

Ethics from a Global Perspective

Jennifer Prentice, Keith S. Dobson, and Janel Gauthier

The increasing globalization of our world has created a state where it is incumbent upon psychologists and relevant professionals to view psychological ethics from a global perspective. Professionals may encounter new challenges in the application of ethical principles when they work abroad or with different cultures at home. Such challenges will likely require knowledge, understanding, thinking, flexibility and creative problem-solving on the part of the psychologist, as he or she reframes what it means to behave professionally in the context of a local culture. By contrast, there are ethical principles that transcend specific cultures and can be applied globally. This is not to say, however, that ethical behaviors and standards that affirm the value of local cultures can also be applied globally to the discipline of psychology. Actually, those who have tried to do this, have failed. For example, a Task Force on Ethics was set up by the European Federation of Psychologists' Associations (EFPA) in 1990 with the aim of producing a common ethical code for psychologists in Europe. As stated in Lindsay, Koene, Øvereeide, and Lang (2008, p. 10), "It was evident at the first meeting of the Task Force in Copenhagen 1990, however, that this aspiration was unrealistic. A number of associations had their own codes, but not all. These codes had much similarity (Lindsay, 1992) but there were also a number of significant differences, mainly with detail rather than principle [...]. Nevertheless, each had been devised by the association in question to meet their

J. Prentice
University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada

K.S. Dobson, Ph.D., R. Psych (✉)
Department of Psychology, University of Calgary,
2500 University Drive, NW, Calgary, AB, Canada, T2N 1N4
e-mail: ksdobson@ucalgary.ca

J. Gauthier
Université Laval, Québec, Québec, Canada

specific requirements, and a common code might not ensure this occurred. Furthermore, in many cases (e.g., BPS) a vote of members was needed to change the code. Hence, it was decided that a common code was too difficult to achieve.” (Lindsay et al., 2008, p. 10). Furthermore, a question arises not only as to whether or not establishing international ethical behavioral standards is feasible, but also as to whether it is desirable and in the best interest of worldwide societies. Perhaps what is needed is not a common code of ethics that includes enforceable standards of behavior, but a better understanding of the differences in the local and regional application of ethical principles across cultures. Cultures have much to learn from each other.

The current chapter elucidates the role of professional ethics in the discipline of psychology through a review of the emergence and development of ethics documents in psychology, and an examination of the contribution and significance of a universalist approach to ethics in a globalizing world. The chapter closes with a discussion on the gradual evolution and future of ethics in professional psychology from a global perspective.

Deontology: Are Ethics Universalist, Cultural or Personal?

The term “deontology” refers to the study of ethics that focus on the inherent morality of a behavior (Conway & Gawronski, 2013). The term “ethics” is derived from the Greek word *ethikos* which itself is derived from the Greek word *ethos*, meaning custom or character. It refers to a system of moral principles and values related to human conduct that defines what is morally right or wrong, i.e., what is good and bad behavior. In ethics, the term “ethical principle” refers to an overarching generic and widely held moral belief of what is “right” in interactions between human being and with the environment (Gauthier & Pettifor, 2012). Ethical principles are deeply rooted in our view of the purpose and meaning of life or existence in general.

Professional ethics can be conceptualized as universalist, cultural or personal (Conway & Gawronski, 2013; Falicov, 2014). A universalist perspective asserts that a relationship can exist between the global and local cultures and allow for ethical principles to transcend any one individual culture. More specifically, the values inherent in a code of ethics can be thoughtfully adapted and applied on a global scale. The universalist approach is similar to moral absolutism in that certain behaviors are predetermined to be either ethical or unethical based on a set of expectations determined by a profession. By contrast, a cultural perspective postulates that a universal approach subverts local cultures’ norms, customs, beliefs, laws and values at the expense of the more dominant culture, which is responsible for the dissemination of a common code of ethics. The subversion of the local culture ultimately results in a type of cultural imperialism, and an appearance of globalism or universality which may be artificial. Finally, a personal perspective affords the individual the liberty to govern and determine his or her actions, judgements, and attitudes to be morally right or wrong. Professional psychological ethics presumes a common

perspective and a deontological ethical position. Thus, a code of ethics delineates a minimal set of expectations that are required of an individual to join a profession or, more generally speaking, an association or an institution.

Professional Ethics and a Universalist Perspective

The importance of a code of ethics or a code of conduct lies in the document's delineation of ethical principles, appropriate behaviors, and its ability to establish psychology as a profession. Professional psychological codes of ethics and codes of conduct guide psychologists' behaviors. Such documents are intended to support psychologists as they meet the public responsibilities of the profession. Professional codes of ethics further serve as an accountability framework to adjudicate complaints from the public. Enshrined within a professional code of ethics or a code of conduct is a minimal set of expectations that align with the norms and values of a particular culture, and are judged to be morally right. As such, psychologists are expected to act in congruence with the code of ethics or the code of conduct across time, context and clients. A corollary of this expectation is that psychologists may be expected to challenge the legal system when their legal obligations threaten the principles enshrined in the code of ethics or the code of conduct. It is expected that the code of ethics or the code of conduct supersedes a nation's laws when the risks associated with acting in accordance with the legal system outweighs the benefits to the client. Thus, it is the intention of a society's code of ethics or a code of conduct to ensure that psychologists exercise good moral judgment in the application of the ethical guiding principles or behavioral standards and that the code will pervade all psychologists' professional activities.

Ethics Documents in Psychology: Emergence and Development

Emergence

Codes that decree desired professional and societal behaviors have existed since Antiquity (e.g., *Code of Hammurabi*, *Hippocratic Oath*). Prior to World War II, however, ethics codes for psychologists did not exist. The convergence of several factors following the war contributed to the development of codes of ethics for psychologists. In 1945–1946, for example, the Nuremberg Trials disclosed to the world the extent of torture carried out by medical professionals in Nazi Germany. As a result, the public demanded greater professional scrutiny and stricter standards (Sinclair, Simon, & Pettifor, 1996), and the medical profession developed the *Nuremberg Code of Ethics in Medical Research* (1947). This code had tremendous influence

on the subsequent development of professional codes of ethics. The Nuremberg Code, in combination with the 1948 World Medical Association (WMA) *Declaration of Geneva* (WMA, 1948), and the WMA *Declaration of Helsinki* (WMA, 1964) formed the foundation for modern psychological research ethics in many countries in Europe and North America.

In 1945, the first legislation in the world for the regulation of psychological practice for the purpose of protecting the public from harm was passed in the state of Connecticut in the United States (Pettifor, Estay, & Paquet, 2002). The remaining American states, and provincial/territorial jurisdictions in Canada all followed suit. With legislated regulation, it also became essential to develop codes of ethics and the means to handle disciplinary complaints. In 1948, the American Psychological Association (APA) began working on the first code of ethics for psychologists, again to protect the public from harm. In the development of its first code of ethics, the APA depended heavily on continued consultation with its members on the kinds of ethical dilemmas that they encountered in practice. A final draft was adopted by APA in 1952 and published in 1953 (APA, 1953; Fisher, 2003). Since then, the code has been revised nine times. The latest revision was adopted by the APA Council of Representatives in 2002 (APA, 2002a, 2002b). Over the years, the APA Ethics Code has been used as model for the development of codes in other psychology jurisdictions, albeit with modifications to meet local needs.

Since the development of the first APA Ethics Code, more than 70 national codes of ethics have been developed globally (see <http://psychology-resources.org/explore-psychology/standards/ethics/codes-of-ethics-of-national-psychology-organisations/> for a list), with the majority being developed in the past quarter-century. In addition, a number of psychological organizations have revised their codes. An examination of these codes reveals that some codes tend to be more prescriptive in nature and define in behavioral terms what one *must* or *must not* do as a psychologist without linking standards to specific ethical principles or values while other codes tend to be more aspirational in nature, and link standards to overarching principles and values. To reflect those differences, the term “codes of conduct” is used to refer to the former and the term “codes of ethics” is used to refer to the latter. These two terms are often mistakenly used interchangeably. They are, in fact, two unique documents. Codes of conduct are used primarily to govern behavior, while codes of ethics are used primarily to govern ethical-decision making; codes of conduct are enforceable, while aspirational ethical principles without further elaboration are not. Some codes of ethics such as the *Canadian Code of Ethics for Psychologists* (Canadian Psychological Association, 2000) explicitly require psychologists to engage in an ethical decision-making process, but they are the exceptions.

National codes that decree desired professional behaviors for psychologists are designed to provide ethical guidance to psychologists in all of their professional activities. While some of them emphasize the need to respect cultural differences and address cultural issues, none of them are designed to provide explicit ethical guidance to psychologists providing interventions or conducting research in other cultures. Since the emergence of national codes, ethics documents intended to be applied across national boundaries have been developed to meet new needs.

Regional Development

In the history of ethics documents for psychologists, the consideration of psychological ethics from a regional perspective is relatively new. In 1988, the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden) were among the first psychology regions to adopt a common code of ethics (Aanonsen, 2003). In 1996 and 1997, they revised this code to be consistent with the *Meta-Code of Ethics* of the European Federation of Psychologists' Associations (EFPA, formerly EFPPA—European Federation of Professional Psychologists' Associations (EFPPA, 1995). The revised version was adopted in 1998. Entitled *Etiske Prinsipper for Nordiske Psykologer* [In English: Ethical Principles for Nordic psychologists] (1998), it is organized around four main ethical principles: (a) respect for individual rights and dignity, (b) professional competence, (c) professional and scientific responsibilities, and (d) professional integrity. All the members of the Nordic psychological associations are obliged to follow these principles in their professional practice. The individual country associations or governments are responsible for the regulatory systems that include the investigation and adjudication of disciplinary complaints.

The development of the EFPA *Meta-Code of Ethics* (EFPPA, 1995, 2005) is also of great interest from a global perspective because it provides an example of how a regional federation of psychologists' associations with members from several different countries can promote common high standards for ethical practice (Lindsay et al., 2008). An EFPA Task Force on Ethics had been set up in 1990 with the aim of producing a common ethical code for psychologists in Europe. However, it was evident at the first meeting of the Task Force that this aspiration was unrealistic. Instead, the Task Force devised a meta-code that set out what each member association should address in their codes of ethics, but left it to the member associations to produce their own specific codes. Since EFPA adopted the *Meta-Code of Ethics* in 1995, national associations with existing codes have revised their codes of ethics as needed to be consistent with the *Meta-Code*. European Psychologists' associations without codes or in the process of developing a code have used or are using the *Meta-Code* as a template. The template comprises four ethical principles: (a) respect for a person's rights and dignity, (b) competence, (c) responsibility, and (d) integrity.

Another regional initiative was led by the Association of States and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB), which represents 63 regulatory bodies of psychology in the United States and Canada. It provides services to its member bodies at the state, provincial and territorial levels in the two countries. The *ASPPB Code of Conduct* was first approved by the Board of Directors of ASPPB in 1990 and revised in 2005 (ASPPB, 2005). It has no freestanding regulatory force in itself. Rather, it serves as model, with each jurisdiction deciding how to use it. As the ASPPB ethics document is a code of conduct, the rules contained in the Code are essentially unambiguous concerning what behavior in the professional relationship functions is acceptable and what is not.

Another important regional initiative was the *Protocolo de Acuerdo Marco de Principios Éticos para el Ejercicio Profesional de los Psicólogos en el Mercosur y*

Paises Asociados [In English: Protocol of the Framework Agreement of Ethical Principles for the Professional Practice of Psychology in the Mercosur and Associated Countries] (1997), which was developed by the Comité Coordinador de Psicólogos del Mercosur y Paises Asociados [In English: Coordinating Committee of Psychologists of the Mercosur and Associated Countries] and endorsed in 1997 by six southeast countries of South America that had formed in 1991 a common market called “Mercado Común del Sur” or “Mercosur”. Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay were full members, while Chile and Bolivia served as associated countries. The document reflects how psychologists from different countries without a regional association were able to develop an ethical framework for the professional practice of psychology. The framework includes five “general” ethical principles: (a) respect for people’s rights and dignity, (b) professional competence, (c) professional and scientific commitment, (d) integrity, and (e) social responsibility. The Coordinating Committee of Psychologists is responsible to implement the *Protocol*. According to Ferrero (2008), the endorsement of common ethical principles has strengthened commitment for ethical behavior in the psychology community and helped Mercosur members and associated countries to develop their own ethics codes.

International Development

The interest of international psychology organizations to guide the ethical conduct of psychologists is not new. For example, in 1976, the General Assembly of the International Union of Psychological Science adopted a statement that requested each national member to enact a code of ethics to enable action against any member guilty of abuses against the rights of human beings (International Union of Psychological Science, 1976). However, the development of ethics documents by international psychology organizations is quite recent.

Four international psychology organizations have developed an ethics code or ethical standards explicitly for their own members. The International School Psychology Association (ISPA) was among the first, when it adopted a code of ethics for its members in 1990 (Oakland, Goldman, & Bischoff, 1997). In 2009, the ISAP undertook a revision of its code. The revised version was approved by the ISPA General Assembly in 2011 (ISPA, 2011). The ISPA code has an introduction followed by two separate sections: one on ethical principles and the other on professional standards. The ISAP expects school psychologists to exemplify the following six ethical principles articulated in the code: (a) beneficence and nonmaleficence, (b) competence, (c) fidelity and responsibility, (d) integrity, (e) respect for people’s rights and dignity, and (f) social justice. It is acknowledged in the introduction of the code that “the translation and manifestation of ethical principles and standards important to this code may vary somewhat between countries as a reflection of each country’s norms, values, traditions, and laws.”

The International Society of Sport Psychology (ISSP) developed standards to ensure respect for the dignity and welfare of individuals, athletes, professionals,

volunteers, administrators, teams, and the public in the provision of services by its members during the first half of the 1990s (ISSP, n.d.). These standards are grouped according to seven “general principles”: (a) competence, (b) consent and confidentiality, (c) integrity, (d) personal conduct, (e) professional and scientific responsibility, (f) research ethics, and (g) social responsibility. The standards are expressed so that they can be applied to sport psychologists engaged in varied roles (Henschen, Ripoll, Hackfort, & Mohan, 1995). The code states clearly that the application of the ethical standards may vary depending upon the context (e.g., country and organization).

The International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors (IAMFC) adopted ethical standards for practice by its members in 2002. Since then, those standards have been revised twice. The latest revision was approved by the IAMFC Board in 2010 (Hendricks, Bradley, Southern, Oliver, & Birdsall, 2011). The 2010 ethical code is divided into nine sections: (a) the counseling relationship and client well-being, (b) confidentiality and privacy, (c) competence and professional responsibilities, (d) collaboration and professional relationships, (e) assessment and evaluation, (f) counselor education and supervision, (g) research and publications, and (h) ethical decision making and resolution, and (i) diversity. Each of the nine sections includes aspirations and principles. Members are required not to impose personal values on the families with whom they work, to become multiculturally competent, and to use indigenous healing practices when appropriate.

The International Society for Coaching Psychology (ISCP) adopted its first code of ethics in 2011 (ISCP, 2011). This code sets out the core values and guiding principles to inform the professional practice of coaching psychologists. It is based on six ethical principles called the “6 R’s”: (a) rights of individuals (rights to confidentiality, privacy, freedom of self-determination), (b) respect for the rights and dignity of all human beings, (c) recognition of standards and limits of competence, (d) relationships with others (good and based on trust), (e) representation (accurate and honest), and (f) responsibility (i.e., professional responsibilities to the coaches, the stakeholders, the society, general public, and to the profession of coaching psychology). These principles are said to be “interrelated”.

Recognizing Fundamental Ethical Principles Through a Universal Declaration

Arguably, the single most important international development in the history of psychological ethics is the unanimous adoption of the *Universal Declaration of Ethical Principles for Psychologists* (herein referred to as the Universal Declaration) by the General Assembly of the International Union of Psychological Science and the Board of Directors of the International Association of Applied Psychology in 2008 (Ferrero & Gauthier, 2009; Gauthier, 2008a, 2008b, 2009). This adoption resulted from 6 years of extensive research, broad international consultation, and

numerous revisions in response to feedback and suggestions from the international psychology community. The development of the Universal Declaration is noteworthy as it reflects a successful process that attained maximum generalizability and acceptance. The most important components of that strategy involved inclusiveness, careful research, broad consultation, and respect for cultural diversity.

The Universal Declaration was developed by an international Ad Hoc Joint Committee working under the auspices of the International Union of Psychological Science and the International Association of Applied Psychology, chaired by Janel Gauthier (Canada). The Committee included distinguished scientists and practitioners in psychology from China, Colombia, Finland, Germany, Iran, New Zealand, Singapore, South Africa, United States, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. While many regions and cultures of the world were represented on the Committee, no attempt was made to have representation from all countries because a smaller group appeared more effective than a larger group for drafting a document. However, national organizations from over 80 different countries having membership in the International Union of Psychological Science had the opportunity to review and discuss reports and drafts of the Universal Declaration.

Research results helped to identify the principles and values that would be considered for the framework to be used to draft the Universal Declaration. First, comparisons were made among existing codes of ethics for psychologists from around the world to identify commonalities in ethical principles and values (Gauthier, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005). Second, comparisons across disciplines, domains and throughout history were made to assess the “universality” of the ethical principles used most often to develop codes of ethics in psychology. For example, codes of ethics in other disciplines (e.g., sports, martial arts) were examined to identify the ethical principles and values espoused by other disciplines and communities (Gauthier, 2005); internationally accepted documents such as the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (United Nations, 1948) were reviewed to delineate their underlying moral imperatives (Gauthier, 2003, 2004); ancient historical documents from Babylon, China, Egypt, India, Japan, Persia, and so on were explored to identify the roots of modern-day ethical principles and values (Gauthier, 2006; Sinclair, 2005a, 2005b, 2005c).

The research-based framework and drafts of the document were presented for review and discussion at many international conferences and in many parts of the world, and formed the basis of both focus groups and symposia at international conferences. Further information regarding its development (e.g., background papers, progress reports and discussions on important issues) is available from the International Union of Psychological Science website (<http://www.iupsys.org/ethics/univdecl2008.html>).

While the methodology used to establish the Universal Declaration was unique and had many strengths, the discipline must be alert to the possibility of unintentional cultural bias. For example, the leadership for developing the document came largely from Western societies. Furthermore, many non-Western countries have used North American models to develop their own codes of ethics. Finally, English is the language for international discourse. However, it is not a universal language

and the meaning of words varies across cultures. Actually, one of the biggest lessons learned in developing the Universal Declaration was that words, or the translation of English words used in some cultures, can have unanticipated meanings in other cultures (Gauthier et al., 2010; Gauthier & Pettifor, 2011, 2012). For example, the word “others” may have negative connotations rather than being neutral. Differences in meaning across cultures are not always immediately visible and resolutions to differences is not always obvious. Hopefully, dialogue, research, and practice will continue to help to refine universal ethical principles.

Structure and Objectives of the Universal Declaration

The Universal Declaration (2008) includes a preamble followed by four sections, each relating to a different ethical principle: (a) respect for the dignity of persons and peoples, (b) competent caring for the well-being of persons and peoples, (c) integrity, and (d) professional and scientific responsibilities to society. Each section includes a statement defining the ethical principle and a list of the fundamental values that embody that principle. By accepting the principle, one also accepts the values that are inherent to that principle.

The four enumerated ethical principles and values contained in the Universal Declaration are presented in Table 1. This ordering of the principles from I to IV is meant to facilitate reference to various parts of the content of the Universal Declaration. Although there is no hierarchy involved in the numbering of the Principles, there is a relationship among them (Gauthier & Pettifor, 2012). For example, out of respect, psychologists treat others fairly and with compassion, provide competent care, practice with integrity and seek the collective good of society. Therefore, in the structure chosen for the Universal Declaration, no principle has priority over another, since all are manifestations of *respect*. This is why Respect for the Dignity of Persons and Peoples (Principle I) is described as “the most fundamental and universally found ethical principle across geographical and cultural boundaries, and across professional disciplines.”

The Universal Declaration provides a universal moral framework and generic set of ethical principles to guide psychologists worldwide in meeting the ethical challenges of rapid globalization, a set of principles that encompasses all their scientific and professional activities as psychologists in a manner that also recognizes and may be used to address culture specific interpretations (Gauthier & Pettifor, 2012). The objectives of the Universal Declaration are defined in the second paragraph of the Preamble, which states:

“The objectives of the *Universal Declaration* are to provide a moral framework and generic set of ethical principles for psychology organizations worldwide: (a) to evaluate the ethical and moral relevance of their codes of ethics; (b) to use as a template to guide the development or evolution of their codes of ethics; (c) to encourage global thinking about ethics, while also encouraging action that is sensitive and responsive to local needs and values; and (d) to speak with a collective voice on matters of ethical concern.”

Table 1 Ethical principles and related values contained in the universal declaration of ethical principles for psychologists.

Principle I <i>Respect for the Dignity of Persons and Peoples</i>	Principle II <i>Competent Caring for the Well-Being of Persons and Peoples</i>	Principle III <i>Integrity</i>	Principle IV <i>Professional and Scientific Responsibility to Society</i>
<p><u>Values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respect for dignity and worthiness of all human beings • Non-discrimination • Informed consent • Freedom of consent • Privacy • Protection of confidentiality • Fair treatment/due process 	<p><u>Values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caring for health and well-being • Maximize benefits • Minimize harm • Offset/correct harm • Competence • Self-knowledge 	<p><u>Values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy/honesty • Maximizing impartiality • Minimizing biases • Straightforwardness/openness • Avoidance of incomplete disclosure • Avoidance of conflict of interest 	<p><u>Values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of knowledge • Use of knowledge for benefits of society • Avoid misuse of knowledge • Promotion of ethical awareness and sensitivity • Promotion of highest ethical ideals • Ethical responsibilities to society

The Universal Declaration (2008) is not a global code of ethics or code of conduct, and that it is not intended to act as a code (Gauthier & Pettifor, 2011, 2012). However, it was designed to provide a moral framework of universally acceptable ethical principles based on human values across cultures and, accordingly, the values enshrined in the Universal Declaration are expected to be included in any psychological code of ethics or code of conduct (Gauthier et al., 2010).

It is also important to note that the Universal Declaration does not promulgate that certain behaviors are proscribed or compulsory for the ethical practice of psychology, as specific behaviors or rules that are indicative of ethical practice are frequently value-laden and culturally specific. Any guide to ethical behaviors contending to be “universal” could potentially defy some cultures’ norms, customs, beliefs, laws and policies. Indeed, it is clearly stated that the “Application of the principles and values to the development of specific standards of conduct will vary across cultures, and must occur locally or regionally in order to ensure their relevance to local or regional cultures, customs, beliefs, and laws.” (Universal Declaration, 2008, page 1, paragraph 4). This is why the Universal Declaration articulates principles and related values that are general and aspirational rather than specific and prescriptive.

Significance of the Universal Declaration

Psychologists in the twenty-first century are faced with expansion of their scope of practice and competency in order to work multi-culturally within their own country and culture, as well as to work internationally or globally. The Universal Declaration (2008) provides a common moral framework to guide and inspire psychologists toward the highest ethical ideals, as it states:

“Psychologists recognize that they carry out their activities within a larger social context. They recognize that the lives and identities of human beings both individually and collectively are connected across generations, and that there is a reciprocal relationship between human beings and their natural and social environments. Psychologists are committed to placing the welfare of society and its members above the self-interest of the discipline and its members. They recognize that adherence to ethical principles in the context of their work contributes to a stable society that enhances the quality of life for all human beings.”

While the Universal Declaration cannot be enforced, it has the potential to influence the development of local and global ethics. The mechanism whereby it can exercise this influence is described in the last paragraph of the Universal Declaration’s Preamble, which reads:

“The significance of the Universal Declaration depends on its recognition and promotion by psychology organizations at national, regional and international levels. Every psychology organization is encouraged to keep this Declaration in mind and, through teaching, education, and other measures to promote respect for, and observance of, the Declaration’s principles and related values in the various activities of its members.”

This mechanism is the same as the one whereby the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR) has influenced the worldwide development of laws, rules and regulations since it was adopted by the United Nations in 1948. Strictly speaking, the UDHR is not a legally binding document and, therefore, cannot be enforced. That said, the UDHR has acquired the status of “customary international law” because most states have come to treat it over the years as though it were. It has been a powerful instrument for the promotion and implementation of inalienable rights for all people, and it has left an abiding legacy for humankind.

Since the adoption of the Universal Declaration, there have been several developments, some of which are highlighted here. A major development has been the endorsement, ratification or adoption of the Universal Declaration by several psychology organizations. In 2008, for example, it was adopted by the Psychological Society of South Africa, and ratified by the Canadian Psychological Association. It was also adopted in 2008 by the Interamerican Society of Psychology, which took the extra step in 2009 to amend its Constitution to require from its membership compliance with the Universal Declaration. The International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology adopted the Universal Declaration in 2010.

A “culture-sensitive” model has been developed to assist psychologists to apply the Universal Declaration to creating or reviewing a code of ethics (Gauthier, Pettifor, & Ferrero, 2010). The first step that is recommended is to consider the reasons to create a code of ethics (e.g., for whom is it intended, why is it needed,

how will it be used, are unique or cultural aspects to be addressed?). The second step is to consider what each of the four ethical principles means within the given culture and context. The third step is to define culture-specific standards or behaviors that are relevant to local objectives and also reflect proposed universal ethical principles. Throughout the process, it is strongly encouraged to consult those individuals whose work will be most affected by the code of ethics, as their input is invaluable to create a relevant document, and their support is invaluable in accepting the ultimate code of ethics.

National psychology organizations use the Universal Declaration (2008) to develop or revise codes of ethics. For example, the College of Psychologists of Guatemala used it to develop its very first code of ethics in 2008–2010 (Colegio de Psicólogos de Guatemala, 2011). Actually, Guatemala was the first country in the world to use the Universal Declaration as a template to create an ethical code and the model proposed by Gauthier et al. (2010) as a guide to do so. The Australian Psychological Society used it to revise its code of ethics from 2005 to 2007 when the document was still in development. The International School Psychology Association consulted the Universal Declaration as part of revising its existing code in 2009–2011, and used it to inform the revision process (ISPA, 2011). It is presently used by the Canadian Psychological Association to review the *Canadian Code of Ethics for Psychologists*. An example of the influence of the Universal Declaration on the revised version of the Canadian Code can be found in the inclusion of the concept of “peoples” in the wording of one the first ethical principle presented in the Code which was changed from “Respect for the Dignity of Persons” to “Respect for the Dignity of Persons and Peoples” to reflect the importance of balancing respect for the individual versus the communal or collective.

Researchers and practitioners have used the Universal Declaration as a framework to discuss ethical issues from an international perspective and to offer recommendations of global value. In a recent article by Fitzgerald, Hunter, Hadjistavropoulos, and Koocher (2010), the authors examine ethical issues relating to the growing practice of internet-based psychotherapy through the lens of the Universal Declaration. On the basis of their review and discussion, they make recommendations intended to guide mental health practitioners who are considering involvement in the provision of internet-based services. Further, Psychologists around the world are faced daily with ethical questions and dilemmas. Sinclair (2012) has demonstrated how the Universal Declaration can be used as a resource in ethical decision making. Finally, the Universal Declaration has been the focus of book chapters in international handbooks (e.g., Gauthier & Pettifor, 2011, 2012) and a book chapter on internationalizing the professional ethics curriculum in the United States has dedicated several pages to the Universal Declaration (Leach & Gauthier, 2012). In summary, although the Universal Declaration (2008) is still new, it holds promise for extending psychological practice globally in ways that maintain the highest level of ethical practice, and that incorporates advocacy to eliminate misuse and abuse.

Future Global Directions of Ethics

This overview of ethics from a global perspective indicates that ethics documents have evolved considerably since the publication of the first code of ethics in psychology in 1953. They are becoming more international and more global. The Universal Declaration represents the latest expression of this movement and the largest international effort of psychologists to establish an explicit moral framework of ethical principles that are based on shared human values across cultures.

Another major development in ethics is the shifting emphasis from defining specific behaviors or standards as acceptable or not, to linking behaviors to an explicit moral framework. These changes were first observed in national codes of ethics in the late 1980s (Gauthier & Pettifor, 2011). While the value of combining statements of aspirational principles with general guidelines and enforceable standards for ethical behavior was being questioned in the United States (American Psychological Association, 1992, 2002a, 2002b), it was embraced in countries such as Canada (Canadian Psychological Association, 1986, 1991, 2000), Ireland (Psychological Society of Ireland, 1999), New Zealand (New Zealand Psychological Society, 2002), and Mexico (Sociedad Mexicana de Psicología, 2002, 2007). Universal principles and shared values are a prerequisite to link behavior to ethical principles internationally and globally. The Universal Declaration has built on the growing practice of defining a moral or philosophical foundation of universally shared principles, and has also been embraced in regional ethics documents (e.g., EFPA, 1995, 2005).

Language, meanings and themes evolve. For example, the definitions provided by the *Canadian Code of Ethics for Psychologists* on Respect for the Dignity of Persons since 1986 (CPA, 2000) and by the APA Ethics Code on Respect for People's Rights and Dignity since 1992 (APA, 2002a, 2002b) are similar in content, as they emphasize moral rights. Both codes also emphasize individual rights and well-being more than the collective good, which is common in Western societies. In the Universal Declaration, respect is described as "the most fundamental and universally found ethical principle" and is inclusive of non-Western and aboriginal beliefs:

All human beings, as well as being individuals, are interdependent social beings that are born into, live in, and are a part of the history and ongoing evolution of their peoples. The different cultures, ethnicities, religions, histories, social structures and other such characteristics of peoples are integral to the identity of their members and give meaning to their lives. The continuity of peoples and cultures over time connects the peoples of today with the peoples of past generations and the need to nurture future generations. As such, respect for the dignity of persons includes moral consideration of and respect for the dignity of peoples.

The meaning of language will continue to be a challenge to the global acceptance and implementation of ethical principles shared across cultures. One of the lessons learned in working on the Universal Declaration was the meaning of language: differences in meaning across cultures are not always immediately visible and how to

cope with those differences is not always obvious (Gauthier et al., 2010). The importance of the meaning of language in a global society that lacks a global language cannot be overemphasized.

The current chapter also reveals that ethics documents tend to reflect contemporary concerns and that they evolve with changing world conditions. A huge concern after World War II was the discovery of the atrocities committed in Nazi Germany by qualified professionals, and the necessity to protect citizens from harm. The Nuremberg War Crime Trials led to new ethics standards to protect research participants from inhumane treatment. The United Nations (1948) adopted the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* outlining for nations the rights and entitlements of all persons. In 1948, the APA began working on the development of the first code of ethics for psychologists that was adopted on a trial basis in 1952.

The Universal Declaration (2008) was developed in response to the rapid globalization of the world. We now live in a world where isolation is impossible, traditional national borders are rapidly fading, and many countries are increasingly becoming multicultural. On the one hand, technology has opened the possibilities for global peace and harmony, while on the other hand, it has increased the potential for universal suffering and destruction. The Universal Declaration was developed at a time when, for the sake of the future of our world, global consensus on what constitutes “good” was urgently needed.

The Universal Declaration (2008) reflects a concern that psychologists in a rapidly globalizing world need ethical guidelines that address global issues and can encompass working cooperatively across worldviews in ways that were not included in their professional training, their practice standards, their codes of ethics, or their past experiences. The larger context is the desire that the rapid globalization of life on the planet contributes to a better life for persons and peoples generally rather than contributes to increased suffering. While technology makes possible “one world”, the needs of people to maintain their cultural identities demand respect and, in addition, negate rules and prescriptions imposed from the outside on how they should conduct their lives. In this context, guidance from a moral framework that approaches universality leaves room for local initiative in defining culture-specific interpretations. In this respect, the Universal Declaration contributes to the process of recognizing what all peoples have in common and what is culture-specific.

References

- Aanonsen, A. (2003). EFPA Metacode on ethics and the Nordic Code. In J. B. Overmier & J. A. Overmier (Eds.), *Psychology: IUPsyS global resource* [Computer software] (4th ed.). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- American Psychological Association. (1953). *Ethical standards of psychologists*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychological Association. (1992). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist*, 47, 1597–1611.

- American Psychological Association. (2002a). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist*, 57, 1060–1073.
- American Psychological Association. (2002b). *Guidelines for providers of psychological services to ethnic, linguistic, and culturally diverse populations*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Association of States and Provincial Boards of Psychology. (2005). *Code of conduct*. Retrieved from <http://www.aspb.org/publications/model/conduct.aspx>
- Canadian Psychological Association. (1986). *Canadian code of ethics for psychologists*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Canadian Psychological Association. (1991). *Canadian code of ethics for psychologists* (2nd ed.). Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Canadian Psychological Association. (2000). *Canadian code of ethics for psychologists* (3rd ed.). Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Conway, P., & Gawronski, B. (2013). Deontological and utilitarian inclinations in moral decision making: A process dissociation approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(2), 216–235. doi:10.1037/a0031021.
- Colegio de Psicólogos de Guatemala. (2011). *Código de Ética* [Code of Ethics]. Ciudad de Guatemala: Servisa Litografía.
- European Federation of Professional Psychologists' Associations. (1995). *Meta-code of ethics*. Brussels: Author.
- European Federation of Psychologists' Associations. (2005). *Meta-code of ethics* (2nd ed.). Brussels: Author.
- Etiske Prinsipper for Nordiske Psykologer* [Ethical principles for Nordic psychologists]. (1998). Retrieved from <http://www.psykologforeningen.no/medlem/etikk/etiske-prinsipper-for-nordiske-psykologer>
- Falicov, C. J. (2014). Psychotherapy and supervision as cultural encounters: The MECA framework. In C. A. Falender, E. P. Shafransky, & C. J. Falicov (Eds.), *Multiculturalism and diversity in clinical supervision: A competency-based approach*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Ferrero, A. (2008, July). South American perspectives on ethical principles for psychologists. In J. Gauthier (Chair), *International perspectives on the newly revised draft of the universal declaration of ethical principles for psychologists*. Symposium conducted at the 29th International Congress of Psychology in Berlin, Germany.
- Ferrero, A., & Gauthier, J. (2009, March). Desarrollo y adopción de la Declaración Universal de principios Éticos para Psicólogas y Psicólogos [The development and adoption of the Universal Declaration of Ethical Principles for Psychologists]. *Boletín de la SIP*, 90, 8–10. Retrieved from http://issuu.com/sipsych/docs/sip_newsletter_v90_march_2009
- Fisher, C. (2003). *Decoding the ethics code: A practical guide for psychologists*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fitzgerald, T. D., Hunter, P. V., Hadjistavropoulos, T., & Koocher, G. P. (2010). Ethical and legal considerations for internet-based psychotherapy. *Cognitive Behavior Therapy*, 34, 1–15.
- Gauthier, J. (2002, July). Ethics and human rights: Toward a universal declaration of ethical principles for psychologists. In J. L. Pettifor (Chair), *Professional codes of ethics across national boundaries: Seeking common grounds*. Symposium conducted at the 25th International Congress of Applied Psychology, Singapore.
- Gauthier, J. (2003). Toward a universal declaration of ethical principles for psychologists. In J. B. Overmier & J. A. Overmier (Eds.), *Psychology: IUPsyS Global Resource* [Computer software] (4th ed.). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Gauthier, J. (2004). Toward a universal declaration of ethical principles for psychologists. *International Association of Applied Psychology/Newsletter*, 16(4), 10–24.
- Gauthier, J. (2005). Toward a universal declaration of ethical principles for psychologists: A progress report. In M. J. Stevens & D. Wedding (Eds.), *Psychology: IUPsyS global resource* [Computer software] (6th ed.). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Gauthier, J. (2006). Onward toward a universal declaration of ethical principles for psychologists: Draft and progress report. In M. J. Stevens & D. Wedding (Eds.), *Psychology: IUPsyS global resource* [Computer software] (7th ed.). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.

- Gauthier, J. (2008a). IAAP adopts the universal declaration of ethical principles for psychologists. *The IAAP Bulletin: The International Association of Applied Psychology*, 20(4), 110–112.
- Gauthier, J. (2008b). The universal declaration of ethical principles for psychologists presented at the United Nations DPI/NGO conference in Paris. *Psychology International*, 19(4), n.d. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/international/pi/2008/10/gauthier.aspx>
- Gauthier, J. (2009). Ethical principles and human rights: Building a better world globally. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 22, 25–32.
- Gauthier, J., & Pettifor, J. (2011). The evolution of ethics in psychology: Going international and global. In P. R. Martin, F. Cheung, M. Kyrios, L. Littlefield, M. Knowles, B. Overmier, & J. M. Prieto (Eds.), *The IAAP handbook of applied psychology* (pp. 700–714). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Gauthier, J., & Pettifor, J. (2012). The tale of two universal declarations: Ethics and human rights. In M. M. Leach, M. J. Stevens, G. Lindsay, A. Ferrero, & Y. Korkut (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of international psychological ethics* (pp. 113–133). London: Oxford Press.
- Gauthier, J., Pettifor, J., & Ferrero, A. (2010). The universal declaration of ethical principles for psychologists: A culture-sensitive model for creating and reviewing a code of ethics. *Ethics and Behavior*, 20(3&4), 1–18. doi:10.1080/10508421003798885.
- Hendricks, B. E., Bradley, L. J., Southern, S., Oliver, M., & Birdsall, B. (2011). Ethical code for the International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors. *The Family Journal*, 19, 217–224.
- Henschen, K., Ripoll, H., Hackfort, D., & Mohan, J. (1995). Ethical principles of the International Society of Sport Psychology (ISSP). *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 26, 588–591.
- International School Psychology Association. (2011). *Code of ethics*. Retrieved from http://www.ispaweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/The_ISPA_Code_of_Ethics_2011.pdf
- International Society for Coaching Psychology. (2011). *Code of ethics*. Retrieved from <http://www.isfcp.net/ethics.htm>
- International Society of Sport Psychology. (n.d.). *Ethical principles of the International Society of Sport Psychology*. Retrieved from http://www.isponline.org/p_codeofethics.asp?ms=3
- International Union of Psychological Science. (1976). *Statement by the International Union of Psychological Science*. Retrieved from <http://www.iupsys.net/dotAsset/4a729da4-4609-4425-987a-ddc40d75a6b6.pdf>
- Leach, M. M., & Gauthier, J. (2012). Internationalizing the professional ethics curriculum. In F. T. L. Leong, W. E. Pickren, M. M. Leach, & A. J. Marsella (Eds.), *Internationalizing the psychology curriculum in the United States: Meeting the challenges of globalization* (pp. 29–50). New York, NY: Springer.
- Lindsay, G. (1992). Educational psychologists and Europe. In S. Wolfendale, T. Bryans, M. Fox, A. Labram, & A. Sigston (Eds.), *The profession and practice of educational psychology* (pp. 185–197). London: Cassell.
- Lindsay, G., Koene, C., Øvreide, H., & Lang, F. (2008). *Ethics for European psychologists*. Cambridge, MA: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.
- New Zealand Psychological Society. (2002). *Code of ethics for psychologists working in Aotearoa/ New Zealand*. Wellington: Author.
- Nuremberg Code. (1947). *Trials of war criminals before the Nuremberg military tribunals under Control Council Law No. 10* (vol. 2, pp. 181–182). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Oakland, T., Goldman, S., & Bischoff, H. (1997). Code of ethics of the International School Psychology Association. *School Psychology International*, 18, 291–298.
- Pettifor, J. L., Estay, I., & Paquet, S. (2002). Preferred strategies for learning ethics in the practice of a discipline. *Canadian Psychology*, 42, 260–269.
- Protocolo de Acuerdo Marco de Principios Éticos para el Ejercicio Profesional de los Psicólogos en el Mercosur y Países Asociados* [Protocol of the framework agreement of ethical principles for professional practice of psychology in the Mercosur and associated states]. (1997). Santiago, Chile: Author.

- Psychological Society of Ireland. (1999). *Code of professional ethics*. Dublin: Author.
- Sinclair, C. (2005a). A brief history of ethical principles in professional codes of ethics. In J. B. Overmier & J. A. Overmier (Eds.), *Psychology: IUPsyS global resource* [Computer software] (6th ed.). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Sinclair, C. (2005b). The eastern roots of ethical principles and values. In M. J. Stevens & D. Wedding (Eds.), *Psychology: IUPsyS global resource* [Computer software] (6th ed.). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Sinclair, C. (2005c). The roots of ethical principles and values in codes of ethics. In J. L. Pettifor (Chair), *Cultural implications for a universal declaration of ethical principles*. Symposium conducted at the European Congress of Psychology, Granada, Spain.
- Sinclair, C., Simon, N. P., & Pettifor, J. L. (1996). The history of ethical codes and licensure. In L. J. Bass, S. T. DeMers, J. R. P. Ogloff, C. Peterson, & J. L. Pettifor (Eds.), *Professional conduct and discipline in psychology* (pp. 1–15). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Sinclair, C. (2012). Ethical principles, values, and codes for psychologists: An historical journey. In M. M. Leach, M. J. Stevens, G. Lindsay, A. Ferrero, & Y. Korkut (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of international psychological ethics* (pp. 3–18). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Sociedad Mexicana de Psicología. (2002). *Código ético del psicólogo* [Psychologist's code of ethics] (3rd ed.). Mexico City: Editorial Trillas.
- Sociedad Mexicana de Psicología. (2007). *Código ético del psicólogo* [Psychologist's code of ethics] (4th ed.). Mexico: Editorial Trillas.
- United Nations. (1948). *Universal declaration of human rights*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr>
- Universal Declaration of Ethical Principles for Psychologists*. (2008). Retrieved from <http://www.iupsys.net/about/governance/universal-declaration-of-ethical-principles-for-psychologists.html>
- World Medical Association. (1948). *Declaration of Geneva*. Retrieved from <http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/g1/>
- World Medical Association. (1964). *Declaration of Helsinki*. Retrieved from <http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/>