

From: Guy Curtis [<mailto:G.Curtis@murdoch.edu.au>]
Sent: Sunday, 8 May 2011 11:54 PM
To: NationalBoards
Subject: Attention: Chair, Psychology Board Examination Consultation

Please disregard my previous email, I have made a small correction to my submission below.

The proposed curriculum for the examination in the consultation paper shows a clear bias toward a perception of psychology as being equivalent to clinical psychology. Psychology is more diverse than what one might deduce from reading the proposed exam content and recommended textbooks.

A generally registered psychologist may be interested in work more closely aligned with organisational than clinical psychology. Such a psychologist would be likely to need to know the legal framework of occupational safety and health, which is not included, but would be much less likely to need to know the legal framework related to children and adolescents, which is included.

The curriculum is clearly based on a narrow view of psychology that is forcing the training of psychologists to fit with a particular and narrow model. Again, someone with an interest in organisational psychology may need to know very little about CBT, which is included in a lot of detail, but is likely to need to know a whole lot about job analysis and job design, which are missing altogether.

As another example, "Psychopharmacology for Health Professionals" is a recommended book - a psychologist who works in the area of sports psychology is more likely to need knowledge of performance enhancing drugs than psychoactive one.

In short, the proposed curriculum for the exam taking a one-size-fits-all view of psychology, which seems to only view clinical psychology as what we do, is a disservice to the breadth of interests and work that exists in our profession.

I do not think the solution to this is to add more and more content to the exam to cover everything. Doing this would mean generally registered psychologist would need to know more than we expect from those with an area of endorsement. A better solution would be to scale back the required content and to allow for areas of more diverse interest than clinical applications of psychology by providing candidates with a choice of sub-tests or sub specialties. More thought is needed as to what constitute core skills for *all* psychologists as opposed to skill sets that will be used by some psychologists.

Sincerely,
Guy Curtis

P.S. I do not support the inclusion of the Rorschach among the list of tests that psychologists should be expected to have knowledge of (D2.6b). It has nearly zero

validity as a personality assessment. How does expecting knowledge of an invalid test relate to the promotion of evidence-based practice?

=====
Guy Curtis, PhD
School of Psychology
Murdoch University
90 South St
Murdoch, WA, 6150
Australia
Phone: +61 8 9360 2268
Fax: +61 8 9360 6492
Email: g.curtis@murdoch.edu.au
Web: <http://www.psychology.murdoch.edu.au/staff/curtis.html>
=====

"This message contains information that may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the addressee (or authorized to receive the message for the addressee), you may not use, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received the message in error, please advise the sender by return email and delete the message. It is also possible that this email contains the thoughts and opinions of the sender only, which do not represent the official University policy."

CRICOS Provider No: 00125J