eligible for inclusion in the list. How then will such a doctor fare when a procedure performed in good faith and to the best of his or her ability goes wrong and the question of litigation arises? What will be the response of the defence unions to such a doctor who is not on the minor surgery list? These questions are urgently in need of an answer. The 'all or none' ruling by the Department of Health makes little sense, the composition of the list itself defies logical interpretation, and the exclusion of the 'suturing of lacerations', surely one of the commonest minor surgical procedures performed in general practice, is incomprehensible.

With goodwill a more flexible and sensible list of procedures can be agreed and clearer criteria of competence established. Specific training in minor surgery is likely to be included in vocational training schemes and assessed as part of the MRCGP examination. The way forward for this aspect of the new contract is not entirely clear, nor is it for most of the other elements of the contract, thrust by a determined government upon a reluctant profession.

Minor surgery affords an excellent opportunity for audit. The clinical condition is clear, and the outcome is capable of precise measurement. Peer review and audit have been accepted by the profession as the way in which we can set and maintain our own standards. However, we have been too slow and now for the first time in the history of medical practice, family practitioner committees and health boards are being asked to judge our competence to perform normal medical procedures. It is up to us to regain the initiative and to show that we can keep our professional standards in good order, so that the public can continue to be assured that they are safe in our hands. Minor surgery in general practice offers a golden opportunity to do this.

ROBERT MILNE
General practitioner, Kirkliston, West Lothian

References

1. Department of Health and the Welsh Office. *General practice in the National Health Service. A new contract.* London: Department of Health and the Welsh Office, 1989.
2. Sharman J. Patients' response to a general practice minor surgery service. *Practitioner* 1986; **230**: 27-29.
3. Brown JS. Minor operations in general practice. *Br Med J* 1979; **1**: 1609-1610.

Anger in the consultation

ANGER is a frequent concomitant of the doctor–patient interaction. It may arise on either side and has many outcomes, a few of which can even be therapeutic. For example, if the physician handles his patient's anger with tact, temporarily humbling himself, the latter is given an opportunity to be magnanimous and forgiving. At the other extreme, patients stir up feelings in us, often at a subconscious level where we are dimly aware of the salt being sprinkled on our own unresolved conflicts. If it is true that our faculties for observing the doctor–patient relationship are inherently unreliable,[1] then the distinction between two 'sides' of the relationship is an artificial one and we must bear this in mind when trying to analyse the source of anger for doctors and patient separately.

The physician is most likely to become angry when he feels that his professional competence or integrity is being impugned. In a general way one might call this a disappointment of expectations on his side because he believes that, for the most part the patient should react to his ministrations with gratitude and admiration. Examples of the doctor's competence being questioned are the patient who asks for referral before he states his chief complaint — an almost daily occurrence in general practice — and the mother who flaunts a letter from the regional emergency room where little Johnny's cough was diagnosed as pneumonia 'when you said he only had a cold'. It is interesting that the diagnostic process seems far more emotionally charged for patients than does treatment and that in primary care we are more likely to be taken to task for overlooking a condition, no matter how benign, than for the worst imaginable therapeutic misadventure. Missing a diagnosis suggests that the physician did not believe the patient whereas an iatrogenic disorder confirms that he was out there trying his best.

The doctor is particularly prone to anger when the propriety of what he does is challenged. A man who does not belong to the practice but whose mother, with terminal cancer, is a patient, is allowed to jump the queue in order to get a prescription for her and a letter to the oncologist. The doctor regards these proceedings as justifiable and considerate and does not feel he owes an explanation to those who came earlier. However, should the next patient remark on the irregularity of what occurred, the doctor may well feel insulted and interpret the complaint as expressing a lack of confidence in him.

On the patient's side, too, disappointment of expectations is the chief cause of anger. At the lowest level, he may have expected a sick note or a letter to social services or a prescription for antibiotics when the doctor believes that none of these is indicated. In a system of pre-paid medicine such requests are often reinforced by a strong sense of entitlement.

On a higher plane, patients and doctors may be frustrated with the shortcomings of medicine as a whole. As general practitioners we represent a profession that has no cure for most of the disease processes besetting humanity, among them diabetes mellitus, hypertension, atherosclerosis, rheumatoid arthritis, asthma and duodenal ulcer. This uncomfortable state of affairs, applying as it does to hundreds of millions of people throughout the world, is often obscured by brilliant successes with narrow applicability: chemotherapy for testicular cancer and Hodgkin's disease, organ transplants and the like. The best that general practitioners have to offer in most instances is a kind of secondary prevention: expensive, protracted and damaging to the quality of life. An illustration of the anger of those who apply to us for relief is the 64-year-old man with cirrhosis and an abdomen distended by ascites who is being treated by a state-of-the-art hepatology clinic. He comes to his general practitioner (who else can he turn to?) and asks: 'Can't something be done for this terrible belly?' The doctor, who sincerely believes he has done his best, experiences a moment of irritation, as if to say: 'Why is he making me feel guilty?' As front-line doctors we must face the fact that when we undertake a career in medicine the guilt becomes collective and we cannot simply shift the blame to the researchers.

The doctor, who is seen as the expert in the encounter with the patient, is felt to bear ultimate responsibility for the way matters proceed,[2] and life is often made difficult for the individual practitioner by the profession's penchant for raising expectations in the public. These are mostly of a biomedical kind — molecular cures for molecular derangements.[2] As we lose our homey, old-fashioned prestige, we look for a place in the sun of science, forgetting that it is a critical attitude, not statistical rigour, that makes a man a scientist.[3] We change the recommendations for staying healthy as often as we change our socks,

exasperating the public so that an intelligent and well-read patient has good reason to be angry with his doctor even before consulting him.

A disappointment of expectations may occur for the patient at the level of the doctor's apostolic function, the sum of his idiosyncrasies determining the way he practises.[4] If a patient is looking for a paternalistic approach and the physician suddenly leaves him or her to make an important decision about elective surgery, there may be anger because the doctor is perceived as avoiding his responsibilities. It must be kept in mind that we can be regarded as continually on trial and that our past records are of no importance in the matter on hand if the patient feels let down. This is the price we pay for indulging our 'need to be needed'.[5]

Anger is a well recognized stage in the process of a patient's adjustment to the knowledge that he has an illness that must terminate fatally.[6] His family, too, almost certainly passes through the same stage, although this has been less remarked upon, as they face the necessary task of building new lives even before death comes. Such anger, if directed at the doctor, may stem from feelings of guilt harboured by a spouse or an offspring who feels he should have intervened and given vent to his fears earlier in the diagnostic process.

Anger on the patient's part over a seemingly minor incident may signify a building up of grudges over the years. If the physician's attitude has been condescending or judgemental, the patient may one day lash out at him when he seems least to have warranted it. Balint spoke of 'offers' that are brought daily into the doctor's surgery, each having a kind of anatomic correlation to some psychosocial predicament.[4] When these are misread and the physician sets about 'ruling out' a series of organic disorders, making no attempt to discover the meaning of the symptoms, the patient may become incensed. 'If the x-ray is normal, then why does it hurt?' is a question we hear often.

Of course anger may be unrelated to an event in the consultation. Thus, the angry patient may be blowing off a head of steam that built up at home or he may be experiencing a problem for which the doctor cannot be held responsible. As for us, how often do we offload the frustrations of a long day on the 'wrong' patient who comes in a few minutes before closing time with a perfectly reasonable request.

Anger is a normal human response to certain stimuli and it should be regarded as such even in the consulting room. When it originates with the patient, it can have both diagnostic and therapeutic benefits. If the doctor experiences it first, the encounter should be reviewed and an attempt made to understand why the patient's words or actions were perceived as a threat. Although daily hassles may be the most frequent trigger, the broadest meaning of anger in the doctor–patient relationship is that expectations, realistic or otherwise, have been disappointed.

JOSEPH HERMAN

Department of family medicine, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva, Israel

References

1. Minuchin S, Fishman HC. *Family therapy techniques.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981: 80.
2. Engel GL. The need for a new medical model: a challenge for biomedicine. *Science* 1977; **196:** 129-136.
3. Schwartz MA, Wiggins OP. Scientific and humanistic medicine: a theory of clinical methods. In: White KL. *The task of medicine.* Menlo Park: Henry J Kaiser Family Foundation, 1988: 137-171.
4. Balint M. *The doctor, his patient and the illness.* London: Pitman Medical, 1973.
5. Gabbard GO. The role of compulsiveness in the normal physician. *JAMA* 1985; **254:** 2926-2929.
6. Kubler-Ross E. *On death and dying.* New York: MacMillan, 1970: 38.