



Vol. 3, No. 2, October 1977

ANNUAL SURVEY OF PSYCHOLOGISTS IN ONTARIO

In the past few years a brief questionnaire has been enclosed with the renewal notices sent out in April. The information provided has enabled the Board to answer questions directed to it by several divisions of the Ontario Ministry of Health, by the Ministry of Labour, Health and Welfare Canada and Statistics Canada. Although the requests have been relatively simple and straightforward, without your cooperation it would have been impossible to provide information much beyond numbers of registrants.

Responses to the questions indicate that psychologists are finding employment in a wide variety of settings, are engaged in providing an increasingly broad range of services and, in doing so, perform a complex array of functions. Direct clinical service in a psychiatric setting is no longer, if it ever was, the modal role. Efforts to summarize and describe the diverse activities of psychologists inevitably run the risk, therefore, of oversimplification.

This year the responses have been tabulated and cross-tabulated by computer through a service provided at the Ontario Institute of Studies in Education in Toronto. Of the 892 psychologists on the register, questionnaires were returned by 748, or 83.9 percent.

Services in Other Languages

Altogether, psychologists in the group responding can offer services in 30 languages. These skills are held by relatively few, however, as 80.4 percent of the group are limited to offering services in English, with 11.4 percent prepared to offer services in French

and 10.5 percent in other languages.

Private Practice

The proportion of the respondents who are "self-employed" in their principal area of work was 9.6 percent, similar to the 11 percent of last year. Those who are self-employed are more likely than employed psychologists to be those whose interest is in industrial psychology or in some combination with industrial and are less likely to be interested in educational psychology.

An additional 30.9 percent indicate that they are self-employed in their secondary area of work. This represents a considerable increase over the 21 percent of last year who, though employees, were engaged in some private practice. Men and women continue to be proportionally represented among those who are self-employed in their principal area of work. Women, however, are less likely to be engaged in a secondary area of work (51.1 percent compared with 62.2 of the men) and, if so, less likely to be self-employed in this secondary area (26.1 percent as compared with 45.6 percent of the men).

Area of Interest

Frequencies based on those responding (706) to the question suggest that 59.6 percent consider their interest area to be "clinical", 12.5 percent indicate "educational", 3.1 percent, "developmental", with an additional 9.6 percent (frequently psychologists working with school boards) indicating some combination of the above. Another 6.8 percent checked "industrial", with "social" and "physiological" selected by less than 2 percent in each case. Other combined responses were provided by

3.7 percent. Women were more likely to indicate developmental or educational and less likely than men to indicate clinical or industrial.

Work Setting

Of the 701 indicating their work setting, 15.5 percent are working in primary or secondary educational facilities, 23.1 percent in post-secondary institutions, 17.1 percent in psychiatric hospitals or mental health centres, 14.1 percent in general hospitals (psychiatric, other special, or general services), 4.3 percent in mental retardation centres, 2.9 percent in correctional services, 5.6 percent in industrial or commercial firms, 7.4 percent in private offices, and 10.0 percent provided multiple answers or were working in a variety of other settings (government departments, armed services, research institutes, police forces, or social agencies).

Psychological Activity

Using frequencies based on the number of responses (696) to the question, 30.7 percent indicated their activity to be direct service with an additional 19.8 percent checking direct service in combination with some other activity. Consulting was checked by 11.4 percent, administration by 12.9, teaching or training by 11.9, research by 5.9, and some combination of the latter three categories by an additional 7.3 percent. The format of the response choices, insofar as they tended to force single responses, may not give an accurate picture of a psychologists's activities. This question will be revised or dropped in future years.

Health Professionals

Although 73.5 percent of the sample consider themselves to be "health professionals", 10.4 percent refused to answer the question and many queried the meaning of the term. The implications for viewing oneself as a health professional or the rationale for including this question are unclear to many. Although psychologists certainly

are committed to the concept of the well-being, growth or development of those they serve, many find their professional activities unrelated to health in the special sense of a health-illness dimension.

In Conclusion

More detailed information provided by additional cross-tabulations is available for those who may be interested but is not presented here for reasons of economy.

TEMPORARY REGISTRATION: RESTRICTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

In the interest of reducing the ambiguity possibly clouding the status of persons on the Temporary Register the Board has attempted to formulate a clear set of guidelines regarding supervision. It is anticipated that these will be available for circulation in a few weeks.

In the interim, temporary registrants will be concerned to know that the privileges extended to them are limited to those which are consistent with being a psychologist in training and, although they include the privilege of using the title "psychologist", they do not include activities which imply that they are independent practitioners of psychology. Specifically, such privileges do not include listing in the yellow pages of the telephone directory, issuing cards or engaging in other forms of advertising or announcement. If they are engaged in private practice, it is with the knowledge and permission of the Board and on the understanding that these activities are on referral from and under the supervision of a psychologist on the Permanent Register. The Board has adopted the following principle enunciated by the American Association of State Psychology Boards, of which it is a member, "The supervisory psychologist accepts full and complete responsibility for all professional conduct of the supervisee; all professional responsibility resides with

the supervisor, not with the supervisee. The supervisee will be considered to have joined the practice of the supervisor." (AASPB Handbook for Members of State Psychology Boards, pp. G-34 ff.)

A PSYCHOLOGIST BY ANY
OTHER NAME...

The ethical standards which, as psychologists, we have adopted can be restrictive as well as a goal to aim for. Particularly in planning services to be offered privately, it is tempting to shift from using professional standards to those used to advantage in the market place.

An interesting question has recently been posed for the Board: Is a psychologist relieved of the responsibility of adhering to "professional rather than commercial standards in making known his availability for professional service" (Bulletin, November, 1976) if he provides these services without suggesting they are psychological or that he is a psychologist?

Clearly, the answer is "No". A psychologist is judged by what he does professionally and not by the labels he gives to what he does, or by the guise in which he does it. Although it might be arguable that, in running a hardware store, he would not be bound by the ethical standards of psychologists, in offering human services implying personal or behavioural change he is obligated to adhere to the standards of the profession.

The Board wishes to present this problem and its policy to all psychologists in order that they may not, through misunderstanding, suffer penalty for violations of the standards.

NON-RENEWALS

The names of the following psychologists were removed from the Register either at their own request or due to failure to pay the renewal fee:

Jan K. Adamowicz
Lalit C. Bhandari
Kenneth S. Bowers
John R. Bramwell
Marjorie E.C. Carson
Victor A. Colotla
Irene Crofts
Raymond M. Daly
Ovidius A. Elstone
Walter D. Fenz
J. Barnard Gilmore
Bruce W. Gladstone
Joyce R. Graham
Farrell J. Hannah
Ruth Hoyt-Cameron
Alfred A. Keltner
Margery L. King
Michael S. Kotkin
John J. La Gaipa
Gordon R. Lowe
Monique Lussier
Donald A. MacTavish
Wilburn R. Mann
Clement P. Meunier
Tara C. Mezei
Colin G. Miles
Gerald P. Motz
Brian J. O'Neill
Paul G. Otke
Ronald K. Penney
Frank C. Peters
John A. Satterberg
Judith G. Schachter
Rosemary S.A. Scott
Emmett P. Sloan
Robert Swartz
Mary Elizabeth Vander Goot
Verna M. Van Leeuwen

The Board regrets that the following psychologists have died during the past year:

Eleanor M. Campbell
William E. Carter

The names of the following candidates have been removed from the Temporary Register:

Rudolf L. Kincel Stephen Motowidlo
Jill Moscovitch Jerome A. Travers

THE PSYCHOLOGIST'S DUTY TO WARN

A question has been presented to the Board regarding the psychologist's duty to warn responsible authorities if, in the psychologist's view, a client is a potential danger to himself or to others. The question was raised originally in regard to the implications of the Highway Traffic Act, R.S.O. 1970, Chapter 202 which, in Sections 143 and 144, states (without reference to other professionals) that a legally qualified medical practitioner or optometrist has the obligation to warn the Registrar of Motor Vehicles (subsection 1) and is correspondingly protected against action for complying with this section (subsection 2).

As a recent decision of the Supreme Court of California (Tarasoff v. Regents of the University of California, 1976, 551 p. 2d 334) has suggested, however, it is not entirely clear that psychologists are therefore relieved of this responsibility by virtue of being omitted from the Highway Traffic Act or the Health Disciplines Act, 1974. In the Tarasoff case, it was the opinion of the Court that, in view of the "special relationship" between a patient and his doctor of psychotherapist, there was a duty to exercise reasonable care to protect others. Although it acknowledged the importance within this special relationship of respecting the confidentiality of the client, the Court declared that the public safety must be paramount.

Although this case was heard in a California court, it is the view of this Board's legal counsel that there is some basis for arguing that similar reasoning could apply to a psychologist's professional conduct in Ontario. This case is discussed in the February 1977 issue of the APA Monitor (pp 5 ff.). Psychologists assessing driving skills, for example, may wish to protect themselves by obtaining permission to release relevant information to the client's physician.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

The June issue of the Bulletin carried a copy of a letter dated May 30 addressed to the Minister of Education, the Honourable Mr. T.L. Wells. Below, we reproduce a reply to this letter written by Dr. G.D. Bergman, Director of the Special Education Branch, as well as subsequent correspondence.

"June 16, 1977

Dear Dr. Wand :

Your letter of May 30th to The Honourable T. L. Wells, in which you expressed the professional concerns of psychologists employed by school boards, has been referred to me for response.

As you are probably aware, boards of education function autonomously and make decisions at the local level with regard to educational matters in their respective jurisdictions. Each board of education, therefore, establishes its own pattern of service and employs personnel to provide the best possible education for its pupils. The Ministry attempts to provide opportunities for boards to employ personnel required to serve its specific student population.

The approach and position of the Ontario Board of Examiners in Psychology as a professional organization regarding psychologists employed by boards of education is understandable. There are, however, certain aspects that must be taken into consideration:

- (a) Pupils who are individually assessed by psychologists must be served in the educational system, parents are to be advised, and administrators and teachers informed of results, so that suitable programs may be planned by educators to help pupils to develop to their fullest potentials;
- (b) Psychologists are employed to

serve the school system; therefore, information about students obtained by psychologists should be shared on the basis of parental approval, providing information to other professionals, through methods of communication mutually agreed upon;

- (c) The use of a team approach by personnel within the school system is especially beneficial for pupils with learning problems;
- (d) There are measures built into the structure of the Ontario School Records to protect the rights of students and parents.

In order to avoid future problems, it would be advisable for psychologists who seek employment with school boards to request that a specific statement be inserted in their contracts with regard to directives b, c, and d, of your list. By negotiated agreements, on the part of the employing school board and the psychologist, many of your concerns could be dealt with.

Another approach for psychologists might be to establish private practices as a self-governing profession, informing boards that they are ready to provide psychological services. Boards could then purchase services and obtain assessment information with parental approval, while the possession of confidential records would be left with the psychologist or agency who provided the services.

With regard to employment of other than registered psychologists, boards of education are in the position of using personnel in ways and in type as local needs are determined. The misleading titles of personnel employed by boards of education has been the result of a number of situations in the past which have not been clarified by either the Ontario Psychological Association or the Ministry. With this in mind, a liaison committee consisting of two Education Officers of the Ministry of Education, Special Education Branch, and two appointed liaison members of the Ontario

Psychological Association was initiated. This committee is in the process of preparing a guideline which will be inserted in the "Education of Exceptional Children" manual, for distribution to all school boards in the Province.

The content of this guideline will include such information as the definition, role and function of the registered psychologist, psychometrician, and teacher-diagnostician, as well as other information pertinent to school boards regarding Psychological Services. This guideline should assist in many ways to eliminate problems caused by the misconception of roles and functions assigned to personnel who are not registered psychologists. This might also provide the answer to directive (a) in your letter.

I hope that this clarifies some of your concerns regarding approaches being taken by school boards in Ontario.

Yours sincerely,
G. D. Bergman, Ph.D.,
Director,
Special Education Branch."

"August 18, 1977

Dear Dr. Bergman :

Thank you for your letter of June 16 in response to my letter to the Honourable Mr. T. L. Wells, Minister of Education.

The Ontario Board of Examiners in Psychology is pleased to learn of the meetings being held in the Ministry of Education with representatives of the Ontario Psychological Association. It is hopeful that the discussions you describe will result in greater understanding of the professional standards to which psychologists are legally obligated to adhere in providing psychological services to the public, not only in their private practices but in their employment by third-party purchasers, as well.

The Board of Examiners is somewhat mystified by your suggestion that, in order to avoid professional problems,

psychologists might "establish private practices as a self-governing profession". It is precisely because psychology is a self-governing profession under the provisions of the Psychologists Registration Act, R.S.O. 1970, Chapter 372, that the Board has felt it necessary to initiate this correspondence with the Ministry of Education. Moreover, the Board is reluctant to accept the inference that it is only in their private practices that psychologists are free to protect the public interest by adhering to minimum standards of practice. Furthermore, in a retreat to private practice, it would be difficult for the psychologist to maintain the level of effectiveness provided by interdisciplinary and team approaches to problem solving which we both agree is beneficial to the student.

The Board is not reassured that measures presently taken for the handling of school records cover the requirements for dealing with confidential information in psychological files. The Board is disappointed to note your suggestions that, in order to ensure that the rights of students and parents are protected in the handling of confidential information, it would be incumbent upon individual psychologists to negotiate arrangements with each school board separately. Individual contractual arrangements as you suggest, between particular psychologists and school boards, would be necessary, of course, in the absence of any policy within the Ministry of Education to support the maintenance of professional standards in the provision of psychological services to the public.

The Ontario Board of Examiners in Psychology is hopeful that the Ministry of Education will see the importance of ensuring that psychological services provided by the taxpayer through the auspices of school boards will be comparable in quality to those which psychologists are obligated to provide in their private practices. It looks forward to hearing what action the Ministry of Education proposes to take to maintain the quality of psycholo-

gical services offered by its employees.

Yours very truly,

Barbara Wand, Ph.D.
Registrar

cc: The Honourable T. L. Wells
The Minister of Education

Dr. Marvin Goodman
President-elect
Ontario Psychological Association"

"September 13, 1977.

Dear Dr. Wand :

With reference to some of the doubts expressed in your letter of August 18, 1977, regarding the alternatives suggested for psychologists in my previous letter, The Education Act, 1974, Section 147, Paragraph 5 (ii) states that "A board may appoint one or more psychologists who are legally qualified medical practitioners or hold a certificate of registration under The Psychologists Registration Act; R.S.O. 1970, c 424, s. 34, par. 3, amended". Thus each board establishes its own terms of reference when negotiating contract agreements with the psychologist seeking employment.

It is the school board's responsibility to determine the services required and the role and function of the employee must be under the supervision of the appropriate supervisory officer of the board. This holds whether it be an agreement for a full or part time employment or a purchase of services from a private psychological agency.

Again, thank you for your letter.

Yours sincerely,

G. D. Bergman, Ph.D.,
Director,
Special Education Branch."

REGULATION TO AMEND
REGULATION 698 OF REVISED REGULATIONS OF ONTARIO, 1970
MADE UNDER
THE PSYCHOLOGISTS REGISTRATION ACT

1. Section 3 of Regulation 698 of Revised Regulations of Ontario, 1970 is revoked and the following substituted therefor:

- 3.-(1) Each member shall be paid necessary travelling and other expenses incurred in connection with the business of the Board and where a member suffers a loss of income as a result of doing Board work, he shall be paid a per diem allowance of \$100 for attendance at Board meetings or hearings.

- (2) The per diem allowances payable under subsection 1 shall not exceed \$1,200 in any one year.

2. Subsection 2 of section 8 of the said Regulation is revoked and the following substituted therefor:

- (2) The fee for an examination is \$150.