

Exam ID:

INSTRUCTIONS:

• Please use pencil ONLY.

• Do not fold or bend.

2B PENCIL 1)

Please MARK LIKE THIS ONLY: 💆 • Erase mistakes fully. • Completely fill in the oval.

In essay form, critically discuss this statement from different points of view and provide your conclusion.

2021

GUS

"... psychiatry itself is stigmatised within medicine and that some psychiatrists feel that they will be more respected by their medical colleagues if they approach mental disorders from a biological perspective." (40 marks)

Reference:

Crichton P, Carel H and Kidd I. Epistemic injustice in psychiatry. BJPsych Bulletin 2017; 41:65-70. https://doi.org/10.1192/pb.bp.115.050682

Fellowship Competency 1. Communicator – Weighting 10%

| The candidate demonstrates the ability to communicate clearly. Spelling, grammar and vocabulary are adequate to the task, and able to convey ideas clearly. | Proficiency Level |
|---|----------------------|
| The spelling, grammar or vocabulary significantly impedes communication. | 0 |
| The spelling, grammar and vocabulary are acceptable, but the candidate demonstrates below average capacity for clear written expression. | 1 2 |
| The spelling, grammar and vocabulary are acceptable, and the candidate demonstrates good capacity for written expression. | 3 4 |
| The candidate displays a highly sophisticated level of written expression. | 5 |

Fellowship Competency 3. Medical Expert, Communicator, Scholar – Weighting 15%

| The candidate is able to identify and develop a number of lines of argument that are relevant to the proposition. The candidate makes reference to the research literature where this usefully informs their arguments. Includes the ability to consider counter arguments and/or argue against the proposition. | Proficiency Level |
|--|----------------------|
| There is no evidence of logical argument or critical reasoning: points are random or unconnected or simply listed. | 0 |
| There is only a weak attempt at supporting the assertions made by correct and relevant knowledge OR there is only one argument OR the arguments | 1 |
| are not well linked. | 2 |
| The points in this essay follow logically to demonstrate the argument and are adequately developed. | 3 |
| The points in this essay follow logically to demonstrate the argument and are adequately developed. | 4 |
| The candidate demonstrates a sophisticated level of reasoning and logical argument, and most or all the arguments are relevant. | 5 |

Fellowship Competency 5. Medical Expert, Health Advocate, Professional – Weighting 25%

| The candidate demonstrates a mature understanding of broader models of health and illness, cultural sensitivity and the cultural context of psychiatry historically and in the present time, and the role of the psychiatrist as advocate and can use this understanding to critically discuss the essay question. | Proficiency Level |
|--|----------------------|
| As relevant to the question or statement: the candidate limits themselves inappropriately rigidly to the medical model OR does not demonstrate cultural | |
| awareness or sensitivity where this was clearly required OR fails to demonstrate an appropriate awareness of a relevant cultural/historical context | 0 |
| OR fails to consider a role for psychiatrist as advocate. | |
| The candidate touches on the expected areas, but their ideas lack depth or breadth or are inaccurate or irrelevant to the question/statement. | 1 |
| | 2 |
| The candidate demonstrates an acceptable level of cultural sensitivity and/or historical context and/or broader models of health and illness and/or the | 3 |
| role of psychiatrist as advocate relevant to the question/statement. | 4 |
| The candidate demonstrates a superior level of awareness and knowledge in these areas relevant to the statement/question | (5) |

Fellowship Competency 8. Medical Expert, Collaborator, Manager – Weighting 25%

| The candidate is able to apply the arguments and conclusions to the clinical context, and/or apply clinical experience in their arguments. | Proficiency Level |
|---|----------------------|
| Arguments and conclusions appear uninformed by clinical experience (no clinical link) or are contrary or inappropriate to the clinical context. | 0 |
| There is an attempt to link to the clinical context, but it is tenuous, or the links made are unrealistic. | 1 |
| | 2 |
| The candidate is able to apply the arguments and conclusions to the clinical context, and/or apply clinical experience in their arguments. | 3 |
| | 4 |
| The candidate makes links to the clinical context that appear very well-informed and show an above average level of insight. | 5 |

P.T.O. →



_

The Royal Australian & New Zealand College of Psychiatrists

Δ AUGUST 2021

Fellowship Competency 9. Medical Expert, Communicator, Scholar – Weighting 10%

| The candidate is able to draw a conclusion that is justified by the arguments they have raised. | Proficiency Level |
|--|----------------------|
| There is no conclusion. | 0 |
| Any conclusion is poorly justified or not supported by the arguments that have been raised. | 1 |
| | 2 |
| The candidate is able to draw a conclusion(s) that is justified by the arguments they have raised. | 3 |
| The candidate is able to draw a conclusion(s) that is justified by the arguments they have raised. | 4 |
| The candidate demonstrates an above average level of sophistication in the conclusion(s) drawn, and they are well supported by the arguments raised. | 5 |

Fellowship Competency 10. Professional and/or ethical – Weighting 15%

| The candidate demonstrates relevant professional and/or ethical awareness. | Proficiency Level |
|---|----------------------|
| The candidate fails to address professional and/or ethical issues where this was clearly required, or produces material that is unethical or not professional in content. | 0 |
| The candidate raises professional and/or ethical issues that are not relevant, or are simply listed without elaboration, or are described incorrectly, or so unclearly as to cloud the meaning. | 1 2 |
| The candidate demonstrates an awareness of relevant professional and/or ethical issues. | 3 4 |
| The candidate demonstrates a superior level of knowledge or awareness of relevant professional and/or ethical issues. | 5 |
| | |
| CANDIDATE DID NOT ATTEMPT | \bigcirc |
| DID HANDWRITING AFFECT MARKING? | 0 |
| | |
| | |

Marker initials:

© Copyright 2021 Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists (RANZCP) This documentation is copyright. All rights reserved. All persons wanting to reproduce this document or part thereof must obtain permission from the RANZCP.