OPEN

Does Objective Structured Clinical Examinations Score Reflect the Clinical Reasoning Ability of Medical Students?

Wan Beom Park, MD, PhD, Seok Hoon Kang, MD, Yoon-Seong Lee, MD, PhD and Sun Jung Myung, MD, PhD

Abstract: *Background:* Clinical reasoning ability is an important factor in a physician's competence and thus should be taught and tested in medical schools. Medical schools generally use objective structured clinical examinations (OSCE) to measure the clinical competency of medical students. However, it is unknown whether OSCE can also evaluate clinical reasoning ability. In this study, the authors investigated whether OSCE scores reflected students' clinical reasoning abilities. *Methods:* Sixty-five fourth-year medical students participated in this study. Medical students completed the OSCE with 4 cases using standardized patients. For assessment of clinical reasoning, students were asked to list differential diagnoses and the findings that were compatible or not compatible with each diagnosis. The OSCE score (score of patient encounter), diagnostic accuracy score, clinical reasoning score, clinical knowledge score and grade point average (GPA) were obtained for each student, and correlation analysis was performed. *Results:* Clinical reasoning score was significantly correlated with diagnostic accuracy and GPA (correlation coefficient = 0.258 and 0.380; $P = 0.038$ and 0.002, respectively) but not with OSCE score or clinical knowledge score (correlation coefficient = 0.137 and 0.242; $P = 0.276$ and 0.052, respectively). Total OSCE score was not significantly correlated with clinical knowledge test score, clinical reasoning score, diagnostic accuracy score or GPA. *Conclusions:* OSCE score from patient encounters did not reflect the clinical reasoning abilities of the medical students in this study. The evaluation of medical students' clinical reasoning abilities through OSCE should be strengthened.

Key Indexing Terms: Objective structured clinical examinations; Clinical reasoning; Medical education. **[Am J Med Sci 2015;350(1):64–67.]**

T he objective structured clinical examination (OSCE) is a useful tool for clinical performance assessment and is used worldwide as part of medical licensing examinations, for example, in the U.S. Medical Licensing Examination Step 2 Clinical Skills section. Mounting evidence validating the OSCE has led to increasingly widespread use of this tool to measure the clinical competency of medical students.[1–3] In 2009, this clinical skills examination was introduced in Korea as an independent examination to be performed as part of the Korean Medical Licensing Examination. During an OSCE, the examinee compiles the history and physical examination information for a standardized patient (SP) and documents the relevant findings, differential diagnosis and plan of action in a structured patient note. The OSCE score usually comprises the following evaluation categories: history taking (30%–40%), physical examination (20%–40%), patient education (0%–10%), physician-patient interaction (20%–40%) and patient note (~5%).

Clinical reasoning ability is regarded as an important factor determining a physician's competency and thus should be taught and tested in medical schools. The OSCE is a useful tool for assessing clinical performance, but it remains unknown whether the OSCE score from a patient encounter reflects a student's clinical reasoning ability. Few studies have investigated the efficacy of an OSCE for evaluating medical students' clinical reasoning ability.[4–6] Therefore, here the authors conducted an analysis to determine whether a high OSCE score from a patient encounter was significantly correlated with good clinical reasoning ability.

METHODS

In March 2011, 65 fourth-year students at Seoul National University College of Medicine (Seoul, South Korea) voluntarily participated in this study. The institutional review board approved this study and waived the requirement for written consent. The OSCE consisted of 4 stations presenting the following clinical cases: IgA nephropathy, neurogenic diabetes insipidus, acute pyelonephritis and exercise-induced asthma. Each station involved a 10-minute student-SP encounter, followed by a 5-minute interstation examination. Performances were evaluated by trained SPs using a checklist. The major evaluation components were overall assessment, history taking, physical examination, physician's manner, patient education and physician-patient interaction. After encountering patients, the students received an answer sheet presenting a table designed to evaluate the students' clinical reasoning process. During the 5-minute interstation examination, students were asked to complete the table with the differential diagnoses and the symptoms or signs that were compatible with or differed from each diagnosis. Then, the patient note was independently rated by 2 physician raters, who assessed the table and counted the number of correct findings within each section. Each correct finding counted as 1 point, and the student's clinical reasoning score was calculated as the total sum of points. Diagnostic accuracy score was calculated as the total number of correct diagnoses among 4 cases.

This patient note form was considered to have content validity because its components were consistent with the literature regarding clinical reasoning skills[7–11] and were chosen based on what physicians write on patient notes in clinical practice. The diagnostic accuracy score was literally a numeric index of diagnostic correctness.

For each student, the authors recorded the OSCE scores from SP encounters, including history taking, physical examination and patient-physician interaction, as well as the diagnostic accuracy scores from the 4 cases. The authors also obtained the students' demographic characteristics, grade point average (GPA) and clinical knowledge test score. The clinical knowledge test investigated clinical knowledge (eg, internal medicine, surgery, psychiatry) using the same format as the Korean Medical Licensing Examination, comprising a 6-section 400-multiple-choice question examination. These collected data were subjected to correlation analyses using Pearson's correlation coefficient. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS software (version 19.0; SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL). A P value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

A total of 65 fourth-year students underwent OSCE examination. Table 1 presents the students' demographic data and examination scores, including GPA and OSCE. Clinical reasoning score was not statistically significantly correlated with OSCE score or clinical knowledge test score (correlation coefficient = 0.137 and 0.091; P = 0.276 and 0.472, respectively) but was significantly correlated with GPA and diagnostic accuracy score (correlation coefficient = 0.380 and 0.258; P = 0.002 and 0.038, respectively) (Table 2). The total OSCE score was not significantly correlated with clinical knowledge test score, clinical reasoning score, diagnostic accuracy score or GPA. Among the components of the OSCE score, neither history taking score nor physical examination score was correlated with clinical reasoning score (correlation coefficient = 0.199 and 0.045; P = 0.112 and 0.722, respectively) (Table 2).

DISCUSSION

Clinical reasoning skills may help students to better focus on the efficient history taking and physical examinations that are required for making a correct diagnosis.[12] Appropriate clinical reasoning is more likely to result in appropriate history taking and physical examination, which comprises a large percentage of OSCE checklists. However, the present results showed that clinical reasoning score was not correlated with OSCE score—meaning that OSCE (especially with a checklist scoring system) could not differentiate students who asked appropriate history questions with appropriate clinical reasoning from others who asked history questions with insufficient clinical reasoning. This further suggests that some students could receive a high OSCE score simply by asking and checking memorized items without adequate reasoning.

Additionally, the authors found that diagnostic accuracy was positively correlated only with clinical reasoning score and not with OSCE score or clinical knowledge score. This suggests that clinical information obtained from the patient may not be the only factor that raises the probability of correct diagnosis and that clinical reasoning may be more vital for correct diagnosis than the amount of clinical information. Some students who gained limited clinical information (low OSCE score) during an encounter still made the right diagnosis by having good clinical reasoning ability. The authors also found that GPA was significantly correlated with clinical knowledge score and clinical reasoning score. GPA is regarded as the global indicator of a student's performance across the spectrum.[13,14] The results showed that GPA was positively correlated with clinical reasoning ability (correlation coefficient = 0.380; P = 0.002).

The clinical knowledge test was originally designed to assess problem solving and clinical decision-making abilities; however, here the authors found that the clinical knowledge test score was not correlated with the diagnostic accuracy score or the clinical reasoning score. In contrast to the SP encounters during OSCE, which required students to actively gather the clinical information required for making an appropriate clinical decision, the clinical knowledge test was a paper examination in which students were passively given all clinical information in a paragraph so that they could interpret laboratory or radiological data and make a diagnostic or therapeutic assumption. The practice situation presented in OSCE is closer to real-world clinical reasoning than the paper examination, as physicians can only get clinical information when they properly ask. Overall, the data underline that the evaluation of clinical competency should include not only clinical knowledge and clinical performance but also clinical reasoning ability, which was not adequately reflected by the results of the presently analyzed methods.

Many efforts have been made to develop a valid and reliable measure of clinical reasoning ability. These have included the use of patient management problems, modified essay questions, script concordance tests and other methods.[15–18] Although clinical reasoning must be assessed in educational programs and certification processes, no study to date has uncovered a single best tool. In this study, the authors tried to assess clinical reasoning ability by simply modifying the existing OSCE examination.

There may be some shortcomings of performing the OSCE examination using SPs as evaluators. It is possible that

TABLE 1. Characteristics and examination scores of 65 medical students

	Mean (SD)	Min	Max
Mean age, yr	26.4 (2.0)	23	35
Sex, M:F	46:19		
Grade point average of the last semester	3.03 (0.59)	2.00	4.14
OSCE score[a]			
Total score[b]	68.0 (5.9)	55.8	82.8
History taking	71.6 (6.8)	58.5	88.7
Physical examination	46.6 (10.3)	31.0	72.1
Patient-physician interaction	63.9 (5.7)	48.6	79.0
Mean diagnostic accuracy score[c]	3.40 (0.66)	1	4
Clinical reasoning score[d]	29.1 (9.0)	12	47
Clinical knowledge test score[e]	285.5 (38.6)	208.0	373.0

[a] A perfect score is 100.
[b] Total score is composed of 40% history taking score, 30% physical examination score and 30% patient-physician interaction score.
[c] A perfect score is 4.0.
[d] A perfect score is not limited.
[e] A perfect score is 400.
OSCE, objective structured clinical examination.