Managing Stress – Mark Scheme

Q1.

[AO3 = 2]

1 mark for a brief explanation of a limitation (must be explained rather than stated).

Plus

1 mark for elaboration

Possible limitations:

• does not consider individual differences in response, eg divorce or children leaving home
• illness outcomes are not clearly specified
• correlations between the SRRS scores and illness outcomes are small / non-existent
• use of retrospective questionnaire has problems of self-presentation, demand characteristics, accuracy of recall.

Credit other relevant limitations.

Q2.

[AO3 = 2]

Possible content:
• Demand characteristics, self-presentation
• Reliance on recall
• Does scale cover all possible hassles and uplifts?
• Ignores major life events that can affect stress
• Results linking H & U and stress measures (illness, depression etc) are correlational, cause/effect cannot be concluded

2 marks for a clear and coherent explanation
1 mark for a vague /muddled explanation or for a limitation merely identified

Q3.

AO3 = 2

Ethical issues could include:

• Informed consent
• Right to withdraw
• Protection from harm
• Anonymity
• Confidentiality
• Deception.

Any relevant ethical issue can receive credit, but the question requires candidates to explain the ethical issue.

1 mark for identifying the ethical issue and a further mark for the explanation. For example, confidentiality is an issue because when investigating stress the participant might be disclosing personal information that they want to keep private.

Q4.
[AO1 = 3   AO3 = 5]

Level	Marks	Description
4	7 – 8	Knowledge of self-report scale(s) as measures of stress is accurate with some detail. Evaluation is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	5 – 6	Knowledge of self-report scale(s) as measures of stress is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Evaluation is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	3 – 4	Limited knowledge of self-report scale(s) as measures of stress is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any evaluation is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1 – 2	Knowledge of self-report scale(s) as measures of stress is very limited. Evaluation is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible outline:
• SRRS (Holmes and Rahe) scale of 43 life events experienced over a specified time each event is accorded life change units (LCUs) which can be added up to give an overall life change score (credit also knowledge of how the scale was constructed)
• Hassles and Uplifts Scale (Kanner) 117 daily hassles, respondent indicates hassles occurring over last month and their severity, 135 uplift events which mediate effect of hassles.

Credit other self-report scales, eg Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen) and Stress Appraisal Measure (Peacock and Wong).

Possible evaluation:
• validity issues, eg ambiguity of certain life events on the SRRS that may be stressful for some people but not for others eg marital separation is highly rated but may be a relief for some people
• need to distinguish between positive and negative events on SRRS
• causality issues – illness may lead to some stressful life events (eg job loss) rather than the other way round

- issues of reliability – recall is retrospective so may be inaccurate – test-retest reliability for SRRS varies
- use of evidence, eg Kanner – hassles correlate with psychological health; Johnson – link between high SRRS score and illness
- individual differences, eg hardiness and personality type can mediate stress so measurement needs to take personal variables into account
- ethics – completing self-report Qs may affect a person's stress level
- combined measure of life events and hassles gives fuller picture – one can exacerbate the effect of the other
- hassles a better measure of stress troubling most people
- comparison with other measures, eg objective physiological measures.

Credit other relevant material.