

Whatsapp : +919892507784 for psychology classes

E-mail : vyotika@excellingpsychology.com for other queries

A strength of making and presenting a diagnosis is that it is applicable to everyday life. For eg- the calm, unworried appearance of the practitioner will result in less stress for the patients . There is informed decision by patients, making the finding even more useful. However, there can be cultural differences as patients from the US we're told about the illness and the Japanese patients weren't told about their illness.

Commented [1]: Paragraph openings are correct. They begin with clearly naming a strength or weakness

Commented [2]: Incomplete sentences are problematic. Which 'informed decisions' are being referred to here?

Commented [3]: Firstly, using phrases like 'were' and 'were not told' implies that some specific research study is being addressed. If this is the case, the study's aim and results in the least must be explicitly mentioned.

Secondly, if this is referring to some general practice in the USA and in Japan, some reasoning or implications of this practice for presenting a diagnosis must be stated. Else what is the purpose of this point?

Commented [4]: The argument of usefulness in this paragraph is relevant. However, it fails to reach top mark because of lack of clarity and failure to show the connection between the argument and counterargument - how do differences in who is given diagnoses between cultures affect usefulness?

Commented [5]: Again 'the' study means nothing.

Is it a key or example study from the syllabus? Then it should be identified by the authors.

Is it some study not from the syllabus, then its aim should be specified for the examiner to understand what is being discussed.

Commented [6]: ?

A weakness of making and presenting a diagnosis is that the study was based on unrealistic breast cancer patients. As the patients had to watch a video clip , not like real life diagnosis. This, findings may not be generalised to real diagnosis in clinics. This lowers the ecological validity of the study. However, there was high internal validity as it was in a laboratory setting, and the researchers had control over how the physicians appeared in the video either being anxious or relaxed.

Commented [7]: This entire point is very difficult to understand because the study being referred to is not explained at all.

It cannot be expected that the examiner should know each and every study related to the topic or should try to figure out that out of the many available, which is being referred to.

Therefore, this argument cannot be credited at all

Whatsapp : +919892507784 for psychology classes

E-mail : vyotika@excellingpsychology.com for other queries

Another weakness of making and presenting a diagnosis is that it supports the individual side as the participant **may have chosen** a side of emotion based on their perception of 'anxious' or 'relaxed'. This reductionist approach may not be the best for making a presenting a diagnosis as the situation varies too. A better situational experience would have potentially given the researchers a deeper insight to their reactions based on the **type of situation** they are put in. In **the individual explanation**, the doctor can present the diagnosis as per the personality of the patient. For eg- if the patient is 'worried' typee, the doctor can give the diagnosis to the patient's family. instead of telling the **patient**.

Commented [8]: Again the same issue of not making it clear which participants of which study are being referred to

Commented [9]: Ambiguous points must not be given. Every point in an answer must be explicit. If situational factors are important to making and presenting diagnoses, it must be clarified which these factors are by means of examples

Commented [10]: Signposts must be used for an examiner to understand how one point is relating to the next.

Is this a counterargument? Is it a continuation of the ongoing argument? Arguments must not jump from one to the next

Commented [11]: The argument in this paragraph does show how looking into individual differences can be useful in making and presenting diagnoses. However, it lacks a clear counterargument and by itself loses clarity because the counterargument is needed to bring about clarity in showing how the individual explanation is reductionist.

Whatsapp : +919892507784 for psychology classes

E-mail : [jyotika@excellingpsychology.com](mailto: jyotika@excellingpsychology.com) for other queries

9990/03

Cambridge International AS & A Level – Mark Scheme
SPECIMEN

For examination
from 2024

Table B: AO3 Analysis and evaluation

The table should be used to mark the 10 mark part (b) 'Evaluate' questions (4, 8, 12 and 16).

Level	Description	Marks
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Detailed evaluation of the psychological theories, research, approaches, explanations and treatments/therapies.Analysis is evident throughout.A good range of issues including the named issue.Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective.	9–10
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Detailed evaluation of the psychological theories, research, approaches, explanations and treatments/therapies.Analysis is often evident.A range of issues including the named issue.Selection of evidence is thorough and effective.	7–8
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Some detailed evaluation of the psychological theories, research, approaches, explanations and treatments/therapies.Analysis is limited.A limited range of issues including the named issue.Selection of evidence is mostly effective.	5–6
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Superficial evaluation of the psychological theories, research, approaches, explanations and treatments/therapies.Little analysis.Limited number of issues which may not include the named issue.Selection of evidence is sometimes effective.	3–4
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Little evaluation of the psychological theories, research, approaches, explanations and treatments/therapies.Little or no analysis of issues.Selection of evidence is limited.	1–2
0	No creditable response.	0

This answer classifies for a level 3 answer as follows-

- There is some detailed evaluation
 - There is an attempt to present both sides of every issue - arguments and counterarguments.
 - Paragraphs begin with explicit statement of an issue being considered a strength or weakness and then proceed to an attempt towards showing the other side as well;
- Analysis is limited
 - The arguments and counterarguments given are limited because they are not elaborated upon with explanations and concrete examples as pointed out in the comments throughout the answer;
- Limited range of issues including the named issue
 - The named issue is discussed right at the beginning;
 - A sufficient number of additional issues are also there - two to be specific - and they are relevant to the question asked;
- Selection of evidence is mostly effective

Whatsapp : +919892507784 for psychology classes

E-mail : [jyotika@excellingpsychology.com](mailto:vyotika@excellingpsychology.com) for other queries

-
- Evidence selected is relevant, such as the cultural differences issue in the first paragraph and the sample study in the second paragraph. However, it cannot be considered very thorough or effective because there is ambiguity in the points made and a failure to connect them to the rest of the argument.

This answer will score 5 out of 10.

Whatsapp : +919892507784 for psychology classes

E-mail : [jyotika@excellingpsychology.com](mailto: jyotika@excellingpsychology.com) for other queries

Following is a better version of the answer-

One strength of making and presenting a diagnosis is that it has good application to everyday life. For example, while presenting a diagnosis if a physician uses helpful non-verbal communication like maintaining a calm and unworried appearance, then the patient receiving the diagnosis will experience less stress. They will then be in a relaxed position to take an informed decision for how to proceed with their treatment, which is likely to make treatment more effective. However, one weakness in application is that cultural differences can determine how diagnosis should be presented. For example, in the USA, it is common practice to inform patients about their condition directly and so, a physician maintaining stress-free body language can be effective in this culture. However, in Japan, patients are not directly informed about any dire condition that they are suffering from. Their families are informed instead. Hence, how patients' families should be presented with diagnosis would be a focus of application in this culture.

Whatsapp : +919892507784 for psychology classes

E-mail : [jyotika@excellingpsychology.com](mailto: jyotika@excellingpsychology.com) for other queries

A weakness of making and presenting a diagnosis is that some of the studies in this area have been unrealistic. For example, in a classic study with breast cancer patients who were receiving their diagnosis, the patients had to watch a video clip in which they were presented with their diagnosis by a physician who looked either worried or relaxed. While the study did show that receiving a diagnosis from an unworried physician made participants feel at ease, the ecological validity of results is questionable. Receiving a diagnosis in the physical presence of a physician is a different experience from watching it on video because of greater sensory stimulation involved in face-to-face contact and because of a two-way interaction between the physician and patient. Nevertheless, the internal validity of the study was sound as researchers could control exactly how worried or relaxed they appeared, showing that the appearance of the physician is a credible factor influencing presentation of a diagnosis.

Another weakness is that the explanations of making and presenting a diagnosis tend to support the individual side of the individual and situational explanations debate. This is because it is largely a matter of perception of the physician's body language that could influence the patient's reception of the diagnosis. For example, in the aforementioned study, whether participants saw the physician as worried or relaxed must have influenced how they interpreted the diagnosis that was presented. This makes the explanations reductionist. More holistic explanations would also investigate the role of situational factors such as presence of others, support from family members, etc. that could affect how a diagnosis is interpreted, besides the perceptions of patients.

Whatsapp : +919892507784 for psychology classes
E-mail : [jyotika@excellingpsychology.com](mailto: jyotika@excellingpsychology.com) for other queries

This answer classifies for a level 5 answer as follows-

- There is detailed evaluation
 - Both sides of every issue - arguments and counterarguments are presented;
- Analysis is evident throughout
 - Every point is evaluated, there is no point that is only described and not evaluated; or left one-sided;
- Good range of issues including the named issue
 - The named issue is discussed right at the beginning;
 - A sufficient number of additional issues are also there - two to be specific - and they are relevant to the question asked and also detailed;
- Selection of evidence is very thorough and effective
 - Evidence selected is relevant to the topic and it clearly and elaborately supports the arguments and counterarguments made.

This answer will score 10 out of 10.

Whatsapp : +919892507784 for psychology classes

E-mail : jyotika@excellingpsychology.com for other queries

Lesson prepared by:

Jyotika Varmani (M.A. Psychology Honours, NET, SET, PGDHE)
CIE A-levels Psychology Teacher - Modern College, Mauritius
CIE A-levels Psychology Subject Expert - Podar International, Mumbai
8+ years experience in private tutoring for CIE, IB, AQA, Edexcel Psychology
Owner of 'Excelling Psychology' online
Visit Jyotika Varmani's complete profile at -
<https://www.teacheron.com/tutor-profile/1KH>

