

Ethical considerations in the use of artificial intelligence in counselling and psychotherapy training: A student stakeholder perspective—A pilot study

Stuart Gore  | Emily Dove

School of Healthcare, University of Leeds,
Leeds, UK

Correspondence

Stuart Gore, School of Healthcare,
University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK.
Email: s.gore@leeds.ac.uk

Abstract

Background: This study delves into the ethical considerations of artificial intelligence (AI) use in higher education, focusing on counselling and psychotherapy students' perspectives. Amidst growing interest in AI across educational sectors, this research aimed to highlight student views on the benefits, risks and ethical challenges posed by AI tools in their training.

Methods: Employing a qualitative approach, this scoping study gathered data from seven counselling and psychotherapy students through an online survey, which were analysed using reflexive thematic analysis.

Findings: Four main themes were constructed: (1) guidelines, (2) concerns about the use of AI with highly sensitive information, (3) acceptable and unacceptable uses, and (4) risk of AI compromising the quality of knowledge and practice.

Conclusion: This research underscores the necessity for collaborative guideline development that addresses ethical AI use, the protection of sensitive information, and the delineation of AI's appropriate roles in education and practice. It advocates for ongoing discussion amongst educational institutions, professional bodies and students to create dynamic, ethical standards that evolve with AI advancements, ensuring technology enhances learning outcomes, upholds integrity and respects privacy.

KEYWORDS

artificial intelligence, counselling, psychotherapy, qualitative methods, students, training

1 | BACKGROUND

The interest in the use of artificial intelligence (AI) across society has increased in recent years. Higher education (HE) and psychotherapy are not immune from this. A systematic review shows that in 2021 and 2022, the amount of studies published on the use of AI in HE rose by two to three times more than in previous years (Crompton & Burke, 2023). Crompton and Burke (2023) explore

some examples of how AI is currently being used in HE. AI has been utilised to develop intelligent tutoring systems, which can tailor learning to individual student needs, and in automatic marking, which reduces tutor workload and provides real-time feedback for students. Many of these uses are seen to offer benefits in personalising education, allowing students with different learning needs to access information in varying ways and freeing up time for tutors to allow them to engage in other activities. However, the

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2024 The Authors. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy.

use of AI in education and its purported benefits have not gone unchallenged.

There is a split across HE in how universities have responded to the student adoption of large language models, such as Chat GPT. Responses range from displaying an interest in developing guidelines on how students can use AI tools effectively and responsibly in their work, to banning the use of AI tools for the writing of assignments and incorporating policies on the use of AI into plagiarism rules (Housden, 2023). Concerns around the use of AI include the worry that students using these tools in their learning may not develop the skills and knowledge required (Konecki et al., 2023). In addition to this, the potential use of AI to provide individualised education has been challenged as a path to inclusivity and can be seen as a move away from the aim of finding common ground in how all people could share educational experiences, towards further individualism, which divests from the political aims of the inclusive education movement (Knox et al., 2019). It is essential that the challenges that AI can pose in education for inclusion, equity and student learning are considered as policy is developed within the sector.

Within the world of mental health, AI has also been seen to present both risk and opportunity. Sweeney et al. (2021) found that 65% of mental health professionals perceived the benefit of using chatbots to support patients but 86% believed that these tools were not sufficient to support patient mental health. Practitioners have raised concerns over the ethical use of AI in mental health, particularly in relation to data protection, training for professionals in the use of AI and gaps within existing regulatory frameworks (Fiske et al., 2019).

1.1 | Rationale

Whilst the use of AI has begun to be considered by academics, educationalists and practitioners (Fiske et al., 2019; Sam & Olbrich, 2023; Slimi & Villarejo Carballido, 2023), there is limited consideration of student perspectives on how AI should or should not be used in HE and clinical practice and the potential benefits, risks and challenges. Students offer a unique perspective on the ethical issues that may be raised by the use of these tools and the impact they might have on the education system and practitioner training (Cook-Sather, 2002). To increase fidelity to guidelines where there is high potential for students to use these tools undetected, it is essential they feel their views are represented and that these guidelines are fair, reasonable and dynamic. To achieve this, it will be essential that students, as stakeholders, are given the opportunity to have their perspectives considered.

The main use of AI tools by students and practitioners under consideration at present is that of generative AI. This is understood to be defined as 'technology that (i) leverages deep learning models to (ii) generate human-like content (e.g., images, words) in response to (iii) complex and varied prompts (e.g., languages, instructions, questions)' (Lim et al., 2023, p. 2). As this is the centre of current

Implications for practice

- There is a need for professional bodies and educational institutions to collaboratively develop and explicitly outline ethical guidelines for AI use in counselling and psychotherapy training. These guidelines should address acceptable and unacceptable uses of AI, ensuring they are dynamic and adaptable to technological advancements.
- It is crucial to implement robust data protection mechanisms to safeguard sensitive information shared with AI tools. Explicit consent protocols must be established, ensuring that clients and students are adequately informed about AI use and have the option to opt out.
- The integration of AI into counselling and psychotherapy education requires a framework that promotes deep engagement with course material and professional integrity. AI tools should be used to complement learning, not replace essential personal growth and skills development activities.

Implications for policy

- There is a pressing need for higher education institutions, professional bodies and policymakers to engage in ongoing dialogue with students and educators. This collaborative approach is essential for co-creating ethical standards and policies that reflect the evolving landscape of AI in education, ensuring that AI enhances learning outcomes whilst upholding ethical standards and respecting privacy.

discussions around student use within education, generative AI will be the focus of this study.

1.2 | Aim

This study aimed to take the initial steps in exploring counselling and psychotherapy (C&P) students' perspectives on ethical considerations in the use of AI in HE.

1.3 | Objectives

This study had three objectives as follows:

1. to identify what students consider to be important ethical considerations in the use of AI tools in C&P education;
2. to identify student concerns around the use of AI tools in C&P education; and

3. to identify student suggestions for ensuring AI tools are used ethically in C&P education.

2 | METHOD

2.1 | Philosophical position

The desired outcome of this research was to understand some of the considerations that C&P students may find pertinent when considering the use of AI to inform future wider research and policy development. Therefore, a pragmatic philosophy (Kelly & Cordeiro, 2020; Newton et al., 2020) was adopted in achieving the desired outcomes.

2.2 | Research design

This pilot study took a qualitative survey approach to understanding the perspectives of C&P students on the use of AI in HE.

2.3 | Recruitment and respondents

Potential participants were approached across Year 1 ($N=14$) and Year 2 ($N=22$) of an MA in C&P via in-person teaching contact and an online announcement and Year 3 students ($N=11$) were approached by online announcement only.

During in-person teaching contact, students were invited to take part in the study through being provided with an overview of the research. An announcement was sent via the virtual learning environment to all MA C&P students containing a research poster inviting expressions of interest to take part in the study. Students had 7 days to express interest in taking part by emailing the lead author. Students provided written informed consent to take part in the study.

Wu et al. (2022) found that the average response rate for online surveys is 44.1%. A positive impact on the survey response rate was found when the target population was clearly defined, which was the case for this study where the respondents were C&P students across all 3 year groups ($N=47$). Therefore, a conservative response rate of 20% ($N=9.4$) was aimed for in this study. In total, seven respondents completed the survey, 15% of the available student population.

2.4 | Data collection

Data were collected through an online survey questionnaire (Appendix 1). The survey questions were developed from the research objectives for this study. The questions were formed in the assumed knowledge there would be potentially limited understanding about AI tools amongst the student population. Therefore, the questions were very specific, and guidance was provided to students

at the beginning of the survey about ways in which AI tools can be used in education. Students were also offered some examples of specific AI tools and asked to answer the survey questions in relation to the information provided and their general understanding of the potential uses of AI in C&P education.

2.5 | Data analysis

Braun and Clarke's (2006, 2019) reflexive thematic analysis was used to analyse the data. Responses were read multiple times, so the authors were familiarised with the data. The process of coding then began, looking for meaningful information shared by respondents. From these codes, initial themes were identified. Themes were reviewed to ensure internal homogeneity and external heterogeneity and some themes were reconstructed when moving beyond a descriptive understanding of the data to a conceptual analysis. Four themes were identified, and these were written up to produce a final narrative report supported by extracts from the data.

There was one quantitative question asking respondents if they think the use of AI tools in C&P training should be allowed.

2.6 | Ethics

Ethics approval for this study was granted by the university ethics committee.

2.7 | Reflexivity

The lead author is a blind academic, teacher and researcher who has a positive leaning towards the incorporation of AI technology into the delivery of education and holds the view students who have multiple needs as part of their learning experience may benefit from having access to AI tools to enhance and facilitate their studies. However, he is cognisant that in the absence of any statutory obligation for this technology to be accessible to all, there is a strong potential for there to be further digital exclusion leading to even greater inequality. The lead author is aware that his perception of the usefulness of AI has led him to observe the findings of this study, where students are not overly enthusiastic about wide-ranging use of AI in education, as representative of the lack of knowledge currently held about this technology. He holds the view that as our relationship with this technology develops, opinions may shift, and this has influenced how the findings have been conceptualised where it is evident there is a more optimistic tone for the future of AI and its use in HE.

The co-author holds a somewhat less optimistic view of how AI technology may influence education and society more widely. Whilst she acknowledges the potential of these tools to be vast in being able to provide a way for marginalised people to access education on a more level playing field, her pessimism lies in acknowledging the structures through which this would need to occur are the same

structures which have not truly harnessed previous technological advancements to the benefit of those people. Her own experiences of attempting to access resources through routes such as disabled students' allowance have left her with doubts as to whether these technologies will be made truly accessible to those for whom they would have the most benefit in a timely, efficient and supportive manner. These focused concerns have likely impacted the conceptualisation of the findings of this study where any expression of similar anxieties to that of the co-author by respondents is likely to have been highlighted.

3 | FINDINGS

Four themes were identified as follows: guidelines, concerns about the use of AI with highly sensitive information, acceptable and unacceptable uses, and risk of AI compromising the quality of knowledge and practice.

3.1 | Guidelines

Respondents would like professional bodies and educational institutions to explicitly outline rules and guidelines relating to the ethical use of AI tools in C&P training. There was a shared anxiety in the use of AI tools as instruction on how they could be used has not yet been provided. Sarah stated that it would be useful to have guidance on how AI could be used appropriately. Arya suggested the generation of these guidelines should be 'created collaboratively by professional bodies, training course providers, and trainees to set clear boundaries and expectations around AI use', indicating a desire for a variety of stakeholder views to be taken into consideration in the formation of this guidance.

Ben recognised the AI tool landscape is going through rapid change, stating that 'ethical bodies and universities need to catch up'. He added that AI tools have the potential to be beneficial but thinks students are fearful of their use in the absence of any clearly defined rules on how they can be ethically adopted. Arya acknowledged that guidelines would have their limitations as adherence would be challenging to monitor, a recognition that there is no current reliable screening technology for detecting the use of AI.

3.2 | Concerns about the use of AI with highly sensitive information

Respondents had concerns about sharing highly sensitive information with AI tools. Respondents valued confidentiality highly and made regular reference to the importance of maintaining this. Arya stated that 'client confidentiality would need to be protected as a matter of utmost importance' and Sam suggested 'confidentiality is a huge concern' for 'both counselling trainee and client'. It was fundamental to the respondents they had confirmation that the AI tools

they might consider using had clear safeguards for the protection of confidential information but were sceptical about the feasibility of this due to a lack of understanding about how AI tools use the information they are provided with.

I don't know a lot about AI, but I think that the programmes use the data they are given to improve and create algorithms, so any data fed into the AI tools will be used in some way, and no longer in control of the subject (be that counselling tutor, trainee or their client). Where does this go? Who owns/controls it? What can be done with it?

(Sam)

Respondents believed that consent for personal information to be shared with AI tools should be explicitly gained, with Sarah questioning, 'clients might give consent to a recording to be used in training but do they give consent for these outside AI services to have access to their private information?', and Robert sharing his thoughts that clients should be given the 'the opportunity to comment on [their personal information being shared with AI] and opt out should they wish'. These concerns highlight a need for careful consideration to be given to how client and student data can be appropriately protected.

3.3 | Acceptable and unacceptable uses

Respondents provided examples of what they believed to be acceptable and unacceptable uses of AI in C&P training. Examples of these uses, as provided by respondents, are outlined in Table 1.

Where respondents deemed the use of AI tools to be appropriate, it was thought they should only be used to offer a starting point from which students can build an end point to review the presentation of work or to assist with academic skills development. When focusing on the use of AI tools to provide a foundation for student work, Arya suggested AI tools that have the potential to support learning through personalised education, which they believed would most benefit students with specific learning needs, mature students returning to education and those with gaps in educational attainment attributed to social deprivation. Examples of this use were offered by multiple respondents and included using AI to provide tailored lessons on specific topics, searching using AI tools to gather initial information on research topics and using these tools to assist with academic writing. Three respondents believed that the use of AI to transcribe client recordings was acceptable, but Rachel stated this should only be a starting point from which students would then engage with their client material in more depth. Respondents made frequent reference to the use of AI tools to perform grammar and spelling checks on written work, which they considered an acceptable use of the technology.

Respondents found the idea of AI tools completing students work through writing the entirety of an essay, dissertation or sitting

TABLE 1 Acceptable and unacceptable uses.

	Use	Examples	Respondents
Acceptable uses	A starting point for student work	Searching the internet for information	Rachel
		Producing initial project ideas	Arya Rachel
		Transcribing client recordings	Arya Robert Rachel
	Reviewing completed student work	Grammar and spelling checks	Arya Ben
		Support with presentation and formatting of work	Ben Robert
	Supporting learning through personalised education	Tailored lessons Support with academic writing	Arya Arya Bob
Unacceptable uses	Completing the entirety of student work	Writing full essays	Rachel Sam
		Sitting an exam	Rachel
		Writing a dissertation	Ben
	Delivering psychological therapy		Robert
	Any generation of academic work		Bob

an examination unacceptable. From a practice perspective, Robert did not think that AI tools should be used to deliver psychological therapy as he believed the fundamental essence of C&P to be the union of two human beings to create a helping, therapeutic relationship and that machines can only mimic empathy, congruence and unconditional positive regard, not offer these authentically. Bob did not believe it is ethical to use AI to generate any content for academic work in C&P training, stating that 'to use AI tools to complete academic work ... is clearly unethical but particularly so in a profession where ethics is at the heart of practice'. Overall, three out of seven respondents were in favour of the use of AI tools to some extent, three were uncertain as to whether these tools should be used in C&P education, and one believed that AI should not be used at all for this training.

3.4 | Risk of AI compromising the quality of knowledge and practice

Respondents shared a concern that the quality and knowledge of qualified practitioners may be jeopardised if AI tools were to be used in training. Respondents were concerned that the use of AI in C&P training may impact the levels of knowledge, personal growth and quality of counselling skills. It was suggested that the use of AI may allow trainees to circumvent a deep engagement with course material, which would damage the student learning process, reduce investment in the topic and pride in their work. Bob believed there was a danger that qualified counsellors and psychotherapists may be less well trained if they use AI tools during their studies as they may

not have developed the skills of reflexivity and an ability to integrate theory with practice.

There was a shared belief that students using AI tools in C&P training may demonstrate a lack of integrity, which impacts on student character, compromising their ability to be ethical practitioners. Bob stated that he had 'a concern of the real ethical standards of trainee counsellors and psychotherapists if they feel it is acceptable to use these tools'. Other respondents did not believe that the use of these tools generally necessitated an ethical concern, but Rachel did add that an attempt to conceal the use of AI tools was detrimental to a student's integrity and moral character and suggested that this could have a negative impact on their therapeutic work with clients.

Respondents questioned the trustworthiness and quality of work generated by AI tools. There was a shared awareness that AI tools do not always produce accurate information, with Ben stating that, 'depending on how AI is used it could be presenting false information as fact', and Sam articulated a need for quality control when verifying sources and information provided by AI.

4 | DISCUSSION

This study met its aims and objectives in taking the initial steps of exploring C&P students' perspectives on ethical considerations in the use of AI in HE through identifying what students consider to be important ethical considerations, concerns around the use of AI tools and suggestions for ensuring AI tools are used ethically in C&P education.

It is likely that concerns respondents raised in this study with regard to the detrimental effect AI tools may have on integrity and moral character are explicit due to the nature of training that C&P students undertake. C&P education is centred around professional body ethical frameworks. For example, the British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy (BACP) specifies personal moral qualities which practitioners should uphold, including integrity (BACP, 2018). Wider arguments around the use of AI tools and academic honesty have been raised (Cotton et al., 2023) and do seem to hold an underlying concern about student morals. However, this study is the first time this has been stated so explicitly and has questioned the impact of intrinsic morality on the extent and quality of what they will learn and how they will be able to practice ethically upon qualification.

Arguments around academic honesty have explored concerns around how using AI tools to do the majority of work may impact the quality of knowledge obtained by students. This was also expressed by respondents in this study, who believed reliance on AI tools could compromise the quality of knowledge and practice in C&P. It was suggested that AI might enable trainees to bypass deep engagement with course material, affecting their learning process and skill development. This concern echoes Konecki et al.'s (2023) research, which suggests that AI may offer students the possibility to skip important lessons, relying on AI to do the work for them. They highlight the risk that these tools may be misused, but do not offer explicit commentary on which uses may be classed as unacceptable. This study takes tentative steps towards exploring how and how not to use AI in HE. Respondents in this study provided examples of unacceptable uses of AI, including writing entire essays, and acceptable uses, such as assisting with academic writing or providing tailored lessons for students. Crompton and Burke's (2023) research reveals that there is precedent for the use of intelligent tutoring systems, which tailor learning to individual student needs. In Ahmad et al.'s (2023) research, students saw AI as beneficial for diagnostic and stress-relief roles, but were sceptical about its empathetic capabilities. This aligns with our findings, where students did not believe AI should be allowed to deliver psychological therapy, as machines were viewed as being only able to offer a replica of empathy rather than providing this authentically.

Whilst respondents in this study did generally believe there were acceptable uses for AI in C&P education, this was raised alongside doubts about the accuracy and reliability of information generated by AI tools, and the need for quality control in verifying AI-provided information. Ahmad et al.'s (2023) research highlighted that medical students believe that work produced by AI should be verified by humans, implying a reluctance to fully trust in the ability of these technologies. There is a likelihood that students in this study who were unfamiliar with AI may express concerns about its trustworthiness because of a lack of knowledge on how the technology works and what it does. This lack of understanding of the technology was shown by Marrone et al. (2022) to impact how willing students were to adopt the technology, with students who reported having a greater understanding of the technology being less fearful

of its use. The literature exploring the adoption of AI has shown that knowledge about this technology is key in building trust, which can, in turn, lead to greater acceptance of the use of this technology (Bedué & Fritzsche, 2021). It is, therefore, pertinent to note that as AI becomes more integrated in day-to-day life and understanding of it grows, views around the ethical application of this technology may change.

Respondents in this study did express mistrust around how AI tools use personal information, with a specific focus on confidentiality and consent. C&P student training around ethical frameworks may again offer some explanation as to the extent to which this was highlighted as a key consideration in the ethical adoption of AI technology, as these issues are widely covered in ethical frameworks for the profession (BACP, 2018; UKCP, 2019).

This study saw respondents express significant concerns about sharing sensitive information with AI tools and emphasised the need to protect client data rigorously. This aligns with broader anxieties about AI's ability to handle sensitive healthcare information ethically and securely, necessitating robust data protection mechanisms and explicit consent protocols, as found in research exploring the use of AI in healthcare more widely (Ahmad et al., 2023).

The necessity of obtaining explicit consent for sharing personal information with AI tools was highlighted by respondents in this study, with concerns about whether clients and students are adequately informed about the use of AI and given the opportunity to opt-out of having their data shared with these tools. In the UK, current NHS guidance states that where AI is used for individual patient care, implied consent is assumed and patients are not asked to provide explicit consent for their data to be shared with these tools (NHS, 2023). The strength of concern about the use of AI with client information expressed by respondents in this study and the emphasis placed on ensuring clients are informed about how their data are used suggests further consideration may need to be given to the extent of client records that are shared with AI in practice, and how consent for this is obtained.

The respondents in this study expressed the importance of wide stakeholder involvement in the formation of clearly defined guidelines which outline acceptable and unacceptable uses of AI in HE. They recognised the limitations of guidelines when responding to a rapidly developing AI landscape in the absence of a reliable method of detecting the use of AI. The need for guidelines on how AI can be used in HE and the challenges in achieving this have been widely explored (Chan, 2023; Perera & Lankathilaka, 2023). Cotton et al. (2023) offer a variety of suggestions on how to ensure students follow guidelines and how to detect the use of AI tools in student work, such as looking for patterns in language and reviewing student submissions at various stages of development. However, these suggestions are fallible and would require significant additional work on the part of educators. In addition, it has been more widely suggested that guidelines need to be continually adapted and updated to keep pace with technological developments (Said et al., 2023). There has been no suggestion of how this might happen in slow-moving institutions, such as universities, and large professional bodies,

particularly where a plethora of stakeholder voices are needed in the development of such guidance. Further consideration needs to be given to how these guidelines can be developed to keep up with both the pace of technological development and the potentially evolving ethical and moral positions in the use of AI tools as a greater understanding of their function and capacity to be integrated into HE is achieved. These considerations need to be held alongside the challenges in identifying work which has been developed using AI and how this can be practically addressed.

4.1 | Strengths, limitations and future research

This study offers a timely reflection on the use of AI in C&P education from the perspectives of students, which are underexplored. The qualitative approach taken has provided the depth of reflection from students, which has allowed for the complexity of their opinions to be explored, leading to detailed and multifaceted findings. The focus on C&P students has led to a unique perspective on the use of AI in training where specific ethical considerations, alongside strict data protection protocols, need to be considered.

This narrow perspective, however, is somewhat of a limitation on how far the findings can be applied to understanding the perspectives of students more widely in the use of AI, particularly given the small sample size and that students were all studying the same programme. Additionally, the students who took part have a limited understanding of the range of applications of AI in HE and this has led to a narrow focus. Further research with a larger and more diverse sample could produce data which would assist in the development of frameworks for guideline generation, which could advance the discourse and guide policy and practice effectively.

The survey design of this research meant that students could not be further prompted to offer more depth of reflection on their answers, meaning that there is limited information on exactly the type of guidelines they would like to be produced around the use of AI. Future research should consider the use of interview or focus group designs, where prompting could be used to elicit further information in this area.

5 | CONCLUSION

The exploration of C&P students' perspectives on the ethical considerations of AI use in HE has uncovered a complex mixture of concerns, potential benefits and the necessity for thoughtful integration of technology. This study begins to indicate that it is likely important to establish clear, collaborative guidelines that address the ethical use of AI tools, ensuring that the confidentiality of sensitive information is rigorously protected, and delineating acceptable versus unacceptable uses of AI in educational settings.

The respondents' concerns about the potential for AI to compromise the quality of knowledge and practice in C&P training highlight a need to further explore educational frameworks that prioritise

deep engagement with course material and the development of personal and professional integrity. Furthermore, the study reveals a cautious optimism amongst respondents about the role of AI in personalising education to cater to diverse learning needs, whilst also recognising the potential risks associated with data privacy and the integrity of the educational process.

In moving forward, it is crucial that HE institutions, professional bodies and policymakers engage in an ongoing dialogue with students and educators to co-create dynamic, ethical guidelines that can adapt to the rapidly evolving AI landscape. Further research could explore how a collaborative approach can ensure that AI tools are integrated into C&P education in a manner that enhances learning outcomes, upholds ethical standards and respects the privacy and dignity of all individuals involved.

As AI continues to permeate various aspects of educational and professional practice, the insights gained from this study serve as a foundation for further research and policy development aimed at harnessing the benefits of AI whilst mitigating its risks. The commitment to ethical, informed and inclusive use of AI technology in HE will be pivotal in shaping a future where technology enhances human connection, learning and professional integrity in the C&P field.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

We have no known conflict of interest to disclose.

ORCID

Stuart Gore  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4761-2974>

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, M. N., Abdallah, S. A., Abbasi, S. A., & Abdallah, A. M. (2023). Student perspectives on the integration of artificial intelligence into healthcare services. *Digital Health*, 9, 20552076231174096. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20552076231174096>
- BACP. (2018). *BACP ethical framework for the counselling professions*. <https://www.bacp.co.uk/events-and-resources/ethics-and-standards/ethical-framework-for-the-counselling-professions/>
- Bedué, P., & Fritzsche, A. (2021). Can we trust AI? An empirical investigation of trust requirements and guide to successful AI adoption. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 35(2), 530–549. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEIM-06-2020-0233>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(4), 589–597.
- Chan, C. K. Y. (2023). A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1), 38. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3>
- Cook-Sather, A. (2002). Authorizing students' perspectives: Toward trust, dialogue, and change in education. *Educational Researcher*, 31(4), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X031004003>
- Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2023). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61(2), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>
- Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: The state of the field. *International Journal of Educational*

- Technology in Higher Education, 20(1), 22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00392-8>
- Fiske, A., Henningsen, P., & Buyx, A. (2019). Your robot therapist will see you now: Ethical implications of embodied artificial intelligence in psychiatry, psychology, and psychotherapy. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 21(5), e13216. <https://doi.org/10.2196/13216>
- Housden, J. (2023). *i morning briefing: How are universities dealing with ChatGPT?* <https://inews.co.uk/news/i-morning-briefing-how-are-universities-dealing-with-chatgpt-2179732>
- Kelly, L. M., & Cordeiro, M. (2020). Three principles of pragmatism for research on organizational processes. *Methodological Innovations*, 13(2), 2059799120937242. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2059799120937242>
- Knox, J., Wang, Y., & Gallagher, M. (2019). Introduction: AI, inclusion, and 'everyone learning everything'. In J. Knox, Y. Wang, & M. Gallagher (Eds.), *Artificial intelligence and inclusive education: Speculative futures and emerging practices* (pp. 1–13). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-8161-4_1
- Konecki, M., Konecki, M., & Biškupić, I. (2023). *Using Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education*. 136–141 <https://doi.org/10.5220/0012039700003470>
- Lim, W. M., Gunasekara, A., Pallant, J. L., Pallant, J. I., & Pechenkina, E. (2023). Generative AI and the future of education: Ragnarök or reformation? A paradoxical perspective from management educators. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21(2), 100790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100790>
- Marrone, R., Taddeo, V., & Hill, G. (2022). Creativity and artificial intelligence—A student perspective. *Journal of Intelligence*, 10(3), 65. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence10030065>
- Newton, P. M., Da Silva, A., & Berry, S. (2020). The case for pragmatic evidence-based higher education: A useful way forward? *Frontiers in Education*, 5, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.583157>
- NHS. (2023). *Artificial intelligence*. NHS Transformation Directorate. <https://transform.england.nhs.uk/information-governance/guidance/artificial-intelligence/>
- Perera, P., & Lankathilaka, M. (2023). AI in higher education: A literature review of ChatGPT and guidelines for responsible implementation. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 7, 306–314.
- Said, G., Azamat, K., Ravshan, S., & Bokhadir, A. (2023). Adapting legal systems to the development of artificial intelligence: Solving the global problem of AI in judicial processes. *International Journal of Cyber Law*, 1(4), 4. <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijcl.49>
- Sam, A. K., & Olbrich, P. (2023). The need for AI ethics in higher education. In C. C. Corrigan, S. A. Asakipam, J. J. Kponyo, & C. Luetge (Eds.), *AI ethics in higher education: Insights from Africa and beyond* (pp. 3–10). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-23035-6_1
- Slimi, Z., & Villarejo Carballido, B. (2023). Navigating the ethical challenges of artificial intelligence in higher education: An analysis of seven global AI ethics policies. *TEM Journal*, 12(2), 590–602.
- Sweeney, C., Potts, C., Ennis, E., Bond, R., Mulvenna, M. D., O'Neill, S., Malcolm, M., Kuosmanen, L., Kostenius, C., Vakaloudis, A., Mcconvey, G., Turkington, R., Hanna, D., Nieminen, H., Vartiainen, A.-K., Robertson, A., & Mctear, M. F. (2021). Can chatbots help support a person's mental health? Perceptions and views from mental healthcare professionals and experts. *ACM Transactions on Computing for Healthcare*, 2(3), 25, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3453175>
- UKCP. (2019). *UKCP code of ethics and professional practice*. <https://www.psychotherapy.org.uk/media/bkjd33f/ukcp-code-of-ethics-and-professional-practice-2019.pdf>
- Wu, M.-J., Zhao, K., & Fils-Aime, F. (2022). Response rates of online surveys in published research: A meta-analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 7, 100206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2022.100206>

How to cite this article: Gore, S., & Dove, E. (2025). Ethical considerations in the use of artificial intelligence in counselling and psychotherapy training: A student stakeholder perspective—A pilot study. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 25, e12770. <https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12770>

APPENDIX 1

Questionnaire

Artificially intelligent (AI) tools are increasingly being used by students in higher education. These tools have been used to write essays, generate reports, prepare presentations, sit examinations and transcribe recordings. These case use examples raise questions in relation to academic integrity and professional body ethical standards. The adoption of these AI tools could have implications for both theory and practice in counselling and psychotherapy training.

There are many AI tools, which could be used in counselling and psychotherapy education. A few examples to help contextualise the questions in this survey include.

- QuillBot, an AI-powered writing assistant that can help refine your writing styles
- ChatGPT, an AI-powered language model that can answer questions and generate content.
- Canva and Prezi, two AI-powered tools that can help create professional-looking presentations and visual content

This is not an exhaustive list and you should answer the below questions in relation to your understanding of AI tools in general and their potential use in education.

Very important note: When completing this survey, you must not provide any of your personal experience in using AI tools in education. If you do disclose the use of AI tools in education and that use raises any concerns relating to student conduct or fitness to practice, this will have to be investigated by the University of Leeds. This could have implications for the continuation of your study.

This questionnaire will take approximately 20min to complete.

1. What do you think are important ethical considerations in the use of AI tools in counselling and psychotherapy training?
2. What concerns, if any, do you have about the use of AI tools in counselling and psychotherapy training?
3. What suggestions, if any, do you have for ensuring AI tools are used ethically in counselling and psychotherapy training?
4. Do you think the use of AI tools in counselling and psychotherapy training should be allowed?
 - ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ Maybe
5. Please explain the reason for your response to Question 4

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Dr Stuart Gore is a lecturer and chartered counselling psychologist. He is the programme lead for the MA in psychotherapy and counselling at the University of Leeds and works in private-sector psychology. His research interests lie in aiming to better understand the systemic challenges disabled people encounter when accessing higher education through an intersectional lens.

Emily Dove is a master's psychology student with a background in social research. She currently works on the MA in counselling and psychotherapy at the University of Leeds. Her research interests are focused around exploring the lived experience of neurodivergent adults in accessing later-in-life diagnosis and support for work, education and mental well-being.