see her partner and whatever else, gets to see in skimpy little outfits, is, is, is that right? Yeah, ‘cause I know we kind of cringe but why not, she’s human? [Mmmhmm, mmmhmm, how about] [‘Cause for me like I would love to go on], like, the biggest loser [<=Laughter>] [something like that, and I just think, if I go on there they’re gonna see me and know how much I weigh, they’ll know all my, my fuck ups and then I’m gonna be like their therapist or something], and I’m just like, hmm. [Or go on big brother or something] [I don’t know what I think I’m just playing] devil’s advocate, I honestly don’t know what I think about that but I’m just like, why not? <Laughs>

I, I ,I agree, I But then ethically there was a they may s-, would they Why? say? Then all the ‘Cause then we’re feeding into this idea Yeah. that we’re perfect, our kids are just sitting there quietly doing homework, so no it’s [crap] [Yeah it’s bollocks.] [I think that there’s] a real sense of imprisonment for me [Mmm.] [erm] <Laughs> [Yeah but that’s a] [maybe I’m going extreme] but like being aware what I, you know Mmm. oh you know I better be careful what I write you know under this person’s picture you know or, or if I make a comment here on, on my status I’m, you know, what, what if someone sees it and reports it to the HPC, I mean that’s a bit, pathetic really, erm [Mmmhmm.] [Mmm.] [That’s extreme.] [That’s just taking it] to the extreme but <Laughs> But I think, sorry, I was just going to say I think what we were told was not as bad as we’re making out now, I think what she was saying, our lecturer, is that we need to be able to justify our actions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1483</td>
<td>and our decisions, so if we do want to go on an anti-war march</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1484</td>
<td>C2 [Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485</td>
<td>C1 [we have] to be able to say, if we do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486</td>
<td>C4 [Mmm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1487</td>
<td>C1 [get] called up because of this we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>C2 [Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1489</td>
<td>C1 [have] to be able to defend ourselves and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490</td>
<td>C4 [Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1491</td>
<td>C1 [say], I am against war, I am ag- I believe in peace, I don’t think anyone, and that is part of my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1492</td>
<td>C2 [Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1493</td>
<td>C1 [like], myself as a counselling psychologist or whatever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1494</td>
<td>C2 Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>C1 err or yeah okay, I think, I think it's different with these examples of TV because that is actually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1496</td>
<td>showing your whole life to people anyway which is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1497</td>
<td>C4 [Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1498</td>
<td>C1 [something] that I don’t think everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499</td>
<td>C4 [Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>C1 [would agree] with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>C3 Okay so how I’ve taken a kind of lead of, during a anti war mask, mask, erm march</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1502</td>
<td>C1 Mask.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1503</td>
<td>&lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504</td>
<td>C3 it’s been a long day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505</td>
<td>C2 It has.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1506</td>
<td>C3 erm, how about if a therapist err is a member of say the BNP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1507</td>
<td>C5 Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td>C1 Well that’s different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509</td>
<td>C5 Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510</td>
<td>C3 Why’s that different?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511</td>
<td>C1 Because that is excluding a group, being part of anti-war march is not excluding anyone, in my eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>it’s actually, it’s actually saying, it depends why you’re on that march, but when I go on marches like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513</td>
<td>that, if I do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1514</td>
<td>[&lt;Laughter&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515</td>
<td>C5 [( )]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td>C1 then erm, then you know it’s because actually I believe in peace and I don’t think that going and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td>attacking people in another country is right, and I don’t think there’s anything about that that is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>incongruent with my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>C2 [Values.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520</td>
<td>C1 [posit-] with my kind of position as a counselling psychologist, whereas being in the BNP would be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>saying, you know, all these people, they need to be excluded from society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522</td>
<td>C5 [But like you say it’s all sub- subjective]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1523</td>
<td>C3 [Well, not necessarily], yeah, perhaps, perhaps the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1524</td>
<td>C4 Yeah, yeah, no, no [( )]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td>C3 [perhaps the] that person would say that err, that the country hasn’t got the infrastructure to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td>maintain the number of immigration into the country and there’s no other political party that’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>addressing that issue so therefore [( )]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1532</td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1544</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td>MOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1559</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1562</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1566</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1567</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>so [those kinds of things are, mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>[but ethically they were like, no you] have to treat everybody the same, [so]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>[But although], perhaps’ I’d be even more unethical for him to work with that couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>[&lt;Laughter&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>[Exactly]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>[You know?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>So he doesn’t believe in keeping the relationship intact obviously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Yeah, ‘cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>So</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>I, I know what you’re say but I, mmm, it’s an idealism isn’t it, that if, this is maybe going a step too far, if you don’t believe in human kind then anything which promotes exclusion or division, whether it’s gay marriages or erm, I don’t know, erm, stopping immigration, or things to me that don’t, don’t promote inclusion in the broadest sense are a value that’s, that conflicts with which ever body it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>Whichever?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>Which ever professional body it is. So there’s a conflict between some personal values that are very deeply held are going to come into conflict in that case with professional ethical value-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>professional ethics sorry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>Mmmhhmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>and that’s tough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>Okay we’ve got erm just a minute or two left so I just want to repeat the question and if you want to give a final say on anything then fine, if you don’t also fine, so my original question was, what do the terms values and ethics mean to you in relation to counselling psychology, and specifically your training and practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>&lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>[Sorry, say that again?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>[I’m even more confused] now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>What do the terms values and ethics mean to you in relation to counselling psychology, and specifically your training and your practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>I’m happy to go first. I think what it means to me, to my profession, is &lt;Laughs&gt; no it’s gone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>&lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>You don’t know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>It was there a second ago, erm, is that it’s important for ethics to, for the profession of counselling psychology to be embedded in the ethics of whatever body it’s involved in &lt;Laughs&gt; this is such waffle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>&lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>this is such waffle, however, it’s important to remember that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>[We’re human.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1603 | [we’re human] first, we’re not caught up in this mystique of the profession, that we’re human and that for me comes before any expectation set by some faceless body that will dictate how we’re meant to be when those ethics will change over time, those ethics will not, guaranteed will not be
the same in 10 years time, yet we will still hopefully be here and how we are comes first, as people, so our values are important.

But yet our values could change just as ethics change.

Our values can change but if we’re human then they are still part of us

Mmm, yeah.

Mmm.

and we’re allowed to be who we are, if we’re allowed to get pissed on a Friday night, which is important

And dance on the table <Laughs>

yeah, occasionally, but yeah, our values may well change over time and may well evolve

Yeah.

but we’re not machines, we’re not robots

Mmm.

and sometimes perhaps it’s wrong to see us as not being flawed, ‘cause we are flawed and maybe it’s wrong for them to just expect us to dance all the time

Mmm.

Yeah to me I think I pretty much ditto that, values are something that change and are shaped by your experiences and very closely tied in with morality and, and humanistic values I think, erm, ethics, I think all the way through this discussion it feels tied up with rules in my mind, rules which inevitably I will break at some point in my career and I hope that the bodies just grant the space to let you explain, let me explain how my values led me to do that.

Mmmmm.

So I think I’ll be quite value driven, and try and abide by the ethical codes of which ever body I’m working with at the time.

Mmm.

Mmm.

The message we’re getting from people is that it’s going to be a conflict, between ethics and values, it’s a constant battle

[Yeah.]

[trying a] balance act, trying to fit them together, and sometimes they will and sometimes they won’t and

But will it be a constant battle or just a occasional one that will happen? That for the majority they kind of run side by side

Yeah.

Mmm.

Yeah.

[Yeah, well there could be, yeah, there could be]

[but occasionally but occasionally there could be] conflict

Yeah.

And I guess for me it’s a process I suppose, erm, of how they overlap and how they shape my erm, my way of thinking about my values and erm ethics in relation to the course.

I mean I don’t really have much to add apart from that I think the important thing for me seems that I think through my actions, which are based on values and ethics, or one of the two, and am able to justify them, I think that’s what’s important, for me. I know it’s not answering the question but

And what would you use to justify them?
Erm, well, what do you mean? <Laughs>

Well you said you, it’s important, quite important that you justify them, so

By my thinking, you know I mean obviously I have reasons behind why I might do whatever I do with a client, I mean it’s very, it’s not something specific but

And those reasons are based on?

Was, err, values and ethics, but obviously, I’m just saying, oh god, you’ve confused me with your questions, erm, I actually don’t know

[i actually don’t know.]

[that’s the concluding statement]

I’m just wondering, I’m just wondering what you would be drawing on to give justification for what you did?

Her values?

Well my values and my, and my ethi- well the kind of ethics that I like to abide by

And what do they draw on? What forms them?

Life experience

Okay.

erm mostly, and then obviously we have these guidelines and rules which help guide us.

Okay.

So it kind of sounds as though, sorry I just, I just want to

[iet the last word in.]

Just want to be the last edit don’t you? <Laughs>

[Absolutely], so it sounds as though regarding the values which we have, that they’re quite organic, that they will just develop and grow with the ethics they’re forced upon us. <Clicks fingers> Go.

<Laughter>

Okay thanks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>What do the terms values and ethics mean to you in relation to counselling psychology?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>&lt;Laughs&gt; Yeah, actually, I'm going to say it, that, I'm not really sure I understand the word values, I mean I know I think I understand the word ethics but the word value doesn't really, seems for me to unders- to be undst- understandable, erm, I did try to look in the dictionary, I thought maybe it's a fff, you know bilingual things but it still doesn't really make sense, so before we kind of try to talk about this or discuss this, can you share with me what you really understand by values? Is it something that more social or more inner, is it, how it's relate to morals, or what's the difference because I'm not really, I mean on the internet it says like three different things, moral, values, and ethics, so I do understand morals, I do understand ethics, values still stayed for me a bit separately, not really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>I can't even find err now like in my language to be honest and I did really tried my best before I came here and I, and I couldn’t, so yeah maybe it’s might be interesting to, for me to understand as well, and afterwards look how I apply this if I understand I apply it somewhere or how it’s been transformed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>I think for me erm values and morals I see as similar, for me morals has something of a erm religious aspect to it but not necessarily I think that’s just because erm you know within a religious context talking about morals but values I would say for me are about erm what I, they’re inner as well, v-what I value in erm, err in how I am as a person, erm how I conduct myself according to those values, erm whether I value err being kind to others, or friendship, then they will inform how I act to other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>erm, yeah, that’s one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>I was, I was I was gonna say I suppose from my perspective, quite similar, but also about, I suppose, I, as you was talking I was thinking, I suppose for me it’s about beliefs in, my belief system in the way, ways of being, and that encompasses I suppose various social and cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>erm elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>This was my question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>erm, and, and, and that be, from a micro to a macro level in terms of cultural and social as well erm so I suppose value-systems around, within the family and extended I suppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>So what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>myself, yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>So what's the difference here between morals and values? 'Cause morals are also quite cultural isn’t it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Yes they can be but I think for m- yes I think, I think they are but I, I suppose I, do I or don’t I? I think I perceive morals as having a more religious connotation associated with it, not to say that they’re not social erm but I suppose my belief is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 18 | D2 | [that] those social codes if you like, no those moral codes that perhaps are religious actually come out of what we, I say we very generally, erm perceive as acceptable within society, if that makes
sense. I suppose I don’t really hold particular religious beliefs so I struggle a bit with it. Mmm.

d2  erm and I believe that morals are fairly controlling, erm, yeah.

d5  So are you saying that va- values is something that’s coming from inner, something we develop within the family, something maybe unspoken more, while morals are more.

d3  I think for me it is very similar, like you both were saying, with the, the values and the morals, family values to me is, is a little bit about my upbringing and erm, and the road I was allowed to follow, so to speak, erm something about control, erm something about being brought up with manners, please, thank you, that sort of thing, and that’s the morals as well, they’re not so much religious but they are rules.

d5  Okay.

d2  [Mmm.]

d3  [erm] that I suppose I follow to a degree but my values are quite inner.

d5  Okay.

d3  yeah, they are quite inner, but they do involve people around me, of what I will and I won’t accept I suppose as well, from others.

d2  So would you say that your, so your values are more inner and your, the morals are [more external?] [Maybe more outer], more external yeah.

d2  That’s interesting.

d5  Mmm.

d3  Yeah.

d5  Mmm.

d2  So you haven’t assimilated those in the same, right okay.

d3  Mmm.

mod  And ethics in there?

d2  Ethics.

d5  I mean as soon as I understand ethics it’s something that’s socially constructed, so it’s not something we grow up with, it’s kind of a particular community makes a set of rules, you know to do something, medical ethics, or psychological ethics, you know to provide any kind of help or work, whatever you call it, so it’s very, it’s like written rules exactly for this particular community.

d3  For safety.

d5  Perhaps for safe-

d3  [Mmm.]

d5  [I mean I’m] sure they’ve got their own reasons why it’s appear to be.

d3  Mmm.

d5  I’m not there, I don’t know really why but it sounds for me like something they put on me, and if I’m with this professional community I need to know a bit more you know unless I have to be aware they exist, but it’s, doesn’t really some- seems for me like ethics is something that I grew up with. I think what you were talking about morals and values.

d3  [Mmm.]

d5  [it’s more] in terms of cultural and inner thi- things and ethics are, definitely comes when you’ve become more professional.

d2  So they’re not socially constr- it’s interesting ‘cause that, that you see ethics as more socially constructed whereas morals and values perhaps aren’t, ‘cause I would, for me, they’re all socially constructed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 132  | D4           | [so] how can you resolve it with it not, without erm compromising or diminishing one of the values?
This is when ethics helps, this is what you mean?

Well sometimes it I don’t think it does help does it

[Yeah.]

[because] you have that ethical dilemma, so it’s which way to go and that’s the

[Mmm.]

[hard], that’s the hard part I think.

Mmmhmm, mmmhmm. Okay so we’re applying this from a profession called counselling psychology, how it works there <laughs> this is the question.

Well I think, I think all professions have to have an ethical framework, an ethical code, erm to protect self and others where, wherever you work and I think in all professions there are ethical codes, I think that’s what partly makes a profession

[Mmm.]

[Mmm.]

erm, and so for counselling psychology of course we’re working with people, so we have to be able to protect them and protect ourselves, erm because it’s very easy to slip through those boundaries and, and get pulled.

Which boundaries?

Any boundaries

Ooh.

<Laughter>

So

That sounds interesting.

<Laughter>

No I just like the word boundaries, is it not ethics it is boundaries?

Well a lot of the time

[Mmm.]

[it could] be said, yeah, yeah, it is a boundary isn’t it?

Yeah.

Mmm.

So do we need to stay within this, a boundary?

[Depends if you]

[I, I’m questioning], I’m not

<Laughter>

Hmm.

I mean I think when I ask how values and ethics fit each other, what I mean is that

[You said]

[what if], what if ethical profession sometime doesn’t really

Mmm.

I cannot apply them to the way I work or, how do you say that correct, erm my values for example are different

So do they conflict?

Exactly

[Mmm]

[I see.]

[and they] conflict so what’s, what’s there, and you said that ethics in a way comes from values, and
I’m thinking, not really, sometimes I can have completely different understanding of values than what professional community applies [you know.]

But [ethics are with the]

[So what in this case] I’m unethical? I become very quickly unethical?

Well that sounds as if you have your own ethics and

and then there are the professional ethics as well.

Yeah, I think there are aren’t there, personal ethics [and professional ethics, mmm.]

Yeah I think I have personal ethics but perhaps they’re called values.

[Mmm.]

So it sounded like what you were saying was that values were perhaps a slightly more abstract notion, and then ethics were something kind of performative of those values, and I’m wondering if that still kind of holds for what you’re saying, so you could have personal values and you could have, personal ethics would be almost the enactment of those personal values, something like that

[Mmm.]

within the counselling psychology arena that would be with clients, being with clients, erm and peers

actually.

So it sounded like what you were saying was that values were perhaps a slightly more abstract notion, and then ethics were something kind of performative of those values, and I’m wondering if that still kind of holds for what you’re saying, so you could have personal values and you could have, personal ethics would be almost the enactment of those personal values, something like that

Something about enactment

[I think], or not depending on, you know, actually yeah, it, it might be about enacting, or not because that might be part of the ethic, that you don’t [enact.]

Which is still an act], still an action

[err yeah]

[chooses] not to do something [is]

[Yes], as opposed, [yes, yes, yes.]

[Mmm.]

[Mmm, mmm.]

Yes.

I was, I was curious, the idea of professional ethics and then personal ethics, when you said that could you think of erm

An example.

example of when they’ve clashed maybe?

Erm

Are you looking for personal example because I can

[Oh okay.]

[I can] come up with example from books, I can’t come up with personal example.

An example from?

From books, you know
[Oh.]

[from], from some kind of therapeutic books, I mean for example we know that some therapists took their clients for a beer for example, and definitely it’s against ethics

[Like Freud did, mmm.]

[which we have, which we] have right now, you know in the ethics code, so what, what about this kind of situations? Which, I mean perhaps the value of that particular therapist was that it’s fine,

Mmm.

you know it’s, it’s moral, it’s okay, why not? Perhaps he even believed that clients would benefit from this you know? I don’t think he would do it, or he did it, with intention to harm clients so, but ethically that’s not approved.

Mmm.

This is the question, this is the answer of when they clash isn’t it?

Mmm.

I sup-

[Yeah, and just] you saying that I erm I’ve had a few clients who have erm talked about the importance of their faith and err, and I’ve tried to, I’ve struggled with how to, I don’t, I don’t have a strong faith but how can I, you know professionally, acting ethically, you know accepting diversity and

[Mmmhmm.] with somebody

[with], with somebody

Mmm.

erm from a professional ethical basis there was no way that I would do that with, with my, my client, and that felt, that felt, that was an internal conflict

Mmm.

for me, is that what you’re [saying? Is that]

[Mmm.] [Yeah, and just] you saying that I erm I’ve had a few clients who have erm talked about the importance of their faith and err, and I’ve tried to, I’ve struggled with how to, I don’t, I don’t have a strong faith but how can I, you know professionally, acting ethically, you know accepting diversity

[Mmm.] people’s erm respecting their

Mmm.

faith, how can I work with that in the room? Is it, is, is it important erm to, for the work

[to], you know.

And even within that there’s the questions around, ethically, ‘cause I was thinking about, whilst I might argue with it in a personal capacity, outside of the err therapeutic room or in a different sort of encounter, I would still have my personal value around respecting someone’s err religious beliefs erm but in the, in the therapeutic setting there’s something else in there around to, around potentially that being quite harmful to try to challenge that

[Mmm.]

belief system, whether I agree with it or not.
Mmm, whereas in a personal context you’d maybe not consider whether it’s harmful to challenge it so much because you’re not the therapist in a personal context?

Possibly, I still think there would be something around tempering that and being cognisant of, of how important that might be for somebody, but there’s a different type of responsibility there’s a different type of responsibility, there’s still responsibility about being with another human being but there is, it’s different,

Mmm. different quality to it. Gosh. Hmm.

So as soon as I understand it, seems like this, this example the one you just gave, you’ve, you prefer to follow ethics, professional ethics with a client than personal values when you’re very aware then they’re clashing.

Erm, I think that, I think there are other, there are other things that I consider within the therapeutic encounter around values, erm, that go in to the mix, I think that poss- that sounds a bit vague, but I’m very much aware of, mmm I don’t know, god can I say this, that, that, it’s about responsibility I think, and that I have to, perhaps I’m more aware of the fact that’s, it’s very, mmm I don’t know what I’m saying, here because I’m now beginning to question the boundary between the, the client room and, and, and not to be honest with you. It’s about responsibility. It’s about my responsibility as a counselling psychologist in that room, to another human being that has, has, has sought psychological help, and perhaps is particularly vulnerable, and I’m not saying that people aren’t vulnerable outside

[Mmm, mmm.] [of the client room] but is particularly vulnerable [And there’s a power imbalance perhaps?] [and that I don’t know], yes there’s the power imbalance there’s the power erm difference and also I’m likely to have those conversations outside of the therapy room with somebody that I know quite well, it isn’t something that I would probably discuss with somebody I

[Mmm.] [don’t know] very well, so I think there is something about res- differences in responsibility there as well. I don’t know so much about this person that’s in the therapy room with me as I might do somebody who’s a, quite a good friend outside of the therapy room.

So what kind of difference this makes?

Erm perhaps I’m more aware of the vulnerabilities of friends and I’m less likely to be aware of everything that is, not that I know everything that’s going on in a friend’s life but I’m more aware of, of them holistically if you like, in terms of what they do what their [home life’s like.]

[So because you’re less] aware of your client, who perhaps you see first time, you are more responsible, or you feel like you have to follow some ethics

[Yes.] [maybe], oh okay.

I wonder whether then as the therapy progresses and the context of the therapy, if it’s erm long term and you get to know your client more, whether that opens up opportunity to actually erm speak about different values and to erm

Mmm.

yeah.
When there’s a more of a relationship there, a bit more trust. Except that you still only see them in one particular context which you might not have in a personal environment, you might see somebody in an, a multitude of contexts, or know them from a multitude of different contexts if that makes sense. Whereas it’s always the same context within therapeutic relationship. I suppose it’s, it’s, again going back to the here and now isn’t it, what a client brings up, what they want to talk about, if that is something that came up in a session then I’d talk about it. Erm if it didn’t I wouldn’t, erm, say religious beliefs or something, erm, and would I talk about mine? I suppose that’s another one, another ethical dilemma in itself isn’t it? Yeah that’s, I’ve struggled with that when I talked about having clients who have faith and one in particular I can remember sort of asking you know erm, do you follow religion, and erm, I guess it depends on maybe the approach, therapeutic approach you use, but err, I struggled with, what do I do with that? Do I bring in my own values in to the room with a client? Erm, Because again it’s that power isn’t it, that power imbalance. Will they then take on yours more than theirs? Yeah. Erm, mmm. If I say, no I don’t. Is that does that put difference? [Yeah.] [between us], how do we manage that? Yeah. erm Is that denigrating theirs? [Mmm.] [in a way]
Mmm. What did you do?

In that context, that time, I think I said, no I don’t. [no] And have you had, had a, a situation similar where you’ve actually been asked the same question by a different client or, and your answer has been different?

The person I’m thinking of, that was the last. Mmm. No I haven’t, not since

I’m just thinking how my own personal therapist erm talking about religion and he’s a, he erm, is, well he’s from a Buddhist background, he’s very atheist, and I think he mentioned that quite early on, erm that was where he, what his stance was, that’s was where he sat, erm, and I don’t think there was anything from me and my religious beliefs that came in to it, I think that was just something perhaps he, I can’t remember how it was said, how he had to put that out there because that would affect perhaps how we worked

‘cause religion is a big thing isn’t it, [to a lot of people] So there’s an element of congruence] as well then that [is in there.]

[Mmm.] [Mmm.] And how did you experience that when he did?

How did I experience it? I think in a way I thought, well if I, because I haven’t got a particular religious, religious belief myself, I’m perhaps more spiritual than religious if you can say that, erm but I think in a way I did wonder if I did have a religious belief, I wondered how I would feel with him putting his beliefs out there

it would’ve been a clash and perhaps somebody with a strong religious belief would end up not working with such a therapist, maybe.

And how do you experience that when you’re working seeing clients as a therapist, all of you, you consider the clients, what these two terms might mean to the client, their notions of values and their notions of ethics?

I think erm, I had a client who err, he- I realised pretty early on that we had different values of erm, of relationships and of erm the role of men and women in a, in a marriage, erm, so I had to sort of process that, how to, yeah how to respect his, erm, his values about that, which were influenced by his cultural background, erm, that was an interesting client because I think it was also complicated, I had a very strong, to use a psychodynamic term, a psy- a countertransference with him, which trig-triggered my own stuff, erm so it was quite a complicated experience but erm I was aware of, he was also err quite a bit older than me, erm, so there was these differences, and differences erm, yeah how do you, how do you, juggle that?

Erm, and whether bring it to the room with the client that I have different, different values, but that’s okay, you know how can we erm work with that or, I’m just thinking I’ve got those value-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>different values but erm not bringing in the room, just trying to understand where he is, erm, yeah, I feel like I'm just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>So part of being a counselling psychologist is, involves observing and managing difference in some way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>D3 Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>D4 Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>D2 Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>D5 I was thinking, when you asked the question, I was thinking that one of the value perhaps I have, which probably, maybe family value as well, I don’t know, is that people are different, full stop. Like on a very profound level, and I think this, this is what really helps me being a counselling psychologist, being in the room with the client, because I’ve never really thought, I’ve never really had this clash with my clients in terms of values, or religion beliefs, or any kind of, I mean over three years of my work I’ve never really experienced this kind of things, you know it’s never was there in the room, and I’m thinking why is there, why have I never really had this kind of problems with these differences, and I think it’s my personal value that people are different and it’s fine, and this is how it is, and you’re not judging, you’re not trying to rebuild, redo something, it’s just the way it is, and then it’s, if you really understand this on a very fundamental level, it’s really helps in the profession. “Cause I need to say some, I mean some clients really bring really amazing stories and etc. etc. etc. and sometimes I notice I’m never really in a big surprise let’s say, I’m never really in a big shock, in a big surprise, it’s in a way always kind of, it’s, it’s how it is, it’s fine, and may- maybe it helps, I’m thinking it really helps me actually quite a lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>MOD So it sounds like what you’re saying is that you feel th- that err observing and respecting difference is almost second nature to you because it’s a family value or it’s a personal value that you feel f- fits and sits very congruently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>D5 I think so yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>MOD personal value that you feel f- fits and sits very congruently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>MOD [Absolutely.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>D5 Perhaps yeah, I’ve never really thought about is it actually really what part of the ethics of counselling psychology that I feel right now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>MOD Right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>D5 but maybe it is actually, but I think when D4 was saying about his e- you know experience of this man who really, kind of, I was thinking, it’s interesting how I’ve never really had this clash of values with anyone, and I’ve had also religious people, I’m, I’m very atheistic let’s say, I don’t really believe in any kind of god there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>MOD So you’re saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>D5 [but this]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>D5 but it was fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>MOD but the word clash mean- for you means, like there’s not been a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>D5 It wasn’t the issue, it wasn’t a problem, for me it was easy let’s say to be there, and I think it, this why for client it was easy as well, in this context, yeah, I’m not talking about other issues but in terms of differences, values differences. I’m actually thinking right now for some reason how D4 said that, you know ethics actually comes from values, and professional ethics are quite related to what, the kind of human or personal values, if it’s this connection between them, this mean that everyone who’s going into this profession should have some common personal values or what? Or how</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
otherwise we are just a professional ethics

[Well I think]

[if they] already come from personal values do you understand what I mean?

[We do]

[I’m not very] clear perhaps.

We do have a common profession, we do have a common value, in the sense that, erm, perhaps that we, we do believe in, I mean

I think there’s a, I think it’s not so much as a, as a we, I think that each one of us has certain values, and each person in the world has different values, however to work in a profession you need certain boundaries in order f- to protect that profession to protect those people in it and out of it, erm there’s something about our own values maybe not getting in the way

Not getting in the way?

[not getting in] the way erm because some of our values, well I wouldn’t be, say they’re dangerous but as, as counselling psychologists I think because perhaps we look, well I’d like to say, and I’m saying we now, but, but that I try and look at my own stuff and that’s where personal therapy and supervision comes in to it, erm and perhaps that’s why supervision is so important, but I think it’s easy to be swayed by people.

So how do you decide do you think, this is a value which I need to erm contain, or bracket off, or sit with and not necessarily bring in a direct way in to the therapy, and then in other circumstances, this is a value that legitimately is okay to enter in to things here? How would you

I don’t think, I, I don’t think sort of in the moment I actually think of, this is a value, I think it’s just part of me, my values are a part of me and they don’t, it, it’s not as if, ooh I have this value, it’s, it’s sometimes it’s looking back and reflecting and thinking, ooh I was actually drawn in there or, or erm, it would’ve been easy to have gone over time or erm, or rescued that person, erm part of it comes from my own background I think and, and being aware of my own background, and my own values and whether they’re, well, good values, good values.

But I was just thinking we haven’t used the word prejudice at all yet

[Yeah.]

[but] perhaps that’s in the mix there for us

[Yeah.]

[as well] because

and dys- dysfunction [is another]

[you know], prejud- you know we’re, we’re saying values about everything but perhaps some of it we’re actually talking about, it, you could argue is prejudice in some way or other.

Mmm.

I mean one might, I could, I suppose somebody could, you know say, well sorry perhaps you’re prejudiced against faith

Mmm.

in terms, religious faith.

Yeah.

Perhaps I am

Mmm.

although I do try to really respect, I do respect the, the notion that it’s needed by some but I think perhaps I also find that quite difficult because of how I perceive, how actions are taken in the name...
of certain faiths at times, which I find very difficult

to, to condone, to accept, whatever they, whatever they be, depending on what it is.

I suppose you’re getting at maybe what I was asking in that with faith, you’ve brought up, it seems
that that is an area which is earmarked as being particularly value-laden and

[you’ve] started off saying something about morals there as well, so that seems decided upon by
some of you, if not all of you, as an area that needs to be considered and mediated and you’re not
quite sure when to let values in and not, and I’m just wondering what governs that process, or how
you decide, and what other areas there might be of, okay well this is a legitimate area of value-laden
ideas which is okay to be talked about in therapy and this is an area of value-laden ideas which isn’t
so much, maybe in the same way as faith is, that you’ve just talked about.

I’m, I’m just thinking of erm sexual abuse, if I worked with an abuser

how comfortable would I feel working with such a person when I have a daughter

[you’ve] started off saying something about morals there as well, so that seems decided upon by
some of you, if not all of you, as an area that needs to be considered and mediated and you’re not
quite sure when to let values in and not, and I’m just wondering what governs that process, or how
you decide, and what other areas there might be of, okay well this is a legitimate area of value-laden
ideas which is okay to be talked about in therapy and this is an area of value-laden ideas which isn’t
so much, maybe in the same way as faith is, that you’ve just talked about.

Mmm.

I think in the two examples I’ve already mentioned, erm with the client who had a strong religious
faith I was conscious of, how do my values colour how I interpret the role of her faith in her
problems and stuff, so if I’m cynical about faith I could’ve sort of thought erm you know you’ve got
these different things going on but you talk about your faith getting you through and you’re in
denial or you’re, you know

but then, and then also with erm that, that other client I talk ab- talked about who had, we seemed
to have different ideas about err relationships between men and women erm, I was conscious of, if
they conflict then me being a therapist I could potentially erm sort of shape the way, the things I say
could shape them to my values so erm, yeah diminish her faith rather than sort of also seeing it as
something that’s err

[Important.]

[what is it for her]

and supporting it, or not supporting necessarily but just erm not letting my values about faith erm
shape how I, shape my interventions, shape how I am with her, erm, sort of colonising her, colonising her values with my values, erm, so that’s a difficult one when you, know work, with erm
sex offenders or whatever, where’s the line, you know the sort of personal values and societal
values? And I think there’s, there’s probably certain behaviours or things that erm, my, my idea is
that maybe more people share erm a personal value of an abhorrence of err sexual abuse erm, but
how do you err, but someone needs to work with
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>different people with, sexual abuse [or whatever.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>[I work actually] with sexual abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>So [what do you do with your values?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>[Yeah, with, with the] client’s like this. Err I, I haven’t really questioned these things. Interestingly I haven’t really questioned, do I really wanna work with this person or not, do I really think, I mean, let’s put it this way, I know I’m not a court there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>You’re not a?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>A court, I’m not in a court, I’m not a judge there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>A court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Oh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>I’m in a different role, erm I choose a different profession, I’m not there to explain or to see, it’s right, it’s wrong, this is not my duty and it’s not what I wanna do in this world, you know, in front of me is a person with his own, you know, understanding, his own problems, his own issues etc. etc. etc. whatever is there, and I don’t really question, do I like it or not, this is not why I’m there, I need to say I found it very difficult to work here because of these countertransference feelings etc. etc. but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>this is not question of values or ethics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>What was it then, your countertransference?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>We’d better not go there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>[&lt;Laughs&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>[because], no because it is very difficult, I need to say it’s, it’s present work and it’s very difficult and my supervisor is doing her best to help me with this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>but it’s not a question of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>[It’s not about values]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>[values], no not at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>See I see it as erm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>It’s not about values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Mmm, I think I’ve, there’s just been a bit of a shift for me with erm being very accepting of everyone, I’m, I think now in my work I’m trying to allow myself to acknowledge my feelings of hate and erm disgust and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>[erm] to then say okay that’s what I feel, this person, that’s my reaction to that person and what can I,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Do with this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>what, what can I do with that, erm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>I’m interested ‘cause it sounds like the position you’ve just sketched out there is very relativistic, as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Big word [relativistic.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
<Laughter> well as if, as if erm], there’s a sort of sense of, well anything goes, it doesn’t matter about values to me, I’m not making any kind of judgements at all, so what are you doing then? Where are you working from?

D5 You mean in terms of what?

MOD Well I thought what you were saying was, when I sit with somebody I don’t sit there and think, erm, I don’t necessarily think about how I value their experience or, or make judgements about it Mmmhmm.

D5 and so I’m curious as to what you are doing then?

MOD It’s exactly what you said right now, I’m not thinking in terms of values or judging. I am working with feelings most of the time but I think I predominantly work psychodynamically, [so]

D5 [But] psychodynamically, okay so if we bring a model in there then, psychodynamically would be erm you’d be working with emotions and giving interpretations, so they have to be

D5 [If.]

MOD [guided] by something

D5 [If.]

MOD [or] inf- informed by something, otherwise I imagine a very erm agreeable, otherwise I just imagine you would sit there and just agree with whatever they said.

D5 No, no but the interpretations is something that’s going on between you and your client in this room.

MOD So what informs that if it’s, if it’s not a judgement of something, of some sort?

D5 This informs what’s going on between us right now, it’s a label of feelings, it’s not a judgement of his or her actions, or his or her ideas

MOD How do you decide what to say about their feelings then?

D5 How do I decide?

MOD Mmm.

D5 I think it’s a question of if I experience something hidden there, which is, which is not explicit yet and I feel that it’s right moment to bring into the room, because client perhaps might be ready for hear this, I might bring it as an intervention or as interpretation, if I feel the client is not ready, for different reasons you know, I’m not gonna do it, I keep this in my mind, I can bring it to therapy and think about this, I can bring it ther- ther- and supervision and never bring it with the client, for example because of the end is of session, I would definitely, no way I gonna, not gonna go there etc. etc.]

MOD [See that to me sounds like you’ve made] a string of judgement calls. I have judged that this person perhaps has a hidden feeling, I’ve judged that it may be useful for them to hear what I think this hidden feeling is, I’ve judged that we have a particular amount of time therefore I may not say it because we haven’t got time to, so sounds to me like you’re making a, many, many decisions there, based on

D5 Mmm.

MOD what’s going on

D5 Mmm.

MOD based on

D5 Yeah .

MOD [by the sounds of things you’re working psychodynamically.]

D5 [definitely I’m not sure judged is] the right word here but
<p>| 628 | MOD | [Okay.] |
| 629 | D5  | [decisions] are definitely there, yeah. |
| 630 | D4  | Which I guess that brings up everything could be values in a way of, any decision, seems like from what you’re saying it can be a sort of, every decision we make is a weighing up of different things and so there’s an implicit value in, in each decision we make, kind of |
| 633 | D5  | Oh it is there |
| 634 | D4  | Mmm. |
| 635 | D5  | or otherwise how we make decisions? |
| 636 | D4  | Mmm. |
| 637 | D5  | We need to base it on something, explicit or implicitly but we still base it on something. |
| 638 | D3  | But what is it based on? |
| 639 | D5  | This is a good question. Experience, theory, knowledge, I don’t know, personal values, professional values. |
| 640 | D3  | So it is based on some values. |
| 642 | D5  | I mean how otherwise do you make decisions? I mean |
| 643 | D3  | Mmm, I think that’s what you were saying wasn’t it |
| 644 | D5  | or wishes perhaps, you know it’s a question of, do you want coffee or tea? You know what you want, coffee or tea isn’t it? Because you do like something, how do you know this, because of your experience, because you’ve tried both of them, I mean I know it’s, I’m saying this very primitive way but it is, I mean you’ve learned something through your experience, you know what you like, I like coffee more than tea, so it’s easy for me to make these decisions, with client it’s not because I haven’t, I don’t know this person for long time, so I base it on what’s going on right now between him and, or her, and me, and I’m definitely not gonna apply this to whole his or her life because I have no idea, it’s just this particular moment, and probably this characterisation really saved me in a way, it’s a kind of secure base for me you know, but I cannot work differently, I cannot think or pretend that I know something about this person, I have no idea. |
| 654 | MOD | But in the example you just gave, the knowledge you were drawing on was coming from a psychodynamic model, sounded like, ‘cause you were t- in terms of hidden feelings and working with emotions and deciding how much insight perhaps you wanted to try and encourage. |
| 656 | D5  | Yeah, yeah, yeah I think so yeah, but I’m quite, I think I’m very aware of the fact that I am working predominant psychodynamically, or I think I work predominantly, or maybe I would like, I never know how to put it right away but yeah. |
| 660 | D2  | So there’s a value there in itself isn’t there |
| 661 | D3  | Mmm. |
| 662 | D2  | that actually that is the most err f- for that client or, that may be the way that you work predominantly with most of your clients I don’t know, but that, that there’s a, a value there, that is the, the more, perhaps the most helpful err model |
| 665 | D5  | Mmm. |
| 666 | D3  | [Sits ( )] |
| 667 | D2  | [as you perceive] |
| 668 | D3  | Mmm. |
| 669 | D2  | for |
| 670 | D5  | [Mmm.] |
| 671 | D2  | [that] client or, or whatever. |
| 672 | D5  | I don’t know it’s more helpful or not |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>673</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>[But you chose to work like that]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>[I feel that it’s what] suits me more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Yes, [so]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>[this is different.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>677</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>I’m just not sure I’m able to provide any other model let’s say, because it doesn’t, it doesn’t suits me, it doesn’t feel right for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>So you’re not necessarily fitting it to the client it’s more this is what I have to offer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>681</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Yeah, perhaps yes, let’s be honest yeah, and this is why sometimes perhaps clients you know doesn’t stay with you for a long time ‘cause it’s not what they want and it’s, it’s fine as well, it’s fair enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>684</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>686</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>and if me as a client, I, I mean I took my time to choose therapist for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>687</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>which I felt was good for me, you know was right, so, but I think playing game that I can do different things, which I, I can’t really, it’s not fair as well you know? I can offer what I can offer and I’m not gonna jump over my head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Yeah I guess I find that, you talked about it, where tensions are, I think a tension for me is erm, you know we’re supposed to, acting ethically, provide the most appropriate erm therapy for a particular client in that context, erm, but I can relate to that a bit as well I think I don’t, I don’t feel competent in a number of approaches even though I’ve been taught here a number of approaches but, and maybe that’s erm, yeah, erm, but, so there’s something about choosing approaches based on what appeals to me or what I value, what I can relate to, my own, what as a person I relate to, which approach, more in a b- err in a better way, and then also the context of the, of the placements that I’m at so erm, you know I’m in psychodynamic supervision and the contracts of the particular placement are supposed to be a year long, erm, so my work tends to be psychodynamic &lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>I think you, [you’ve kind of just]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>[so it’s not really] being ethical in a professional sense, not taking what’s the most appropriate for that particular person, but then there’s an argument about, is it really that one approach is the best for a particular problem? Erm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Yeah we don’t know yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>I mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>But also there’s a question, I mean I’m just thinking particularly about psychodynamic work that, about whether the client actually can withstand that type of [therapy]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Not every.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>and therefore perhaps is there an ethical consideration to refer on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>You know, if our method, you know the way we want to work is specifically psychodynamic or that’s where we’re, that’s, that’s what that particular agency erm only offers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
erm then do we have a, an ethical responsibility to refer on?

Mmm.

I think you, what you’re starting to touch on is what I was gonna ask next which was, how do you think your training and your practice experiences have shaped your views on values and ethics? You mentioned being taught and now I feel like you’re talking a bit about context and practice

Mmm.

so I’m wondering how you think those two components, your training experiences, how have they shaped your views on values and ethics do you think?

Do you know I don’t think my training experience, in CBT here, erm really shaped me working in a s-
in a cognitive way, I think that was something I learnt in my placement, erm, because it’s in substance misuse and, and so it’s, it’s working sort of a lot with the goal of what that person wants to achieve and the triggers, erm so I think I learned more in the placement than I did here, erm, within, within the uni, erm because I don’t think at the time that our teaching was partic-
particularly great, erm, so there it was, it was more working in that placement over time and yeah learning, learning myself, updating through books, whatever, erm and being with that client and working with that client but it didn’t come in, the training here didn’t particularly come in to that, for CBT in itself anyway.

What about others, how do you think these two terms or notions have been dealt with on your course, or training, values and ethics?

Well I guess it’s sort of been erm at different times, counselling psychology you’ve been taught that it’s erm, values the person of the client erm, it values being erm, taking a critical stance to using labels, erm which come from medical ideas, erm, and valuing, yeah valuing diversity and erm, that each person’s different, valuing difference so, which is the whole idea of why we’re taught a number of approaches and erm, yeah.

I was, I was going to say that I find that quite a difficult a question to answer really erm because I have an a- I have an awareness that there have been periods where it’s been very specifically focused on, erm perhaps it was issues of professional practice where there was a lot of talking within a module around issues of diversity erm and it was, there was a real, and ethics and confidentiality and all of those sorts of things, erm and it was very, very focused on that, and then, and so very, very explicit for us to think about, and then there are other times when it’s felt more, that I’ve assimilated

Mmm.

and integrated things that have been far more, you know values and ethics around counselling psychology from lots of different, lots of different places, which are harder for me to, to grasp if that makes sense, in the sense of where that actually comes from

Mmm.

specifically. I have a notion that d- also depends upon given lecturers as well, erm and their emphasis and what those are but I think that one of the things that has really brought this in to sharp focus for me has been the integrative model module actually, because it’s thrown so much up in the air

Mmm.

and made me think so much about how to work with three models, and how I do it, and do I do it, you know all of, all of those sorts of things, and I guess that’s probably another steep learning curve that’s been there for me, which encompasses this idea of values, identity, ethics, erm it’s almost like
on a different, like if I were to visualise it, it’s almost
Another step?

and I don’t know why that module specifically would’ve done that but it, it seems to have done, and
whether that’s

Almost [serendipitous I don’t know.]
[brought it together in a] way I think for me as well

Yeah, yeah, it, it brought all the strands together and yes it threw it up in the air but also when they
settled they seemed to set in to bigger clumps of where I was, or where I want to be, how I want to
work I suppose, in a way

<laughs> I suppose that’s like we were saying earlier about sort of, you know a difference between
clinical and counselling psychologists, what do we say when we go for to an interview? Erm, well,
what is a counselling psychologist? Erm, it’s that uncertainty and that’s what we always have with
our clients.

It, it feels as if, and this may, it’s not completely correct but it feels as if within that, that module I’m
ha- I am consciously having to make more decisions about where I want to place myself.

I know it’s been talked about before but it’s almost been received knowledge more

than actually

[having, yeah.]
[have, yeah] to decide, there’s something about, okay

where are you putting yourself?

(It is a bit like that), [mmm.]
[I think it’s]

It’s a question of responsibility for you [again isn’t it?]
[Yeah, yeah of course], it always is.

It’s what?

It’s a question of responsibility

It is.

what you were talking

Yeah.

[In the beginning]

[Question of] possibility?
 Of responsibility, sorry.

Yes, I'm a bit of rock

[<Laughter>]

[with responsibility running through, I mean it does feel a bit like that but I], but it, it is about that

it's

[Yeah.]

[about] where are you now.

Mmm.

I think, yeah something about being a trainee, you know having to do the case study and process

reports and stuff, having to think, okay I am a professional counselling psychologist, I consider these
different things before I see a client and I make these various professional ethical err theor- err
theoretical decisions, erm, but the reality has been during my, my experience of placements is I'm a
trainee and I sort of have been, worked within the confines of the different placements in terms of
length of work, who they see, erm approaches supervised and that kind of thing, erm, and, yeah I
guess I see it as well as now getting to a point of having to think, okay I’m, I wanna be an adult now

<Laughter>

I need to, this is how I work, this is what I do, this is what I believe, ethically with clients,
theoretically, erm, so that’s quite a challenge.

Mmm.

When you, you said I’m gonna be an adult now.

Yeah.

<Laughter>

So previously

I guess I see it as an, a, a bec-

a becoming of an adult in, of sorts, erm a trainee to erm not just being
received knowledge but sort of, what do I th-

Mmm.

Where’s your [stance?]

[Yeah conta- contain .]

[where is my stance on this?] Rather than, you know, rather than answering questions about, about
my work as, well I’ve been taught this and that, erm

So are you pitching the university as the parent there?

[Yeah.]

[in some way], you are.

And so now with the interpret, with the integrative, erm, actually sort of saying, okay the, the values
of the course is that we’re, we can work diversely, sort of different approaches but my journey has,
has my journey really been like that? It’s time for me to own up to that. Do I work in advance with
clients or is it sort of more making sense afterwards?

Mmm.

Erm, and then the contradiction, the modernist idea of erm, of unis, of, you know I work in a certain
way, I, I plan it in, in ahead rather than erm it sort of evolves and erm I make sense of it afterwards.

To go back to what you said about, thinking about how you would explain your, I guess I’m just using
this as a tool ‘cause I think it might open it up a little bit more, but how you would explain your
position, for want of a better word, as a counselling psychologist, perhaps using clinical psychology
as a, erm, something to contrast against

[D2]

[or] to compare against, I mean what do you think, in terms of these terms values and ethics, they

mean in terms of counselling psychology and being a counselling psychologist?

[D3]

I think it’s, I think it’s dealing with uncertainty maybe, erm, and actually that’s okay, it’s okay to be

uncertain, it’s not erm that we have to follow, again the medical model, which is quite concrete, but

we can actually be in that uncertainty and be okay, erm, with that client, and both wrestle with what

is going on in the moment, working in the moment, in the here and now, erm rather than to a script,

which I, maybe I imagine that’s what clinical psychologists do more, is working to a script of, this is

what we shall do, this is the aim at the end, the goal at the end, whereas sometimes with a client in

a room it’s actually sitting with that uncertainty and not saying, you need to do this, you need to do

that, erm, it’s not looking at the erm DSM and saying, you are this, it’s actually what’s, what’s

happening now, what’s going on now?

[D4]

And I think it’s sort of something about as well, that as counselling psychologists we’re supposed to be

more aware of ourself and our reactions to the client and what relationship is happening between

us, erm, but I think, talking about clinical and counselling, I know that I can be erm, guilty of err sort

of holding on to those labels of, oh this is, this is what we do, counselling psychologists do, and

that’s much better than clinical psychologists who don’t do that, and I was talking to someone about

it and she said she knows a friend on a clinical course at one uni and they’re actually quite erm,

there’s quite a sort of a, a critiquing element to their programme so, so I can sort of hold on to these

labels of what it means to be a clinical psychologist or counselling psychologist but then I know in

discussions with other people erm, at this uni of erm, who you know when they’ve done different

interviews at different uni’s and the counselling psychologists on those programmes have different

emphasises of what it means to be a counselling psychologist

[D3]

[D5] [Mmm.]

[D4] [Mmm.]

So do you think there has been a critiquing element of your course?

[D4]

In our course? Erm, yeah, there’s certainly a, not a, there’s an opening, there’s an opening up

emphasis rather than sort of, this is how it’s done, kind of, say for example in the research

component, erm, it’s been frustrating at times sort of wanting a bit of guidance or err, my

experience has been with different lecturers, has been just when you’re sort of thinking, okay this is

what I wanna do, they sort of come in with different things to throw it up to sort of question and to

get different ideas so, but then that’s another aspect, well I guess that is part of counselling

psychology, we’ve been talking a lot about practice, but as psy the psychology part of it, we are

supposed to be

[D2]

[Mmm.]

[D4] erm, have a research focus and to value, to value theory and research in that way so erm, yeah

that’s something I’m conscious we haven’t spoken about much.

[D2]

[Mmm.]

We talk about practice in terms of with our clients but erm, the research I see it as what we’re

supposed to use as a way of defining ourselves as different from psychotherapists but then having

said that psychotherapists, you know there’s, there’s research programmes, theses and stuff so all
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>898</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>these definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>[erm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>903</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>are quite, maybe it’s all about job markets and erm sort of Marxist, capitalist sort of ideas about different groups defining themselves to erm, with the growing &lt;Laughs&gt; I don’t know I’m sort of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>904</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>&lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>905</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>going on and on, erm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Well there were definitely people within the research literature that would argue that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>907</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>908</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>stance isn’t it but that’s what our, not just us as counselling psychologists, but that’s what the profession, if you like, of therapists is, is doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>it’s exactly that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Exactly what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>913</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Well just perpetuating on creating you know work for ourselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>914</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>915</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>And sort of diversifying what we offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>I’m a counselling psychologist and I can offer this and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Can you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>919</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>That’s the thing, erm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>So what do you think about that research component to being a counselling psychologist and what you were saying about uncertainty or being okay with not really knowing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Well I suppose it’s being okay with not really knowing in the room, however, as counselling psychologists we have to have a background of knowledge, erm and being able to erm bring that knowledge, well not even bring that knowledge, but have an awareness of that knowledge, erm, that could work with that client, but until we start working with that client we don’t know but have to have that background knowledge, we have to have a grounding I suppose, a knowledge base, quite a big knowledge base, a large knowledge base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>It’s an uneasy marriage really isn’t it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>924</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>[Yes, yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>[I just think about that], I’ve suddenly realised it is actually quite an uneasy marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>927</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>and it’s no surprise that, that we come across counselling psychologists within our own peer group and who are already qualified who very much, I don’t wanna do research, I don’t wanna do research, and, and others who are quite research focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>928</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>929</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>and erm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>931</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>&lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>932</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>&lt;Laughs&gt; it’s, it is quite an uneasy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[Mmm.]

[marriage] isn’t it, in the sense that, sitting with the, if you’re talking about tensions and conflicts, and err, I remember being told in the first year that I was here that, you know, you’re a psychologist first and a counsellor second, that you are a psychologist who counsels

D3

[Mmm.]

D2 [What] does this mean?

D3 [Mmm.]

D2 [Well] what does that mean?

D3 Mmm.

D2 Exactly, but actually [therein]

MOD [Well what] did you take that as meaning?

D2 I understood that to m- I understood that to mean that, well exactly, I, I understood

MOD [Mmm.]

D2 [that] to mean, and it stayed with me for s- for a number of years, clearly, that, that I would use my understanding of psychology, which is about generalisability isn’t it,

D4 Mmm.

D2 to counsel individuals,

D5 [Mmm, mmm.]

D2 [that’s an un- that’s], that’s it in a nutshell and that’s, that’s an uneasy marriage

D3 [Mmm.]

D2 [that is], because to hold generalisability to populations of people

D4 Mmm.

D2 and holding that people are unique and different in the other hand

D4 Yeah.

D2 and taking those two things into the room is a, is a constant challenge actually

D5 It’s quite dialectical yeah

D2 It is

D3 Mmm.

D4 Yeah this, this research this approach backed by evidence, generalisably will work but then, oh no

D2 Yeah.

D4 maybe it won’t work with this particular individual so don’t hold on to that too much, sort of, see if this other one will work or

D2 Yeah.

D5 That is the same kind of dialectical conflict as you were saying, that you kind of learn to be with this uncertainty and this unknown in the room but at the same time we have a background of knowledge, theoretical knowledge, wherever you call it, so how we are doing this? Because in a way it’s also clashing to each other isn’t it?

D4 [Mmm.]

D5 [’Cause] you cannot be with uncertainties ha- if you have knowledge

D3 Yeah, mmm.

D5 and you, you know, it’s kind of, for me it’s two different

D2 [Mmm.]

D5 [you know] ways of being in the room

D3 Mmm.

D2 Mmm.
and somehow we need or, you know, they teach us to learn how to you know tolerate these two opposite things so
And I'm just wondering if that affects values, our own values?

Erm as we learn, as we have a, you know learn a, a broader know- knowledge base, does that affect our own values and then are we, do we become, not different but erm, do we grow I suppose? 'Cause we don't become different but, but, well do we become slightly different people?

In accordance with?

With our own, with erm, learning I suppose.

With going through uni, going through, you know learning the theory, erm understanding ourselves more, understanding the theoretical base more, erm, having the personal therapy and everything else, and we become different, like you were

[Or]
saying] all people are different, maybe we become different.

different yeah.

Perhaps we create a new narrative for ourselves.

Yeah.

Or we assimilate something we already have, or we emphasise something and bringing

[up something that we wasn't really aware before]

[Emer, it's kind of suits me, seriously, I always felt that it's kind of, it's really suits me, I always thought about human being and some kind of confrontation or conflict within, maybe that's why taking on a theory it's so, you know, easy for me to understand, because it's, it's fine, it suits me, I kind of, I'm fine with these dualities, maybe that's why this course is so, I'm, I'm totally in love with the research part, and I love this one to one therapy you know and it's, and I know it's kind of, as I said, I have this kind of, both opposite direction in a way but it's fine I li- I really like it.

Maybe that's us, as counselling psychologists we're supposed to be able to draw on different th-
different approaches but maybe that's denying our own diversity that our own uniqueness of one approach may, erm, 'cause choosing a, 'cause where are, where are we in the choo- choice of approach, because we're unique, the client's unique, but it's all about, what, based on the uniqueness of the client, what approach would work, but we're as unique as well and sort of, we'll be able to relate to different clients in different way- ways and relate to different theories and approaches in different ways, more easily or less easily
Mmm. How much space do you think on the training course you’ve had to, have you had to think about these, you’ve mentioned the integrative model, but you all seem to be thinking quite hard and reflecting and, and so I’m wondering err, it’s, I’m wondering how you feel the training has shaped your, I suppose both has given you the opportunity to do this and has shaped your ability to do this.

I guess it’s been a pretty erm, I’m enjoying this ‘cause it’s enabling me to sort of take responsibility as we talked about, think about, you know, the natural sort of talking about it, as opposed to going to lectures and hearing these different things and then often in different modules having opportunities to do role plays or to have discussion groups, erm, but the emphasis is, what happens first is sort of the dispensing of information, so I think there’s been a leaning towards that, which, those ideas enabled me, and also reading and stuff, enables me to, and experience, enables me to talk about it now, but it’s here that lets me actually sort of form my own narrative as opposed to listening to my lecturers’ narratives or, of what all these things mean.

And you think it’s leaned more towards that.

It’s leaned more towards erm being the receiver, or a passive receiver,

Mmm.

Of information.

allowing me to be a bit more active.

I suppose, I’m just thinking of how our group are, were, our small group, and I suppose there was th- there was some talk about us, that we weren’t so passive, that we were more vocal, erm, and I wonder what that’s about, I wonder why we were so more vocal

Mmm.

and your group were quieter, or, or what it, was it something about our own small group, I don’t know, I don’t know. I think the experiential group, we did talk quite a bit about the theory and, and the, the uni and the teaching

Mmm.

[at times] didn’t we? I think it was nice not to be passive.

Mmm.

I don’t know, I don’t, I don’t really think that, m- I d- I don’t wanna say for whole group of our, our, our group but, I definitely wasn’t the one who talked a lot over three years but I don’t think about myself as a passive in the same time.
| 1078 | D5 | I don’t think I’m this passive person who just you know erm ask for information, it doesn’t seems for me this way, but what is interesting, I actually I, I spoke about this with some of my friends in uni, erm, it seems like the university really helps us name things, whatever it is, like really gives us language or discourses or narratives where I recalled, like gives us the role, how to speak about things, name things, but in terms of experience, or in terms of how they shape, you know values or ethics for us or different things, it also, it always felt for me that it was not enough time |
| 1079 | D3 | Mmm. |
| 1080 | D5 | always, and I think I, I brought it up couple of times with erm supervisors here that, I mean for us it was three years and it feels now it’s not enough in terms of experience, in terms of knowledge or information maybe it’s too much you know, but in terms of experience, and it’s kind of, because you can experience something but you need time to process this, and this is what for me wasn’t enough, and obviously I still have a life outside our profession etc. etc. but maybe I would like more time. I know practically it’s not possible and all these things, money der der der, but if you know were ( ) of escape of all these practical issues I’d probably think that this programme should be about five years, just for processing things. |
| 1081 | D4 | Mmm. |
| 1082 | D3 | I think that’s a really good point |
| 1083 | D5 | [Mmm.] |
| 1084 | D3 | [about] process |
| 1085 | D5 | Mmm. |
| 1086 | D3 | erm I think that even today it’s allowed us to, to really talk about |
| 1087 | D5 | Yeah and look how, how slow |
| 1088 | D3 | [Yeah.] |
| 1089 | D5 | [we are] isn’t it, ‘cause we’re |
| 1090 | D3 | [Yeah.] |
| 1091 | D5 | [really] processing things |
| 1092 | D4 | [Mmm.] |
| 1093 | D5 | [right], I mean I personally, definitely, like, trying to process things before saying something and it’s takes time, so three years wasn’t enough. |
| 1094 | D3 | Mmm. |
| 1095 | D2 | I think there’s something about, what we’re doing here is we’re talking and we’re exploring at a more abstract perhap- is abstract the right word? Possibly not, possibly philosophical level, erm not quite sure what word I’m looking for but it’s, it’s, I don’t think in, in, in the years that I’ve been here that there has been a great deal, a great deal of that in terms of erm exploration of the things that feel less tangible and less erm formulated |
| 1096 | D4 | Mmm. |
| 1097 | D2 | if that makes [sense] |
| 1098 | D5 | [Mmm], mmm. |
| 1099 | D2 | erm and therefore it feels more abstract |
| 1100 | D3 | Mmm. |
| 1101 | D2 | erm, because all along I was thinking, well this whole course has all been about integration, of some description, but actually what you’re talking about for the first three years, from my experience, is receiving things in kind of separate chunks |
| 1102 | D4 | Mmm. |
| 1103 | D2 | and that this last year has been about trying to bring those together, and I understand why that’s |
happened the way that it has, erm, don’t really know where I’m going with this, but the discussions that have been had with- within the role plays or part of, part of the lectures when, in the seminar bits, again it’s all been about very much practical application

| 1123 | D3 | Mmm. |
| 1124 | D4 | Mmm. |
| 1125 | D3 | Mmm. |
| 1126 | D2 | hasn’t it, the things that we’ve been set |
| 1127 | D3 | Yeah. |
| 1128 | D2 | to discuss, erm, rather than the integration of concepts I suppose and things that are less tangible or observable, the things that are slightly more, yeah ethereal, you know, whatever, you know what are values and ethics, you know? |
| 1129 | D3 | Those things we can’t grab. |
| 1130 | D2 | Yeah. |
| 1131 | D3 | Mmm, mmm. |
| 1132 | D2 | And perhaps that’s where my greatest learning is, when we’ve had the opportunity to do that, which is why I’ve probably cited the integrative model, ‘cause it’s thrown up many more questions for me than others have |
| 1133 | D4 | Mmm. |
| 1134 | D2 | that’s what it’s done |
| 1135 | D4 | Mmm. |
| 1136 | D2 | and that’s where my learning really is, in trying to struggle, the struggle, and trying to find my answers. |
| 1137 | D5 | But it’s interesting I’m thinking that integrative model really gives us space without really roles, when we really need to build our own ways, while any other model, which is much more concrete and structured, gives us roles as well, so what you’re describing is exactly maybe what they want from us and what they kind of plan you know, by giving us integrative model that |
| 1138 | D2 | [Mmm.] |
| 1139 | D5 | [we] give you space right now, the field, and you, you know, you find your own way |
| 1140 | D3 | Mmm, I was |
| 1141 | D4 | Yes, it reminds me of, I think LECTURER was saying in that last group, erm, how it wouldn’t be integrative if he, if they had told us how to be integrative |
| 1142 | D5 | Mmm. |
| 1143 | D4 | how to integrate, they could only sort of show examples of and |
| 1144 | D3 | Mmm. |
| 1145 | D2 | and then allow us to integrate it. |
| 1146 | D3 | I was thinking of what you said earlier about the parent |
| 1147 | D5 | Mmm. |
| 1148 | D3 | and erm, and I have in my mind a, a small toddler being taken by the hand and learning certain things and then being allowed out to play, erm, and that’s how it feels, that, yeah go and play in the sand and see how it feels and erm then later you can build a sandcastle |
| 1149 | D5 | [<laughs>] |
| 1150 | D3 | [erm], something like that, learning a few, learning some rules, before, and then being allowed to develop that. |
| 1151 | D4 | Mmm. |
| 1152 | D5 | Mmm. |
| 1168 | D2 | But you see why are they not able to say, I can’t really tell you how to be integrative ‘cause that wouldn’t be being integrative, but it’s okay |
| 1169 | D3 | [<Laughs>]
<p>| 1170 | D2 | [to say, this] is how you should be psychodynamic, this is how you should be CBT, because I would argue that actually from person to person that’s very different |
| 1171 | D3 | Yeah. |
| 1172 | D4 | Mmm. |
| 1173 | D2 | and that you know |
| 1174 | D5 | Absolutely |
| 1175 | D2 | you know so, what is, you know, why is that different? |
| 1176 | D4 | Mmm. |
| 1177 | D2 | Does that make sense? |
| 1178 | D3 | Mmm. |
| 1179 | D2 | Why is it okay for some models |
| 1180 | D5 | But I to be more prescriptive about how [to be (              )] |
| 1181 | D5 | [I’m thinking that actually] they did say this no? Maybe I heard this, somehow, I think they all said it, this is kind of what roles, for example set A B C D, but it doesn’t mean you are gonna be the same way in the room, and they all said this, for psychodynamic especially. |
| 1182 | D2 | I didn’t hear that so much. |
| 1183 | D5 | No? Maybe, maybe it’s my imagination right now I don’t know |
| 1184 | D4 | Mmm. |
| 1185 | D5 | but somehow I always feel that they gave us this open space like, you know, it’s maybe this way but it might be other way around. Maybe I wanted to hear this I don’t know &lt;Laughs&gt;. |
| 1186 | MOD | Okay we’ve got just over five minutes left and I just want, so I wanna go back to the question that I asked just to, for the last five minutes to round things up |
| 1187 | D5 | [Mmm.] |
| 1188 | MOD | [but] erm, so what I asked earlier was, what role do values and ethics play in counselling psychology training and practice? |
| 1189 | D5 | &lt;Laughs&gt; |
| 1190 | MOD | It’s funny ‘cause as I ask it now it feels like it’s become a much bigger question. |
| 1191 | D5 | [Yeah.] |
| 1192 | D2 | [Yeah.] |
| 1193 | D4 | Yeah. |
| 1194 | D5 | Yes, absolutely. |
| 1195 | D2 | Yeah. |
| 1196 | MOD | Than when I asked it |
| 1197 | D5 | Yeah. |
| 1198 | MOD | maybe |
| 1199 | D5 | Before. |
| 1200 | MOD | an hour ago. |
| 1201 | D2 | Yeah. I want to say that it, it is the very foundation for me, I think, of what it is to be a counselling psychologist. I’ve never thought of it like that before. |
| 1202 | D4 | Mmm. |
| 1203 | D5 | I think values as soon as I understand it today, it is a foundation. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1213</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1214</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Like the basic, basic, basic principles, but with ethics I think it’s a different story for me. I’m not sure they’re the same and I’m not sure I really erm, it’s difficult to explain but I can see myself sometimes breaking the boundaries, breaking the rules, I mean the ethics rules not my personal values, but ethics rules, I can easily see this, I haven’t done it yet but, maybe I did actually, you never know, but I can see it, easy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>When you said it’s the foundation wh- what were you talking about, just in terms of the language there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1216</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Ethics and, [values and ethics]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1217</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>[(   )]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1218</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Both together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1219</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>[Both, yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>[but actually] just thinking about what you just said I was also thinking that perhaps it depends upon what we consider to be ethical and non-ethical as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1221</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1222</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>[Absolutely], no absolutely it’s a big question [of (what)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1223</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>[and our values will] probably inform that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1224</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>what do we mean yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>I’m thinking about saying, going over time sometimes with a client, you could say, going over time erm it’s, the boundaries aren’t as firm so the client isn’t as contained, is that doing harm to the client? Which is an ethical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1226</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1227</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>[thing], erm, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1228</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Or is it unethical to allow someone to leave the room when something has just come up, they’ve said something and you haven’t worked it through with them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1229</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Exactly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>in any way shape or form, it’s the dilemma [isn’t it]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1231</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>[Exactly], [yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1232</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1233</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>I think for me the eth- an ethical framework, having an ethical fr- ethical framework written down, like the BPS guidelines, the BACP, actually holds me in my work, erm, and if I have a client that I haven’t worked something through, that’ll just have to stay ‘til the next time, erm, values is, ooh, slightly more shady erm &lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1234</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>&lt;Laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Yeah, mmm, but I like the holding stance of having an ethical framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1237</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>‘Cause that protects you against what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1238</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Yeah do you think [ethics is safe here?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>[Well I don’t know if it] protects me, [well I think it does protect me]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>[But it holds you, therefore it’s safe]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1241</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>I think it, yeah I like the safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1242</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Safe, yeah it’s safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>I th- I like the safety, erm I like to work within that framework, for my own safety and for other peoples’ safety, mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1244</td>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>Can you say a little bit more about values being shady?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Well values I suppose is that my values, I expect, erm, I think, have probably changed but then I h-we haven't got time to question that right now but it has made me think about, have my values actually changed through this training?

Mmm.

I think ethics scare me, when I think about going into private practice would I do it? It feels like ethics, how to adhere to them, or not, feels dangerous when it's sort of, you know with the HPC if you,

if you break any ethics then you'll be struck off or

erm, so, yeah, I think if I think about 'em all the time, yeah, I think they do hold me but at the same time I, I don't think about them 'cause I think if I did all the time I would, it would make me anxious about [<Laughs>]

the erm, you know, the, the, erm, the regulatory bodies that could dish out punishments if I

the dilemma is that a lot of our work is around taking some kind of relational risk with people.

This is what

[Yes .]

[I wa- I wanted to say as well actually <Laughs>]

[Yeah, so, it's about the fear, yeah]

[[It's all about fear and ethics]]

[Yeah.]

yeah, 'cause if you're fearing being erm, I shouldn't do that because

[Yeah.]

[Exactly.]

I don't wanna put a foot out then

[Yeah.]

[can I be creative or [risk, risk taking]

[Mmm].

[Yes.]

[Exactly, I mean ethics, it is] a boundaries isn't it, if you don't cross the boundaries where is the development?

Yes.

[It's like a human]

[It always comes at the end] doesn't it
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1303</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1304</td>
<td>It’s like human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1305</td>
<td>&lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1308</td>
<td>&lt;Laughter&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1309</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td>You can go (   ) out of the boundaries of one and half hours, you’re being a bit less ethical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311</td>
<td>&lt;laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1313</td>
<td>Ethical risk [&lt;laughs&gt;]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1314</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1316</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1317</td>
<td>No but this is the point you know if you don’t cross the boundaries, why are we there for? How are we gonna provide the environment for our client to cross some boundaries that they’ve got</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1318</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1319</td>
<td>[(They’ve got you)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321</td>
<td>But is it not that we’re not able to do it, what about them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1323</td>
<td>[Yeah.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325</td>
<td>[But you don’t.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1327</td>
<td>[but I don’t], yeah, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1328</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1329</td>
<td>What if you need to in terms of clients, client benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1331</td>
<td>[I wouldn’t.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1332</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1333</td>
<td>[but you], still you wouldn’t?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335</td>
<td>I wouldn’t, that is up to that client if they want to cross a boundary, it doesn’t mean I have to cross a boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1336</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1337</td>
<td>So would you allow them to cross the boundary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1338</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1339</td>
<td>Well it depends on my safety doesn’t it, depends if it involves me or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1341</td>
<td>Okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1342</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1343</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345</td>
<td>And I think it depends on approach as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347</td>
<td>[Mmmhmmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349</td>
<td>[whether you’re]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>[Mmm.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355</td>
<td>[person-centred] and you wanna be congruent and put a hand on, on them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1357</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359</td>
<td>in that moment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1362</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363</td>
<td>erm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365</td>
<td>because that’s a boundary in itself isn’t it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369</td>
<td>Mmm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371</td>
<td>very no-no psychodynamically but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373</td>
<td>Touch, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375</td>
<td>erm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377</td>
<td>But actually I was thinking psychodynamically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379</td>
<td>&lt;laughs&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381</td>
<td>interpretation is open to enormous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[Mmm.]
[potentially] enormous risk, of psychodynamic work
[Okay.]
[(just to end)]
[<Laughter>]
[finish, finish just need to (                    )]
[Does anybody want to say anything], final burning things anyone wants to say before I stop?
Thanks for [doing this]
[No]
No?
[great, really enjoyed being part of it.]
[it’s been very good, yeah.]
[No but thank you], we'll carry on without you.
<Laughter>
OK thanks.