

CANDIDATES NAME:



The Royal
Australian &
New Zealand
College of
Psychiatrists

**THE ROYAL AUSTRALIAN AND NEW ZEALAND
COLLEGE OF PSYCHIATRISTS**

**MOCK WRITTENS
CRITICAL ESSAY PAPER**

MARKING GUIDE

November 2023

**Produced and delivered by the NSW Branch Training Committee
in collaboration with Health Education and Training Institute
Higher Education**



HEALTH
EDUCATION
& TRAINING
INSTITUTE

CANDIDATE'S NAME:

DATE:

TRAINING ZONE:

CANDIDATES NAME:

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

“*Validity* means that our diagnostic categories describe real entities and not flawed concepts”.

Reference: Crocq MA. Can psychopathology and neuroscience coexist in psychiatric classifications? Dialogues in clinical neuroscience. 2022 Apr 1.

Fellowship Competency 1. Communicator – Weighting 10%

<i>The candidate demonstrates the ability to communicate clearly</i> Spelling, grammar and vocabulary adequate to the task; 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 5. Medical Expert, Health Advocate, Professional - Weighting 20%

<i>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.</i>	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 OR fails to consider a role for psychiatrist as advocate.	0
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 role of psychiatrist as advocate relevant to the question/statement.	3 4
The candidate demonstrates a superior level of awareness and knowledge in these areas relevant to the statement/question.	5

CANDIDATES NAME:

Fellowship Competency 3. Medical Expert, Communicator, Scholar – Weighting 30%

<i>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.</i>	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 are not well linked.	1 2
The points in this essay follow logically to demonstrate the argument and are adequately developed.	3 4
The candidate demonstrates a sophisticated level of reasoning and logical argument, and most or all the arguments are relevant	5

Fellowship Competency 6. Professional – Weighting 20%

<i>The candidate demonstrates appropriate ethical awareness.</i>	Proficiency level
The candidate fails to address ethical issues where this was clearly required or produces material that is unethical in content.	0
The candidate raises 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 appropriate awareness of relevant ethical issues.	3 4
The candidate demonstrates a superior level of knowledge or awareness of relevant ethical issues.	5

Fellowship Competency 8. Medical Expert, Collaborator, Manager - Weighting 20%

<i>The candidate is able to apply the arguments and conclusions to the clinical context, and/or apply clinical experience in their arguments.</i>	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