

2019

Counselor Education Graduate Students' Experiences with Multiple Roles and Relationships

Kristen N. Dickens
Georgia Southern University

Richard E. Cleveland
Georgia Southern University

Lauren Amason
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jcrp>



Part of the [Counselor Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dickens, Kristen N.; Cleveland, Richard E.; and Amason, Lauren (2019) "Counselor Education Graduate Students' Experiences with Multiple Roles and Relationships," *Journal of Counseling Research and Practice*: Vol. 5 : Iss. 1 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jcrp/vol5/iss1/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Education, School of at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Counseling Research and Practice by an authorized editor of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

***Counselor Education Graduate Students’
Experiences with Multiple Roles and
Relationships***

The Journal of Counseling Research and Practice (JCRP)
Volume 5, No. 1
(1 - 15)

**Kristen N. Dickens
Richard E. Cleveland
Lauren Amason**

Georgia Southern University

Abstract

Counselor Education graduate students participate in multiple roles and relationships during their programs (Dickens, Ebrahim, & Herlihy, 2016). The purpose of this quantitative investigation was to explore counselor education graduate students’ awareness of and experiences with multiple roles and relationships through the development of a self-report scale. Building on previous qualitative studies, the authors constructed a 41-item survey – the Multiple Roles, Relationships, and Responsibilities (M3R). Exploratory factor analysis was applied to data from a sampling of counseling students ($n = 140$) yielding an 8-factor solution accounting for approximately 63% of the variance. Implications for faculty are discussed and programmatic recommendations are offered.

Dual relationships have been a controversial ethical issue in mental health professions for several decades (Lazarus & Zur, 2017; Remley & Herlihy, 2016). Various labels have been used interchangeably to denote a secondary relationship that exists between client and counselor, including *dual relationship*, *multiple relationship*, and *nonprofessional relationships* (American Counseling Association [ACA], 2014; Corey, Corey, & Corey, 2019; Moleski & Kiselica, 2005; Lazarus & Zur, 2017). Multiple relationships occur when counselors participate in two or more professional roles and relationships with a client (e.g., counselor and supervisor), and/or blend their professional role and relationship with a nonprofessional role (e.g., counselor and friend) (Corey et al., 2019). Initially, researchers discouraged counselors’ participation in multiple roles and relationships with clients, due to the potential for harm and possibility of counselors’ misusing their power (Herlihy & Corey, 2015). Over time, however,

practitioners and ethics boards have acknowledged the potential benefits for clients of some nonprofessional interactions and dual relationships and addressed these in updated ethical codes (Corey et al., 2019; Herlihy & Corey, 2015; Lazarus & Zur, 2017).

Similarly, the existence and complex dynamics of multiple roles and relationships in counselor education training programs continues to be a relevant topic among students and faculty (Bowman & Hatley, 1995; Dickens et al., 2016; Kolbert, Morgan, & Brendel, 2002). Multiple relationships include relationships between students (e.g., master’s and doctoral) (Oberlander & Barnett, 2005; Scarborough, Bernard, & Morse, 2006), faculty and students (Dickens et al., 2016; Herlihy & Corey, 2015), supervisors and students (Sullivan & Ogloff, 1998), and administrators and students (Bowman & Hatley, 1995; Dickens et al., 2016; Holmes, Rupert, Ross, & Shapera, 1999; Kolbert et al., 2002). Students enrolled in counselor education programs

are expected to participate in roles and subsequent responsibilities in which they are required to interact with faculty, clinical supervisors, and other graduate students (e.g., master's and/or doctoral students). Researchers have analyzed multiple relationships and nonprofessional interactions in counselor education faculty-student relationships and doctoral-master's student relationships, focusing on supervision (Kolbert et al., 2002; Schwab & Neukrug, 1994; Sullivan & Ogloff, 1998), advising (Barnett, 2008), friendships (Biaggio, Paget, & Chenoweth, 1997; Bowman & Hatley, 1995; Kolbert et al., 2002), mentoring (Barnett, 2008; Bowman & Hatley, 1995; Holmes et al., 1999; Johnson & Nelson, 1999; Protivnak & Foss, 2009), monetary interactions (Kolbert et al., 2002), and romantic or sexual relationships (Bowman & Hatley, 1995).

A review of studies on multiple relationships in counselor education reveals an acknowledgement of the lack of program emphasis on teaching students about setting and maintaining boundaries with faculty and fellow students (Biaggio et al., 1997; Blevins-Knabe, 1992; Bowman & Hatley, 1995; Kolbert et al., 2002; Schwab & Neukrug, 1994). Additionally, despite acknowledgment by students and faculty that multiple relationships exist in higher education, students still struggle to navigate the dimensions of these relationships (Bowman & Hatley, 1995; Dickens et al., 2016; Holmes et al., 1999; Kolbert et al., 2002). Although literature regarding multiple relationships may be sparse in comparison with other programmatic aspects of counselor education, there are salient themes which have emerged. Common findings include a high prevalence of multiple relationships between students and faculty and between doctoral and master's students, differing opinions between

students and faculty regarding the nature of certain multiple roles and relationships within counselor education, and a lack of education for students regarding how to evaluate and navigate various types of multiple relationships (Biaggio et al., 1997; Blevins-Knabe, 1992; Dickens et al., 2016; Bowman & Hatley, 1995; Kolbert et al., 2002; Schwab & Neukrug, 1994). Despite researchers discussing the influence of the power differential and its potential to affect students' ethical decision-making processes (Dickens et al., 2016), a remaining concern has been expressed regarding the potential for future counselors and counselor educators to succumb to the slippery slope phenomenon after participating in multiple relationships while enrolled as graduate students (Barnett, 2008; Kitchener, 1988; Sullivan & Ogloff, 1998).

Blevins-Knabe (1992) described the mentoring effect and noted the potential for harm if early mentoring relationships are characterized by poor boundaries between professor and student. By contrast, the multiple relationships involved in mentorship were consistently cited as an important theme connected to doctoral student success in programs and professional development (Barnett, 2008; Bowman & Hatley, 1995; Holmes et al., 1999; Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Such findings from previous research on multiple roles and relationships support the need for increased education for students regarding multiple relationships in counselor education, along with teaching viable ethical decision-making models to assist in navigating boundary issues that may arise.

Dickens et al. (2016) conducted a qualitative study using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis to explore the experiences of counselor education graduate students who participated in multiple

relationships during their doctoral program. The analysis yielded four superordinate themes: power differential, need for education, transformation, and learning from experiences. The researchers indicated that a need exists for quantitative feedback from counselor education students regarding their experiences with various types of multiple roles and relationships within their training programs.

The purpose of this study was to develop a self-report survey protocol based on literature and qualitative studies. Such an instrument may help gain further insight through a quantitative lens into graduate students' experiences with multiple roles and relationships while they were enrolled in their counselor education programs. Though previous studies highlighted the existence and complicated nature of multiple roles and relationships for counselor education graduate students, no instrument was available to assess students' perceptions of multiple roles relationships. Thus, it was posited that the development of a self-report survey demonstrating adequate psychometric properties would aid counselor educators in ethically and meaningfully addressing the multiple roles and relationships graduate students experience. Building on the qualitative investigation of Dickens et al. (2016), the authors developed a self-report survey instrument, investigating: (a) participants' level of awareness of the phenomenon of multiple roles and relationships; (b) whether and how participants were affected by the power differential inherent in some multiple roles and relationships (e.g., faculty advisor and master's student); and (c) participants' experiences with boundary issues that may have occurred as a result of engaging in multiple roles and relationships.

Method

Sample

Prior to initiating the data collection process, permission was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the researchers' university. Participants were recruited through posting on counselor education listservs after receiving permission from organization leadership. No incentives were offered for participation. Additionally, the researchers directly emailed program directors of CACREP-accredited counselor education training programs (approximately 320) about the study. As there was no requirement for program directors to state whether or not they forwarded on the information to students, it is unknown how many graduate students were made aware of the study. However, a total of 140 participants responded to the email invitation. The majority of participants reported their age in the late twenties/early thirties ($M = 31$) and identified as White or Caucasian (64.3%) and female (70.7%). The majority respondents reported being masters-level students (68.6%) with the remaining identifying as doctoral students. The majority of participants reported being enrolled in Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accredited programs (96.5%).

Instrument

The primary research question guiding instrument development was: how do counselor education graduate students experience multiple roles, responsibilities, and relationships with counselor education faculty/supervisors? Approximately 34 items were initially created by the authors based on existing literature addressing

multiple roles and responsibilities, and more specifically the qualitative work done by Dickens et al. (2016). These items initially aligned with the broader themes of power differential, need for education, transformation, and learning from experiences with multiple roles and relationships. The authors then reviewed the items and made revisions, yielding an increase in total items to 41. These items were then placed within a protocol piloted by a small pool of graduate students (approximately five). Of note, graduate students chosen for the pilot were intentionally not enrolled in the authors' graduate program, thereby minimizing potential influence of multiple roles/relationships. Based on the pilot experience, the 41 items were retained with minimal editing and revisions. Items were then used to create an online survey instrument utilizing Qualtrics. The resulting instrument was titled The Multiple Roles, Relationships, and Responsibilities instrument, or M3R.

Procedures

The researchers distributed the M3R instrument to participants via an introductory email containing the Qualtrics survey link. The link was provided as both hyperlink-enabled URL as well as QR code (inserted/attached image). The email (as well as introductory page of the Qualtrics survey) introduced the researchers, the focus of the study, IRB approval information, and contact information for the researchers. Additionally, the email affirmed participation was voluntary, participants could withdraw from the survey at any time, and that participants' data would be kept confidential with no identifying information retained in the dataset. The survey was kept open for active collection of data for approximately five months. After that time,

based on declined participants responses, the researchers closed the survey link and began data analyses.

Results

Preliminary analysis investigated descriptive statistics for the sampling. This analysis reviewed basic measures of central tendency, range, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis. All data were found to be within tolerable limits of normality. While some items presented skewness and/or kurtosis statistics outside the general "rule of thumb" of $|1|$, all functioned with the broader parameters required for factor analyses (Fabrigar & Wegener, 2012; Field, 2018). During this process, missing data were discovered and addressed utilizing expectation maximization (EM) procedures. Expectation Maximization (EM), one of the third-generation techniques for missing data imputation, is efficient, nimble, robust and superior to many first-generation methods such as Listwise Deletion, Pairwise Deletion, or Mean Substitution (Karanja, Zaveri, & Ahmed, 2013). Prior to implementing EM, Little's MCAR test was found non-significant, suggesting no systematic cause for the missing data. Missing data were replaced using EM and the resulting dataset was once again reviewed. As before, descriptive statistics were found within tolerable limits of normality. Secondary analyses reviewed mean, median, and mode values for individual survey items as well as cumulative mean averages for each of the factors (derived from literature and previous qualitative work) comprising the instrument. These results are presented in Table 2 by individual item. Mean averages for items ranged from 2.99 (Item 21: *Discussion on multiple roles is initiated by my faculty/supervisor*) to 4.26 (Item 29: *I recognize how challenges shape my*

development as a future counselor/counselor/educator). The majority (80.6%) items' mean average scores fell within a range of 2.99 to 3.94 with 6 items scoring 4.00 or higher. Interestingly, items 18, 29, 30, and 31 fell within this range (i.e., higher than 4.00) with each item addressing some facet of students' individual awareness of multiple roles/relationships.

Final analyses investigated the dataset for appropriateness for factor analysis. Review of inter-item correlations found low values but still within acceptable limits. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was found significant, and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) was .806. These results suggested factor analysis was appropriate for the dataset. As this study was an initial development of the instrument, the authors chose Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) versus Principal Components Analysis (PCA). PAF was then applied to all 41 items, yielding an initial 9-factor extraction. The authors reviewed the scree plot and item loadings, eventually deciding to drop ten items which did not align with the 9 factors but instead remained independent. PAF was applied to the remaining 31 items and an 8-factor solution was extracted. As the authors believed the factors underlying the experience of multiple roles and relationships were related, oblique rotation was employed (Fabrigar & Wegener, 2012). Specifically, rotation was applied to the PAF extraction using Direct Oblimin ($\delta = 0$). The resulting rotated 8-factor solution continued to demonstrate a significant value for Bartlett's Test, produced a KMO of .824, and accounted for 62.629% of the variance. Consulting previous research and literature surrounding multiple roles, relationships and responsibilities, the researchers reviewed the items composing each of the 8 factors and

chose names best describing the themes represented. See Table 1 for factor names, item loadings, and cumulative variance.

The resulting themes (and specific items within) were as follows: Faculty Interactions (15, 16, 14, 28, 20, 21); Defining Identities & Boundaries (23, 22, 24, 13); Individual Awareness (31, 29, 30, 18); Individual Resilience (10, 27, 2, 19); Ethics of Multiple Roles & Responsibilities (7*, 6, 8); Implementing & Maintaining Boundaries (26*, 25*); Roles & Responsibilities (9*, 12, 11, 17); and Expression & Opinion (3*, 4*, 1*, 5). Note that items marked with an asterisk were reverse-coded. Variance accounted for by factors ranged from a high value of 33.38% to a low of 2.38% in the following rank order: Faculty Interactions (33.38%); Defining Identities & Boundaries (7.27%); Individual Awareness (5.20%); Individual Resilience (4.57%); Ethics of Multiple Roles & Relationships (3.92%); Implementing & Maintaining Boundaries (3.04%); Roles & Responsibilities (2.88%); and Expression & Opinion (2.38%). Combined these eight factors accounted for 62.63% of the cumulative explained variance.

Discussion

Multiple roles and relationships may be a relevant concern for students and faculty within any graduate program of study. However, considering the importance of acknowledging and attending to such relationships as demonstrated by professional codes of ethics (ACA, 2014; American Psychological Association, 2017; American School Counseling Association, 2016; National Board for Certified Counselors, 2016), counselor educators are arguably called to a higher standard. Researchers who have investigated multiple relationships in counselor education have

noted the failure of some programs to emphasize the importance of creating and maintaining boundaries, or even to provide students with information on what constitutes an acceptable relationship and how to handle boundary violations (Barnett, 2008; Dickens et al., 2016; Bowman & Hatley, 1995; Holmes et al., 1999; Kolbert et al., 2002; Scarborough et al., 2006). This lack of training is especially problematic considering that many counselor educators believe multiple relationships are essential to the growth and development of future counselor educators (Barnett, 2008; Biaggio et al., 1997; Blevins-Knabe, 1992; Bowman & Hatley, 1995; Holmes et al., 1999; Kolbert et al., 2002). Intentionally and diligently demonstrating awareness of and attending to such relationships requires accurate assessment of students' perceptions of multiple roles.

Reviewing the literature on multiple roles, relationships and responsibilities of graduate students enrolled in counselor education programs, the authors created a 31-item survey. Factor analyses extracted 8 distinct factors accounting for approximately 63% of the variance aligning with previous qualitative work (Dickens et al., 2016). The eight factors were named: Faculty Interactions, Defining Identities and Boundaries, Individual Awareness, Individual Resilience, Ethics of Multiple Roles and Relationships, Implementing and Maintaining Boundaries, Roles and Responsibilities, and Expression and Opinion.

Review of participants' responses suggest that overall participants had a healthy conceptualization of multiple roles and responsibilities. Items were worded from a positive health perspective (e.g., "I feel comfortable reaching out to faculty/supervisors for professional support"

(21)) with negative items reverse-coded (e.g., "I am often confused about the expectations of me in my multiple roles and responsibilities" (9)). All survey items demonstrated mean averages greater than or equal to 3.00 except for item 15 (e.g., "Discussion on multiple roles is initiated by my faculty/supervisor"). Similarly, all items demonstrated median and mode values greater than or equal to 3.00.

Furthermore, of the eight factors comprising the instrument, "Individual Awareness" demonstrated the highest cumulative mean average (4.20) while "Implementing & Maintaining Boundaries" yielded the lowest (3.25). These findings align with previous results from Dickens et al. (2016) that demonstrated students' heightened awareness of multiple roles and relationships as a common part of being a counselor education graduate student. The results from the current study suggest that participants recognized the value of establishing boundaries due to the intricacies of the multiple roles and relationships in which they participate, further aligning with findings from Dickens et al. (2016).

These findings suggest that the Multiple Roles, Relationships, and Responsibilities (M3R) instrument functions as a reliable tool for assessing the perceived multiple roles and relationships experienced by graduate students enrolled in counselor education programs. Furthermore, these results parallel previous literature evidenced by factor alignment with qualitative superordinate themes (Dickens et al., 2016). Interestingly, the results from this investigation found "Faculty Interactions" as the most prominent factor constituting more than half of the variance accounted for. In light of these results, the authors suggest three implications for counselor educators and counselor education programs.

Implications

Counselor-in-Training Monitoring

As outlined in the literature review, while some investigations have emerged in answering the call for ethical self-monitoring and examination in regard to multiple relationships (Bowman & Hatley, 1995; Herlihy & Corey, 2015; Kolbert et al., 2002), there remains a need for a quantitative instrument specifically addressing counselor education students. This seems especially pertinent as counselor education students, or “counselors-in-training,” enter into their practicum and internship field experiences where there may exist greater opportunities to experience multiple roles and relationships. The M3R can serve as a resource available to counselors-in-training as they navigate an ethical decision-making model to objectively evaluate their situation (Younggren & Gottlieb, 2004).

Programmatic Implementation

In addition to serving as a tool for individual practitioners (and/or counselors-in-training), the M3R can aid counselor educators programmatically in terms of evaluation and instruction. Current accreditation (i.e., CACREP) and licensing agency standards call for regular assessment and evaluation of program stakeholders, surveying various aspects of the program. Representative of this focus, Burns and Cruikshanks (2019) explored the impact of ethical decision-making resources faculty consult when addressing potential boundary violations with students. The results suggested although faculty may be reticent in employing various models and/or frameworks, 100% of participants reported using the ACA Code of Ethics (2014) for past and future situations. However, while

such results are encouraging and support counselor educators integrating discussions of multiple roles and responsibilities into their programmatic work, the focus (i.e., perspective) remains explicitly faculty-centric rather than incorporating student voice.

The M3R, whether used as a stand-alone instrument or embedded within other program surveys, can add further context to comprehensive evaluation of the program through assessing multiple role/relationships as experienced by counselor education students. Recent graduates may be surveyed as well to further address potential bias from responders who are currently enrolled students. While applicable to all counselor education programs, such evaluation would arguably seem even more pertinent for programs incorporating graduate/research assistantships for students enrolled within their program.

The M3R might also be employed for instructional purposes by counselor education faculty. The instrument might be used within an ethics class to create student awareness of multiple role/relationships within counselor education. Revisiting the instrument at a later time during the program (i.e., practicum, internship) could facilitate more critical inquiry, given students’ increased knowledge and experience, and might be viewed with more relevance by the counselors-in-training.

Faculty Influence/Responsibility for Change

Lastly, it is noteworthy that in the current study the factor “Faculty Interactions” was responsible for 33.38% of the variance. Much of the literature approaches multiple roles and responsibilities from the graduate student perspective, as does this instrument; for

example, graduate students' *self*-reported perceptions, education *for* graduate students, navigating role ambiguity/confusion, and support *for* graduate students, etc. Yet results from this investigation point to the central role faculty themselves play in creating, permitting, or minimizing multiple role/responsibilities with graduate students. Whereas items from other factors addressed graduate student autonomy ("I feel confident setting boundaries between my personal and professional identities"), past experience ("My experiences with multiple roles and relationships have increased my resiliency"), and programmatic resources ("I know where to find additional information about my roles and responsibilities"), items within the "Faculty Interactions" factor allude to the influence of faculty and their personal/professional interactions with graduate students. Items within this prominent factor refer to direct actions initiated by faculty (e.g., "Discussion [...] is initiated by my faculty"; "My faculty discussed...") as well as climates created by faculty behaviors (e.g., "I feel comfortable reaching out") aimed towards successful navigation of multiple roles and responsibilities with graduate students.

This clearly aligns with previous work (Bowen & Hatley, 1995; Holmes et al., 1999; Kolbert et al., 2002) illustrating the emphasis on the role faculty play towards minimizing the effects multiple roles and responsibilities may have on graduate students' experiences and development. Burns (2019) found that counselor education students often fear negative repercussions from speaking out against boundary crossings and violations with faculty, and are commonly encouraged to stay silent (whether implicitly or explicitly); sometimes even by other counselor educators. As faculty and students are well aware of existing power differentials, counselor

educators should endeavor to initiate conversations about multiple roles and incorporate models of how students can navigate ethical dilemmas. Counselor educators may also discuss ways they personally have navigated multiple relationship situations in the past, including helpful resources used.

These results illustrate the pivotal role and responsibility of faculty within counselor education and supervision programs. Faculty possess the ability and autonomy to mitigate the harmful effects of multiple roles and responsibilities, not only in their individual interactions with students but on a programmatic level as well. It is vital for faculty to recognize the power differential between themselves and students, and to positively model how to navigate multiple roles and relationships for their students.

Limitations and Recommendations

This study was not without limitations, including the limited sample size. Although the sample size of 140 may be considered adequate for an initial exploration, some researchers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012) advise a minimum sample size of approximately 300, or a ratio of 10 participants to each initial item (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003). The participants in this study were majority White, female, master's-level students. A larger, more diverse sample could provide a more inclusive perspective on the experience of being a graduate student involved in multiple roles and relationships. Finally, as with any self-report measure, social bias must be considered. This may be even more pertinent to the current study given the potentially sensitive nature of the topic (Dickens et al., 2016). Although statistical review of the dataset (i.e., Little's MCAR

test) suggested no external systematic effect upon the data, the potential for social bias arguably remains high with an instrument asking participants (i.e., graduate students) to consider possible negative outcomes associated with faculty/supervisor relationships.

Further research is needed to explore how graduate students perceive and experience multiple roles and relationships. In validating the factor-structure and application of the instrument, future studies might also address concerns of sample size, demographics, and social bias. Additionally, concurrent validity may be explored through mixed-method studies. Quantitative methods might include utilizing instruments measuring similar constructs, and qualitative methods might involve interviewing select participants. It is the authors' hope that this initial development of the M3R will aid in such endeavors.

References

- American Counseling Association (2014). *2014 ACA Code of Ethics*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from https://www.counseling.org/docs/default-source/ethics/2014-code-of-ethics.pdf?sfvrsn=2d58522c_4
- American Psychological Association (2017). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index.aspx>
- American School Counselor Association (2016). *ASCA ethical standards for school counselors*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asc>
- a/me
dia/asca/Ethics/EthicalStandards2016.pdf
- Barnett, J. E. (2008). Mentoring, boundaries, and multiple relationships: Opportunities and challenges. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 16*, 3-16.
- Biaggio, M., Paget, T. L., & Chenoweth, M. S. (1997). A model for ethical management of faculty-student dual relationships. *Professional Psychology: Research & Practice, 28*, 184-189.
- Blevins-Knabe, B. (1992). The ethics of dual relationships in higher education. *Ethics & Behavior, 2*(3), 151-163.
- Bowman, V. E., & Hatley, L. D. (1995). Faculty-student relationships: The dual role controversy. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 34*(3), 232-242.
- Burns, S. T. (2019). Students' ethical decision-making when considering boundary crossings with counselor educators. *Counseling & Values, 64*(1), 53-71.
- Burns, S. T., & Cruikshanks, D. R. (2019). Impact of selected ethical information resources on counselor educators' decision-making regarding boundary crossings. *Counseling & Values, 64*(2), 204-226.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2016). *Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational*

- Programs (CACREP) 2016 standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.cacrep.org/doc/2009%20Standards%20with%20cover.pdf>
- Corey, G., Corey, M., Corey, C. (2019). *Issues and ethics in helping professions* (10th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage.
- Dickens, K. N., Ebrahim, C., & Herlihy, B. (2016). Counselor education doctoral students' experiences with multiple roles and relationships. *Journal of Counselor Education & Supervision, 55*(4), 234-249.
- Fabrigar, L. R., & Wegener, D. T. (2012). *Exploratory factor analysis*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Herlihy, B., & Corey, G. (2015). *Boundary issues in counseling: Multiple roles and responsibilities* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Holmes, D. L., Rupert, P. A., Ross, S. A., & Shapera, W. E. (1999). Student perceptions of dual relationships between faculty and students. *Ethics & Behavior, 9*, 79-107.
- Kolbert, J. B., Morgan, B., & Brendel, J. M. (2002). Faculty and student perceptions of dual relationships within counselor education: A qualitative analysis. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*, 193-206.
- Lazarus, A. A., & Zur, O. (Eds.). (2017). *Dual relationships and psychotherapy*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Moleski, S. M., & Kiselica, M. S. (2005). Dual relationships: A continuum ranging from the destructive to the therapeutic. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 83*(1), 3-11.
- National Board for Certified Counselors (2016). *Code of ethics*. Greensboro, NC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.nbcc.org/Assets/Ethics/NBCCCodeofEthics.pdf>
- Oberlander, S. E., & Barnett, J. E. (2005). Multiple relationships between graduate assistants and students: Ethical and practical considerations. *Ethics & Behavior, 15*(1), 49-63. doi:10.1207/s15327019eb1501_4.
- Pett, M. A., Lackey, N. R., & Sullivan, J. J. (2003). *Making sense of factor analysis: The use of factor analysis for instrument development in health care research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. doi: 10.4135/9781412984898
- Remley, T. P., Jr., & Herlihy, B. (2016). *Ethical, legal, and professional issues in counseling* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Scarborough, J. L., Bernard, J. M., & Morse, R. E. (2006). Boundary considerations between doctoral students and master's students. *Counseling and Values, 51*, 53-65.
- Schwab, R., & Neukrug, E. (1994). A survey of counselor educators' ethical concerns. *Counseling and Values, 39*, 42-55.

- Sullivan, L. E., & Ogloff, J. R. P. (1998).
Appropriate supervisor-graduate
student relationships. *Ethics &
Behavior*, 8, 229-248.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2012).
Using multivariate statistics (6th
ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ:
Pearson.
- Younggren, J. N., & Gottlieb, M.C. (2004).
Managing risk when contemplating
multiple relationships. *Professional
Psychology: Research and Practice*,
35(3), 255-260. doi: 10.1037/0735-
7028.35.3.

Table 1

Extracted 8-Factors & Variance

Factor	Items	Loading	% Variance
Faculty Interactions			33.38
	15	.82	
	16	.80	
	14	.61	
	28	.38	
	20	.37	
	21	.34	
Defining Identifies & Boundaries			7.27
	23	1.00	
	22	.61	
	24	.56	
	13	.39	
Individual Awareness			5.20
	31	.94	
	29	.79	
	30	.51	
	18	.45	
Individual Resilience			4.57
	10	.65	
	27	.64	
	2	.53	
	19	.43	
Ethics of Multiple Roles & Relationships			3.92
	7*	-.74	
	6	-.72	
	8	-.48	
Implementing & Maintaining Boundaries			3.04
	26*	.78	
	25*	.45	
Roles & Responsibilities			2.88
	9*	-.45	
	12	-.45	
	11	-.41	
	17	.35	
Expression & Opinion			2.38
	3*	.86	
	4*	.83	
	1*	.62	
	5	.52	
Cumulative Variance			62.63

Note. * denotes reverse-coded item

Table 2

<i>Factor & Individual Item Descriptive Statistics</i>		Mean	Median	Mode	SD	Skew	Kurt	Min	Max
<i>Faculty Interactions</i>									
Discussion on multiple roles is initiated by my faculty/supervisor. (15)		2.99	3.00	3.00	0.82	-0.05	0.25	1.00	5.00
My faculty/supervisors discussed the potential impact of multiple roles and responsibilities with me. (16)		3.20	3.00	3.00	0.90	-0.35	-0.19	1.00	5.00
My faculty/supervisors facilitate continuous dialogue regarding my multiple roles and responsibilities. (14)		3.01	3.00	3.00	0.86	0.04	-0.14	1.00	5.00
My experiences with faculty/supervisors have improved my ability to balance multiple roles and responsibilities. (28)		3.80	4.00	4.00	0.80	-1.01	1.26	1.00	5.00
I feel comfortable reaching out to faculty/supervisors for personal support. (20)		3.33	3.00	3.00	0.94	-0.33	0.15	1.00	5.00
I feel comfortable reaching out to faculty/supervisors for professional support. (21)		4.12	4.00	4.00	0.69	-1.35	4.22	1.00	5.00
<i>Defining Identities & Boundaries</i>									
I feel confident setting boundaries between my personal and professional identities. (23)		3.74	4.00	4.00	0.77	-0.73	0.38	2.00	5.00
I feel confident in my ability to separate my personal identity from my professional identity. (22)		3.69	4.00	4.00	0.84	-0.82	0.43	1.00	5.00
I feel confident creating boundaries between my multiple roles and responsibilities. (24)		3.78	4.00	4.00	0.71	-0.87	1.01	2.00	5.00
My roles and responsibilities are defined similarly by faculty/supervisors and me. (13)		3.71	4.00	4.00	0.76	-1.81	3.68	1.00	5.00
<i>Individual Awareness</i>									
I am aware of potential challenges of participating in multiple roles and relationships. (31)		4.22	4.00	4.00	0.45	0.86	0.02	3.00	5.00
I recognize how challenges shape my development as a future counselor/counselor educator. (29)		4.26	4.00	4.00	0.53	-0.13	1.34	2.00	5.00
I am aware of potential benefits of participating in multiple roles and relationships. (30)		4.11	4.00	4.00	0.52	-0.48	3.61	2.00	5.00
My experiences with multiple roles and relationships have increased my level of self-awareness. (18)		4.22	4.00	4.00	0.54	-0.43	2.97	2.00	5.00

Table 2 continued

Factors & Items	Mean	Median	Mode	SD	Skew	Kurt	Min	Max
<i>Individual Resilience</i>								
I can clearly identify and describe the definitions and duties of my multiple roles. (10)	3.81	4.00	4.00	0.64	-1.14	2.06	2.00	5.00
I am able to balance my multiple roles and responsibilities. (27)	3.84	4.00	4.00	0.49	-1.12	2.68	2.00	5.00
I feel encouraged to express my views even if they differ from the views of faculty/supervisors. (2)	3.73	4.00	4.00	0.90	-1.14	1.10	1.00	5.00
My experiences with multiple roles and relationships have increased my resiliency. (19)	3.94	4.00	4.00	0.55	-0.81	2.83	2.00	5.00
<i>Ethics of Multiple Roles & Relationships</i>								
I fear addressing ethical issues with faculty/supervisors will result in negative consequences. (7*)	3.91	4.00	4.00	0.83	-1.13	1.48	1.00	5.00
I feel comfortable addressing ethical issues with faculty/supervisors. (6)	3.93	4.00	4.00	0.84	-1.14	1.86	1.00	5.00
I feel encouraged to address ethical issues with faculty/supervisors. (8)	3.94	4.00	4.00	0.80	-1.25	2.94	1.00	5.00
<i>Implementing & Maintaining Boundaries</i>								
I struggle to implement personal boundaries. (26*)	3.25	3.00	3.00	0.79	0.15	-0.41	2.00	5.00
I experience difficulties maintaining boundaries between my multiple roles and responsibilities. (25*)	3.25	3.00	3.00	0.71	0.08	-0.24	2.00	5.00
<i>Roles & Responsibilities</i>								
I am often confused about the expectations of me in my multiple roles and responsibilities. (9*)	3.34	3.00	4.00	0.89	-0.53	0.18	1.00	5.00
There are clear boundaries that delineate where the responsibilities of one role ends and another role begins. (12)	3.05	3.00	3.00	0.78	-0.36	-0.06	1.00	5.00
I know where to find additional information about my roles and responsibilities. (11)	3.74	4.00	4.00	0.68	-1.14	2.22	1.00	5.00
My experiences with multiple roles and relationships have fostered my growth as a counselor/counselor educator. (17)	4.13	4.00	4.00	0.49	0.29	0.80	3.00	5.00

Table 2 continued

Factors & Items	Mean	Median	Mode	SD	Skew	Kurt	Min	Max
<i>Expression & Opinion</i>								
I am hesitant to express my opinion for fear of academic consequences. (3*)	3.75	4.00	4.00	1.05	-0.82	0.01	1.00	5.00
I fear expressing my opinion will result in future negative interactions with faculty/supervisors. (4*)	3.35	3.00	3.00	1.06	-0.11	-0.49	1.00	5.00
I am hesitant to vocalize my opinion to faculty/supervisors if my opinion is different from theirs. (1*)	3.29	3.00	3.00	0.92	0.08	-0.63	1.00	5.00
I feel comfortable addressing perceived or real conflict with my faculty/supervisors. (5)	3.19	3.00	3.00	0.90	0.04	0.01	1.00	5.00

Note. Item number in parentheses; * denotes reverse-coded item