

Correspondence

The Approval Exercise—constipated chaos?

DEAR SIRs

Dr Launer (*Bulletin*, April 1984, 8, 74–5) brings serious charges to bear against the Approval Exercise, claiming that it is 'bringing units all over the country to their knees'; 'leading to real suffering among patients'; 'morally wrong'; and 'undermining patients' rights to care and treatment'. He attributes this to widespread anal fixation among those responsible, leading to progressive costiveness (metaphorically speaking, I presume).

The evidence which I have collected from many parts of the country runs counter to this view. Most have found the Exercise to be an excellent aperient—perhaps resulting in a little painful colic at times, but usually constructively productive.

I believe the Exercise to be an important instrument of College educational policy. There are good grounds for concluding that it has promoted an improvement of educational standards throughout Great Britain and Ireland and this, in the long run, must bear fruit in terms of better clinical practice. I would like to pay tribute to the large number of members who have taken part in visits, to the Panel Conveners who carry a heavy burden, and to the Dean, who is responsible for the Exercise to the Court.

K. RAWNSLEY

*Royal College of Psychiatrists
17 Belgrave Square, London SW1*

Getting rid of 'Section' jargon

DEAR SIRs

Professor Gunn's letter about 'Section jargon' (*Bulletin*, April 1984, 8, 74) is most timely, but the headings could be even more coherent. I would suggest the following for the sections most relevant to general psychiatrists: S 2—assessment order (civil); S 3—treatment order (civil); S 4—emergency order; S 5—detention order; S 35—assessment remand; S 36—treatment remand; S 37—treatment order (judicial); S 41—restriction order; S 57—irreversible treatment certificate; S 58—hazardous treatment certificate; S 78—assessment order (judicial); S 136—police order.

JOHN MARKS

*Halton Hospital
Runcorn, Cheshire*

Job stress and burnout

DEAR SIRs

We found Dr Morrice's article on job stress and burnout (*Bulletin*, March 1984, 8, 45–6) very interesting. However,

we wondered if the questionnaire employed by Dr Morrice really measured what it was intended to measure. In particular, we were concerned over the possibility that general practitioners and hospital doctors would use a less exact definition of 'clinical depression' than psychiatrists.

To explore these misgivings, we repeated part of the Morrice experiment with one addition to the questionnaire: the psychiatrist was asked to explain why he answered 'yes' or 'no' to question (e)—see Table I.

TABLE I

Responses from psychiatrists (Aberdeen—Eb; Eastern Health Board—EHB) expressed as percentages of each group

Question	Eb (n = 11)	EHB (n = 22)
(a) Lack of work enjoyment	9	91
(b) Periods of exhaustion	54	68
(c) Work stressful	63	55
(d) Enduring boredom	27	41
(e) Depression	0	14

Seventy-eight questionnaires were sent by post to consultant psychiatrists, psychiatrist grade practitioners, and senior registrars in the Irish Eastern Health Board area. The names were obtained from the comprehensive mailing list of the *Irish Journal of Psychotherapy*. Twenty-two (28 per cent) completed questionnaires were returned—21 were from consultants, one came from a senior registrar.

When these results are compared with those of Morrice, psychiatrists emerge as the group most lacking in work enjoyment and as the group reporting the highest incidence of 'clinical depression' (Table I). Since this is a reversal of the original findings, and despite the different geographical setting and the lack of controls, doubt is cast on whether Morrice's questionnaire measured what was intended.

In answer to the question 'Please explain the basis for your answer to question (e)' (i.e. 'Would you say this has amounted to clinical depression?'), the expected explanations were received: psychiatrists will not use such a term unless they perceive certain symptoms (e.g. sleep disturbances, loss of interest, or reduced vegetative functions) which would have to last for at least a number of weeks. By contrast, one may gather that non-psychiatrists employ the term in the same way as we would use terms like 'unhappy' or 'bored'.

The 'Remarks' section was filled in by most respondents. Many of the entries were remarkably candid and personal. The greatest stressors were perceived as 'lack of an understanding colleague to confide in'; 'lack of sabbatical and educational breaks'; 'the obstructionism of administrators';