

ICPSR 26841

**Midlife in the United States
(MIDUS 2): Daily Stress
Project, 2004-2009**

Carol D. Ryff
University of Wisconsin-Madison

David M. Almeida
Pennsylvania State University

Interviewer Manual

Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
www.icpsr.umich.edu

Terms of Use

The terms of use for this study can be found at:
<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/cocoon/ICPSR/TERMS/26841.xml>

Information about Copyrighted Content

Some instruments administered as part of this study may contain in whole or substantially in part contents from copyrighted instruments. Reproductions of the instruments are provided as documentation for the analysis of the data associated with this collection. Restrictions on "fair use" apply to all copyrighted content. More information about the reproduction of copyrighted works by educators and librarians is available from the United States Copyright Office.

NOTICE

WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.



MIDUS Project 2:

National Study of *Daily Experiences*

Wave 2: Daily Inventory of Stressful Events (DISE): Interviewer Manual

For file: M2_P2_DAILY DATA_7-14-09.sav

July 14, 2009

Address correspondence to David M. Almeida, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, The Pennsylvania State University, 114-H Henderson Building, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802 (email: dalmeida@psu.edu). This project was supported by the Network on Successful Mid-Life Development of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and Grants R01 AG19239 and P01 AG0210166-02, from the National Institutes of Health.

National Study of Daily Experiences

**Wave 2: Daily Inventory of Stressful Events (DISE):
Interviewer Manual**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page Number
I. Introduction	3
II. Background on "Life Events" and "Contextual Threat".....	5
III. Probing – A General Overview	
A. Maintaining a Conversational Tone.....	7
B. The "Flow" of Probing.....	8
C. Objective Aspects of Events & Incidents vs. Perceptions of Stress.....	9
Under-reporting and Over-reporting.....	9
D. Probing for Clarity and Severity.....	10
IV. Probing – Some Examples Using the Pre-test Material	
A. Examples	12
V. Exercises	18
VI. References.....	22

INTRODUCTION

The Daily Experiences Study Interview is an interview designed to elicit reports of daily stressors. This interview is based on several sources. One of the most important is the Structured Life Event Interview (SLI: Wethington, Brown, & Kessler, 1995). The SLI, in turn, is based on the open-ended, semi-structured Life Events and Difficulties Schedule (LEDS: Brown & Harris, 1978). The LEDS has been in use for over 20 years in England, Europe, Canada and Africa.

The LEDS uses interviewing techniques very different from those used in conventional American survey interviews. The Daily Experiences Interview is much briefer and more structured than the LEDS, but it also requires mastering interview techniques that differ significantly from the average American survey interview.

The Daily Experiences Study stress measure consists of a series of 7 open-ended questions about daily events:

1. Did you have an argument or disagreement with anyone since this time yesterday?
2. Since this time yesterday, did anything happen that you **COULD** have argued about, but you decided to **LET PASS** in order to **AVOID** a disagreement?
3. Since this time yesterday, did anything happen at work or school that most people would consider stressful?
4. Since this time yesterday, did anything happen at home that most people would consider stressful?
5. Many people experience discrimination on the basis of such things as race, sex, or age. Did anything like this happen to you since this time yesterday?
6. Since this time yesterday, did anything happen to a close friend or relative that turned out to be stressful for **YOU**?
7. Did anything **ELSE** happen to you since this time yesterday that most people would consider stressful?

The purpose of these 7 open-ended questions is to obtain information that enables us to estimate the contextual threat of any event a respondent reports. We discuss what we mean by "contextual threat" in more detail in the next section.

In order to obtain the kind of objective information necessary for coding, interviewers are instructed to probe some of the responses in an extemporaneous, conversational manner – that is, to follow the lead of suggested probe questions, but not necessarily read a series of structured probe

questions verbatim from the interview schedule. It is important to be able to taylor the questions for individual situations and for individual respondents.

This training manual concentrates on:

1. Understanding the basic ideas and principles that underlie rating the "contextual threat" of daily life events. This is to facilitate your understanding of the kind of information we hope to elicit from the respondents.
2. Probing for objective information about the event, in contrast to R's emotional reaction to it, which may over- or under-state the objective severity.
3. Learning to recognize the individual, contextual factors that may increase the severity of a particular event.¹

¹ For the purpose of this study, "daily life events" and "incidents" are interchangeable.

BACKGROUND ON LIFE EVENTS AND THE IDEA OF "CONTEXTUAL THREAT"

This study takes an "environmental" approach to studying stress. We are interested in the interaction between external stressors (what happens to people in their lives) and the impact these have on people's mental and physical well-being.

A problem in stress research is the difficulty in developing measures that avoid conflating the experience of an event with an individual's reaction to that event – in being able to separate out the internal from the external (the environment). Asking people to tell you about an experience they found upsetting or distressing is, by definition, asking them to identify what happened to them in terms of how it affected them. As a result, it is difficult to know whether you are examining the event itself or the emotional response. This ambiguity creates difficulties in interpreting variations across people – in explaining different outcomes. In order to make sense of differences between individuals' levels of stress, we need to separate out people's responses to an experience from the actual experience.

One of Harris and Brown's (the developers of the LEDS) main contributions to this debate is the importance they give to contextual meaning – to the individual, social and cultural context of an event which give it meaning. This focus on context incorporates two levels of meaning, the broader social or cultural context in which an event occurs (i.e., the difference between the meanings attached to the pregnancy of an unmarried woman in Ireland versus the United States) **and** the context of the event in the individual's life – in other words, the specific background against which an event occurs (for example, being the victim of a break-in when your house and household possessions are insured versus uninsured and you don't have the income to replace what is stolen). The LEDS takes both of these levels of meaning into account. It does this by employing a measurement of "what one can expect the average person in that particular set of biographical circumstances to feel."

Brown and Harris do this by relying on highly trained interviewers and raters – investigators who make judgments of a "person's likely response in terms of an assessment of his or her plans and concerns" (pg. 9, Life Events and Illness; 1989). There is, therefore, a "commitment on the part of the investigator to explore the likely significance of an event for those involved in terms of their role identities or lives as a whole" (pg. 14, Life Events and Illness).

There are several key components to this methodology:

- 1) Obtaining a detailed description of events – as a way to understand the meaning of the event in an individual's life and to understand the broader consequences an event may have for the individual. For example, if the event is a move: is the move planned or enforced? Does it mean moving away from friends? Is it a result of a financial difficulty? Will it lead to a financial difficulty? This kind of information obviously has consequences on an individual's reaction to this event and on how it affects him or her.

- 2) Measuring the event according to a number of dimensions – one of the most important being "threat." According to the LEDS, "threat" = "the degree of undesirability or unpleasantness

of events – the degree to which they threaten the physical or emotional well-being of the individual."

Other important dimensions of the event, which are particularly relevant to our study, are:

Loss

Danger

Disappointment

We also incorporate a measure to describe events that, while they may be stressful, also include positive characteristics:

Opportunity

We are not able to get detailed information relating to the specific, "biographical circumstances" of each individual we interview in the way that we can in a LEDS interview. However, we are still able to get an adequate amount of information to use these measurements broadly. Given that, for the most part, we hear about more mundane and ordinary events, achieving the same kind of specificity is less crucial.

Contextual threat:

Threat is the uncertainty and anticipation of difficulty surrounding the consequences of an event. An important dimension of threat is "unpleasantness" or the severity of negative feelings expected to arise from experiencing such a threat.

The assessment of contextual threat of a given event takes into account background information about the respondent and the anticipated consequences of the event.

Therefore, the rating is not determined by what an event is, but by how threatening it is.

PROBING

The Daily Experiences Study consists of several different types of questions:

1. Standard survey questions, to be read exactly as written.
2. Standard daily stressor questions, to be read exactly as written.
3. "Free" probes after daily stressor "stem" questions, to be tailored to individual events and respondents.

A. Maintaining a Conversational Tone

Establishing good rapport with the respondent is the basis for getting high quality data. For this particular interview, facilitate good rapport by maintaining an interaction that reproduces some of the more sensitive and diplomatic qualities of successful conversation with someone you are just getting to know. This is particularly salient when engaging in "free" probing, but also when R has already volunteered information that you are going to be asking about later.

Here are some helpful hints:

1) Be sensitive about reading verbatim questions that will refer to information you already know. Respondents may get impatient ("I told you that already!") or experience unnecessary hurt (see section 2, below). Read the question but apologize for going over the same ground again; thank R for being patient and cooperative.

2) Remember that the free probing option allows you to be very sensitive in raising issues that the respondent may find hurtful or redundant. Asking a woman whether her day was disrupted by having her computer crash, when she has just explained that it crashed in the middle of big deadlines, is an example of a needlessly redundant question (the answer is obvious).

3) Some of the issues you may encounter – homosexual relationships, drug use, criminal activity, violence – are stigmatized by society at large. Handle such revelations using skills consistent with your professional interview training. It is not appropriate to communicate in any way to the respondent that you are uncomfortable with such activity.

4) Although this interview allows you to be much more conversational than a traditional survey instrument, remember it is still **very important** to give neutral feedback. It can be appropriate to respond sympathetically to something a Respondent has told you when it is **clear** that they were distressed or upset. However, be careful and cautious in this. It is most appropriate to use neutral phrases that **acknowledge** that you have heard what the Respondent said or that you appreciate that they have shared this information with us. [For example, even the simple phrase, "thank you for sharing that information with us. We really appreciate it."]

B. The "Flow" of Probing

After R has indicated that an event fitting the stem question description has occurred, you begin probing the event. Many of the probes are standardized in the interview. Thus, you are to read them exactly as written. Others are "free" and require you to probe in a more extemporaneous, conversational style.

No matter what the style of probing requested, though, probing tends to follow a consistent "flow." We describe the different parts of this flow below, with some explanations about why we seek this material.

1. Establish the objective content of the event. In ALL instances, we need evidence that some objectively verifiable event has occurred in the environment. We want to know as much as possible about the objective, concrete specificity of the event.

Respondents may report a **general condition** that is stressful for them such as living with a husband who has Alzheimer's, living with a husband who is an alcoholic, chronic tension they have with a supervisor, etc. However, we are concerned with stressors that occurred only on that day. If R reports a general tension or difficulty they have, be sure to refocus them. One way to do this is to ask: "What in particular happened today about that?" or "Did something like that happen today?"

2. Probe for clarity. Try to make sure the description the Respondent gives you answers the following questions:

a. Did an actual, objective event happen? Or, was there an ongoing challenge, threat, or demand from the environment or from someone else that elicited a response from the R?
Examples of useful probes are:

- 1) Was there a particular event or crisis associated with this situation?
- 2) Was there a specific event that led to (this situation/you feeling this way)?

You should probe in order to estimate the implication of an event or incident for important plans, concerns, and purposes held by the respondent, taking into account the disruptiveness and lack of preparation for the event or incident. This boils down to directing your probes to determining whether the event derailed important plans or intentions.

As introduced in the previous chapter, accurate coding/rating may require some extra probing on your part, particularly if the situation seems to be very unusual. There will also be instances when the R does not volunteer sufficient information to understand the meaning of the event or it is vague and nonspecific.

C. Objective Aspects of Events & Incidents vs. Perceptions of Stress

It is important at all times to distinguish the objective threat of a situation from R's report of how threatening or stressful the situation was. In general, objective threat and R's report of threat will be very similar. However, there are some instances, in which you will notice that R is under- or over-reporting the severity of an event. It is very important to understand these situations, so that you do not let it influence your rating.

Under-reporting and over-reporting

Under-reporting. It is possible for a respondent to report a situation, which constitutes a severe or high moderate threat from a common-sense point of view, but also to deny that it posed any particular problem to him ("no big deal"). This seems to be more likely to happen under certain circumstances:

1. R's health problems, particularly if the disease is threatening. For example, a person who is recovering from cancer must have periodic tests, and research among cancer survivors suggests that the anticipation of the yearly tests is objectively stressful. However, the R may be coping with the continued threat of recurrence by stoic control of his or her emotional reactions.

2. Men are much less verbal (and research has shown, somewhat less accurate) reporting their children's health and school problems. Beware of vague descriptions of child problems from men.

Over-reporting. A respondent may also report an intense emotional response to an event that may seem objectively to be minor or "no big deal."

The important focus of the interview is on obtaining objective information.

D. Probing for Clarity and Severity

We have tried to make it more likely for you to get objective information you need right off the bat, by writing questions that are as objective as possible.

Here are a few things to avoid when probing for clarity and severity.

1. Avoid asking R how "s/he felt" at that time. This question tends to sidetrack respondents from the objective things that happened. Instead, ask for "an example of that."

2. Also avoid asking R whether she was "emotionally upset" at the time. This will give you a report of symptoms, not the problem that caused them.

Here are some hints for getting the respondent to report objective information:

1. Ask for "examples" – for example, if the event is an argument, you might ask, "Could you give me an example of what was said?"

2. Repeating the stem question sometimes really helps people who are way off the track in their response.

3. We discovered in pilot and practice interviews that the phrase, "Was there a particular event that brought this on?", was extremely useful and to the point. When you feel R is not being very specific, try this one early.

Guidelines for Probes to Use:

1. Did you have an argument or disagreement with anyone since this time yesterday?

Argument:

Could you tell me a little bit more about that?
Could you tell me a little about the background to that?
What about this was stressful for YOU (if anything)?
What kinds of things were said? Did either of you swear/shout?
What happened in particular today about that?
How severe was the argument? How long did it last?
Could you give me an example of what you mean by that?

2. Since this time yesterday, did anything happen that you COULD have argued about but you decided to LET PASS in order to AVOID a disagreement?

Avoided Argument:

What happened in particular today?
Can you give me an example of what you mean by that?
Could you tell me a little more about that?
Could you tell me a little about the background to that?
What about this was stressful for YOU (if anything)?

3. Since this time yesterday, did anything happen at work or school that most people would consider stressful?

Work:

[If conflict with co-worker/supervisor]: What specifically happened today?
[If complaints made by co-worker]: What kinds of things were said?

General Probes:

Can you give me an example of what you mean by that?
What happened in particular today about that?
Could you tell me a little more about that?
Could you tell me a little more about the background to that?
What about this was stressful for YOU?

[If Health Problem or Accident]:

What does the doctor say?
What are the future health implications?

PROBING – SOME EXAMPLES USING EXAMPLES FROM NSDE WAVE 1

This chapter contains events from the pretest with some suggestions for how these could be probed. During the pretest, we asked only the stem questions as they are written in the questionnaire: e.g., "Did you have an argument or disagreement with anyone since this time yesterday?"; "Who did you have this argument/disagreement with?"; "What happened?" The verbatim transcripts of the responses to these questions are below. In the suggestions, for "free probes" written underneath, you will notice that the most frequently suggested probe is "Could you tell me a little bit more about that?" The focus in all probes, however, is on trying to get at as much objective information as possible, in order to determine whether there was anything remarkable about the event that would influence its severity (e.g., to distinguish between routine frustrations and frustrations that might have broader, more significant consequences).

A. Examples

18884

(Avoided Argument): sister

"My son is sick and she was supposed to take him to the doctors and decided that he didn't need to go. And I just didn't want to cause hard feelings. So, I just didn't want to say anything to her. You know, if he needs to go, I'll just take him tomorrow... Well, it was very [stressful] because I was very worried about my son all day. [R is stranded without a vehicle]."

- a) What was your son sick with?
- b) What did your sister say to you about this?
or Do you know why she was unable to take him?
- c) Will it be difficult for you to take him to the doctors yourself?

Stakes [Ones to which R said "yes"]:

The way you feel about yourself:

a little

The way other people feel about you:

a lot

The health or well-being of someone you care about:

a little

For all "stakes" questions, probe any affirmative answer (affirmative = "a lot", "some", "a little") with "Could you tell me a little bit more about that?" And, if necessary, follow it with "How did this event affect the?"

18884

(Argument): son

“Well, my son and I aren't getting along too well today. He's a four-year old boy and he's miserable. He's doing stuff that's aggravating me that he knows he's not supposed to do and stuff. I haven't had him all week, so, you know...Well, I get very stressed out from it.”

a) Could you tell me a little bit more about that?

23123

(Argument): Co-worker

“Oh, I just needed a particular resource and they weren't inclined to give it to me at the time I wanted it. And, uh, I had to persuade them to get that resource. [not very stressful]”

a) Could you tell me a little bit more about that?

b) How was the resource related to your work?

c) How would not getting the resource affect your work?

(Avoided Argument): Customer

“Okay. Well, it's a situation we're in sort of sales service disagreement with a particular customer, and the customer is not all that sophisticated in a particular area, and was making a point based on information that was not necessarily true. Not that the customer was misrepresenting the truth, but just didn't know. At the time, it would not have been beneficial to point that out. [somewhat stressful] A lack of control would reflect poorly on myself.”

a) Could you tell me a little bit more about that?

b) How does this affect your job? Does it put your job or finances at risk?

c) What does this disagreement mean for the future or for your future relationship with this customer?

Stakes:

Daily routine:

A lot

Financial situation:

A lot

The way you feel about yourself:

Some

The way other people feel about you:

A lot

Your physical health or safety:

A little

The health or well-being of someone you care about:

A little

Your plans for the future:

A lot

Again, for all "stakes" questions, probe any affirmative answer (affirmative = "a lot", "some", "a little") with "Could you tell me a little bit more about that?" and, if necessary, "How did this event affect the?"

23123

(Work):

“I had to deliver my business plan for the next month. Which is pretty much telling the business unit how much revenue you're going to bring in, and why, and when.”

a) Were there any surprises involved in this?

b) Did you expect it to be well-received? (How did you expect it to be received?)

c) Have you had any problems with this in the past?

Stakes:

Daily Routine:

A lot

Financial Situation:

A lot

The way you feel about yourself:

A lot

The way other people feel about you:

A lot

Physical health or safety:

A little

Plans for the future:

A lot

23123

(Argument): Co-Worker

“Part of my job is working with a dealer network, and the dealer networks sell our product, and they always want to get a better cut on the product price, and I always have to say "no," or at least say "no" for a long time and say "yes" towards the end. So, that's usually what the argument's about. [how stressful?] Oh not very. It's kind of fun actually.”

a) Was there anything out of the ordinary in this?

23123

(Avoided argument): Boss

“I needed a price concession and it wasn't a very big one and thought I should get it. But, it was so insignificant that it wasn't a big enough battle, so it was one choose the right battle situations.”

a) Why didn't you get the concession?

b) Do you work on commission?

c) What do these price concessions mean to your work?

(Work):

“[gets a phone call on another line in the middle of our interview] Another stressful situation as we speak. Oh, customers wanting specific delivery on a product that's kind of outrageous. I get that a couple of times a day usually. Today it was very stressful, because it was a customer that we were trying to start a relationship with, and when you don't have the product, you can't really say they can have it next week.”

a) Is it likely they'll take their business elsewhere?

b) What impact does this have on you specifically in terms of your job or finances?

23123

(Anything else):

“Part of one of the situations I deal with is trying to get a certain product line out to a certain dealership, and they put a lot of pressure on me to get these delivery times, and I have to keep pushing them back. So, it's kind of one of those things where each time you have to push them back, the tension increases and they have specific numbers they have to meet to the company which I work for, that they can't meet, so they obviously get kind of angry about it.”

a) (Again,) What impact does this have on you specifically?

b) Any potential risk to you or your job?

c) What is likely to happen if you tell them their delivery times are unrealistic?

23123

(Argument): Co-worker

“Co-worker wanted to make a visit to a customer and I didn't think it was a wise idea, and we had a chat. We got into an argument about it. [not very stressful].”

- a) Could you tell me a little bit more about that?**
- b) Why didn't you want your co-worker to make the visit?**

30123

(Event to other stressful for R): Friend

“I was talking to a friend today who has cancer. I already knew they did. But it's just more poignant when you're talking and, you know, hearing. He asked me to go to a healing service. He's very, very sick. I guess sometimes I just hope that they aren't that sick and then when you talk to them again and you realize he is. So, I guess, whenever I speak to him, it makes me very sad. Even though I know it's happening every day.”

- a) How often do you see or speak to this friend?**
- or Is this a close friend?**
- or How involved have you been in his sickness?**

29423

(Disagreement): Spouse

“Just about driving... I get real nervous when he drives fast and tailgates, and I try to get him to stop and he wouldn't. [How stressful?] Very. My stomach gets tied up in knots. I think [it's a risk to my physical health and safety].”

- a) Can you give me an example of what you said and how he responded?**
- b) Does he seem angry?**

(Avoided Disagreement): Spouse

“It's the same thing [as disagreement]. I try to hold it in and not say anything because it doesn't do any good.”

29423

(Disagreement): Spouse

“Well, it was just, there's all these problems since we came from our trip and he just hollers at me to do everything and it's like he's taking everything out on me. And, I just get mad back. [financial situation] well, that's what it was kind of all about. Money problems. We came home and found one of our rental houses empty and unheated and it's freezing and aaaaagh! And a camper that we left to get fixed cost \$1000 to get fixed and we didn't think it was going to cost that much. Just a bunch of financial problems but I don't – the disagreement...”

- a) Can you give me an example of what was said?**

29423

(Avoided Disagreement): Spouse

“Oh, when the phone bill, and I opened up the phone bill and there's all these calls that he made that I would ordinarily make a big deal about because we agreed that he wasn't going to do these things and making all these motorcycle calls. And, I looked at it and I got mad and then I thought, he's already mad enough! I'm not going to bring it up. [physical health?] Well, if I'd of brought it up, he might have got really, really mad. A little.”

In this case, I would have probed the "stakes" questions. R responded to the "How much did it risk your physical health or safety" question by saying "Well, Maybe a little. He was very mad".

If you felt comfortable doing this, you might try to probe that answer.

25223

(Work) (3 1/2 minutes):

“Well, I don't know about most people, I did [find it stressful]. Well, they just told me I had to work overtime and I wasn't planning on working it. Some of the things they do where I work is a little bit uncalled for; they could have got by without making me work overtime and so on. But, that was okay. I call it red-ass – when you plan on getting home and they come up to you and you got to stay for an hour on something that could have been avoided.”

a) What kind of things do they do at work that are uncalled for?

b) (And I would have paid special attention to how he answered the "stakes" question about "disrupt your daily routine" or "plans". I would have made sure to follow that up).

25223

(Argument) (3 1/2 minutes):

“My supervisor where I work, they, uh, I don't think they do things quite like they should be done and it's costing the company I work for more money than it should. I just disagree. I've been there 27 years and I've got some long-hand experience on the stuff I work on, and I guess you could call it stressful a bit. It kind of gets your blood pressure up sometimes [So, who was the disagreement with?] It was with one of my supervisors.”

a) Could you tell me a little bit more about that?

b) Is it unusual for you to argue with your supervisor? (What normally happens when you do?)

EXERCISES

29423

(Avoided Argument): Brother

“He keeps trying to push my mother into dealing with financial matters in the way he wants. I disagree with him. It's just would make bad feelings if I would open my mouth.”

23123

(Avoided Argument): Dealer District Manager

“He put some numbers up for next year that we couldn't possibly make and I just chose not to challenge him on it, but it could be something that would influence our business significantly.”

23123

(Work)

“Had a proposal to a rather large potential customer that I was responsible for putting the proposal together and presenting. So, it was a pretty big deal in terms of the size of customers we normally deal with and the high profile it is within the company.”

23123

(Avoided Argument): Customer

“A customer just had some incorrect facts, and it just wasn't worth the challenge. It was a pretty major point. So, I just conceded it and moved on.”

25223

(Avoided Disagreement) (7 min): Supervisor

“Well, with my immediate supervisor. I decided to just blow it off and let him have his own way and all. I decided not to argue about it because I just didn't carry it any further. [Briefly what happened and why no argue?] Well, it's just another disagreement with him and with the way I think and the way he thinks, he never did what I do and he's my boss. He never did the job that I do, so he doesn't really know, he just goes by the book and, uh, it's kind of hard to explain to somebody who's never had hands-on experience like that. I work in a mill, in a paper mill and I do a lot of hard work everyday, most of the day. And, it's kind of hard to tell somebody who's never done anything like that how things should go, or are supposed to go together. It's just hard to make somebody understand that who's never actually did it.

I've gotten to the point where I don't let it worry me much. I'm kind of just do it like he does, I just don't worry about it.

[Risk the way you feel about yourself?] I don't know how to explain this to you, when I express myself to somebody else, I tell them what I think, what's on my mind – and I get through telling them what I think's on my mind, when I get through telling them what I think is right. When I tell them, as far as feeling about myself, I'm feeling good about it. ‘Cause I don't try to cover up nothing.”

Day 1: 30123

(Avoided disagreement): Husband

“Well, he stayed home sick. He's on medication and he went to a meeting tonight. So, I really thought he shouldn't, but I decided to not say anything. (My husband and son stayed home sick from work and school). [his attending the meeting was away from home].”

29423

(Home)

“Well, I don't know if most people would consider it stressful or not, but it bothered both my husband and I. A letter came to our daughter. And, this is the daughter that died three years ago. It wasn't important, it was just – it bothered us both.”

Day 3: 29423

(Work)

“It would have to be most nurses that would find it stressful. I got floated to another unit. An unfamiliar unit. And that's always stressful because you don't know where anything is. You don't know their routine. [not very stressful].”

(Discrimination): Sex

“Sometimes you get treated – It's at work and it's by doctors, so I guess it's not sex discrimination – it's not any of those things you said. It's a doctor-nurse thing.”

29423

(Argument): Mother

“I was trying to help her and she just got upset and, I don't know. She's 85 years old and really thrown by all the things she has to deal with, and yet she just doesn't accept it very well if you're trying to tell her that she can't handle everything herself. I hate getting in a disagreement with her. I always worry that her heart will bother her when she gets so upset.”

29423

(Work)

“My work involves a lot of stress sometimes. Oh, dear (sigh). I guess not more than usual, no. (Would you say no to that?) Well (sigh), it's stressful dealing with mothers who have lost babies. I don't know. But, you know, it's pretty common in my day. Oh, I'll just say "no" – it's easier.”

[pre-test ad-lib: "just going back to the question about work – was there anything that did happen today that you found stressful? I know you say it's nothing more than usual, but –" "Well, it's my job. My job gets very stressful at times. Especially when you're dealing with somebody that's, you know, that's found out that they're having a baby that's dead. They're all upset, and you're trying to deal with them, and it's stressful." "Did something like that happen today?" "Yes... I guess it's just harder to deal with it when you don't feel that good yourself. To have to be there for somebody that's going through a hard time. And you have a patient, that she knows her baby is dead and she's got to face this and it's hard. You know, I got crying about it with the patient."]

29423

(Home):

“I had to show one of our rental houses today. It's kind of stressful being with strangers alone in an empty house.”

29423

(Discrimination) (Sex):

“The man that I was showing the house to, wanted to know when my husband would make the decision. He wanted to deal with my husband. I own this house too! But, he didn't seem to want to deal with a woman.”

REFERENCES

- Brown, G. W., & Harris, T. O. (1978). *Social origins of depression: A study of depressive disorder in women*. New York: Free Press.
- Brown, G. W., & Harris, T. O. (1989). *Life events and illness*. New York: Guilford.
- Wethington, E., Brown, G. W., & Kessler, R. C. (1995). Interview measurement of stressful life events. In S. Cohen, R. C. Kessler, & L. Gordon (Eds.), *Measuring stress: A guide for health and social scientist* (pp. 59-79). New York: Oxford University Press.