

**Ambedkar University, Delhi**

MA Psychology (Psychosocial Clinical Studies) Entrance Test

July 4, 2012

Roll No.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Signature of Invigilator: \_\_\_\_\_

---

**SECTION C**

Total Marks: 100

**Instructions:**

1. Section C has 3 sets of questions from the 3 readings provided beforehand; ONLY ONE question has to be answered from each set.
2. Please write your answers in the answer sheet provided separately.

**Set 1: Based on 'Psychoanalysis: Adjustment or Freedom' By Erik. H. Erikson (40 marks)**

- a. Admittedly the essay by Erikson is difficult for most of you to 'relate and absorb well.' Enlist comprehensively these difficulties and speculate the rationale for its choice in the Entrance procedure.
- b. What does this writing celebrate about human living and thinking? Delineate while evolving the set of responsibilities that this celebration also entails.
- c. Erikson focuses on youth in this essay as a special stage with a specific relation to the theme of adjustment and/or freedom. Illustrate with personal associations and experiences how you as a young person receive his inspiration and caution.

**Set 2: Based on 'Psychology and Philosophy':An Interview with Michel Foucault.(30 marks)**

- a. What role does philosophy play in defining the project for psychology? What is the nature of the entanglement [M.F., *Philosophy and Psychology*, p. 250] between the two?
- b. Why does the speaker, were he a professor of philosophy all set to start teaching psychology, feel the absurd need to first put on a mask and then take it off, in the course of encountering and "reencountering psychology" [M.F., *Philosophy and*

*Psychology*, p. 258]? Does this say something about the relationship between philosophy and psychology?

- c. Why does the speaker associate psychology with decoding rather than decipherment? [M.F., *Philosophy and Psychology*, p. 253]

“Psychology may well be, like philosophy itself, a medicine and a therapeutics—actually, there is no doubt that it’s a medicine and a therapeutics ... you cannot know without transforming.” [M.F., *Philosophy and Psychology*, p. 255] Would you agree (state your reasons)? Would not this reasoning forever separate psychology (or philosophy) as *human* sciences from the *social* sciences?

Set 3: Based on ‘A Wife’s Letter’ By Rabindranath Tagore (30 marks)

- a. Set up a dialogue between the three -

- "Now *Mejo-Bou* dies"
- "I too will be saved. I am saved"
- "Removed from the Shelter of Your Feet, *Mrinal*" -

in the context of the clinical and/or the socio-political.

- b. "*My brother died; I survived. All the neighbourhood girls said, ‘Mrinal’s a girl, that’s why she lived. If she’d been a boy, she couldn’t have been saved.’ Jom-Raj is wise in his deadly robbery: he only takes things of value*"

Imagine you have joined the MA programme in Psycho-social-clinical Studies and Mrinal has come to you for psychotherapy. How would you deal with her sense of self-devaluation? How would you relate to her transition from Mejo-Bou to Mrinal? Would you agree with the statement that ‘the personal is political’?

- c. "*Today we have been married fifteen years, yet not until today have I written you a letter. I’ve always been close by your side. You’ve heard many things from me, and so have I from you, but we haven’t had space enough to write a letter*"

Why do you think Tagore resorted to the form of a *letter* to write the story of a woman? Would the letter reach its destination? How do you relate to the question of "*space ... to write a letter*"? How does it relate to questions of listening, communicating *and* relating in the interpersonal space of a couple marked by their respective genders? Or is it more a question of *writing* and not just space, writing itself as a mode of experience and expression women are denied or have been historically denied?