correspondence

Time for candid debate about the difficulties of managing patients

Sir: May I comment on the misunderstanding which seems to be occurring between two of my colleagues. Dr Mohan (*Psychiatric Bulletin*, April 2000; **24**, 155) worries that Professor Maden's (*Psychiatric Bulletin*, December 1999; **23**, 707–712) view on relaxing the treatability criterion for patients held under the legal classification of 'psychopathic disorder' will mean that psychiatrists are more concerned with public protection than treatment of patients. I am aware that this view is commonly held, and indeed it has some origins in the original parliamentary debate on the Mental Health Act 1983, when the age limit for the treatment of patients deemed to be 'psychopathic' (which was originally set at 21 years) was lifted. Some lawyers and politicians have fondly imagined in the past that psychiatrists were willing and able to identify individuals they took a dislike to and lock them up in one of their mental hospitals on an indefinite basis simply for tidiness and/or security rather than for treatment.

Professor Maden is of course right; the reverse has occurred. Doctors have never been keen to admit homeless and/or long-term patients into hospital even when there were plenty of beds. In recent years the position has been exacerbated by the very sharp fall in the number of psychiatric beds available. We are now faced with the situation that patients who any member of the public or a profession other than psychiatry can see are in serious need of psychiatric care are rejected by psychiatrists on the grounds that they are 'psychopathic' and 'untreatable'. This has already led to some damage of the profession's image and indeed to a remarkable consultation document published by the Home Office recently which is proposing that psychiatrists be forced, in some way yet to be specified, to take on patients they believe fall into this category.

We are in a frightful muddle about this and as such are vulnerable to political initiatives which will damage both the interests of patients and of the psychiatric profession. Professor Maden is right. The appropriate stance for a caring profession is to say 'yes, we will try to help whenever we can' rather than 'no, take that patient away'. We need to couple this type of approach with very strong representations for proper resources to undertake that task and we need to accept that not every psychiatrist will want to treat every kind of patient as seems to be the general expectation at the moment.

I believe the time has come for a much more open and candid debate about the difficulties of managing some patients in all diagnostic categories, the level of resources which are actually required, the need for greater sub-specialisation, and the need, therefore, for more psychiatrists. If this is put within the context of 'we the psychiatric profession will do whatever we can to alleviate suffering attributable to mental disorder' we will not be accused either of neglecting our responsibilities, or of turning ourselves into a security service. I do not know any psychiatrists who wish to become quasi-jailers and attempts by the current government to give us such a role will not succeed because, while jailers constitute an important caring profession, they are different from psychiatrists.

John Gunn Professor of Forensic Psychiatry, Department of Forensic Psychiatry, Institute of Psychiatry, De Crespigny Park, Denmark Hill, London SE5 8AF

Cognitive–analytical therapy – a most suitable training for psychiatrists?

Sir: Not surprisingly, I welcome the paper by Harvey Rees (*Psychiatric Bulletin*, April 2000, **24**, 124–126). Cognitive–analytic therapy (CAT) was always intended to offer a NHS-relevant model of psychological therapy and management. Rees comments on the need for a "robust evidence base for its effectiveness", in this respect. It should be noted that the development of the model over the past 25 years has involved both conceptual developments and numerous small scale studies of both process and outcome. These are recorded in three books and over 50 papers published in peer-reviewed journals and a number of further papers are due to appear in a special section of the June issue of the *British Journal of Medical Psychology*. Much of this work has been focused on borderline personality disorder. Bowing to current definitions of 'robust', and despite considerable ethical and design problems, we have now embarked on a large scale randomised controlled trial of 24-session CAT in this category of patients. Despite favourable referees' reports and a completed feasibility study, this inexpensive study of a group of currently neglected patients who have a very low spontaneous recovery rate, a high suicide rate and are high consumers of resources has failed to attract research and development funding.

Anthony Ryle Honorary Consultant Psychotherapist and Honorary Senior Research Fellow, GKT at the Munro Centre, Guy's Hospital, London SE1 9RT

Place and purpose of research training

Sir: The ability to appraise research and apply the results to everyday clinical practice currently has a high profile. At present, one-fifth of all higher training time for psychiatrists is allocated to research activities in the form of the research day. The need for two sessions per week devoted to research has been questioned, and a working party of the Collegiate Trainees' Committee (CTC) was formed to consider the place of research training within the specialist registrar years. Their findings can be found in a report published on the College website (Ramchandani *et al*, 2000).

This report continues to recognise research as an integral part of higher training in psychiatry, but argues for increased flexibility in the use of the research day. At present the *Higher Specialist Training Handbook* states that "the HSTC now requires two sessions each week to be devoted to planning, conducting and communicating the

https://doi.org/10.1192/pb.24.8.314-b Published online by Cambridge University Press

outcome of a research project" (Royal College of Psychiatrists, 1998). However, many trainees find it difficult to undertake a significant research project, and the experience of a failed attempt to achieve publication can be demoralising.

It is important to distinguish between actually doing research, and appraising and applying the results of research in everyday clinical practice. There is a need to shift the emphasis away from publication as the solitary goal of research time. The CTC suggests that clear individual objectives should be set for the use of a trainee's research time, allowing far greater flexibility over the methods by which these are met. Such objectives may include the ability to formulate answerable questions from clinical situations, to confidently appraise research findings, and to use research evidence in developing service provision or evaluating clinical practice. Documented training objectives allow trainees to monitor their own progress and, in conjunction with their research tutor or supervisor, to ensure that their individual needs are appropriately met during higher training.

While undertaking a research project is one way of meeting these aims, other specific training experiences have an important role. Courses and seminars, clearly focused smaller projects (including audit) and other forms of scholarship can enable trainees to reach the consultant level with a clear grasp of the skills needed to inform and improve their practice. The CTC still believes that the research day forms a crucial part of a fully balanced training but needs to be used more effectively and in an individually tailored manner.

RAMCHANDANI, P., CORBY, C., GUEST, L., *et al* (2000) *The Place and Purpose of Research Training for Specialist Registrars: A View from the Collegiate Trainees' Committee (CTC)* www.rcpsych.ac.uk/members/ctc.htm

ROYAL COLLEGE OF PSYCHIATRISTS (1998) *Higher Specialist Training Handbook*. Occasional Paper OP43. London: Royal College of Psychiatrists.

***Ed Day** Specialist Registrar and CTC Chairman, **Paul Ramchandani** Specialist Registrar and Research Day Working Party Chairman, Royal College of Psychiatrists, 17 Belgrave Square, London SW1X 8PG

Acquisition of skills during higher specialist training

Sir: Many skills have to be assimilated during training to equip psychiatrists for the role of consultant. A survey was carried out in 1995 (Haddad & Creed, 1996) in the North-West Region among newly appointed consultants in general and old age psychiatry. While consultants in their cohort felt senior registrar (SR) training had adequately trained them in areas of clinical, research, teaching and group work they felt poorly trained in areas of general management, personal management and information technology. As a result of this survey trainers were encouraged to use the poorly rated skills as a menu of topics for discussion in supervision, the deficit areas were used as themes for SR training days and SRs were encouraged to attend management training courses.

The survey was recently repeated using the same methodology. Newly appointed consultants in old age and general adult psychiatry who had trained on the Manchester specialist registrar rotation and were appointed between 1995 and 1999 were contacted. Twenty-three consultants out of a total of 33 (70%) completed the questionnaire. Of the 14 (out of 39) skills rated as poorly prepared, 11 of these were in areas of general management, personal management, working with groups and information technology. Newly appointed consultants also felt less than moderately well prepared in three specific clinical areas: (a) use of cognitive–behavioural techniques; (b) dealing with patient/relative complaints; and (c) giving evidence in court. These three clinical areas had also been rated poorly in the 1995 survey. Of the 14 skills rated as being 'poor' in the 1995 survey 12 of these remained rated as poor.

Despite the introduction of several changes as a result of the previous survey of newly appointed consultants to the training scheme it was evident that there had been little change in the pattern of response. While training courses no doubt play an important part in training it was clear that the areas where consultants felt most confident were areas where they were likely to have had most practical exposure in training. It maybe that the old medical adage 'see one, do one, teach one' has as much relevance to learning management skills as to learning clinical skills. More novel, 'hands on' learning experiences need to be developed to address these areas of perceived deficit.

HADDAD, P. & CREED, F. (1996) Skills training for senior registrars. Results of a survey of newly appointed consultants. *Psychiatric Bulletin*, **203**, 391–394.

PLUMMER, D. (1994) Objectives for higher psychiatric training. Working document. London: Royal College of Psychiatrists.

Kate F. Lovett Specialist Registrar in General Adult Psychiatry, Wonford House Hospital, Dryden Road, Exeter EX2 5AF

The wisdom of Ali G

Sir: Why do Hickling & Hutchinson (*Psychiatric Bulletin*, March 2000, **24**, 94–95) insist on naming what is essentially a delusion of racial identity "roast breadfruit psychosis"? Not only is the term offensive, akin to having named it "bounty bar psychosis", but as Hari Maharaja's erudite response (*Psychiatric Bulletin*, March 2000, **24**, 96–97) pointed out they have simply "extrapolated a cultural concept – into a diseased state".

Confusion over identity is not unique to Black people and racial identity is only one aspect of one's identity that individuals and groups in society struggle to define. In our complex multi-cultural society 'White' culture is increasingly aware of, exposed to, and influenced by 'non-White' culture. We now have 'trustafarians' and comedic characters such as Ali G. A trustafarian is a derogatory term used to describe White teenagers who have both trust funds and Rastafarian hairstyles! Ali G is a comedic caricature of a White man mimicking Black rap/reggae street style and is the invention of a White Jewish comedian.

Ali G became famous after a series of televised spoof interviews with prominent people in the public eye. The interviewees did not realise that Ali G was not the real thing and answered his increasingly ridiculous questions in a naïve, serious or patronising manner. I believe Hickling & Hutchinson have been taken in by a similar spoof – they have decided to analyse the delusional content of individuals with psychosis and in so doing have revealed more about themselves than any new insight into psychotic illness.

Masum Khwaja Specialist Registrar, The Gordon Hospital, Bloomburg Street, London SW1V 2RH; masumkhwaja@hotmail.com

The 'Hitchcock factor' in advertising

Sir: I would be interested in the College's view on pharmaceutical advertising in relation to the current campaign to reduce stigma in mental illness. I have recently been struck by the increasing use of negative images by some of the atypical neuroleptic manufacturers.

The black and white images with stark lighting and plenty of shadow seem designed to provoke feelings of fear and menace. Photographing patients as gaunt almost lupine individuals with sunken eyes, angular cheekbones, long hair and humourless, irritated expressions all seem to emphasise the perceived 'differentness' and threat of people with severe mental illness. Likewise 'case histories' laced with suggestions of suicide or danger to emotive groups such as children alongside pictures of a young woman mutilating herself or a frightened girl huddling behind her mother seem to play on misunderstanding and prejudice about schizophrenia.

The risks of alienation, marginalising and stigmatising people suffering with a severe mental illness by using adverts to

https://doi.org/10.1192/pb.24.8.314-b Published online by Cambridge University Press