In defence of the long case

Benning & Broadhurst (Psychiatric Bulletin, December 2007, 31, 441–442) argued that the abandonment of the long case from the Member of the Royal College of Psychiatrists (MRCPsych) exam threatens the holistic approach in psychiatry and ignores the importance of the subjective dimension of the experience/behaviour and the role of the patient’s biography in aiding understanding. We share their concern.

An online survey of trainee psychiatrists working in the North Trent Rotation Scheme with a response rate of 46% (n=43; ST1–3 and trust grade doctors n=26, ST4 and specialist registrars n=17) showed that the majority of trainees (62.8%) did not agree with abandoning the long case. Those who have passed the MRCPsych (i.e. ST4 grade and specialist registrars) opposed it more strongly than junior trainees (94% v. 42%, P=0.01).

Similarly, senior trainees were more likely to disagree that Observed Standardised Clinical Examination (OSCE) is a fair alternative than junior trainees (76.5% v. 34.6%, P=0.01), but is not capable of testing from the bio-psychosocial perspective (82% v. 50%, P=0.05). Unsurprisingly, more senior trainees (58.8%) than junior trainees (30.8%) felt that the exam would be easier.

The majority of responders were concerned that passing the long case depends largely on one encounter. This could be addressed by incorporating one or two long cases per year as part of workplace-based assessments, which would ensure the appropriate choice of patients and possibly more time allocated for each case, as it has been shown to increase reliability from 0.60 to 0.90 (Waas & Jolly, 2001).

Finally, although we agree that OSCE could test different specific competencies, we should not forget that ‘the whole is more than the sum of its parts’ as one of our responders commented.
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How and why the long case should be kept: a view from the antipodes

The commentary by Tyrer (Psychiatric Bulletin, December 2007, 31, 447–449) summarises the reasons why the Royal College of Psychiatrists has decided to abandon the long case as a summative assessment in the MRCPsych examination. The Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists (FRANZCP) examination. We agree with Tyrer that the main question is not whether the skills tested in a long case are important and need to be assessed, but whether they need to be assessed using a summative examination. A major value of a summative assessment is that the examiners have no possible conflict of interest or even awareness of the prior training and examination history of the candidate. Making the long case part of training as a formative assessment does not get around any problems of reliability and may make the reliability worse as assessors do not have the same degree of examination training. There may also be a significant conflict of interest with local supervisors keen to get their trainees through training.

Finally, there is the wider issue of the change in culture in medicine. Increasingly there are moves to reduce medicine to a set of procedures which are laid out by guidelines, encouraged by incentive payments and evaluated by audit or other performance measures. Relying solely on OSCEs encourages this ‘tick-box procedural approach to healthcare. We believe that what patients need when they visit a specialist is someone who can make sense of complexity, knows what procedures to use and what to do when they do not work. Dropping the long case in the examination is not good for consumers and risks reducing psychiatry to a set of simplistic procedures.
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