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ABSTRACT

The literature on nonsexual boundary crossings in academic relationships has produced mixed results (Bowman, Hatley & Bowman, 1995) and utilized primarily undergraduate (Holmes, Rupert, Ross & Shapera, 1999; Owen & Zwahr-Castro, 2007) or master’s level samples (Kolbert et al., 2002). The focus of this study was to enhance the literature base by assessing doctoral level, counseling psychology faculty and student perceptions of nonsexual boundary crossings. In addition, the role of power was assessed utilizing the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner, Gruenfeld & Anderson, 2003) to help explain potential differences. A total of 135 counseling psychology faculty members (n = 62) and students (n = 73) participated in the current study. To assess the role of power, five propositions of the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power were examined. These included: sensitivity to rewards and punishments, engagement in automatic versus controlled thought processes, and perceptions of inappropriate behaviors. Participants read four vignettes, which assessed supervisor/supervisee, mentor/protégé, advisor/advisee and co-authorship relationships. Each vignette assessed degree of appropriateness, comfort level, and degree to which various behaviors were considered boundary crossings. Finally, participants were asked to provide their definition of nonsexual boundary crossings within the academic relationship in an open-ended question format. The results of the present study did not fully support the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power with this sample. Mixed results were found with
faculty and student perceptions of appropriateness, comfort, and nonsexual boundary crossings, with the most differences noted in degree of comfort. Overall, faculty members and students appeared less clear on how to navigate co-authorship roles. Additionally, most participants defined a nonsexual boundary crossing using a risk management approach, suggesting that boundary crossings should be avoided. However, this definition was not congruent with participant ratings on vignette behaviors, indicating the complexity to understanding nonsexual boundary crossings in academic relationships.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The American Psychological Association’s annual report from the Ethics Committee tracks statistical data on ethical inquiries and formal complaints made against its members. In the last five years, not a single case has been brought against a psychologist for “inappropriate research, teaching or administrative practice” where one would expect to find complaints made by students (APA, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010). On the surface, the absence of reported ethical violations between faculty and students is a good thing. However, it also creates the illusion that ethical issues in academia are a rare occurrence. The purpose of this dissertation is to examine faculty and student perceptions of one such ethical issue, specifically nonsexual boundary crossings in counseling psychology doctoral programs.

Boundaries and Boundary Crossings

According to Pope and Vetter (1992) maintaining boundaries in professional relationships is the second most frequently encountered ethical dilemma faced by psychologists. Boundaries are defined as the “rules of the professional relationship that set it apart from other relationships” (Knapp & VandeCreek, 2006, p. 75). Gutheil and Simon (2002) further defined boundaries as the ‘edge’ of appropriate or professional
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behavior, [the] transgression of which involves the therapist stepping out of the clinical role” (p. 585). Boundaries are meant to provide safety and predictability within the therapeutic relationship (Gutheil & Gabbard, 1998). Under the larger umbrella of boundary transgressions, a differentiation has been made between boundary crossings and boundary violations.

A boundary crossing has been defined as a deviation outside of a typical clinical role (Gutheil & Simon, 2002). Gutheil and Gabbard (1993) further delineated boundary crossings as being neither “laudatory nor pejorative” and remarked that “an assessor could then determine the impact of a boundary crossing on a case-by-case basis that takes into account the context and situation-specific facts…” (p. 190). Boundary crossings are intended to benefit the client and enhance the therapeutic relationship (Gutheil & Gabbard, 1998; Smith & Fitzpatrick, 1995). An example of a boundary crossing that aids the therapeutic relationship would be the therapist holding the hand of a client who just learned of a serious physical illness. As a caveat, the subjectivity of the client deems the effect of a boundary crossing, therefore it is important for boundary crossings to be addressed and discussed between client and therapist (Gutheil & Gabbard, 1998).

A boundary violation has been defined as a departure from common clinical practice that puts the client at serious risk (Gutheil & Gabbard, 1993; Smith & Fitzpatrick, 1995). Engagement in a boundary violation clearly results in exploitation or harm to the client. The primary example of a boundary violation is engaging in a sexual relationship with the client. Other types of interactions considered to be boundary violations include wasting valuable therapeutic time, asking the client for a non-
therapeutic favor or repeated self disclosure (Gutheil & Gabbard, 1998). The emphasis here is that the therapist’s own need is being met rather than the client’s.

Given this, there is debate in the field regarding the ethical implications of boundary crossings (e.g., Koocher & Keith-Spiegel, 1998). Some (Koocher & Keith-Spiegel, 1998) believe that all boundary crossings are harmful and should be avoided whereas others believe that they are inevitable given the natural existence of overlap in relationships (Lazarus & Zur, 2002). One side of the debate urges clinicians to avoid inflexible boundaries and subscribing to a ‘one size fits all’ model (Lazurus, 1994). In fact, Waldinger (1994) claimed that rigid boundaries with clients can actually result in harm. The literature has supported that clients feel connected to therapist’s who are more open and willing to stretch boundaries (Kolden, Klein, Wang, and Austin, 2011; Speight, 2012) and indeed the therapeutic relationship has been examined as one of the core factors that facilitates client change (Lambert & Barley, 2001).

On the other side of the debate, avoidance of boundary crossings adheres to a risk-management approach that may be fueled by the socio-political climate aimed at preventing litigation (Kroll, 2001). Most of the evidence from this approach comes from the literature on the “slippery slope” (Gutheil & Gabbard, 1998) or the idea that a set of minor boundary crossings can then lead to a boundary violation. The most notorious example of this is the therapist and client slowly becoming friendly by sharing personal information with each other and then developing a sexual relationship. Most research on the slippery slope has come from retrospectively interviewing therapists who engaged in sexual misconduct and identifying a pattern of boundary crossings (Gabbard, 2001).
There is even less agreement when attempting to identify specific behaviors that are considered boundary crossings. For example, Kroll (2001) claimed that such a wide net has been cast that offering a client a tissue or giving free sample medications would be considered boundary crossings. One other area of contention is with self-disclosure (Kroll, 2001). Should therapists remain a neutral party and avoid sharing personal information with clients? Is this even possible given the nature of the therapeutic relationship and setting? Although these questions have yet to be answered in the literature, most clinicians attempt to avoid adhering to extremely loose boundaries with clients or extremely rigid boundaries and tend to fall somewhere in between (Glass, 2003). It is this gray area of interactions that can leave some clinicians feeling uneasy.

Most clinicians fall somewhere in the middle as suggested by Gutheil and Gabbard (1998) on the boundary crossing debate, focusing largely on context. It would be impossible to identify and label every single possible interaction as a crossing or not. However, much can be learned from gaining an understanding on how psychologists perceive common interactions and how the definition of boundary crossings is understood. The purpose of this dissertation is to do just that with a focus on counseling psychology faculty and students. The focus of boundary crossings in the literature has been on the therapeutic relationship. More recently, the concepts of boundary crossings have been adopted by the world of academia to better understand the relationships between faculty and students (Gottlieb, Robinson & Younggren, 2007; Koocher & Keith-Spiegel, 1998; Lamb, Catanzaro & Moorman, 2004). One pertinent question is how the definition of boundary crossings translates to the faculty student relationship and whether there is a mutual understanding of the definition.
The APA Ethical Standards (2002) advise psychologists to “take reasonable steps to avoid harming their clients/patients, students, supervisees, research participants, organizational clients, and others with whom they work, and to minimize harm where it is foreseeable and unavoidable” (Standard 3.04). Thus, psychologists are urged to preemptively consider how their interactions would affect students. However, Koocher and Keith-Spiegel (1998) contended that psychologists may not be the best judges of their own behavior. Thus, understanding the perceptions of boundary crossings from both the student and faculty member perspective may shed light onto the implications of boundary crossings in academic relationships.

Nonsexual Boundary Crossings in Academia

The literature on boundary crossings regarding the counselor-client relationship provides a starting point for understanding boundary crossings in academia. However, the doctoral faculty-student relationship is distinct from the counselor-client relationship in many ways. For example, the primary goal of doctoral training is for faculty and students to eventually become colleagues, which ultimately leads to a decrease in the power differential. Additionally, the faculty-student relationship typically lasts over the course of four or five years, however many students may extend their stay to the six or seven year mark before completing their degree. Program length provides time for faculty and students to get to know each other not only professionally through shared interests, but also personally. Thus, the intimate nature of doctoral programs along with longevity of contact may contribute to the prevalence of boundary crossings (Bowman, Hatley & Bowman, 1995).
For the purposes of this study, the focus will be on relationships or roles that occur naturally in counseling psychology programs. Specifically, the supervisor-supervisee, mentor-protégé, advisor-advisee and co-authorship relationships will be examined. The logic behind this focus is that entering into relationships that are atypical of the academic setting (i.e., romantic relationships) may be more readily perceived as unethical by students and faculty (Bowman et al., 1995; Kolbert, Morgan & Brendel, 2002), whereas boundary crossings that occur under the guise of typical roles may be more difficult to discern.

Research in the area of nonsexual boundary crossings in academia has been limited to undergraduate (Holmes, Rupert, Ross & Shapera, 1999; Owen & Zwahr-Castro, 2007) or master’s level student samples (Kolbert et al., 2002). Much of the focus has been on the student perspective alone (Holmes et al., 1999; Owen & Zwahr-Castro, 2007). However, two studies within the counselor education literature considered both faculty and student perspectives in the assessment of dual relationships (Bowman et al., 1995; Kolbert et al., 2002). The results of these two studies will be reviewed in detail in Chapter 2. It is important to note that a great deal of ambiguity existed in how students and faculty perceived the appropriateness of engaging in boundary crossings, however concern for faculty loss of objectivity and the power differential between faculty and students were consistent themes across the aforementioned studies.

Loss of Objectivity

Students and faculty alike appeared to be concerned about the loss of faculty objectivity (Bowman et al., 1995; Holmes et al., 1999; Kitchener, 1992; Kolbert et al.,
Faculty members manage a multitude of evaluation responsibilities including giving course grades, serving on dissertation committees, scoring comprehensive exams, and evaluating clinical experience. If objectivity is compromised, this could lead to unfair treatment of the student (Kitchener, 1992; Koocher & Keith-Spiegel, 1998). Kitchener (1988) claimed that objectivity can be lost when many dual relationships are in place at once. This may happen more readily in doctoral programs because faculty and students simultaneously occupy many roles. If objectivity is lost, it can lead to blurred boundaries, making the navigation of the professional relationship more difficult (Kitchener, 1988; Sullivan & Ogloff, 1998).

Power Differential

Beginning with the work of Lewin (1935), power was defined as the ability to influence a certain degree of force over another. French and Raven (1993) later defined social power as the “potential influence” one individual has over another and developed five taxonomies that describe how power is used in an interpersonal context (p. 232). According to Fiske and Berdahl (2007) the concept of social power refers to the relative control one person has over the valued outcomes of another and is contingent on context. There have been many variations to the definition of power across theories, most of which include the concepts of influence, managing access to resources (positive and negative) and dependence.

By nature of the faculty-student relationship, an inherent power differential exists, which places faculty members in an elevated power position compared to students (Barnett, 2008; Kitchener, 1992; Koocher & Keith-Spiegel, 1998). Faculty members are
considered more knowledgeable and experienced. They also are responsible for educating and evaluating student training. According to Burian and Slimp (2000), the potential for harm is present as long as the student’s training is the responsibility of the faculty member.

The power differential places students in a subordinate role, thus increasing their dependency on faculty members for access to resources and training opportunities. As such, students may be unwilling to risk the relationship by reporting boundary crossings or boundary violations (Sullivan & Ogloff, 1998). In a national survey of APA student affiliates, Zakrzewski (2006) found that 53% (n = 223) of respondents indicated they would not feel safe reporting an ethical violation if they had knowledge of a sexual contact between a student and faculty member. The primary reason for not reporting was fear of losing anonymity and concern over repercussions. This finding has been examined elsewhere (Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro & Wolgast, 1999; Sandler & Russell, 2005) indicating that students are affected by the power differential that exists in the faculty student relationship.

For the purposes of this dissertation, the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner, Gruenfeld & Anderson, 2003) will be used to examine how elevated and reduced power influences faculty and student perceptions of nonsexual boundary crossings.

The Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power

Although the faculty-student relationship is comprised of many facets, one thing is clear: an inherent power differential exists (Sullivan & Ogloff, 1998). The Approach-
Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al., 2003) proposes to explain the cognitive, affective and behavioral responses associated with individuals in high-power positions (faculty) and low-power positions (students). The Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power was derived from empirical research based on Gray’s (1981, 1982) model of the behavioral approach and inhibition systems. The behavioral approach system is characterized by sensitivity to rewards and has been linked to impulsivity (Newman, Wallace, Schmitt, & Arnett, 1997), whereas the behavioral inhibition system is characterized by sensitivity to punishment and when activated can result in anxiety, avoidance, or fear (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002). Keltner et al. (2003) extended the research on the behavioral approach and inhibition systems to explain how power operates in social relationships.

Keltner et al. (2003) defined power as an “individual’s relative capacity to modify others’ states by providing or withholding resources or administering punishments” (p.265). According to Keltner et al., elevated power creates a risk free environment where one has few consequences. This type of environment leads to an activation of the behavioral approach system and fosters positive emotion, attention to rewards, engagement in more automatic thinking and disinhibited behavior. Reduced power, on the other hand, activates the behavioral inhibition system, resulting in increased focus on punishment and constraints in the environment. As such, reduced power tends to be expressed through negative emotions (e.g., anxiety or fear), sensitivity to punishment, controlled thought processes and socially constrained behavior.
Keltner et al. (2003) developed twelve propositions to explain how power influences the affective, cognitive and behavioral responses of individuals in high power and low power positions. For the purposes of this study, only five of the twelve propositions were considered (see Table 1). These five propositions focus on cognitive processing (related to attention) and engaging in socially inappropriate behavior. The other seven propositions which were not examined in this study are related to affect (Propositions 1, 2), behavioral approach (Proposition 9), behavioral inhibition (Proposition 10), and consistency of social behavior (Proposition 11). Although these propositions are interesting additions to understanding the operation of power, they do not fit with the research questions addressing the level of awareness high-powered individuals have with regard to boundary crossings.

Four of the propositions chosen for this study (Proposition 3, 4, 7, and 8) relate to cognition and one (Proposition 12) relates to behavior. Proposition 3 hypothesized that high power increases sensitivity to rewards whereas Proposition 4 suggested that low power increases sensitivity to threats and punishments in one’s environment. In Proposition 7, high power is associated with an increase in automatic thinking whereas low power is associated with controlled thought processes (Proposition 8). Proposition 12 refers to high power increasing the likelihood of engaging in socially inappropriate behaviors. Keltner et al. (2003) hypothesized that the mere possession of power can change how a person engages with others. Specifically, high power leads to reward seeking behavior and automatic thought processes, which in turn lead to a greater likelihood of engaging in socially inappropriate behaviors (e.g., nonsexual boundary crossings).
Table 1. Propositions of the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power Propositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Smith, Jost and Vijay (2008) found that when the roles of power are clearly defined and a legitimate explanation provides reasoning for delineation of high power versus low power positions, both high power and low power individuals are more likely to fall in line with the propositions of the Approach-Inhibition Theory. In other words, high power individuals were more likely to engage in approach related behaviors, were less polite, reported less dissonance, and perceived and experienced less threat (Smith et al., 2008). Thus, in examining the well-established power roles of faculty and students we would expect to find support for approach and inhibition behavioral patterns. With respect to this study, faculty members are expected to report a higher sensitivity to rewards, be more automatic with their thought processes and in turn, perceive nonsexual boundary crossings as more appropriate.

Summary

The concept of boundary crossings originated in the psychotherapy literature, but has been extended to include diversions from normal professional bounds within academic relationships. Many questions still exist though on how faculty and students are
defining boundary crossings. As discussed earlier, a boundary crossing, by definition, is intended to enhance the relationship. As a risk management approach has been espoused by many, the positive aspects of boundary crossings have often been ignored and many have come to view boundary crossings as something to avoid. The responsibility is on the person of high power to assess the effect of a boundary crossing. However, despite the good intentions of the high-powered person, it is the subjectivity of the person in a low power position that actually determines the outcome of a boundary crossing. Thus, it is important to understand both the faculty member’s and student’s perspective on of various interactions that may be perceived as boundary crossings. In addition, a primary focus of this study will be to qualitatively assess how faculty and students are defining boundary crossings.

The doctoral faculty-student relationship is unique and due to the natural occurrence of multiple roles in academia there is potential for boundaries to become blurred and crossings to occur (Sullivan & Ogloff, 1998). Previous research examining nonsexual boundary crossings between faculty and students has produced mixed results (Bowman, et al., 1995; Holmes et al., 1999; Kolbert et al., 2002; Owen & Zwahr-Castro, 2007) and has tended to focus on only one group’s perspective. In addition, the role of power has yet to be examined in this context. The Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al., 2003) provides a theoretical understanding of how power can affect social relationships, including those of faculty and students.

The Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (AITP) was chosen to support this study because of its emphasis on the unconscious cognitive processes of power. It is my
belief that most individuals in high power positions, such as academic faculty, are not actively seeking to abuse their power. According to the AITP and other research (Fiske, 1993) on the experience of high-powered individuals, the sheer possession of power can change how one behaves in his or her environment and relates to others. Thus, the role of power may help to explain the impact of boundary crossings.

Most would agree that the responsibility is on the high-powered individual to be self-aware and monitor their interactions with those of low-power. The main way of distinguishing the impact of a boundary crossing lies in whether the crossing is a “distinct discussable (italics added for emphasis) departure from an established treatment framework” (Glass, 2003, p. 430). Logically, one would need to have a certain level of awareness regarding a behavior in order to bring it to the attention of the client and process it. Waldinger (1994) noted that “clinicians often take their conscious intentions at face value and fail to pursue both their own deeper motivations for a departure from standard technique and patient’s experiences of those departures” (p. 226). In fact, clinicians who are being rehabilitated for sexual misconduct undeniably claim that they were acting in the best interest of the client (Gabbard, 2001). So, the idea that persons of high power are able to actively and without bias scrutinize their behaviors may be questionable.

The AITP postulates that power significantly reduces an individual’s awareness of their interactions with others. If the person of power is not aware and the low-powered individual does not feel comfortable (perhaps due to the power differential) to address the crossing, can this be leading to the “slippery slope?” That is, how does power affect the
dynamics of boundary issues? The AITP provides one explanation of how power may be influencing awareness from both the high-powered and low-powered perspective.

This topic has become increasingly important to me as I have some understanding of boundary crossings from the student’s perspective. As a sixth year counseling psychology doctoral student, I have experienced boundary crossings that I have perceived as having both positive and negative outcomes. Both of these ‘types’ of boundary crossings have had a lasting effect on me. In instances of positive boundary crossings, I felt affirmed by my faculty counterparts, was treated as a colleague rather than a subordinate, and felt bonded in human interaction. In situations of negative crossings, I often questioned my own experience and despite feeling uncomfortable, I kept silent and complied. There were reasons why I did not voice how I felt (e.g., I was being evaluated, wanted to make a good impression, believed that ‘this is how a doctoral program operated’), which led me to question if other students felt the same. In conversations with my peers, there seemed to be a collective dialogue focused on “us” (the students) and “them” (the faculty) that seemed to display divergent student-faculty perspectives. Given the complexity of the faculty-student relationship there are bound to be some disagreements, yet I found myself wondering what level of agreement existed between faculty and students on boundary crossings. This questioning led to the birth of this project.

Statement of the Problem

As previously stated, the literature base regarding nonsexual boundary crossings has focused mainly on undergraduate student perceptions or master’s level student and
faculty perceptions. To date, there has not been an examination of doctoral-level student and faculty member perceptions of nonsexual boundary crossings. Doctoral students may rely more heavily on the faculty-student relationship compared with undergraduates because they tend to have less mobility within programs and face greater struggles if they decide to leave a program (Sullivan & Ogloff, 1998). To better understand how students and faculty perceive ambiguous situations of boundary crossings, this dissertation will focus on roles that occur naturally in academic settings. Specifically, the roles of supervisor-supervisee, mentor-protégé, advisor-advisee, and co-authorship will be examined. In addition, both a quantitative and qualitative approach will be incorporated to better understand how faculty and students are defining boundary crossings, how power may be affecting the awareness of boundary crossings, the level of agreement between faculty and students on qualifying certain behaviors as boundary crossings, and how comfortable each group is in engaging in these behaviors.

Although understanding the potential outcomes of boundary crossings is beyond the scope of this study, understanding how faculty members and students perceive nonsexual boundary crossings in academia provides a first step. This dissertation builds on previous literature by using a theoretical base to understand the role of power in academic relationships. According to the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al., 2003), faculty may not be aware of how the possession of power can change how they interact with others, namely their students. The potential focus on rewards in the environment coupled with automatic thought processing could lead to more accepting perceptions of boundary crossings. There has been some discussion on the development of multiple relationships and how to manage them (Biaggio, Lucic Paget, Chenoweth,
1997), but before we can start to manage them we first need to understand them. This study will seek to understand both faculty and student perceptions of nonsexual boundary crossings in order to promote ethical relationships between faculty and students.

As a means of reducing confusion, the following definitions are provided for constructs meaningful to this study. A boundary is defined as a rule or tenet of the professional relationship that separates it from other types of relationships in order to provide safety and predictability. A boundary crossing is considered delineation from a typical clinical role that is meant to aid or enhance the therapeutic relationship; however, can unintentionally result in harm. Boundary violations are defined as departures from common clinical practice that put the client at risk; the clinician’s needs are put before the needs of the client. Finally, power is defined by Keltner et al. (2003) as one person’s ability to modify others’ states by providing or withholding resources or administering punishments.
The purpose of this study is to explore perceptions of nonsexual boundary crossings that occur within the academic arena. Specifically, the relationships between graduate students and faculty in counseling psychology doctoral programs will be examined. The APA Ethics Committee (2002) has extended the prohibition of sexual conduct to include faculty members and their supervisees (Standard 7.07). However, much ambiguity still remains as to what is deemed ethical behavior in the academic setting with regard to nonsexual boundary crossings. The following chapter will review the dynamic relationship between counseling psychology faculty and students, introduce the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003) as a basis for understanding the relations between faculty and students, discuss previous literature on nonsexual boundary crossings in academia, and address the role of sex differences within these relationships.

The Faculty-Student Relationship

Mahoney (1976) described graduate life as filled with “confusion, anxiety, and a paranoia which is occasionally reinforced by the quirks and injustices of the mysterious
‘system” (p. 41). Although Mahoney (1976) may have presented a more cynical look at the doctoral atmosphere, he acknowledged that there are unclear and unexpressed expectations of students that they must uncover through “trial and error” (p. 42). Upon entering a doctoral program, students are entering into a new culture. This uncertainty about expectations encourages students to depend heavily on the relationships they develop with faculty, especially mentors (Johnson & Huwe, 2003; Lovitts, 2001; Mahoney, 1976) and supervisors (Gottlieb et al., 2007). Thus, if these relationships are ambiguous, increased confusion from the student perspective regarding ethical behaviors and boundaries may result.

Boundary crossings in academia are unavoidable (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Biaggio, Lucie Paget, & Chenoweth, 1997; Kitchener, 1988; Koocher & Keith-Spiegel, 1998) given the limited size of many graduate programs and the complex nature of academic tasks and roles. Faculty and students often take on a variety of roles. For example, faculty members serve as dissertation chairs, committee members, clinical supervisors, mentors, academic advisors and academic evaluators. Additionally, the student role often extends to teaching assistant, research assistant, co-author, co-presenter and supervisee. The overlapping expectations associated with each of these roles can make it difficult to discern where one relationship begins and another ends. Kitchener (1988) noted, however, that the existence of multiple relationships in graduate education is necessary for student development.

A multiple relationship occurs when “a psychologist is in a professional role with a person and (1) at the same time is in another role with the same person, (2) at the same
time is in a relationship with a person closely associated with or related to the person with
whom the psychologist has the professional relationship, or (3) promises to enter into
another relationship in the future with the person or a person closely associated with or
related to the person” (APA, 2002). Additionally, the Ethical Standards caution that
engagement in a multiple relationship should be avoided if the relationship results in a
loss of objectivity, effectiveness or competence, or if the other individual is exploited by
the psychologist. Furthermore, the Ethical Standards indicate that if a multiple
relationship must occur then role expectations and limits to confidentiality must be
discussed at the outset.

Barnett (2008) noted that an educator might engage in a boundary crossing with a
student without necessarily developing an additional relationship with that student. The
guidelines on multiple relationships have been addressed by the APA, however
navigating nonsexual boundary crossings in academia is less clear. To better understand
how faculty and students perceive and define nonsexual boundary crossings, the
relationships of supervisor-supervisee, mentor-protégé, advisor-advisee, and co-
authorship will be examined. These roles were chosen because of their natural occurrence
and development in counseling psychology graduate programs.

Supervisor-Supervisee Relationships

Engagement in long-term, intense clinical supervision adds a unique layer to the
faculty-student relationship in counseling psychology doctoral programs. Clinical
supervision is a requirement of the program and students are frequently supervised by
faculty members. Clinical supervision is meant to maintain client welfare and aid in the
professional development of the student (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). A strong supervisory working alliance (Bordin, 1983) can contribute to improved multicultural competency (Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997), self-efficacy (Efstation, Patton & Kardash, 1990), and supervision satisfaction (Ladany, Ellis & Friedlander, 1999), whereas a weak working alliance is related to non-disclosure in supervision (Ladany, Hill, Corbett & Nutt 1996), and role ambiguity (Ladany & Friedlander, 1995).

The supervision experience can, at times, leave the supervisee feeling vulnerable and exposed due to the personal nature of the process (Biaggio et al., 1997). Supervisees are often asked to explore personal issues and countertransference that may influence the therapeutic relationships they share with their clients (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). Thus, the supervisor (faculty member) is often privy to intimate details of the supervisee’s life. This can pose a set of unique challenges with maintaining boundaries if the student feels that what they share in the supervisory relationship may influence other aspects of their relationship with his/her supervisor (e.g., class evaluations). On the other hand, the development of a trusting relationship and safe working environment can be core to aiding in the student’s personal growth.

Lamb, Catanzaro, and Moorman (2004) surveyed 298 clinical (52%) and counseling (46%) psychologists regarding sexual and nonsexual dual relationships with their clients, supervisees, and students. The majority of psychologists who responded currently worked in private practice (60%), university counseling centers (9%), academic settings (8%) and 23% worked in a combination of these settings. These researchers were interested in identifying how psychologists negotiated conversations of entering into new
social, business, collegial, or professional (considered an “equal power” relationship), collegial or professional with social component, supervisory or evaluative, religious affiliation, or workplace relationships with supervisees. Participants were asked to indicate how often they addressed these relationships with current or former (once the professional relationship had ended) students and supervisees. Results indicated that social interactions and events were most frequently discussed (676 times) followed by collegial or professional relationships. Overall, participants were most likely to have these conversations with supervisees (721 times) versus clients (664 times) or students (379 times). Additionally, discussions about entering into new relationships happened most frequently with students after the professional relationship had ended (1,165 times) than with current relationships (599 times). These data suggest that supervisors and supervisees have a great deal of negotiating to do when it comes to the adaptive and dynamic supervisory relationship. Lamb et al. (2004) suggested that psychologists need to pay special attention to relationships with former and current supervisees in order to anticipate generating discussions on matters of boundary crossings and entering into multiple relationships.

Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro and Wolgast (1999) assessed how the supervisor’s ethical behavior impacts supervisees’ perceptions of the supervisory working alliance and overall satisfaction. Additionally, Ladany et al. (1999) examined how supervisors’ divergence from ethical practices influenced the quality of client care and whether supervisees disclosed the unethical behaviors to others. Participants included 151 doctoral and master’s level trainees in either counseling psychology (68%) or clinical psychology (26%) programs. Supervisors were primarily White (89%) females
(60%) working in college counseling centers, hospitals, community mental health centers, schools, prisons, and private practices. Results indicated that 51% of participants reported at least one ethical violation by their supervisors. Of the ethical violations reported, session boundaries (i.e., supervisor cancelling sessions or arriving late), and disrespectful treatment were noted by 12.6% of participants followed by orientation to professional roles and monitoring site standards (8.6%), modeling ethical behavior and responding to ethical concerns (7.9%), and dual roles (6%). Examples of these violations included, the supervisee consistently feeling shortchanged in supervision time because the supervisor wanted to go out to lunch/shopping, not being educated on the appropriate roles and tasks associated with the supervisory relationship, the supervisor not responding appropriately to supervisee concerns, and supervisors attempting to befriend the supervisee.

It is of considerable concern that over half of this sample indicated that their supervisor engaged in some type of ethical transgression (Ladany et al., 1999). From the supervisee’s perspective, the unethical behaviors had a negative impact on his or her supervisory working alliance. Furthermore, supervisees reported that supervisor unethical behavior mildly to moderately affected the quality of care provided to clients. Of those who reported ethical violations, 35% of supervisees discussed the violations with their supervisors whereas 54% discussed them with someone other than their supervisor (most often a peer or friend). Additionally, 14% of the sample reported that a person of power (considered a training director or department head) had known about the ethical violation but had done nothing about it. Thus, as suggested from this study of student perceptions, the ethical behaviors of supervisors can significantly impact supervisees’ graduate
experience and clinical work. Moreover, there appeared to be limited disclosure of ethical violations with individuals in power positions. The work of Ladany et al. (1999) provides impetus to further understand how boundaries and ethical behaviors are viewed by faculty and students in supervisory roles.

Mentor-Protégé Relationships

The mentor-protégé relationship is another type of relationship in which many faculty and students engage. Johnson and Huwe (2003) contended that mentor relationships provide students with several benefits: a higher level of exposure and visibility within the field; nomination for awards or positions (sponsorship); protection, acceptance and confirmation; and a model for successful academic behaviors. Additionally, Johnson and Huwe described counseling and friendship/mutuality as one of the functions of the mentor-protégé relationship. The authors acknowledged that the mentor may provide advice on career goals and address how to balance personal and career responsibilities (Johnson & Huwe, 2003). As such, a friendship can develop through mutual feelings of appreciation, value and trust. Thus, it seems that a mentor-protégé relationship with flexible boundaries can be a highly beneficial resource for students.

In a national survey of clinical psychology doctoral training, Clark, Harden and Johnson (2000) assessed mentor relationships. Ph.D. or Psy.D. graduates \( n = 787 \) from APA accredited programs between the years of 1994 and 1996 were asked to evaluate the relationship with their mentor using the Mentor Relationship Survey developed for the study. The survey addressed the nature of mentor relationships, typical profile of faculty
mentors, negative aspects of mentoring, attraction to the mentor, and ethical concerns. Fifty-seven percent rated the mentor-protégé relationship as extremely positive, whereas 34% rated the relationship as moderately positive. The most common functions of a mentor were providing direct training or instruction to the protégé, offering acceptance, support, and encouragement, and serving as a role model.

Of the 519 respondents who answered the open-ended question regarding ethical concerns, 11% reported having concerns about the relationship with their mentor. The main concerns were sexualized relationships with other students in the program (3%), followed by research related concerns (2%), the mentor having poor boundaries or being too emotionally involved with students (2%), engaging in a sexualized relationship with the respondent (2%), and the mentor claiming credit for the respondent’s work (1%). Although these percentages may seem small upon first glance, nearly 60 students reported some type of ethical concern. The authors noted that these numbers may even be distorted because participants were asked to describe the mentor they perceived most favorably; thus, unethical behaviors of faculty members whom they did not have a positive relationship with may have been unaccounted for (Clark et al., 2000). This study demonstrates the importance of needing to better understand the complex relations of graduate students and faculty in mentor-protégé relationships.

Advisor-Advisee Relationships

The advisor-advisee relationship can significantly impact a student’s progress and experience within a graduate training program (Schlosser, Knox, Moskovitz & Hill, 2003). Schlosser, Knox, Moskovitz, and Hill (2003) defined the advising relationship as
having a positive or negative experience wherein a faculty member provides academic guidance. Additionally, the advising relationship may aid in the student’s professional development (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). In a qualitative study examining counseling psychology advisee perspectives of the advising relationship, Schlosser et al. (2003) found that in a positive advising relationship \((n = 10)\), advisors were readily accessible, conflicts were dealt with openly, and the relationship led to student growth as a researcher. On the other hand, negative advising relationships \((n = 6)\) were described as uncomfortable and cautious, lacking in advisor support of professional participation and/or conference attendance, and discussions of conflicts were typically avoided (Schlosser et al., 2003).

Lovitts (2001) addressed the quality of the advisor-advisee relationships through interviews with 816 students (511 degree completers, 305 non-completers) who were enrolled in science (mathematics, biology, chemistry), social science (sociology, economics, psychology) and humanities (English, history, music) Ph.D. programs in the U.S. between the years of 1982 and 1984. Lovitts completed follow-up telephone interviews with 30 students who did not complete their degree programs. Non-completers persisted longer in their programs if they had an advisor (3.3 years) than those who did not (2.2 years). Eight of the non-completer interviewees reported that they never established a connection with their advisor and that the process of choosing an advisor was unclear (Lovitts, 2001). When rated on a 1-5 point Likert scale about the degree of interest their advisors took in them, completers reported their advisors were significantly more interested in them as a person \((M = 3.68)\), their ideas \((M = 4.09)\) and their professional development compared \((M = 3.92)\) with non-completers \((M = 2.89, 3.10,\)
3.06 respectively, \( p < .001 \)). Thus, the amount of interaction that an advisee had with her or his advisor greatly impacted whether the degree was completed.

Through interviews with 33 faculty members, Lovitts (2001) uncovered differences between those faculty who were designated high producers (\( n = 18 \); selected by department chairs based on higher rates of producing Ph.D.’s and through the number of dissertations supervised) and low producers (\( n = 15 \)). High producers were more likely to initiate interaction and spent more time (\( M = 4.85 \) hours per week) with their advisees than low producers (\( M = 4.50 \) hours per week). Although significance levels were not reported, this difference of 20 minutes per week over a several-year period combines to a substantial amount of time. Additionally, high producers were more involved in departmental and social activities with advisees. In fact, high producers were more likely to describe their advisees as a “friend” and reported inviting advisees into their home or to social outings. Although not specifically assessed, perhaps for many students in this study nonsexual boundary crossings with faculty were beneficial to helping them reach degree completion.

As such, it would be important to assess students’ levels of satisfaction with the advisee-advisor relationship. Sixty percent of completers reported being very satisfied with their advisor compared with only 31% of non-completers (Lovitts, 2001). The primary reason for advisee satisfaction was the method of advisor selection as students who selected their advisor were more likely to be very satisfied (58%) than those who did not (16%). Additionally, intellectual/professional development, interest in the student, professionalism, personality, advising style, and accessibility were rated as contributing
to satisfaction (reasons are listed in descending order of importance). As can be seen, the quality of the advising relationship can impact degree completion for doctoral students. Thus, it is imperative to better understand what contributes to this relationship and how faculty and students perceive the potential boundary crossings that may occur.

Co-Authorship Relationships

Publication in academia is of high importance to both faculty and students (Koocher & Keith-Spiegel, 1998). Faculty members are often required to publish scholarly research in order to obtain tenure and move up the academic ladder. Similarly, students benefit from publishing as they seek recognition in the field to further their careers. Standard 8.12a of the APA (2002) Ethics Code recommends that psychologists claim authorship “only for work they have actually performed or to which they have substantially contributed” (p. 12). Furthermore, psychologists are urged to include any individuals who were involved in the research despite their status (Standard 8.12b) and to allot principal authorship to the student for her or his dissertation work (8.12c). The Ethics Code, though, remains ambiguous regarding what constitutes as a “substantial” contribution and what portions of the research are considered most important in identifying principal authorship. For example, if the student collects the data, conducts the analysis and contributes to the written manuscript, does he or she deserve first authorship even if the initial idea belonged to the faculty member? It seems important to better understand the role of power when assessing perceptions of authorship relationships in academia.
To better understand students’ perceptions of authorship issues, Rose and Fischer (1998) asked 277 (119 women, 158 men) graduate students from the biological, physical, engineering, and social sciences (psychology students were excluded due to their participation in the study development) to indicate ethical behavior when a professor claims first authorship. Three vignettes were presented to participants: the professor generates the idea for a research project, but the student does most of the work (Vignette 1); the student generates the idea for a research project, but the professor does most of the work (Vignette 2); and the student’s dissertation is prepared for publication (Vignette 3). Rose and Fischer were also interested in participant awareness of publication policy (policy was manipulated by half of the questionnaires including a copy of the APA Ethical Code of Conduct) and how sex of the student impacted the results. Students rated how ethical it would be for the professor to claim the first author position and whether the professor submitting the manuscript without the student’s knowledge to a journal would be ethical.

A significant three-way interaction existed for Vignette x Policy x Gender, $F(2, 255) = 3.11, MSE = 2.08, p < .05$, indicating that men and women endorsed different perceptions of the vignettes. Post hoc tests for men indicated a main effect for vignette condition, $F(2, 155) = 55.06, p < .001$; however, the presence of a policy did not have an effect ($F(1, 156) = 0.12, p > .10$). Men were more likely to rate the professor’s claim of first author in Vignette 3 (dissertation vignette; $M = 1.83, SE = .18$) as unethical than Vignette 1 (professor idea/student work; $M = 2.94, SE = .22$), $F(2,155) = 12.31, p < .001$). Additionally for men, the professor claiming first author in Vignette 1 was rated as more unethical than Vignette 2 (student idea/professor work; $M = 4.79, SE = .20$), $F(2,$
155) = 39.9, \( p < .001 \). Similar to men, there was a main effect for vignette condition for women, \( F(2, 115) = 22.38, p < .0001 \). Women rated the professor claiming first author in the dissertation vignette (Vignette 3; \( M = 1.57, SE = .24 \)) as more unethical than Vignette 1 (\( M = 2.83, SE = .23 \), \( F(2, 115) = 15.83, p < .001 \)). Vignette 1 was also rated as more unethical than Vignette 2 (\( M = 3.79, SE = .28 \), \( F(2, 115) = 8.39, p < .01 \)). However for women, policy (policy, \( M = 2.36, SE = .19 \); no policy, \( M = 3.10, SE = .23 \)) had a significant effect (\( F(1, 116) = 7.81, MSE = 1.96, p < .01 \)) indicating that women rated the professor’s behavior in each vignette as less ethical after receiving the policy (\( M = 2.36, SE = .19 \)) compared with women who did not receive the policy (\( M = 3.10, SE = .23 \)).

As indicated from this study, it is not enough to generate the idea for the research project. Graduate students in this study expected the professor to put effort into the design, data collection, and analyses of the research project before claiming first authorship (Rose & Fischer, 1998). Male and female students agreed that the professor’s attempt to claim first authorship was unethical with regard to the student’s dissertation. Sex differences emerged regarding the degree to which the professor’s behaviors were deemed ethical, especially if participants were familiar with the APA Ethical Code of Conduct. Based on this study, not only is it important to increase awareness of ethical standards, but faculty members must also understand that male and female students may respond differently regarding issues of boundary crossings and authorship. Furthermore, participants reported that they were unlikely to report the professor’s unethical behavior to an authority figure primarily for fear of retaliation or negative consequences, with
women rating a lower likelihood of reporting than men (Rose & Fischer, 1998). Thus, understanding the role of power, as well as sex differences, is an integral part when addressing issues of boundary crossings and authorship.

Summary

Understanding the ethical dilemmas that arise from boundary crossings and multiple relationships is imperative to providing a healthy academic atmosphere (Biaggio et al., 1997). The navigation of the aforementioned relationships remains ambiguous and has yet to be examined in counseling psychology graduate programs. Despite the ambiguity around perceptions of boundary crossings in academia, two themes can be highlighted based on the reviewed literature. First, ethical violations by faculty can result in harm to student welfare, educational experience (Lovitts, 2001), and client care (Ladany, et al. (1999). Second, an underlying force inherent in each extension of a boundary is the role of power (Bowman, Hatley & Bowman, 1995; Rosenberg & Heimberg, 2009). The power hierarchy in academic relationships can influence how the student perceives and responds to a boundary crossing.

The Role of Power

Inherent power exists within the faculty-student relationship. Rosenberg and Heimberg (2009) noted that all the power is held by the mentor in a mentor-protégé relationship. The power differential is increased as faculty members take on an evaluative role, are more experienced, and thus, are perceived as having expert knowledge (Kitchener, 1988; Rosenberg & Heimberg, 2009). Students may expect the faculty member to always do the right thing because he or she is more knowledgeable and
powerful. Although the belief that the faculty member is always right may be misinformed, it may lead students to disregard their own objectivity and rely on the faculty member for guidance. Rosenberg and Heimberg (2009) suggested that students may feel obligated to adjust their behavior to match faculty member expectations for fear of potential negative consequences. Thus, the power differential in the relationship can significantly impact student perceptions of boundary crossings.

The Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power

As a means of understanding the inherent power in the faculty-student relationship, the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner, Gruenfeld & Anderson, 2003) can illuminate the dynamic relationship of power that exists between individuals of high power status (faculty) and individuals of low power status (students). Keltner et al. (2003) defined power as an “individual’s relative capacity to modify others’ states by providing or withholding resources or administering punishments” (p.265). Resources and punishments can further be defined as being of a social capacity or moral goods. Resources can range from tangible goods (e.g., money or food) to social rewards (e.g., attention or knowledge). Individuals in high-power positions have control over resources and, thus, are more likely to influence others (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002).

Power can be determined through status, authority, and dominance. However, each of these components does not have to be present to maintain a high power position (i.e., an authority figure that is fair). Other determinants of power include individual variables (personality traits, physical characteristics), dyadic variables (interest in relationship, relative commitment), within-group variables (authority, status) and
between-group variables (ethnicity, sex, class, ideology, numerical majority/minority). These variables contribute to an individual’s level of high or low power.

The dyadic and within-group variables are of particular interest when examining the faculty-student relationship as they relate to interpersonal characteristics. Doctoral students are typically interested in, invested in, and committed to maintaining a relationship with a faculty member. As previously stated, the maintenance of this relationship can be highly beneficial for students during their training and even after degree completion (Johnson & Huwe, 2003; Kolbert et al., 2002; Lovitts, 2001).

Additionally, Keltner et al. (2003) described that low power individuals may value the relationship more if they are unable to obtain the needed resources through alternative means. This may be of greater concern for students in smaller training programs who are unable to establish a relationship with a faculty member or those who are paired with an incompatible advisor (Lovitts, 2001). Furthermore, with regard to within-group variables, the well-established hierarchy of doctoral training programs inherently places the faculty member in a high power position due to his or her authority and status.

Keltner et al. (2003) described three basic assumptions that underlie the approach inhibition theory of power. One assumption was that ownership of power can change the person who holds the power. Additionally, the possession of power can be expressed both positively and negatively. The second assumption is that the individual in power does not have conscious awareness of the effects of power. As such, the possession of power over time can continually diminish the powerholder’s level of social awareness to the
experiences of others as well as their own behavioral expressions. The third assumption is that power affects the cognitions, affect, and behaviors of both high and low power individuals.

The major premise of Keltner et al.’s (2003) theory was that power activates the behavioral approach and inhibition systems. Individuals in high power positions are more likely to engage in approach-type behaviors, cognitions, and affect (e.g., pay more attention to rewards, endorse positive emotions, and engage in automatic cognition). According to Keltner et al., power activates the approach-related process because powerful people have more access and exposure to resources. Additionally, due to the position of high power, they are able to act with minimal consequences or interference from others. Thus, high power individuals can behave as if they have nothing to lose. A contributing factor to this is the assumption that power changes individuals and they have little to no awareness of their influence on others. This is consistent with Kitchener’s (1988) claim that a professional who is engaging in a dual relationship faces a conflict of interest and thus may be less willing to put others’ needs before his or her own.

Conversely, individuals in a low power position are more likely to engage in inhibited-type behaviors, cognitions, and affect (e.g., pay more attention to threats, endorse negative emotions, and engage in systematic/controlled cognition; Keltner et al., 2003) As such, individuals with less power have reduced access to resources and are sensitive to threats and punishments. Low power individuals are more likely to rely on individuals in power to gain access to rewards and resources. Sensitivity to threats can be expressed in the form of anxiety and embarrassment resulting in low power individuals
inhibiting their thoughts, emotions and behaviors as a means of avoiding conflict with a high powered individual (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002). Additionally, low powered individuals are more attuned to social constraints in the environment, thus resulting in behavioral inhibition (Keltner et al., 2003). Overall, Keltner and his colleagues shift the theoretical framework of power and its effects by conceptualizing power not as working on a continuum but by suggesting that high power and low power operate on two separate systems: the approach and inhibition systems. Figure 1 presents a graphical representation of the approach-inhibition theory of power.

The Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al., 2003) may be especially relevant as we consider the tenured track of most faculty positions. Faculty members who have earned tenure are offered job security. Therefore, tenure status may only reinforce their power position, leading them to behave as if they have nothing to lose. In addition, faculty members may feel pressure from the larger university system (especially top-tiered institutions) to be high producers of research. There has also been a recent push for faculty to secure grant money, which can supplement a portion of their salary. That said, faculty may be propelled to put research efforts first and teaching/student development tasks second.

Conversely, the assumptions of the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power may not fit given faculty members who prioritize student development. These individuals may be more willing and able to put student needs before their own. Moreover, by nature of the psychology profession, counseling faculty members may have an increased sense of self-awareness compared to other types of professions. The aforementioned aspects of faculty engagement are important when considering the role of power in academic
relationships. The purpose of this study is to better understand the role of power with acknowledgment that faculty members hold high powered positions compared to students.

Hypothesis 1: Consistent with the approach-inhibition theory of power, it is hypothesized that faculty members will report a greater sense of power and students will report a reduced sense of power.

Figure 1. Determinants and Consequences of Power (Keltner et al., 2003)

Propositions. Keltner et al. (2003) postulated 12 propositions regarding the role of power divided into affective, cognitive (social attention and social cognition) and behavioral responses for high and low power individuals. For the purposes of this study, five of the twelve propositions will be examined (see Table 2). Although power is
theorized to operate on two separate systems (behavioral approach and inhibition), it is helpful to conceptualize Propositions 3 and 4 as one set and Propositions 7 and 8 as another set as each are representatives of how high and low power influences social cognition and social attention, respectively. Proposition 12 is theorized to operate independently and is considered to be the result of elevated power only. Propositions 3 and 7 represent the function of elevated power whereas propositions 4 and 8 represent how reduced power can affect individuals in low power positions. Each of these propositions is described in detail below along with supporting research.

Table 2. Propositions Examined as Suggested by Keltner et al. (2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power Propositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Power Increases Sensitivity to Rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Power Increases the Sensitivity to Threat and Punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Power Increases Automatic Thought Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Power Increases Controlled Thought Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Power Increases the Likelihood of Socially Inappropriate Behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Propositions 3 and 4: sensitivity to rewards and punishments. Proposition 3 indicates that elevated power increases sensitivity to rewards. Individuals who hold high power positions are expected to attend more to material and social rewards such as money, attention, and approval. Additionally, elevated power is believed to heighten an individual’s attraction toward rewards in ambiguous situations (Keltner et al., 2003). This would be of particular interest with regard to situations of nonsexual boundary crossings.
given their ambiguous nature. In relation to faculty and student relationships, faculty members may be more focused on meeting their own needs rather than the needs of the student.

Conversely, the next proposition to be examined (Proposition 4) posits that reduced power increases sensitivity to threats and punishment. Keltner et al. (2003) hypothesized that those in low power positions identify ambiguous situations as more precarious. Thus, low power individuals (e.g., students) may be quicker to perceive boundary crossings as an encroachment (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002; Galinsky, Gruenfeld & Magee, 2003). Additionally, those in reduced power positions may feel more anxious or embarrassed, and be less likely to share their opinions (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002).

Support for high power individuals being focused on rewards (Proposition 3) has been found by Magee, Galinsky and Gruenfeld (2007). These researchers were interested in understanding how power influenced negotiation. Magee et al. (2007) completed four experiments assessing power and negotiation. For the purposes of this dissertation, the results of Experiment 1a and 1b will be summarized, as they are most relevant to the topic of faculty and student interactions. In the first experiment, 38 undergraduates (11 men and 27 women) were randomly assigned to either a high or low power condition to assess propensity for negotiations. Power was primed through an experiment (see Galinsky et al., 2003) asking participants to recall a time when they held power over another person (high power condition) or when an individual held power over them (low power condition). Magee et al. hypothesized that high power individuals would be more likely to negotiate for a better price when buying a new car than individuals in the low
power condition (as indicated on a 7-point scale from 1 = not at all likely, 7 = very likely). Results of an independent samples t-test supported this hypothesis as high power individuals \((M = 6.58, SD = 0.69)\) indicated that they would negotiate the car price more than individuals in the low power condition \((M = 5.84, SD = 1.43)\), \(t(36) = 2.03, p = .05\).

To examine whether individuals in high power positions would initiate negotiation, Magee et al. (2007) assessed how 20 (7 men and 13 women) university students and staff would bargain for a larger voucher and amenities if they were asked to relinquish their seat on an overbooked airline flight. Again, participants were randomly assigned to conditions and rated their likelihood to negotiate on a 7-point scale. Results from an independent samples t-test supported the hypothesis that high-power individuals \((M = 5.27, SD = 1.01)\) were more likely to negotiate the airline voucher than low power individuals \((M = 3.67, SD = 2.18)\), \(t(18) = 2.18, p = .04\). Magee et al. concluded that individuals in high power positions are more likely to initiate and engage in negotiation, thus indicating support for Keltner et al.’s (2003) third proposition. It appears based on these results that not only are high powered individuals more focused on rewards, but they are also more likely to barter for greater rewards than individuals in low power positions (Magee et al., 2007).

The small sample sizes and lack of reported effect sizes makes generalizability of these results difficult. There is also limited information regarding demographic characteristics of the sample, thus little is known of potential confounding variables. In Experiments 1a and 1b a control condition was not included; however Magee et al. (2007) added a control group in Experiment 2 supporting the hypothesis that individuals
in a high power position would be more likely to choose to go first in a debate than those in the control condition. Overall, the experimental design of this study and random assignment improve on internal validity, but the external validity of the findings is yet to be established. Thus, understanding how the concepts of reward focus influence naturally occurring relationships, such as those between faculty and students as in the proposed study, will add to the literature on power.

It is important to better understand how the inherent power associated with a faculty position can lead to a propensity toward rewards. Although explicit negotiation may not be a typical practice in academia, the power position of a faculty member coupled with access to resources may be enough to influence student behaviors (Gottlieb, Robinson & Younggren, 2007; Rosenberg & Heimberg, 2009). Thus, faculty members may have greater leverage to sway students to, for example, work on their preferred research projects, change the topic of their dissertation to match the faculty member’s interest or modify their own clinical judgments to follow the recommendations of their supervisor.

Additionally, a focus on rewards for faculty members would be especially relevant in the area of authorship. Faculty members are subjected to the “publish or perish” culture of academia (Sandler & Russell, 2005) and face pressure to remain an active participant of the research arena. This is especially true for faculty members who are new to academia and not yet tenured (Zanna & Darley, 2004). Additionally, faculty members face a variety of demands and responsibilities beyond publication accrual based on their position of power and status within the university setting (Zanna & Darley,
More demands and responsibilities lead faculty members to be actively focused on completing these tasks. Utilizing graduate students, especially research assistants, can help to ease faculty load. Thus, faculty members may see some of their relationships with graduate students as a means to an end.

As such, Gruenfeld, Inesi, Magee and Galinsky (2008) examined the role of power on objectification of social targets. They defined objectification as “a process that involves viewing people in ways that facilitate using them for personal gain” (Gruenfeld et al., 2008, p. 112) and incorporated the construct of instrumentality as a key assumption to understanding objectification. Instrumentality or using a social target as a tool for meeting one’s own needs is considered essential to the definition of objectification (Nussbaum, 1999). “Targets” are considered a method of directly completing a meaningful goal or task for those who are in a heightened power position (Gruenfeld et al., 2008). A total of five experiments were conducted within this study, however for the purposes of this dissertation the results from Experiment 1a were relevant.

To assess hierarchical power and objectification within a business setting in Experiment 1a, 42 high-ranking executives and 37 MBA students were randomly assigned to reflect on a relationship with a work partner where they either had power over the other individual (subordinate target condition) or a relationship in which equal power was present (peer target condition). Subsequently, participants were asked to rate their level of agreement on a 7-point scale regarding the extent to which they viewed their work partner and the relationship as instrumental to accomplishing goals or tasks. A 2 (subordinate vs. peer target) x 2 (executive vs. MBA respondent) ANOVA revealed that
respondents reported higher instrumentality in relationships with subordinates \((M = 4.33, SD = 0.90)\) than with peers \((M = 3.76, SD = 0.97)\), \(F(1, 75) = 4.88, p = .03, \eta^2 = .06\).

Furthermore, executives \((M = 4.47, SD = 0.90)\) reported higher levels of instrumentality across both target conditions than did students \((M = 3.52, SD = 0.81)\), \(F(1, 75) = 20.37, p < .001, \eta^2 = .21\). Gruenfeld et al. (2008) concluded that for all respondents, power influenced whether or not subordinates were viewed as a means to an end compared with peers in a work setting. Interestingly, the business executives who are accustomed to having power compared with students were more likely to objectify others across both types of relationships. Thus, individuals with an inherent power position may be more inclined to see others, especially subordinates, as a means to goal attainment.

Consistent with the purposes of this dissertation, Gruenfeld et al. (2008) assessed inherent power within established relationships rather than using an experimental power prime. This may more accurately mirror the effects of power in faculty-student relationships. Again, the use of small sample sizes hinders the ability to generalize results of the study to include relationships between faculty and students. Additionally, the measure used to assess objectification was developed by the authors for this study. Reliability \((\alpha = .79)\) was established with this sample; however, the validity of the scale was not addressed. Thus, the results need to be interpreted with caution.

Although this study utilized participants from a business setting, it relates to the managerial components found in academic hierarchy. Faculty members are responsible for evaluating not only a student’s academic achievements but also assess a student’s professional development (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Biaggio et al., 1997). Thus,
evaluation and oversight are important components of the faculty-student relationship. According to the results from Gruenfeld et al. (2008), faculty members may utilize students for personal gain. Thus, they may pay less attention to the needs of the particular student and focus more attention on their own needs and experiences. As suggested by Keltner et al. (2003), this lack of awareness could lead to the engagement of inappropriate social behavior, such as boundary crossings.

Magee et al. (2007) and Gruenfeld et al. (2008) provided support for elevated power increasing sensitivity to rewards (Proposition 3); however, they did not provide insight into the experience of reduced power increasing sensitivity to threats and punishments (Proposition 4). Although participants in the low power condition were less likely to negotiate (Magee et al., 2007), this may indicate activation of the inhibition system but does not imply a focus on threats or punishments. Thus, more research is needed to better understand the experiences of reduced power. This dissertation will build on previous literature by not only examining how elevated power can increase attention to rewards, but also attend to the experiences of individuals in low power positions. As such, the experiences of students’ sensitivity to threats and punishments will be assessed.

In summary, Propositions 3 and 4 identified by Keltner et al. (2003) will be examined in this study. Both propositions suggest how individuals in high power and low power will respond regarding to social attention. Elevated power is believed to increase sensitivity to rewards and reduced power is believed to increase sensitivity to threats and punishments. The literature to date regarding social attention and the approach inhibition theory of power has tended to focus on those with elevated power. The present study
seeks to extend this literature base by assessing elevated power and reward focus with counseling psychology faculty. In addition, this dissertation will add insight into the perceptions of individuals in low power positions (counseling psychology students), which has received less attention.

Hypothesis 2: Faculty members will report significantly more sensitivity to rewards than students.

Hypothesis 2a: Students will report significantly more sensitivity to punishments than faculty members.

Propositions 7 and 8: automatic and controlled thought processes. The next set of propositions to be examined states that elevated power increases automatic cognition (Proposition 7) and reduced power increases controlled thought processes (Proposition 8). In reference to Proposition 7, power has been linked to limited social cognition toward others in low power positions as well as stereotyping (Fiske, 1993; Goodwin, Gubin, Fiske, & Yzerbyt, 2000; Keltner et al., 2003). Cognitive resources may be limited for those in high power positions who face myriad demands (Fiske, 1993); thus, fewer attentional resources may be devoted to the needs of others. Additionally, Kipnis (1972) indicated that increased power can lead to heightened self-focus and propensity toward self-serving attributions. According to Keltner et al. (2003), high power individuals may utilize less conscious effort and behave in thoughtless ways. Contrarily, reduced power is proposed to increase controlled thought processes (Proposition 8). As such, individuals of low power status would be more attentive to the behaviors of others, are better able to
judge how they are perceived by others (Snodgrass, Hecht & Ploutz-Snyder, 1998), and more accurately judge the experiences of others (Ebenbach & Keltner, 1998).

The majority of literature in this area has concluded that power leads to heavier use of heuristics and stereotyping (Fiske, 1993). According to Fiske (1993), power is having control over outcomes and people tend to pay more attention to those who have power over their resources. Furthermore, individuals with more power do not need to extend their attention to subordinates because they typically do not rely on them for access to resources. As for the relationship between faculty and students, it is not unheard of for students to have more knowledge about the lives of faculty both professionally and personally (Fiske, 1993). In fact, a study by Anderson and Galinsky (2006; which will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter), found that individuals in high power positions were more likely to divulge personal information compared with individuals in low power positions. This finding coupled with increased social attention toward faculty members may, according to Fiske (1993), be a means of sustaining power and control.

Furthermore, faculty members face the burden of juggling many tasks at once. Much of their attentional resources are attenuated due to their high status position and myriad evaluating, researching, teaching, advising and supervising responsibilities. This cognitive burden may lead to a lack of social attention toward subordinates and an increase in use of stereotyping (Fiske, 1993; Keltner et al., 2003). Thus, faculty members may not have the attentional resources needed to accurately judge the experiences of students regarding nonsexual boundary crossings. For example, a faculty member may easily overlook a student’s expression of unease as he/she agrees to assist with a
substantial research project even though he/she is in the midst of studying for comprehensive exams. The student is placed in a difficult position due to the existing power differential and potential fear of repercussions if the request would be declined. Thus, a lack of consideration to the experiences of those in low power positions may result in unwanted or harmful consequences.

Ebenbach and Keltner (1998) found that in a conflict situation within a university setting, high power individuals were less accurate judges of their opponent’s position. Specifically, those individuals who had a greater internal sense of power were the least accurate in their judgments. Additionally, individuals with less power were able to consistently sustain attention toward the experiences of the high-powered group and more accurately judged the position of the high-powered group (Ebenbach & Keltner, 1998). Although conflict-ridden interactions are not typical between faculty and students, there is concern that power may contribute to overlooking the ideas and experiences of students. Furthermore, the literature implies that the powerful are not motivated to pay attention to the powerless because they are not dependent on them for rewards or resources (Fiske, 1993; Keltner et al., 2003).

In summary, Keltner et al. (2003) proposed that elevated power increases automatic thought processes (Proposition 7) and reduced power increases controlled thought processes (Proposition 8). As such, individuals in high power positions are expected to rely more readily on the use of heuristics and stereotypes and be less accurate judges of others’ experiences (Fiske, 1993; Ebenbach & Keltner, 1998). On the other hand, individuals in low power positions are expected to pay deliberate attention to the
experiences of high powered individuals because they rely on them for resources (Fiske, 1993; Keltner et al. 2003). Furthermore, they are more accurate judges of other’s experiences (Ebenbach & Keltner, 1998). The heavy cognitive demands placed on individuals in high power positions and lack of reliance on others to gain access to resources has been cited as decreasing motivation toward to attend to the experiences of others (Fiske, 1993).

Hypothesis 3: Faculty members will engage in significantly more automatic thought processes than students.

Proposition 12: elevated power increases socially inappropriate behaviors.

Finally, the last proposition (Proposition 12) to be examined is that elevated power may increase the likelihood of socially inappropriate behavior. Historically, the mere possession of power was thought to corrupt (Kipnis, 1972). Previous literature supported that power can contribute to engagement in sexually inappropriate behavior, gambling and drinking (Winter 1973, 1988; Winter & Barenbaum, 1985), poor communication etiquette (DePaulo & Friedman, 1998), and aggressive acts (DePue, 1995). Similarly, Keltner et al. (2003) proposed that propensity toward rewards coupled with limited attention toward others could lead high-powered individuals to engage in more socially inappropriate behaviors. Additionally, a lack of influential consequences for people in high power positions may provide an unrealistic feeling of comfort to do as one pleases (Keltner et al., 2003). It is of interest for the present study to understand the influence of power on appropriateness of engaging in nonsexual boundary crossings between faculty and students.
A study by Anderson and Galinsky (2006) provided insight into perceptions and engagement of socially inappropriate behaviors. They conducted five experiments, however for the purposes of this review only Experiment 3 and Experiment 5 are relevant to this topic. To better understand the relationship between power and risk taking perceptions and behaviors, Anderson and Galinsky (2006) assessed 86 students using a lexical power priming manipulation as a measure of risk preference by determining how participants would help a car company in an economic crisis. Participants were assigned to either a gain or loss frame. In the gain frame, participants were focused on saving company plants and jobs. They are presented with two possible solutions: “Plan A will save one of the three plants and 2000 jobs. Plan B has a 1/3 probability of saving all three plants and all 6000 jobs, but has a 2/3 probability of saving no plants and no jobs” (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006, p. 521). In the loss frame, participants were presented with solutions focused on losing jobs: “Plan A will result in the loss of two of the three plants and 4000 jobs. Plan B has a 1/3 probability of losing no plants and no jobs, but has a 2/3 probability of resulting in the loss of all three plants and jobs” (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006, p. 521). Previous research demonstrated that people tend to choose the riskier option in the loss framework and the more certain outcome in the gain frame (Dawes, 1998). Participants were primed to either a high, neutral, or low power condition using a lexical word task.

Results of a 3 (high vs. neutral vs. low power) x 2 (gain vs. loss) ANOVA indicated a main effect for risk preference ($F(2, 80) = 3.98, p < .05$) as participants in the loss frame ($M = 3.30, SD = 1.22$) chose the riskier option than those in the gain frame ($M = 2.76, SD = 0.99$). There was an independent main effect for power, $F(2, 80) = 3.98, p <$
.05. Post hoc tests demonstrated that those in the high power position ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.05$) took more risks than those in the neutral condition ($M = 2.79$, $SD = 1.35$, $F(1, 47) = 5.55$, $p < .05$) and those in the low power position ($M = 2.86$, $SD = 0.97$, $F(1, 47) = 6.97$, $p < .05$). However, those in the low power position did not differ on risk preferences from the neutral condition ($F(1, 55) = .15$, $ns$). Thus, from this study it appeared that experiencing high power may lead to a greater preference for risk, but a lack of power does not necessarily lead to risk avoidance (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006).

Critique of this study includes the use of small sample sizes, lack of random assignment to conditions, and the absence of reported effect sizes. Additionally, Anderson and Galinsky (2006) did not provide demographic data on their sample and did not conduct a manipulation check to ensure that the power priming task was successful. Although the results of this study should be taken with caution, they shed light on the potential perceptions that high power individuals may have regarding engaging in socially inappropriate behaviors. If a person in high power status perceives their world as less risky and void of consequences, are they more likely to actually engage in behaviors that are inappropriate with the given situation? To further answer this question, Anderson and Galinsky (2006) assessed how much personal information would be divulged between high and low power participants in a simulated negotiation task.

In Experiment 5, Anderson and Galinsky (2006) assessed 36 MBA students (25 men, 11 women) in face-to-face dyads. Each dyad consisted of a job recruiter and a job candidate negotiating job related issues (i.e., salary) during an interview. Recruiters and candidates were assigned to either high or low power conditions. For example, low power
recruiters were told they did not have any other job candidates to interview and high power candidates were told that they had another promising job offer available. Participants’ sense of power was measured using Anderson, John and Keltner’s (2005) context-specific Sense of Power scale. The context-specific (versus generalized) Sense of Power scale was used to evaluate individual beliefs about power held in relationships with others specific to the context of negotiation. Participants rated their level of agreement on a 7-point scale to questions such as, ‘I think I have a great deal of power in negotiation.’ Internal consistency for the Sense of Power scale with this sample was .79 with a mean score of 5.46 ($SD = 0.64$). Risk-taking was examined through participants own ratings of how much information they shared within the dyad. Five items were used to assess risk taking and included questions such as, ‘I communicated my interests and preferences openly.’ Internal consistency was 0.68 with a mean score of 5 ($SD = 1.06$). No sex differences emerged for either the Sense of Power scale or the risk-taking items.

Results of a 2 (high vs. low) x 2 (recruiter vs. candidate) ANOVA indicated that high power individuals had a higher sense of power ($M = 5.70$, $SD = 0.49$) than those in the low power condition ($M = 5.21$, $SD = 0.69$), $F(1, 32) = 5.77, p < .05$. Additionally, a regression analysis revealed a significant effect for risk-taking behavior on participant sense of power, $\beta = 0.33, t(34) = 2.01, p = .05$. Thus, those in the high power position were more likely to take risks and were more likely to share information about their preferences and priorities. This finding is especially important with regard to the faculty-student relationship. Faculty members, due to their high power position, may have a tendency to divulge personal information. This may give the appearance that their relationship extends beyond the professional realm. Moreover, students may be inclined
to model this behavior, which could contribute to engagement in boundary crossings (Bartell & Rubin, 1990). The potential consequences of students modeling unethical behavior may affect not only the students, but their clients and subsequent students they intend to train.

As such, Lamb and Catanzaro (1998) were interested in examining if engagement in sexual boundary violations as students, supervisees, or clients (individuals who engaged in sexual intimacies with an individual therapist) would lead to violations when the student practiced as a professional psychologist. Through an anonymous survey of 596 clinical and counseling psychologists, results revealed a nonsignificant relationship between engagement in sexual boundary violations as a professional and reported violations as a client, student, or supervisee ($\chi^2(1, N = 596) = .06$). However, practicing professionals who reported engaging in sexual boundary violations ($n = 50$), also reported engaging in significantly more nonsexual boundary crossings ($M = 6.30, SD = 3.40$) as compared with professionals who denied engagement of sexual boundary crossings ($n = 533$), $M = 4.42, SD = 2.58, F(1, 503) = 20.82, p < .001$. Assessment of nonsexual boundary crossings was based on 18 examples of possible boundary crossings such as, ‘Renting an apartment/house to a trainee under your supervision’ and ‘Having a current trainee obtain therapy at your agency’. Additionally, Lamb and Catanzaro (1998) asked participants to rate the acceptability of engaging in the 18 potential boundary crossings on a 5-point scale ranging from poor professional practice to good professional practice. Those who reported engaging in sexual boundary violations as a professional rated the nonsexual boundary crossings as more acceptable ($M = 2.42, SD = .59$) than those who denied engaging in sexual boundary violations, ($M = 2.22, SD = .52$), $F(1, 503) = 6.64, p$
This finding illustrates a relationship between engaging in sexual boundary violations and attitudes toward nonsexual boundary crossings, although the sequence of origin cannot be determined. Either way, this study provided insight into how practicing psychologists view crossing boundaries with individuals of lower power status.

Although these results were based on self-report data and may be subject to social desirability effects, this study by Lamb and Catanzaro (1998) addressed an important aspect of the relationship between boundary crossings and boundary violations. It seems that based on this sample, the engagement of sexual boundary violations as a student or supervisee did not result in a higher frequency of engagement once he or she becomes a practicing psychologist. Lamb and Catanzaro (1998) contended that this may be due to the recent literature highlighting the negative consequences of sexual boundary violations. However, questions still remain regarding the effects of nonsexual boundary crossings on student development. Although conclusions regarding the consequential aspects of nonsexual boundary crossings are beyond the scope of this dissertation, it is useful to gain an exploratory understanding of how students and faculty perceive nonsexual boundary crossings.

In summary, Keltner et al. (2003) proposed that elevated power would increase the engagement of socially inappropriate behaviors (Proposition 12). Based on the work by Anderson and Galinsky (2006), elevated power was found to increase not only one’s perceptions of engaging in risk-taking behaviors but also increased disclosure of personal information in a face-to-face interaction. Taken together, these results suggest that individuals in high power positions may be less aware of the risks and consequences
present in their environment. Within the faculty-student relationship, faculty may model increased disclosure of personal information, which may be perceived as appropriate behavior by students. This could give the impression that the relationship extends beyond professional bounds. Lamb and Catanzaro (1998) found that psychologists who engaged in sexual boundary violations as students did not report committing sexual boundary violations as practicing psychologists. However, less is known about the role of nonsexual boundary crossings in faculty-student relationships. This dissertation provides an exploratory look at the perceptions of counseling psychology faculty and students regarding the appropriateness of such crossings.

Hypothesis 4: Faculty members will perceive boundary crossings as more appropriate than students.

Summary

Overall, the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al., 2003) provides a theoretical understanding of how power can affect the cognitions and behaviors of individuals in high and low power positions. Keltner et al. (2003) suggested that power can change how one experiences and acts across settings. As such, elevated power can increase one’s sensitivity to rewards and automatic thought processes toward others. Due to the lack of social attention and increased focus on reward attainment, those in high power positions may be more likely to engage in socially inappropriate behaviors, such as nonsexual boundary crossings. Reduced power, on the other hand, is proposed to increase one’s sensitivity to threats and punishments and result in more controlled social cognition (Keltner et al., 2003). However, the experiences of individuals in low power positions
have been underscored in past literature. Based on the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power, it is expected that faculty members, due to the inherent power they hold within the faculty-student relationship, will be more likely to perceive boundary crossings as appropriate. Conversely, students are expected to perceive nonsexual boundary crossings as less appropriate. Previous literature helps to shed light on how faculty and students understand the appropriateness of nonsexual boundary crossings.

**Perceptions of Nonsexual Boundary Crossings**

Given the many implications that the inherent power differential between students and faculty can create, it is important to better understand perceptions of nonsexual boundary crossings. Holmes, Rupert, Ross, and Shapera (1999) assessed undergraduate student perceptions of 109 interactions that might occur between faculty and students. The interactions described behaviors associated with sexual/dating relationships, friendship/social relationships, personal/counseling relationships, business/financial relationships, or professional/academic relationships.

Introductory to psychology undergraduates \((n = 158; 73\text{ males and 82 females})\) rated the appropriateness of the interactions on a 5-point scale. The two interactions rated as most inappropriate were, ‘Flirts with a student’ \((M = 1.40, SD = 0.79)\) and ‘Tells a student that he is attracted to him or her’ \((M = 1.48, SD = 0.89)\). These items were classified as sexual/dating relationships. The two interactions rated as most appropriate were, ‘Stays after class to answer a student’s question’ \((M = 4.28, SD = 1.00)\) and ‘Offers to write a letter of recommendation for a student’ \((M = 4.14, SD = 1.10)\). These items were classified as professional/academic relationships. From this study, it appears that
students clearly considered sexual/dating relationships as more inappropriate and professional/academic relationships as more appropriate. However, perceptions of the friendship/social, professional/counseling, and business/financial relationships fell somewhere in between.

As a follow up to the study by Holmes et al. (1999), Owen and Zwahr-Castro (2007) adapted 33 of the faculty-student interaction items to specifically assess nonsexual boundary crossings in academia. Four hundred and thirty undergraduate students rated the appropriateness of the interactions on a 6-point scale. Owen and Zwahr-Castro (2007) established a cutoff signifying that ratings below 3.5 were considered inappropriate whereas ratings above 3.5 were considered appropriate. Based on this distinction, 24 of the 33 interactions were perceived as inappropriate. In this study, the item rated as most inappropriate was ‘Professor gives student an expensive gift’ ($M = 1.94$, $SD = 1.20$). The item rated as most appropriate was ‘Professor encourages/allows a student in class to call him or her at home regarding school-related issues’ ($M = 4.41$, $SD = 1.28$).

There was a great deal of variation across the two studies (Holmes et al., 1999; Owen & Zwahr-Castro, 2007) even though participants were being assessed on the same items. For example, a student accepting an expensive gift was an interaction associated with sexual/dating relationships in the Holmes et al. (1999) study, whereas it was identified as a nonsexual boundary crossing in the Owen and Zwahr-Castro (2007) study. Additionally, some of the items (i.e., inviting a student to dinner, giving a student an inexpensive gift) were rated as appropriate in the Owen and Zwahr-Castro (2007) study but were considered inappropriate in the Holmes et al. (1999) study. Although the
significance of these differences is unknown, it may signify that, at least from the student’s perspective, boundary crossings are unclear. Furthermore, the characteristics of the graduate faculty and student relationship vary greatly from those of undergraduate faculty and students. Therefore, there may be potential for greater ambiguity regarding perceptions of boundary crossings.

To assess perceptions of nonsexual boundary crossings of graduate faculty and students in the counselor education literature, Bowman et al. (1995) completed a study assessing master’s level faculty and student perceptions of monetary interactions, friendships, and mentoring types of dual relationships. Both faculty ($n = 127$) and students ($n = 247$) were given seven scenarios and asked to rate 26 specific behavioral responses to the scenarios as ethical or unethical. Sex differences were also analyzed and will be discussed later in this chapter. Results of the study indicated disparities between faculty and student perceptions of these boundary crossings.

With regard to monetary relationships, both students and faculty (77%) indicated that a professor lending money directly to a student was unethical. Students were more likely to rate hiring a student as a counselor in the professor’s private practice as ethical ($\chi^2 (1, N = 377) = 25.49, p = .00001$) whereas faculty were more likely to rate hiring a student to complete clerical duties as ethical ($\chi^2 (1, N = 375) = 4.15, p = .04$). Significant differences between faculty and students were also found in the area of informal social interactions. In this scenario, a faculty member overhears a student making prejudiced comments at a social outing. Students were more likely to indicate that sharing this information with other faculty members at the annual student review was unethical.
\( \chi^2 (1, N = 375) = 11.35, p = .0007 \). No significant differences were found between faculty and student perceptions regarding mentoring relationships, friendships, socializing outside of the program and sexual relationships. One critique of the Bowman et al. (1995) study is that the forced choice rating of ethical or unethical is not conducive to the ambiguous nature of ethical decision making (this was a concern also brought up by participants). Thus, it is important to assess participants’ perceptions using a Likert-type scaling as suggested by Bowman et al. (1995).

Kolbert, Morgan and Johnston (2002) added to the counselor education literature through a qualitative study assessing the perceptions of faculty and students regarding dual relationships. Kolbert et al. (2002) were interested in further understanding the reasons behind faculty and student perceptions. Using the same vignettes from Bowman et al. (1995), the authors asked master’s level students (\( n = 16 \)) and faculty (\( n = 6 \)) to respond based on their reactions to faculty-student interactions concerning friendship, a mentoring relationship, a monetary interaction and a sexual relationship. Participants were also asked in a follow-up questionnaire to specify the reasoning behind their statements and to provide additional information about other conditions that may influence their decisions.

One primary theme that arose was to trust the professor to maintain objectivity and to implement boundaries in the relationship (Kolbert et al., 2002). Due to the power differential, both faculty and students were more likely to rely on professors’ judgments than their own. This is of high concern given that, according to the approach inhibition theory of power, faculty may be focused more on their own rewards than the needs of the
student (Proposition 3). The students were more likely to be concerned about faculty exploiting students whereas the faculty expressed concern that a student may be exploitative (Kolbert et al., 2002). Another difference between the faculty and student perceptions was that students were more concerned with an environment of unfairness if a professor and student were to engage in a dual relationship (Kolbert et al., 2002). Thus, as can be seen from this literature with counselor education Master’s level students and faculty, there is a clear mismatch between what is considered appropriate boundaries.

One consideration of this study is that both faculty and students believed students are able to independently consent to engaging in dual relationships. However, this may not be true given the power differential and evaluative nature of the relationship. Kitchener (1988) stated that due to the “asymmetry in the relationship, we cannot assume that persons interacting with the professional are able to objectively evaluate the advice of the professional or reject it when it is not in their best interests” (p. 218). Sullivan and Ogloff (1998) also supported that the inherent power in the faculty-student relationship inhibits students from freely giving voluntary consent in a supervisory relationship. This is in congruence with literature from the approach-inhibition theory of power as low power individuals may be more sensitive to threats and punishments (Proposition 4; Keltner et al., 2003). As such, due to the evaluative nature of many faculty and student multiple relationships, students may fear that declining a faculty request would result in a negative evaluation. Thus, it is important to understand the perceptions of low power individuals in their ability to feel comfortable declining a request from a high power individual.
Additionally, in the aforementioned studies, sex of participants impacted some of the results. There continues to be variation in how men and women perceive boundary crossings among faculty and students. Thus, understanding the role of sex differences in faculty-student relationships can further illuminate the ambiguous nature of boundary crossings.

Sex Differences, Power and Nonsexual Boundary Crossings

Discussions of power are rarely had sans mention of gender or sex differences. Due to socialization, men are typically perceived as the more powerful of the two. Men generally have greater access to resources, are able to assert greater influence over others and are perceived as more competent (Carli, 1999). Women, on the other hand, are considered passive, perceived as less competent and as unlikeable if they use assertive or directive language (Carli, 1999). Given the sociological power differences, men and women may have differential perceptions of nonsexual boundary crossings.

Most psychological research assessing gender has relied on analysis of sex differences (Stewart & McDermott, 2004). Additionally, many researchers use the terms gender and sex interchangeably, which adds to the complexity of interpreting results (McCreary & Chrisler, 2010). The term gender is typically used to explain social and psychological components of behavior and social roles whereas sex is described as the biological and physical aspects of being male or female (McCreary & Chrisler, 2010). However, it is difficult to delineate the overlap of biological and environmental components of sex differences in psychological research (Caplan & Caplan, 2009). Although studying sex differences does not provide a clear representation of gender per
se, it has often been used to understand differences in behavior of men and women (Stewart & McDermott, 2004; McCreary & Chrisler, 2010; Eagly, 1995).

Due to the exploratory nature of this dissertation, the more complex relationship of power and gender will not be analyzed. Instead, differential responses between men and women will be examined to better understand the dynamic aspects of power within faculty and student interactions. However, it is important to review how previous literature regarding sex differences has influenced what is known about faculty-student relationships. One caveat to this is that the studies described below report studying gender, however the results are based purely on assessment of differential responses based on participant self report of biological sex.

Most of the previous literature assessing faculty-student interactions has focused on sexual boundary crossings. One notable study by Glaser and Thorpe (1986) indicated that 17% of female clinical psychology students engaged in sexual intimacy with a faculty member during graduate training. The primary roles held by the faculty member who engaged in the sexual contact were research or academic advisor (33%), clinical supervisor (27%), course instructor (25%) and other psychology educator (15%). In retrospect, the majority of respondents reported feeling coerced or harmed by the advance. Glaser and Thorpe (1986) did not assess for sex of the faculty member stating that they believed the transgressions were more an effect of the power differential in the relationship than of biological sex.

In a follow up study to Glaser and Thorpe (1986), Hammel, Olkin, and Taube (1996), found that 10% of the 510 respondents in their sample had engaged in sexual
contact with a faculty member. Of these, 15% were female and 2% were male clinical and counseling psychology doctoral students. The majority (79%) of sexual contacts occurred during the first 3 years of graduate study and all of the respondents reported that their sexual contact had been with an educator with whom they had a working relationship of clinical supervisor (36%), instructor (34%), or dissertation chairs or committee members (14%). Additionally, 84% of the sexual contacts reported occurred between a male educator and female student. Similar to Glaser and Thorpe (1986), 84% of respondents retrospectively reported that the relationship was coercive, ethically problematic, and a hindrance to the working relationship. Thus, it appears that the prevalence and engagement of boundary violations between faculty and students have concerning ethical implications and signifies an interaction between sex and power.

Through collection of survey data, Lamb and Catanzaro (1998) assessed the frequency of engaging in sexual boundary violations and nonsexual boundary crossings of male and female psychologists. Fifty of the 596 clinical and counseling psychologists surveyed reported engaging in at least one sexual boundary violation as a psychologist. From this, 41 were men and 9 were women, $\chi^2 (1, N = 596) = 19.98, p < .001$. This significant pattern of sex differences arose across relationships psychologists had with clients, supervisees and students indicating that men were more likely to report sexual boundary violations than women. Conversely, women were more likely to report being the object of the sexual boundary violation as a client, supervisee or student ($n = 69, 86\%$), $\chi^2 (1, N = 596) = 51.27, p < .001$. This is consistent with literature on the victimization of women as women are more likely to be targets of abuse and sexual harassment (Logan, Walker, Jordan & Leukefeld, 2006).
Based on this literature, sex differences regarding sexual boundary violations appear to be most prevalent among male faculty members and female students. However, the research regarding nonsexual boundary crossings is less clear. Bowman et al. (1995) found significant within-group sex differences regarding faculty and student perceptions of nonsexual dual relationships. With regard to friendships, female faculty were more likely to perceive a professor and student attending a public event together as friends ($\chi^2 (1, N = 125) = 9.37, p = .002$) and sharing personal feelings as friends ($\chi^2 (1, N = 123) = 7.84, p = .005$) as unethical compared to male faculty. Female students rated a professor identifying his or her relationship with a student as primarily a friendship as more unethical ($\chi^2 (1, N = 124) = 8.56, p = .003$) compared to male students. Additionally, female students were more likely to rate a professor gossiping with a student as unethical ($\chi^2 (1, N = 247) = 7.22, p = .007$) compared to male students. For men, male faculty members were more likely to rate hiring a student to baby-sit as ethical ($\chi^2 (1, N = 124) = 13.82, p = .0002$) compared to female faculty. No sex differences emerged regarding mentoring and sexual relationships. Overall, women were more likely than men to rate the behaviors as unethical. Bowman et al. (1995) contended that this may again be related to the area of sexual harassment as women are more likely to be victims. Specifically, women may be more vigilant of unethical behaviors, particularly sexual advances, given their history of such victimization.

Hypothesis 5: Females will rate boundary crossings as less appropriate than men.
In summary, research assessing sexual boundary violations and nonsexual boundary crossings has revealed differences between men and women. Typically, sexual boundary violations have occurred between a high-powered male and a low-powered female. Additionally, men tended to rate nonsexual boundary crossings as more ethical than women. It will be useful to assess how sex may moderate the relationship between power and perceptions of nonsexual boundary crossings. Additionally, understanding within and between-group differences may provide insight into the ambiguous findings from previous research on nonsexual boundary crossings.

Summary and Research Questions

The purpose of this dissertation is to extend previous literature on nonsexual boundary crossings between faculty and students to include doctoral level counseling psychology educators and trainees. Specifically, the supervisor-supervisee, mentor-protégé, advisor-advisee, and co-authorship relationships will be examined due to their natural occurrence in doctoral level training. The majority of the literature published in this area has included master’s (Bowman et al., 1995; Kolbert et al., 2002) or undergraduate student (Holmes et al., 1999; Owen & Zwhar-Castro, 2007) samples. Additionally, few studies have simultaneously examined faculty and student perceptions of boundary crossings (see Bowman et al., and Kolbert et al., for exceptions).

Due to the dynamic nature and longevity of the faculty-student relationship, there are many opportunities for boundary crossings to occur (Bowman et al., 1995). Thus, it is important to better understand the perceptions of faculty and students to determine if they are similar or divergent. Furthermore, understanding how the inherent power within the
faculty-student relationship influences both faculty and student perceptions are an important piece of the puzzle. According to the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al., 2003), faculty members should be more focused on rewards and endorse less social cognition. Students should be more focused on threats and punishments and demonstrate an increase of social cognition. A reduction of attentional resources and a focus on rewards may contribute to the engagement of socially inappropriate behaviors (Keltner et al., 2003). Thus, it is hypothesized that faculty members have the potential of engaging in more risk taking behaviors, such as nonsexual boundary crossings.

Research on the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power has found support for a focus on rewards (Magee et al., 2007; Gruenfeld, et al., 2008), automatic and controlled social cognition (Fiske, 1993; Overbeck & Park, 2006) and a propensity for risk taking and divulgence of personal information (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006) primarily through experimental research design. Much of the research included random assignment to conditions and experimental priming tasks, which contribute to internal validity of the design. The present study will extend the literature base through assessment of inherent power already existent in the faculty-student relationship rather than relying on an experimental manipulation. Although internal validity may be reduced, the hope is to achieve results that adequately depict the experiences of counseling psychology faculty and students.

Sex of respondents is additionally important as past literature has demonstrated that sex differences exist with regard to perceptions of boundary crossings as well as experiences of power. In general, men are considered to have an already established
sense of power due to their role is society. Women, on the other hand, are socialized into a position of lower power compared with men. Past research on perceptions of nonsexual boundary crossings between faculty and students has resulted in within-group and between-group differences. Thus, it will be important to assess how sex affects the relationship between power and perceptions of nonsexual boundary crossings.

Overall, this dissertation will add to the literature of ethical dilemmas faced by faculty and students in counseling psychology doctoral programs. Ambiguity around role expectations has the potential for increased miscommunication and anxiety for graduate students (Barnett, 2008). Additionally, exploitation or harm can result if professors lose objectivity and/or slide down the slippery slope leading to boundary violations (Gutheil & Simon, 2002). On the other hand, there can be notable benefits from appropriate crossings of boundaries. It can be useful to identify behaviors that faculty and students perceive as fruitful to their working alliance. Either way, it is imperative to better understand how faculty and students perceive nonsexual boundary crossings in academia.

Consistent with the underlying assumption of the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al., 2003), faculty members are considered to be in an elevated power position by virtue of their placement in the academic hierarchy when compared with students. Likewise, students are considered to be in a reduced power position. The following hypotheses to be explored in this study are based on this theoretical assumption.
Hypothesis 1: Faculty members will report a greater sense of power as compared to students.

Hypothesis 2: Faculty members will report greater sensitivity to rewards as compared to students.

Hypothesis 2a: Students will report greater sensitivity to punishments as compared to faculty members.

Hypothesis 3: Faculty members will engage in automatic thought processes and students will engage in controlled thought processes.

Hypothesis 4: Faculty members will rate behaviors of vignettes as more appropriate, feel more comfortable engaging in the behaviors, and be less likely to consider them boundary crossings than students.

Hypothesis 5: Regardless of power, females will perceive vignette behaviors as less appropriate, feel less comfortable engaging in the behaviors, and be more likely to consider the behaviors boundary crossings than males.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the method that was utilized to explore the research questions surrounding nonsexual boundary crossings and power as it relates to doctoral faculty and student relationships. Specifically, the research design, participants, data collection methods, and measurement instruments are reviewed. The chapter concludes with a description of the research hypotheses and statistical procedures used to test them.

Research Design

A non-experimental research, between-subjects design with convenience sampling was used for this study. Each participant completed a demographic form, a revised version of the Sensitivity to Punishments and Sensitivity to Rewards Questionnaire (SPSRQ: O’Connor, Colder & Hawk, 2004), and the Sense of Power scale (Anderson, John & Keltner, 2005). Participants also answered an open-ended question that assessed their definition of a boundary crossing. In addition, each participant read four vignettes that corresponded to supervisor/supervisee, mentor/protégé, advisor/advisee, and co-authorship roles and subsequently rated various behaviors on level of appropriateness, comfort and degree to which he/she perceived the behavior as a
boundary crossing. Space was also provided for participants to make open-ended comments about each of the behaviors associated with the vignettes.

Participants identified themselves as a female faculty member, male faculty member, female doctoral student or male doctoral student. Each participant read different vignettes depending on how they identified themselves in terms of their sex and title. For example, female faculty members only read vignettes based on female faculty members and male doctoral students only read vignettes based on male doctoral students. The vignettes for all participants depicted the same scenario; the only difference is the sex of the main character in the vignette matched that of the person taking the survey. The reason for this limitation was to aid in the participant’s ability to identify with the vignettes by sharing both sex and status identities with the vignette characters.

A small protocol analysis was conducted to assess the format of the survey as well as receive feedback on the readability and clarity of several measures. Eight (4 male and 4 female) counseling psychology doctoral students from The University of Akron completed the survey. Participants were of European American (75%) and Hispanic (25%) descent ranging in age from 23 to 43 (M = 29). They were asked to complete the survey from one of the four sex/title options, thus three surveys were completed from the Male Doctoral Student perspective, two from the Female Doctoral Student and Female Faculty Member perspective and one from the Male Faculty Member perspective. Results of the protocol analysis led to minor changes described in detail later in this chapter for the SPSRQ and Sense of Power Scale. No changes were made to the vignettes or behavioral response statements.
Participants

Participants were recruited from APA accredited counseling psychology doctoral programs across the United States. Doctoral programs were chosen because of the longevity of the faculty-student relationship, which may add to the potential for more boundary crossings (Sullivan & Ogloff, 1998). Extant literature has focused on either undergraduate samples (Holmes et al., 1999; Owen & Zwahr-Castro, 2007) or master’s level samples (Bowman et al., 1995; Kolbert et al., 2002). Additionally, previous literature on graduate students has focused on counselor education programs (Bowman, Hatley & Bowman, 1995; Kolbert et al., 2002). While the findings on these groups are important, they may not generalize to counseling psychology programs.

An estimate of sample size needed for adequate power was obtained using G-Power statistical software. A medium effect size was chosen for this analysis based on previous literature on the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al., 2003), which indicated a median effect size of approximately .6. It was determined that a sample size of 122 (61 faculty members and 61 students) would correspond to power of 0.95 for detecting a medium effect size (Cohen’s d = 0.6) for one-tailed independent samples t-tests. The final sample size obtained was 135 (62 faculty members and 73 students).

Of the 135 participants, the sample was mostly female (76.3%) with a smaller male representation (23.7%). In addition, 39 identified as a female faculty member (29%), 23 identified as male faculty member (17%), 64 identified as female doctoral students (47%), and nine identified as male doctoral students (7%). One participant did not report his/her age, otherwise ages ranged from 22 to 68 (M = 35.6, SD = 12). The
sample was primarily European American (71.9%), with others endorsing Black/African American (10.4%), Asian/Pacific Islander (6.7%), Hispanic/Latino(a) (5.2%), Bi-Racial/Multi-Racial (3.7%), Native American/Alaskan Native (.7%), International-European (.7%), Jewish American (.7%), and Lebanese (.7%) descent. For doctoral students, most were in their 3rd year (11.9%), followed by 2nd year (11.1%), 1st year (9.6%), 5th year (6.7%), and more than 6 years (4.4%). Faculty members were most likely to have more than 20 years experience in academia (13.3%), followed by 6-10 years (10.4%), 11-15 years (5.2%), 16-19 years (5.2%), 2 years (3%), 5 years (3%), 1 year (2.2%), 3 years (2.2%) and 4 years (.7%). A summary of demographics characteristics can be found in Table 3.

Procedure

Data collection for this study was completed through an online survey hosted by Survey Gizmo. An email was sent to training directors of all APA accredited counseling psychology programs in the U.S. The email included a brief description of the survey including participant eligibility (faculty member or student in counseling psychology doctoral program) as well as informed consent. The informed consent (Appendix A) described the procedure for completing the survey, risks and benefits of participating, as well as resources to contact if taking the survey resulted in the experience of emotional distress. Participant identity remained anonymous and he/she was able to discontinue the survey at any time without consequence.

In addition, each participant had the opportunity to enter into a random drawing to win one of four prizes: a $25, $50, $75, or $100 gift certificate to Amazon.com. After
they completed the survey, participants had the option to send an email with their name to the following email address, tlm73@zips.uakron.edu to be included in the drawing.

Participants’ survey responses were not linked to the prize drawing. A total of 64 individuals opted to enter the certificate drawing.

Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of the Current Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/European American</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino(a)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaska</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Racial/Multi-Racial</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19 years</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prior to data collection, approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (#20110223) at The University of Akron. The Informed Consent (Appendix A) described the procedures of the study, possible risks or discomfort to the participant, participant anonymity and voluntary involvement, contact information for the principal investigator and dissertation advisor as well as the potential for winning the Amazon gift card. As noted in the Informed Consent, the survey took about 15-20 minutes to complete.

Measures

The following section describes the measures utilized in this study including, a demographic questionnaire, vignettes and behavioral responses, time completing the vignettes, the Sensitivity to Punishments and Sensitivity to Rewards Questionnaire, and the Sense of Power Questionnaire.

Demographic Questionnaire

Participant demographics were collected on sex, age, and race/ethnicity (see Appendix B). Participants were also asked to indicate the length of time they have been associated with a counseling psychology doctoral program as either a doctoral student or faculty member. No further demographic information was obtained in order to protect participant anonymity.

Vignettes

Four vignettes (Appendix C) were developed for this study to depict scenarios that might occur in supervision, advising, mentorship, and co-authorship roles in
counseling psychology doctoral programs. The vignettes were meant to portray different types of faculty-student roles and participants were not asked to consider their own relationships with actual faculty members or students.

The structure of the vignettes and behavioral responses were adapted from the Bowman et al. (1995) study. Similar to the current study, they developed vignettes based on different faculty-student relationships followed by three or four questions focused on particular behaviors that might occur in the relationship. However, the details in the vignettes and behaviors for this study were different from the Bowman et al. study. The vignettes in the current study were created through a combination of the author’s personal experience and scenarios from the study by Kolbert et al. (2002). For example, similar to the mentor-protégé vignette in this study, the “Friendship” scenario (Kolbert et al., 2002) depicted a faculty member and student who share interests both inside and outside of the classroom.

Specific to this study each vignette was tailored to the academic position and sex of the individual taking the survey. As such, the sex of the protagonist in each scenario matched that of the survey participant. For example, a female doctoral student reads a vignette with a female doctoral student as the main character. The sex of the other character(s) in the vignette is neutral. For example, “Mark and one of his faculty members realized during the first semester of his doctoral training that they had a lot in common.” Manipulating sex in the vignettes allowed participants to more easily identify with the scenarios while still assuming the role of the vignette character, which has been found to reduce socially desirable responding (Constant, Kiesler & Sproull, 1994). In
addition, as discussed in Chapter 2, the interaction between sex and power is not the primary focus of this study and may potentially complicate interpretation of the results. Thus, the other characters’ sexes in the vignettes remained neutral as a means of controlling for sex as a contributor to power differences within the academic relationship. Thus, it is believed that power in the relationship will be highlighted above and beyond sex.

Behavioral responses to vignettes. After each vignette, participants rated a series of behaviors that depicted possible ways of responding to the vignettes. For example, in the mentor/protégé vignette, one possible response is, “Dr. Katie and her protégé drive to a professional conference together.” Participants were asked to rate each behavior on a 6-point scale. Each vignette was followed by four statements which assessed the appropriateness of the behaviors, level of comfort the participant would have engaging in the behavior, and the degree to which she/he perceived the behavior as a boundary crossing (see Appendix C). The behaviors that followed each vignette were developed through a combination of the author’s personal experience and from the Student/Faculty Relationship Survey (Holmes et al., 1999). Examples of behaviors obtained from the Holmes et al. (1999) study include: a faculty member having a group of students over for dinner, carpooling with a student, and asking a student to babysit. In addition, respondents from Holmes et al. identified friendship/social, personal/counseling and business/financial behaviors as more ambiguous regarding degree of appropriateness. Professional/academic relationships were consistently considered more appropriate and sexual/dating relationships were consistently considered less appropriate. Thus, they were not included in this study.
In the supervisor/supervisee vignette, the responses were related to personal/counseling behaviors, friendship/social behaviors for the mentor/protégé vignette, and business/financial behaviors for the advisor/advisee vignette. The responses for the co-authorship relationship were adapted from Rose and Fischer (1998) and assessed perceptions of claiming primary authorship on a project. Based on this classification, 12 scales were created to assess the how participants perceived the appropriateness, comfort with and identified the behaviors as a boundary crossing for each of the following types of behaviors (personal/counseling, friendship/social, business/financial and authorship). A total score was calculated for each of the 12 scales with higher scores indicating a greater degree of appropriateness, comfort or perception of a boundary crossing.

**Time**

To assess Keltner et al.’s (2003) propositions that elevated power leads to engagement in automatic thought processes (Proposition 7) and reduced power leads to controlled thought processes (Proposition 8), the time each participant spent reading each vignette and answering the subsequent questions was recorded. Survey Gizmo calculated the time a survey participant spent on each page in seconds and included that as a variable in the data collection.

**Sensitivity to Punishments and Sensitivity to Rewards Questionnaire**

The Sensitivity to Punishments and Sensitivity to Rewards Questionnaire (SPSRQ) was originally developed by Torrubia, Avila, Molto, and Grande (1995). The SPSRQ, which was based on Gray’s (1981, 1982) theoretical model, measures individual
differences in activity of the behavioral approach and inhibition systems. The SPSRQ consists of 48 questions with a yes/no dichotomous format. The questionnaire is divided into two 24-item scales to measure individual differences in (1) sensitivity to punishments, and (2) sensitivity to rewards. The sensitivity to punishments (SP) scale relates to the behavioral inhibition system, whereas the sensitivity to rewards (SR) scale relates to the behavioral approach system. The SPSRQ was originally developed in the Spanish language; however, has since been translated into English.

Reliability and validity has been adequately supported for the SPSRQ with European populations. Internal consistency reliability has been reported as .83 for SP and .75 for SR (Torrubia, Ávila, Moltó, & Caseras, 2001). Test-retest reliability was acceptable for the SP and SR respectively at 3 months (0.89; 0.87), 1 year (0.74; 0.69), and 3 year (0.57; 0.61) follow-ups (Torrubia et al., 2001). In a study by Beck, Smits, Claes, Vandereyckcn, and Bijttebier (2009), construct validity was supported by assessing correlations of the SP and SR scales with the Behavioral Inhibition/Behavioral Activation System Scales (BIS/BAS Scales; Carver & White, 1994). The SR scale was significantly positively correlated with BAS-Drive and Fun Seeking ($r = .36, p < .01$), and the SP scale was significantly positively related to BIS-Anxiety ($r = .46, p < .01$). The SR and SP scales were not significantly correlated with each other (Beck et al., 2009). However there is limited research available examining reliability and validity of the SPSRQ with an American sample.

Examination of the internal structure of the SPSRQ has provided mixed results. Torrubia et al. (2001) conducted separate analyses for male and female undergraduate
students from Spain. Through principal components analysis with Varimax rotation, a two-component structure emerged for both males and females (Torrubia et al., 2001). Component loadings for males ranged from .20 - .66 for the SP scale and from .11 - .56 for the SR scale. For females, component loadings for the SP scale ranged from .06 - .65 and .09 - .55 for the SR scale. Although Torrubia et al. (2001) reported support for a two-component structure, their results were contingent on items with low component loadings (e.g., .11) and they did not report a cutoff for component loadings or publish the component loadings for each item. Thus, the results of this study need to be interpreted cautiously.

Using three separate undergraduate American samples and an English version of the SPSRQ, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted by O’Connor, Colder, and Hawk (2004) to better assess the psychometric properties of the SPSRQ. An initial CFA using the entire 48-item SPSRQ did not support a two-factor model. Following an exploratory factor analysis, a different two-factor model emerged. Through an iterative process, eleven items with weak loadings (< .32), and two items that loaded substantially on both factors were dropped. The final version of the SPSRQ contained 18 items for the SP scale and 17 items for the SR scale. Through separate CFAs using all three samples, O’Connor et al. (2003) reported mixed support for a two factor structure. The authors concluded that CFA may not be appropriate for examining the factor structure when a scale has a large number of items. Because of the large number of items, O’Connor et al. (2004) suggested that $R^2$ and the size of factor loadings are better methods of assessing factor structure. Based on these criteria, O’Connor et al. concluded that the two-factor model of the revised version of the SPSRQ is adequately supported.
Reliability was assessed through internal consistency measures ($\alpha = .83$ for SP and .74 for SR) for the revised version of the SPSRQ (O’Connor et al., 2004). O’Connor et al. (2004) also found support for the validity of the revised version of the SPSRQ. They examined correlations with the Positive and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS; Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988) and the BIS/BAS scales (Carver & White, 1994). As expected, the SP scale correlated positively with the negative affect scale ($r = .47$, $p < .01$), and the BIS scale ($r = .54$, $p < .01$) and negatively correlated with the positive affect scale ($r = -.29$, $p < .01$). The SR scale was positively correlated with the positive affect scale ($r = .20$, $p < .05$) and the BAS scale ($r = .30$, $p < .01$). The SR scale was unassociated with the negative affect and BIS scales.

For the purposes of this study, O’Connor et al.’s (2004) 35-item revised version of the SPSRQ (Appendix E) was used as the factor structure was improved without compromising the reliability and validity of the scale. O’Connor and her colleagues suggested that potential benefit would come from rewording some of the items to better fit the English language. As such, participants ($n = 8$) of the protocol analysis were asked to pay special attention to the wording of this measure. Their suggestions were incorporated into the finalized measure as a way to improve readability. Several items were modified for the current study. For example, the original item ‘In tasks that you are not prepared for, do you attach great importance to the possibility of failure?’ was changed to ‘If you are not prepared for a task, are you concerned with the possibility of failure?’
Additionally, six of the eight participants from the protocol analysis disliked the dichotomous format of the SPSRQ. One participant noted that she felt “limited” by the forced choice as she considered herself as falling on a continuum for many of the items. Based on the results of the analysis and consideration that scale reliability is increased when 2 or more response categories are provided (Alwin & Krosnick, 1991; Weng, 2004), the format was changed to a 6-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Lardi et al. (2008) also changed the rating format for the SPSRQ without compromising the reliability and validity of the measure. Higher scores on the SP indicate greater sensitivity to punishments and higher scores on the SR indicate greater sensitivity to rewards. Reliability was supported in the current sample with internal consistencies of .87 for the full scale, .90 for the SP subscale, and .80 for the SR subscale.

Sense of Power Scale

The Sense of Power Scale (Appendix F) was developed by Anderson, John, and Keltner (2005) as a self-report measure used to assess the beliefs one has over his/her power over others. The scale has both a generalized version and a context-specific version. The Sense of Power Scale is comprised of 8 items rated on a 7-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. An example of an item is ‘I can get people to listen to what I say.’ A total score is derived from all 8 items with higher scores indicating a greater sense of individual power. The context-specific version was used for this study such that faculty members are asked to consider their sense of power in relationships with
students and students are asked about their sense of power in relationships with faculty members. Reliability of the scale has been supported with internal consistencies ranging from .79 to .88 (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006).

Principal components analysis found support for a unidimensional component structure for the Sense of Power Scale (C. Anderson, personal communication, December 23, 2010). In a study using four different undergraduate samples, one component emerged consistently and accounted for almost half (47%) of the total variance. Results of a scree test across the four samples also supported the one-component solution. Component loadings from all four samples were above .50 for all eight items on the first unrotated component (mean absolute loading = .69). Thus, these results support the one-component internal structure of the Sense of Power Scale.

Results of the protocol analysis conducted for this study indicated that many participants (who were all students) chose the ‘Neutral’ category consistently across the eight items. Thus, to limit the ambiguity associated with the ‘Neutral’ category and to remain consistent with item scales throughout the rest of the survey, the Sense of Power Scale was revised to have participants rate their agreement on a 6-point scale. Literature on middle points in formatting of survey questions suggests that their use can reduce reliability of measurement (Alwin & Krosnick, 1991) especially for individuals from Westernized countries (Steven & Cullen, 1993).

For the purposes of this study, removing the neutral category was deemed applicable considering the theoretical base of the Sense of Power Scale is interested in examining elevated versus reduced power. Thus, the interpretability of “neutral”
responses would necessarily be ambiguous. As such, the 6-point scale was utilized for this study. The Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient in the current study was similar to previous studies at .88.

Definition of a Boundary Crossing

Participants were asked to respond to an open-ended question regarding the definition of a boundary crossing. Specifically the question stated, “Please provide your definition of a boundary crossing as it pertains to the faculty/student professional relationship.” There were no limits to the amount of information a respondent could provide nor were they required to answer the question. A total of 126 participants answered this question (34 female faculty members, 20 male faculty members, 63 female doctoral students, and 9 male doctoral students).

Hypotheses and Analyses

The following primary hypotheses will be addressed in this research:

Hypothesis 1: Faculty members will report significantly more power than students as evidenced by scores on the Sense of Power Scale. This hypothesis will be tested using an independent samples t-test, \( p < .05 \).

Hypothesis 2: Faculty members will report significantly greater sensitivity to rewards than students as evidenced by scores on the Sensitivity to Rewards scale of the SPSRQ. This hypothesis will be tested using an independent samples t-test, \( p < .05 \).
Hypothesis 2a: Students will report significantly greater sensitivity to punishments than faculty members as evidenced by scores on the Sensitivity to Punishments scale of the SPSRQ. This hypothesis will be tested using an independent samples $t$-test, $p < .05$.

Hypothesis 3: Faculty members’ responses to the four vignettes will be more automatic as compared to student responses as evidenced by the average time in seconds taken to read the vignettes and answer the subsequent questions. This hypothesis will be tested using an independent samples $t$-test, $p < .05$.

Hypothesis 4: Faculty members will rate behaviors related to personal/counseling, friendship/social, business/financial and authorship roles as significantly more appropriate than students. This hypothesis will be tested using an independent samples $t$-test, $p < .05$.

Hypothesis 4a: Faculty members will rate feeling significantly more comfortable engaging in behaviors related to personal/counseling, friendship/social, business/financial and authorship roles than students. This hypothesis will be tested using an independent samples $t$-test, $p < .05$.

Hypothesis 4b: Faculty members will significantly perceive behaviors related to personal/counseling, friendship/social, business/financial and authorship roles as boundary crossings less often than students. This hypothesis will be tested using an independent samples $t$-test, $p < .05$. 
Hypothesis 5: Females will perceive behaviors related to personal/counseling, friendship/social, business/financial and authorship roles as less appropriate than males regardless of power. This hypothesis will be tested using an independent samples t-test, $p < .05$.

Hypothesis 5a: Females will rate feeling less comfortable engaging in behaviors related to personal/counseling, friendship/social, business/financial and authorship roles compared to males regardless of power. This hypothesis will be tested using an independent samples t-test, $p < .05$.

Hypothesis 5b: Females will perceive more behaviors related to personal/counseling, friendship/social, business/financial and authorship roles as boundary crossings than males regardless of power. This hypothesis will be tested using an independent samples t-test, $p < .05$.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter discusses the preliminary analyses and results of the primary and secondary analyses. Preliminary analyses include screening the data including analysis of outliers and abnormality. Tests of the hypotheses are presented in terms of independent samples $t$-tests.

Preliminary Analyses

The data were visually screened and it was determined that less than 5% of the data were missing. Further inspection of the data suggested that missing data were random. For missing data on the SPSRQ and the SOP scale, the mean substitution method was utilized. For the ratings of responses regarding personal/counseling, social/friendship, business/financial and authorship behaviors, each case was examined individually and missing data were substituted with the mean derived from the four items that corresponded with each behavior related to appropriateness, comfort, and perceived degree of boundary crossing.

The final dataset consisted of 135 participants. Outliers were identified through the use of box plots and histograms and revealed five outliers on the TIME variable.
Analyses were conducted with and without the identified outliers and significant differences were noted in the results when the cases were deleted, thus the outliers were deleted from the final analyses.

Primary Analyses

The following primary analyses were calculated with $p < .05$ with the purpose to of reducing Type I error considering this is the first study to examine doctoral-level faculty and student relationships. However, when independent samples $t$-tests were conducted with $p < .01$ to take a more conservative look at the data, some differences existed. Specifically, the following variables no longer resulted in statistically significant differences between faculty and students: Sensitivity to Punishments, Time, and Appropriateness of Co-Authorship behaviors. In addition, the following variables no longer resulted in statistically significant differences between women and men: Perception of Boundary Crossing for Friendship/Social Behaviors and Degree of Comfort for Business/Financial Behaviors. Given the few differences between uncorrected and corrected $p$-values, a less conservative stance ($p < .05$) was utilized to analyze and interpret the primary analyses.

Sense of Power

The first hypothesis assessed whether faculty members and students differed significantly in their perceived sense of power within their academic relationships. This hypothesis was tested using an independent samples $t$-test with a significance level of $p < .05$. Results indicated that faculty members ($M = 36.96, SD = 5.22$) endorsed a greater
sense of power as compared to students ($M = 31.76, SD = 6.88$), $t (133) = 4.98, p < .001$, $d = 0.85$. Thus, the first hypothesis was supported. A summary of these results can be found in Table 4.

Sensitivity to Punishments and Sensitivity to Rewards

The second set of hypotheses explored faculty and students’ sensitivity to rewards and punishments as evidenced by scores on the SPSRQ. It was expected that faculty members would endorse a greater sensitivity to rewards than students. This hypothesis was investigated with an independent samples $t$-test with a significance level of $p < .05$. Results indicated that a significant difference existed between faculty and students, ($t (133) = -2.71, p = .004$, $d = 0.46$), however students ($M = 48.48, SD = 10.9$) were more likely to indicate a greater sensitivity to rewards than faculty members ($M = 44, SD = 8.27$). Thus, hypothesis 2 was not supported in the theorized direction. Hypothesis 2a suggested that students would report greater sensitivity to punishments than faculty members. Results from the independent samples $t$-test revealed significant differences with students ($M = 55.96, SD = 14.77$) reporting a higher sensitivity to punishments than faculty members ($M = 51.74, SD = 12.98$), ($t (133) = -1.75, p = .04$, $d = 0.30$). Thus, hypotheses 2a was supported. A summary of these results can be found in Table 4.

Time

It was hypothesized that faculty members would be more automatic in their thinking and subsequently take less time to complete the survey vignettes than students. To test this hypothesis, the time each participant took to read and rate the behaviors following each vignette was calculated in seconds. The average total time to complete the
vignette portions of the survey was assessed using an independent samples \( t \)-test, \( p < .05 \). As stated previously, five outliers were identified in the data through the use of box blots and histograms. These cases were deleted from the final analysis. The results were statistically significant, \( t (128) = 1.66, p = .05, d = 0.29 \), however faculty members (\( M = 214.85, SD = 139.56 \)) spent more time on the vignettes than students (\( M = 174.87, SD = 135.05 \)). Therefore, this hypothesis was not supported in the theorized direction. A summary of these results can be found in Table 4.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Cohen’s ( d )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>( SD )</td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>( SD )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>39.96</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>31.76</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>48.48</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishments</td>
<td>51.74</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>55.96</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>214.85</td>
<td>139.56</td>
<td>174.87</td>
<td>135.05</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Behavioral Responses to Vignettes

Personal/counseling behaviors. Behaviors related to personal/counseling types of interactions were assessed within the supervisor-supervisee vignette. Participants were asked to rate four behaviors on degree of appropriateness, degree of comfort he/she would feel engaging in the behavior, and degree to which she/he perceived the behavior as a boundary crossing. Independent samples \( t \)-tests were conducted with a significance level of \( p < .05 \). With regard to appropriateness, it was hypothesized that faculty
members would rate personal/counseling behaviors as more appropriate than students. This was not supported \((t (133) = 1.56, p = .06, d = 0.27)\), thus faculty members \((M = 4.28, SD = .98)\) and students \((M = 4.04, SD = .74)\) did not differ on degree of appropriateness with regards to personal/counseling behaviors.

Regarding degree of comfort participants would have engaging in personal/counseling behaviors, it was hypothesized that faculty members would feel more comfortable. This hypothesis was supported, \((t (133) = 2.88, p = .0025, d = 0.50)\) with faculty members \((M = 4.2, SD = .88)\) rating the behaviors as more comfortable than students \((M = 3.78, SD = .79)\). Finally, it was hypothesized that faculty members were less likely to perceive the behaviors as boundary crossings. Results supported this hypothesis as students \((M = 3.09, SD = .86)\) were more likely to perceive the behaviors related to personal/counseling as boundary crossings than were faculty members \((M = 2.67, SD = .87)\), \(t (133) = -2.82, p = .003, d = 0.49\). A summary of these results can be found in Table 5.

| Table 5. Means, Standard Deviations, and T-tests Related to Personal/Counseling Behaviors |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Variable                        | Faculty         | Students        |                |                |                |                |
|                                 | \(M\) | \(SD\) | \(M\) | \(SD\) | \(t\) | \(p\) | \(Cohen's d\) |
| Appropriateness                 | 4.28 | .98 | 4.04 | .74 | 1.56 | .06 | 0.27 |
| Comfort                         | 4.2  | .88 | 3.78 | .79 | 2.88 | .0025 | 0.50 |
| Boundary Crossing               | 2.67 | .87 | 3.09 | .86 | -2.82 | .003 | 0.49 |
Friendship/social behaviors. Behaviors related to friendship/social types of interactions were assessed following the mentor-protégé vignette. Participants were asked to rate four behaviors on degree of appropriateness, degree of comfort he/she would feel engaging in the behavior, and degree to which she/he perceived the behavior as a boundary crossing. Independent samples t-tests were conducted to assess each of these domains with a significance level of $p < .05$. It was hypothesized that faculty members would rate the friendship/social behaviors as more appropriate than students. This hypothesis was not supported, $t (133) = -.891, p = .186, d = 0.14$ as no mean differences were found between faculty members ($M = 4.18, SD = .86$) and students ($M = 4.3, SD = .81$).

In relation to comfort level of participants engaging in friendship/social behaviors, it was hypothesized that faculty members would rate feeling significantly more comfortable engaging in these behaviors than students. This was not supported, $t (133) = -1.25, p = .108, d = 0.22$ with no mean differences found between faculty members ($M = 3.76, SD = 1.03$) and students ($M = 3.97, SD = .92$). Finally, exploration of perceptions of boundary crossings regarding friendship/social behaviors revealed no significant differences between faculty members ($M = 2.99, SD = 1.03$) and students ($M = 3.01, SD = .9$), $t (133) = -.14, p = .44, d = 0.02$. Thus, the hypothesis that faculty members would rate behaviors as boundary crossings less than students was not supported. A summary of these results can be found in Table 6.
Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, and T-tests Related to Friendship/Social Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.891</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Crossing</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Business/financial behaviors. Perceptions of business/financial behaviors were assessed through the advisor-advisee vignette. Participants were asked to rate four behaviors on degree of appropriateness, degree of comfort he/she would feel engaging in the behavior, and degree to which she/he perceived the behavior as a boundary crossing. Independent samples $t$-tests were conducted to assess each of these domains with a significance level of $p < .05$. Regarding the degree of appropriateness of business/financial behaviors, it was hypothesized that faculty members would rate behaviors as significantly more appropriate than students. Results were statistically significant, $t (133) = -2.36, p = .01, d = 0.30$, however students ($M = 3.33, SD = .76$) considered the behaviors as more appropriate than faculty members ($M = 3.03, SD = .73$). Therefore, this hypothesis was not supported in the theorized direction.

The degree of comfort participants had engaging in business/financial behaviors was also assessed. It was hypothesized that faculty members would feel more comfortable than students. This hypothesis was not supported in the theorized direction, $t (133) = -3.2, p = .001, d = 0.56$, with faculty members ($M = 2.81, SD = .76$) indicating
significantly less comfort engaging in business/financial behaviors than students (M = 3.23, SD = .75). Lastly, it was hypothesized that faculty members would be less likely to perceive business/financial behaviors as boundary crossings. This hypothesis was not supported, t (133) = -1.12, p = .456, d = 0.01, with no mean differences found between faculty members (M = 3.79, SD = .87) and students (M = 3.78, SD = .74). A summary of these results can be found in Table 7.

Table 7. Means, Standard Deviations, and T-tests Related to Business/Financial Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Faculty M</th>
<th>Faculty SD</th>
<th>Students M</th>
<th>Students SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-3.19</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Crossing</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Authorship behaviors. Perceptions of author relationships were assessed as participants rated the student or faculty member claiming primary authorship on appropriateness, level of comfort, and degree to which the behaviors were perceived as boundary crossings. To assess this hypothesis, independent samples t-tests were conducted with p < .05. There were statistically significant differences between faculty members (M = 3.7, SD = .81) and students (M = 3.43, SD = .99) on appropriateness (t (133) = 1.71, p = .044, d = 0.30) with faculty members seeing behaviors as more appropriate. Significant differences were also found on level of comfort engaging in authorship related behaviors for faculty members (M = 3.49, SD = .89) and students (M = 3.49, SD = .89) with faculty members seeing behaviors as more comfortable.
3.14, $SD = .92$), $t (133) = 2.19$, $p = .015$, $d = 0.39$), with faculty members endorsing greater degrees of comfort. In addition, statistically significant differences were found between faculty members ($M = 2.99$, $SD = 1.04$) and students ($M = 3.4$, $SD = .93$) regarding authorship behaviors perceived as boundary crossings ($t (133) = -2.38$, $p = .0095$, $d = 0.42$). Thus, this hypothesis was supported, as students were more likely to perceive behaviors as boundary crossings than faculty members. A summary of these results can be found in Table 8.

Table 8. Means, Standard Deviations, and T-tests Related to Authorship Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Faculty Mean</th>
<th>Faculty SD</th>
<th>Students Mean</th>
<th>Students SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Crossing</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-2.38</td>
<td>.0095</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sex Differences

Personal/counseling behaviors. It was hypothesized that women would rate behaviors related to personal/counseling types of interactions as less appropriate, feel less comfortable engaging in these types of behaviors, and be more likely to perceive them as boundary crossings. Independent samples $t$-tests were conducted to explore these hypotheses with an alpha level of $p < .05$. For degree of appropriateness, men ($M = 4.47$, $SD = .68$) rated personal/counseling behaviors as more appropriate than women ($M = 4.05$, $SD = .89$), $t (133) = 2.44$, $p = .008$, $d = 0.53$). Thus, this hypothesis was supported.
However, no significant differences existed with regards to comfort level, \((t(133) = 1.56, p = .06, d = 0.33)\) or perceptions of boundary crossings, \((t(133) = -1.37, p = .086, d = 0.28)\). A summary of these results can be found in Table 9.

Table 9. Means, Standard Deviations, and T-tests of Sex Differences for Personal/Counseling Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Crossing</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Friendship/social behaviors. Regarding friendship/social behaviors, it was hypothesized that women would rate these behaviors as less appropriate, feel less comfortable engaging in these behaviors and be more likely to consider them boundary crossings. An independent samples \(t\)-test was conducted to examine each of these assumptions with a significance level of \(p < .05\). No significant differences were revealed between men and women regarding appropriateness \((t(133) = .559, p = .289, d = 0.11)\) or comfort level \((t(133) = .38, p = .352, d = 0.08)\). However, significant differences existed regarding perceptions of boundary crossings \((t(133) = -1.99, p = .024, d = 0.37)\). Women \((M = 3.09, SD = .87)\) were more likely than men \((M = 2.71, SD = 1.16)\) to consider friendship/social behaviors as boundary crossings. A summary of these results can be found in Table 10.
Table 10. Means, Standard Deviations, and T-tests of Sex Differences for Friendship/Social Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Crossing</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Business/financial behaviors. Hypothesis 5 suggested that women would be more likely to perceive business/financial behaviors as less appropriate than men. In addition, women were expected to feel less comfortable engaging in these types of behaviors and be more likely to perceive them as boundary crossings. Results of independent samples t-tests (p < .05) indicated that no significant differences existed between men and women regarding appropriateness, (t (133) = -1.39, p = .083, d = 0.26) and perceptions of boundary crossings (t (133) = -.524), p = .301, d = 0.09). Thus, these hypotheses were not supported. Significant differences were revealed for men and women on degree of comfort (t (133) = -1.7, p = .045, d = 0.22), however the hypothesis was not supported in the proposed direction. Women (M = 3.01, SD = .75) reported feeling more comfortable than men (M = 2.83, SD = .86) with business/financial interactions. A summary of these results can be found in Table 11.
Authorship behaviors. It was hypothesized that women would be more likely than men in this sample to rate behaviors related to authorship as less appropriate, be less comfortable engaging in the behaviors and be more likely to perceive the behaviors as boundary crossings. An independent samples t-test was conducted to examine each of these assumptions with a significance level of $p < .05$. No differences were revealed with regard to appropriateness, $t(133) = 1.33, p = .094, d = 0.28$, between males ($M = 3.74, SD = .69$) and females ($M = 3.5, SD = .98$). Statistically significant differences were found with level of comfort, $t(133) = 2.68, p = .005, d = 0.53$, with men ($M = 3.66, SD = .85$) endorsing higher levels of comfort than women ($M = 3.19, SD = .91$). Thus, this hypothesis was supported. Perceptions of authorship behaviors as boundary crossings were also examined and resulted in non-significant results, $t(133) = -0.68, p = .249, d = 0.13$, with no differences between men ($M = 3.11, SD = .99$) and women ($M = 3.24, SD = 1$). A summary of these results can be found in Table 12.
Table 12. Means, Standard Deviations, and T-tests of Sex Differences for Authorship Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Crossing</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Primary Analyses

Support was found for Hypothesis 1, which theorized that faculty members would report significantly more power than students. The effect size $d$ of 0.85 indicates a large effect. Hypothesis 2 was not supported in the theorized direction. In other words, students reported greater sensitivity to rewards than faculty members. The effect size $d$ of 0.46 indicates a medium effect. Hypothesis 2a proposed that students would report greater sensitivity to punishments. This hypothesis was supported with an effect size $d$ of 0.30, which indicates a small effect. The third hypothesis was not supported in the theorized direction; therefore faculty members spent more time completing the vignette portion of the survey. The effect size $d$ of 0.29 indicates a small effect.

Hypothesis 4 stated that faculty members would rate behaviors related to personal/counseling, friendship/social, business/financial and authorship interactions as more appropriate than students. Variable support was found for this hypothesis. This hypothesis was supported with regard to authorship behaviors with an effect size $d$ of
0.30 indicating a small effect. This hypothesis was not supported in the theorized direction for business/financial behaviors revealing that students rated these behaviors as more appropriate than faculty. The effect size \( d \) of 0.30 indicates a small effect. No differences were found regarding personal/counseling and friendship/social behaviors. The effect sizes of \( d \) were 0.27 and 0.14, respectively indicating small effects.

Hypothesis 4a proposed that faculty members would rate feeling significantly more comfortable engaging in behaviors related to personal/counseling, friendship/social, business/financial and authorship interactions than students. This hypothesis was supported for personal/counseling and authorship interactions. The effect sizes \( d \) of 0.50 and 0.39 indicated medium and small effect sizes, respectively. Support was not found in the theorized direction for business/financial interactions with a medium effect size of 0.56. No significant differences were found for friendship/social behaviors. The effect size \( d \) of 0.22 indicates a small effect.

Hypothesis 4b theorized that faculty members would significantly perceive behaviors related to personal/counseling, friendship/social, business/financial and authorship interactions as boundary crossings less often than students. The hypothesis was supported for personal/counseling and authorship interactions. The effect sizes \( d \) of 0.49 and 0.42 indicate medium and small effects, respectively. This hypothesis was not supported for friendship/social and business/financial behaviors. The effect sizes \( d \) of 0.02 and 0.01 indicate very small effects.

Hypothesis 5 stated that females would rate behaviors related to personal/counseling, friendship/social, business/financial and authorship interactions as
less appropriate than males. This hypothesis was only supported for personal/counseling interactions with an effect size \( d \) of 0.53 indicating a medium effect. There were no significant group differences for friendship/social (\( d = 0.11 \)), business/financial (\( d = 0.26 \)), or authorship interactions (\( d = 0.28 \)), with small effect sizes for each.

Hypothesis 5a proposed that females would rate feeling less comfortable engaging in behaviors related to personal/counseling, friendship/social, business/financial and authorship interactions than males. This hypothesis was supported with regard to authorship behaviors with a medium effect size \( d \) of 0.53. For business/financial behaviors, this hypothesis was not supported in the theorized direction suggesting that women rated feeling more comfortable than men. The effect size \( d \) of 0.22 indicated a small effect. No support was found for personal/counseling or friendship social behaviors. The effects sizes \( d \) of 0.33 and 0.08, respectively indicated small effects.

Finally, Hypothesis 5b theorized that females would perceive more behaviors related to personal/counseling, friendship/social, business/financial and authorship interactions as boundary crossings than males. This hypothesis was only supported for friendship/social interactions with an effect size \( d \) of 0.37, indicating a small effect. No significant differences were found for personal counseling (\( d = 0.28 \)), business/financial (\( d = 0.37 \)) or authorship (\( d = 0.13 \)), with small effects for each.

Exploratory Analyses

One area of exploration is with Hypothesis 2 and 2a. Hypothesis 2 stated that faculty members would endorse greater sensitivity to rewards. This hypothesis was not supported in the theorized direction resulting in students reporting greater sensitivity to
rewards in their environment. Hypothesis 2a proposed that students would endorse
greater sensitivity to punishments. This hypothesis was supported. Thus, it appears that
students endorsed both sensitivity to punishments and rewards, which is contrary to the
propositions of the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al., 2003).

To better understand his finding, age differences were examined utilizing
independent samples t-tests, \( p < .025 \). All participants (faculty and students) were initially
divided into two groups: 40 and younger (\( n = 100 \)) and 41 and older (\( n = 34 \)). A similar
pattern was identified, with younger individuals (\( M = 48.36, SD = 10.24 \)) endorsing
greater sensitivity to rewards than older individuals (\( M = 40.93, SD = 6.92 \)), \( t(84.8) = 4.74, p < .001, d = 0.85 \). Younger individuals (\( M = 55.93, SD = 14.22 \)) also endorsed
greater sensitivity to punishments than older individuals (\( M = 48.16, SD = 12.26 \)), \( t(132) = 2.85, p = .005, d = 0.59 \). In understanding that the previous analyses were conducted
with unequal sample sizes, participants were then divided by 35 and younger (\( n = 78 \)) and
36 and older (\( n = 54 \)). Interestingly, similar results were found for sensitivity to rewards
with younger individuals (\( M = 48.61, SD = 10.57 \)) endorsing greater sensitivity to
rewards than older individuals (\( M = 43.48, SD = 8.49 \)) \( t(130) = 2.96, p = .004, d = .54 \).
However, there were no longer group differences with regard to sensitivity to
punishments, \( t(130) = .95, p = .343, d = .17 \).

Within-group differences were then examined to explore the aforementioned
findings. No age differences were revealed for doctoral students. Faculty members were
initially divided with the age 40 cutoff for younger (\( n = 28 \)) and older (\( n = 31 \))
individuals. A similar pattern emerged with younger faculty (\( M = 47.95, SD = 8.21 \))
endorsing greater sensitivity to rewards than older faculty ($M = 40.57$, $SD = 6.91$), $t (57) = 3.75$, $p < .001$, $d = .97$. Younger faculty members ($M = 55.98$, $SD = 12.65$) also endorsed greater sensitivity to punishments than older faculty ($M = 48.11$, $SD = 11.91$), $t (57) = 2.46$, $p = .017$, $d = .64$. Despite the unequal sample sizes, faculty members were then divided by the age 35 cutoff with younger faculty ($n = 9$) and older faculty ($n = 50$). Results approached statistical significance between younger faculty ($M = 49.71$, $SD = 5.84$) and older faculty ($M = 43.06$, $SD = 8.38$) with sensitivity to rewards, $t (57) = 2.28$, $p = .027$, $d = .92$. However, there were no differences on sensitivity to punishments, $t (57) = .317$, $p = .753$, $d = .13$.

One possible explanation for these results could be faculty tenure. To assess this, faculty members were divided into two groups: those who have been teaching in a doctoral program for 5 years or less ($n = 15$) and those who have been teaching for 6 years or more ($n = 46$). Although it would have been better to split faculty with a cutoff of 7 years or less considering this is when most reach tenure, the demographic data were not collected in a way to capture this. Exploratory analyses utilizing independent samples $t$-tests ($p < .025$) revealed that early career faculty members ($M = 50.16$, $SD = 8.58$) endorsed greater sensitivity to rewards than later career faculty ($M = 42.3$, $SD = 7.06$), $t (59) = 3.55$, $p = .001$, $d = 1.00$. There were also significant differences between early career faculty ($M = 59.1$, $SD = 12.78$) and later career faculty ($M = 49.29$, $SD = 12.38$) with sensitivity to punishments, $t (59) = 2.64$, $p = 0.01$, $d = 0.78$. In other words, early career faculty members endorsed greater sensitivity to punishments than later career faculty as well as greater sensitivity to rewards. Therefore, it seems that factors other than power, such as age and career attainment, may be influencing results on the SPSRQ.
Behavioral Responses to Vignettes

In the primary analyses, a total score was derived for each vignette across all four types of vignettes: personal/counseling, friendship/social, business/financial, and co-authorship. However, when taken on face value, the behavioral items differed substantially in content. For example in the mentor-protégé vignette that assessed friendship/social behaviors, one of the behaviors that participants rated was the student and professor driving to a professional conference together whereas another behavior rated by participants was the student and professor attending a rock concert together. This is just one example of the degree to which these behaviors differed, thus making it important to explore perceptions of each behavior.

In order to further explore the data for differences between faculty and students, each behavior was assessed individually. Thus, independent samples $t$-tests with a Bonferroni corrected $p < .003$ were conducted to analyze statistical differences between faculty members and students specific to each of the 16 behavioral responses regarding degree of appropriateness, comfort level, and perceptions of boundary crossings.

Personal/counseling behaviors. Of the four personal/counseling type behaviors rated on degree of appropriateness, only one resulted in statistically significant differences ($p < .003$) between faculty and students regarding the supervisor-supervisee roles. Results of the analysis indicated that faculty members ($M = 3.68, SD = 1.5$) considered supervisors sharing information discussed in the supervision session with the program training director to be more appropriate than students ($M = 2.67, SD = 1.24$), $t(132) = 3.86, p < .001, d = 0.73$. The behaviors that did not result in significant
differences were: the supervisor-supervisee discussing the supervisee’s personal life, $t(132) = -2.04, p = .043, d = 0.34$; the supervisor-supervisee spending the entire session focused on the supervisee’s concern, $t(131) = .184, p = .854, d = 0.03$; and the supervisor referring the supervisee to the university counseling center, $t(132) = 1.37, p = .172, d = 0.24$.

One of the behaviors rated on degree of comfort resulted in statistically significant differences. Faculty members ($M = 3.87, SD = 1.49$) were more comfortable than students ($M = 2.42, SD = 1.26$) in sharing the details of the supervisory session with the training director, $t(132) = 6.09, p < .001, d = 1.05$. The following behaviors did not result in significant differences: discussing the supervisee’s personal life ($t(132) = .392, p = .695, d = 0.06$), the entire session focusing on the supervisee’s concern ($t(130) = -1.62, p = .109, d = 0.28$), and the supervisee being referred to the university counseling center ($t(128) = 2.114, p = .36, d = 0.39$).

Two of the behaviors assessing perceptions of boundary crossings were statistically significant. Faculty members ($M = 3.54, SD = 1.82$) considered discussing the supervisee’s personal life in session to be a boundary crossing more than students ($M = 2.54, SD = 1.28$), $t(131) = 3.6, p < .001, d = 0.64$). Conversely, students ($M = 4.19, SD = 1.38$) perceived the supervisor sharing details of the supervisory session with the program training director as a boundary crossing as compared to faculty ($M = 3, SD = 1.43$), $t(129) = -4.85, p < .001, d = 0.85$). No group differences existed between faculty and students regarding the entire session being spent on the supervisee’s concern,
Friendship/social behaviors. The four behavioral responses to the mentor-protégé vignette which assessed friendship/social interactions were: The mentor and protégé drive to a concert together, attend a rock concert together, talk on the telephone usually about school related issues, and the mentor invites the protégé and his/her cohort over for dinner. For faculty members and students, no statistically significant differences (p < .003) were found across degree of appropriateness, comfort level and perceptions that these behaviors were considered boundary crossings.

Business/financial behaviors. In the advisor-advisee vignette, participants rated the following four behaviors on degree of appropriateness, comfort level and perception of a boundary crossing: the advisor paying the advisee from her/his own salary, the advisor hires the advisee to work in his/her private practice, the advisor hires the advisee as a babysitter and the advisor recommends the advisee for a job at a local agency. Two of the behaviors that assessed comfort level with business/financial interactions resulted in statistically significant (p < .003) differences. Students (M = 3.25, SD = 1.45) rated feeling more comfortable with the advisee being hired in the advisor’s private practice than did faculty members, (M = 2.41, SD = 1.49), t (131) = -3.29, p = .001, d = 0.57. In addition, students (M = 2.17, SD = 1.16) also reported a greater level of comfort with the advisee being hired as the advisor’s babysitter when compared with faculty members (M = 1.53, SD = .84), t (129) = -3.55, p = .001, d = 0.63. All other comparisons were not statistically significant.
Authorship behaviors. Behaviors associated with claiming primary authorship on a research project were rated on degree of appropriateness, comfort level and perception of a boundary crossing by faculty and students. No statistical differences (p < .003) were found with regards to degree of appropriateness. The student finishing the manuscript, submitting it on his/her own and claiming first authorship was considered more comfortable (t (130) = 3.49, p = .001, d = 0.61) by faculty members (M = 3.69, SD = 1.9) than students (M = 2.59, SD = 1.71). This behavior was perceived as a boundary crossing by students (M = 3.9, SD = 1.77) more so than faculty members (M = 2.89, SD = 1.62), t (131) = -3.42, p = .001. d = 0.60. Another behavior also perceived by students (M = 3, SD = 1.38) to be a boundary crossing more than faculty members (M = 2.19, SD = 1.28) was the professor finishing the manuscript, submitting it for publication, and listing the student as the second author, t (133) = -3.49, p = .001, d = 0.61.

Definition of Boundary Crossing

Participants were asked to provide a definition of a boundary crossing as it relates to the faculty-student relationship. A total of 126 participants completed this item including 34 female faculty members, 20 male faculty members, 63 female doctoral students and 9 male doctoral students. Only one participant (female doctoral student) defined a boundary crossing in line with the definition by Gutheil and Gabbard (1998). She provided the following definition, “Movement from professional to non-professional roles between or among individuals that does not impose harm to either the individuals or the profession[al] involved.” The rest of the responses adopted a risk management approach suggesting that boundary crossings should be avoided to reduce risk or harm.
Definitions were organized based on content and the following four themes were identified: Extending beyond roles or rules of the professional relationship; Risk of causing harm or defined as inappropriate; Discussion of power differential; and Resulting in a personal or multiple relationship. Examples of definitions of a boundary crossing extending beyond the roles or rules of the professional relationship include, “Any action that may go outside of the professional boundary that should exist between a faculty member and student” and “A boundary crossing would be going beyond the professional/academic relationship to get a person’s needs met.” Faculty members and students were equally likely to define boundary crossings as an act that extends beyond the roles of the professional relationship (19.4%).

Faculty members (9.3%) were more likely to identify potential harm caused by crossing a boundary whereas students were more likely to identify the behavior as inappropriate (5.4%). An example of harm includes, “Stepping outside of the ascribed professional roles in such a manner that it could lead to potential harm or exploitation.” In terms of inappropriateness, one student defined a boundary crossing as, “Behavior that a reasonable student/faculty member would deem inappropriate for the faculty/student relationship.” Faculty members (4.6%) were also more likely than students (1.5%) to address the impact of the power differential, including statements such as, “Because faculty have more power than students and are in an evaluative relationship with students, any interaction that fails to respect that or influences [the] student to do something because of that, I would see as a boundary crossing.”
Students (12.4%) were more likely than faculty (4.6%) to provide a definition relating to boundary crossings leading to a multiple relationship or moving from the professional relationship into a personal one. An example of this type of statement is, “A boundary crossing would be an unexpected relationship springing from a professional relationship, and can be desired or undesired by both parties.”

Beyond the four main themes identified through the content analysis, some other points of interest arose. Specifically, students often identified a sense of discomfort that would result from a boundary crossing. For example, “A boundary crossing from a faculty member is when they use their power in a way that makes students uncomfortable.” Students were also three times more likely to provide examples of boundary crossings within their definitions. This included statements such as, faculty members inviting themselves to an all-student party, faculty members disclosing too much, a student feeling unable to say no to a faculty member’s social invitation, and having a key to a faculty member’s house. This may suggest that students have a heightened awareness of the emotional impact of a boundary crossing (i.e., level of comfort) as well as personal experience.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Understanding nonsexual boundary crossings has been a topic of interest for many years with regard to therapist-client relationships (Gutheil & Gabbard, 1993; Kroll, 2001; Lazarus & Zur, 2002; Smith & Fitzpatrick, 1995), however much less is known about how this concept translates to academic relationships. The purpose of this study was to explore faculty and student perceptions of nonsexual boundary crossings. In addition, this study sought to combine literature from counseling psychology and social psychology to understand the role of power within faculty-student relationships utilizing the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al., 2003). Specifically, Keltner et al. (2003) proposed that the degree of power an individual has could affect that person’s awareness of how he/she attends to the environment and engages with others. The cognitive processes related to power were assessed in this study in the context of nonsexual boundary crossings. In addition, this study sought to understand how faculty and students perceive various behaviors related to academic relationships and if they are defining nonsexual boundary crossings similarly.

A total of 135 individuals from counseling psychology doctoral programs across the US participated in this study. Of those, 39 identified as a female faculty member, 23 identified as a male faculty member, 64 identified as a female doctoral student, and nine
identified as male doctoral students. Participants completed an online survey that included a demographic form, a revised version of the Sensitivity to Punishments and Sensitivity to Rewards Questionnaire (SPSRQ: O’Connor, Colder & Hawk, 2004), and the Sense of Power scale (Anderson, John & Keltner, 2005). Participants also answered an open-ended question that assessed their definition of a boundary crossing. In addition, each participant read four vignettes that corresponded to supervisor/supervisee, mentor/protégé, advisor/advisee, and co-authorship roles and subsequently rated various behaviors on degree of appropriateness, comfort and extent to which he/she perceived the behavior as a boundary crossing.

The Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner, et al., 2003), which assessed the effect of power on cognitive processes, was minimally supported in this study. Although faculty members endorsed an elevated sense of power, several of the propositions were not supported in the hypothesized direction. The present data revealed that faculty members and students differ in their perceptions of nonsexual boundary crossings, especially with regard to personal/counseling, business/financial, and authorship behaviors. Finally, qualitative assessment of the definition of boundary crossings in academic relationships demonstrated that the majority of faculty members and students have adopted a risk management approach.

Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power

The data from this study indicated that faculty members endorsed an elevated sense of power in their academic relationships compared to students. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported. The effect size of $d = 0.85$ suggests that there is a large difference in the
experience of power for faculty and students. This finding makes considerable sense given the nature of the faculty-student relationship. Students are inherently placed in a reduced power position considering they are entering doctoral programs with the goal to learn from faculty who have more knowledge, skills, and training (Barnett, 2008).

Hypothesis 2 predicted that faculty members would endorse greater sensitivity to rewards in their environment. Although the results of an independent samples t-test were significant, the findings were not in the hypothesized direction. In other words, students reported greater sensitivity to rewards in their environment than faculty. The items of the SPSRQ that assess reward sensitivity included concepts such as monetary gain, competitiveness, winning, and gaining attention. Support was found for Hypothesis 2a, which predicted that students would endorse greater sensitivity to punishments. Items from the SPSRQ that assessed sensitivity to punishments were related to inhibition, fear, discouragement, and embarrassment. Taken together, these results indicate that students endorsed greater sensitivity to both rewards and punishments compared with faculty members. These contradictory findings shed light on one confusing aspect of doctoral student life. A similar pattern was revealed when examining age differences (cutoff age 40) across all participants and when examining differences among early versus later career faculty members.

One possible explanation for this finding could be that students and early career faculty (who tend to be younger) have yet to achieve their level of desired success. Therefore, they may be more focused on extrinsic rewards in their environment, such as money, praise, and approval. Later career faculty members (who tend to be older), on the
other hand, may have stability within their careers and financial status, thus leading them to attend to more intrinsic rewards. They may be less likely to look outwardly for recognition or be as concerned with how others view them. Later career faculty are more likely to be tenured as well, which may be a distinguishing factor between these two groups. Regarding age differences, one study (Lardi et al., 2008) utilizing the SPSRQ found that the Sensitivity to Rewards scale was negatively correlated with age.

These findings suggest that power differences may not be the best explanation for results on the SPSRQ with this sample. Early career faculty and psychology doctoral students appear more similar than different regarding sensitivity to rewards and punishments. In fact, a study by Olsen (1993) found that faculty in the first and third year of their appointment endorsed overall job dissatisfaction, especially with salary, as they were becoming socialized into academia. Although there was no comparison with tenured faculty in the Olsen study, it may be that faculty members early in their careers have a dialectic experience with rewards and punishments in their environment. In other words, the simultaneous experience of desiring more rewards in one’s environment while being faced with the struggle to obtain promotion may create a dissonant experience for early career faculty. A similar case could be made for doctoral students who are actively seeking autonomy while simultaneously faced with organizational barriers. It would be useful in future research to ask faculty members specifically as to whether or not they have achieved tenure, which would likely help explain some of these results.

Hypothesis 3 proposed that faculty members would engage in more automatic thought processes when completing the survey vignettes compared to students. This
hypothesis was not supported in the predicted direction. Students spent less time completing the vignette portion of the survey. Given the small effect size found (d = 0.29), it is likely that this finding holds relatively little meaning. However, there are many possible reasons for this finding, including a flaw in the research design. This hypothesis was assessed by calculating the time each participant spent completing the vignettes. They completed the survey in an uncontrolled environment, which meant they could leave the survey window open and come back to it later. This resulted in some extreme values and despite the deletion of outliers, the uncontrolled nature of collecting these data could have significantly affected the results.

Another possible explanation is that faculty may have a heightened awareness or sensitivity to boundary issues given the degree of responsibility associated with their position. It can be assumed that psychologists are well versed in understanding the implications of boundary crossings. It may be that faculty members took their time in assessing the many variables associated with nonsexual boundary crossings, which could be one possible explanation for this finding. Faculty members likely have many prior examples of student-related issues, which may also account for their time spent on the vignettes. Although the majority of the social psychology literature on power and attention supports high-powered individuals utilizing more stereotyping and cognitive shortcuts, Overbeck and Park (2001) found the opposite effect. High-powered individuals in their study were better able to remember information and differentiate their subordinates especially when they are completing a single task associated with organizational decisions (Overbeck & Park, 2001). In addition, research has suggested that when motivated and invested, high-powered individuals have higher degrees of
attention (Vescio, Snyder & Butz, 2003). Therefore, for the faculty members in this sample, the power they possess may have actually increased their awareness of boundary crossings.

Overall, there was little support for the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (AITP; Keltner et al., 2003) with regard to faculty and student relationships. One reason may be that most of the previous literature was conducted with experimental design in which power was primed (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006; Gruenfeld et al., 2008; Magee et al., 2007), therefore producing results that may not generalize to real-world situations. The samples utilized by the majority of AITP studies included undergraduate participants, which may not be as representative of other groups. Moreover, the concepts of AITP may not be as generalizable to the dynamic nature of academic relationships.

Another reason for the lack of support for the AITP may be how Keltner et al. (2003) defined power as control over resources. This definition is inline with the mainstream conceptualization of power in organizational behavior, however may not fit for academic relationships. The types of resources available in academic versus organizations differ significantly. For example, in an occupational setting employees are able to be promoted, receive raises, and be offered bonuses or commission for good work. These types of resources are not a part of the faculty-student relationship. Academic programs also differ from organizational structures by the mere fact that within most organizations there are several employees who answer to one supervisor. The employee’s direct supervisor likely has significant control over resources. Students have a very different experience considering they have several faculty members with whom
they interact. Therefore, even though one faculty member may not provide access to a resource the student can seek out another faculty member. The student, in comparison to the employee, has greater autonomy in how his/her needs are met.

Another possibility may be that faculty members and students are more aware of these issues because of their own training and prior exposure to these concepts. Previous AITP research has been conducted mostly within managerial relationships. The field of business espouses a different philosophy and goals than counseling psychology. Counseling psychology programs pride themselves on understanding the multicultural aspects of an individual, thus enhancing the attention one pays to the individual needs and perspectives of others. In a way, a lack of support for AITP may indicate that counseling psychology faculty and students are able to transcend the negative effects of power endorsed elsewhere (Anderson & Galinsky, 2006; Fiske, 1993; Gruenfeld et al., 2008; Kipnis, 1972; Magee et al., 2007) and are interacting differently than other types of dominant/subordinate relationships. Despite the limited support of the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al., 2003), the information gathered from the vignettes helps to shed light on how faculty and students perceive nonsexual boundary crossings.

Vignettes

Hypotheses 4, 4a, and 4b relate to the degree of appropriateness, comfort and perception of behaviors as boundary crossings. Discussion of the vignette portion of the study will be presented by vignette topic (personal/counseling, friendship/social,
business/financial, and co-authorship) rather than by hypotheses for ease of interpretation. However, each hypothesis will be clearly indicated throughout the discussion.

With regard to personal/counseling interactions, no support was found on ratings of appropriateness (Hypothesis 4). However, significant differences were found regarding degree of comfort and perception of behaviors as a boundary crossing. Faculty members endorsed a mild degree of comfort with engaging in personal/counseling behaviors compared to students whose responses fell in the mildly uncomfortable range. Thus, support was found for Hypothesis 4a. The effect size of $d = 0.50$ suggests that faculty and students differ on level of comfort to a moderate degree. The reason for this could be that faculty are generally more comfortable with this type of behavior and are used to reporting students' progress to training directors and other members of the faculty. Exploratory analyses revealed that faculty members and students differed significantly with the supervisor sharing details of the supervisory session with the training director. Faculty responses fell in the mildly uncomfortable range, whereas student responses were in the moderately uncomfortable range. Qualitative data revealed that both faculty and students were concerned with whether the student (in the vignette) had given permission to share details of the supervision sessions with the training director.

Hypothesis 4b predicted that students would be more likely to perceive behaviors related to personal/counseling interactions as boundary crossings. This hypothesis was supported. Student responses fell in the mildly disagree range, whereas faculty responses fell in the moderately disagree range. Overall, it appears that faculty and students do not
perceive this behavior as a boundary crossing, but students may be more sensitive to issues of confidentiality than faculty. The effect size of $d = 0.49$ suggests that faculty and students differ in their perceptions to a moderate degree. Exploratory analyses revealed that faculty members mildly disagreed that discussing the supervisee’s personal life in session was a boundary crossing, whereas students moderately disagreed with this behavior. Qualitative responses by students were oriented more toward the qualities of the supervisory relationship (personality and trust) and faculty responses were focused on how the supervisee’s personal issues would affect her/his academic or clinical work.

Students were more likely to consider the supervisor sharing details of the supervisory session with the training director as a boundary crossing. Faculty members mildly disagreed that this behavior was a boundary crossing. Student responses fell in the mildly agree range. Qualitative data revealed that students questioned whether the information being shared with the supervisor was done as a form of gossip or intended to address the supervisee’s needs. Faculty members noted assessing impairment in supervisees as an important responsibility associated with their role. This demonstrates the need for faculty to balance meeting the student’s needs and satisfying professional responsibilities.

These findings regarding confidentiality have been supported elsewhere (Bowman et al., 1995) and demonstrate the importance of discussing expectations within supervisory relationships. Students may expect a degree of confidentiality that does not exist. Even though the faculty are providing supervision, this relationship remains
embedded in the academic program, which includes evaluation of students. Conversations about confidentiality and the rules of the supervisory relationship may need to be more explicit and be part of an iterative process.

No significant differences were found regarding friendship/social interactions in the areas of appropriateness (Hypothesis 4), comfort (Hypothesis 4a), and perception of boundary crossings (Hypothesis 4b). Thus, it appears that faculty and students are on the same page regarding social interactions. Overall, they seemed to view these friendship/social behaviors as mildly appropriate, felt mildly uncomfortable engaging in these behaviors, and mildly disagreed that the behaviors were boundary crossings. This finding is contrary to what past research has found (Bowman et al., 1995; Holmes et al., 1999; Owen & Zwahr-Castro, 2007), especially because friendship types of interactions are incorporated into the early stages of the “slippery slope” phenomenon (Guthiel & Gabbard, 1998). One reason for this finding may be that this is the first study to assess doctoral-level academic relationships. There may be more of a distinction between faculty and students in undergraduate and master’s degree programs. Certainly, doctoral-level faculty and students tend to spend more time together due to program length and intensity (Barnett, 2008). There may also be something quite valuable to having aspects of the faculty-student relationship reach beyond the classroom. In a study assessing mentor relationships, faculty members indicated that the bond developed with students as well as staying in touch with students as benefits to the mentor-protégé relationship (Campbell & Campbell, 2000).
With regard to business/financial interactions, significant differences existed for
degree of appropriateness (Hypothesis 4) and comfort (Hypothesis 4a), however both of
these findings were not in the hypothesized direction. The effect size of $d = 0.30$ suggests
a small difference between faculty and students for degree of appropriateness whereas the
effect size of $d = 0.56$ suggests a moderate difference for degree of comfort. No support
was indicated for perception of business/financial behaviors as boundary crossings
(Hypothesis 4b). Both student and faculty responses fell within the mildly inappropriate
range with regard to business/financial behaviors. The effect size ($d = 0.30$) highlights the
small magnitude of this difference, with student responses being only slightly higher than
faculty. A moderate difference ($d = 0.56$) existed for faculty and students with
perceptions of business/financial behaviors as boundary crossings. Student responses
were in the mildly uncomfortable range whereas faculty responses were in the moderately
uncomfortable range.

When taking previous findings of students endorsing a greater sensitivity to
rewards into consideration, students may be more willing to engage in business/financial
interactions to fulfill part of that reward-oriented behavior. Additionally, because of
students’ limited financial resources, they may be more willing to rely on faculty
members for financial support outside of their academic responsibilities. Exploratory
analyses revealed that students were more comfortable being hired in an advisor’s private
practice with students rating this behavior as mildly uncomfortable and faculty rating it as
moderately uncomfortable. Relatedly, students rated being hired as the advisor’s
babysitter as moderately uncomfortable, however faculty rated this as unquestioningly
uncomfortable. Interestingly, qualitative responses indicated that although some believed
hiring the student as a babysitter was a boundary violation, it was primarily due to the
details in the vignette (the advisor feeling responsible to the student for monetary
compensation) than the act of hiring the student.

Regarding co-authorship interactions, support was found for each hypothesis
relating to appropriateness (Hypothesis 4), comfort (Hypothesis 4a), and perception of a
boundary crossing (Hypothesis 4b). Both faculty members and students responses on
appropriateness fell within the mildly inappropriate range, however faculty members
considered the behaviors as slightly more appropriate. Relatedly, faculty members were
slightly more likely to report a greater degree of comfort with co-authorship behaviors,
however both student and faculty responses fell in the mildly uncomfortable range.
Finally, students were more likely to perceive authorship behaviors as a boundary
crossing with their responses falling in the mildly disagree range and faculty responses
falling in the moderately disagree range. Each of these findings resulted in small effect
sizes.

Exploratory analyses revealed that faculty members were more comfortable than
students with the student finishing the manuscript on his/her own and claiming first
authorship. Faculty may feel more comfortable because they have other projects to rely
on for authorship and therefore could consider this an aspect of the student’s
development (Oberlander & Spencer, 2006). The effect size of $d = 0.61$ suggests a
medium effect. However, students perceived this behavior as boundary crossing more so
than faculty. The effect size for this behavior ($d = 0.59$) also suggests a medium effect.
This finding is somewhat confusing considering the student would be getting credit for
his/her work. It may be that the students in this sample perceived this behavior as a boundary crossing against the faculty member. In other words, the student would be the one crossing the boundary. This finding may relate to power within the relationship with students being hesitant to act without permission. Conversely, students considered the professor finishing the manuscript, submitting it for publication, and listing the student as the secondary author to be a boundary crossing. Again, a medium effect ($d = 0.61$) was found for this interaction. Thus, it appears that some mixed messages surround issues related to co-authorship. Perhaps when it comes to publications and research, open dialogue about authorship and responsibilities needs to be happening before projects get underway (Arthur et al., 2004; Oberlander & Spencer).

Qualitative data revealed just that; faculty members and students were mainly concerned with whether or not the characters in the vignette had discussed authorship order at the onset of the project. Students more often stated that the professor must grant permission before the student could submit the publication. This may help explain why students perceived the student finishing the manuscript and claiming first author as a boundary crossing. Perhaps they considered the student to be crossing the boundary because the professor’s permission had not been obtained. Faculty members described co-authorship behaviors as ethical concerns, but were less likely to consider them a type of boundary crossing. One faculty member suggested a contract be drafted as a way of avoiding later conflicts. Overall, the importance of maintaining an open dialogue for authorship issues is evident.
Sex Differences

Hypotheses 5 – 5b predicted that men and women would significantly differ on their ratings of appropriateness, degree of comfort, and perceptions of behaviors as boundary crossings for each vignette. Again, for interpretation purposes the following section will be organized by vignette type: personal/counseling, friendship/social, business/financial, and co-authorship.

For the personal/counseling vignette, sex differences were revealed only in degree of appropriateness (Hypothesis 5). Men were slightly more likely than women to rate these types of behaviors as appropriate, but both of their responses fell in the mildly appropriate range. However, the effect size of $d = 0.53$ suggests a moderate degree of difference for men and women. Support was not found for Hypotheses 5a (degree of comfort) or 5b (perception of boundary crossing). Overall, it appears that men and women rated behaviors related to personal/counseling interactions in the mildly comfortable range and moderately disagreed that personal/counseling behaviors are considered boundary crossings.

With regard to the friendship/social vignette, support was found for Hypothesis 5b only, which proposed that women would be more likely than men to perceive these types of behaviors as boundary crossings. Women mildly disagreed that friendship/social behaviors were boundary crossings, whereas men moderately disagreed however this difference was considered small ($d = 0.37$). This finding is line with previous research, which shows that women tended to rate friendship behaviors as more unethical than men (Bowman et al. 1995; Owen-Zwahr-Castro, 2007). There were no differences between
men and women with regard to degree of appropriateness (Hypothesis 5) or comfort (Hypothesis 5a). More specifically, responses from men and women of friendship/social behaviors were rated in the mildly appropriate range, yet participants were mildly uncomfortable engaging in these behaviors. This finding is interesting and may highlight the gray area of nonsexual boundary crossings by participants endorsing a behavior as relatively appropriate, yet are hesitant to engage in the behavior. In this vignette example, it could be that appropriateness was interpreted from a third person standpoint whereas comfort was interpreted from a subjective standpoint. In other words, participants may not stop someone else from engaging in the behavior, but they would not want to engage in it themselves. This may speak to the importance of individual interpretations of behaviors and the subjectivity that goes into understanding how friendship/social behaviors are perceived.

Significant differences were found for the business/financial vignette related to degree of comfort, however findings were not in the predicted direction. Instead, women rated feeling more comfortable in business/financial behaviors than did men. Women’s responses fell in the mildly uncomfortable range whereas men’s responses were in the moderately uncomfortable range, although the magnitude of this difference was small ($d = 0.22$). This finding is in opposition to previous research (Bowman et al., 1995), which indicated that men were more likely to rate monetary exchanges as more ethical. One reason for this difference may be that the definition of ethical behavior is quite disparate from the construct of comfort. Another explanation could be that men may be more likely to recognize problems that could arise from these types of interactions. A meta-analysis examining ethical perceptions of business practices found that men were more wary of
monetary exchanges, such as gifts or bribes (Franke, Crown & Spake, 1997). There was no support for Hypotheses 5 and 5b. Overall, men and women rated business/financial behaviors in the mildly inappropriate range and mildly disagreed that these behaviors were boundary crossings.

Degree of comfort was also an important factor in understanding sex differences in the co-authorship vignette. As hypothesized, men were more likely than women to endorse a greater sense of comfort with interactions of claiming primary authorship. This would make sense given previous research that has found men to be more assertive and more likely to negotiate than women (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010; Carli, 1999). This seems to fall in line with gender stereotypes. No support was found with regard to appropriateness (Hypothesis 5) or perception of boundary crossings (Hypothesis 5b). Essentially, men and women rated authorship behaviors described as mildly inappropriate and mildly disagreed that they were boundary crossings.

Similar to previous research on nonsexual boundary crossings (Bowman et al., 1995; Holmes et al., 1999; Owen & Zwahr-Castro, 2007) analysis of sex differences produced mixed results. Information gathered on sexual boundary crossings is much more clear and consistently points to the likelihood of women endorsing more inappropriate or unethical perceptions (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Lamb & Catanzaro, 1998). In the current study, there were more similarities between men and women than differences, contrary to what was hypothesized. However, it is important to note that the unequal samples sizes between women (n = 103) and men (n = 32) likely limited the statistical power of the t-tests. Analyses of observed power indicated low power, which
likely contributed to the relatively few statistically significant differences found between the groups. Therefore, the following interpretations are made with caution given the issues related to low power.

In consideration of the findings in this study and mixed results from other studies of nonsexual boundary crossings in academia (Bowman et al., 1995; Holmes et al., 1999; Owen & Zwahr-Castro, 2007), one explanation may be related to a divergence from the mainstream views that men and women are dissimilar. In fact, Diekman and Eagly (2000) contended that as societal structures evolve (e.g., more women in the workforce), so do the related stereotypes and perspectives. Therefore, differences are less about biological sex. Instead, perceptions can change over time (Franke, Crown, & Spake, 1997) and are associated with more with the roles that an individual occupies (Diekman & Eagly, 2000). Interestingly, there were no significant differences in sense of power between the men and women in this study. Although low statistical power may be the culprit, another possibility could be related to social-role theory of sex differences (Eagly, 1995), which proposes that men and women will behave similarly when adopting equalized power roles. This could be occurring for doctoral-level faculty and students, who compared with the general population, may occupy elevated power positions. Future researchers may want to examine the role of power in nonsexual boundary crossings with larger sample sizes of men and women to better understand these findings.

**Definition of Boundary Crossing**

Although no specific hypothesis addressed participants’ definitions of a boundary crossing, much can be gained from understanding the pattern of responses. There was a
large disparity between how respondents from this survey defined boundary crossings and Gutheil and Gabbard’s (1998) original definition. Participant definitions were closer to describing boundary violations. It appears that many have adopted the risk management approach, despite recent efforts to steer away from this perspective (Barnett, 2007; Lazurus & Zur, 2002; Speight, 2012). In some ways this can be positive. A risk management approach has the potential to heighten the awareness level of boundary violations. As a result, people may become more sensitive to these types of issues, which may help to partially explain some of the findings in the current study.

On the other hand, when the concepts of boundary violations have seeped into the definition of boundary crossings, the beneficial aspects of engaging in boundary crossings may be lost. Not to say that beneficial boundary crossings are not occurring, but are we calling them something different? Or have we just adopted “good” boundary crossings as standard practice? Kroll (2001) suggested that the term boundary crossing is too broad and encompasses too many human interactions. Perhaps a redefinition is in order.

Implications

The following section addresses implications that can be derived from this study. Specifically, the areas of the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power, nonsexual boundary crossings, and doctoral education for both faculty members and students are discussed.
Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power

Overall, the propositions of the AITP were not well supported in the current study. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, this could be unique the sample, counseling psychology as a discipline, or to faculty-student relationships in general. It also suggests that the AITP is not adequately accounting for the ever-changing processes of social relationships. The AITP does not seem to capture the nuances of power in established relationships. Keltner et al. (2003) briefly acknowledge that individual variables (personality traits and physical characteristics), dyadic variables (interest in relationship and relative commitment), within-group variables (authority and status), and between-group variables (ethnicity, gender, class, ideology, and numerical majority/minority) determine an individual’s degree of interpersonal power. The authors state that they are unsure how these variables combine, vary across different contexts, and what happens when factors contradict one another.

This study highlights the importance of understanding the unique characteristics each individual brings to a power relationship. With regard to boundary crossings, each person has different boundaries and expectations of a relationship. Qualitative responses by faculty and students often mentioned that their behavior would depend on the personality characteristics of the individual, previous interactions they had, motivations, and relationship factors, such as trust. The propositions of Keltner et al.’s theory are lacking in assessment of these factors. Future research may want to focus more on individual determinants of power especially when examining established relationships. Future research may also want to examine other theories of power such as, social-
dominance theory or Hamilton and Biggart’s (1985) definition of power to determine how they relate to perceptions of nonsexual boundary crossings. Overall, the AITP is a newer theory and this study draws attention to aspects of the theory that may need additional examination.

Nonsexual Boundary Crossings

Through combined assessment of qualitative and quantitative data, this study highlights the complexity of boundary issues. One implication of the current study relates to how boundary crossings are being defined. The majority of participants defined a boundary crossing from a risk management approach indicating that crossing boundaries can be harmful, inappropriate, uncomfortable, or change the professional relationship into something more personal. However, when this definition is compared to participant ratings of specific behaviors, they rated very few behaviors as inappropriate, uncomfortable, or as boundary crossings. Faculty members (but not students) considered only one behavior (hiring the student as his/her babysitter) “unquestionably inappropriate.” Again, only faculty members indicated that paying a student from her/his own salary, hiring the student as a babysitter, and driving with a student to a rock concert made them “unquestioningly uncomfortable.” Further, no behavior was “unquestionably” perceived as a boundary crossing by faculty or students.

One explanation certainly could be that the behaviors associated with the vignettes were not relevant to students and faculty in counseling psychology doctoral programs. Or this could mean that despite providing a risk management definition for boundary crossings, many faculty and students are actually living more flexible
boundaries. There may be a difference between what we’re saying about boundary crossings and what we’re actually doing.

In addition, participants would rate a behavior as appropriate, indicate that it made them feel uncomfortable, however did not consider the behavior to be a boundary crossing. Not only does this highlight the complexity of boundary crossings, but it also suggests that there may be a difference between the intellectual and emotional interpretations of boundary crossings. In other words, when asked about appropriateness or perception of a boundary crossing, it can be thought of from a third-person standpoint. So, in some respects the person is able to take himself/herself out of the equation. However, when asked about degree of comfort, it requires the individual to utilize her or his own experience. In fact, the current study found the most significant group differences were on ratings of comfort. Future research efforts may want to focus on understanding the emotional aspects of boundary crossings.

One thing that can be learned from this study is to be careful to not qualify boundary crossings as good or bad, harmful, appropriate or inappropriate. This study revealed very few differences associated with degree of appropriateness. There is so much gray area whenever these concepts are being studied quantitatively, which makes it difficult to capture contextual and interpersonal aspects. Waldinger (1994) stated that codifying all boundary crossings is impossible and we need to look at the intrapsychic meanings of those involved. This would be consistent with many participants’ qualitative responses that often adopted an “it depends” viewpoint. Many respondents requested
more details from the vignettes. Perhaps future studies assessing nonsexual boundary crossings should take a qualitative approach to better understand individual and contextual factors.

Overall, understanding boundary crossings can be confusing because each individual has different boundaries that originate from his/her unique life experiences. Thus, it makes it increasingly difficult to understand the impact of crossing a boundary ahead of time. To make matters even more complicated, the boundaries of the faculty-student professional relationship are not clearly defined. As it stands, the definition of a boundary crossing may be too broad. If we are not even sure of the boundaries, how do we know if we’ve crossed them? It will be beneficial for future research to further develop the definition of a boundary crossing as well as identify boundaries in the faculty-student relationship.

Implications for Doctoral Education

Although this study focused solely on counseling psychology faculty and students, there may be implications for doctoral education as a whole. It seems that faculty and students are interested in a social aspect of the relationship and as well as the professional components. Participant responses on friendship/social interactions indicated that they were open to having more flexible boundaries. This is consistent with previous research, which has highlighted the importance of out-of-classroom contact (Nadler & Nadler, 2000; Rose, 2005). Faculty and students should consider these factors and how they may contribute to the atmosphere of doctoral education.
Certainly, cultural considerations play a role in how boundary crossings are perceived. More recently, literature on boundary crossings has pushed for the inclusion of culture in assessment of boundary crossings (Barnett, 2007; Speight, 2012; Vasquez, 2007). Vasquez (2007) proposed that adhering to rigid boundaries could actually result in harm by recreating shaming and oppressive experiences of minority groups. Examples are present in the literature demonstrating how cultural beliefs can be slighted by rigid boundaries (Barnett, 2007; Kertesz, 2002; Moorehead-Slaughter, 2007; Smith & Fitzpatrick, 1995; Speight, 2012; Vasquez, 2007). With regard to faculty-student relationships, one study found that African-American students valued interactions with professors that were “student-centered,” which included spending adequate time attending to the student’s academic, career, and personal issues (Guiffrida, 2005). Thus, students were looking for more from faculty beyond teaching in a classroom. Although, cross-cultural comparisons cannot be determined from the current study considering minority groups were underrepresented, qualitative responses support faculty and students valuing the “real” relationship that exists. That is, a faculty-student relationship that incorporates authenticity, warmth, and basic human interaction (Speight, 2012; Vasquez, 2007).

Significant differences existed between faculty members and students with regard to power in academic relationship, however the nuances of this were not identified by the present theory of power. It will be beneficial for future research to capture what aspects of faculty-student relationship influence power. There may be something unique to the evaluation component of the faculty-student relationship that influences behavior/interactions/power. Qualitative responses of faculty members often cited this
aspect of their role as being part of the decision-making process regarding crossing boundaries. For me, the notion that my ability to complete my degree was in the hands of faculty members was regularly on my mind. It seems that it would be useful for faculty to clearly outline what it means to be “impaired” and to repeatedly acknowledge that students can come to you without risking their position in the program, as this may not be as implicit to students as it is to faculty.

This study has identified the uniqueness of the faculty-student relationship. It seems that this relationship is important to both faculty and students and is something to be valued. Considering faculty and students contribute to the academic relationship, it is essential to highlight the implications this study has for each group.

Faculty. The current study revealed that faculty members are open to participate in discussions of boundary crossings. Although it was somewhat of a struggle to obtain the faculty sample for this study (e.g., needed to send multiple email requests over a period of two months), those who did participate provided useful quantitative as well as qualitative data. Faculty members often left additional comments on the open-ended response items. In addition, several faculty members emailed me personally and commented on the utility of this study and expressed interest in learning the results. Aside from anecdotal information, the faculty responses from this study did not fall in line with the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al., 2003) suggesting that the power they experience may actually enhance the attention given to student-related issues. Faculty members appear to be motivated and invested in providing students with an optimal experience during their doctoral training.
Despite faculty members’ investment in issues related to crossing boundaries, it seems as if navigating boundaries in real-life scenarios may be a bit more challenging. The qualitative responses of faculty varied, which suggests that differentiation exists between individual faculty members on how they would respond to issues of boundary crossings. For example, in the supervisor-supervisee vignette, some faculty members indicated that sharing information with the training director was appropriate because it is considered a faculty member’s responsibility. Others, however, indicated that the student’s permission must first be obtained. Still, other faculty members indicated that sharing details with the training director seemed unethical. Not only is the importance of understanding individual factors that influence decisions about boundary crossings being highlighted again here, but this also suggests that faculty would benefit from consulting with each other on these issues. In addition, it seems that adopting a certain degree of transparency with students would be beneficial for both the faculty members and the student body.

It seems important for faculty members to create environments that promote open dialogue with students. The findings from this study suggest that faculty members and students perceive behaviors differently, especially regarding personal/counseling, business/financial, and co-authorship interactions. It does not seem as if having one conversation at the beginning of the semester will be enough given the constantly changing academic environment and multiple roles of faculty and students. Glass (2003) proposed that boundary crossings must be discussable in order to assess the impact. This would be especially important given the findings of the current study in which many of the group differences were in the area of comfort. Interpreting a person’s level of comfort
is not an easy task as there may be few observable signs. Therefore, it seems useful to engage in conversations about comfort level regularly. The current study suggests that faculty and students are aware of boundary issues, however future research could examine how they are activating dialogue.

Finally, there appear to be vastly different experiences for early versus later career faculty members. Although tenure was not directly assessed, it likely influenced the present results with regard to sensitivity to rewards and punishments. Early career faculty members seem to have a similar experience as doctoral students considering they endorsed greater sensitivity to rewards and punishments in their environment. Future research may want to address these differences and further assess if there is something unique about the tenure process and experiences of power for faculty members.

Students. Previous research has shown that students do not report ethical concerns regarding faculty (Sullivan & Ogloff, 1998; Zakrzewski, 2006). It is unclear as to what aspects influence their reluctance, which would be an important endeavor for future researchers to examine. However, this study highlights faculty members’ willingness to listen and interest in issues related to boundaries. Although the high-powered individual is often expected to initiate such conversations, it does not mean that low-powered person is void of responsibility. Students often addressed intrapsychic aspects that influence how they would behave or respond to the vignette scenarios. Future research is needed to better understand what internal aspects influence a low-powered person’s decision-making.
Strengths and Limitations

The present study exhibited several strengths. This was the first study examining perceptions of nonsexual boundary crossings with doctoral-level faculty members and students. This study also assessed the role of power in relation to nonsexual boundary crossings. It combined concepts from counseling psychology and social psychology literature in hopes to bridge a gap between the fields (Linley, 2006). The present study revealed that, contrary to previous research on high-powered individuals; faculty members are attending to issues of boundary crossings. The faculty members in this study appeared motivated and invested by taking time to thoroughly understand the vignettes and providing thoughtful qualitative responses. As stated previously, it appears that participants from this study were able to transcend Keltner et al.’s (2003) claim that elevated power results in attention to rewards, limited attention paid to others, and an increased likelihood of engaging in inappropriate behavior.

Of course, the results of the present study cannot be generalized to all counseling psychology students and faculty members. However, it could be that the multicultural philosophy espoused by counseling psychology faculty has encouraged its members to attend to the individual needs of students, which is quite divergent from the business arena that supported much of the research on the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner, et al., 2003). In addition, the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power may not have fit given doctoral students have more autonomy and are both groups have more awareness of power issues compared with the general public. The results may have also been construed by personality factors, which Keltner et al. (2003) consider moderators of
power. For example, as a whole, counseling psychologists may be more altruistic with regard to student development or conscientious where these relationships are involved. This could certainly affect their interpersonal awareness.

Other limitations include social desirability, which could have affected the present results. Although the rating scales of the SPSRQ and SOP were modified in an attempt to counteract issues of social desirability, a specific measure was not embedded in the study. Despite anonymity in the research design, participants may have wanted to portray themselves in an ethical light. Future research may want to include a measure of social desirability to better understand the effects on ethical decision-making. In addition, the individuals who chose to complete a study on nonsexual boundary crossings may be different in some way from those who opted to not complete the study.

Despite these limitations, the current study adds to the literature by highlighting the majority of faculty and students defining boundary crossings from a risk management prospective. In addition, the findings from this study suggest that it is time to move beyond identifying specific behaviors that are considered boundary crossings (Kroll, 2011) and instead seek to understand the interpersonal components associated with power relationships. Anxiety related to making a mistake or fear of litigation can lead psychologists to want “right” and “wrong” labels on boundary crossings (Barnett, 2007) and many decision-making models (Barnett, 2008; Burian & Slimp, 2000; Pope & Keith-Spiegel; Younggren & Gottlieb, 2004) exist to help reduce unintended harm to others. I believe that Karl Menninger said it best: “when in doubt, be human.”
Summary

Conversations of boundary crossings have spanned over 10 years of the psychology literature. This study adds to the field by examining counseling psychology doctoral level relationships of faculty and students. Overall, the propositions of the Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power (Keltner et al., 2003) did not adequately capture the power dynamics of the faculty-student relationship. Not only does this demonstrate the uniqueness of the faculty-student relationship, but it also highlights the importance of understanding individual and contextual factors of social interactions. In addition, most faculty members and students are not adopting the current definition of a boundary crossing as proposed by Guthiel and Gabbard (1993, 1998). Instead, a risk management approach was identified as the way of defining a boundary crossing. As noted earlier, how participants defined boundary crossings differed from their quantitative and open-ended responses. This suggests that the way individuals are living boundaries may be different from how they are defining them on paper. Finally, there seems to be a distinction between the intellectual and emotional aspects of boundary crossings. Further research is needed to understand these differences and how they relate to boundary issues.
REFERENCES


APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Thank you in advance for your assistance. Please forward this e-mail to anyone who is a doctoral level graduate student or faculty member in counseling psychology.

My name is Teri Madura. I am a Ph.D. candidate from the Collaborative Program in Counseling Psychology at the University of Akron. I am currently collecting data for my dissertation study, which is supervised by Dr. James Rogers.

The purpose of this study is to understand faculty and student perceptions of nonsexual boundary crossings within academic relationships.

You are eligible to participate in this study because you are either a doctoral level graduate student majoring in counseling psychology or a faculty member teaching in a counseling psychology program.

Your participation involves completing a set of questionnaires that will be accessed on a web based survey. Participation in this study will take about 25 to 35 minutes to complete. Your responses are anonymous and you will not be asked for your name in any part of the survey. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you are free to discontinue your participation at any time, without prejudice from the researcher, by exiting the survey website. There are no foreseeable risks for persons participating in this study. However, if you feel any discomfort about answering any of the items, you may discontinue the study at any time without consequence. Also, if you experience discomfort you may wish to seek counseling through your university counseling center or employee assistance program.

If you are interested, you may enter a drawing for a chance to win one of four Amazon.com(r) gift cards in the amount of $25, $50, $75, and $100, respectively. Winners will be selected randomly. In order to enter the drawing, you will be asked to send an e-mail message with your name and email address to an address that will be provided to you at the end of the survey. These emails will be stored separately and will not be connected with your survey responses. Please note that you must complete the entire survey to be considered for the gift card drawing.
This study has been approved by The University of Akron Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about the study, please contact the principle investigator Teri Madura by email at tlm73@zips.uakron.edu or by phone at (330) 972-7813. You may also contact my faculty sponsor, Dr. James Rogers, by email at jrr1@uakron.edu or by phone at (330) 972-8635.

Again thank you for your interest in this study. Your responses are greatly appreciated.

Please copy the following URL into your web browser or click on the link below:
APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

1. What is your age?

2. Which best describes your race/ethnicity?
   a. Asian/Pacific Islander
   b. Black/African American
   c. Caucasian/European American
   d. Hispanic/Latino(a)
   e. Native American/Alaska Native
   f. Bi-Racial/Multi-Racial
   g. Other

3. Please indicate which one best describes your time involvement in a Counseling Psychology Doctoral Program?
   a. First Year
   b. Second Year
   c. Third Year
   d. Fourth Year
   e. Fifth Year
   f. 6-10 Years
   g. 11-15 Years
   h. 16-20 Years
   i. 20+ Years

4. Please select one of the following options that best describes you.
   a. Female Faculty Member
   b. Male Faculty Member
   c. Female Doctoral Student
   d. Male Doctoral Student
APPENDIX C

VIGNETTES AND RESPONSE OPTIONS

Please read each of the following scenarios on degree of appropriateness, comfort, and extent you agree the behavior to be a boundary crossing using the following scales:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unquestioningly Inappropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unquestioningly Inappropriate | Moderately Inappropriate | Mildly Inappropriate | Mildly Appropriate | Moderately Appropriate | Unquestioningly Appropriate |
Uncomfortable | Moderately Uncomfortable | Mildly Uncomfortable | Mildly Comfortable | Moderately Comfortable | Unquestioningly Comfortable |
Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Mildly Disagree | Mildly Agree | Moderately Agree | Unquestioningly Agree |

Supervisor/Supervisee Female Faculty Member

A supervisee was going through a difficult time personally and considered taking a break from the program. During one supervisory session, the clinical supervisor, Dr. Mary, was curious about the situation. She asked questions and expressed concern and support for the supervisee's anxiety about leaving the program.

1.) The two discuss what has been going on in the supervisee's personal life.

2.) Dr. Mary shares details of the supervisory session with the program's training director.

3.) Dr. Mary and the supervisee spend the entire session focused on this concern.

4.) Dr. Mary refers the supervisee to the university counseling center.
Supervisor/Supervisee Male Faculty Member

A supervisee was going through a difficult time personally and considered taking a break from the program. During one supervisory session, the clinical supervisor, Dr. Joe, was curious about the situation. He asked questions and expressed concern and support for the supervisee's anxiety about leaving the program.

5.) The two discuss what has been going on in the supervisee's personal life.

6.) Dr. Joe shares details of the supervisory session with the program's training director.

7.) Dr. Joe and the supervisee spend the entire session focused on this concern.

8.) Dr. Joe refers the supervisee to the university counseling center.

Supervisor/Supervisee Female Doctoral Student

Samantha was going through a difficult time in her personal life and considered taking a break from the program. During one supervisory session, her clinical supervisor was curious about her situation, asked questions and expressed concern and support for Samantha's anxiety about leaving the program.

9.) The two discuss what has been going on in Samantha's personal life.

10.) The clinical supervisor shares details of the supervisory session with the program's training director.

11.) The supervisor and Samantha spend the entire session focused on this concern.

12.) The supervisor refers Samantha to the university counseling center.

Supervisor/Supervisee Male Doctoral Student

Paul was going through a difficult time in his personal life and considered taking a break from the program. During one supervisory session, his clinical supervisor was curious about his situation, asked questions and expressed concern and support for Paul's anxiety about leaving the program.

13.) The two discuss what has been going on in Paul's personal life.
14.) The clinical supervisor shares details of the supervisory session with the program's training director.

15.) The supervisor and Paul spend the entire session focused on this concern.

16.) The supervisor refers Paul to the university counseling center.

Mentor/Protégé Female Faculty Member

Dr. Katie and one of her students realized during the first semester of the student's doctoral training that they had a lot in common. They enjoyed the same type of music, TV shows and hobbies. On top of that, they shared similar professional and research interests. Dr. Katie asked the student to work on several academic projects and a mentorship developed. Dr. Katie was thankful to find a protégé who was not only adept academically but was someone with whom she enjoyed spending time.

17.) Dr. Katie and her protégé drive to a professional conference together.

18.) Dr. Katie and her protégé attend a rock concert together.

19.) Dr. Katie and her protégé talk on the telephone, usually about school related issues.

20.) Dr. Katie invites her protégé and the rest of the cohort over her house for dinner.

Mentor/Protégé Male Faculty Member

Dr. Bob and one of his students realized during the first semester of the student's doctoral training that they had a lot in common. They enjoyed the same type of music, TV shows and hobbies. On top of that, they shared similar professional and research interests. Dr. Bob asked the student to work on several academic projects and a mentorship developed. Dr. Bob was thankful to find a protégé who was not only adept academically but was someone with whom he enjoyed spending time.

21.) Dr. Bob and his protégé drive to a professional conference together.

22.) Dr. Bob and his protégé attend a rock concert together.

23.) Dr. Bob and his protégé talk on the telephone, usually about school related issues.

24.) Dr. Bob invites his protégé and the rest of the cohort over his house for dinner.
Mentor/Protégé Female Doctoral Student

Jenny and one of her faculty members realized during the first semester of her doctoral training that they had a lot in common. They enjoyed the same type of music, TV shows and hobbies. On top of that, they shared similar professional and research interests. Her professor asked her to work on several academic projects and a mentorship developed. Jenny was thankful to find a mentor who not only supported her academically but was someone with whom she enjoyed spending time.

25.) Jenny and her mentor drive to a professional conference together.

26.) Jenny and her mentor attend a rock concert together.

27.) Jenny and her mentor talk on the telephone, usually about school related issues.

28.) Jenny's mentor invites her and the rest of her cohort over for dinner.

________________________

Mentor/Protégé Male Doctoral Student

Mark and one of his faculty members realized during the first semester of his doctoral training that they had a lot in common. They enjoyed the same type of music, TV shows and hobbies. On top of that, they shared similar professional and research interests. His professor asked him to work on several academic projects and a mentorship developed. Mark was thankful to find a mentor who not only supported him academically but was someone with whom he enjoyed spending time.

29.) Mark and his mentor drive to a professional conference together.

30.) Mark and his mentor attend a rock concert together.

31.) Mark and his mentor talk on the telephone, usually about school related issues.

32.) Mark's mentor invites him and the rest of his cohort over for dinner.

________________________

Advisor/Advisee Female Faculty Member

An advisee approached Dr. Kelly and asked which credits should be signed up for during the summer semester. Dr. Kelly told the student to sign up for several independent research credits to work with her on a grant-funded project. The advisee followed Dr. Kelly's suggestion. A short time later, Dr. Kelly told the advisee that the funding for the project had fallen through. The student still had to pay for the credits and fees through the university.
33.) Dr. Kelly feels awful about the situation and agrees to pay her advisee out of her own salary.

34.) Dr. Kelly hires her advisee to work part-time in her private practice.

35.) Dr. Kelly hires her advisee as a babysitter to compensate for the money the student lost.

36.) Dr. Kelly recommends her advisee for a job at a local agency that Dr. Kelly is not affiliated.

Advisor/Advisee Male Faculty Member

An advisee approached Dr. George and asked which credits should be signed up for during the summer semester. Dr. George told the student to sign up for several independent research credits to work with him on a grant-funded project. The advisee followed Dr. George's suggestion. A short time later, Dr. George told the advisee that the funding for the project had fallen through. The student still had to pay for the credits and fees through the university.

37.) Dr. George feels awful about the situation and agrees to pay his advisee out of his own salary.

38.) Dr. George hires his advisee to work part-time in his private practice.

39.) Dr. George hires his advisee as a babysitter to compensate for the money the student lost.

40.) Dr. George recommends his advisee for a job at a local agency that Dr. George is not affiliated.

Advisor/Advisee Female Doctoral Student

Claire went to her advisor to ask which credits she should sign up for during the summer semester. Her advisor told her to sign up for several independent research credits to work with the advisor on a grant-funded project. Claire followed the advisor's suggestion. A short time later, her advisor told Claire that the funding for the project had fallen through. Claire still had to pay for the credits and fees through the university.

41.) Claire's advisor feels awful about the situation and agrees to pay her from the advisor's own salary.

42.) Claire's advisor hires her to work part-time in the advisor's private practice.
43.) Claire's advisor hires her as a babysitter to compensate for the lost money over the summer.

44.) Claire's advisor recommends her for a job at a local agency that her advisor is not affiliated.

---

Advisor/Advisee Male Doctoral Student

Jack went to his advisor to ask which credits he should sign up for during the summer semester. His advisor told him to sign up for several independent research credits to work with the advisor on a grant-funded project. Jack followed the advisor's suggestion. A short time later, his advisor told Jack that the funding for the project had fallen through. Jack still had to pay for the credits and fees through the university.

45.) Jack's advisor feels awful about the situation and agrees to pay him from the advisor's own salary.

46.) Jack's advisor hires him to work part-time in the advisor's private practice.

47.) Jack's advisor hires him as a babysitter to compensate for the lost money over the summer.

48.) Jack's advisor recommends him for a job at a local agency that his advisor is not affiliated.

---

Co-Authorship Female Faculty Member

A student earnestly agreed to work with Dr. Carrie on a research project. Dr. Carrie told the student their work could be submitted for publication. The student was excited to add a publication to the student's vita before applying to internship next year. The student collected and analyzed the data for the project and Dr. Carrie agreed to draft the manuscript. In the meantime, Dr. Carrie was elected President of APA Division 17 and spent more and more time out of the office. Each time the student stopped by the faculty office, Dr. Carrie said the project was coming along. A year passed without any further action on the project.

49.) The student finished the manuscript and submitted it for publication. The student was listed as the primary author.

50.) The student finished the manuscript and submitted it for publication. The professor was listed as the primary author.
51.) Dr. Carrie finished the manuscript and submitted it for publication. The student was listed as the primary author.

52.) Dr. Carrie finished the manuscript and submitted it for publication. The student was listed as a secondary author.

Co-Authorship Male Faculty Member

A student earnestly agreed to work with Dr. Brian on a research project. Dr. Brian told the student their work could be submitted for publication. The student was excited to add a publication to the student's vita before applying to internship next year. The student collected and analyzed the data for the project and Dr. Brian agreed to draft the manuscript. In the meantime, Dr. Brian was elected President of APA Division 17 and spent more and more time out of the office. Each time the student stopped by the faculty office, Dr. Brian said the project was coming along. A year passed without any further action on the project.

53.) The student finished the manuscript and submitted it for publication. The student was listed as the primary author.

54.) The student finished the manuscript and submitted it for publication. The professor was listed as the primary author.

55.) Dr. Brian finished the manuscript and submitted it for publication. The student was listed as the primary author.

56.) Dr. Brian finished the manuscript and submitted it for publication. The student was listed as a secondary author.

Co-Authorship Female Doctoral Student

Tracey earnestly agreed to work with one of her faculty members on a research project. Her professor told her their work could be submitted for publication. Tracey was excited to add a publication to her vita before applying to internship next year as she had no previous published research cited on her vita. Tracey collected and analyzed the data for the project and her professor agreed to draft the manuscript. In the meantime, the professor was elected President of APA Division 17 and spent more and more time out of the office. Each time Tracey stopped by the faculty office, the professor said the project was coming along. A year passed without any further action on the project.
57.) Tracey finished the manuscript and submitted it for publication on her own. She listed herself as the primary author.

58.) Tracey finished the manuscript and submitted it for publication on her own. She listed her professor as the primary author.

59.) The professor finished the manuscript and submitted it for publication. Tracey was listed as the primary author.

60.) The professor finished the manuscript and submitted it for publication. Tracey was listed as a secondary author.

---

Co-Authorship Male Doctoral Student

Mike earnestly agreed to work with one of his faculty members on a research project. His professor told him their work could be submitted for publication. Mike was excited to add a publication to his vita before applying to internship next year as he had no previous published research cited on his vita. Mike collected and analyzed the data for the project and his professor agreed to draft the manuscript. In the meantime, the professor was elected President of APA Division 17 and spent more and more time out of the office. Each time Mike stopped by the faculty office, his professor said the project was coming along. A year passed without any further action on the project.

61.) Mike finished the manuscript and submitted it for publication. He listed himself as the primary author.

62.) Mike finished the manuscript and submitted it for publication. The professor was listed as the primary author.

63.) The professor finished the manuscript and submitted it for publication. Mike was listed as the primary author.

64.) The professor finished the manuscript and submitted it for publication. Mike was listed as a secondary author.
APPENDIX D

SENSITIVITY TO PUNISHMENTS AND SENSITIVITY TO REWARDS

QUESTIONNAIRE

Revised by O’Connor, Colder, & Hawk (2004)

For each of the following items, please use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.) I refrain from asking for something if I am not sure I will get it.
2.) I am strongly motivated by the prospect of obtaining money.
3.) I am often afraid of new or unexpected situations.
4.) I often do things with the hope of receiving praise.
5.) It is difficult for me to telephone someone I don't know.
6.) I like being center of attention at a party or social gathering.
7.) If I am not prepared for a task, I become concerned about the possibility of failure.
8.) I spend a lot of time concerned with my image.
9.) I am easily discouraged in difficult situations.
10.) When in a group setting, I try to say the most intelligent or funniest things.
11.) I am a shy person.
12.) I often try to pick up people that I find attractive.

13.) When possible, I avoid demonstrating my skills for fear of embarrassment.

14.) As a child, I did a lot of things to gain the approval of others.

15.) When I’m with a group, I have trouble thinking of good topics to talk about.

16.) The possibility of social advancement moves me to action, even if it involves not playing fair.

17.) I hesitate to complain in a restaurant if I am not satisfied with my meal.

18.) I generally prefer activities that result in immediate gain.

19.) Whenever I can, I avoid going to unknown places.

20.) I often have trouble resisting temptation to do things I shouldn’t.

21.) I often worry about things I said or did.

22.) I like to compete and do whatever I can to win.

23.) It be difficult for me to ask my boss for a raise.

24.) I sometimes do things for quick gains.

25.) I generally try to avoid public speaking.

26.) I get easily distracted from my work when I’m in the presence of an attractive stranger.

27.) On a regular basis, I think I would do more things if my fear and insecurity did not get in the way.

28.) I am interested in money to the point of being willing to engage in risky activities.

29.) Compared with most people, I am more afraid of things.

30.) I like to add a competitive component to all of my activities.

31.) I often find myself worrying about things so much that my intellectual performance is impaired.
32.) I would like to be a socially powerful person.

33.) I often avoid doing something I like in order to not be rejected or disapproved of by others.

34.) I like displaying my physical abilities even though it might involve danger.

35.) I often refrain from doing something for fear of being embarrassed.
APPENDIX E

SENSE OF POWER SCALE

Anderson, John, Keltner (2005)

In rating each of the items below, please use the following scale:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_______ I can get people to listen to what I say.
_______ My wishes do not carry much weight.
_______ I can get others to do what I want.
_______ Even if I voice them, my views have little sway.
_______ I think I have a great deal of power.
_______ My ideas and opinions are often ignored.
_______ Even when I try, I am not able to get my way.
_______ If I want to, I get to make the decisions.

The following instructions were used:

For faculty members:

In my relationships with graduate students...

For students:

In my relationships with faculty members...