

## Mark schemes

**Q1.****[AO1 = 4]**

Answers:

**A** – Challenge**B** – Hardiness**C** – Commitment**D** – Control

No credit if more than one letter is attached to a particular term.

**[4]****Q2.****[AO3 = 6]**

Level	Mark	Description
3	5-6	Evaluation of personality type as an explanation for stress is detailed and effective. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
2	3-4	Evaluation of personality type as an explanation for stress is mostly appropriate but lacks detail and/or clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology
1	1-2	Evaluation of personality type as an explanation for stress is limited/very limited. The answer lacks clarity. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible evaluation:**

- use of evidence to support/contradict personality type explanation, eg Friedman and Rosenman (1950s) research into Type A personality and stress-related illness; Temoshok et al (1985) Type C and cancer; Forshaw (2002) hostility is a key trait rather than general Type A
- problems with notion of Type A – comprised of many traits, some more relevant than others, eg hostility linked to CHD
- usefulness when there is limited scope for change eg if personality type is part of the problem it is difficult to change
- problem of cause and effect – does the personality type cause stress or are there other mediating variables, eg Type A people may expose themselves to more stressful experiences
- contrast with alternative explanations, eg physiological explanations.

Credit answers based on the hardy personality.

Credit other relevant material.

**[6]**