

We have a difficult problem. Whereas professional schools such as those in medicine, law, social work and education provide technical training with implicit vocational goals underlying their programs, departments of psychology provide both liberal arts *and* professional training. A consequence of this split function is that we can not be certain which of our graduates will offer service to the public. Hence we try to provide opportunities, by both seminar and precept, for acquiring sound scholarly, scientific and professional values.

I am making this point for other than academic reasons. Legislation which will provide a legal basis for the practice of psychology will inevitably contain definitions and standards which, in time, will affect the education of psychologists. The guidelines for training implicit in legal definitions and standards will not abridge academic freedom. A department of psychology need not provide professional training if its faculty and students wish to concentrate upon scholarly and scientific activities. However, for those departments wishing to provide professional in addition to academic training, the implicit model for psychologists provided by legislation can offer strong hints for curriculum development and supervised experience. Thus the proposed legislation can be helpful on more than one score.

Thank you for the opportunity to present these ideas to the committee today.

Mr. SISK. Doctor, do you have any statement in addition that you desire to make?

Dr. BAYROFF. No.

PSYCHOLOGY DEFINED

Mr. SISK. I will direct this to you, Dr. Meltzer, and then if anyone else can comment on it, who would desire to do so, they may, but, certainly, for my own edification and I hope for the record, I would appreciate it if you would define "psychology" and the "practice of psychology" in connection with the situation with which are concerned and are discussing here today, where psychologists are available for a fee to practice their profession in the District of Columbia, to define—and I suppose this could go on indefinitely, but as briefly as possible, give us a definition of the practice of psychology, as it compares with the practice of psychiatry, and, keeping that in mind, would you make comments on that, and to what extent there may be overlapping or no overlapping in these fields.

Dr. MELTZER. May I take some time to do that?

Mr. SISK. Yes, sir. I appreciate that this is a \$64 question, but, as I say, for the benefit of the record and, in view of the fact, that I am sure that we are going to have further testimony, I understand, and I might say that I have received from my own state of California letters in connection with this bill raising certain questions, and I think it would be well if we could lay out for the record right now the area and the guidelines of the practice of psychology vis-a-vis the practice of psychiatry and other healing arts or arts that fall within that category dealing with mental health and the wellbeing of people. I think that is about as well as a layman can put the question.

Dr. MELTZER. I should like, since I know the field of psychology the best of all, to start from that standpoint.

In general, a psychologist is a person who specializes in the understanding, prediction, and the changing of human behavior.

That is the most general statement that one can make.

Now, going from that one could say that there are two basic types, and then there are many other kinds of differentiations that I will give in a moment, but one type of psychologist is the basic scientist-psychologist who is interested in the general law of human behavior, who is interested in understanding, knowing about how people learn,