Reports on Happiness

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
MONOGRAPHS IN SOCIAL RESEARCH

1. JAMES A. DAVIS / *Great Aspirations*
2. JAMES A. DAVIS / *Undergraduate Career Decisions*
3. NORMAN M. BRADBURN AND DAVID CAPLOVITZ / *Reports on Happiness*
4. JOHN W. C. JOHNSTONE AND RAMON J. RIVERA / *Volunteers for Learning*
5. JAMES A. DAVIS / *Education for Positive Mental Health*
6. THEODORE M. NEWCOMB AND EVERETT K. WILSON (EDS.) / *The Study of College Peer Groups*
7. SEYMOUR WARKOV / *Lawyers in the Making*
8. JACOB J. FELDMAN / *The Dissemination of Health Information*
9. WALTER L. WALLACE / *Peer Groups and Student Achievement*

Reports on Happiness

A Pilot Study
of
Behavior Related
to Mental Health

By
NORMAN M. BRADBURN
and
DAVID CAPLOVITZ

ALDINE PUBLISHING COMPANY
Chicago

This investigation was supported in whole
by Public Health Service Contract No. PH43-62-145
from the National Institute of Mental Health

First published 1965 by
ALDINE Publishing Company
64 East Van Buren Street
Chicago, Illinois 60605

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 64 – 15605
Designed by Greer Allen
Printed in the United States of America

Preface

Happiness and its correlates are the ambitiously conceived subjects of the researches reported in this volume. To many—social scientists and laymen alike—the endeavors of the authors would be characterized as more foolhardy than ambitious, for, to them, the nature of happiness is by definition beyond the limitations of empirical research. Happiness is too personal and subjective a phenomenon to be studied by the crude measuring devices presently available to the social scientist. Indeed, when my colleagues and I have attempted to describe this particular research project, our remarks have often been met at the outset with, at best, polite incredulity and sometimes with explosive laughter. Often, however, further explanation usually convinces all but the most skeptical that the study has been seriously conceived and that it is potentially productive of knowledge of considerable importance to the social sciences.

Because reactions have so frequently been skeptical, it appears to me that the researches in this volume can easily be misunderstood. It is therefore extremely important that the reader understand thoroughly what the objectives of this study are, and, equally important, what the researches were not designed to study.

Perhaps it would be useful to list what the study did not undertake. This is not an attempt to study happiness at any level of psychological depth. We are concerned with self-assessments of the sort that could be obtained in a survey interview administered by relatively skilled survey interviewers and not with the protocols that would result from more intensive studies of particular individuals.

This is not an attempt to uncover the "causes" of happiness, but rather an attempt to see how self-assessments of happiness are distributed throughout the social groupings of the American population and how the American population varies over time in its level of happiness.

This is not an attempt to provide prescriptions for happiness for individuals. Given our objective and the kinds of data we have collected, it would be more than pretentious to attempt to do so.

What, then, is the purpose of this research? The studies presented in this volume are only a part of a much broader, ongoing program of research whose ultimate aim is to assess periodically the social-psychological state of the American public. From such a research program, we expect to establish trend lines for the nation as a whole and for significant subgroups—those differentiated by region, socio-economic class, age, etc.—on behavior and feeling states generally considered to be closely related to mental health. These trend lines would be drawn on such items as personal esprit and morale; felt concerns, worries, satisfactions and dissatisfactions; mild psychoneurotic symptoms; participation in or withdrawal from social life.

A further objective is to explore in detail how social phenomena on the national, regional, and local level affect these items. Does unemployment or tension among groups and classes, for example, have an impact on individual morale, feelings, or activities?

We plan to deepen this exploration by determining the correlates for variations in individuals over time in the major dependent variables, looking particularly at the impact of factors such as changes in the economic sphere (unemployment, shifts in income), changes in the interpersonal scene (death, interpersonal tensions, etc.), and other personal changes, such as sickness, accidents, and so on. Finally, we want to assess the extent to which episodes of acute anxiety and other similar transitory emotional strains incapacitate individuals in their day-to-day activities and to determine the ways in which such episodes are handled by different individuals.

Reports on Happiness consolidates two of the initial studies in this continuing program. This research began in 1961 when the National Institute of Mental Health entered into a contract with NORC for the design and development of prototype instruments that would measure fluctuations in behavior related to mental health. In the pilot study reported in Chapters 1–3, the instru-

ment was both developed and put to its first test. In the ongoing program the instrument itself will be studied carefully, so we will know how much variability is inherent in it and how sensitive it is to important changes in the individual or his immediate situation. Furthermore, this volume builds the conceptual framework that will guide our continuing efforts to understand psychological well-being or happiness.

The research of which *Reports on Happiness* is the initial phase has a twofold significance. First, if the research is successful in validating a measuring instrument, we will be in a position to establish trend lines and national norms for mental health–related behavior by means of periodic national surveys. Such norms would provide base lines to which specific "problem" populations could be compared, as well as provide a continuing measure of fluctuations in the psychological well-being or "mood" of the population as a whole. Once trend lines have been established, the relationships between fluctuations in the level of certain social phenomena such as birth rates, marriage rates, divorce rates, or levels of optimism about economic conditions and fluctuations in the psychological well-being of the population could be investigated. Ultimately the use of such an instrument in longitudinal studies would help greatly in the solution of some of the basic problems concerning the relationships between mental health and the social environment.

Second, it will enable us to determine empirically the way in which certain types of behavior having important implications for mental health vary for individuals over time. With a knowledge of the clustering of behavior changes over relatively short periods of time, we will be in a better position to understand the range of normal variability in behavior and to gain some insight into the differences between transient emotional disturbances and mental illness.

In order to test the discriminatory power of the instruments we had constructed, we chose to study four communities in Illinois of comparable size, one pair being economically depressed and another pair being economically well off. We had hoped that the feeling states in the two pairs of communities would differ strongly from each other. As you can see from the results of the

research, these expectations were not strongly borne out. Thus the instrument was well able to discriminate between persons in different stages of the life cycle and in different social positions within each community, but the differences across communities were slight and sometimes contradictory. Had these been our only findings, we could have made a very good case to abandon this particular line of research as unfruitful, at least with the present instrumentation. However, out of the analysis of the interrelationship among feeling states arose a finding of considerable significance. Norman Bradburn was able to show that feeling states were composed of two almost completely unrelated dimensions: positive feelings and negative feelings. Furthermore, it was the balance between positive and negative feelings that determined whether or not an individual would assess himself as "happy" or "unhappy." This finding and its elaboration in analysis constitutes the bulk of the productive results of the present volume (Chapters 1–3).

Still in the search for social processes that affect trends in well-being, we took advantage of the Cuban crisis in the fall of 1962 to return to the respondents in two of our communities to ascertain how this important series of events affected their feelings of well-being. David Caplovitz presents the analysis of these materials (Chapters 5–6). Somewhat to our surprise, the Cuban crisis was felt only at the cognitive level among the majority of our respondents; the emotional response to a major event, even on this scale, was slight.

The researches described in this volume are now being carried several steps further. We have studied neighborhoods and larger areas in metropolitan communities over a year's period of time to observe the fluctuations among individuals and within individuals over short periods of time. The results of these further investigations will be reported in the volumes to come in this series.

Most of the studies carried out at NORC involve an extensive amount of collaboration among different individuals. The present volume represents no exception to this rule. The initial conception of this program was set forth by Jacob J. Feldman, formerly director of research of NORC, and myself. Norman Bradburn

skilfully constructed the initial instrument in consultation with the following people: Elaine Cumming, John Cumming, Bruce Dorenwhend, Donald Fiske, Gerald Gurin, William E. Henry, Morris Janowitz, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Robert C. Nichols, Leo Srole, and Joseph Veroff.

Mr. Bradburn undertook most of the analysis of the data from the initial four communities in Illinois. He was ably assisted in this early stage by William A. Simon, now at Southern Illinois University. David Caplovitz, the second author of this volume, analyzed the data concerning the impact of the Cuban crisis and participated in later stages of the research not reported here. Anthony Orum assisted Mr. Caplovitz in this endeavor. The field work was under the general supervision of Galen Gockel. Branson Frevert and Shirley Breuer were the field supervisors. NORC staff members James Davis, Beatrice Treiman, Seymour Warkov, and John Johnstone contributed valuable ideas in all phases of the project.

Dr. Richard Williams of the National Institute of Mental Health was the contract officer on Contract #PH43-62-145 with the National Institute of Mental Health, under which this research was carried on. His advice, encouragement, and strong interest in the research were important factors in bringing it to a successful conclusion. We are also grateful to Dr. Joseph Bobbitt of the National Institute of Mental Health, who was good enough to lend his ear to our scheme.

Some years ago, Paul F. Lazarsfeld stated that the time would come when we would make periodic assessments of social-psychological factors in the American population in much the same way that we measure the state of the labor force. We hope that this research represents a step toward that day when we will keep as close and continuous an eye on the mental and social aspects of American life as we do upon its economic and physical aspects.

PETER H. ROSSI
Director
National Opinion Research Center

Contents

List of Tables

1

The Structure of the Studies

This report presents data from two pilot studies in a series of research projects designed to measure, on a mass scale, fluctuations over time in behavior related to mental health. This research, which is supported by the National Institute of Mental Health, is an effort to develop, for psychological and behavioral phenomena, time-series studies comparable to those that are commonplace in economics and demography. Its long-range objective is to conduct periodic inventories of the psychological well-being of the nation's population. From such inventories it is possible to determine for the first time the extent to which feeling states of the population are affected by major social trends, national and local crises, and changes in the economic and social structures, as well as by patterned events in the life cycles of individuals.

The underlying assumption of this research is that there is a dimension variously called mental health, subjective adjustment, happiness, or psychological well-being, and that individuals can be meaningfully described as being relatively high or low on such a dimension. At present there is neither a generally agreed upon name for this dimension nor agreement as to the appropriate methods of deciding where a particular individual should be placed on it. From Jahoda's excellent review (1960) of the current status of theorizing about mental health, however, it is apparent that greater conceptual clarity can come only from further empirical studies, rather than from more theorizing in the absence of good data.

The pilot studies reported here were undertaken in the belief that much of the disagreement over conceptions of mental health stems from a basic lack of knowledge about the behavior of people leading normal lives. By systematically studying heterogeneous normal (i.e., non-clinical) populations, we should be better able to understand the patterning of psychological adjustment and the relationship of various aspects of a person's life to his adjustment. With more detailed knowledge of how people live their lives, what problems they encounter in their everyday activities and how they cope with these problems, how they view their relations with other people, and how they spend their time, we should be in a better position to determine the nature of mental health, as well as to study the causes of mental illness.

As a first step toward this goal, NORC conducted a small-scale study in the spring of 1962, interviewing a sample of people living in four small communities in Illinois. The interview schedule was designed to cover as wide a range as possible of feelings, behavior, and attitudes generally considered to be closely related to or indicative of mental health. The interviews focused on six major topics: social activities, marriage and family life, work experiences, involvement in the community, physical health, and subjective states such as felt concerns, anxiety, worries, and life satisfactions and dissatisfactions. Where possible the questions were designed to yield data comparable to those collected in related studies so that our findings could be used to replicate and illuminate previous work.

RESEARCH DESIGN

While we were concerned primarily with selecting a sample of persons who would be representative of a normal population, we also wished to study the effects of differing degrees of environmental stress on the lives of our respondents. Our research design was guided by the belief that a person's relative position on a dimension of mental health or psychological well-being is determined by and reflected in his current life situation. Thus a person's mental health may depend not only on what happens directly to him, but also on what happens to those around him, and how he compares himself with others similar to him. What-

ever the effects of early developmental factors in setting the personality dispositions of the individual, an underlying assumption of this research is that a person's current life situation is a major determining factor of his mental health, and major changes in life situations will have significant effects upon it.

The research strategy selected was to study people living in communities that differed in the degree to which the environment might be considered stressful. The assumption here is that a cross-sectional analysis of persons living in communities that were undergoing different degrees of stress would reveal some of the major differences which might be expected in individuals over time as they are subjected to similar types of stressful or nonstressful situations. Four communities in Illinois were selected which differed in degree of economic prosperity. Two of the communities, East Parrish and Clyde,[1] are in a chronically depressed area of high unemployment, with few prospects for much improvement over the next few years. Both have suffered substantial decline in population due to the out-migration of young people looking for better job opportunities elsewhere. A third town, Spiresburg, is in the same chronically depressed area, but has recently experienced considerable improvement with the opening of three new plants in the last four years. While Spiresburg appears to be doing fairly well economically at the moment, it too has suffered during the past ten years from the general population decline in the area, although to a lesser extent than East Parrish and Clyde. The fourth community, Brewer, is a booming town in an area of high employment which has grown rapidly during the past decade, having had, in 1962, its general prosperity augmented by the opening of a new plant paying high wages.

Differences among the four towns in population change, unemployment rate, income level, educational level, and age structure are presented in Table 1.1. It can be seen that the differences between the communities do not form a uniform progression. Spiresburg, in particular, stands in a rather indeterminate position with regard to the economic and demographic variables. From a structural viewpoint it appears to be a depressed community with an unemployment rate higher than the 6 per cent used by

[1]All names of towns in this report are fictitious.

the government to define depressed areas, and a declining and aging population indicating out-migration of the younger workers. Because of substantial and successful local efforts to bring in new industry, however, it is experiencing an economic revival relative to the other two communities in the area, as can be seen from the median income figures. While Spiresburg's revival can be expected to produce some positive factors in the lives of its inhabitants, it is not likely to have such large or widespread effects as the really rapid growth taking place in Brewer.

The study was designed to yield a sample of 450 households in each of the four communities. Because of the small scale of the study, it was felt that the maximum benefit would be obtained from the interviews by restricting them to men between the ages of twenty-five and forty-nine, thus controlling for the important variables of sex and age. Each household was screened to locate male respondents between the ages of twenty-five and forty-nine with whom to conduct a personal interview. In order to put to good use the time and effort spent in screening households for eligible respondents, however, an abbreviated self-administered

Table 1.1 Selected Demographic Characteristics of Communities*

Item	East Parrish	Clyde	Spiresburg	Brewer
Total population 1960	9,027	7,023	3,085	7,008
Per cent age 20–24	4	4	4	7
Per cent age 25–49	29	28	29	31
Per cent age 50 and over	37	37	36	24
Per cent change in total population 1950–60	−21	−11	−6	+29
Per cent unemployed†	20	20	9	2
Per cent employed in manufacturing	16	12	24	43
Persons age 25 and over: median school years completed	8.7	8.9	8.9	11.2
Per cent completing 4 years high school or more	26.5	30.1	33.9	45.8
Median family income	$4,528	$4,482	$5,043	$6,493
Per cent with incomes under $3,000	31.0	35.3	23.5	11.4
Per cent with incomes over $10,000	6.5	6.9	11.4	16.9

*U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1960. General Social and Economic Characteristics, Illinois*, Final Report PC (1).

†Governor's Committee on Unemployment (personal communication). Figures available only for counties (August, 1961).

version of the interview schedule was left to be filled out by the head of the household and by the nearest relative of opposite sex. If the head of the household was in the age group to receive a personal interview, a short form was left for his wife and one other adult relative, if one were living in the household. The interviewers returned at a later date to collect the completed questionnaires and conduct the interview where necessary. By utilizing both self-administered questionnaires and personal interviews, we were able to obtain data from a relatively large sample. The total number of completed cases was 2,006, including 393 personal interviews and 1,613 self-administered questionnaires. The total number of respondents in each community by age, sex, and method of data collection is given in Table 1.2.

The Cuban crisis provided a timely opportunity to investigate the psychological effects of a period of national stress. When the crisis developed plans were made immediately to reinterview respondents in the most prosperous and most depressed of the communities, Brewer and East Parish respectively. The President addressed the nation on the evening of October 22, 1963. By Saturday, October 27, NORC interviewers were in the field with a questionnaire containing the same measures of feeling states that had appeared on the March version, and a special section dealing with opinions and feelings about the Cuban situation. The interviewing took place over a nine-day period, during which the crisis itself changed dramatically into a victory for United States policy. In all, 547 people in the two communities were reinterviewed in October.[2]

PLAN OF ANALYSIS

The most fruitful starting point in developing an instrument to measure a dimension of mental health seemed to be people's own estimates of their level of psychological well-being or distress. While self-reports yield different classifications of individuals from those provided by other types of measures such as psychological tests or experts' ratings of clinical interviews, there is no evidence that self-reports are any less (or for that matter

[2]We shall refer to the second series of interviews as the October survey, although the field work, which began on October 27, lasted until November 4.

Table 1.2 Number of Respondents by Community, Age, Sex, and Method of Data Collection

Community	Long Form: Personal Interview	Short Form: Self-Administered Questionnaire						Total
	Men 25–49	Men			Women			
		Under 50	50 or Older	No Answer on Age	Under 50	50 or Older	No Answer on Age	
East Parrish	108	19	123	2	123	160	10	545
Clyde	90	20	88	3	129	112	9	451
Spiresburg	89	22	74	2	135	101	5	428
Brewer	106	65	95	3	198	95	20	582
Total	393	126	380	10	585	468	44	2,006
			Total Men	909				
			Total Women	1,097				

more) valid than expert ratings or psychological tests for rating people on a mental health dimension. Furthermore, self-reports have the eminently practical virtues of face validity, directness, and ease of use. It is most likely that there would be a high degree of overlap, although by no means a perfect correlation, between self-reports and experts' ratings.

How then do we ask a person to rate himself in terms of his subjective feelings of well-being or distress? Believing that the best first approach to the problem of measurement is a direct one, we asked the straightforward question, "Taking all things together, how would you say things are these days—would you say you are very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy?" Considering the answer to this question to be the respondent's best estimate of his present over-all sense of well-being, or distress, we took the respondent's report of his level of happiness as the basic dependent variable in our study.

The analysis presented in this report explores the correlates of different self-reports of level of happiness and develops a conceptual framework within which the effects of different events in his life on a person's psychological well-being may be better understood. In Chapter 2 we relate the patterning of self-reports of happiness first to various demographic and social status dimensions and then to other measures of psychological well-being or distress such as feeling states, anxiety, worries, work and marital adjustment, and social interaction. In Chapter 3 the conceptual framework developed from the analysis of the interrelations of indicators of happiness is used to investigate the psychological effects of economic stress.

In the two subsequent chapters we assess the effects of a national crisis, namely the Cuban situation, on psychological well-being. Chapter 4 considers trends in feeling states between March and October. Chapter 5 deals with data bearing directly on the Cuban crisis; in this chapter we present a measure of worry over the crisis and examine the social and psychological correlates of worry.

The concluding chapter summarizes our findings and suggests what we consider to be their implications for future research.

2

Correlates of Well-Being

In this chapter we investigate various social and psychological correlates of over-all well-being. Discussing first the distribution of happiness in the social structure, we show that to a large extent differences in happiness level can be attributed to differences in social status. When we come to examine psychological correlates, we see that happiness is not a simple phenomenon that can be understood in terms of a single dimension, but rather a complex resultant of the satisfactions and dissatisfactions, the gratifying and frustrating emotional experiences that occur in a person's life situation.

DISTRIBUTION OF HAPPINESS IN THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Education, income, age, and happiness

Of the 2,006 respondents in our sample, 24 per cent said they were "very happy," 59 per cent said "pretty happy," and 17 per cent said "not too happy." A slightly different distribution was reported in *Americans View Their Mental Health* by Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960*a*), who found that in a national sample of residents of small towns, 35 per cent were "very happy," 54 per cent "pretty happy," and 10 per cent "not too happy." This difference is consistent with the fact that our sample is heavily concentrated in an economically depressed area, and is at least presumptive evidence that respondents' reports of their general sense of well-being mirror the objective situation.

Table 2.1 shows the relation of happiness to major demo-

Table 2.1 Happiness and Selected Demographic Characteristics

Selected Demographic Characteristics	Per Cent "Very Happy"	Per Cent "Pretty Happy"	Per Cent "Not Too Happy"	Total	
				Per Cent	N – NA
Sex					
Men	25	59	16	100	901
Women	23	60	17	100	1,091
					1,992
					NA 14
					2,006
Age					
Under 30	30	58	11	99	297
30–39	24	66	10	100	385
40–49	25	62	13	100	417
50–59	23	59	18	100	338
60–69	21	54	24	99	280
70 and over	18	52	30	100	221
					1,938
					NA 68
					2,006
Education					
8th grade or less	19	56	25	100	644
Less than high school graduate	25	59	16	100	361
High school graduate	27	61	12	100	555
Part college	22	67	10	99	241
College graduate or more	29	60	10	99	154
					1,955
					NA 51
					2,006
Income					
Less than $3,000	14	55	31	100	536
$3,000–$3,999	21	63	16	100	158
$4,000–$4,999	27	61	12	100	227
$5,000–$5,999	26	64	10	100	241
$6,000–$6,999	24	65	10	99	249
$7,000–$7,999	30	60	10	100	118
$8,000–$9,999	29	63	7	99	181
$10,000 or more	38	54	8	100	152
					1,862
					NA 144
Socio-economic status*					2,006
High	28	62	10	100	865
Low	20	58	22	100	1,025
					1,890
					NA 116
					2,006

*Respondents were divided into two social classes. "High" consists of people who have at least two of the following attributes: Family income of $5,000 or more, high school graduate or more, and white collar occupation. "Low" consists of those with none or only one of the above attributes.

graphic variables. The data confirm findings reported by Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960*a*): there is a strong positive correlation between happiness and both education and income, a marked negative correlation between happiness and age, and no difference in reported happiness between men and women. While these findings are not exactly new, their importance needs to be emphasized because they contradict some generally held notions—that women, for example, tend to be unhappier than men or that money brings unhappiness.

Since education and income are themselves correlated, it is possible that the correlation of one or the other of them with happiness is spurious. When we study the joint effects of education and income on happiness (Table 2.2), we note an interesting and rather perplexing relationship. At every level of education making more money is associated with being happier, but having more education is not always related to being happier. Education and happiness are positively related for the majority of the sample, who earn less than $7,000 a year, but negatively related among the wealthier people; among the relatively wealthy it is the well-educated who more often say that they are "not too happy." The extremely low incidence of unhappiness among the poorly educated people with incomes of over $7,000 a year might be explained by their having achieved more than their expecta-

Table 2.2 Education, Income, and Happiness (Per Cent "Not Too Happy")

Education	Less than $3,000	$3,000–$4,999	$5,000–$6,999	$7,000 or more
8th grade or less	33 (359)*	13 (115)	13 (97)	3 (32)
High school or part high school	27	16	10	7
	21 (142)	9 (213)	7 (284)	10 (227)
Part college or more	(29)	(53)	(107)	(188)

N–NA	1,846
NA on happiness	14
NA on education and/or income	146
Total N	2,006

*Numbers in parentheses in this and subsequent tables represent case base upon which percentages are based.

tions. On this basis one would expect the "underachievers," those who have at least some college education but make less than $3,000 a year, to be the most unhappy group; surprisingly, however, they are less unhappy than those who are both poorly educated and very poor. The combined negative effect of low income and little education is seen in the proportion of respondents in this latter group who report that they are "not too happy," a proportion which is nearly twice that for the sample as a whole.[1]

Since age is also correlated negatively with education and income, let us look simultaneously at the relative contribution of each to the distribution of happiness in our sample. Table 2.3 presents the per cent of respondents in different education,

[1]These findings are at odds with the theory of status equilibration that has been developed by Lenski (1954) and his students. According to this theory, people whose statuses are not congruent should experience more stress and psychological malaise than those whose statuses are equilibrated. Our findings suggest that the level at which equilibration occurs is also important, and that it would be a mistake to treat as one those whose statuses are equilibrated at different levels of social ranking.

Table 2.3 Education, Income, Age, and Happiness (Per Cent "Not Too Happy")

Education	Income	Age		
		Under 40	40–59	60 or over
Less than high school graduate	Less than $5,000	18 (95)	25 (205)	32 (340)
	$5,000 or more	11 (88)	9 (163)	4 (24)
High school graduate or more	Less than $5,000	9 (116)	20 (81)	20 (49)
	$5,000 or more	8 (349)	9 (225)	12 (33)

N–NA	1,768
NA on happiness	14
NA on education, income, and/or age	224
Total N	2,006

income, and age groups who report that they are "not too happy." The negative relationship between age and happiness appears strongest among the poor people. Looking across the first row of the table, we see that the least educated, lowest income, oldest group has the highest proportion of "not too happy" people (32 per cent). Among the better educated, low-income respondents (third row), age is also related to unhappiness. In this group those who are under forty are happier than those who are forty or over, although there appears to be little relation between age and happiness after forty.

The effects of income are shown in the columns of Table 2.3. Income makes little difference in reported happiness among younger respondents, but a considerable difference among respondents forty or older. This finding suggests that present income has different meanings at different stages of the life cycle. For younger people, who presumably have not yet reached their full earning power, expectations of future income are more important than present income. The more serious effect of low income on people forty or older, who have reached their full earning power, is apparent in the considerably higher proportion of respondents in this group who report that they are "not too happy." Among the poor it might be said that "life ends at forty."

The most interesting group, however, is that of the poorly educated, higher income respondents (second row) for whom there is a positive relationship between age and happiness. A possible interpretation of this finding is that while the younger, poorly educated respondents making over $5,000 a year perceive themselves to be doing better than others of similar age and educational background, they may feel that their relative success is only a temporary phenomenon, since many of those presently making low incomes can still achieve higher incomes later in life. By the age of forty, however, income differential is apt to remain relatively constant, enabling those with higher income to feel that they really are doing considerably better. Among the oldest group, those who have poor educations, but incomes of over $5,000, are a very small minority. The difference between the number of cases in the low and high income groups increases as one moves from the younger to the older groups. Compared

with others of similar educational background they are doing extremely well. Their position might be called one of "relative enrichment," as an analogue to the concept of relative deprivation.

Marital status and happiness

Table 2.4 presents the relationship of happiness to marital status. It can be seen that respondents who (for whatever reason) are not married are considerably less happy than those who are. It was pointed out earlier that in the aggregate men and women did not differ in degree of reported happiness. Important sex differences do emerge, however, when marital status is considered. The difference is particularly striking among single respondents, single men being twice as likely as single women to report being "not too happy." Indeed, single women differ only slightly from married women in their reported happiness, a surprising finding in view of the widespread impression that being unmarried is one of the worst things that can happen to a woman. Although these findings are based on a relatively small number of cases, they are consistent with those reported from a nationwide sample (Gurin, Veroff, and Feld, 1960*a*), and from an extensive sample in mid-town Manhattan (Srole *et al.*, 1962). We

Table 2.4 Sex, Marital Status, and Happiness (Per Cent "Not Too Happy")

Marital Status	Men	Women
Married	14 (794)	11 (824)
Single	31 (42)	15 (33)
Divorced or separated	38 (26)	26 (39)
Widowed	43 (23)	39 (176)

N–NA	1,957
NA on happiness index	14
NA on marital status	35
Total N	2,006

might note also that widowers and divorced or separated men are more likely to be unhappy than women in similar situations. Taken together, these findings suggest that being married is in fact more important for the happiness of men than of women. A somewhat similar conclusion was arrived at by Durkheim (1951), who suggested, on the basis of a study of suicide rates, that unmarried men live in a greater state of *anomie* than do unmarried women. While our data are not sufficient to permit an explanation of these differences, we hope to investigate the relation of marital status and happiness more fully in future research.

Employment status and happiness

We would expect employment status to be related to happiness, at least among men; there has also been considerable speculation recently about the relative happiness of women who are and are not working. Table 2.5 shows that a man's employment status does indeed make a considerable difference in his reported happiness; 33 per cent of those who are unemployed report that they are "not too happy" as against only 12 per cent of the cur-

Table 2.5 Sex, Employment Status, and Happiness (Per Cent "Not Too Happy")

Employment Status	Men	Women
Self-employed	9 (128)	16 (55)
Employed	12 (520)	12 (200)
Part-time employed	* (14)	15 (93)
Unemployed	33 (73)	27 (30)
Retired	27 (139)	26 (80)
Not in labor force	28 (26)	17 (613)

N–NA	1,971
NA on happiness	14
NA on employment status	21
Total N	2,006

*Too small case base to percentage.

rently employed and 9 per cent of the self-employed men. Men who are retired or otherwise not in the labor force (mainly those who have had disabling injuries) are nearly as likely to report being "not too happy" as are the unemployed men. This finding indicates that, as we shall discuss in greater detail later, work is of crucial importance to the happiness of men.

Among women, however, the situation is entirely different. Of the women who define themselves as being in the work force, those who are unemployed but looking for work, or who are retired, tend to report that they are "not too happy" about as frequently as do men; there appears to be little difference, however, in reported happiness between women who are currently employed, whether full-time, part-time, or self-employed, and women who say that they are neither working nor looking for work, i.e., the full-time housewives. Among the men, then, for whom the work role is a most important part of life, being unemployed or not working, for whatever reason, increases the likelihood of being unhappy. Women, on the other hand, seem to be about equally happy whether or not they choose to take on a work role; however, those women who do desire a work role and have been unable to find employment, or have been forced to retire, are more likely to be unhappy. In view of the increasing proportion of women in the labor force, the conclusion that whether or not a woman chooses to work is unrelated to her happiness is somewhat startling. A definite answer to the question of the relation of work to women's happiness may be found in further studies which will include samples of women from urban areas and investigate some of the reasons women have for entering the labor force.

TWO DIMENSIONS OF HAPPINESS: POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE FEELINGS

After observing some of the major patternings of self-reports of happiness with education, income, age, marital status, and employment, these same self-reports were studied in relation to other more detailed measures of well-being. One such measure was designed to investigate subjective feeling states which were conceptualized as having positive and negative poles. A study of

the relationship of these feeling states to each other, to happiness, to demographic factors, and to other possible correlates, such as anxiety, marital and job adjustment, social interaction, and worry, should yield important information about the psychological correlates of well-being.

The question, "How are you feeling?" is one heard often in everyday conversation, but one that has played very little role in the psychological study of behavior. In order to help the respondent go beyond what might be heavily conventional answers, we constructed a questionnaire describing twelve ways people feel at different times and asked each respondent to indicate how often he had felt that way during the past week.[2] The twelve items were chosen to represent a wide range of pleasurable and unpleasurable experiences apt to be common in a heterogeneous population. We expected that the items would cluster in two groups, one indicative of positive and the other of negative feelings, and that the two clusters would be negatively related to one another. Table 2.6 presents the product-moment intercorrelations of the twelve items based on the responses of the 393 men, aged twenty-five–forty-nine, who were given the long form of the interview.

The intercorrelations confirm one expectation, namely that there is a strong tendency for most of the items to fall into two clusters of positive and negative feelings. Two items–"angry at something that usually wouldn't bother you" and "you couldn't do something because you just couldn't get going"–showed a somewhat lower correlation with the other items in a negative cluster and were dropped from the cluster. One item–"you had more things to do than you could get done"–had a low intercorrelation with all other items and appears to lie on another dimension entirely. On the basis of the cluster analysis two indices were constructed. Each respondent was scored on a zero-to-three scale for each feelings item and given a summary score on the

[2]This rather short time focus was chosen because, in accord with our emphasis on current life situation, we were interested in the respondent's particular experiences in the recent past rather than in his experiences "in general" or "on the average." We also felt that respondents would have a reasonably accurate memory for different experiences if only a recent time period were considered.

Table 2.6 Product-Moment Correlations of Items on Feelings Scale (Males, Age 25–49 Only, N = 393)

Items from Feelings Check-List	Proud	Excited	Top of World	Angry	Too much To Do	Couldn't Get Going	Uneasy	Restless	Bored	Lonely	Depressed
Positive cluster											
Pleased about having accomplished something	*+0.47**	*+0.38*	*+0.31*	+0.04	+0.16	−0.02	+0.03†	−0.09	−0.11	−0.14	−0.13
Proud because someone complimented you on something you had done	—	*+0.28*	*.26*	.05	.12	+ .04	+ .11	+ .01	+ .10	− .08	− .02
Particularly excited or interested in something		—	*+0.31*	+ .12	.18	+ .08	+ .08	+ .03	− .02	− .08	+ .04
On top of the world			—	0.00	.07	− .12	− .09	− .14	− .12	− .16	− .19
Angry at something that usually wouldn't bother you				—	+0.19	+ .29	+ .30	+ .23	+ .26	+ .24	+ .33
That you had more things to do than you could get done					—	+0.30	+ .22	+ .10	+ .08	+ .10	+ .16
That you couldn't do something because you just couldn't get going						—	+0.31	+ .25	+ .25	+ .32	+ .35
Negative cluster											
Vaguely uneasy about something without knowing why							—	**+0.34**	**+ .31**	**+ .31**	**+ .38**
So restless you couldn't sit long in a chair								—	**+0.38**	**+ .31**	**+ .38**
Bored									—	**+0.40**	**+ .45**
Very lonely or remote from other people										—	**+0.54**
Depressed or very unhappy											—

*Italic = positive cluster.
†Boldface = negative cluster.
Shaded area = correlation between positive and negative clusters.

positive feelings index equal to his score on the four items in the positive feelings cluster, and a summary score on the negative feelings index equal to his score on five items in the negative cluster. The scores were then combined to give three groups—high, medium, and low—on each of the two indices.

One very surprising fact stands out in Table 2.6: while the items do fall into two clusters as expected, the items in one cluster are not negatively related to those in the other cluster in any consistent or strong fashion. Although fourteen of the twenty correlations between items in the two clusters are negative, the largest single correlation is only −.19 and that is between "depressed or very unhappy" and "on top of the world," which would be expected on a priori grounds to show a strong negative correlation. Respondents' total scores on the two indices are themselves uncorrelated (R = .07, N = 393).

If the positive and negative dimensions do not correlate with one another, how does each alone correlate with happiness? As we see in Table 2.7, each of the two indices does correlate in

Table 2.7 Positive and Negative Feelings Indices and Happiness

Indices	Per Cent "Very Happy"	Per Cent "Pretty Happy"	Per Cent "Not Too Happy"	Total	
				Per Cent	N—NA
Positive feelings index					
Low	15	58	28	100	590
Medium	21	62	17	100	682
High	34	59	7	100	720
					1,992
					NA 14
					2,006
Negative feelings index					
Low	35	59	6	100	757
Medium	28	63	9	100	181
High	15	59	26	100	1,054
					1,992
					NA 14
					2,006

the expected direction with respondents' self-reports of happiness. Respondents high on the positive feelings index tend to consider themselves "very happy," while those low on the positive feelings index tend to report that they are "not too happy"; respondents reporting many negative feelings during the previous week tend to say that they are "not too happy," while those who report having few negative feelings are more likely to describe themselves as "very happy." Combining the two indices, as in Table 2.8, we find that of those who are high on the positive feelings index and low on the negative feelings index, nearly 50 per cent report that they are "very happy" as against only 1 per cent who are "not too happy." Of those who are low on the positive feelings index and high on the negative feelings index only 8 per cent report being "very happy," while nearly 40 per cent report being "not too happy."

The fact that positive and negative feeling states correlate individually with happiness, but not with each other, has two major implications for the assessment of well-being. In the first place we must consider the balance of positive and negative feelings and the implications of different sorts of balances for the functioning of the individual. In this view, one's subjective assessment of his well-being is a function of the relative strengths of the forces contributing to the experience of positive and negative feelings, with the strong implication that experiences producing

Table 2.8 Combined Positive and Negative Feelings Indices and Happiness

Positive Feelings	Negative Feelings	Per Cent "Very Happy"	Per Cent "Pretty Happy"	Per Cent "Not Too Happy"	Total	
					Per Cent	N – NA
High	Low	47	51	1	99	279
High	High	24	64	12	100	360
Medium	Medium	23	61	16	100	804
Low	Low	22	65	13	100	227
Low	High	8	52	40	100	322
						1,992
						NA 14
						2,006

negative feelings do not necessarily at the same time diminish positive feelings, nor do experiences producing positive feelings affect the number of negative feelings. The independence of these two dimensions, if confirmed by our further studies,[3] suggests a radical departure from usual notions about psychological well-being because it means that it is quite possible for a person to report being, for example, "very depressed" and still describe himself as "very happy." Such a report would be perfectly logical if the experience of the negative feelings were offset by the experience of several positive feelings.

The effect of this relative balance of positive and negative feelings at all levels of feelings can be seen in Table 2.9, a more

[3]Preliminary analysis of data from a follow-up study in two of our communities confirms the independence of the two dimensions. A complete report of this study will be published in the near future.

Table 2.9 Balance of Positive and Negative Feelings Indices and Happiness

Positive Feelings	Negative Feelings	Per Cent "Very Happy"	Per Cent "Pretty Happy"	Per Cent "Not Too Happy"	Total	
					Per Cent	N–NA
Positive > Negative						
High	Low	47	51	1	99	279
High	Medium	33	62	5	100	81
Medium	Low	34	61	5	100	251
Positive = Negative						
High	High	24	64	12	100	360
Medium	Medium	24	68	8	100	59
Low	Low	22	65	13	100	227
Positive < Negative						
Low	Medium	24	59	17	100	41
Medium	High	13	61	26	100	372
Low	High	8	52	40	100	322
						1,992
						NA 14
						2,006

detailed version of Table 2.8. Here respondents are divided into three groups according to relative balance of feelings, with each group then further divided into three groups according to the feelings reported. We see that respondents with more positive than negative feelings are more likely to report being "very happy," even though they have some negative feelings, while those who report more negative than positive feelings are more likely to say that they are "not too happy," even though they may have some positive feelings. If there is a balance between the two feelings, at whatever level of feeling, respondents are apt to report being "pretty happy." This is striking evidence that happiness is a result of the relative strengths of positive and negative feelings, rather than of the absolute amount of one or the other. Such a conception should help explain why some people who seem to have a very high number of negative forces acting on them still are able to maintain a sense of well-being, while others who appear to be exposed to only a small number of negative experiences become extremely depressed.

A second implication of the independence of positive and negative feelings is that there may be a dimension of "feelingness" or affectivity cutting across the positive-negative feeling dimension. Thus some people may have many different feelings during a short period of time while others may be relatively affectless and be aware of (or at least report) having few or no feelings at all. Such an implication would be in line with distinctions in personality theory between "intraceptive" and "extraceptive" persons (Murray, 1938), or between those who are sensitive to inner states and those who are relatively unaware of feelings, or are emotionally unresponsive to situational cues.

To explore further the meaning of the independence of positive and negative feelings, let us look at the patterning of feelings along some of the major dimensions of social structure. In doing so we will employ a fivefold typology characterizing people as being (*1*) high in positive but low in negative feelings; (*2*) low in positive but high in negative feelings; (*3*) low in both positive and negative feelings; (*4*) high in both positive and negative feelings; and (*5*) medium in both sets of feelings. This typology will enable us to see the effects of a predominance of one kind of feeling or

the other by comparing the responses of those who are high only on one index with those who are high only on the other, and to see the correlates of high and low affectivity by comparing the responses of those who are high on both indices with those who are low on both. The relevant data are presented in Table 2.10. Comparisons between columns A and B indicate the differences between groups on a "pure" positive or negative dimension, while comparisons between columns D and E indicate differences between groups on the affectivity dimension.

First, columns A and B show differences very similar to those reported in Table 2.1 for self-reports of happiness. There is practically no difference in the percentage of men and women in our sample having either predominantly positive or predominantly negative feelings. As we move from the less educated to the more educated respondents, the precentage having high negative and low positive feelings, (i.e., are less happy) steadily declines and the percentage having high positive and low negative feelings (i.e., are happier) steadily increases. Similar results are found as one moves from low to high income groups. In the case of age, however, the differences are not quite as marked as they were in the case of self-reports of happiness, although, as Table 2.1 showed, only after age sixty did the percentage of respondents reporting that they were "not too happy" begin to exceed the percentage reporting that they were "very happy." Here, too, it is only after sixty that a large difference in the balance of feelings begins to emerge on the side of negative feelings.

Looking down columns D and E we notice different types of relationships. In contrast to the lack of difference in self-reports of happiness between men and women, we notice that they do differ in the degree to which they report experiencing feelings of both sorts, with women slightly more likely to report having had many feelings both positive and negative, and men somewhat more likely to report having had neither positive nor negative feelings. As we move from the less to the more educated, and from the lower to the higher income groups, we see a decline in the proportion reporting no feelings, and an increase in the proportion reporting many positive and negative feelings. With

Table 2.10 Combined Positive and Negative Feelings Indices and Selected Demographic Characteristics

Selected Demographic Characteristics	Feelings					Total	
	Per Cent High Positive Low Negative (A)	Per Cent Low Positive High Negative (B)	Per Cent Medium Positive Medium Negative (C)	Per Cent Low Positive Low Negative (D)	Per Cent High Positive High Negative (E)	Per Cent	N – NA
Sex							
Men	13	16	40	16	16	101	909
Women	15	16	41	8	20	100	1,097
							2,006
Age							
Under 30	11	15	38	5	31	100	299
30–39	12	13	48	10	17	100	385
40–49	16	15	40	11	18	100	419
50–59	17	14	39	12	18	100	339
60–69	13	18	41	17	11	100	283
70 and over	13	26	33	18	10	100	226
							1,951
							NA 55
							2,006
Education							
8th grade or less	8	24	40	14	14	100	647
Part high school	14	18	39	12	17	100	365
High school graduate	14	12	44	10	20	100	555
Part college	23	7	36	9	24	99	242
College graduate or more	23	8	41	6	22	100	155
							1,964
							NA 42
							2,006
Income							
Less than $3,000	10	26	34	15	15	100	537
$3,000–$4,999	13	13	42	14	18	100	389
$5,000–$6,999	12	14	43	12	19	100	492
$7,000 or more	20	9	43	5	23	100	452
							1,870
							NA 136
							2,006

age we get the opposite result; as we move from younger to older, there is a steady increase in the percentage reporting no feelings, and a corresponding decrease in the percentage reporting many feelings of both kinds. These differences in affectivity suggest that one important characteristic of people with higher education and income is their increased emotional sensitivity and psychological responsiveness to their environment. Such heightened sensitivity may be one of the reasons why the authors of *Americans View Their Mental Health* found that better educated and higher income groups, although happier, had greater feelings of social inadequacy and more problems.

CORRELATES OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE FEELINGS

We have shown that positive and negative feelings are independent dimensions of such a nature that knowing a person's level of one type of feelings will not enable us to predict his level of the other. How can we explain this finding, which so clearly contradicts our original expectation, that a person who is experiencing many negative feelings would not at the same time be likely to have many positive feelings? The answer appears to be that negative feelings are produced by certain types of experiences the absence of which results not in positive feelings but merely in the absence of negative feelings. Similarly, there are other types of experiences that produce positive feelings, but their absence results only in the absence of positive feelings and not in any increase in negative feelings. While the nature of the present study does not permit us to establish causal relationships between variables, we can attempt to clarify the reasons for the independent variation of the two types of feelings by examining factors that correlate with each. Our analysis will focus on four factors which previous studies have shown to be significantly related to mental health: anxiety, marital adjustment, job adjustment, and social interaction.

Anxiety

Included in our questionnaire was a symptom check-list derived from earlier studies attempting to measure anxiety (Stouffer *et al.*, 1949; MacMillan, 1957). The product-moment intercorre-

lations of the items on the symptom check-list are found in Table 2.11. From this pool of intercorrelations there emerged one cluster of items which seemed indicative of anxiety: "dizziness," "general aches and pains," "headaches," "muscle twitches," "nervousness," and "rapid heart beat." These or analogous items load fairly heavily for both men and women on factor one (psychological anxiety) from a factor analysis of a similar list of items by Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960*a*). Each respondent in our sample was given an anxiety score equal to the number of symptoms in this cluster that he reported experiencing during the previous week. Respondents were then divided into three groups: low anxiety (zero symptoms), medium anxiety (one or two symptoms), and high anxiety (three or more of the six symptoms).

Although we have labeled this cluster of items an anxiety index, only one item, "nervousness," is a direct report of feelings of anxiety. The other items we assume to be common somatic indicators of the presence of anxiety. In order, however, to investigate the construct validity of our index, that is, the degree to which it is meaningfully related to other behavioral indices of anxiety, let us look at its relationship to some other items from the long-form interview obtained only from men between the ages of twenty-five and forty-nine (see Table 2.12).

One of the first things we might expect, if an anxiety index is valid, is that people who are high on such an index would be more likely to have sought help in connection with a nervous or mental problem than people who are low on the index. This is indeed the case, not only for our respondents themselves but also for members of their families. Of those who are high on the index, 36 per cent, as against only 14 per cent of those low on it, report that either they or someone in their family had at some time consulted a doctor or other professional person about a nervous or mental problem. (In some cases, these figures represent both a respondent and his wife having been to a doctor.) More strikingly, those who had themselves consulted doctors comprised 19 per cent of the respondents with high scores, but only 2 per cent of the respondents with low scores on the index; furthermore, 19 per cent of the high-scoring respondents, as against only 9 per cent of the low-scoring respondents, had wives who had con-

Table 2.11 Product-Moment Correlations of Items on Symptom Check-List (Anxiety Index) (Men Age 25–49 Only, N = 393)

Items on Symptom Check-List	Aches and Pains	Dizziness	Headaches	Muscle Twitches	Rapid Heart Beat	Loss of Appetite	Upset Stomach	Cold Sweats	Fever	Constipation	Diarrhea	Common Cold	Back Pains	Skin Rashes
Nervousness	*+0.42**	*+0.34*	*+0.38*	*+0.37*	*+0.32*	+0.29	+0.27	+0.23	+0.14	+0.16	+0.09	+0.09	+0.31	+0.11
Aches and pains	–	*+0.38*	*.29*	*.36*	*.29*	.20	.30	.22	.21	.24	.12	.16	.44	.12
Dizziness		–	*+0.28*	*.30*	*.32*	.21	.29	.26	.24	.16	.12	.25	.27	.13
Headaches			–	*+0.21*	*.21*	.19	.27	.16	.17	.13	.09	.13	.24	.13
Muscle twitches				–	*+0.32*	.18	.22	.18	.12	.15	.08	.09	.28	.12
Rapid heart beat					–	+0.21	.24	.24	.15	.20	.04	.09	.18	.09
Loss of appetite						–	+0.27	.23	.22	.08	.07	.09	.16	.03
Upset stomach							–	+0.15	.22	.15	.20	.17	.21	.12
Cold sweats								–	+0.19	.09	.06	.15	.22	.09
Fever									–	+0.08	+ .16	.13	.14	.11
Constipation										–	0.00	.09	.14	.02
Diarrhea											–	+0.15	.08	.07
Common cold												–	+0.08	.06
Back pains													–	+0.06
Skin rashes														–

*Italic = anxiety index.

sulted someone about a nervous or mental problem. These findings suggest that high anxiety may reflect not only the respondent's own problems but also his marital or family situation, and the tensions that have built up within it.

People who are classified by our index as having high anxiety should also be more likely to report having trouble getting to sleep, since this is an item which has high loading on a similar factor constructed by Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960*a*). Indeed

Table 2.12 Anxiety and Selected Health Items (Men Age 25–49 Only, N = 393)

Selected Items	Anxiety Index		
	Per Cent Low (N = 119)	Per Cent Medium (N = 153)	Per Cent High (N = 121)
Respondent or someone in family consulted doctor for nervous or mental problem	14	25*	36*
Self	2	10	19
Spouse	9	17	19
Other	3	3	5
During past week took			
Aspirin	21	56	64
Stomach medicine	3	16	26
Nerve medicine (tranquilizers)	1	3	12
Prescribed medicine	5	12	28
Respondent sick during week	7	15	30
If sick, caused respondent to cut down on activities	– (8)	22 (23)	44 (36)
Sleep problems			
Has trouble getting to sleep	7	7	15
Has trouble getting up	16	24	17
Has both trouble getting to sleep and getting up	3	3	7
Neither	74	66	61
Total	100	100	100
Energy during week			
More	19	20	16
Same	69	63	50
Less	12	18	33
Total	100	101	99

*Some respondents gave more than one response.

our high-scoring respondents were twice as likely as the low scorers to have had trouble getting to sleep.

Respondents with high scores on the index were also much more likely to report that they had been sick during the week preceding the interview and were, of those who had been sick, the most likely to indicate that the illness caused them to cut down on their usual activities. High-scoring respondents were much more likely to use various types of medicine such as aspirin, stomach medicine, nerve medicine or tranquilizers, and other medicine prescribed by a physician. They were also much more likely to report that they had less energy than usual during the previous week. These findings raise the question of whether our index is really measuring anxiety, or merely reflecting the fact that some respondents had been ill, and thus suffered from many of the symptoms on our check-list. While some of the respondents probably were classified as high on the index because they were suffering from a physical illness with minimal psychic concomitants, the vast majority (70 per cent) of those classified as having high anxiety were not sick. Moreover, an inspection of the interviews indicates that many of those who had been sick were suffering from illnesses, such as "nervous stomach," ulcers, and hypertension, that had at least a large psychic component. Taken together, these various findings indicate that our index is measuring a construct which legitimately falls within the meaning of our notions of anxiety.

How does the anxiety index relate to our other indices of well-being? Table 2.13 shows that there is a negative relationship between the anxiety index and respondents' reports of how happy they are, with the high-anxiety respondents being more likely to report that they are "not too happy" and the low-anxiety respondents being more likely to report that they are "very happy." When examined with the two feelings indices, however, the anxiety index is found to be strongly related only to the negative feelings index, and has no significant relationship with the positive feelings index. The lack of relationship between anxiety and positive feelings, coupled with the strong relationship between anxiety and negative feelings, indicates that anxiety affects happiness only by contributing to negative feelings, and not by decreasing positive feelings. Viewing the relation of responses to

the anxiety index to major demographic variables, we note in Table 2.14 that women are much more prone to high anxiety than men, but that there is no consistent relationship between age and anxiety. Anxiety is inversely related to income and education, although, for a reason as yet unclear, the $7,000 a year bracket constitutes one exception to the general decline in anxiety with increasing income. These relationships are, in general, similar to those found for negative feelings (no table reported) and would be consistent with the interpretation that anxiety is associated with a general negative factor.

Marital adjustment

For the men between the ages of twenty-five and forty-nine who received the long-form interview we have more extensive data on adjustment in two important roles—the marital role and the work role. For married men in the interviewed group we

Table 2.13 Anxiety and Happiness, Positive and Negative Feelings (Total N = 2,006)

Feelings	Anxiety Index		
	Per Cent Low	Per Cent Medium	Per Cent High
Happiness			
"Very happy"	35	27	16
"Pretty happy"	55	61	60
"Not too happy"	10	11	24
Total	100	99	100
N–NA	414	707	871
Positive feelings			
High	38	37	34
Medium	33	33	36
Low	39	30	30
Total	100	100	100
N–NA	419	711	876
Negative feelings			
High	29	42	73
Medium	10	11	7
Low	61	47	20
Total	100	100	100
N–NA	419	711	876

Table 2.14 Anxiety and Selected Demographic Characteristics

Selected Demographic Characteristics	Anxiety Index			Total	
	Per Cent Low	Per Cent Medium	Per Cent High	Per Cent	N – NA
Sex					
Men	28	41	31	100	909
Women	15	31	54	100	1,097
					2,006
Age					
Less than 30	21	33	46	100	299
30 – 39	20	34	46	100	385
40 – 49	19	41	40	100	419
50 – 59	21	35	44	100	339
60 – 69	26	34	40	100	283
70 and over	21	37	43	101	226
					1,951
					NA 55
					2,006
Education					
8th grade or less	18	32	50	100	647
Part high school	23	33	44	100	365
High school graduate	19	38	43	100	555
Part college	22	44	35	101	242
College graduate or more	31	36	33	100	155
					1,964
					NA 42
					2,006
Income					
Less than $3,000	19	30	51	100	537
$3,000 – $3,999	23	34	43	100	160
$4,000 – $4,999	25	35	40	100	229
$5,000 – $5,999	16	40	44	100	242
$6,000 – $6,999	18	45	37	100	250
$7,000 – $7,999	13	32	54	99	118
$8,000 – $9,999	24	38	38	100	181
$10,000 or more	29	37	34	100	153
					1,870
					NA 136
					2,006
Socio-economic status					
High	22	38	41	101	865
Low	20	34	46	100	1,025
					1,890
					NA 116
					2,006

included a question describing different types of problems that sometimes cause disagreements in marriage and asked them to indicate whether or not each had been a problem in their marriage. Table 2.15 presents the intercorrelations of the items on the marital problem check-list. The intercorrelation among all of these problem areas except one, "how the house looks," was high enough to suggest that we could utilize simply the number of problem areas mentioned as an index of degree of tension in the marital relationship. We thus constructed a marital tension index, giving each respondent a score equal to the number of problems he mentioned, and then divided respondents into three groups: a low-tension group consisting of those respondents who mentioned no problems in their marriage, a medium-tension group of respondents who mentioned one or two problems, and a high-tension group consisting of those respondents who said that three or more problem areas had caused differences of opinion or difficulties between them and their wives.

Since it is not certain that the mere number of different problem areas mentioned is indicative of real tension in marriage, let us explore the relationship between the marital tension index and other items having to do with the marital relationship. In Table 2.16 we see that there is a strong relationship between the marital tension index and the respondent's report of how happy his marriage is. Men who are low on the index are much more likely than those who are high to report that their marriages are "very happy," and, similarly, men high on the index are much more likely to have only "average" or "not too happy" marriages than are men low on the index. Men who are low on the marital tension index are also more likely to report that they spend a lot of time doing things together with their wives. It is interesting to note that tension appears to decrease with the length of the marriage, 37 per cent of those married for twenty years or more being low on the marital tension index, as against 28 per cent of those married for ten to nineteen years, and only 19 per cent of those married for less than ten years. It seems likely that this result is due both to a gradual accommodation between marriage partners over time and to the fact that marriages with high tension would probably have broken up before too many years had passed.

Table 2.15 Q-Values for Items on Marital Tension Index (Married Men, Age 25–49, N = 360)

Items on Marital Tension Index	Religion	House Expenses	Time Spent with Friends	Disciplining Children	Being Tired	Personal Habits	Leisure Time	Work	Being Away from Home	In-laws	Work Around House	How House Looks
Not showing love	+0.80	+0.78	+0.78	+0.72	+0.69	+0.69	+0.69	+0.66	+0.65	+0.63	+0.57	+0.35
Religion	–	+0.32	.63	.36	.45	.53	.66	.58	.39	.59	.42	.52
House expenses		–	+0.55	.63	.61	.34	.41	.71	.35	.77	.60	.47
Time spent with friends			–	+0.49	.28	.38	.60	.64	.59	.30	.59	.15
Disciplining children				–	+0.47	.61	.31	.37	.05	.57	.45	.23
Being tired					–	+0.58	.36	.35	.21	.55	.40	.27
Irritating personal habits						–	+0.69	.27	.34	.44	.45	.30
How to spend leisure time							–	+0.51	.55	.46	.45	.37
Work								–	+0.55	.55	.56	.31
Being away from home too much									–	+0.24	.46	.34
In-laws										–	+0.19	.40
Work around the house											–	+0.46
How the house looks												–

Table 2.16 Marital Tension and Selected Items (Married Men, Age 25–49, N = 360)

Selected Items	Marital Tension Index			Total	
	Per Cent Low (N=99)	Per Cent Medium (N=118)	Per Cent High (N=143)	Per Cent	N–NA
Marriage is:					
Very happy	70	56	38		
Above average	11	27	29		
Average or "not too happy"	19	17	33		
Total	100	100	100		
Spends time with wife					
A lot	54	42	27		
Moderate amount	26	42	39		
Little	20	16	34		
Total	100	100	100		
Spends time with children					
A lot	39	31	22		
Moderate amount	33	53	51		
Little	28	16	26		
Total	100	100	99		
Felt not as good father as would like to be	55	50	72		
Years married					
Less than 10	19	37	44	100	103
10–19	28	28	44	100	172
20 or more	37	37	26	100	84
					359
					NA 1
					360
Married more than once	27	47	27	101	34
No children living in household	44	31	24	99	54
Children living in household	25	33	42	100	306

Note, however, that having been married more than once is not related to marital tension.

The presence of children in the household, however, does appear to increase the likelihood of marital tension; 41 per cent of those with children living in the household have high marital tension as compared with 24 per cent of those having no children in the household. Furthermore, among men who do have children living with them, those who are high on the marital tension index are less likely to spend a lot of time with their children and much more likely to feel that they are not such good fathers as they would like to be. In general, then, the marital tension index would appear to be a good indicator of maladjustment in the marital role and to some extent in the parental role, although we have fewer data on behavior in this role.

Job adjustment

Since the work role is one of the most central in a man's life, we would expect that adjustment in this role would be of major importance in determining his sense of well-being. Four items in the interview concerned satisfaction with different aspects of work: type of work, wages, employer, and over-all level of job satisfaction. The intercorrelations of these four items are presented in Table 2.17. A job satisfaction index was constructed by totaling each respondent's answers on three items (the item on satisfaction with employer being excluded because it did not apply to the self-employed), and the respondents were divided into three groups on the basis of total score.

Table 2.17 Q-Values for Items on Job Satisfaction Index (Employed Men, Age 25–49, N = 352)

Satisfaction With	Kind of Work	Wages	Employer*
Over-all job	+0.90	+0.80	+0.77
Kind of work	–	+0.68	.40
Wages		–	+0.49
Employer*			–

*Not asked of self-employed (N=93).

Table 2.18 presents the relationship of the job satisfaction index to other work-related items. As compared with those having high job satisfaction, men who are low in job satisfaction are much less likely to report that they feel very much a part of their work group, more likely to report that they did not work as well as usual during the previous week, and considerably more likely to report that they had disagreements at work during the previous week. Such differences, however, do not carry over when we consider the respondents' reports of having received praise or recognition for doing a good job, or of being criticized or complained about in regard to their work during the previous week, there being no differences on these two items between those with high and those with low job satisfaction. Men with low job satisfaction are, however, more likely to feel that their employer acted unfairly during the previous week.

Table 2.18 Job Satisfaction Index and Related Work Items (Employed Men, Age 25–49, N = 352)

Related Work Items	Job Satisfaction Index		
	Per Cent Low (N=127)	Per Cent Medium (N=153)	Per Cent High (N=72)
Work performance during previous week			
Better than usual	14	17	13
Same as usual	76	75	83
Not as good as usual	10	7	4
Total	100	99	100
Feel very much part of work group	77	86	93
Had disagreement at work during previous week	24	17	8
Received praise or recognition*	33 (98)	43 (116)	38 (45)
Experienced criticism or complaint*	6 (98)	7 (116)	2 (45)
Feel employer acted unfairly*	14 (98)	4 (116)	2 (45)
Job does not use all of respondents' skills	79	50	40
Gone as far as can in present job	36	30	29
Respondents wished they had started in different line of work	32	8	8

*Not asked of self-employed (N=93)

It would appear that another major factor is the feeling that one's particular job does not use all one's skills or talents; those who report feeling this way about their jobs comprise 79 per cent of the low satisfaction as against only 40 per cent of the high satisfaction group. Lack of promotion opportunities is also a cause of job dissatisfaction, although to a much lesser extent; 36 per cent of the respondents with low job satisfaction, as against 29 per cent of those with high job satisfaction, report that they have gone about as far as possible in their present jobs. It is not surprising, then, to find that approximately four times as many respondents with low than with high job satisfaction wish that they had started in different lines of work. We would conclude that people who have low job satisfaction do not find their work a source of positive gratification, but, indeed, as we shall see later, find it an active source of dissatisfaction.

Is there any relationship between our two role adjustment indices? Table 2.19 shows that men who are high on the marital tension index tend to be low on the job satisfaction index, but that respondents who are low on the marital tension index are about equally likely to have high as low job satisfaction. This relationship indicates that while people with poor role adjustment in one area are likely to have poor role adjustment in other areas also, there is still considerable independence between adjustment in the marital role and adjustment in the work role.

Role adjustment and measures of well-being.—Turning now

Table 2.19 Marital Tension and Job Satisfaction Indices (Married and Employed Men, Age 25–49 Only, N = 331)

Job Satisfaction Index	Marital Tension Index		
	Per Cent Low	Per Cent Medium	Per Cent High
Low	28	33	42
Medium	51	42	42
High	21	25	16
Total	100	100	100
N–NA	85	114	132

Table 2.20 Marital Tension and Job Satisfaction Indices and Measures of Well-Being

Measures of Well-Being	Marital Tension Index (N=360)			Job Satisfaction Index (N=352)		
	Per Cent Low (N=99)	Per Cent Medium (N=118)	Per Cent High (N=143)	Per Cent Low (N=127)	Per Cent Medium (N=153)	Per Cent High (N=72)
Happiness						
"Very happy"	40	38	23	13	36	56
"Pretty happy"	51	57	68	70	59	42
"Not too happy"	9	4	9	16	5	1
Total	100	99	100	99	100	99
Positive feelings						
Low	34	31	34	39	24	29
Medium	34	37	28	29	36	38
High	31	32	38	32	40	33
Total	99	100	100	100	100	100
Negative feelings						
Low	61	47	24	29	46	49
Medium	20	31	29	27	26	33
High	19	21	46	44	28	18
Total	100	99	99	100	100	100
Anxiety						
Low	45	26	21	23	31	36
Medium	39	37	40	40	39	40
High	15	36	39	37	30	24
Total	99	99	100	100	100	100

to the relationship between our measures of role adjustment and of well-being, we find that, in general, there tends to be a positive relationship between adequacy of role adjustment and happiness. Table 2.20 shows that people who report little marital tension are more likely to be "very happy" than those reporting high tension. Job satisfaction is very strongly correlated with happiness; respondents who are satisfied with their jobs are much more likely to be "very happy" and much less likely to be "not too happy" than those who are low in job satisfaction. Analogous relationships are found with regard to negative feelings and anxiety. Marital tension is particularly highly correlated with negative feelings; the job satisfaction index is somewhat less so; marital tension shows a much stronger relationship with anxiety than does the job satisfaction index, but, in both cases, the less well-adjusted tend to have more anxiety.

Combining the two role adjustment indices (Table 2.21), we find a very strong correlation between over-all role adjustment and happiness. Thus, respondents with both low marital tension and high job satisfaction are much more likely to be "very

Table 2.21 Combined Role Adjustment Indices and Happiness (Men, Age 25–49 Only)

Job Satisfaction	Marital Tension	Per Cent "Very Happy"	Per Cent "Pretty Happy"	Per Cent "Not Too Happy"	Total	
					Per Cent	N–NA
High	Low	72	28	0	100	18
	Medium	59	41	0	100	27
	High	48	52	0	100	21
Medium	Low	45	48	7	100	42
	Medium	42	54	4	100	48
	High	27	70	3	100	56
Low	Low	8	75	18	101	24
	Medium	21	71	8	100	38
	High	13	76	11	100	55
						329
					Not applicable or NA	64
						393

happy" than those having both high marital tension and low job satisfaction, who are more likely to say that they are "not too happy." There appears, then, to be a cumulative quality to maladjustment, the more the unmerrier.

Notice, however, that maladjustment in social roles is associated only with an increase in negative feelings and not with a decrease in positive feelings, there being—in striking exception to the general pattern of findings—practically no relationship between our two measures of role adjustment and the positive feelings index. It would appear that, like anxiety, problems in marriage and work contribute to a decrease in happiness, not by having any significant effect on the amount of positive feelings a person has, but by significantly increasing negative feelings and thus tipping the balance of feelings toward the negative side.[4] Thus high marital tension or job dissatisfaction may not necessarily produce unhappiness if they are offset by a sufficient number of positive feelings.

Such a conception helps to explain an otherwise paradoxical set of findings. We saw earlier (Table 2.16) that there is a positive correlation between marital unhappiness and marital tension. We find also, and not surprisingly, considering our findings on over-all well-being, that marital unhappiness occurs more frequently among men of lower socio-economic status; 33 per cent of the respondents in Class II, as compared with 17 per cent in Class I, report that their marriages are only "average" or "not too happy" (Table 2.22*a*). But here the syllogism breaks down, for marital tension is reported by a greater proportion (44 per cent) of men

[4]The finding that job satisfaction consists of only one dimension, and that it is related only to the negative feelings index, does not support the findings of Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) that job satisfaction consisted of two dimensions, one of job satisfaction and the other of job dissatisfaction. In their study job satisfaction was related to such factors as task responsibility, interesting work, and professional advancement, while job dissatisfaction was related to negative working conditions, poor company policies and administrative practices, and unfair salary schedules. Our failure to find two such dimensions may be a function of the fact that our sample is heavily skewed toward blue collar workers while their subjects were all in white collar, high-status occupations. Separate dimensions of satisfaction and dissatisfaction may exist only for higher status occupations, or for men with considerable professional commitment to the work. Further exploration of such possible differences will be pursued in subsequent studies.

Table 2.22 Marital Happiness, Marital Tension, and Socio-Economic Status (Men, Age 25–49 Only)

a. Martial Happiness and SES

SES	Marriage Is			Total	
	Per Cent Very Happy	Per Cent Little Happier Than Average	Per Cent Average or Not Too Happy	Per Cent	N
High	56	27	17	100	201
Low	49	18	33	100	159
				N–NA	360
				Not married	33
				Total	393

b. Marital Tension and SES

SES	Marital Tension			Total	
	Per Cent Low	Per Cent Medium	Per Cent High	Per Cent	N
High	27	29	44	100	201
Low	28	38	35	101	159
				N–NA	360
				Not married	33
				Total	393

c. Marital Happiness and Marital Tension, Controlling for SES (Per Cent Whose Marriage Is "Average or Not Too Happy")

SES	Marital Tension		
	Per Cent Low	Per Cent Medium	Per Cent High
High	14 (55)	5 (58)	26 (88)
Low	25 (44)	28 (60)	44 (55)
	N–NA	360	
	Not married	33	
	Total	393	

of high than of low socio-economic status (35 per cent; see Table 2.22*b*). How can we explain a correlation that goes in one direction at the individual level but in the opposite direction at the group level?

It was pointed out earlier that higher income, better educated groups were higher in affectivity than lower income, poorly educated groups; that is, they had a higher level of both positive and negative feelings. Now, if it is the relative strengths of positive and negative feelings that determine happiness, a factor that contributes to negative feelings will decrease happiness relatively more among respondents of lower socio-economic status, who have few positive feelings to balance the negative ones, than it will among respondents of higher socio-economic status who have more compensatory positive feelings to mitigate the effects of an increase in negative feelings. This interpretation is supported by the fact that marital tension and marital happiness show a stronger negative relation among low than among high men (Table 2.22*c*). "Average" or "not too happy" marriages are reported by 25 per cent of the low but only 14 per cent of the respondents high in socio-economic status with low marital tension, and by 44 per cent of the low as against only 26 per cent of the high socio-economic status men having high marital tension. Note also that at every level of marital tension low-SES men are more dissatisfied with their marriages than are high-SES men.

This explanation of the apparent paradox that men of higher socio-economic status have a higher degree of marital tension, but at the same time happier marriages, illustrates the utility of our concept of well-being as dependent on the relative strengths of two dimensions for resolving some of the conflicting findings in mental health research.

Social interaction

In discussing various factors found to be associated with negative feelings—anxiety, marital tension, and job dissatisfaction—we have noted with surprise that these factors do not appear to have any significant relation to positive feelings. What, then, is related to positive feelings? The answer to this question is crucial because we have been arguing that it is not simply a variation in

the degree of negative feelings which determines the subjective assessment of well-being, but rather the relative strengths of positive and negative feelings.

From our data it appears that the factor most significantly associated with high positive feelings is a high degree of social interaction and participation in the environment. This finding seems eminently reasonable in view of the fact that persons of higher socio-economic status, who, as we have seen, tend to have higher positive feelings, have been found in almost all studies to show a greater degree of involvement in the world about them and a higher rate of social interaction. Such a finding would also be in line with the argument of Homans (1961) that increased interaction leads to greater liking; a higher rate of interaction should generate a greater number of positive sentiments and thus increase the number of positive experiences a person has.

Several questions on the long form of the interview dealt with the degree of social contact respondents had. We see in Table 2.23 that for both socio-economic status groups there is, in general, a consistent relationship between positive feelings and various measures of social interaction. For instance, men who were in contact with more families of relatives and who got together more often with friends were more likely to have high positive feelings. (The relationship between positive feelings and contact with relatives is somewhat stronger among the lower socio-economic status men, but the relationship with visiting friends is about the same for both groups.) Similar relationships with positive feelings are found for the average number of times per day that a respondent talked to friends on the telephone and for the respondent's having met someone during the previous week whom he had never met before. No consistent relationship was found between positive feelings and the distance a respondent had traveled from his home during the week.

There is one reversal of this general trend in association between greater social participation and higher positive feelings, and that has to do with the number of church or church-sponsored events attended. Of the low socio-economic status men, those who attended more church-sponsored events were less likely to have positive feelings, while in the high socio-economic status

group men who attended more church-sponsored events had slightly higher positive feelings. While we need a larger number of cases to explain this difference definitively, a possible interpretation might be that our low socio-economic status, high-religious participators come from predominantly fundamentalist Protestant groups which frown on many sorts of social activity.

Table 2.23 Positive Feelings and Social Interaction, Controlling for Socio-Economic Status (Men, Age 25–49, N = 393) (Per Cent High Positive Feelings)

a. Contact with Relatives during Week

SES	No Families	1 Family	2 Families	3 or More Families
High	37 (52)	30 (69)	57 (42)	49 (51)
Low	15 (52)	26 (53)	30 (30)	30 (43)

b. Got Together with Friends Other Than Relatives

SES	Not at All	Once	Twice
High	37 (75)	31 (55)	57 (83)
Low	19 (86)	26 (43)	34 (50)

c. Telephone Contact with Friends

SES	None	Less Than Once a Day	Once a Day or More
High	33 (75)	46 (63)	42 (76)
Low	19 (100)	33 (36)	30 (43)

d. Met New People during Week

SES	Met Someone Never Met Before	Did Not Meet Anyone New
High	52 (104)	29 (110)
Low	37 (56)	19 (123)

(Table 2.23 continued)

Table 2.23 *Continued*

e. Distance Traveled from Home during Week

SES	Less Than 1 Mile	2–24.9 Miles	25 or More Miles
High	46 (35)	39 (71)	39 (108)
Low	25 (51)	16 (63)	32 (65)

f. Participation in Religious Events during Month*

SES	None	1–4 Times	5 or More Times
High	39 (77)	37 (81)	48 (50)
Low	33 (87)	23 (47)	13 (31)

*Excluding those with no religious preference.

g. Average Television Viewing

SES	1 Hour or Less a Day	2 Hours a Day	3 Hours or More
High	44 (85)	42 (74)	33 (55)
Low	20 (40)	29 (58)	24 (80)

h. Participation Index

SES	0	1	2	3
High	32 (25)	32 (50)	37 (59)	49 (80)
Low	18 (57)	24 (55)	31 (39)	33 (27)

Thus our low socio-economic status, high-religious participators would be low on other participation measures; that is, there would be a negative correlation among low socio-economic status men between religious participation and other forms of social participation, but a positive correlation among high socio-economic status men.

Finally, we might note that there is little relationship between positive feelings and the amount of time spent watching television, although there is a slight tendency for high socio-economic status men with higher positive feelings to watch less television.

To study the general effects of increased interaction and participation, we constructed a participation index that included most of the above items plus several others from the interview. The index dealt with the following aspects of a respondent's behavior during the week preceding the interview: (*1*) the number of organizations he belonged to; (*2*) the average number of times a day he chatted with friends on the telephone; (*3*) the furthest distance he went from his home; (*4*) the number of times he attended a meeting; (*5*) the number of times he got together with friends; (*6*) the number of times he went for a ride in the car; and (*7*) the number of times he ate in a restaurant. On the basis of their scores on this index, respondents were divided into four groups of as nearly equal size as possible. Table 2.23*h* shows that there is a consistent relationship within both socio-economic status groups between positive feelings and score on the participation index. Among lower socio-economic status men, 33 per cent of the high participators, as compared with 18 per cent of the low participators, have high positive feelings, the comparable figures for high socio-economic status men being 49 per cent and 32 per cent respectively.

On the short-form questionnaire, unfortunately, there were few questions dealing with social interaction rates, but several dealt with participation in the environment. We see in Table 2.24*a* that for both sexes and both socio-economic groups there is, on the whole, a positive relationship between belonging to organizations, clubs, or community groups and having positive feelings. Reflected in this table are some of the findings mentioned previously, namely that the tendency to have high positive feelings is greater among women than men, and among upper socio-economic groups. Considering organizational membership and sex differences alone, we find relatively little difference in degree of positive feelings between men and women who belong to no organization, but quite a substantial difference between men and women who belong to three or more organizations,

indicating that organizational membership has a greater positive effect on women than on men.

For the most part, social interaction and participation items are related only to positive feelings and not to negative feelings, or even directly to happiness. Organizational membership, however, is an outstanding exception, being related, in opposite directions, to both positive and negative feelings and directly, as might be expected, to happiness. Table 2.24*b* indicates that for both men and women in both socio-economic groups there is a negative relationship between degree of organizational membership and negative feelings. Organizational membership is positively related to happiness (Table 2.24*c*), the relationship being strongest for women and for lower socio-economic status groups.

Turning now to other items reflecting participation in the environment, we see in Table 2.25 that, for both sexes and both socio-economic groups, those who, during the week, went for a ride in the car or ate in a restaurant several times or more, and those who participated in or watched games or sports activities, were more likely to have positive feelings than those who did not

Table 2.24 Organizational Membership and Measures of Well-Being

a. Organizational Membership and Positive Feelings, Controlling for Socio-Economic Status and Sex (Per Cent High Positive Feelings)

SES	Sex	Organizational Membership			
		None	One	Two	Three or More
High	Men	38 (109)	30 (86)	43 (93)	49 (116)
	Women	42 (139)	41 (91)	57 (75)	52 (120)
Low	Men	23 (207)	27 (131)	34 (50)	32 (31)
	Women	24 (286)	40 (106)	44 (48)	50 (54)

N–NA	1,742
NA on SES	116
NA on organizations	148*
Total	2,006

*On the self-administered form many respondents did not write in the number of organizations they belonged to. While no number probably meant zero, blanks have been treated as no answers.

Table 2.24 *Continued*

b. Organizational Membership and Negative Feelings, Controlling for Socio-Economic Status and Sex (Per Cent High Negative Feelings)

SES	Sex	Organizational Membership			
		None	One	Two	Three or More
High	Men	58 (109)	44 (86)	46 (93)	41 (116)
	Women	59 (139)	55 (91)	55 (75)	47 (120)
Low	Men	52 (207)	54 (131)	40 (50)	35 (31)
	Women	67 (286)	61 (106)	44 (48)	52 (54)

N–NA	1,742
NA on SES	116
NA on organizations	148
Total	2,006

c. Organizational Membership and Happiness, Controlling for Socio-Economic Status and Sex (Per Cent "Not Too Happy")

SES	Sex	Organizational Membership			
		None	One	Two	Three or More
High	Men	8 (107)	17 (86)	9 (92)	6 (115)
	Women	12 (139)	11 (91)	14 (74)	6 (119)
Low	Men	24 (204)	23 (130)	16 (50)	13 (31)
	Women	30 (285)	12 (106)	6 (48)	9 (54)

N–NA	1,731
NA on SES	116
NA on organizations	148
NA on happiness	11
Total	2,006

do any of these things. While none of the differences is spectacularly large, their consistency is impressive and supports the notion that those who engage actively in their environment are more likely to experience positive feelings. It is also noteworthy that none of these items shows any relationship at all with negative feelings.

In sum, then, we find that positive feelings are associated with higher rates of social interaction and active engagement in the environment. Careful scrutiny of our data fails to reveal any other factor which is significantly correlated with positive feelings or, on the other hand, any relationships, by and large, between social interaction or active participation in the environment and negative feelings. We do not wish to suggest that social interaction is the only factor related to positive feelings, since there may be others that were not sufficiently covered in our

Table 2.25 Positive Feelings and Selected Participation Items, Controlling for Socio-Economic Status and Sex (Per Cent High Positive Feelings)

a. Went for Trip in Car during Week

Sex	SES	No Times	Once	Several Times or More
Men	High	37 (139)	34 (117)	48 (158)
	Low	19 (159)	28 (134)	35 (158)
Women	High	42 (154)	45 (117)	60 (171)
	Low	26 (230)	32 (128)	40 (192)

N–NA	1,857
NA on SES	116
NA on item	33
Total	2,006

b. Ate in Restaurant during Week

Sex	SES	No Times	Once	Several Times or More
Men	High	30 (140)	35 (91)	51 (185)
	Low	24 (289)	29 (75)	34 (95)
Women	High	47 (231)	52 (129)	55 (88)
	Low	29 (411)	35 (81)	45 (67)

N–NA	1,882
NA on SES	116
NA on item	8
Total	2,006

Table 2.25 *Continued*

c. Participated in and Attended Sports Events during Week

Sex	SES	Non-participators	Participators	Non-attenders	Attenders
Men	High	38 (283)	46 (131)	37 (268)	47 (143)
	Low	24 (354)	31 (105)	25 (386)	34 (70)
Women	High	49 (378)	53 (62)	48 (351)	57 (95)
	Low	31 (493)	44 (48)	32 (506)	42 (45)

N–NA	1,854	N–NA	1,864
NA on SES	116	NA on SES	116
NA on item	36	NA on item	26
Total	2,006	Total	2,006

interview schedule. We would suggest, however, that there has been a bias in research on mental health toward the investigation of negative factors, with relatively little consideration being given to forces that may contribute toward positive satisfactions. Such a bias would follow understandably from an assumption that evaluations of well-being are unidimensional, with any increase in negative factors automatically producing a decrease of positive factors, and a consequent lowering of the sense of well-being. In view of our finding, that these are two independent dimensions, each of which is correlated with different aspects of a person's life, it is apparent that greater attention will have to be paid to those forces producing positive satisfactions before we can fully understand what determines a person's well-being.

Worries and happiness

The relationship between happiness and worries is a particularly intriguing one. One view of the relationship is that the happy person is free from worries, or as nearly free as possible. Another view, holding the worry-free individual to be a pathological case denying his anxieties, pictures the happy man as one who has a "healthy" amount of worry. Underlying these two images appear to be somewhat different concepts of the term "worry." The image of the happy man as carefree suggests that worries are

manifestations of anxiety or mental disturbance, whose presence should contribute toward a decrease in happiness, and whose absence should be associated with happiness. This concept of worries is the one accepted by lexicographers, at least; the dictionary defines "worry" as a troubled state of mind or harassing anxiety. Such an image, while not ruling out the possibility that some people might consciously deny having any worries as a defense against anxieties, suggests that, on the whole, there should be a negative correlation between degree of worrying and feelings of happiness. The second image, of the "healthy" worrier, suggests that worry is a more positive state, expressive not so much of anxiety as of active concern over certain problems that all people are assumed to face. This conception would imply a much more complicated relationship between level of worry and happiness: either a positive relationship, or perhaps a curvilinear one, with a moderate degree of worry being associated with happiness, and either a very high or a very low degree of worry with unhappiness. Support for this latter conception of worry is given by the authors of *Americans View Their Mental Health,* who show that the more highly educated and wealthy, who scored higher on measures of happiness, also did a greater amount of worrying.

Lack of a standard vocabulary makes the problem of doing research on worries particularly vexing. Some people, denying that they ever "worry," proceed to mention things that they have been "very concerned about," or that have "weighed on their minds." In our questionnaire we tried to skirt the problem by using neutral phrases such as "thinking about," or "had on your mind," letting the particular problem areas convey the notion of worry. Since the "worry" check-list consisted of common areas of worry, there is every reason to suppose that the respondents interpreted it in this context. To a direct question on the long-form interview, "Do you worry a lot or not very much?" very few respondents (7 per cent) replied that they never worried.

How, then, are these indicators of worry related to happiness? Judging from our sample, it would seem that the "carefree" model of happiness has much merit, for reported happiness decreases as intensity of worry increases. Those men aged twenty-five to

forty-nine who report that they worry "a lot" comprise 15 per cent of the "very happy" respondents, as against 21 per cent of the "pretty happy," and 67 per cent of the "not too happy" respondents. Similarly, 34 per cent of the men with high negative feelings report that they worry a lot, as against only 15 per cent of those with low negative feelings. Somewhat surprisingly, however, there is no relationship between positive feelings and intensity of worry, 23 per cent of both those with high and with low positive feelings reporting that they worry a lot. We find also that men with high anxiety (34 per cent, as against 20 per cent of the lows), those men with high marital tension (27 per cent, as against 19 per cent of the lows), and men with low job satisfaction (26 per cent, as against 18 per cent of the highs) report worrying a lot. Thus, intensity of worry is negatively related to well-being.

In terms of their content, worries fall into two distinct groups. Worries about "growing old," "death," "health," and "the atom bomb or fallout" are all concerned with situations over which the individual, as more or less the passive victim of natural (or unnatural) forces, has very little control. A second group—"getting ahead," "money," "personal enemies," "work," "marriage," and "bringing up children"—consists of areas of life in which the individual himself has a considerable degree of control or influence over the outcome. For the sake of convenience we will refer to these two groups as "uncontrollable" and "controllable" worries.

The patterning of worry content by socio-economic status and age is shown in Table 2.26. Uncontrollable worries are associated with lower socio-economic status and being old, while controllable worries are associated with higher socio-economic status and being young. That is, within both socio-economic groups, respondents of fifty or older are, for the most part, more likely than younger respondents to worry about uncontrollable areas of life and within each age group; respondents from lower socio-economic groups are more apt to worry about uncontrollable areas, though not about "growing old," than are those from upper socio-economic groups. On the other hand, younger and high socio-economic status respondents are, in general, more likely to worry about areas of life over which there is some indi-

vidual control. The only exception to this general tendency is in the area of "getting ahead," about which the younger respondents do tend to worry more than the older; however, it is those from the lower socio-economic group who worry most about this area. Otherwise it is the younger, upper socio-economic respondents who are most likely to have worried about controllable areas of life.

Given the fact that older respondents from lower socio-economic groups worry more about uncontrollable areas of life, while younger respondents from upper socio-economic groups worry more about controllable areas, and the fact that youth and high socio-economic status are positively related to happiness, we might expect the two types of worries to correlate differentially with happiness. We could then resolve the conflict between images of the relationship of happiness to worries by

Table 2.26 Socio-Economic Status, Age, and Worries (Per Cent Worrying "Often")

Worries	Socio-Economic Status			
	High		Low	
	Age		Age	
	Younger Than 50	50 or Older	Younger Than 50	50 or Older
Growing old	4	12	4	21
Death	4	7	5	14
Health	8	14	19	39
A-bomb or fallout	2	4	4	8
Getting ahead	39	24	46	24
Money	52	43	51	41
Personal enemies*	13	9	8	6
Work	58	55	54	39
Marriage	17	8	12	4
Bringing up children	55	18	46	14
N	612	227	450	547

N–NA	1,836
NA on SES and age	164
NA on worries	6
Total	2,006

*Per cent who worry "sometimes" plus "often."

pointing out that it all depends on the type of worry involved. The happy person of the first image is one who does not worry about things beyond his control, while the happy person in the second image may worry, but only about things he can control and presumably improve.

Unfortunately, as we see in Table 2.27, the data do not permit such a neat explanation. Within both socio-economic groups there is a strong negative relationship between happiness and worrying, of either the controllable or uncontrollable sort. The only exceptions to this trend are that, among the lower socio-economic group, worries about "getting ahead" and "bringing up children" are unrelated to unhappiness, and that, among the upper socio-economic group, there is a slight tendency for respondents who report that they are "very happy" to worry more about "bringing up children." These findings suggest that the first image is indeed the correct one, namely that there is a direct negative correlation between happiness and worry, but with the qualification that the content of worries varies greatly with age and class.

Even though at all socio-economic levels those who are less happy worry more often about almost every topic, there is some support for the previously mentioned finding, reported in *Americans View Their Mental Health,* that higher education and income groups, which tend to be higher in over-all happiness, are nevertheless also higher in the extent of their worries. Our data suggest that this finding can be accounted for, not by a lack of relationship between worries and happiness, but by the relationship of worries to another dimension that cuts across happiness, namely degree of affectivity; it is people with a high degree of affectivity who most tend to worry, at least about controllable areas of life. Table 2.28 presents the per cent who worried often about each of the areas in our check-list by socio-economic status and the fivefold typology of feelings. For each socio-economic group the relative comparisons are in rows B and E. The uncontrollable areas of life have been a source of worry chiefly to people with low positive and high negative feelings, that is, those who are most likely to report being "not too happy" (row E), with the exception of the atom bomb in the high socio-economic status

Table 2.27 Happiness and Worries, Controlling for Socio-Economic Status
(Per Cent Worrying "Often")

SES	Happiness	Worries										N
		Growing Old	Death	Health	A-Bomb	Getting Ahead	Money	Personal Enemies*	Work	Marriage	Bringing Up Children	
High	"Very happy"	3	6	12	3	35	43	8	55	16	47	240
	"Pretty happy"	5	4	18	2	33	48	12	55	12	44	529
	"Not too happy"	21	8	31	4	44	68	23	66	26	42	90
Low	"Very happy"	7	7	20	5	35	35	5	39	8	28	207
	"Pretty happy"	10	8	26	5	34	46	6	48	6	28	595
	"Not too happy"	30	18	47	10	34	54	11	49	9	27	216
										N–NA		1,877
										NA on SES		116
										NA on happiness		13
										Total		2,006

*Per cent who worry "sometimes" plus "often."

Table 2.28 Combined Positive and Negative Feelings Indices and Worries, Controlling for Socio-Economic Status (Per Cent Who Worry "Often")

SES	Positive Feelings	Negative Feelings	Growing Old	Death	Health	A-Bomb	Getting Ahead	Money	Personal Enemies*	Work	Marriage	Bringing Up Children	N
(A)	High	Low	6	5	10	4	38	44	5	41	15	48	149
(B)	High	High	4	8	20	3	46	61	21	63	21	60	187
High (C)	Medium	Medium	6	2	19	3	31	47	11	55	13	41	367
(D)	Low	Low	5	5	14	0	21	42	1	50	3	30	67
(E)	Low	High	14	10	22	2	36	48	15	43	4	35	89
(A)	High	Low	6	5	17	5	33	26	4	88	8	22	114
(B)	High	High	14	13	36	6	45	52	13	68	12	39	165
Low (C)	Medium	Medium	12	9	27	6	35	46	7	46	7	31	389
(D)	Low	Low	6	4	21	4	25	38	1	36	3	18	138
(E)	Low	High	27	17	43	9	31	54	7	40	5	26	212
											N–NA		1,877
											NA, SES		116
											NA, worries		13
											Total		2,006

*Per cent who worry "sometimes" plus "often."

group. The high-affective people, however—those who are high in both positive and negative feelings (row B)—are most likely to have worried about the controllable areas of life, with the exception of those who worry about money in the lower socio-economic group.

We find, then, a somewhat complicated, yet understandable, relationship between happiness and worries. In general, worries and happiness are negatively related. When the particular content of the worries is examined, however, this relationship is found to be cut across, although not destroyed, by another dimension. The relation of worries to two independent dimensions, degree of affectivity and happiness, helps explain the otherwise apparent paradox that the high socio-economic status group, who tend to be happier, worry more than the low socio-economic status group about some areas of life, even though, in the aggregate, happy people worry less about almost all areas of life.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter we have been concerned with the social and psychological correlates of over-all well-being. We have presented data to show that happiness is positively correlated with education and income, negatively correlated with age, and uncorrelated with sex. We have shown further that unmarried people, particularly men, are unhappier than married people, and people who are unemployed or retired are less happy than those who are employed.

In analyzing further the relationship between happiness and other aspects of well-being, we came to the conclusion that a person's sense of well-being can be understood best as a function of the relative strengths of the positive and negative feelings he has experienced in the recent past. The data show clearly that these are two distinct and independent dimensions associated with different aspects of a person's life. Forces contributing toward increased negative feelings, such as anxiety, marital tension, and job dissatisfaction, do not produce any concomitant decrease in positive feelings, and those forces which contribute toward the development of positive feelings, such as social interaction and active participation in the environment, do not in any

way lessen negative feelings. Thus it is possible for a person who has many negative feelings to be happy, if he also has compensatory positive feelings. Only by knowing the relative balance of feelings can one make predictions about people's happiness.

Another finding has been that a dimension of affectivity cuts across the relative strength of the two types of feelings. This dimension was shown to be related to other areas of well-being, such as the patterning of worries, but not to happiness itself. It was suggested that taking into account both affectivity and the relative strength of positive and negative feelings would be useful in explaining some of the puzzling findings of recent studies of mental health, for example, that people who are happy may also feel socially inadequate.

The conception of psychological well-being as the resultant of the relative strength of positive and negative feelings is similar in some respects to the motivation-hygiene concept of mental health developed by Herzberg and Hamlin (1961). Their theory is based on an earlier study of job attitudes (Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman, 1954) in which it was found that factors associated with job satisfaction were independent of factors associated with job dissatisfaction. As we mentioned earlier, in the discussion of job satisfaction, they found that factors associated with job dissatisfaction primarily centered around the environment in which the job task was performed and did not concern the job itself. On the other hand, factors associated with job satisfaction revolved around the content of the job, and involved such things as recognition for achievement, professional task responsibility, professional advancement, and interesting work. Generalizing from the existence of these two factors, Herzberg and Hamlin hypothesized that these two factors might be conceptualized as a "hygiene" dimension, involving the pleasantness or unpleasantness of the environment, or the context in which the job is performed, and a "motivation" dimension, involving the content of the job and the personal involvement of the individual in the job or task he is doing. They further hypothesized that the "motivation" dimension involves essentially concepts of psychological growth and the fulfillment of self-actualizing needs.

Insofar as Herzberg *et al.* found that factors associated with

job dissatisfaction were different from those associated with job satisfaction, and that the two were independent, their conceptualization is similar to ours. In extending these findings, however, to a two-factor theory of mental health, Herzberg and Hamlin moved in a direction which is somewhat different from the one we have set forth. These authors postulate that there are two distinct non-intersecting dimensions, one of mental health and a separate, qualitatively different one of mental illness. The distinction is not one of the relative balance of satisfieds and dissatisfieds, but rather a fundamental distinction between those individuals who find their source of satisfactions in a sense of personal growth, or the satisfaction of self-actualization needs, and those who attempt to gain satisfactions by the avoidance of unpleasant environmental situations. Thus, the distinction appears to be between those whose fundamental personality dispositions orient them toward situations or activity in which the individual can achieve a growth experience, and those individuals whose personality dispositions orient them toward avoiding situations characterized by an uncomfortable environment. In this conception, an individual is either on a mental health dimension, or on a mental illness dimension, but cannot be on both. An individual on the mental health dimension can, at best, achieve positive mental health and self-actualization, and, at worst, achieve "symptom free adjustment." If a person is on a mental illness dimension he can, at best, achieve some environmental satisfactions accompanying a hygienic environment, but these will tend to be of a transitory and unstable quality, and, at the worst, people on this dimension are the truly mentally ill.

In the conception of psychological well-being that we have developed in this report, we have stressed the notion that psychological well-being is a single dimension along which people can be placed, but position on this dimension is determined by the relative balance of two independent conditions: positive and negative feeling states. Our theory is based on a notion of emotional balance, regardless of the sources of that balance, rather than on differences in the types of needs an individual has. Readers interested in personality differences may find such an approach less satisfactory than one that postulates dif-

ferent types of needs, but the limited data from our pilot study do not permit us, at this time, to make any statements beyond an over-all conception of emotional balance. It should be pointed out, however, that the two approaches are not necessarily incompatible, and that further studies may enrich the conceptualization by revealing personality or motivational differences which have importance above and beyond the resultant emotional balance of the individual.

Another conception of the independence of positive and negative affect has been suggested by Bovard (1962) in his work on positive and negative brain system activity. The model he suggests for the relationship between the positive or reinforcing system (first discovered by Olds in 1953) and the negative system is a particularly intriguing one for those interested in the neuro-physiological mechanisms by which stimuli in the external environment produce differential reactions in individuals. Bovard (1959) suggests that the positive system is the mediating mechanism for such reinforcing stimuli as affection and social approval, and that the negative system is the mediating mechanism for noxious psychological stimuli that produce emotional stress responses, particularly those characterized by many of the symptoms that constitute our anxiety index. He reports studies indicating that direct electrical stimulation of different areas in the positive system produces in humans feelings of ease and relaxation, smiling and great satisfaction, and that direct electrical stimulation of the negative system produces such responses as restlessness, anxiety, depression, fright, and horror. On the basis of the available experimental evidence Bovard hypothesizes that the two systems are related in a reciprocally inhibitory fashion. Thus, stimulation of the positive system results in an increase in the threshold for the arousal of the negative system, and, conversely, stimulation of activity in the negative system raises the threshold for stimulation in the positive system.

While the differences between the experimental methods of the neurophysiologist studying changes in individual behavior over time and our grosser measures of distribution of feeling states in a population at a single point in time do not permit any detailed integration of the two conceptions, there are points of similarity

between conclusions that Bovard draws from his model of the relationship of the two systems of brain activity and our conclusions based on the findings of the independence of positive and negative feelings. One implication of Bovard's theory is that any stimulus that activates the reinforcing system, such as affection or social approval, would tend to decrease the activity of the negative system and thereby make an individual more resistant to the deleterious effects of stressful situations. Such a conclusion is similar to our finding that positive feelings apparently could offset negative feelings and reduce the consequences of a given amount of negative feelings. While the two hypotheses differ in their implied mechanisms, they both embody the important idea that positive affect plays a crucial role in moderating the effects of stressful situations, either by raising the threshold for the neuroendocrine response to stress or by moderating its effects on subjective experiences of well-being.

While it is probably too early in the development of either of these two models to do more than speculate on the possible areas of similarity, they do suggest that in the future there may be a fruitful convergence of theoretical conceptions, stemming on the one hand from social-psychological data, and, on the other, from neuro-physiological experimentation. Such a convergence would enhance our understanding of human behavior immeasurably.

3

Economic Depression and Psychological Well-Being

Our pilot research project was designed to investigate, among other things, the effect of environmental conditions, particularly those that may vary from time to time, on the psychological well-being of individuals. One of the most important of such conditions is economic climate. Taking the simplest model, we expected individuals living in communities with a prosperous economy to have a higher sense of well-being than individuals living in economically depressed communities. To test this hypothesis, our sample was drawn, as described in Chapter 1, from residents of four communities which varied in degree of economic prosperity. Having developed a conceptual framework for studying psychological well-being, we are now in a position to apply this framework to the four communities to see whether economic climate has a significant effect on psychological well-being.

Knowing the social composition of the four communities, and the correlation of happiness with youth, education, and income, we would expect to find differences between communities in the percentages of people reporting different degrees of happiness. Table 3.1 confirms the expectation, although the differences are found only in the percentage reporting that they are "not too happy." Similarly, community differences turn up on other measures of well-being, which are unfortunately available only for the men between twenty-five and forty-nine who were given the long

personal interview (Table 3.2). The men in the more depressed communities were more likely to worry "a lot" and to say that they worry more now than they used to. A greater percentage of men from the depressed than from the prosperous communities also reported that they were happier five years ago. We see, then, that the "average" person in the prosperous communities has a greater sense of well-being than the "average" person in the depressed communities.

The question naturally arises, however, as to whether these community differences are due merely to the disproportionately large number of respondents in the two depressed communities who have low education and income and are older, or to some

Table 3.1 Economic Climate and Happiness

Economic Climate	Community	Per Cent Who Are			Total	
		"Very Happy"	"Pretty Happy"	"Not Too Happy"	Per Cent	N
Depressed	East Parrish	21	59	20	100	538
Depressed	Clyde	22	57	20	99	449
Improving	Spiresburg	30	57	13	100	424
Prosperous	Brewer	24	63	13	100	581
				N–NA		1,992
				NA on happiness		14
				Total		2,006

Table 3.2 Worry Intensity and Happiness Five Years Ago by Community (Men, Age 25–49 Only)

Economic Climate	Community	Per Cent of Respondents Who			N
		Worry a Lot	Worry More Now Than Used To	Were Happier Five Years Ago	
Depressed	East Parrish	27	49	35	108
Depressed	Clyde	31	50	38	90
Improving	Spiresburg	18	39	16	89
Prosperous	Brewer	19	34	22	106
Total					393

more general "depressive" climate affecting respondents in these towns, regardless of socio-economic status and age. Table 3.3 indicates that, when socio-economic status and age are controlled for, community differences in happiness appear only among the lower socio-economic status groups, and disappear entirely among the upper socio-economic status groups. In Class I there are no differences between younger respondents from community to community; of the older people in this class, those from the most depressed community are least likely to report being "not too happy," providing perhaps another example of relative gratification. Among the lower socio-economic status group, however, we notice a consistent community difference; people from both age groups in the depressed communities were more likely to report that they were "not too happy" than respondents from the economically better off communities. These data suggest that the psychological impact of economic depression is felt primarily by those most directly affected, that is, those with lower education and income, and fewer resources for coping with the stress of economic decline.

One of the most interesting effects to be noted is the apparent

Table 3.3 Happiness and Community, Controlling for Socio-Economic Status and Age (Per Cent "Not Too Happy")

SES	Community	Age	
		Under 50	50 or Older
High	East Parrish	8 (107)	8 (75)
	Clyde	8 (117)	19 (37)
	Spiresburg	8 (124)	18 (39)
	Brewer	9 (261)	16 (76)
Low	East Parrish	18 (135)	34 (182)
	Clyde	17 (110)	30 (150)
	Spiresburg	8 (110)	22 (116)
	Brewer	12 (96)	19 (95)
	N–NA	1,830	
	NA on SES	116	
	NA on age	48	
	NA on happiness	12	
	Total	2,006	

accentuation of socio-economic status differences in the depressed communities. Table 3.4 shows the percentage differences in reported unhappiness between socio-economic groups within each age group and community. Note that the difference between upper and lower socio-economic status groups in percentage of people reporting that they are "not too happy" is fairly large in the two depressed communities, particularly among the older group, but practically disappears in the two more prosperous communities. This finding suggests that one of the important effects of economic depression, in relation to psychological reaction, is the sharpening of the difference in levels of happiness between different social classes. The poor and elderly in predominantly poor and elderly communities appear to be worse off, psychologically speaking, than the poor and elderly in younger and wealthier communities. Apparently misery does not love company.

When socio-economic status is controlled for, differences still appear between communities in the intensity of worry and the amount of worry present as compared to past worry reported by the men interviewed in the middle age range. Men of both social classes in the depressed communities tend to worry more, and more now than formerly, than men in the more prosperous communities. Since all these men are in the "prime of life," the differences suggest that adverse economic conditions do place a

Table 3.4 Percentage Differences between Socio-Economic Status Groups in Happiness (Per Cent "Not Too Happy" Among High SES Minus Per Cent "Not Too Happy" Among Low SES)

Community	Under 50	50 or Older
East Parrish	−10	−26
Clyde	9	11
Spiresburg	0	4
Brewer	− 3	− 3
N–NA		1,830
NA on SES		116
NA on age		48
NA on happiness		12
Total		2,006

strain on people, particularly men with responsibilities for family welfare, which is reflected in their over-all sense of well-being. On the whole it does appear that a "depressive" economic climate has some adverse effects on the psychological well-being of those living in it, even those who may not be directly affected by economic pressures. Such effects, however, are relatively small compared with the large and direct effects of economic privation through loss of job, low income, or increased vulnerability to economic stress with increasing age.

What, then, are the mechanisms through which the depressive climate affects psychological well-being? We see in Table 3.5 that, on the whole, people living in the more prosperous communities had more positive feelings; surprisingly, however, there is no consistent difference between communities in the degree of negative feelings reported. This finding suggests that an absence of positive satisfactions in life, rather than an increase in negative forces, is the main consequence of a depressive economic climate. It is the lack of joy in Mudville rather than the presence of sorrow that makes the difference.

When age and socio-economic status are controlled for, however, differences between the communities in positive and negative feelings are greatly minimized (Table 3.6). Here again, as in the case of happiness, what differences there are tend to be concentrated in the lower socio-economic groups, with a slight tendency, among people fifty and older, for those from the more depressed communities to have fewer positive and more negative feelings; among those under fifty, there is relatively little difference, except that a higher proportion of those from Brewer have high positive feelings. The four upper socio-economic groups do not differ significantly in positive or negative feelings. Given the absence of differences between communities in negative feelings, we would also expect to find no differences in the factors related to negative feelings. Anxiety, for one, is relatively stable from community to community (Table 3.7). As noted in Chapter 2, anxiety shows only a small negative correlation with income and is not related to age; nor, apparently, is it produced by a general climate of economic depression, although it may be produced by direct economic threats such as that of unemployment.

Table 3.5 Positive and Negative Feelings by Community

Community	Per Cent of Respondents Who Have								N
	Positive Feelings				Negative Feelings				
	Low	Medium	High	Total	Low	Medium	High	Total	
East Parrish	33	34	33	100	40	8	51	99	545
Clyde	35	34	31	100	36	6	57	99	451
Spiresburg	27	37	36	100	43	8	49	100	428
Brewer	24	33	43	100	34	12	54	100	582
Total									2,006

Marital adjustment does differ from community to community, but, as Table 3.8 shows, the differences do not follow our economic dimension. If anything, the men with the greatest degree of marital tension and the most unhappy marriages are those in the most prosperous community, while those in the improving community have the least amount of marital tension and the happiest marriages. Although the findings on marital happiness do not present a clear picture, the indications are certain that

Table 3.6 Positive and Negative Feelings by Community, Controlling for Socio-Economic Status and Age

SES	Community	Per Cent High Positive Feelings		Per Cent High Negative Feelings	
		Age		Age	
		Under 50	50 or Older	Under 50	50 or Older
High	East Parrish	46 (109)	41 (75)	48 (109)	39 (75)
	Clyde	37 (117)	45 (38)	51 (117)	50 (38)
	Spiresburg	50 (125)	35 (40)	51 (125)	32 (40)
	Brewer	51 (261)	40 (76)	57 (261)	51 (76)
Low	East Parrish	27 (135)	26 (186)	51 (135)	57 (186)
	Clyde	31 (111)	23 (150)	60 (111)	63 (150)
	Spiresburg	27 (110)	32 (118)	52 (110)	52 (150)
	Brewer	42 (96)	35 (95)	60 (96)	52 (118)
					(95)

N–NA	1,842
NA on SES and/or age	164
Total	2,006

Table 3.7 Anxiety by Community

Community	Anxiety Index			Total	
	Low	Medium	High	Per Cent	N–NA
East Parrish	22	36	42	100	545
Clyde	18	33	49	100	451
Spiresburg	26	34	40	100	428
Brewer	19	37	44	100	582
Total					2,006

economic depression is not associated with any increase in marital unhappiness.

It should be noted in Table 3.8 that while, in general, marital happiness tends to be associated with higher socio-economic status, this trend disappears in the depressed communities, and, in the case of Clyde, even slightly reverses itself. In the prosperous communities, however, the difference between upper and lower socio-economic groups in marital happiness is considerable. This finding is the opposite of a previous one, namely that economic depression tends to increase the difference between social classes in over-all happiness. It suggests that one reaction to the increased stress of economic depression is a tightening of family bonds and a greater investment in the marital relationship, particularly among the lower socio-economic groups who are hardest hit. Such an interpretation, however, must be regarded as extremely tentative in view of the small number of cases on which these findings are based.

A somewhat similar finding appears, however, with job satisfaction (Table 3.9). Insofar as straightforward differences between communities are concerned, low socio-economic status men in the more prosperous communities are more likely to be dissatisfied with their jobs than are low socio-economic status men in the depressed communities. While there is a tendency for men of lower socio-economic status to be low in job satisfaction (42 per cent of Class II men as compared with 32 per cent of Class I men), this difference disappears almost entirely in East Parrish, and again reverses itself in Clyde. In fact, in the economically depressed communities, men from the lower socio-economic group are more likely to have high job satisfaction than men from the upper socio-economic group, although in the more prosperous communities the opposite is true. Such differences suggest that, for a man of low socio-economic status in the economically depressed communities, the mere fact of having a job is an achievement, and he is less able to afford the luxury of being dissatisfied with his job than are men who live in a more prosperous area. This interpretation is supported by the fact that among men of low socio-economic status, only 10 per cent in Brewer are "very satisfied" with their wage level, as com-

Table 3.8 Marital Adjustment by Community, Controlling for Socio-Economic Status (Married Men, 25–49 Only)

SES	Community	Per Cent High on Marital Tension Index	Per Cent Whose Marriage Is		Per Cent Who Spend a Lot of Time With Wife	N–NA
			Very Happy	Average or Not Too Happy		
High	East Parrish	39	67	7	40	43
	Clyde	42	48	23	42	48
	Spiresburg	28	64	8	31	39
	Brewer	56	50	24	28	71
Low	East Parrish	40	62	23	53	47
	Clyde	32	50	32	48	40
	Spiresburg	22	51	36	42	45
	Brewer	48	22	44	28	27
					N–NA	360
					Not married	33
					Total	393

pared with 38 per cent in East Parrish and 41 per cent in Clyde. We have here a good example of relative deprivation. In an area where jobs are plentiful and wages generally high, there is considerable dissatisfaction about wages among people making low incomes because, compared with others all around them, they are not doing very well. Those making low incomes in an area of high unemployment and low wages are much less dissatisfied with their wages because, relative to those around them, they are not doing too badly.

It was pointed out earlier that respondents in the more prosperous communities tended to have slightly more positive feelings. As might be expected from this, the communities differed in rates of social interaction and participation. Looking at organizational membership in Table 3.10, we see within each age and socio-economic group a steady increase in the per cent belonging to two or more organizations, as we move from the most depressed to the most prosperous community. Greater organizational membership implies increased opportunities for social interaction and more active involvement in the environment. Table 3.11 shows that, at least among the upper socio-economic group, men in the more prosperous communities were more likely

Table 3.9 Job Satisfaction by Community, Controlling for Socio-Economic Status (Employed Men, 25–49 Only)

SES	Community	Job Satisfaction Index			Total	
		Per Cent Low	Per Cent Medium	Per Cent High	Per Cent	N–NA
High	East Parrish	30	52	17	99	46
	Clyde	39	45	16	100	44
	Spiresburg	22	49	29	100	41
	Brewer	34	49	17	100	76
Low	East Parrish	36	36	28	100	47
	Clyde	33	41	26	100	27
	Spiresburg	49	29	22	100	41
	Brewer	50	40	10	100	30
				N–NA		352
				Not working		41
				Total		393

Table 3.10 Organizational Membership by Community, Controlling for Socio-Economic Status (Per Cent Belonging to Two or More Organizations)

SES	Community	Age	
		Under 50	50 or Older
High	East Parrish	33 (106)	52 (69)
	Clyde	43 (112)	60 (35)
	Spiresburg	46 (123)	63 (38)
	Brewer	50 (252)	64 (72)
Low	East Parrish	15 (127)	18 (168)
	Clyde	19 (102)	19 (132)
	Spiresburg	17 (106)	22 (105)
	Brewer	27 (86)	26 (69)
N–NA			1,702
NA on SES			116
NA on age and/or organizations			188
Total			2,006

Table 3.11 Selected Participation Items by Community, Controlling for Socio-Economic Status (Men, Age 25–49 Only)

SES	Community	Per Cent of Respondents Who			N–NA
		Met Someone New during Previous Week	Traveled 25 or More Miles from Home during Previous Week	Watched TV One Hour or Less a Day	
High	East Parrish	39	39	33	49
	Clyde	40	37	35	48
	Spiresburg	56	66	51	41
	Brewer	57	58	41	76
Low	East Parrish	36	39	17	59
	Clyde	29	24	26	42
	Spiresburg	25	33	26	48
	Brewer	37	53	23	30
Total					393

to have met someone new during the week preceding the interview, were more likely to have traveled twenty-five miles or more from their homes, and spent less time watching television. Parallel differences were not found, however, among the lower socio-economic groups, except that the men in the most prosperous town were more likely to have traveled twenty-five miles or more during the previous week.

In the lower socio-economic status group, there appear to be some community differences in social interaction patterns, with the men in the more depressed communities being more likely to be in contact with relatives, but those in the more prosperous communities with friends. Such a difference supports the interpretation given earlier that for the lower socio-economic status men in the more depressed communities family ties take on greater importance, perhaps at the expense of interaction with friends who are not relatives. Low socio-economic status men in the more depressed communities were, however, more likely to have had telephone contact with a friend during the week than were those from the more prosperous communities (Table 3.12).

The above differences are slight, and, in view of the small

Table 3.12 Social Interaction by Community, Controlling for Socio-Economic Status (Men, Age 25–49 Only)

SES	Community	Per Cent of Respondents Who			N–NA
		Were in Contact with Three or More Families of Relatives during Previous Week	Got Together with Friends during Previous Week	Chatted on Telephone with Friends during Previous Week	
High	East Parrish	22	67	67	49
	Clyde	31	54	58	48
	Spiresburg	24	54	61	41
	Brewer	20	76	70	76
Low	East Parrish	29	46	51	59
	Clyde	26	48	45	42
	Spiresburg	21	54	38	48
	Brewer	17	67	40	30
Total					393

number of cases involved, should be considered tentative. It should be noted, however, that social interaction was also found to decrease with economic depression in studies of the unemployed by Eisenberg and Lazarsfeld (1938) and by Komarovsky (1940).

On the whole, then, as far as direct measures of well-being are concerned, differences between communities are due largely to the differing age, education, and income characteristics of the inhabitants. Where there are small community effects, independent of differences in age, education, and income, they appear chiefly among the respondents of lower socio-economic status who are more vulnerable to the vagaries of economic conditions. Economic depression appears to affect psychological well-being primarily through a reduction in positive feelings, rather than through an increase in negative feelings, or such correlates as anxiety, or poor role adjustment. The decrement in positive feelings appears to be related to the decreased social interaction and participation that characterizes the more depressed communities. Thus the primary effect of a depressive economic climate, in addition to reduced income, increased unemployment, and selective out-migration of young people, is the alteration of people's degree of involvement in the social environment, there being, however, a compensatory strengthening of familial bonds; people withdraw from the world into the relative safety of the family.

The communities under study have been characterized here exclusively in terms of a general economic dimension. It is evident that they may differ in significant ways along other important dimensions, some of which may be relatively remote from direct influence by economic conditions. Further detailed analysis of the communities is being undertaken currently, with particular emphasis on historical influences and characteristic patterns of social life and community leadership. The results of this analysis will be published in a separate report.

4

Trends in Feelings

In the preceding chapter the effects of economic climate upon the feeling states of the study population were investigated. The events of October, 1962, provided an opportunity to study the impact of a national diplomatic crisis on the feeling states of the American people. The Cuban crisis that erupted was an event which few people in America could have predicted. During its initial phase, from the day preceding the President's speech on the evening of October 22, and for several days following, the situation was fluid and the outcome uncertain. The mass media reported the situation with an imagery of extreme crisis. What little could be learned about how people were responding tended to substantiate the prevailing sense of crisis. For example, there were isolated reports of panic-buying of food and increased demands for civil defense information. All in all, it seemed as if considerable anxiety had swept over the nation.

NORC seized the opportunity to return to the field. The interviews were conducted with the long-form questionnaire used in March, plus a special section dealing with opinions and feelings about the Cuban situation.

Because we wished to complete the interviewing before the "crisis" atmosphere had evaporated, we decided to restrict the reinterviewing to only two of our communities, the ones at both ends of the economic prosperity continuum. All respondents who had been interviewed with the long form and half of those who had received the short form were selected for reinterviewing. This procedure yielded a subsample of 670, of whom 547 or 82 per cent were reinterviewed during the nine day period.

In this chapter we shall show how these various feeling states changed between March and October. We begin our review by considering an area of feelings that would seem most directly connected with an international crisis, the content of people's worry and concern.

WORRIES

In both March and October respondents were asked how much, if at all, they had worried about various topics during the week preceding the interview. (We ignore until later their responses to an open-ended question about what they were most worried about.) Nine of these worry topics are aspects of people's immediate life-situation, such as money, work, marriage, and health, commonly perceived as problems. Table 4.1 compares

Table 4.1 Trends in Worry Topics, March–October

Worry Topic	Time Period	Per Cent Worried			Total	
		Not at All	Sometimes	Often	Per Cent	N–NA
Money	March	12	41	47	100	543
	October	24	42	34	100	545
Growing old	March	59	29	12	100	542
	October	72	20	8	100	544
Work	March	25	25	50	100	541
	October	29	29	42	100	545
Marriage	March	67	23	10	100	535
	October	76	17	7	100	545
Getting ahead	March	32	35	33	100	537
	October	45	33	22	100	544
Bringing up children	March	44	21	35	100	535
	October	48	24	28	100	545
Death	March	63	30	7	100	539
	October	71	24	5	100	544
Health	March	32	47	21	100	542
	October	48	34	18	100	545
Personal enemies	March	92	8	0	100	540
	October	95	4	1	100	543

the answers to these questions in March with those given in October.

It will be noticed that in every instance worry over these problems decreased. For example, in March, 88 per cent reported that in the previous week they had worried sometimes or often about money; in October, only 75 per cent had worried about money. The proportion worrying about their health decreased from 68 per cent to 52 per cent. Similar patterns are found for the other items in Table 4.1.

This consistent decline in worry over day-to-day personal problems might well be attributed to the outbreak of the Cuban situation. At least it is in keeping with the idea that a major crisis confronting the country at large serves to distract people's attention from their own problems, thus serving a "masking" function.

That worries were focused on Cuba is shown by the responses to the one item in the worry battery that referred to an international rather than a personal problem. In both March and October people were asked how much they were worried about the atomic bomb and fallout. It is not surprising that the trend for this item is quite different from that for the others. The anxiety provoked by the Cuban crisis can be seen from the rather dramatic increase in this worry, shown in Table 4.2.

The proportion of people worrying about the A-bomb or fallout more than doubled in October, and the proportion worrying about it "often" increased fourfold. Most of our respondents, then, had developed a new concern during the period of the Cuban crisis, one that probably took their minds off their other problems.

Table 4.2 Worry over the A-Bomb or Fallout in March and October

Time Period	Per Cent Worried			Total	
	Not at All	Sometimes	Often	Per Cent	N – NA
March	72	22	6	100	541
October	35	41	24	100	545

TRENDS IN SYMPTOMS OF ANXIETY

We are inclined to think that a serious international situation such as the war scare of October, 1962, brings many an ordinary citizen sleepless nights, and increases, however momentarily, his feelings of anxiety. But, these vague impressions aside, we actually know little about how international crises affect people's feelings of well-being. It is conceivable that people are drawn closer together by a common danger and find that the psychological rewards of this closeness more than offset the fears and anxieties evoked by the crisis. Or it is possible that the anxiety provoked by these crises is soon dissipated as people adjust to the uncertain world in which they live and go about their everyday business. It may even be that the important determinants of people's moods, of their feeling "good" or "bad," are restricted to the more immediate events in their lives rather than to events removed from them and seemingly beyond their control.

With the data now at hand, it is possible to explore the psychological impact of a major crisis. In both March and October, respondents in these Illinois communities were asked whether they had experienced in the past week any of a variety of physical symptoms that are generally taken to be signs of anxiety. If the average citizen[1] was made anxious by the Cuban crisis, we should find these symptoms to be more frequent in October than in March. These trends are shown in Table 4.3.

The frequency of these stress symptoms did not change much over the eight-month period. Three of them were somewhat more frequent in October (aches and pains, muscle twitches, and nervousness), but two (headaches and rapid heart beat) were slightly less frequent, and one (dizziness) shows hardly any change at all. As can be seen from the shift in means (calculated by assigning a score of zero to the absence of the symptoms, of one to experiencing it once or twice, and a score of two for experiencing it more frequently), the largest increase occurred in feelings of "nervousness." Of all the symptoms, this one might be expected to reflect anxiety over the Cuban crisis, and it is somewhat surprising that the increase was not even greater.

[1]Of course, we are not dealing with a national sample, but rather with residents of two relatively small Midwestern cities, and their reactions may not be typical of those of people in other sections of the country or in more urbanized places.

Perhaps many people had forgotten how nervous they had been by the time they were interviewed, or perhaps the amount of anxiety that developed in the population was not as great as might be expected in this age of massive destruction. Still another possibility is that the fear and anxiety provoked by the crisis, although quite real, is not the kind that is readily transformed into physical symptoms. We do know that most of the respondents were worried about the atomic bomb in October, a topic that

Table 4.3 Trends in Psychosomatic Symptoms, March–October

Symptom	Time Period	Per Cent Not at All	Per Cent Once or Twice	Per Cent Several Times and Often	Total		
					Per Cent	Mean	N–NA
Dizziness	March	83	11	6	100	.23	539
	October	85	7	8	100	.23	544
						.00	
Aches and pains	March	50	24	26	100	.76	543
	October	52	16	32	100	.80	544
						+.04	
Headaches	March	52	32	16	100	.64	537
	October	59	25	16	100	.57	544
						−.07	
Muscle twitches	March	85	7	8	100	.23	536
	October	83	7	10	100	.27	543
						+.04	
Nervousness	March	48	24	28	100	.80	538
	October	46	19	35	100	.89	543
						+.09	
Rapid heartbeat	March	83	9	8	100	.25	539
	October	86	7	7	100	.21	542
						−.04	

Summary Index of Symptoms

Time Period	Per Cent with None	Per Cent with One	Per Cent with Two or More	Per Cent	Mean
March	19	39	42	100	1.23
October	17	41	42	100	1.25
					+ .02

would not have entered their minds if they had been oblivious to the danger of war created by the Cuban crisis.[2]

Whether the Cuban crisis did indeed produce that common sign of anxiety, the sleepless night, can be determined for at least a part of the sample, the men between the ages of twenty-five and forty-nine. Men in this age group were interviewed in more detail in March, and it is only for this sub-group that data on sleep patterns are available at both points in time.

The first two columns of Table 4.4 show the trend for the men who were asked this question in both March and October; the reports of troubled sleep increased somewhat (six percentage points) in October. The third column presents the October responses of all the respondents, including older men and women of all ages. Presumably women and older men had somewhat more difficulty with their sleep in October than the younger men, for reports of troubled sleep are slightly higher in the entire October sample.

Heavy smoking and, particularly, an increase in smoking are indications of anxiety. Again, for the men between twenty-five and forty-nine, we can compare their smoking habits in March and October. Of the 154 men in this age group, 111 were smokers.

[2]The distinction often made by psychiatrists between anxiety and fear perhaps is relevant here. Anxiety is a response to a danger that is not clearly understood by the subject, presumably a threat that has been repressed, whereas fear is a response to an objective danger of which the subject is aware. In the Cuban crisis the source of the fear was clearly known. The kinds of psychosomatic symptoms dealt with in Table 4.3 might well be part of the ego's defense mechanisms against anxiety rather than fear. Perhaps this is why their frequency did not increase in October.

Table 4.4 Sleep Patterns in March and October

Sleep Pattern	Men between 25 and 49		All Respondents
	Per Cent in March	Per Cent in October	Per Cent in October
Trouble with sleep	33	39	41
No trouble with sleep	67	61	59
Total	100	100	100
N–NA	154	154	545

These people were asked whether they were smoking more or less than usual. In March, 80 per cent reported that their smoking behavior had not changed recently; in October, 81 per cent reported no change in their smoking behavior. But, as Table 4.5 shows, among those reporting a change, slightly more increased their consumption of tobacco in October.

In March the younger men were likely to report that they were smoking less rather than more; in October this pattern was reversed. And among all the smokers interviewed in October (third column), reports of increased smoking were more frequent than reports of decreased smoking. By adding sleep patterns and smoking behavior to the list of symptoms reported in Table 4.3, we find some signs of an increase in anxiety, but the trend in every instance is quite small. Judging from Tables 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5, it would seem that the anxiety level of the sample did not increase greatly in October over what it had been the previous March. If the Cuban crisis did make people anxious, and, as we shall see in the next chapter, there are many signs that people were worried and frightened, it was a form of anxiety that largely escaped through the sieve of the NORC questionnaire.[3]

[3]We are forced to assume that the March data provided a suitable baseline for detecting an effect of the Cuban crisis. This is certainly a questionable assumption. March, 1962, may not have been a typical period in the lives of our respondents. For all we know, these symptoms may be more frequent in the winter months. Ideally, we should have had as a baseline a survey conducted shortly before the Cuban crisis arose. We shall have more to say about this methodological weakness in the conclusion to this report.

Table 4.5 Smoking Behavior in March and October

Smoking More or Less Than Usual	Men between 25 and 49		All Respondents
	Per Cent in March	Per Cent in October	Per Cent in October
More	8	11	15
Less	12	8	10
Same	80	81	75
Total	100	100	100
N–NA	111	111	286

TRENDS IN POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE FEELINGS AND HAPPINESS

When moving from the area of manifest worry and anxiety to other aspects of feeling states, we find the material even less amenable to inferences about the psychological impact of the Cuban crisis. Should we find, for example, that the rates of various positive and negative emotions have changed between March and October we cannot be certain that this is a consequence of the international situation. The change might reflect a difference in attitude toward winter and fall, or even, possibly, the fact that our respondents have aged almost a year in the interval between interviews. Nevertheless, we shall examine these data as well, for the question of whether various facets of people's moods underwent change is of interest in its own right.

These data refer to specific positive and negative feelings that the respondents experienced during the week prior to the interview. These include rewarding feelings, such as interest in and excitement about something, pleasure over an accomplishment and pride in a compliment, and negative feelings such as depression, boredom, loneliness, and restlessness. We have shown that both positive and negative feelings tend to cluster and that each set constitutes a separate dimension of reported happiness. The more positive feelings people experience, the happier they feel; the more negative, the unhappier they are. Furthermore, we have shown that these dimensions are not related to each other; positive feelings are not the obverse of negative feelings, and assessments of personal happiness are largely derived from the balance of these two sets of feelings. Table 4.6 presents the trend data for the set of positive feelings.

The patterns shown in Table 4.6 are quite striking. In every instance the experience of favorable or positive feelings decreased in October, compared with March. Fewer people were feeling "on top of the world," excited or interested, pleased over their accomplishments or proud because they had been complimented. (This consistent trend is easily seen by the decrease in the means for each item.)

It is tempting to leap to the Cuban crisis for an interpretation of this trend. It is plausible that the crisis dampened people's

spirits, lowered their motivation to accomplish things from which they themselves might take pleasure, or for which they might receive the compliments of others. But it is also possible that this consistent decrease is the result of some stimulus other than the international situation—approaching winter, for example. In order to ascertain whether this trend is a result of the interna-

Table 4.6 Trends in Positive Feelings, March–October

Feeling	Time Period	"In Past Week, Have Felt This Way"			Total		
		Per Cent Not at All	Per Cent Once or Twice	Per Cent Several Times and Often	Per Cent	Mean	N–NA
"Top of the world"	March	53	13	34	100	.81	536
	October	68	9	23	100	.55	544
						−.26	
Excited or interested in something	March	36	19	45	100	1.09	531
	October	46	16	38	100	.92	544
						−.17	
Pleased about accomplishing something	March	23	25	52	100	1.29	540
	October	32	25	43	100	1.11	544
						−.18	
Proud because someone complimented you	March	38	27	35	100	.97	537
	October	48	22	30	100	.82	544
						−.15	

Summary Index of Positive Feelings

Time Period	Per Cent Low (None)	Per Cent Medium (One)	Per Cent High (Two or More)	Per Cent	Mean
March	28	33	39	100	1.11
October	37	38	25	100	.88
					−.23

tional crisis we must know more about the mechanisms which might link the crisis to feeling states. In the next chapter we will consider whether the people who were most concerned about Cuba were the ones who most exhibited this decrease in pleasurable feelings, a reasonable expectation if the two are linked.

We must also consider the role of social participation. We found in the analysis of the March data that positive feelings are associated with social interaction and activity generally. (The very wording of the items suggests this. Compliments are by definition rewards from others, and achievements and excitements imply activity, often occurring in a social context.) But first we will examine what happened to negative feelings during the eight-month interval and whether any trends are evident in assessments of happiness.

If the Cuban crisis reduced positive feelings, we might expect that it also increased negative feelings, such as loneliness, depression, restlessness, and uneasiness. But the facts do not bear this out.

As can be seen from Table 4.7, the frequency of various negative feelings did not change much; what small trend was evident was more often in the direction of their reduction rather than increase. Of the five feelings, the incidence of three hardly changed, boredom decreased, and restlessness increased slightly. One might think of plausible reasons why these trends might reflect an impact of the crisis. It could be expected that people would not be bored at such a time (but almost the same number were bored at both times); their increasing restlessness could also be expected. But feelings of depression did not increase nor did feelings of vague uneasiness, which could also be expected if people's moods had responded to the war scare of the previous week. In short, these results give little basis for attributing negative feelings to the Cuban crisis.

The decrease in positive feelings and the persistence of negative feelings might suggest that assessments of happiness also decreased between March and October. But worries, which we have shown to be associated with unhappiness, also decreased, and so it is difficult to make predictions about the trend in happi-

ness. In fact, the data given in Table 4.8 indicate that the level of happiness increased slightly in October over what it had been the previous March.

The slight increase in personal happiness is a further reminder that it is hazardous to infer a relationship between people's feelings and an international crisis. Whether the findings on happi-

Table 4.7 Trends in Negative Feelings, March–October

Feeling	Time Period	"In Past Week, Have Felt This Way"			Total		
		Per Cent Not at All	Per Cent Once	Per Cent Several Times and Often	Per Cent	Mean	N–NA
Lonely or remote	March	76	8	16	100	.40	536
	October	78	6	16	100	.38	543
						−.02	
Depressed or very unhappy	March	70	13	17	100	.47	534
	October	71	11	18	100	.47	543
						.00	
Bored	March	70	10	20	100	.50	536
	October	77	8	15	100	.38	543
						−.12	
So restless couldn't sit still	March	66	8	26	100	.60	540
	October	65	4	31	100	.66	544
						+.06	
Vaguely uneasy without knowing why	March	69	10	21	100	.52	540
	October	71	8	21	100	.50	542
						−.02	

Summary Index of Negative Feelings

Time Period	Per Cent Low (None)	Per Cent Medium (One)	Per Cent High (Two or More)	Per Cent	Mean
March	35	24	41	100	1.06
October	35	26	39	100	1.04
					−.02

ness and positive and negative feelings are distorted by the fact that the crisis changed dramatically during the course of the interviewing will be considered shortly. But these results seem to indicate that when people assess their happiness they are more likely to be thinking of their personal successes and failures—the status of their married life and work life—than of events in the world community.

Social participation

We know something about the informal social participation of the men between twenty-five and forty-nine in March and October. We know whether they were more or less likely to chat with friends on the telephone and visit with them socially. Table 4.9

Table 4.8 Trends in Estimates of Personal Happiness

Time Period	Per Cent "Very Happy"	Per Cent "Pretty Happy"	Per Cent "Not Too Happy"	Total	
				Per Cent	N–NA
March	23	61	16	100	543
October	28	60	12	100	543

Table 4.9 Trends in Informal Social Participation

Contact	Per Cent in March	Per Cent in October
Average daily phone chats		
None	38	40
Less than one a day	30	25
One or two a day	22	24
Three or more per day	10	11
Total	100	100
Visits with friends in past week		
None	34	36
One	24	28
Two	20	17
Three or more	22	19
Total	100	100
N–NA	153	153

shows that the frequency of these activities hardly changed at all in the eight-month period.

In spite of the decline in positive feelings shown in Table 4.6, rates of informal social interaction remained fairly constant, at least for the younger men for whom we have the data.

THE EFFECT OF STAGE OF THE CUBAN CRISIS ON TRENDS IN FEELINGS

So far in the analysis we have not uncovered anything that would indicate that the Cuban crisis had a major impact on feelings. True, the respondents in October were generally less worried about their personal problems and more worried about the atomic bomb, and their experiences of positive feelings had decreased noticeably. Their reports of various symptoms of anxiety did not increase much, however, and the frequency of negative feelings remained the same.

But this analysis of gross trends has overlooked an important consideration. We have proceeded as if all the October interviews were conducted on a single day, presumably at the height of the Cuban crisis, whereas of course this was not so. The interviewing took place over a nine-day period, and only in the first few days was the outcome of the crisis uncertain. Most of the interviews, in fact, were conducted at a time when it was clear that the United States had won, that Russia was not going to war over Cuba but rather would acquiesce to United States demands. True, our respondents had been asked to report on their feeling states over a period of a week, and the interview should have captured feelings evoked by the crisis even if they were not being experienced at the moment.

But perhaps people forget how they were feeling five or six days ago. If the Cuban crisis, then, had any effects on the particular feeling states that we have been examining, these should become evident when the date of the interview is taken into account. For example, those interviewed when the crisis was at a peak may have experienced an increase in anxiety symptoms, while those contacted later on, when the outcome was apparent, may have had fewer such symptoms than in the previous March.

To test this possibility, we examined trends in feelings sepa-

rately for those interviewed at different times in October. We distinguished three groups: those contacted during the first weekend following the President's speech when the outcome was uncertain; those approached during the next three days when the triumph of American policy seemed likely; and those interviewed during the next four days when all uncertainty about the United States position had vanished and the country was basking in the glory of its victory over the Soviet Union. We have not bothered to replicate all the previous findings taking date of interview into account. Instead we have focused on the summary indices of feelings, the index of psychosomatic symptoms, positive and negative feelings, and the respondent's over-all estimate of his happiness.

It was found that specifying the results by date of interview did not clarify the previous picture: in only one instance, the experience of negative feelings, does the pattern conform to expectations. Moreover, these data, shown in Table 4.10, introduce some new anomalies.

Looking first at the trends in psychosomatic symptoms presented in Table 4.10, we note that those interviewed at the height of the uncertainty about Cuba show a slight increase in symptoms. But this sign of an effect of the crisis is quickly dissipated by results of later interviews. Those interviewed in the last four days, when the immediate crisis was over, also show a slight increase in psychosomatic symptoms, while those interviewed in the middle period experienced a slight decrease.

The time of the October interview also seems to have had little effect on trends in positive feelings. People interviewed at the different stages of the crisis all experienced significant decreases in positive feelings, the late interviewees almost as much as the early ones. Moreover, trends in happiness (Table 4.10, "Per Cent 'Not Too Happy'") show no relationship to the date of the October interview. Whatever the time of the interview, there was a slight trend toward increased happiness.

Only in the data on negative feelings (Table 4.10, "Per Cent High on Negative Feelings") are there patterns that suggest the crisis might have affected feelings. Those interviewed during the uncertain days had slightly more negative feelings than they did

the previous March, while those interviewed after the peak of the crisis had slightly fewer. But even here indications are slight. All in all, it would seem that the Cuban crisis had little bearing on the state of people's feelings between March and October.

Before leaving Table 4.10, it is important to note the patterning of the October responses shown in the second column, particularly those for positive feelings, negative feelings, and happiness. If we were to consider only the relationship between these feelings in October and the time of the interview, we would conclude that the Cuban crisis did indeed have an important effect. Notice that high scores on positive feelings steadily increase as the crisis lessens. Negative feelings, as we would expect, were experi-

Table 4.10 Trends in Feeling States According to Time of Interview in October

Time of October Interview	March	October	Percentage Difference
	Per Cent High on Index of Psychosomatic Symptoms		
First two days	38 (76)	41 (76)	+ 3
Next three days	45 (206)	42 (206)	− 3
Last four days	41 (258)	43 (258)	+ 2
	Per Cent High on Positive Feelings (Score of Two)		
First two days	32	14	−18
Next three days	36	23	−13
Last four days	45	30	−15
	Per Cent High on Negative Feelings (Score of Two)		
First two days	42	47	+ 5
Next three days	40	38	− 2
Last four days	40	38	− 2
	Per Cent "Not Too Happy"		
First two days	25	21	− 4
Next three days	20	12	− 8
Last four days	12	9	− 3
N−NA = 542			

enced more often by those contacted during the height of the crisis; finally, reports of unhappiness steadily diminish as the Cuban crisis changes into an American victory. All of these relationships based on a single survey would argue for the profound effect of such a crisis on people's feeling states. But the fact that the trend data present a more ambiguous picture, one that places in question the impact of the crisis on people's feelings, points up the importance of panel studies. The erroneous impression that would have been obtained from the single survey in October stems from the rather strange fact that the people interviewed early in October happen to have been less happy and to have had fewer positive feelings and slightly more negative ones in the previous March. This can be seen most clearly from the data on happiness. Thus what seems to be a significant relationship between stage of the crisis and feeling "not too happy" in October turns out to be false. (As we shall see in Chapter 5, those interviewed during the early days of the October survey were more likely to be of low socio-economic status – the poorly educated, the low-income, and the older respondents. This association between social status and time of interview may largely account for these patterns, for we know that happiness increases with social status.) Therefore, Table 4.10 should give us pause in evaluating the results of single surveys. What appear to be causal relationships established on the basis of a single survey may well turn out to be spurious relationships when studied over time.

A NOTE ON STABILITY OF FEELINGS

The trend data presented in this chapter suggest that a number of the feelings we are studying, such as psychosomatic symptoms, negative feelings, and happiness, changed very little over the eight-month period. The question of the stability of the various areas of feelings is an important one from the viewpoint of NORC's program of research on mental health. It is frequently asserted that feelings of happiness or worry, people's moods in general, are basically reflections of deep-seated personality traits and are not likely to change much in the adult personality. According to this view, environmental factors, such as events in the community and society at large, are not apt to have much effect on these feelings.

The trend data appear to support this view. But it must be remembered that trends refer to rates of feelings in the sample and do not tell us what has happened to the feelings of individuals over time. The absence of trends could imply that people do not change, but stable rates could also result from large numbers of people changing in opposite directions so that the net change is close to zero. The stability of people's feelings over time cannot be inferred from trend data alone. To study this we must look at panel tables to see what happens to the feelings of the same people at different points in time.

Change in feelings

It will be recalled that in the aggregate the respondents were slightly happier in October than in March, the "very happy" group increasing five percentage points, the "not too happy" group decreasing by four percentage points. But this slight net change is actually the outcome of considerable "turnover" in reports of happiness. This can be seen from Table 4.11.

The people who estimated their level of happiness to be the same in March and October appear in the main diagonal of the table. They constitute 63 per cent of the sample; the remaining 37 per cent revised their estimates of their happiness. Some 23 per cent were happier in October, but this was partially offset by the 14 per cent who had become less happy.

Also to be noted in Table 4.11 is the relationship between the

Table 4.11 Turnover in Happiness, March–October

Time Period	Response	October (Time Two)			N–NA
		"Very Happy"	"Pretty Happy"	"Not Too Happy"	
March (Time One)	"Very happy"	72	49	4	125
	"Pretty happy"	76	231	22	329
	"Not too happy"	3	46	40	89
N		151	326	66	543

March and October responses. Those who were "very happy" in March were much more likely to be "very happy" in October than those who were initially "not too happy." There is obviously considerable consistency in the responses in spite of the turnover. Those who changed from the two extreme positions were most likely to move only one step rather than two. A number of people shifted from "very happy" to "pretty happy" and from "not too happy" to "pretty happy"; few went from one end of the spectrum to the other. This consistency of response can be taken as evidence for the reliability of the happiness question. It is obvious that people did not answer it in a random fashion.

The measure of anxiety based on psychosomatic symptoms also showed little change. The distribution of cases was virtually identical in March and October. Yet, these similar rates conceal considerable turnover, as can be seen from Table 4.12.

From the top row we see that a majority of those who were symptom-free in March had picked up one or more symptoms in October. But this change was offset by the substantial number of people who were high on symptoms in March but who reported fewer symptoms in October. The proportion with the same score at both times is only a little more than half—52 per cent. The 48 per cent who changed positions on the index is comprised of 26 per cent who developed more symptoms and 22 per cent who had fewer in October. Not only are people's assessments of their happiness subject to change over an eight-month period, but even their physical symptoms, which are presumably be-

Table 4.12 Turnover in Scores on Psychosomatic Symptom Index

Time Period	Symptom Index	October (Time Two)			N–NA
		Low (None)	Medium (One)	High (Two)	
March (Time One)	Low	36	58	11	107
	Medium	37	100	71	208
	High	18	63	146	227
N–NA		91	221	228	540

yond their control, change considerably in this relatively short period of time.

Table 4.13 shows the turnover in negative feelings. We have seen that the frequency of negative feelings hardly changed over the eight-month period. But in this area, too, there was considerable turnover.

Only half the respondents remained in the same position on this index; 24 per cent reported more negative feelings in October and 26 per cent reported fewer.

Positive feelings, unlike the other areas, showed a marked trend: substantially fewer people experienced many gratifying feelings in October (Table 4.14). Yet we now learn from the turnover table that these feelings were almost as stable as the

Table 4.13 Turnover in Negative Feelings

Time Period	Frequency of Feelings	Negative Feelings in October (Time Two)			N
		Low (None)	Medium (One)	High (Two)	
Negative feelings in March (Time One)	Low (none)	110	47	37	194
	Medium (one)	49	37	48	134
	High (two)	33	58	128	219
N		192	142	213	547

Table 4.14 Turnover in Positive Feelings

Time Period	Frequency of Feelings	Positive Feelings in October (Time Two)			N–NA
		Low (None)	Medium (One)	High (Two)	
Positive feelings in March (Time One)	Low	81	55	15	151
	Medium	73	82	27	181
	High	45	70	97	212
N–NA		199	207	139	545

negative feelings. Almost half (48 per cent) remained constant; 18 per cent experienced more positive feelings in October, and 34 per cent (almost twice as many) experienced fewer.

In spite of the considerable turnover in these tables, they too show a marked association between responses in March and October. It would seem, therefore, that the measures of feelings that have been developed are quite suitable for the purposes of the NORC program of research. Although they show a fair amount of consistency through time, thus indicating their reliability, they also seem to tap dimensions of feeling that do change in relatively short periods of time.

SUMMARY

The main concern of this chapter has been to examine trends in feeling states among our respondents between March and the period of the Cuban crisis in October. We have seen that the rates of certain feeling states changed while others remained fairly constant. Worry over personal problems consistently declined, suggesting that the crisis shifted people's attention from their own troubles to the world situation. But when we look at specific indicators of anxiety, such as psychosomatic symptoms, problems of sleeping, and smoking behavior, we see that most of these symptoms were only slightly more frequent in October and a few were less frequent. A rather sharp decline in positive feelings occurred, but this was not matched by a comparable rise in negative feelings. And when we examine the respondents' self-estimates of happiness, we find that on the whole they were slightly happier in October. Taking into account the changes that occurred in the crisis during the period of the field work does not add much to this picture. Those interviewed at the end of the crisis, when the favorable outcome was clear, did not manifest very different trends in feelings from those interviewed when the outcome was still uncertain. All in all, the trend data do not support the idea that the international situation had a major impact on the feelings of our respondents. Were we limited to these findings we might almost conclude that most of the respondents were indifferent to the Cuban crisis.

But the trend materials on feeling states are not the only basis

for assessing the psychological impact of the Cuban crisis. As noted earlier, the October questionnaire contained a number of questions dealing specifically with the Cuban situation. From these we can ascertain how many were worried about Cuba and whether these particularly worried people experienced different feelings from the others. It is to these materials that we turn in the next chapter.

5

Worry over the Cuban Crisis

The expectation that the Cuban situation affected people's feelings assumes two things: that people were aware of the crisis and that they were concerned or worried about it. In this chapter we shall discuss the extent to which people were aware of the events and develop an index of worry over the crisis. We shall then consider how this worry was distributed through the social structure and whether the "worriers" had feeling states different from the others.

AWARENESS OF THE CUBAN CRISIS

Studies designed to measure the impact of some event on people's attitudes and behavior often find that its effect was much less than anticipated simply because large numbers of people were not aware of the event. The data on hand indicate that such ignorance of the event did not exist in the Cuban crisis. Some 79 per cent of the respondents said that they had heard the President's address to the nation on the night of October 22. The remaining 21 per cent reported that they quickly learned about the crisis either from the mass media or by word of mouth.

Not only were they aware that there was a crisis, but they were also quite knowledgeable about its nature. When asked what events in Cuba led the President to take action, fully 80 per cent referred to the presence of Soviet missile bases in Cuba. Only 9 per cent had no idea what had happened in Cuba. Their level of knowledge is also indicated by responses to a question asking

what actions the President had taken and was prepared to take in dealing with the situation. About two-thirds mentioned the blockade of shipping and a sizable number of these specified the quarantine applied only to vessels carrying offensive weapons. Others who did not refer to the blockade said that the President was determined to have the missile bases removed, and many pointed out that the President was prepared to use force if necessary to achieve this objective.[1] These findings suggest that nearly everyone was aware of the critical nature of the Cuban situation; if it should turn out that many were not particularly upset, it was not because they did not know about the crisis.

ASSESSING WORRY OVER THE CUBAN CRISIS

Respondents were asked specifically about the Cuban situation only toward the end of the interview. Long before that, however, they were given several opportunities to mention the Cuban crisis if it was on their minds. At the beginning of the interview everyone was asked, "Everything considered, what would you say has bothered you or been on your mind most in the past week or so?" Almost two in every five, 38 per cent, at this point made some reference to the Cuban crisis. A sample of these reactions follows.

A twenty-six-year-old man, interviewed on the last day, when it was quite clear that war would not break out, replied, "Well, the war scare. I saw pictures of bombing and radiation. It worries me to death." And a thirty-four-year-old mother told of this incident: "The children brought home typewritten sheets of what to stock for a family of four in case of disaster and the war scare. I went out and bought some supplies to put in the basement when the children brought the list home."

A thirty-six-year-old housewife, interviewed a week after the President's address, said, "Nuclear attack, I guess. I don't feel that our basement is safe. I've gathered from other people that it wouldn't be the ideal place to go. It's only half a basement."

A forty-three-year-old woman gave this anxious response: "The war that is going to come, you know. We're going to be

[1]Later on we shall have occasion to use these responses in an index of knowledge about the crisis. For the time being, it is sufficient to note that scarcely anyone was totally ignorant of the Cuban situation.

bombed. . . . At work, we try to keep from talking about it, but the conversation will go right back to the Cuban situation."

Of interest here is the fact that she too was interviewed on the Monday following the President's address when it was pretty apparent that the Soviet Union was backing down. Her conviction that war was imminent apparently was not shaken by this favorable turn in events. Later on, we shall explore in more detail the apparent lack of connection between the course of events in the crisis and feelings of our respondents.

A sixty-eight-year-old man, interviewed on the first day when the outcome was still quite uncertain, said, "Nothing but the Cuban affair. The trouble in Cuba is on my mind all the time. I'd sure as hell hate to see something happen. I wish I had Khrushchev on top of a bomb and could pull the string."

Another elderly man, approached after the crisis had abated, replied: "Of course, everybody's been thinking about this war situation more than anything else." His feeling that everyone was concerned about the crisis was shared by others. A sixty-seven-year-old woman answered, "The Cuban affair. . . . It's been on everyone's mind, I think." Another woman was still more eloquent: "The Cuban situation and world conflict is all I've heard talked about. I guess it's bothering me to know that people can't be civilized and get along in a world this big."

Some respondents saw the crisis in more personal terms. A young man replied, "The Cuban situation has been on my mind most. I'm draft age and have reserve status." And a forty-one-year-old mother said, "The situation in Cuba. When you have a boy in the service you worry about things like that."

Somewhat later in the interview, respondents were asked a similar open-ended question, this time about the topic they worried about most. Many people mentioned their financial problems, their health, or other personal problems, but 20 per cent of the sample spontaneously made some reference to the international crisis as the topic they were worrying about most. Their comments were similar to those given in response to the earlier question about what had been on their minds. For example, an elderly mother replied, "The Cuban business. It's had a big effect on me because I have a boy in the Marines and he's being sent to the blockade." And a fifty-four-year-old woman said,

"The Cuban situation and everything that's going on. That scared everybody. I didn't find any exceptions."

In addition to the spontaneous references to the Cuban crisis in these open-ended questions, items in the section dealing specifically with the Cuban situation indicated how worried people were. One such question read:

Think back now to when you first heard about the President's proposals regarding Cuba. At the time some people felt relieved because they expected something even more drastic. Others were disturbed to find that things had gotten so bad. Which of these is closest to how you felt when you first heard about the President's proposals?

The distribution of responses was:

	N	Per Cent
Felt relieved, expected worse	201	37
Felt disturbed, things were so bad	298	54
No feelings one way or the other	26	5
No answer	22	4
Total	547	100

The people who were upset by the news comprise more than half the sample. It is difficult to interpret the reactions of those who said they were relieved because they had expected worse. On the one hand, this group may contain people who were particularly upset by rumors before the President's speech and were perhaps expecting a declaration of war; these would have greeted the proposals with relief even though they still perceived the situation to be serious. On the other hand, this group probably contains people who did not perceive the situation as serious at all and were not particularly worried about it. Since those who said they felt disturbed that things were so bad tended to manifest other signs of worry, we will treat this response as the one indicating worry over the crisis.[2]

[2]The October questionnaire was prepared in great haste. In our efforts to cover the various facets of the crisis, such as level of information and the effect of the crisis on behavior, we unfortunately omitted a direct question about the level of worry that was aroused during the height of the crisis. Since the situation was changing daily, we tried to capture changes in feelings in our questions. For example, we asked the respondents whether they were more or less worried now than when they first heard of the crisis. A question about degree of initial worry would have helped greatly in the interpretation of the data.

Another indicator of worry over the Cuban crisis is the respondent's perception of the reactions of his acquaintances and his reactions relative to theirs. Everyone was asked whether the people they had talked to were "very worried" or "not particularly worried" about the Cuban situation. On this issue, opinion was rather evenly split. Some 51 per cent said that their associates were "very worried," 41 per cent saw them as "not particularly worried," and 8 per cent did not know. This question was followed by another that allowed us to infer the respondent's own level of worry; we asked whether the people he had spoken to felt as he did about the crisis. By combining these two questions, we arrived at a crude and very conservative estimate of the proportion who would have said that they themselves were very worried. This figure comes to 38 per cent of the sample.[3]

Granting the shortcomings of these four indicators of worry about the crisis—the two open-ended questions, the check-list questions about initial reaction to the President's proposals, and the combination of perceived worry of friends and friends' position relative to that of the respondent—there is a pragmatic reason for combining them into a single measure of "Cuban worry"; each of these indicators is positively related to the others. Since we are less concerned with pinpointing the precise number of people who were worried about the Cuban crisis than with uncovering the correlates of worry, even a crude ordering of the respondents is sufficient for our purposes. In constructing the index, we assigned equal weight to each of the four items. Their distribution, when combined, is shown in Table 5.1.

We see that about one-fifth of the sample gave no indication of anxiety over the Cuban crisis on any of the four items; almost one-third evidenced one positive response and the rest, about half the sample, gave two or more "worry" responses. For the purposes of the subsequent analysis, we arbitrarily designated as the worried group those with scores of two or more. (The labels "low" and "high" worry will be used in the subsequent tables,

[3]A number of respondents (13 per cent of the sample) reported that the reactions of their associates varied, some agreeing and some disagreeing with their own reactions. Although a number of these people were undoubtedly very worried themselves, we have excluded them from the positive response to this indicator, and so our estimate errs on the conservative side.

the former consisting of those with scores of zero or one, and the latter, those with higher scores.)

THE MEANING OF "CUBAN WORRY"

Before showing how worry is distributed among people differentially located in the social structure, we must examine first the measure of "Cuban worry." Our confidence in this index will increase if it is related to other signs of concern over the international crisis. Worry over the atomic bomb and fallout is an excellent criterion for testing the index. Another item that appeared in the battery of worry questions only in October is also well suited for this purpose: the extent of recent worry over the world situation. Table 5.2 shows how the responses to these questions are related to the index of "Cuban worry."

The results in Table 5.2 are what we would expect. The index of worry about Cuba, based on items referring directly to the Cuban crisis, is strongly related to these other indicators of concern. What it meant to be worried about the Cuban crisis can be filled out by several other pieces of information. All respondents were asked how much time they had spent talking about Cuba with their friends and associates. Thirty-four per cent of those who scored high on the index of worry reported spending "a lot of time" talking about the crisis compared with 16 per cent of the low worriers. Approximately half in each group said they had spent some time talking about Cuba; only 16 per cent of the worriers, in contrast with 32 per cent of the low worriers, said they hardly talked about the crisis at all. There was apparently a rela-

Table 5.1 Index of Worry over the Cuban Crisis

Score	N	Per Cent
Very low (score 0)	116	21
Low (score 1)	163	30
Total		51
Medium (score 2)	146	27
High (score 3)	91	16
Very high (score 4)	31	6
Total	547	49

tionship between talking and worrying. What direction did it take? It is quite possible that this was a mutually reinforcing process: those who worried more may have been motivated to talk about it more, and, conversely, those who discovered how disturbed others were may have become disturbed themselves. Responses to a follow-up question, however, suggest that it is more likely that worry led to discussion than the other way around. Those who said they had talked to others were asked whether such talks made them feel better or worse. Many more had been reassured by these conversations than had become more disturbed. Thus some 41 per cent said that talking to others had made them feel better, only 5 per cent said it made them feel worse, and the remaining 53 per cent reported that talking to others had no effect on their feelings. The worriers, then, were worried in spite of the fact that they, more than the others, spent time in reassuring talks about the crisis.

One component of worry about the Cuban situation was the belief that the crisis heightened chances of war and that war in the near future is likely. When asked to assess the effect of the events in Cuba on the chances of war between the United States and Russia, some 45 per cent of the sample felt that the crisis had lessened chances of war; a substantial minority, 28 per cent, felt it had increased the likelihood of war; the others had no opinion.

Table 5.2 Cuban Worry and Concern over A-Bomb and World Situation in Past Week

Variable	Per Cent Not at All	Per Cent Sometimes	Per Cent Often	Per Cent	N
	A-Bomb and Fallout				
Low Cuban worry	45	38	17	100	279
High Cuban worry	24	44	32	100	268
	The World Situation				
Low Cuban worry	11	42	47	100	279
High Cuban worry	3	25	72	100	268

From another question we learn that 47 per cent did not believe that a war involving the United States was likely in the next few years: 38 per cent believed that it was; and 15 per cent had no opinion. As can be seen from Table 5.3, those who were greatly worried about the crisis were more pessimistic about war. The measure of worry over the Cuban crisis thus reflects in part fear of thermonuclear war, a possibility that seemed more real to the worriers than to the low worriers.

Table 5.3 Cuban Worry and Responses to Two Questions About Chances of War

a. Do you think that the Cuban crisis has increased or decreased chances of war?

Response	Cuban Worry	
	Per Cent Low	Per Cent High
Increased	23	36
Decreased	50	44
Don't know	27	20
Total	100	100
N	262	261
NA	17	7
Total N–NA	279	268

b. Do you think there is a good chance that there will be a major war in the next five years?

Response	Cuban Worry	
	Per Cent Low	Per Cent High
Yes	37	44
No	55	48
Don't know	8	8
Total	100	100
N	256	248
NA	23	50
Total N–NA	279	268

One thing that Cuban worry does not imply, however, is disapproval of the policy of the United States. Respondents were asked which of two possible reactions described their feelings when they learned about the President's actions, whether they felt "glad because the country was taking such firm action," or "very worried because the proposals were unnecessarily risky." The overwhelming majority chose the first.[4] For 87 per cent the first alternative was closer to their initial reaction; only 7 per cent chose the second, and 5 per cent had no opinion on the matter. Although it is true that the small minority who considered the United States policy unnecessarily risky were much more likely than the others to score high on the worry index, the fact that there was such unanimity on the President's actions means that the great majority of the worriers also approved of the United States policy.

The relationship between Cuban worry and pessimism about war, shown in Table 5.3, prompts the question whether the index of worry may be related to the time of the interview, with those interviewed during the early uncertain period more worried than the others. As can be seen from Table 5.4, there is a relationship between worry and date of interview, but it is not a particularly strong one.

Those interviewed during the first two days of the field work, when the outcome was still uncertain, were most likely to be worried, but surprisingly, worry did not decrease markedly as

[4]The question read as follows: "Some people, when they first learned about the President's actions, were glad because our country was taking such firm action. Others were very worried and thought his proposals were unnecessarily risky. Which comes closest to the way you felt at the time?"

Table 5.4 Cuban Worry by Date of Interview

Date of Interview	Per Cent Highly Worried
First two days	57 (76)
Next three days	49 (208)
Last four days	47 (258)
N–NA	542

time went on. Only ten percentage points separate the two extremes.[5] The stage of the crisis, then, by no means accounts for all the variation in worry. It is relevant, therefore, to ask who the worriers are, and to ascertain whether they share certain social and psychological characteristics that set them apart from the non-worriers.

SOCIAL CORRELATES OF WORRY

Much of the variation in attitudes and behavior found in a population can usually be explained by the social positions that people occupy. Sex, age, income, education, and social class have been shown to be important variables in understanding such diverse phenomena as political behavior, organizational membership, leisure-time activities, and mental illness. Since the positions people occupy partly determine their experiences, interests, and values, it is not surprising that predispositions to think and act in certain ways should vary from one social status to another.

But what about a phenomenon such as worry over the Cuban crisis? The threat that hovered over the nation in late October, 1962, was a danger confronting rich and poor alike, old and young, educated and uneducated, men and women. Concern over a national crisis of this dimension would seem to transcend the socially patterned differences between people. At first glance, the data on hand seem to bear this out. When various demographic characteristics are related to Cuban worry, we find either minor correlations or none at all. This can be seen from Table 5.5.

The results in Table 5.5 would indicate that socio-economic status has no relationship to worry over the Cuban crisis. There is no difference at all between those of low and high socio-economic status. Looking at two of the components of socio-economic status separately—education and income—we find that education has no relationship to worry and that income shows a curvilinear pattern, with those in the middle somewhat

[5]When still more refined breaks are made on date of interview, the pattern becomes more irregular. The proportion highly worried on the eighth day, for example, was almost as great as on the first. Nevertheless, this pattern suggests that if it had been possible for us to get into the field a few days sooner we would have found still greater numbers highly worried.

more prone to worry over the crisis than those in the lowest and highest income categories.

In contrast, sex and age do show some association with worry. Women turn out to have been somewhat more worried than men, and age shows a pattern in keeping with the "disengagement theory of aging" advanced by Cumming and Henry (1961). Thus the proportion of worriers is fairly constant in each age group up to age sixty but declines noticeably among those over sixty.

The women in our sample tend to be older than the men; we can expect to find that the difference in worry between men and women will be more pronounced when age is held constant. Table 5.6 shows this to be so.

In three of the five age groups we find differences in worry between men and women that are larger than the aggregate difference. Only among those over sixty does the difference dis-

Table 5.5 Cuban Worry by Selected Social Characteristics (Per Cent Highly Worried)

Variable	Per Cent	N – NA
Education		
Less than high school	48	242
High school graduate	49	175
Some college	53	75
College graduate	47	53
Income		
Less than $3,000	41	128
$3,000 – $4,999	57	79
$5,000 – $6,999	54	142
$7,000 and over	47	179
Socio-economic status		
Low	50	246
High	49	265
Age		
Under 30	56	78
30 – 39	48	111
40 – 49	56	117
50 – 59	55	88
60 – 69	45	71
70 and over	32	79
Sex		
Men	46	281
Women	53	266

appear. Presumably disengagement from the outside world affects the older women to the same extent that it does the older men.

That women were more likely than men to be worried over the Cuban crisis suggests that family status might be a factor affecting worry. True, everyone is vulnerable to the dangers of a thermonuclear war, but those with families may well be more terrified of such a catastrophe than those with only their own lives to worry about. To test this possibility we must make do with data on family composition collected on the March wave. The format of this question differed somewhat in the two questionnaires used in March, the short form for all women and for men over forty-nine years of age, and the long form for men between twenty-one and forty-nine. But in each form it is possible to distinguish between respondents who had one or more children living in the household and those who did not have any children in their households. As can be seen from Table 5.7, the presence

Table 5.6 Joint Effects of Age and Sex on Cuban Worry (Per Cent Highly Worried)

Sex	Age					N – NA
	Under 30	30–39	40–49	50–59	60 and Over	
Men	51 (39)	41 (69)	53 (68)	45 (44)	37 (59)	279
Women	62 (39)	60 (42)	59 (49)	64 (44)	38 (91)	265
Percentage difference	11	19	6	19	1	544

Table 5.7 Cuban Worry by Presence of Children in Household (Per Cent Highly Worried)

Sex	No Children	One or More Children	N
Total sample	45 (238)	52 (292)	530
Men	41 (99)	47 (175)	274
Women	48 (139)	58 (117)	256

of children in the household had some relationship to worry over the crisis.

Parental concern may not be the only mechanism accounting for the greater tendency to worry on the part of those with children. As we saw from the qualitative data presented earlier, school-aged children were often the bearers of messages about the preparations their parents should make to be ready for an emergency. These official communications brought into the family through children might well have intensified the worry of the parents.

Having children is somewhat more related to worry among women than among men (a difference of ten percentage points compared with one of six percentage points), but this does not fully explain the women's greater propensity to worry, for with or without children, we still find women more often worried than men.

The absence of a relationship between education and worry, shown in Table 5.6, is surprising, if only because the oldest respondents, whom we know were least worried, are also the most poorly educated. When we consider the simultaneous effects of education and age, we find these characteristics interacting in a rather strange way. Since almost half the sample had less than a high school education, we differentiate only between those who have and have not completed high school.

Reading across the rows of Table 5.8, we see that the decline in worry among the oldest respondents occurs primarily in the poorly educated group. Education seems to lessen the tendency toward disengagement among the old, for in the better educated

Table 5.8 Joint Effects of Age and Education on Cuban Worry (Per Cent Highly Worried)

Education	Age			N – NA
	Under 40	40 – 49	60 and Over	
Less than high school graduate	59 (41)	61 (83)	36 (117)	241
High school graduate or more	50 (147)	51 (122)	45 (33)	302

group, the oldest respondents were only slightly less worried than the others.

A more puzzling finding emerges from the columns of Table 5.8. Among those under sixty, the poorly educated tended to be more worried over the crisis than the better educated. Why should this be? Before explaining this finding, it may be well to recapitulate what we have learned so far. We first discovered that our measure of Cuban worry was more stable than we had expected. Although worry tended to decrease as the crisis waned, the difference between those interviewed during the uncertain days and those interviewed when the crisis was over was not very large.

We then learned that various measures of socio-economic status were not related to worry. We did find that the very old were less worried than others, and that women were more worried than men, but our initial hunch, that the sex difference could be explained by the woman's greater involvement in family life and with children, proved inadequate. And now we are confronted with the anomalous result that, except among the aged, the poorly educated were more worried than the better educated. In puzzling over the latter result, it occurred to us that many of the better educated people might have been less worried when they were interviewed because they were better informed than the poorly educated and knew sooner that the crisis had been resolved favorably. Moreover, numerous studies have shown that those of high social status have broader interests, are more cosmopolitan, and lead more active lives than those of low status; they have, to use Lazarsfeld's phrase, a broader "effective scope." As the crisis lessened, such people may have shifted their attention back to their other, more personal interests and worries. This logic might also explain the greater worry on the part of the women. Men must give their attention to their jobs and so they may have recovered from their anxieties over the crisis more quickly than did women.

All this assumes that the decline in worry through the interviewing period was more characteristic of those in certain statuses than in others. The relevant data are shown in Table 5.9.

The patterns in Table 5.9 are quite striking. In every instance, the group with broader effective scope (assuming this to be men rather than women and those under fifty rather than those over fifty) shows a marked decline in worry as the international situation improved; in contrast, the group with the narrower effective scope was as likely to be worried toward the end as at the beginning. For the three variables dealing with socio-economic status—education, income, and the summary measure of socio-economic status (which includes occupational status as well)—we find that people of higher status were more prone to worry than those of lower status during the initial uncertain period and somewhat less prone to worry when the favorable resolution of the situation was obvious. The gap in worry between those under and over fifty is particularly great during the first few days. After this the level of worry among those under fifty diminishes and approaches that of the older respondents. Date of interview also helps clarify the difference in level of worry between men and

Table 5.9 Association between Cuban Worry and Selected Social Statuses at Various Stages in Cuban Crisis

Status	Date of Interview			N—NA
	Per Cent First Two Days	Per Cent Next Three Days	Per Cent Last Four Days	
Education				
High (high school or more)	65 (34)	50 (105)	47 (161)	300
Low (less than high school)	50 (42)	47 (102)	49 (96)	240
Income				
High ($5,000 and over)	74 (34)	52 (109)	44 (174)	317
Low (under $5,000)	47 (38)	45 (94)	50 (74)	206
Socio-economic status				
High	65 (29)	51 (101)	45 (134)	264
Low	51 (45)	48 (90)	50 (111)	246
Sex				
Men	54 (35)	48 (92)	42 (151)	278
Women	59 (41)	49 (116)	55 (107)	264
Age				
Under 50	77 (34)	49 (99)	50 (171)	304
Over 50	42 (41)	47 (108)	41 (87)	236

women. We now see that in the early stage, the men were almost as worried as the women, but while proportionately fewer men were worried toward the end, the proportion of worried women in this period is almost as high as in the early one.

Another finding in Table 5.9 should be noted. The base figures (appearing in parentheses) indicate an association between status and date of interview. Interviewers presumably had more difficulty contacting the people of higher status, for in each instance, their proportions increase in the later stages of the field work.[6]

The role of interest and knowledge

As we have suggested, at least two mechanisms, singly or in combination, might account for the progressively smaller proportion of worried people among those with broad effective scope over the course of the interviewing period. These people were presumably better informed about the changing character of the crisis. Its critical significance was probably clear to them sooner, and they learned more quickly about the favorable events that were occurring at the time of the field work. This might account for their initially high level of worry and their relatively low level of worry during the closing stages of the crisis. Reinforcing the role of knowledge, perhaps, is the tendency of higher status people, men compared with women, and younger people compared with old, to be more actively engaged in the community. With more things competing for their attention, they might turn, as the crisis lessened, more readily to other matters. The very fact that

[6]When the percentages are computed, we find that only 45 per cent of the early interviewees were high school graduates compared with 63 per cent in the last period. High income respondents increase from 47 per cent to 70 per cent between the first and last period of the interviewing. Those of high socio-economic status comprise 39 per cent of the early interviewees, 53 per cent of those in the middle period and 55 per cent of those in the last period. Sex and age are also related to the interviewing process: men make up 46 per cent of the earliest group of respondents and 59 per cent of the latest group; 45 per cent of those contacted in the first two days were under fifty years of age compared with 66 per cent of those contacted in the last four days. These differences between early and late interviewees help explain the association between date of interview in October and feelings experienced in March, for we know that happiness and positive feelings are positively related to social status.

interviewers had more difficulty finding such people at home is testimony to the greater demands on their time.[7]

With the data on hand, we can study the role of two closely related factors – interest in, and knowledge of, the Cuban crisis – as possible mechanisms accounting for the patterns in Table 5.10. We find that these do not fully explain the striking patterns in Table 5.10 even though it turns out that those with broad effective scopes were more interested in the crisis and more knowledgeable about it.

A measure of interest in the crisis was constructed from data on attentiveness to formal and informal channels of communication during the week preceding the interview. In the context of queries about the Cuban situation, respondents were asked whether they spent more time in the preceding week watching television, listening to radio, and reading newspapers. In each instanee, about 25 per cent reported giving more time to these activities. Moreover, those who paid more attention to one me-

[7]This reasoning presupposes that our index of Cuban worry taps in large part preoccupation with the crisis at the time of the interview and not merely the level of worry that was evoked at the height of the crisis. This seems to apply to at least two of the four items used to measure Cuban worry, the two open-ended questions calling for the things the respondent was most worried and most bothered about. A third item used in the index, perceived worry of friends, might also be "time bound." This question was phrased in the present tense: "*Are* the people you've talked to particularly worried?" Those interviewed toward the end might well be more prone to say that their colleagues were not particularly worried at that time. The only question used in the index which on the face of it seems to be unaffected by the course of the crisis is the one asking about initial reaction to the President's proposals: whether the respondent was disturbed that things were so bad or relieved because he had expected worse.

Table 5.10 Knowledge of Cuban Crisis by Involvement in Communication (Per Cent Highly Knowledgeable about Cuba)

Communication Involvement	Per Cent	N
Low (zero)	35	106
Medium (one)	64	179
High (two–four)	70	262
Total N		547

dium were more likely to pay attention to the others, and so we were able to score people on attentiveness to mass media. This measure, in turn, proved to be strongly related to the amount of time spent talking with others about the Cuban crisis. (Only 12 per cent of those who reported no increase in their mass media habits said they had spent a great deal of time talking about the Cuban crisis; 33 per cent of those who gave more attention to one of these media and 51 per cent who gave more attention to two or all three media said they had spent a "lot of time" discussing Cuba.) Since greater attention to formal media is so strongly related to informal communication, we have combined these into a single measure of "involvement in communication" which indicates degree of interest in the crisis.[8]

To arrive at a measure of knowledge, we constructed an index from responses to the two open-ended questions dealing with the situation in Cuba and the nature of the United States actions. As we have noted, some 80 per cent mentioned the construction of Soviet missile bases in response to the first question. This answer was scored as one; all others as zero. In answer to the question about actions taken, some 20 per cent specified an American blockade of Soviet ships carrying offensive weapons, and another 49 per cent referred to a blockade of shipping without specifying its character. The more knowledgeable response of the former was assigned a score of two; the general reference to a blockade, a score of one; complete failure to mention a blockade of Cuban shipping (31 per cent of the cases), a score of zero. The index thus ranges from zero to three. Fourteen per cent of the sample scored zero and 25 per cent scored one; more than 40 per cent achieved a score of two, and almost 20 per cent, a score of three. We will arbitrarily call that 61 per cent of the sample with scores of two or three highly knowledgeable about the crisis. As can be seen from Table 5.10, involvement in communication is strongly related to knowledge.

Only about one-third of those who did not give increased attention to any form of mass media and who did not talk much about Cuba scored high on the knowledge index, compared with

[8]The index was constructed by assigning scores of zero, one, or two to each dimension and adding scores.

seven in every ten of those who were actively participating in various processes of communication.

Before showing how interest in the Cuban crisis and knowledge of it are related to social status, we should point out how each is related to the course of the crisis. Knowledge of a major event is presumably cumulative. As more and more facts are transmitted through media of communication, we should find that more and more people are knowledgeable. Even those less interested in the event should know more about it in time. In contrast, interest in the crisis, and hence attentiveness to channels of communication, is not cumulative in the same sense. Since the crisis lessened markedly during the course of the field work, we should not find interest to be greater toward the end than toward the beginning; if anything, interest should decline over a period of time. The data bear out these expectations. Among those interviewed during the first two days, 51 per cent were highly knowledgeable about the crisis; in the next three days this proportion rose to 60 per cent and in the last four days it reached 65 per cent. Moreover, this pattern holds true for those of broad and narrow effective scope. With the passing of time, knowledge about the Cuban crisis increased in all status groups.

In contrast, interest, as measured by involvement in communications, did not increase for the sample as a whole between the earlier and later phases of the interviewing. In each time period, slightly less than half the respondents were highly involved in communications.[9]

Tables 5.11 and 5.12 demonstrate that people of higher status, those with broad effective scopes, were both more interested in the Cuban crisis and more knowledgeable about it.

In four of the five sets of comparisons shown in Table 5.11,

[9]It follows from these patterns that the relationship between interest in and knowledge of the Cuban crisis was particularly strong in the early days and decreased somewhat in the later stages, when even the less interested became more knowledgeable. The data also bear this out. Although the highly interested people were more knowledgeable at every period of the interviewing, their advantage over the less interested was most marked during the first few days. When the indices are dichotomized we find a difference in knowledge of nineteen percentage points between the more and less interested during the first two days and a difference of thirteen percentage points in the last four days.

the expected relationship holds. From the first column of percentages we learn that those with a higher level of education, income, and social status and those under fifty years of age were more involved in media of communication and so presumably more interested in the crisis than those with the characteristics indicative of a narrower effective scope. Moreover, these differences are exhibited at every stage of the interviewing, although they are particularly marked during the early uncertain period.

Although in the aggregate, date of interview is not related to this measure of interest, we now see that those with broad effective scope were most apt to report increased attention to channels of communication during the first two days; high status respondents interviewed later on showed less interest. In contrast, the level of interest of those with narrow effective scope tended to reach a peak after the first two days or else it remained the same throughout the interviewing period. It is as if those with a narrow scope have a slower reaction time.

The one exception to these patterns occurs when the sample

Table 5.11 Involvement in Communication by Selected Social Statuses and Date of Interview (Per Cent Highly Involved in Communication)

Status	Period of Interview			
	Total	First Two Days	Next Three Days	Last Four Days
Education				
High	56 (303)	68 (34)	49 (105)	58 (161)
Low	37 (242)	33 (42)	41 (102)	34 (96)
Income				
High	59 (321)	76 (34)	55 (109)	57 (174)
Low	33 (207)	29 (38)	34 (94)	34 (74)
SES				
High	60 (367)	72 (29)	51 (101)	63 (134)
Low	37 (247)	33 (45)	43 (90)	34 (111)
Age				
Under 50	58 (306)	62 (34)	58 (99)	57 (171)
Over 50	35 (238)	39 (41)	34 (108)	33 (87)
Sex				
Men	47 (278)	49 (35)	45 (92)	50 (151)
Women	48 (264)	49 (41)	47 (116)	48 (107)

is divided according to sex. Although we have assumed that men have greater effective scope than women, we now see that women were just as likely as men to have been interested in the crisis, at least to the extent of paying more attention than usual to channels of communication.

Table 5.12 shows the relationship between these status characteristics and knowledge of the Cuban crisis. Those with a broad effective scope were in every instance more knowledgeable about the Cuban crisis. Although women were as involved as men in processes of communication, the men, we now see, were better informed. These patterns are not explained by the tendency for higher status people to have been interviewed in the later stages when the general level of knowledge had increased, for in each time period they were apt to know more about the crisis than lower status respondents.

We said earlier that the course of the crisis revealed a pattern of declining worry among people with greater effective scope, and suggested as explanation their greater knowledge and waning

Table 5.12 Knowledge of Cuban Crisis by Selected Social Statuses and Date of Interview (Per Cent Highly Knowledgeable)

Status	Period of Interview			
	Total	First Two Days	Next Three Days	Last Four Days
Education				
High	74 (303)	65 (34)	77 (105)	73 (161)
Low	46 (240)	40 (42)	42 (102)	52 (96)
Income				
High	72 (321)	68 (34)	72 (109)	72 (174)
Low	47 (207)	42 (38)	48 (94)	47 (74)
SES				
High	68 (267)	62 (29)	71 (101)	72 (134)
Low	52 (247)	42 (45)	48 (90)	59 (111)
Age				
Under 50	71 (306)	56 (34)	75 (99)	73 (171)
Over 50	48 (238)	49 (41)	46 (108)	51 (87)
Sex				
Men	69 (278)	57 (35)	70 (92)	71 (151)
Women	53 (264)	46 (41)	53 (116)	56 (107)

interest after the critical period. The findings in Table 5.11 and 5.12 would seem to support this. But the hypothesis, however compelling, is not in keeping with the facts. A cross-tabulation of the indices of interest and knowledge with Cuban worry gives the first clue to its inadequacy. If interest and knowledge were the crucial mechanisms explaining the patterns in Table 5.9, we should find that interested and knowledgeable people were more worried than others during the uncertain days and less worried than the others toward the end. But from Table 5.13 we see that such people were more often worried than the others throughout the interviewing period.

Table 5.13 also shows that our measure of interest, communication activity, is more strongly associated with Cuban worry than is knowledge of the crisis. This suggests that the index of worry reflects interest in the crisis as well as fear. The interaction between interest and worry, and knowledge and worry, over a period of time, should also be noted. Those highly attentive to news media were particularly prone to worry during the uncertain days. Worry in this group decreased sharply in the next two periods. In contrast, those less attentive to news media show the same level of worry throughout the interviewing period. Both the highly knowledgeable and less informed show a decline in worry over the interviewing period, but, contrary to what we had

Table 5.13 Cuban Worry by Involvement in Communication and Knowledge of Crisis at Different Periods of Time (Per Cent Highly Worried)

Variable	Period of Interview			
	Total	First Two Days	Next Three Days	Last Four Days
Interest in media				
High	58 (259)	73 (37)	55 (95)	55 (127)
Low	41 (283)	41 (39)	43 (113)	40 (131)
Knowledge				
High	52 (332)	59 (39)	50 (125)	51 (168)
Low	45 (210)	54 (37)	47 (83)	40 (90)
N–NA 542				

expected, this trend is somewhat more marked among the less knowledgeable.

A full elaboration of the data of Table 5.13 requires the introduction of a fourth variable, the social characteristics of the respondents. In doing this, we reduce the base figures, and in some cases, the resulting percentages are not very reliable. Nevertheless, this more complicated analysis not only forces us to reject knowledge as the crucial mechanism, but also yields some rather strange results that deserve attention. For the sake of simplicity, we present these materials only for the index of socio-economic status; the patterns that show up here also appear with the other status characteristics. Furthermore, we focus only on the index of knowledge since it bears most directly on our speculations about the trend in worry among those of broad effective scope. The interaction of knowledge, socio-economic status, date of interview, and worry can be seen in Table 5.14.

Were knowledge the crucial mechanism explaining the decline in worry among the high socio-economic status respondents, we should find knowledgeable people on each status level showing less worry over the interview period, and those less informed, whatever their status, having similar proportions of worried people at each stage. Clearly this is not the case.

The highly knowledgeable, high socio-economic status respondents interviewed during the first two days were particularly worried. Such people interviewed later on were much less wor-

Table 5.14 Cuban Worry, by Date of Interview, Socio-Economic Status, and Knowledge of Crisis (Per Cent Highly Worried)

Period of Interviewing	Level of Knowledge				N–NA
	High		Low		
	High SES	Low SES	High SES	Low SES	
First two days	72 (18)	47 (19)	55 (11)	54 (26)	74
Next three days	49 (72)	49 (43)	55 (29)	47 (47)	191
Last four days	48 (96)	55 (66)	37 (38)	44 (45)	245
Total					510

ried. This pattern among the high status, knowledgeable respondents approximates what we would expect of people responding mainly to the changing character of the crisis. The less knowledgeable, high status respondents (third column) demonstrate a lesser degree of worry at the outset, but their concern, too, declines through the interviewing period. In this group, however, the break in worry occurs later, between the middle and the end of the interviewing. Less knowledgeable, low status respondents share with the well-informed, high socio-economic status group the pattern of decreasing worry, except that in this group the decline is not very marked.

The puzzling finding in Table 5.14 is the pattern shown by the highly knowledgeable, low status respondents (second column). Unlike the others, they show a tendency toward increased worry through the interviewing period. In spite of their knowledge about the crisis, they are the least worried group during the early uncertain period and the most worried toward the end. These same patterns are found when we consider income, education, and age. In every instance the knowledgeable, lower status group was more worried toward the end than toward the beginning of the survey, while all other groups show the pattern of declining worry. It is almost as if their feelings lag behind their knowledge.

With this baffling result we conclude the analysis of the social correlates of worry over the Cuban crisis. We have seen that people occupying positions characterized by a broad effective scope tended to be more interested in the crisis and more knowledgeable about it. Furthermore, they seemed to be most sensitive to the changing character of the international situation. During the early days, when the outcome was uncertain, they were particularly worried, and were progressively less worried as the crisis changed into a victory for the United States. This was especially true of the more knowledgeable people of higher status. In contrast, the worry of people of narrower effective scope did not lessen toward the end of the interviewing period. But when this group is further specified by level of knowledge, there are, as we have just learned, small but opposing trends: the less knowledgeable were somewhat less worried toward the

end, while the more knowledgeable became increasingly worried as the interviewing period proceeded.

We have learned that the impact of a major crisis such as the war scare in the fall of 1962 can vary among people, according to their location in the social structure. Higher status respondents appear to have been aroused more quickly and to have recovered more quickly than those of lower status, a phenomenon not explained by a greater interest in and knowledge of the international situation. At least these are the conclusions suggested if we can assume that the comparisons based on date of interview reflect a process through time rather than inexplicable personality differences between early and late respondents.

PSYCHOLOGICAL CORRELATES OF CUBAN WORRY

Now we return to the theme of the previous chapter, changes in feelings that might be attributed to the Cuban crisis. We already know that the respondents as a whole demonstrated little change in feelings between March and October. But what about the people who were, for whatever reasons, particularly concerned about the Cuban crisis? Did their feelings change in ways different from the others? As we shall see, the answer to this question is negative, for the most part. The worriers did not have feelings very different from the non-worriers, at least according to our measures of psychosomatic symptoms, positive and negative emotions, and assessments of happiness.

Cuban worry and symptoms of anxiety

At first glance it would seem that worry about the Cuban crisis raised the anxiety level of our respondents, for we find that Cuban worry is positively related to various symptoms of anxiety in October. These results are shown in Table 5.15.[10]

We must examine the March data before we can conclude that concern over the Cuban crisis led to these symptoms of anxiety,

[10]Although only the question about feelings of nervousness is taken from the battery of anxiety symptoms, the other items listed in Table 5.15, including the question about feeling depressed, which is part of the battery of negative feelings, can easily be interpreted as signs of anxiety.

for there is always the possibility that people who are anxious generally were more likely to be upset by the Cuban situation.

In testing this possibility we focus on the index of psychosomatic symptoms as our measure of anxiety. The trend data for low and high worriers are shown in Table 5.16. The October responses (second column) show a pattern similar to those in Table 5.15; symptoms are more prevalent among worriers than among non-worriers. But the same pattern was even more pronounced in March. Neither group manifests much of a trend, but symptoms increased somewhat among non-worriers, and they decreased slightly among worriers. These data cast a very different light on the previous results. The Cuban crisis did not produce

Table 5.15 Worry over Cuba and Selected Indicators of Anxiety

Responses in October	Cuban Worry	
	Low	High
Per cent reporting less sleep than usual	8	13
Per cent having trouble getting to sleep	36	46
Per cent reporting frequent feelings of nervousness	31	39
Per cent reporting having less energy than usual	21	30
Per cent feeling often depressed and very unhappy	14	21
N	279	268

Table 5.16 Trends in Psychosomatic Symptoms Presented Separately for Those Low and High on Cuban Worry (Per Cent High on Symptoms)

Cuban Worry	March	October	Percentage Difference
Low worry	35 (279)	39 (279)	+4
High worry	48 (268)	46 (268	−2
	N 547		

symptoms of anxiety; rather, consistent anxiety was heightened. This becomes more evident when the results are percentaged in the other direction, with symptoms in March as the independent variable and Cuban worry as the dependent variable. Having done this, we find that worry over Cuba increases from 42 per cent in the low symptom group to 44 per cent in the middle group to 57 per cent in the group high on symptoms in March.

Table 5.16 presents simple associations at two different points in time and does not show how initial level of symptoms and subsequent level of symptoms interact with Cuban worry. The interaction among these variables can be seen from Table 5.17, where level of anxiety in March is held constant.

Controlling for symptoms in March, we find that individuals highly worried about the Cuban crisis were not consistently more likely to have symptoms of anxiety in October than those who were not as worried. Among people whose initial anxiety level was low or medium, non-worriers exhibited more symptoms in October. Only among those initially high on symptoms do we find the worriers manifesting more symptoms in October, but even this difference is small. We can only conclude that, on the whole, worry over the Cuban crisis did not result in an increase in symptoms of anxiety.

Table 5.17 Cuban Worry, by Psychosomatic Symptoms in October, Holding Constant Level of Symptoms in March

Cuban Worry	Level of Symptoms in March					
	Low		Medium		High	
Symptoms in October	Per Cent Low	Per Cent High	Per Cent Low	Per Cent High	Per Cent Low	Per Cent High
Low	33	35	16	19	10	6
Medium	53	58	50	46	30	26
High	14	7	34	35	60	68
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total N 545	(63)	(45)	(117)	(93)	(97)	(130)

Cuban worry, positive and negative feelings, and happiness

In Chapter 4 we saw that experiences of gratifying emotions declined markedly between March and October and that negative feelings did not change much in the aggregate. Table 5.18 shows the trends in these feeling states among worriers and non-worriers.

Looking first at the March column of figures, we learn that the people who were worried over Cuba had both more positive and more negative feelings in March than the others. This is yet another indication of the psychological differences between worriers and non-worriers. In October, these differences tend to disappear. The trends indicate a greater loss in positive feelings for the worriers, a result suggesting an impact of the crisis, but neither group shows a trend in negative feelings.[11]

Table 5.19 presents the interaction of positive feelings in both March and October with worry over the Cuban crisis. The picture presented in Table 5.19 is more ambiguous than that shown

[11]When March positive feelings are treated as the independent variable we find a rather strong association with October worry. Only 37 per cent of those low in positive feelings were worriers compared with 51 per cent and 56 per cent of those in the middle and high groups, respectively. The pattern for negative feelings is more irregular. Those low and high in negative feelings in March were more likely to be worriers than those in the middle (49 per cent, 44 per cent, and 52 per cent, respectively).

Table 5.18 Trends in Positive and Negative Feelings Presented Separately for Those Scoring Low and High on Cuban Worry

Per Cent High On	Per Cent in March	Per Cent in October	Percentage Trend
Positive feelings			
Low worry	34	25	− 9
High worry	44	26	−18
Negative feelings			
Low worry	36	38	+ 2
High worry	42	42	0
	N 547		

by the trend data. Among those initially low on positive feelings, worriers were somewhat more likely than non-worriers to experience gratifying feelings in October. Among people initially in the middle group on positive feelings, worriers were more likely to have one positive feeling in October but less likely to have many such feelings. Only among those initially high on positive feelings do we find results conforming with our expectations. Here we see that the non-worriers more often retained their positive feelings in October; the worriers more often lost them.

The comparable results for negative feelings and worry are shown in Table 5.20. Although there were no trends in negative feelings among worriers and non-worriers, we now see that when initial level of negative feelings is held constant, some differences emerge between the two groups. No difference shows up among those low on negative feelings in March; among the initially medium group, worriers were slightly more prone to have one negative feeling in October, but they were less likely to have many. The big difference is seen among those who had many negative feelings in March. In this group the worriers retained

Table 5.19 Relation between Cuban Worry and Positive Feelings in October, Controlling for Positive Feelings in March

Positive Feelings in October	Positive Feelings in March					
	Low		Medium		High	
	Cuban Worry					
	Per Cent Low	Per Cent High	Per Cent Low	Per Cent High	Per Cent Low	Per Cent High
Low	56	50	43	38	13	28
Medium	36	38	40	49	38	29
High	8	12	17	13	49	43
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
N–NA 545	(95)	(56)	(89)	(93)	(93)	(119)

their negative feelings in October more often than did the non-worriers.

Turning now to the relationship between worry over the Cuban crisis and self-reports of happiness, we present first the trend data for worriers and non-worriers and then the association between worry and happiness, with initial reports of happiness held constant (Table 5.21).

The trend story varies depending upon which end of the happi-

Table 5.20 Cuban Worry and Negative Feelings in October, Controlling for Negative Feelings in March

Negative Feelings in October	Negative Feelings in March					
	Low		Medium		High	
	Cuban Worry					
	Per Cent Low	Per Cent High	Per Cent Low	Per Cent High	Per Cent Low	Per Cent High
Low	57	56	39	34	14	16
Medium	25	24	24	32	35	19
High	18	20	37	34	51	65
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
N–NA 547	(98)	(96)	(75)	(59)	(106)	(113)

Table 5.21 Trends in Happiness Presented Separately for Those Low and High on Cuban Worry

Variable	Per Cent in March	Per Cent in October	Percentage Distribution
Per cent "not too happy"			
Low worriers	18 (273)	13 (273)	−5
High worriers	14 (268)	12 (268)	−2
Per cent "very happy"			
Low worriers	24 (273)	25 (273)	+1
High worriers	22 (268)	29 (268)	+7

N–NA 541

ness scale we look at. We know that in the group as a whole happiness increased somewhat between March and October. We now see that those worried about the Cuban crisis were slightly less likely than the non-worried to move out of the "not too happy" category, but they were more likely to move into the "very happy" category.

The results when these variables are examined simultaneously appear in Table 5.22. Again the picture is ambiguous. The worried people who were very happy in March show a slightly greater shift toward unhappiness in October than the non-worried in this group; the worried who were initially unhappy were more likely to remain this way in October than their non-worried counterparts. These comparisons suggest that their happiness may have been depressed by worry over the international crisis. But among the initially "pretty happy" people—the largest group in the sample—worriers were more likely to have increased their happiness in October. On balance it would seem that worry over the Cuban crisis did not affect assessments of happiness very much.

Perhaps the safest conclusion to be drawn from these findings is that worry about Cuba was not an important determinant of

Table 5.22 Happiness and Cuban Worry, Controlling for Initial Level of Happiness

Happiness in October	Happiness in March					
	"Very Happy"		"Pretty Happy"		"Not Too Happy"	
	Cuban Worry					
	Per Cent Low	Per Cent High	Per Cent Low	Per Cent High	Per Cent Low	Per Cent High
"Very happy"	58	54	19	27	–	3
"Pretty happy"	39	42	73	68	59	45
"Not too happy"	3	3	8	5	41	53
Total	100	99	100	100	100	101
N–NA 541	(66)	(59)	(158)	(171)	(49)	(38)

the other kinds of feelings people were experiencing. To the extent that worry did have an effect, it seems to have been confined to those who had rather extreme feelings initially. Thus the worriers who had many positive feelings in March were more likely than their counterparts among the non-worriers to experience fewer in October; if the worriers had many negative feelings and psychosomatic symptoms in March, they were more likely than non-worriers to retain them in October; and they were also more prone to remain unhappy if this was their feeling in March.

There is an intimation in these materials that people with certain psychological predispositions were subject to worry about the Cuban crisis. We have seen that people who had many symptoms of anxiety and many positive feelings in March were more likely to be concerned. But these correlations must be approached with some caution. For one thing, neither the March readings on negative feelings nor happiness was related to Cuban worry. For another, when October measures of these various feelings are treated as independent variables, only one association stands out; a positive correlation between happiness and worry. (Some 54 per cent of the "very happy" people in October were worried about Cuba, compared with 48 per cent of the "pretty happy" and 41 per cent of the "not too happy" people.) Rather than seeking *ex post facto* interpretations for this strange array of findings, perhaps we should recognize that these correlations could arise merely by chance, the random by-products of a large number of cross-tabulations.

SUMMARY

We have tried in this chapter to measure the public's worry about the Cuban crisis and to show how this worry was distributed over the social structure. Apart from the tendency for older people to be less worried about Cuba and for women to be more worried than men, we found no simple correlations between social position and worry. But further specification indicated that people of higher status, those with a greater range of interests, were more likely to reflect the changing character of the crisis in the spectrum of their concern. As the international situation im-

proved their anxiety lessened, a tendency not shown by those of lower status. Our efforts to trace out the psychological consequences of the crisis have not been too successful. Even for those who were especially concerned about the crisis, we could find little evidence that their psychological state was particularly affected thereby.

6

Conclusions and Implications for Further Research

The foregoing chapters have presented an analysis of data collected in our pilot studies. Let us now consider some of the implications of these data for our future research on behavior related to mental health.

If our analysis has been correct, it is possible, utilizing survey methods in a large heterogeneous population, to measure in a meaningful way a dimension of happiness or psychological well-being. This possibility opens the way for longitudinal studies of changes in the level of well-being of the population as a whole, or of significant subsections of the population. The establishment of trend lines for psychologically relevant behavior ultimately would enable us to predict the effects of particular changes in social conditions, or in the life situations of individuals upon mental health or psychological well-being. While the instrument we have used in this study is in no sense a final product, it does look promising as a point of departure for further studies.

The analysis of our data has suggested a very important revision in our thinking about the dimensions of well-being. The establishment of two independent dimensions, each of which is related in approximately the same degree to happiness, but each of which is correlated with different aspects of a person's life, gives a promising theoretical explanation of some apparent paradoxes in the research findings on mental health, on one hand, and

on the other, points out areas of life which have been relatively neglected in research in this field.

The underlying hypothesis of the pilot study was that people living in communities varying in economic climate would show certain basic differences in their involvement in the environment around them, their role adjustment, and their sense of well-being. While we made no hard and fast predictions about the nature or extent of the differences, our expectations were certainly guided by various notions about positive mental health and the results of other research. In general, we expected people in economically depressed communities to manifest less happiness, more worry, less participation in community and social events and less interpersonal involvement, and to derive fewer satisfactions from life. Among people in prosperous communities, on the other hand, we expected to find more active engagement in the community, a greater sense of well-being, less tension in interpersonal relations, and more satisfactions out of life. While we were fairly confident that some differences between communities would result from their different social compositions, we also expected to find a contextual effect such that those living in the context of a depressed community would show certain depressive symptoms, whether or not they themselves were directly affected through threat of unemployment or reduced income.

Our data showed that indeed there were community differences, but that they were largely due to the direct impact of economic conditions on the life situation of individuals, and that, compared with the effects of unemployment or low income on happiness, the contextual effects were small and tended to be limited to the lower socio-economic groups who are most vulnerable to changes in economic conditions. It should also be noted that insofar as there were contextual effects, they tended to appear in factors related to positive satisfactions rather than in those related to negative feelings. The data suggest that the community variable is a much more complex one than we had at first anticipated and is worth more detailed exploration. Further investigation of community differences is being carried out at present.

In considering the implications of the results of the first part

of our study for future research, we see four main areas to be covered.

1. Replication of the basic findings regarding the independence of the two dimensions related to well-being and their correlates.—In particular, we need to obtain more complete data for women, to see whether the relationships we have formulated on the basis of data available only for men will hold also for women. We also need to investigate different types of populations, particularly those living in urban areas and those of more diverse ethnic, religious, and racial backgrounds.

2. Systematic investigation of the stability of the measures over time and the conditions which contribute toward their increase or decrease.—Toward this end it will be necessary to conduct a panel study in which changes in people's life situations can be correlated with changes in their sense of well-being. In the course of such an investigation, we will be able to determine to a considerable extent how variable people's life situations and feelings of well-being in fact are, and of what magnitude situational changes must be in order to bring about changes in our various measures. We also need to discover how variable these measures are in the absence of any changes in life situations.

3. Further investigation of the causes of positive feelings.—Past research, based on the assumption that positive feelings are merely the opposite of negative feelings, has concentrated chiefly on the more pathological elements of behavior which turned out to be related only to negative feelings. Future investigations should consider positive satisfactions derived from important roles, such as marriage, work, and parenthood, as well as from other possible sources of positive feelings, such as experiences that might raise self-esteem. That this will not be an easy task is suggested by a tendency, during the period of questionnaire development, for items to be cast more and more in negative rather than positive terms. The plain fact is that it is easier to ask people what is wrong in their lives and what troubles they are having than it is to ask what is right and what positive satisfactions they are experiencing.

4. Determination of which conditions produce changes in which aspects of these dimensions.—We have spoken in rather general terms about a person's life situation as a determinant of

his sense of well-being. It will be necessary, in order to make our measures more meaningful, to find out what conditions produce, for example, increases in anxiety, marital tension, or work dissatisfaction, and concomitant increases in negative feelings and, on the other hand, what factors influence social interaction and participation rates or such other things as may be found to be correlated with positive feelings. Once having developed a satisfactory series of measures, we will be in a better position to investigate systematically what the important changes in life situations are.

We will also be able to investigate the degree of generality that specific changes may have. For instance, do changes causing increased marital tension also have repercussions on work adjustment, anxiety, or behavior as a parent? In addition, we will be in a position to study the effects on the population as a whole of any large-scale stressful events, such as resumption of nuclear testing or an increase in international tensions or the effects of more localized events, such as the closing of a major industrial plant, a local political scandal or intergroup conflicts in a community. The study of reactions to the Cuban crisis should be viewed as experimental research; it is, to the best of our knowledge, the first attempt to investigate systematically the psychological impact of a national crisis. To be sure, there have been studies of reactions to crises, disasters, and other major unexpected events; they have always been limited to the period after the event. This study, in contrast, made use of the panel technique, interviewing the same people before and after the time of stress.

It is not surprising that such panel studies have not been done in the past. Crises, by definition, are unplanned, unexpected phenomena. Although it is relatively easy to set a study in motion after the event has occurred, it is impossible to anticipate such events and so obtain measurements shortly before they take place.[1] That we have data on the psychological states of our respondents before the Cuban crisis arose is no tribute to our fore-

[1]This is one of the reasons why NORC is developing a time series on the population's feeling states. If an annual inventory of feeling states existed for a ten- or twenty-year period, we would be in a better position to trace the impact of major events.

sight. These materials had been collected some months before in a pilot study designed to test our instrument. The ongoing research detoured momentarily to study the impact of the Cuban crisis. Needless to say, the design of this study leaves much to be desired. Its basic methodological weakness is the long period of time between the first interview and the reinterview. We have had to assume that the readings on feeling states obtained in March are a suitable baseline for assessing the impact of the crisis. This is a dubious assumption at best. It is quite possible that the results are contaminated by a seasonal effect, the difference between later winter and early spring on the one hand, and fall on the other. Ideally, we would have wanted the first wave of interviews to have taken place shortly before the crisis, probably in September.

The rapidly changing character of the Cuban crisis posed a second difficulty. Though we returned to the field quickly, we could not keep pace with the changing events. When the field work started the outcome of the crisis was most uncertain, but the bulk of the interviewing took place in a climate of great national relief and pride over a successful confrontation with the Soviet Union.

Both the long interval between waves and the changing objective situation during the second wave are reminders of the wide discrepancies between the conditions of our experimental study and the requirements of a carefully controlled field experiment. Furthermore, our sample was in no way representative of the national population. At best it is a sample of adults in small Midwestern cities. The rather ambiguous and inconclusive results of the study must be weighed in this context.

If the first wave of interviews had been held shortly before the crisis, and if the crisis itself had retained the same level of intensity throughout the period of the field work, our findings would indeed be newsworthy. The absence of major trends in feeling states would have forced a drastic revision of the popular image of what people experience during periods of national crises. Because of the many uncontrolled variables, our conclusions must be more tentative. And yet, in spite of the methodological shortcomings of the study, these findings have some value. We now

know that even during the early days of the field work, when the possibility of an all-out war was still great, most of our respondents were not burdened with symptoms of anxiety, were not so disturbed that they could not sleep, were not so overwhelmed that they could not experience pleasurable emotions, were not so distressed that they could not feel happy with themselves, and were not so preoccupied that they could think only of the Cuban situation. In short, if these feeling states are acutely affected by a war scare, we should have found major trends even though we cannot be certain that the preceding March was a typical period in the lives of our respondents. That we did not find such increases in anxiety-related behavior and feelings is thus evidence that the Cuban crisis did not have a major impact on the feelings of the people we interviewed.

But, although we did not uncover any marked effect of the Cuban crisis on feeling states, we cannot, on the basis of the evidence, say that there were no effects. We did find consistent decreases in the reporting of worries over personal problems in October, suggesting that the crisis might have taken people's minds off their own troubles. And we did find a consistent decline in the frequency of emotionally gratifying experiences. In fact, what is perhaps frustrating about our findings is that they were not wholly negative. Throughout the investigation there were tantalizing indications of some impact of the crisis on feelings. For example, in addition to the trends in worry topics and positive feelings, we found that reports of troubled sleeping and heavy smoking did increase somewhat in October. And although major trends did not show up when the results were specified by level of concern about the Cuban crisis (we might have expected marked changes in the feelings of worriers), we did find that worried people, who in March had experienced rather extreme emotions, were more likely than others to have feeling states in October more in keeping with the expected impact of a crisis. (For example, respondents with extreme feelings in March who were worried about the crisis in October were more likely to lose their positive feelings and to retain their negative feelings, anxiety symptoms, and feelings of unhappiness.)

Combining this finding with the finding that people who were

anxious in March were more likely to worry about the crisis suggests that the impact of the crisis may have been conditioned by personality characteristics of the respondents.

The analysis of the social patterning of worry about events in Cuba was both fruitful and frustrating. In the aggregate we found little association between social characteristics and worry. Specification by date of interview, however, revealed a characteristic patterning of worry among those occupying positions that create a greater effective scope. Such people, we found, were likely to have been quite worried during the first two days of the field work and progressively less worried as the objective threat diminished. This pattern was not evident among people with a narrower effective scope. We interpreted this finding as indicating differential sensitivity to national events according to varying locations in the social structure. But even this finding is not conclusive because we cannot be certain that the early interviewees were comparable to later interviewees of similar social status. Instead of indicating a course of worry during the cycle of the crisis, these findings might be the result of uncontrolled personality differences between early and late respondents. Moreover, assuming that our interpretation in terms of process is correct, we were unable to pinpoint the mechanisms that account for it. Varying degrees of knowledge about the current events were not, as we expected, the crucial factor.

Apart from the question of the psychological impact of the Cuban crisis, this study has some important implications for NORC's long-range program of research on mental health. The purpose of the initial pilot study was to develop reliable indicators of feeling states. As we have seen, there was a strong relationship between the respondents' reports of their feelings in March and in October. We now know, as a result of this small panel study, that our indicators are reliable; people did not answer our questions in a random fashion. At the same time, we found that the feeling states we are studying are not such deep-seated personality traits that they do not change in a relatively short period of time. In spite of the great consistency in response, we did find that many respondents underwent changes in their feelings over the eight-month period. Thus it becomes meaning-

ful to ask in future studies what environmental factors account for the increase and decrease in symptoms of anxiety, positive and negative emotions, and assessments of happiness.

Another important outcome of this study is that it demonstrates the value of the panel technique over the traditional survey. As we have seen, we would have been misled several times had we relied only on the October survey. Thus we found in Chapter 4 that date of interview was correlated with several areas of feelings, indicating a strong effect of the changing character of the crisis on feeling states. However, the same patterns showed up when the time of the October interview was related to feelings in the previous March. In Chapter 5 we found that worried people were more likely to be anxious in October than those who were less worried, suggesting that worry over the crisis created anxiety. But again we found a similar pattern in the March data and so were able to clarify the time order of the relationship.

Conclusions about whether the psychological impact of major crises is as small as this provisional study indicates must wait upon more carefully designed studies. At least we have made a beginning.

Appendix 1

Long Form Personal Interview

NORC
Survey Number 446
Confidential

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Long Form Personal Interview

Assignment Number _____ Case Number _____

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

RECORD OF CALLS

DATE	TIME	RESULTS
1st		
2nd		
3rd		

Notes:

HOUSEHOLD ENUMERATION AND SCREENING FORM

(INFORMATION MAY BE PROVIDED BY ANY ADULT RESIDENT OF THE HOUSEHOLD.)

1. How many people are living in this household? (Be sure to include all children living in the household, people temporarily away, roomers, etc.)

ENTER NUMBER ABOVE.

A. What is the name of the head? The next person? (ENTER NAMES IN COLUMN A OF THE HOUSEHOLD ENUMERATION TABLE.)

B. What is (his) (her) relation to the head? (ENTER RELATION IN COLUMN B.)

C. ENTER M FOR MALE OR F FOR FEMALE IN COLUMN C.

D. How old was (he) (she) on (his) (her) last birthday? (ENTER IN COLUMN D.)

E. What was the last grade (or year) of school (PERSON) completed? (ENTER IN COLUMN E.)

QUESTIONS F–I SHOULD BE ANSWERED ONLY FOR PERSONS 14 YEARS AND OLDER.

F. What is (PERSON'S) marital status? (ENTER IN COLUMN F.)

Never married . . NM Divorced . . . . . D
Married . . . . . M Separated . . . . . S
Widowed . . . . W Married, spouse absent but not estranged . MA

G. At the present time is (PERSON) working, looking for a job, or not working and not looking for work? (ENTER IN COLUMN G.)

Working . . . . . EMP
Looking for a job . UNEMP Not working and not looking . . NW

H. What kind of work (does PERSON) (did PERSON) do? (ENTER IN COLUMN H.)

I. What kind of business (is) (was) that? (What do they make, sell, etc?) (ENTER IN COLUMN I.)

Time begun _____

THE INTERVIEW

1. Thinking back over the last week (7 days)—for instance taking the things that happened to you and your family during the week and

HOUSEHOLD ENUMERATION TABLE

	Answer for Each Person in Household				Answer for Each Person 14 Years Old or Older			
Name (A)	Relation to Household Head (B)	Sex (C)	Age at Last Birthday (D)	Education Highest Grade (E)	Marital Status (F)	Employ-ment Status (G)	Occupation (H)	Industry (I)
1	Head							
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								

19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5

(For Office Use Only)

the things that happened at work and during your leisure time—would you say that it was an ordinary week or was it different from most weeks?

Ordinary	20–1
Different	2*

*IF "DIFFERENT," ASK A:

A. What was it that made it different?

21–
22–

---

2. One of the things we'd like to know is how people spend their time. For instance—are you a member of any clubs, organizations, or community groups?

Yes	23–1*
No	2

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B:

A. How many?

B. How many meetings did you go to last week? 24–

None	25–0
One	1
Two	2
Three	3
More than three (specify) _____	4

---

3. Were there any meetings held last week that you usually go to, but did not attend?

Yes	26–8*
No	9

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B:

A. What were they?

27–

B. Why didn't you go?

28–

---

4. Thinking of visits, telephone calls, or letters, were you in touch with any relatives last week (not counting any who live with you)?

Yes	29–1*
No	2

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B:

A. About how many?

30–

B. How many families was that?

31–

---

5. Now how about friends other than relatives? Did you get together with any friends—I mean things like going out together or visiting in each others' homes?

Not at all	32–0
Once	1
Twice	2
Three times	3
Four or more times (write number)_____	4

---

6. On the average last week, how many times a day did you chat with friends on the telephone?

None	33–4
Less than once a day	5
Once a day	6
Twice a day	7
Three times a day	8
Four or more times a day (write number)_____	9

---

7. Did you meet any people last week (other than those you meet in the course of your work) that you had never met before?

Yes	34–1
No	2

---

8. (During last week) what was the farthest distance you went from your home other than going to work? (Approximate number of miles one way.)

Did not leave house	35–0
Less than 1 mile	1
1–2.49 miles	2
2.50–4.9 miles	3
5.0–9.9 miles	4
10–24.9 miles	5
25–49.9 miles	6
50–99.9 miles	7
100–199.9 miles	8
200 or more miles	9

A. For what purpose did you go there?

36–
37–

---

9. A. What is your religious preference?

None	38–1*
Protestant	2†
Catholic	3
Jewish	4
Other (specify) _____	
_____	5

*IF "NONE," ASK 1.:

1. In what religion were you raised?

None	39–1
Protestant	2†
Catholic	3
Jewish	4
Other (specify) _____	
_____	5

†IF "PROTESTANT," ASK 2.:

2. What denomination?

40–
_____ 41–

ASK EVERYONE WITH CURRENT RELIGIOUS PREFERENCES:

B. How often have you attended church services or other church sponsored events during the last month?

_____ 42–

---

10. How religious would you say you are—very religious, somewhat religious, not very religious, or not at all religious?

Very religious	43–1
Somewhat religious	2
Not very religious	2
Not at all religious	4

---

11. Here are some things that people do. Would you tell me if you did any of them last week and, if so, about how often you did them? (HAND RESPONDENT CARD #1 [p. 143].)

---

12. Do you ever smoke or use tobacco?

Yes	54–1*
No	2

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B:

A. (During the past week) have you been smoking (using it) more or less than you normally do?

More	55–7*
Less	8
Same	9

B. How do you feel about (FORM OF TOBACCO R. USES)? Do you enjoy it, do you worry about it, or what?

Enjoy it	56–1
Worry about it	2
Would like to stop	3
Both enjoy and worry	4
Other (specify) _____	
_____	5

Activity		Not at All	Once	Several Times	Every Day	More Than Once a Day
A. Read a newspaper	44–	0	1	2	3	4
B. Go to the movies	45–	0	1	2	3	4
C. Listen to or watch a news program	46–	0	1	2	3	4
D. Participate in any games or sports activities such as bowling, basketball, hunting, fishing	47–	0	1	2	3	4
E. Go to watch any games or sports activities	48–	0	1	2	3	4
F. Make a bet or gamble	49–	0	1	2	3	4
G. Read your horoscope	50–	0	1	2	3	4
H. Go for a trip in the car	51–	0	1	2	3	4
I. Read the Bible	52–	0	1	2	3	4
J. Eat in a restaurant	53–	0	1	2	3	4

13. Do you ever take a drink (beer, whiskey, or any other alcoholic drink)?

Yes	57–1*
No	2†

*IF "YES," ASK A:
†IF "NO," SKIP TO Q. 15.

A. Did you take a drink last week?

Yes	58–5‡
No	6

‡IF "YES" TO A, ASK B–D:

B. About how many times (did you take a drink during the past week)?

Once or twice	59–1
Three–four times	2
Nearly every day	3
Once a day	4
Two times a day	5
Three or more times a day (specify) _____	6

C. Is that more or less often than usual?

More	60–1
Less	2
Same	3

D. (During the past week) was there any time (times) when you got high (got so that you were feeling no pain)?

Yes	61–5
No	6

---

14. How often do you drink (alcoholic beverages) at:

A. Your home?

Most often	62–1
Fairly often	2
Once in a while	3
Almost never	4

B. Friends' home?

Most often	63–6
Fairly often	7

Once in a while 8
Almost never 9

C. Restaurants/bars/clubs?

Most often 64–1
Fairly often 2
Once in a while 3
Almost never 4

---

15. About how many hours a day on the average did you watch television last week?

None 65–0
One hour/day or less . . . 1
Two hours/day 2
Three hours/day 3
Four hours/day 4
Five hours/day 5
More than five hours/day (write number) _____ 6

Now let's shift from things people do to some things people think about.

16. Everybody has some things he worries about more or less. Would you say you worry more now than you used to, or not as much?

More 66–1
About the same 2
Not as much 3
Never worry 4

---

17. What kinds of things do you worry about most?

67–

What else?

68–

---

18. Do you worry about such things a lot or not very much?

A lot 69–1
Not very much 2
Other (specify) _____ 3

---

19. Taking things all together, how would you say things are these days—would you say you're very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy these days?

Very happy	70–7
Pretty happy	8
Not too happy	9

20. Compared with your life today, how were things four or five years ago—were things happier for you then, not quite as happy, or what?

Happier	71–1
Not quite as happy	2
About the same	3
Other (specify) _____	
_____	4

BEGIN DECK II

21. We are interested in the way people are feeling these days. I am going to show you a card which describes some of the ways people feel at different times and you tell me whether you felt like that during the past week. (HAND RESPONDENT CARD #2.)

How about the first, during the past week did you ever feel:

Feeling		No	If "Yes," Ask: How Often Did You Feel That Way?		
			Once	Several Times	Often
A. On top of the world	5–	0	1	2	3
B. Very lonely or remote from other people	6–	3	2	1	0
C. Angry at something that usually wouldn't bother you	7–	3	2	1	0
D. That you couldn't do something because you just couldn't get going?	8–	3	2	1	0
E. Particularly excited or interested in something	9–	0	1	2	3
F. Depressed or very unhappy	10–	3	2	1	0
G. Pleased about having accomplished something	11–	0	1	2	3
H. Bored	12–	3	2	1	0
I. Proud because someone complimented you on something you had done	13–	0	1	2	3
J. So restless you couldn't sit long in a chair	14–	3	2	1	0
K. That you had more things to do than you could get done	15–	3	2	1	0
L. Vaguely uneasy about something without knowing why	16–	3	2	1	0

22. Now I'm going to read you several things that some people think about. Would you tell me which ones were on your mind during the past week?

Preoccupation		Not at All	Sometimes	Often
A. Money	17–	6	7	8
B. Growing old	18–	6	7	8
C. Work	19–	6	7	8
D. Marriage	20–	6	7	8
E. Getting ahead	21–	6	7	8
F. Bringing up children	22–	6	7	8
G. Death	23–	6	7	8
H. The atom bomb or fallout	24–	6	7	8
I. Personal enemies	25–	6	7	8
J. Health	26–	6	7	8
K. Other (specify)	27–	6	7	8

23. Some people when they are bothered by things like to talk it over with other people, such as their wife, relatives, neighbors, clergymen, or someone else. I'm going to read you several things that people sometimes talk to other people about and you tell me whether you talked to anyone about any of them during the past week.

Problem		No	If "Yes": Who Did You Talk To? (Anybody Else?)						
			Wife	Relative	Neighbor	Friend	Clergy	Professional — e.g., Doctor, Social Worker	Other (Specify)
A. Not having enough money	28–	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B. Something that happened at work	29–	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C. Ways to make money	30–	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
D. Health	31–	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
E. Bringing up children	32–	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
F. People you have trouble with	33–	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
G. Family problems	34–	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
H. Other (specify)	35–	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

24. Did anything happen last week that you felt you couldn't talk about to anyone?

Yes 36–1
No 2

25. Thinking of people (including relatives) whom you consider really good friends—that is people you feel free to talk with about personal things—would you say you have many, a few, or no such friends?

Many	37–5
A few	6
None	7

---

26. Do you feel you have as many friends as you want, or would you like to have more friends?

As many friends as wants	38–1
Would like more friends	2

---

27. Compared with your normal feelings, would you say that you had more energy or less energy during the past week?

More	39–1
Less	2
Same	3

---

28. (During the past week) have you found yourself eating more or less than you usually do?

More	40–5
Less	6
Same	7

---

29. Do you have any weight problems?

Overweight	41–1
Underweight	2
None	3

---

30. (During the past week) what time did you usually go to bed?

42–
43–

---

31. (During the past week) what time did you usually get up?

44–

---

32. Was the amount of sleep you got (during the past week) more or less than usual?

More	45–1
Less	2
Same	3

33. (Last week) did you have any trouble getting to sleep at night or getting up in the morning?

Trouble getting to sleep	46–6
Trouble getting up	7
Both	8
Neither	9

34. We've been talking about last week. Now, thinking back over the last year, what are the events of the year which have had the greatest effect on you and your family—for better or worse?

47–

What else?

48–

Now I would like to ask you some questions about your health.

35. Were you sick at any time during the past week?

Yes	49–1*
No	2

*IF "YES," ASK A:

A. Did it cause you to cut down on your usual activities?

Yes	50–5†
No	6

†IF "YES," ASK B:

B. In what way?

51–

36. Was anyone in your household sick last week?

Yes	52–1*
No	2

*IF "YES," ASK A–C:

A. Who was it? 53–

B. What was the matter? 54–

C. How did this affect your ordinary activities? 55–

---

37. Did you or anyone in your family consult a doctor of any kind during the past week (for any kind of problem)?

Yes 56–1*
No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A:

A. What was the reason for seeing him? 57–

---

38. Have you or anyone in your family ever consulted a doctor or anyone else in connection with a nervous or mental problem?

Yes 58–1*
No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B:

A. Who was it? 59–

B. Whom did you (they) go to? 60–

BEGIN DECK III

39. I am going to show you a sheet which tells about different troubles or complaints people sometimes have. For each one please tell me how often you were bothered by such a complaint during the past week. (HAND RESPONDENT CARD #3.)

Symptom		Not at All	One or Two Times	Several Times	Nearly All
A. Back pains	5–	0	1	2	3
B. Cold sweats	6–	0	1	2	3
C. Common cold	7–	0	1	2	3
D. Constipation	8–	0	1	2	3
E. Diarrhea	9–	0	1	2	3
F. Dizziness	10–	0	1	2	3
G. Fever	11–	0	1	2	3
H. General aches and pains	12–	0	1	2	3
I. Headaches	13–	0	1	2	3
J. Loss of appetite	14–	0	1	2	3
K. Muscle twitches or trembling	15–	0	1	2	3
L. Nervousness or tenseness	16–	0	1	2	3
M. Rapid heart beat	17–	0	1	2	3
N. Skin rashes	18–	0	1	2	3
O. Upset stomach	19–	0	1	2	3

40. Now I am going to show you a sheet which tells about some things that people sometimes take to preserve or improve their health. Please tell me how often during the past week you took each of the things listed. (HAND RESPONDENT CARD #4.)

Drug		Not at All	One or Two Times	Several Times	Every Day
A. Aspirin	20–	6	7	8	9
B. Health foods	21–	6	7	8	9
C. Iron supplements	22–	6	7	8	9
D. Laxatives	23–	6	7	8	9
E. Sleeping pills	24–	6	7	8	9
F. Stomach medicine (for indigestion)	25–	6	7	8	9
G. Tonics	26–	6	7	8	9
H. Tranquilizers (nerve medicine)	27–	6	7	8	9
I. Vitamins	28–	6	7	8	9
J. Dietary food for weight control	29–	6	7	8	9
K. Medicine prescribed by a physician	30–	6	7	8	9
L. Others (please specify)	31–	6	7	8	9

Now let's turn to another topic.

41. Are you married, single, widowed, divorced, or separated?

Married	32–1*
Never married	2†
Widowed	3‡
Divorced	4‡
Separated	5‡
Married, spouse absent	6‡

*IF "MARRIED," CONTINUE WITH Q. 42.
†IF "NEVER MARRIED," SKIP TO Q. 53.
‡IF "WIDOWED," "DIVORCED," "SEPARATED," OR "MARRIED BUT SPOUSE ABSENT," SKIP TO Q. 47.

42. Would you say that you spend quite a lot of time, a moderate amount of time, or relatively little time doing things together with your wife?

Quite a lot	33–1
Moderate amount	2
Little time	3

43. Did your wife do anything during the past week which particularly pleased you or made you happy?

Yes	34–5*
No	6

*IF "YES," ASK A:
A. What was it?

35–

---

44. Did your wife do anything (during the past week) which particularly bothered or upset you?

Yes	36–1*
No	2

*IF "YES," ASK A:
A. What was it?

37–

---

45. Here are some things husbands and wives often have differences of opinion about. Would you tell me which ones have been problems for you in your marriage and whether they caused any differences of opinion or problems during the past week? (HAND RESPONDENT CARD #5.)

Topic		Rarely Is a Problem	Is a Problem Sometimes but Not Last Week	Was a Problem Last Week
A. Time spent with friends	38–	0	1	2
B. How the house looks	39–	0	1	2
C. Household expenses	40–	0	1	2
D. Being tired	41–	0	1	2
E. Being away from home too much	42–	0	1	2
F. Disciplining children	43–	0	1	2
G. In-laws	44–	0	1	2
H. Not showing love	45–	0	1	2
I. Work	46–	0	1	2
J. How to spend leisure time	47–	0	1	2
K. Work around the house	48–	0	1	2
L. Religion	49–	0	1	2
M. Irritating personal habits	50–	0	1	2
N. Other (specify)	51–	0	1	2

46. Taking all things together, how would you describe your marriage; would you say that your marriage was very happy, a little happier than average, just about average, or not too happy?

Very happy	52–1
Little happier than average	2
Just about average	3
Not too happy	4

ASK EVERYONE WHO HAS EVER BEEN MARRIED:

47. A. When were you married (the last time)?

_____ year 53–
54–

B. Is (was) this your first marriage or have you been married before?

Married only once	55–1
Married more than once .	2

IF NO CHILDREN LIVING AT HOME:
FOR "MARRIED," SKIP TO Q. 60.
FOR "DIVORCED" AND "WIDOWED," SKIP TO Q. 53.
FOR "SEPARATED," SKIP TO Q. 54.
IF "CHILDREN LIVING AT HOME," CONTINUE WITH Q. 48.

48. Would you say that you spend quite a lot of time, a moderate amount of time, or relatively little time doing things with your child(ren)?

Quite a lot	56–5
Moderate amount	6
Relatively little	7

---

49. Did your child(ren) do anything during the past week that particularly pleased you or made you happy?

Yes	57–1*
No	2

*IF "YES," ASK A:
A. What was it?

58–

---

50. Did your child(ren) do anything during the past week that particularly bothered or upset you?

Yes 59–1*
No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A:
A. What was it?

60–

---

51. (During the past week) did you have any occasion to punish or discipline your children?

Yes 61–1*
No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B:
A. What had he (she, they) done?

62–

B. In what way did you punish or discipline him (her, them)?

63–

---

52. Many men feel that they're not as good fathers as they would like to be. Have you ever felt this way?

Yes 64–1*
No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B:
A. What kinds of things have made you feel this way?

65–

B. Have you felt this way a lot of times, or only once in a while?

Lots of times 66–1
One in a while 2

SKIP TO Q. 60.

BEGIN DECK IV

ASK "NEVER MARRIED," "DIVORCED," AND "WIDOWED":

53. Are you engaged?

Yes	5–1*
No	2†

*IF "YES," ASK A:

†IF "NO," ASK B:

A. When do you plan to get married? _____ 6–

B. Do you think you will be married in the next few years?

Yes	7–1
No	2

ASK "NEVER MARRIED," "DIVORCED," "SEPARATED," AND "WIDOWED":

54. (During the past week) did you go out on dates with anyone?

Yes	8–1*
No	2

*IF "YES," ASK A:

A. How often? _____ 9–

FOR "ENGAGED," SKIP TO Q. 56.

55. ASK "NOT ENGAGED": Is there any woman whom you date or see regularly?

Yes	10–1
No	2

---

56. What are some of the problems of living in this community as a single person?

11–

Anything else?

12–

---

57. Here are some things men and women often have differences of opinion about. Would you tell me which ones have been problems between you and your girlfriend (fiancée) and whether they caused any differences of opinion or problems during the past week? (HAND RESPONDENT CARD #6.)

Topic		Rarely Is a Problem	Is a Problem Sometimes but Not Last Week	Was a Problem Last Week
A. Friends	13–	0	1	2
B. Food	14–	0	1	2
C. Money	15–	0	1	2
D. Places you like to go	16–	0	1	2
E. Not showing love	17–	0	1	2
F. Work	18–	0	1	2
G. Parents	19–	0	1	2
H. Other women (men)	20–	0	1	2
I. Other (specify)	21–	0	1	2

58. Did anyone in your family (anyone you live with) do anything during the week which particularly pleased you or made you happy?

Yes 22–1*
No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A:
A. What was it?

23–

59. Did anyone in your family (anyone you live with) do anything during the week which particularly bothered or upset you?

Yes 24–1*
No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A:
A. What was it?

25–

ASK EVERYONE:

60. How often do you lose your temper—would you say that you lose it frequently, fairly often, not very often, or never?

Frequently 26–1*
Fairly often 2*
Not very often 3*
Never . . . . . 4†

*IF "LOSES TEMPER," ASK A:
†IF "NEVER," ASK B:

A. How do you feel after you have lost your temper?

27–

B. What do you do when something annoys you or makes you mad?

28–

---

61. Would you say that during the past week your family (others living with you) did more things or fewer things than usual that make you mad?

More things 29–1
Fewer things 2
Same 3

---

62. Did you feel that (during the past week) any members of your family (others living with you) were asking more of you than you were able to give?

Yes 30–5*
No 6

*IF "YES," ASK A:

A. In what way?

31–

---

63. Did you feel that (during the past week) any member of your family (others living with you) let you down? (Did not do what you felt you had a right to expect them to do?)

Yes 32–1*
No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A:

A. In what way?

33–

---

64. Has any member of your family (anyone who lives with you) acted (during the past week) in any way that led you to feel that he (she) was having a hard time or feeling very unhappy?

Yes 34–1*
No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A–C:

A. Who was it? _____ 35–

B. What was he (she) upset about?

36–
37–

C. How long has he (she) been acting this way? _____ 38–

And now I would like to ask you a few questions about your work.

NOTE: FOR ALL "EMPLOYED," Q's. 65–92.
FOR ALL "UNEMPLOYED" OR "LAID OFF" SKIP TO Q. 87.
FOR ALL OTHERS, SKIP TO Q. 106.

65. ASK ONLY IF SOMEONE OTHER THAN RESPONDENT COMPLETED HEF.
What is your present occupation? (What kind of work do you do?)

39–

---

66. How long have you (had your present job) (been in your present business)?

40–

---

67. Do you work for wages, salary, or are you self-employed?

Wages or salary 41–1
Self-employed 2

B. How many people are employed there?

_____ people 42–
43–

C. How many people do you work with? (Persons who are part of the group you work with or close to regularly.)

_____ people 44–
45–

---

68. A. How many hours a week does this job regularly call for (job worked last week)? (How many hours a week do you usually work—usually spend at your business?)

_____ hours 46–

B. How many hours did you work last week?

_____ hours 47–

C. About how long does it take you to get to work?

Less than 5 minutes	48–1
5–9.9 minutes	2
10–14.9 minutes	3
15–19.9 minutes	4
20–29.9 minutes	5
30–44.9 minutes	6
45–59.9 minutes	7
1 hour–1-1/2 hours	8
More than 1-1/2 hours . .	9
Does not apply—works out of home, at home	0

SKIP FOR "SELF-EMPLOYED":

D. What shift did you work last week?

_____ shift 49–

SKIP TO Q. 72 FOR "SELF-EMPLOYED."

69. Is this your regular line of work?

Yes	50–1
No	2*

*IF "NO," ASK A AND B:

A. What is your regular line of work?

51–

B. Why are you not currently working at this occupation?

52–
53–

---

70. Is this job considered permanent or temporary?

Permanent	54–1
Temporary	2*

*IF "TEMPORARY," ASK A:

A. How long do you expect it to last?

55–

---

71. How many weeks during the last year were you without work because of unemployment or lay-off?

_____ weeks 56–57–

ASK EVERYONE Q's. 72–83.

72. During the last week did you lose any time from work because of:

Reason		No	Yes	Amount of Time	Specific Reason
A. Sickness?	58–	0	1	59–	60–
B. Sickness in family?	61–	0	1	62–	63–
C. Private business?	64–	0	1	65–	66–
D. Other family obligation?	67–	0	1	68–	69–
E. Other reasons? (specify)	70–	0	1	71–	72–

BEGIN DECK V

73. Even though it did not cause you to lose time from your job (work, business) during the last week, were you bothered while you were working by:

Symptom		No	Yes
A. Headaches?	5–	0	1
B. Muscular or back pains?	6–	5	6
C. Digestive or bowel trouble?	7–	0	1
D. General feeling of tiredness?	8–	5	6
E. Other physical condition? (specify)	9–	0	1

74. Did you have any accidents on your job (while you were working) last week? (We are interested in even small, unimportant accidents.) Could you describe that?

10–

75. What (during the last week) did you enjoy most about your job (work)?

11–
12–

---

76. During this same period, what did you like least about your job (work)?

13–
14–

---

77. During that last week, would you say you were able to do your work better than usual or not as well as usual?

Better	15–1
Not as well	2
Same	3

---

78. How satisfied are you with:

Working Conditions		Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
A. Your present wage level?	16–	0	1	2	3
B. The kind of work you do?	17–	6	7	8	9
C. (DO NOT ASK SELF-EMPLOYED) Your boss or employer?	18–	0	1	2	3
D. Taking all things together, how do you feel about your job (work) (business) as a whole? Would you say you are:	19–	6	7	8	9

79. Do you think that you will be (working for the same company a year from now) (in your same business a year from now)?

Yes	20–1
No	2*

*IF "NO," ASK A:

A. Do you think you will be doing the same kind of work (will be in the same kind of business) a year from now?

Yes	21–5
No	6

---

80. What kinds of things do you think might occur that might cause you to (lose your present job) (give up or change your business)?

22–
23–

---

81. Considering the group of people you work with, would you say that you are very much a part of this group, not a part of the group—but they are not unfriendly—or that you don't get along with most of them?

Very much a part of the group	24–1
Not a part—but not unfriendly	2
Don't get along with most of them	3
Works alone	4

---

82. During the last week did you spend any time off the job (away from work) with any people from work?

Yes	25–6
No	7

---

83. During the last week did you have any disagreements or problems with anyone at work (either fellow workers, subordinates, or supervisors)?

Yes	26–1*
No	2

*IF "YES," ASK A:
A. What happened?

27–

SKIP TO Q. 88 FOR SELF-EMPLOYED.

84. During the last week did you get any particular praise or recognition for having done a really good job?

Yes	28–1*
No	2

*IF "YES," ASK A:
A. What happened?

29–

---

85. (During the last week) did anyone criticize or complain about your work?

Yes	30–1*
No	2

*IF "YES," ASK A:

A. What happened?

31–

---

86. (During the last week) has the company you work for done anything that you would consider unfair or unjust?

Yes	32–1*
No	2

*IF "YES," ASK A:

A. What?

33–

ASK EVERYONE EXCEPT SELF-EMPLOYED:

87. Do you belong to a union?

Yes	34–1*
No	2

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B:

A. Have you participated in any union activities during the past three months?

Yes	35–5
No	6

B. What are your feelings about the union—would you say it is doing a good job, a fair job, a poor job, or would you rather there be no union?

Good	36–1
Fair	2
Poor	3
No union	4

ASK EVERYONE:

88. Do you feel that your present job (work, business) (regular line of work) really uses all your skills or talents?

Yes	37–6
No	7

---

89. Do you feel that your present job (work, business) (regular line of work) is (was) too demanding or takes too much out of you?

Yes	38–1
No	2

---

90. Have you gone as far as you can in your present line of work?

Yes	39–1
No	2*

*IF "NO," ASK A:

A. What are the chances for advancement in your work (business)—good, fair, or poor?

Good	40–7
Fair	8
Poor	9

---

91. During the last week have you found yourself wishing that you had started in a different line of work?

Yes	41–1
No	2

---

92. A. What was the first regular, full-time job you had? (What kind of work did you do?)

42–

B. How old were you at the time?

43–
44–

C. Between that one and your present (last) job, how many different jobs have you held?

45–

ASK "UNEMPLOYED" OR "LAID OFF" Q's. 93–105: ALL OTHERS SKIP TO Q. 106.

93. How long has it been since you were last employed?

46–
47–

---

94. What kind of job was that? (What were you doing?)

48–

---

95. What kind of company or business did you work for?

49–

---

96. Was this last job in your regular line of work?

Yes 50–1
No 2*

*IF "NO," ASK A:

A. What is your regular line of work?

51–

---

97. How many weeks during the last year (including your present period of unemployment) have you been without work either because of unemployment or lay-off?

_____ weeks 52–53–

---

98. Are you currently looking for a job?

Yes 54–1*
No . . . . . 2†

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B:
†IF "NO," ASK C AND THEN SKIP TO Q. 102:

A. What kinds of work have you looked for?

55–
56–

B. How have you gone about looking for a job?

57–

C. Why haven't you looked for a new job?

58–

---

99. How many times during the last week have you gone out looking for a job?

_____ times 59–

---

100. Have any health problems interfered with your attempts at getting a job?

Yes 60–1
No 2

---

101. Do you feel that any kind of discrimination or unfair practice has hindered you in getting a job?

Yes 61–5*
No 6

*IF "YES," ASK A:

A. Can you explain? Could you describe the situation?

62–

---

102. If you were offered a less skilled job at a pay rate lower than your old job, would you accept it?

Yes 63–1*
No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A:

A. What kind of job would you accept? (How much lower pay, how much lower in skills?)

64–

---

103. During the last week, what kinds of things did you do during the time that you normally would be working?

65–
66–

---

104. Are you presently collecting unemployment compensation?

Yes 67–1*
No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B:

A. How much longer will you be covered by compensation?

68–

B. In the event that you are not re-employed when this occurs, what do you expect to live on?

69–

---

105. During the last month did any of your total family income come from any of the following sources?

Source		No	If "Yes," Ask: What Proportion Came from (Source)—Would You Say A:		
			Small Amount	Great Deal	Almost All
A. Unemployment compensation	70–	1	2	3	4
B. Wages of others in family	71–	6	7	8	9
C. Relief payments	72–	1	2	3	4
D. Borrowed funds	73–	6	7	8	9
E. Savings	74–	1	2	3	4
F. Other (specify)	75–	6	7	8	9

Now, I'd like to talk a bit about (NAME OF COMMUNITY).

BEGIN DECK VI

106. How long have you lived in (PRESENT COMMUNITY)?

Less than 1 year	5–1
1–less than 3 years	2
3–less than 5 years	3
5–less than 10 years . . .	4
10–less than 15 years . . .	5
15–less than 20 years . . .	6
20–less than 30 years . . .	7
30 years and over	8

107. What do you think is the "biggest" thing that happened to (NAME OF COMMUNITY) in the last year? (Either good or bad.)

6–
7–

108. What do you think is the biggest problem that (NAME OF COMMUNITY) has to face currently?

8–
9–

(IF ANY PROBLEM MENTIONED, ASK A–D:)

A. What or who do you think was the cause of this problem?

10–
11–

B. As things stand, do you think this will get better or worse during the next few months?

Better 12–1
Worse 2

C. What do you think ought to be done?

13–
14–

D. (IF NOT CLEAR FROM C ABOVE:) Who do you think should have major responsibility for handling this problem?

15–

---

109. I would like to know how you feel about each of the following statements. For example, do you agree or disagree that:

Statement		Agree	Disagree	Don't Know
A. Most of the important decisions in (NAME OF COMMUNITY) are made by a small group of people who are on "the inside"	16–	1	2	3
B. There have been so many changes in (NAME OF COMMUNITY) that it is hardly the same (town) (city)	17–	5	6	7
C. Most people in (NAME OF COMMUNITY) really care about what happens to the community	18–	1	2	3
D. (NAME OF COMMUNITY) is no place for a young man just starting out	19–	5	6	7
E. It is better to live in a small town than in a big city	20–	1	2	3

110. A. If you could freely choose what community you lived in, where would you want to live?

21–
22–

B. What is it about (COMMUNITY GIVEN ABOVE) that makes you feel that way?

23–
24–

111. Have you recently given any thought to moving away from (NAME OF COMMUNITY)?

Yes 25–1*
No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B:

A. Do you want to move from (NAME OF COMMUNITY)?

Yes 26–5
No 6

B. Do you expect or plan to move?

Yes 27–1
No 2

Finally, I would like to ask you a few questions about your own background.

112. Where were you born?

28–
_____ 29–

IF U.S., GET STATE:

30–
_____ 31–

(DO NOT ASK A AND B IF FOREIGN BORN.)

A. Where were your parents born?

32–
Mother _____ 33–
34–
Father _____ 35–

IF EITHER PARENT BORN IN U.S., ASK B:

B. What country (countries) did your mother's/father's people originally come from?

36–
Mother _____ 37–
38–
Father _____ 39–

---

113. Did you always live together with both of your real parents up to the time you were 16 years old?

Yes 40–1
No 2*

*IF "NO," ASK A AND B:
A. What happened?

_____ 41–

B. How old were you when it happened?

_____ years 42–

IF STEP-PARENT IS NOT MENTIONED, ASK C:
C. Did your mother (father) remarry?

Yes . . . . . 43–1†
No 2

†IF "YES," ASK D AND E:
D. How old were you when your mother (father) remarried?

_____ years 44–

E. How well did you get along with your stepfather (stepmother)?

45–

---

114. What kind of work did your father (or stepfather) do for a living while you were growing up?

46–

---

115. Were you brought up mostly on a farm, in a town, in a small city, or a large city?

Farm 47–1
Town 2
Small city 3
Large city 4

---

116. About what do you think your total income from all sources will be this year for yourself and your immediate family? (HAND RESPONDENT INCOME CARD.)

48–
_____ 49–

END OF INTERVIEW

I. Time interview ended: _____ A.M. / P.M.

II. Total length of interview _____ (50) hr. and _____ (51–52) min.

III. Was anyone else present during any part of the interview?

Yes	53–1*
No	2

*If "YES":
Who was it?

Wife	54–5
Child(ren)	6
Parent	7
Other (specify) _____	8

IV. In general, what was the respondent's attitude toward the interview?

Friendly and eager	55–1
Co-operative but not particularly eager	2
Indifferent and bored	3
Hostile	4

V. Rate the respondent's use of grammar:

Speaks English correctly, makes few mistakes in grammar	56–7
Speaks English with rather frequent use of idioms that are not grammatical	8

VI. Rate respondent's behavior during the interview:

Nervous	57–1
Fidgety	2
Sporadic nervousness	3
Mostly relaxed	4

VII. Rate respondent's alertness and estimated intelligence:

Dull, uncomprehending . .	58–6
Slow, needs explaining . .	7
Average intelligence	8
Above average intelligence	9

VIII. Type of dwelling:

Single-family, detached . .	59–0
Single-family, attached . .	1
2 units	2
3 units	3
4–6 units	4
7–9 units	5
10 units or more	6
Other (specify) _____ _____	7

Appendix 2

Short-Form Questionnaire: Study of Modern Living

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER

University of Chicago
5720 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois

Dear Friend:

National Opinion Research Center, a non-profit research organization connected with the University of Chicago, is conducting a survey of modern living.

You are one of 5,000 people in the United States who have been chosen by scientific sampling methods to participate in this study.

The research will provide important information on the problems which people face in their everyday life.

The questionnaire takes about 15 minutes or so to fill out. Please answer the questions as frankly and accurately as you can. We are interested in *your* answers so please do not discuss the questions with anyone until you have completed the questionnaire. Your answers will be absolutely confidential, and no person's answers will be revealed in the reports, which will be based on statistical summaries.

Almost all of the questions can be answered by drawing a circle

around one or more numbers on the right hand side of the page. For example:

Which statement best describes where you live now? (Circle one.)

I live in Missouri 1
I live in Illinois . . . . . ②
I live in Indiana 3

NOTE: After each question there are instructions in parentheses. Please follow these instructions closely as they are very important for data processing.

A. If it says "(Circle one)," draw a circle around only the one number which *best describes* your answer, even though one or more other answers might be partly correct.
B. If it says "(Circle one for each statement)," please look to see that you have circled one and only one number for each statement.
C. If it says "(Write number)," please write the number clearly in the space provided.

Please do not write in the space to the right of the black line. The numbers there are for office use only.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Norman Bradburn
Study Director

Survey 446
1962

STUDY OF MODERN LIVING

Do not write in this space

Name_____ Sex (Circle one) Male . . . . . 1 (10) Y
Female 2

Address_____ Age (Write Number)____ (11)(14) Y Y
Number and Street City State

How many people live in this household? _____ Adults and _____ Children
(Write Number) (Write Number)

(8) Y (9) Y

Marital Status
(Circle one)
Single . . . . . 1 (13) Y
Married 2
Widowed 3
Divorced 4
Separated 5

Please answer the following for anyone besides yourself age 20 or older living in your household.

Name	Age	Sex	Relation to you
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

Do not write in this space

ACTIVITIES

1. How many organizations, clubs, and community groups do you belong to (such as Am. Vets., unions, Eastern Star, P.T.A., or other groups)? (Write Number) ____ (14)(15) Y Y

2. The following is a list of things people do. Please indicate how often you did each of them *last week.*

Last Week How Often Did You	(Circle One Number for Each Activity)					
	Not at All	Once	Several Times	Every Day	More Than Once a Day	
A. Read a newspaper?	0	1	2	3	4	(16) Y
B. Go to the movies?	0	1	2	3	4	(17) Y
C. Listen to or watch a news program?	0	1	2	3	4	(18) Y
D. Participate in any games or sports activities such as bowling, basketball, hunting, fishing?	0	1	2	3	4	(19) Y
E. Go to watch any games or sports activities?	0	1	2	3	4	(20) Y
F. Make a bet or gamble?	0	1	2	3	4	(21) Y
G. Read your horoscope?	0	1	2	3	4	(22) Y
H. Go for a trip in the car?	0	1	2	3	4	(23) Y
I. Read the Bible?	0	1	2	3	4	(24) Y
J. Eat in a restaurant?	0	1	2	3	4	(25) Y

3. We are interested in the way people are feeling these days. The following list describes some of the ways people feel at different times. Please indicate how often you felt each way during the *last week.*

Do not write in this space

How Often Last Week Did You Feel	(Circle One Number for Each Feeling)				
	Not at All	Once	Several Times	Often	
A. On top of the world?	0	1	2	3	(26) Y
B. Very lonely or remote from other people?	0	1	2	3	(27) Y
C. Angry at something that usually wouldn't bother you?	0	1	2	3	(28) Y
D. That you couldn't do something because you just couldn't get going?	0	1	2	3	(29) Y
E. Particularly excited or interested in something?	0	1	2	3	(30) Y
F. Depressed or very unhappy?	0	1	2	3	(31) Y
G. Pleased about having accomplished something?	0	1	2	3	(32) Y
H. Bored?	0	1	2	3	(33) Y
I. Proud because someone complimented you on something you had done?	0	1	2	3	(34) Y
J. So restless you couldn't sit long in a chair?	0	1	2	3	(35) Y
K. That you had more things to do than you could get done?	0	1	2	3	(36) Y
L. Vaguely uneasy about something without knowing why?	0	1	2	3	(37) Y

4. The following list describes several things people sometimes think about. Please indicate how often each thing was on your mind *last week.*

Last Week How Often Did You Think About	(Circle One Number for Each Thing)			Do not write in this space
	Not at All	Sometimes	Often	
A. Money?	0	1	2	(38) Y
B. Growing old?	0	1	2	(39) Y
C. Work?	0	1	2	(40) Y
D. Marriage?	0	1	2	(41) Y
E. Getting ahead?	0	1	2	(42) Y
F. Bringing up children?	0	1	2	(43) Y
G. Death?	0	1	2	(44) Y
H. The atom bomb or fallout?	0	1	2	(45) Y
I. Personal enemies?	0	1	2	(46) Y
J. Health?	0	1	2	(47) Y

5. Taking all things together, how would you say things are these days – would you say you're *very happy, pretty happy,* or *not too happy*?

(Circle one)

Very happy 1
Pretty happy . . . 2
Not too happy . . . 3

(48) Y

6. Compared with your life today, how were things 4 – 5 years ago – were you *happier, not quite as happy,* or *about the same* as now?

(Circle one)

Happier 7
Not quite as happy 8
About the same . . 9

(49) 6

7. Please indicate whether the following statements are *true* for *you* or not.

Statement	(Circle One Number for Each Statement)			Do not write in this space
	Not True for Me	Somewhat True for Me	True for Me	
A. I have as many friends as I want.	0	1	2	(50) Y
B. I lose my temper frequently.	0	1	2	(51) Y
C. I have trouble getting to sleep at night.	0	1	2	(52) Y
D. I get along with people easily.	0	1	2	(53) Y
E. My family asks more of me than I am able to give.	0	1	2	(54) Y
F. I want my children to be like me.	0	1	2	(55) Y
G. I do not have any trouble keeping my weight down.	0	1	2	(56) Y
H. I would like to move away from this community.	0	1	2	(57) Y
I. I participate actively in community affairs.	0	1	2	(58) Y
J. ANSWER ONLY IF YOU HAVE CHILDREN: I am not as good a parent as I would like to be.	0	1	2	(59) Y

8. We would like to know how you feel about each of the following statements.

Do You Agree or Disagree That	(Circle One Number for Each Statement)			
	Disagree	Agree	Don't Know	
A. Most of the important decisions in this community are made by a small group of people who are on the "inside."	0	1	2	(60) Y
B. There have been so many changes in this community that it is hardly the same town.	0	1	2	(61) Y
C. Most people in this community really care about what happens to the community.	0	1	2	(62) Y
D. This community is no place for a young man just starting out.	0	1	2	(63) Y
E. It is better to live in a small town than a big city.	0	1	2	(64) Y

HEALTH

Do not write in this space

BEGIN DECK II

9. How Often Last Week Did You Take	(Circle One Number for Each Remedy)				
	Not at All	One or Two Times	Several Times	Every Day	
A. Aspirin?	0	1	2	3	(6) Y
B. Health foods?	0	1	2	3	(7) Y
C. Iron supplements?	0	1	2	3	(8) Y
D. Laxatives?	0	1	2	3	(9) Y
E. Sleeping pills?	0	1	2	3	(10) Y
F. Stomach medicine (for indigestion)?	0	1	2	3	(11) Y
G. Tonics?	0	1	2	3	(12) Y
H. Nerve medicine (tranquilizers)?	0	1	2	3	(13) Y
I. Dietary food for weight control?	0	1	2	3	(14) Y
J. Other medicines prescribed by a physician?	0	1	2	3	(15) Y

10. How Often Last Week Did You Have	(Circle One Number for Each Complaint)				Do not write in this space
	Not at All	One or Two Times	Several Times	Nearly All the Time	
A. Back pains?	0	1	2	3	(16) Y
B. Cold sweats?	0	1	2	3	(17) Y
C. Common cold?	0	1	2	3	(18) Y
D. Constipation?	0	1	2	3	(19) Y
E. Diarrhea?	0	1	2	2	(20) Y
F. Dizziness?	0	1	2	3	(21) Y
G. Fever?	0	1	2	3	(22) Y
H. General aches and pains?	0	1	2	3	(23) Y
I. Headaches?	0	1	2	3	(24) Y
J. Loss of appetite?	0	1	2	3	(25) Y
K. Muscle twitches or trembling?	0	1	2	3	(26) Y
L. Nervousness or tenseness?	0	1	2	3	(27) Y
M. Rapid heart beat?	0	1	2	3	(28) Y
N. Skin rashes?	0	1	2	3	(29) Y
O. Upset stomach?	0	1	2	3	(30) Y

11. Were you sick at any time during the past week?

(Circle one)

Yes . . . . . 1 (31) Y

No 2

If you were sick, did it cause you to cut down on your usual activities?

(Circle one)

Yes 6 (32) 5

No 7

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Do not write in this space

12. Which statement best describes your employment status?

(Circle one)

Employed	1
Self-employed . . .	2
Unemployed or laid-off	3
Retired	4
Part-time worker .	5
Not working and not looking for a job	6

(33) Y

13. What kind of work do you usually do? (Write name of job)

_____

(34)(35) Y Y

14. ANSWER THIS QUESTION ONLY IF YOU ARE CURRENTLY WORKING.

A. How satisfied are you with your present wage level?

(Circle one)

Very satisfied . . .	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Somewhat dissatisfied	3
Very dissatisfied . .	4

(36) Y

B. How satisfied are you with the kind of work you do?

(Circle one)

Very satisfied . . .	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Somewhat dissatisfied	3
Very dissatisfied	4

(37) Y

C. Taking all things together, how do you feel about your job (work) as a whole?

Do not write in this space

(Circle one)

Very satisfied . . . 1
Somewhat satisfied 2
Somewhat dissatisfied 3
Very dissatisfied . 4

(38) Y

D. Do you feel that your present job (work) really uses all your skill or talents?

Yes 6
No 7

(39) 5

15. ANSWER THIS QUESTION ONLY IF YOU ARE UNEMPLOYED AND LOOKING FOR WORK.

A. How many weeks during the *last year* have you been without work because of unemployment or lay-off?

(Write Number)_____weeks

(40)(41) Y Y

B. Do you feel that any kind of discrimination or unfair practice has kept you from getting a job?

(Circle one)

Yes 1
No 2

(42) Y

C. Are you currently collecting unemployment compensation?

(Circle one)

Yes 6
No 7

(43) Y

Do not write in this space

16. Please indicate how much education you have had.

(Circle one)

8th grade or less	1	(44) Y
Part high school	2	
High school graduate	3	
Part college	4	
College graduate or more	5	

17. What is your religious preference?

(Circle one)

Protestant	1	(45) Y
Roman Catholic	2	
Jewish	3	
Other	4	
None	5	

18. About what do you think your *total family income from all sources* will be this year for yourself and your immediate family?

(Circle one)

Less than $1,000	0	(46) Y
$1,000 – $1,999	1	
$2,000 – $2,999	2	
$3,000 – $3,999	3	
$4,000 – $4,999	4	
$5,000 – $5,999	5	
$6,000 – $6,999	6	
$7,000 – $7,999	7	
$8,000 – $9,999	8	
$10,000 and over	9	

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

Appendix 3

Questions on the Cuban Crisis

Now, to close out the interview, I'd like to ask you some questions about the Cuban situation that has been in the news recently.

43. Do you remember how you first learned about President Kennedy's actions with regard to Cuba?

IF PRESIDENT'S BROADCAST SPEECH NOT MENTIONED:
Did you happen to hear his address to the nation (APPROPRIATE NUMBER) days ago when he first described the situation?

Yes 1
No 2

---

44. In your opinion, what was happening in Cuba that led the President to take action?

---

45. As you understand it, what kinds of action has the President taken and is he prepared to take in dealing with the situation?

---

46. What is your opinion of the President's actions with regard to Cuba? On the whole, do you approve or disapprove of them?

Approve 1
Disapprove 2
No opinion 3

---

47. Would you yourself have preferred the President to have taken a different course of action?

Yes 5*
No 6

*IF "YES," ASK A:
A. What kind of action would you have preferred?

---

48. Think back now to when you first heard about the President's proposals regarding Cuba. At the time, some people felt relieved because they expected something even more drastic. Others were disturbed to find that things had gotten that bad. Which of these is closest to how you felt when you first heard about the President's proposals?

Felt relieved, expected worse . 1
Felt disturbed, things were so bad 2
No feelings one way or the other 3

---

49. Some people, when they first learned about the President's actions, were glad because our country was taking such firm action. Others were very worried and thought his proposals were unnecessarily risky. Which comes closest to the way you felt at the time?

Glad, firm action 5
Very worried, unnecessarily risky 6
No feelings one way or other . . 7

---

50. Compared with how you felt when you first heard the news, how do you feel about the situation today? Are you more worried about the situation now, less worried, or about the same?

More worried now 1
Less worried now 2
About the same 3

---

51. In the last week or so, have there been any changes in your activities as a result of the Cuban situation? For example, is there anything that you did or did not do because of it?

Yes 1*
No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A:
A. What was that?

---

52. In the past week or so, have you spent a lot of time talking about the Cuban situation, some time, or hardly any time?

A lot of time 1
Some time 2
Hardly any 3

A. Who have you talked to about it? (CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY.)

Family 5
Relatives 6
Friends 7
Co-workers 8
Others 9

B. Are most people you've talked to very worried about the situation, or not particularly worried?

Very worried 1
Not particularly worried 2

C. Did it make you feel better or worse to talk to these people?

Better 7
Worse 8
No difference 9

D. Do the people you've talked to feel the same way as you do about the situation, or do they feel different?

Same 1
Different 2
Some same, some different . . . 3

---

53. Do you feel that the newspapers, radio, and television have been paying too much attention to the Cuban situation or not enough attention to it?

Too much 7
Not enough 8
Right amount 9

---

54. Did you happen to hear or see any special programs on the Cuban situation in the last week or so?

Yes 1*
No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A:
A. Which ones were they?

55. During the past week or so, did you listen to your radio more often than usual, less often, or about the same?

More often 7
Less often 8
Same 9

---

56. How about television? Did you watch it more often, less often, or about the same (in the past week or so)?

More often 1
Less often 2
Same 3

---

57. In the last ten days or so have you spent more time reading newspapers, less, or about the same?

More time 7
Less time 8
Same 9

---

58. What do you think is going to happen as a result of the Cuban situation?

---

59. A. Do you think that the chances of war between the United States and Russia have increased or decreased because of the Cuban situation?

Increased 1
Decreased 2
Don't know 3

B. Do you think there will be a war within the next few years?

Yes 1
No 2

---

60. Suppose a war did break out. In your opinion whose fault would it be?

---

61. If a war did break out, how would it affect you personally?

---

62. A. During World War II and the Korean War, how seriously were you and your family affected personally—very much affected, fairly much affected, not personally affected?

Very much affected 1*
Fairly affected 2*
Not personally affected 3

*IF "AFFECTED," ASK B:

B. In what ways?

C. When voting, do you consider yourself a Democrat, a Republican, or what?

Democrat 5
Republican 6
Other 7

Now we would like to ask you a few questions about your background. (FOR MALES ONLY)

63. Did you ever serve in the armed forces?

Yes 1*
No 2

*IF "YES," ASK A AND B:

A. In what years did you serve?

B. Were you ever in combat?

Yes 8
No 9

---

64. What's your present status relative to the armed forces? Are you eligible for the draft, in the reserves, the National Guard, or are you ineligible for military service?

Eligible for draft 1
In reserves 2
In National Guard 3
Ineligible 4

---

65. How old were you on your last birthday?

---

66. How much education have you had?

8th grade or less 1
Part high school 2
High school graduate 3
Part college 4
College graduate or more 5

67. What is your religious preference?

Protestant 1
Roman Catholic 2
Jewish 3
Other 4
None 5

References

BOVARD, E. W. 1959. "The Effects of Social Stimuli on the Response to Stress," *Psychological Review,* LXVI, 267–77.

———. 1962. "The Balance Between Negative and Positive Brain System Activity," *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine,* VI, 116–27.

CUMMING, ELAINE, and HENRY, W. E. 1961. *Growing Old: The Process of Disengagement.* New York: Basic Books.

DURKHEIM, E. 1951. *Suicide.* Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

EISENBERG, P., and LAZARSFELD, P. F. 1938. "The Psychological Effects of Unemployment," *Psychological Bulletin,* XXXV, 358–90.

GURIN, G., VEROFF, J., and FELD, S. 1960*a*. *Americans View Their Mental Health.* New York: Basic Books.

———. 1960*b*. *Tabular Supplement to "Americans View Their Mental Health."* Ann Arbor, Mich.: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.

HERZBERG, F., and HAMLIN, R. M. 1961. "A Motivation-Hygiene Concept of Mental Health," *Mental Hygiene,* XLV, 394–401.

HERZBERG, F., MAUSNER, B., and SNYDERMAN, B. 1959. *The Motivation to Work.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

HOMANS, G. 1961. *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms.* New York: Harcourt, Brace.

JAHODA, M. 1958. *Current Concepts of Positive Mental Health.* New York: Basic Books.

KOMAROVSKY, M. 1940. *The Unemployed Man and His Family.* New York: Dryden Press.

LENSKI, G. 1954. "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Stratification," *American Sociological Review,* XIX, 405–13.

MACMILLAN, A. M. 1957. "The Health Opinion Survey: A Technique for Estimating Prevalence of Psychoneurotic and Related Types of Disorder in Communities," *Psychological Reports,* III, 325–39.

MURRAY, H. A. 1938. *Explorations in Personality.* New York: Oxford University Press.

SROLE, L., LANGNER, T. S., MICHAEL, S. T., OPLER, M. K., and RENNIE, T. A. C. 1962. *Mental Health in the Metropolis.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

STOUFFER, S. A., LUMSDAINE, A. A., LUMSDAINE, M. H., WILLIAMS, R. M., SMITH, M. B., JANIS, I. L., STAR, S. A., and COTTRELL, L. S. 1949. *Studies in Social Psychology in World War II, Vol. IV: Measurement and Prediction.* Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.

Index

ABOUT NORC

The National Opinion Research Center is a general social research institute, founded in 1941 and affiliated with the University of Chicago since 1947. The research activities of the Center are financed through grants from and contracts with private foundations, government agencies, and universities.

Staff members of the Center are skilled social scientists, many of whom also hold appointments in the Division of Social Sciences at the University. The Center maintains a part-time national interviewing staff and has the capability of conducting surveys on a wide variety of topics using samples of populations, organizations, and institutions.

Recent studies of the Center include surveys of household medical care costs, occupational prestige, popular reactions to dramatic public events (e.g., the assassination of President Kennedy), participation in adult educational activities, and the effects on adult Catholics of attendance at Catholic schools.

NORC is a not-for-profit corporation governed by a Board of Trustees chosen from among prominent social scientists and laymen interested in social research.

National Opinion Research Center
5720 Woodlawn Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637