

Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal

<http://fcs.sagepub.com>

The Family Daily Hassles Inventory: A Preliminary Investigation of Reliability and Validity

Suzanne Z. Rollins, M. E. Betsy Garrison and Sarah H. Pierce
Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal 2002; 31; 135
DOI: 10.1177/107772702237932

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://fcs.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/31/2/135>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:

[American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences](#)

Additional services and information for *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://fcs.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://fcs.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations <http://fcs.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/31/2/135>

The Family Daily Hassles Inventory: A Preliminary Investigation of Reliability and Validity

Suzanne Z. Rollins
M. E. Betsy Garrison
Sarah H. Pierce
Louisiana State University

This study investigated the preliminary reliability and validity of a new family daily hassles assessment using two well-established instruments that measure daily hassles and health status. Participants (140 mothers) completed a self-administered survey. The results indicated adequate reliability of the new assessment and supported the concurrent and construct validity of the scores obtained with the new assessment as a measure of daily hassles.

The study of stress and the stress process has been a dominant theme in family studies for the past five decades (Boss, 1987; Burr, 1973). Three concepts remain the foundation for current theory: stressors, mediating resources, and manifestations (Pearlin, Menaghan, Lieberman, & Mullan, 1981; Wheaton, 1994). Stressors are the experiences or circumstances that have the potential to create disturbance or problems in the family. Mediators of stress are the actions, resources, or perceptions of the family that may be capable of altering the stressful situation. Manifestations of stress are a family's responses to the disturbance.

Stress research has typically focused on both isolated life-changing events and chronic stressors as predictors of manifestations of stress. Lazarus (1984) proposed that day-to-day minor stresses also have

Authors' Note: The research was supported in part by the School of Human Ecology, the College of Agriculture, Louisiana State University; and the Louisiana State University Agricultural Center. Approved for publication by the director of the Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station as manuscript number 99-25-0161. Address correspondence to M. E. Betsy Garrison, School of Human Ecology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803; phone: (225) 578-1724; fax: (225) 578-2697; e-mail: hcgarr@lsu.edu.

Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, Vol. 31, No. 2, December 2002 135-154
DOI: 10.1177/107772702237932
© 2002 American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences

significance for predicting stress manifestations. Thus, to assess stress, lists of major stressful life events have been supplemented with day-to-day hassles measures. Both the Hassles Scale (Kanner, Coyne, Schaefer, & Lazarus, 1981) and the Daily Hassles Scale (DeLongis, Folkman, & Lazarus, 1988), respectively, were designed to assess an individual's response to stressful day-to-day occurrences, although they have been criticized as confounding both in terms of conceptualization and measurement (B. S. Dohrenwend, Dohrenwend, Dodson, & Shrout, 1984; B. P. Dohrenwend & Shrout, 1985; Flannery, 1986; Reich, Parrella, & Filstead, 1988; Rowlinson & Felner, 1988; Wheaton, 1994), and Kanner et al. (1981) recommended that research on daily hassles examine the nature of daily hassles.

The definition of measurement implies a process that involves both theoretical (abstract concepts) and empirical considerations. Theory specifies, among other things, the requisite concepts and operationalization of these concepts (Carmines & Zeller, 1979; Norton, 1983). Family stress research has incorporated both theory and measurement in the development of models and assessments. No other area of stress research had models and measurement so closely connected (Hobfoll & Spielberger, 1992). The purpose of this study was to investigate the reliability and validity of a new assessment, the Family Daily Hassles Inventory, using two better known and more widely used instruments, the Daily Hassles Scale (DeLongis et al., 1988) and the Brief Symptom Inventory (Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983). The latter two instruments measure constructs of the stress process, stressors (daily hassles), and manifestations (health status).

Examining the reliability and validity of new assessments, such as the Family Daily Hassles Inventory, is important to further our scientific understanding of the stress process. The development of accurate assessments to measure constructs is of fundamental importance in the advancement of knowledge (Fitzsimmons, Hira, Bauer, & Hafstrom, 1993). The Family Daily Hassles Inventory was intentionally designed to build on other daily hassles assessments in that it (a) measures the nature dimensions of daily hassles as recommended by Kanner et al. (1981) that had not previously been incorporated into assessments of daily hassles and (b) avoids conceptual and measurement confounding by excluding items that are either discrete or health related. Thus, in the construction of the Family Daily Hassles Inventory, three dimensions (time and energy, positive influence, and negative influence) were specified for each type of daily hassle. Three dimensions were identified because we knew from our own family

life experiences that the microstressors that take up so much of our practical daily existence often also produce uplifting results that justify the efforts we put into coping with them. Each hassle can simultaneously contain positive as well as negative aspects and also can be assessed in terms of how much time and energy it demands. It also seemed reasonable that the greater the time and energy absorbed by a daily hassle, the greater would be the perceived positive aspects of the activity or situation to justify the investment in it—or else we would experience frustration, concluding that the hassle is “just a waste of my time.”

Reliable and valid assessments are, obviously, of paramount importance in scientific investigations. Reliability is generally understood as the consistency of an assessment and is often estimated through four methods: test-retest, alternative form, split-half, and internal consistency (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). In the development of multi-item assessments in the social sciences, reliability analyses, particularly estimates of internal consistency, are often coupled with principal components analyses. In the current study, these two techniques will be used to assess the reliability of the Family Daily Hassles Inventory.

With respect to measurement, validity is described as the accuracy of an assessment. Two types of validity that involve statistical analyses are criterion and construct. Criterion validity uses a known standard that has been substantiated as an assessment. Concurrent criterion validity establishes the validity of a measure by examining how well it correlates with some other measure believed to be valid at the same point in time with stronger correlations indicating better validity (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). This study used scores from the Daily Hassles Scale as the standard that was correlated with scores from the Family Daily Hassles Inventory. If strong correlations are found between the Family Daily Hassles Inventory scores and the Daily Hassles Scale scores, the concurrent validity of the Family Daily Hassles Inventory as an assessment of family daily hassles is supported.

Construct validity has been described as the extent to which a particular measure relates to other measures consistent with theoretically derived hypotheses of the concepts that are being measured (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). In contrast to concurrent validity, a moderate association between constructs indicates better validity because a strong one may indicate that the two conceptually distinct assessments may be actually measuring the same construct, which leads to questions about confounding. Weak associations between

theoretical-driven constructs, on the other hand, lead to other questions, such as model specification, sampling, and measurement error. Thus, if moderate correlations are found between the theorized relationship between daily hassles as measured by the Family Daily Hassles Inventory and health status as measured by the Brief Symptom Inventory, the Family Daily Hassles Inventory may be considered to have construct validity.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The foundation for family stress theory and research may be traced to Hill's (1949) classic research on war-induced separation and reunion. His ABC-X crisis outlined a set of major variables and their relationships that have remained virtually unchanged (McCubbin et al., 1980). *A* represents the stressor or provoking event, *B* represents the resources or strength of the family, *C* represents the meaning the family attaches to the event, and *X* represents the degree of stress associated with the event. Three of the variables (*A*, *B*, and *C*) remain the foundation of family stress theory (Boss, 1988; McCubbin et al., 1980).

McCubbin and Patterson (1983) recognized the problem of emerging events acting as new stressors when they proposed an extension of the traditional ABC-X model, the Double ABCX model. The Double ABCX model of family stress introduced a phenomenon conceptualized as "pile up," which refers to the cumulative effect, over time, of precrisis and postcrisis stressors and strains. McCubbin and Patterson argued that pile up occurs because family crises evolve and are resolved over a period of time; families are rarely dealing with a single stressor.

Although the double ABCX model, particularly the concept of pile up, is important in the study of family stress (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983), Hill's (1949) ABC-X model is more parsimonious than the double ABCX model and is more compatible with Pearlin's (1989) sociological study of the stress process. Pearlin (1989) and Hill's models (1949) share common concepts in conceptualizing the stress process. In both models, stressors are the provoking events that produce change in the family's equilibrium. Manifestations of stress are the measure of the degree of stress associated with the stressors events and are conceptualized as the response variable in both models.

Stressors. A stressor, or source of stress, is an occurrence of significant magnitude to provoke change in the family system (Hill, 1949). In family stress literature, it is commonly understood that the stressor does not in itself contain the attribute of stress, only the potential or capacity for producing the process of stress (Hill, 1949; McCubbin et al., 1980; Pearlin et al., 1981). Stressors arise out of two broad circumstances: the occurrence of discrete events and the presence of relatively continuous problems (Pearlin et al., 1981). Discrete events are typically characterized as life-changing events or traumas. Chronic events and daily hassles may be identified as stressors that are relatively continuous in nature.

Daily hassles have been defined as the irritating, frustrating, distressing demands that to some degree characterize everyday transactions with the environment (Kanner et al., 1981). Also, daily hassles are experiences and conditions of daily living that have been appraised as salient and harmful or threatening to the endorser's well-being (Lazarus, 1984). Hassles include annoying events such as losing things, traffic jams, inclement weather, arguments, disappointments, and family and financial concerns. Hassles may be perceived as harmful or threatening because they involve demands that tax a person's resources (Lazarus, 1984). Situations over which a person has little control tend to create greater distress. There is a positive relationship between low control, high demand tasks or hassles, and distress (Barnett & Rivers, 1996; Chamberlain & Zika, 1990; Flannery, 1986; Kanner et al., 1981; Lu, 1991; Weinberger, Hiner, & Tierney, 1987; Zarski, 1984). To date, the inventory most commonly used to represent daily hassles is either the Hassles Scale or its successor, the Daily Hassles Scale (Kanner et al., 1981; DeLongis et al., 1988).

Manifestations of stress. Pearlin et al. (1981) observed that perhaps the most ambiguous issue of all in stress research is the meaning and measurement of stress itself. The meaning and measurement of stress are used synonymously with manifestations of stress and stress responses. Stress responses are also defined as the generalized behavioral response of an individual or family to stimuli (Pearlin et al., 1981; Selye, 1974). These responses are the emotional, physical, and behavioral disorders through which stress is manifested (Pearlin, 1989). Health and psychological assessments have typically been used in stress research because health-related symptoms are measured reliably and validly. Kanner et al. (1981) used both the Hassles Scale and the Hopkins Symptom Checklist (Derogatis, Lipman, Rickels,

Uhlenhuth, & Covi, 1974), from which the Brief Symptom Inventory (Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983) was derived, to examine the relationship between daily hassles and health. The results reported a positive correlation between hassles and somatic illness, and the relationship was stronger than that obtained for life events and somatic illness. The Hopkins Symptom Checklist, including the Brief Symptom Inventory, has been used in a wide variety of settings and applications in stress research (Compas & Williams, 1990; Gruen, Folkman, & Lazarus, 1988; Holm & Holroyd, 1992; Kanner et al., 1981; Kohn, Lafreniere, & Gurevich, 1991; Lazarus, DeLongis, Folkman, & Gruen, 1985; Luchetta, 1995; Reich et al., 1988; Roberts, 1995; Thoits, 1994).

Past Empirical Studies

Past studies have established that daily hassles are better predictors of stress manifestations (psychological and somatic health) than are life events (Chamberlain & Zika, 1990; Flannery, 1986; Kanner et al., 1981; Lu, 1991; Weinberger et al., 1987; Zarski, 1984). In a seminal study of 100 middle-aged adults (45 to 64 years old), Kanner et al. (1981) compared day-to-day hassles with major life events in their power to predict psychological symptoms and examined whether hassles, independent of life events, related to psychological symptoms. Results from their study supported the idea that when compared to life events, hassles are more strongly associated with health status as measured by the Hopkins Symptom Checklist.

In the measurement of daily hassles, a frequent topic of debate concerning Kanner et al.'s (1981) Hassles Scale is the confounding of two causes, daily hassles and health (DeLongis et al., 1988; B. S. Dohrenwend et al., 1984; B. P. Dohrenwend & ShROUT, 1985; Lazarus et al., 1985; Reich et al., 1988; Rowlinson & Felner, 1988). B. S. Dohrenwend et al. (1984) and B. P. Dohrenwend and ShROUT (1985) argued that the relationship between daily hassles and health is confounded because items in the Hassles Scale (Kanner et al., 1981) also may assess symptoms of health. DeLongis et al. (1988), Lazarus et al. (1985), Reich et al. (1988) and Rowlinson and Felner (1988), however, all argued that although conceptual overlap occurs between daily hassles and health, the confounding is not sufficient to account for the relationship found between daily hassles and health. DeLongis et al. (1988) and Lazarus et al. (1985) defended their finding by concluding that the confounding may be the result of the complexity of the interaction between variables, the individual and the environment, rather

than measurement error. Wheaton (1994) has also criticized the original Hassles Scale (Kanner et al., 1981) because he believed the Hassles Scale contains an intrinsic problem of a different kind of confounding. He pointed out that the Hassles Scale includes items that represent both discrete and chronic stressors and wrote, "The problem with this measure, then, is that it attempts to be too inclusive while starting from a clear but more delimited conceptual mandate—the minor but regular annoyances of day-to-day life" (Wheaton, 1994, p. 86).

Using both frequency and intensity scores from the Hassles Scale with a sample of 100 adults, DeLongis, Coyne, Dakof, Folkman, and Lazarus (1982) reported correlations, from .03 to .38, between daily hassles and health symptomology as measured by the Hopkins Symptom Checklist. In a study of 600 predominantly older adult male substance abusers, Reich et al. (1988) also divided the Hassles Scale into number and intensity of daily hassles and reported a low correlation between the two dimensions ($r = .12$). They reported correlations between the two daily hassles variables and the symptomology variables as measured by the Symptom Checklist-90, a successor of the Hopkins Symptom Checklist and a predecessor to the Brief Symptom Inventory, as ranging from .28 to .59 and concluded that (a) number of hassles and intensity of hassles measure different aspects of daily hassles and (b) each affects stress responses. Using the Daily Hassles Scale, Gruen et al. (1988) reported a correlation of .24 between hassles severity and frequency and correlations ranging from .13 to .46 between hassles and psychological symptoms and somatic health as measured by the Hopkins Symptom Checklist from a sample of 85 married couples with a child living at home. Holm and Holroyd (1992) revised (and assumably improved) the Hassles Scale by adding the response category of "did not occur" so that respondents were able to endorse the occurrence of an event without also rating its severity.

The latest version of the Hassles Scale is a 53-item checklist designed to eliminate confounding (DeLongis et al., 1988). It has been reported, without providing the actual coefficient, that the revised Hassles Scale has high test-retest reliability (DeLongis et al., 1988), and Lu (1991) reported an alpha coefficient of .71. In a study of daily stress and health of 75 children and their parents, Banez and Compas (1990) reported a correlation coefficient of .57 for mothers and .75 for fathers between the Daily Hassles Scale and symptoms as measured by a version of the Hopkins Symptom Checklist. Using the Daily Hassles Scale, but a different assessment from the Hopkins Symptom

Checklist or the Brief Symptom Inventory to assess health status, Lu (1991) reported correlations ranging from .25 to .48 between hassles and health.

In summary, (a) daily hassles have been found to be better predictors of stressors than life events are, (b) there is some empirical support for the dimensionality of daily hassles, and (c) correlations between daily hassles and health status have ranged from .03 to .75. Based on family stress theory, measurement principles, and past empirical studies, the objectives of the current study were to investigate

1. the reliability of the Family Daily Hassles Inventory,
2. the concurrent validity of the Family Daily Hassles Inventory using the Daily Hassles Scale as the criterion, and
3. the construct validity of the Family Daily Hassles Inventory using the Brief Symptom Inventory to measure health status in the theoretically predicted and empirically supported relationship between hassles and health.

METHOD

Project Design and Sampling

As part of a larger study on family stress and children's cognitive development, the sample was generated by inviting participation from public and private elementary schools in a medium-sized city in the southern United States. All public, Catholic, and selected private elementary schools were canvassed for participation, and 17 schools agreed to participate. To minimize sampling bias, the participating schools were assessed for general demographic characteristics of their student body. It was determined that the schools participating in this project comprised a representative sample of the population using data from the 1990 U.S. census.

Recruitment letters were sent home with first and third graders from the participating schools (approximately 1,500 children); 423 children and their families elected to participate. In spring 1996, surveys were mailed to the families of the participating children. Follow-up measures included (a) mailing surveys a second time and (b) contacting families by telephone and reminding them to complete and return the surveys. Parent surveys were received from 151 mothers for a response rate of 38%. To analyze attrition, the probable

socioeconomic composition of the population was estimated by the participation rate in the federal free and reduced lunch program for each of the children's schools. In research with children, participation rates in the federal free and reduced lunch programs are often used to estimate the socioeconomic status of a population. From this analysis, we surmised that the nonrespondents were primarily mothers with less education (and probably lower literacy) and lower incomes. In the current study, 11 cases were removed because of missing data, yielding a final sample of 140 mothers.

The average age of the mothers was 37 years, and most participants were married. The educational level was quite high; 34% were college educated. Mean family income, measured in categories, was between \$40,000 and \$60,000. More than 70% of the mothers were employed. They worked outside the home an average of 36 hours per week. Family size ranged from two to eight and averaged four people. Most of the participants were White (73%); however, 22% were Black. When compared to the target population of families with first- and third-grade children, the mothers of the current study were more likely to be White, better educated, and from families with higher incomes.

Instruments

Family Daily Hassles Inventory. The Family Daily Hassles Inventory (see the appendix) was developed as a refinement of an earlier unidimensional version of a family daily hassles assessment instrument that broadly conceptualized family microstressors (Lee, 1986). The Family Daily Hassles Inventory contrasts with all of the other assessments of daily hassles reviewed (e.g., Blankstein, Flett, & Koledin, 1991; DeLongis et al., 1988; Kanner et al., 1981; Kinney & Stephens, 1989) in that the family rather than the individual is the unit of interest. The assessment was pilot tested twice: first, with a class of nontraditional college students, many of whom were married with children, and second, with a group classified as university employees. The results of pilot testing primarily led to minor modifications of the phrasing in the assessment; for example, the item "living space" was changed to "housing."

The 22 items in the inventory represent ongoing and broad aspects of daily family life, such as child care, household chores, inside and outside home repairs, car care, financial matters, work, use of leisure time, community involvement, and a variety of relationships.

Respondents completing the Family Daily Hassles Inventory indicate the degree to which the daily life of their family is affected by each item's dimension: time and energy, negative influence, and positive influence. The five possible responses for each dimension are 1 = *none*, 2 = *slight*, 3 = *moderate*, 4 = *a lot*, and 5 = *a great deal*. Preliminary results indicated that the Family Daily Hassles Inventory was adequately reliable (internal consistency), and support for the multidimensional approach was found.

To be consistent with other studies of daily hassles, variables for analysis were created from the Family Daily Hassles Inventory scores by summing the values for each of the three dimension responses to derive three numeric total values, one value for each dimension. Past studies that used the daily hassle assessments have summed, rather than averaged, values across ratings into a single index and rarely used subscales that have been generated by factor analysis (Compas & Williams, 1990; DeLongis et al., 1988; Kanner et al., 1981; Reich et al., 1988).

Daily Hassles Scale (DeLongis et al., 1988). The 53-item Daily Hassles Scale asks respondents to complete the listed items based on how they rated the hassle that particular day. Examples of types of items include relationships (children, parents or in-laws, and other relatives), work-related duties and functions, money and financial matters, social commitments and entertainment, and household responsibilities. The assessment used in the present study is a 48-item version of the Daily Hassles Scale. Five items were removed because they were health related: health or well-being of a family member, smoking, drinking, mood-altering drugs, and health. Responses were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*does not apply*) to 5 (*a great deal*). As used by its authors, variables for analysis were created by summing the numeric responses from the items into a single index.

Brief Symptom Inventory (Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983). The Brief Symptom Inventory is a 53-item form of the Hopkins Symptom Checklist (Derogatis, 1977). The Brief Symptom Inventory was designed to assess the psychological symptom status of individuals. The Brief Symptom Inventory measures nine primary symptom dimensions: somatization (physical health), obsessive-compulsive, interpersonal sensitivity, depression, anxiety, hostility, phobic anxiety, paranoid ideation, and psychosis. The Brief Symptom Inventory is an acceptable short alternative to the Hopkins Symptom Checklist

and has demonstrated a sensitivity to symptoms in nonclinical populations and a usefulness in the prediction of symptoms in previous studies examining stressors-health relationships (Compas & Williams, 1990; Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983; Gruen et al., 1988; Kanner et al., 1981; Luchetta, 1995; Reich et al., 1988). Both test-retest and internal consistency reliabilities have been determined for the basic symptom dimensions of the Brief Symptom Inventory. Also, correlations with similar dimensions of the Brief Symptom Inventory and the Hopkins Symptom Checklist are very high and confirm the validity of the Brief Symptom Inventory (Derogatis, 1977; Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983).

The instrument used in the present study is a 48-item form of the Brief Symptom Inventory. Of the 53 items on the Brief Symptom Inventory, several items were duplicated. The redundant items were eliminated from the survey in the present study. Responses were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely*). The following are examples of feelings or symptoms included in the survey: nervousness or shakiness inside, faintness or dizziness, heart or chest pains, trouble concentrating, feeling lonely, nausea or upset stomach, and your mind going blank. As designed, variables for analysis were created by summing the numeric responses from the 48 items into a total score.

Analysis of the Data

Following frequency analyses, the first objective of the current study, the reliability of the Family Daily Hassles Inventory, was initially examined by principal components analyses and then estimated by Cronbach's alpha (internal consistency). In the current study, the results of the principal components analyses show how well the items of the Family Daily Hassles Inventory grouped together, an indicator of consistency. As typical in this type of analyses, eigenvalues (λ), explained variance (R^2), and factor loadings were used to interpret these results as well as the overall Cronbach's alpha value and the alpha value if a particular item was removed.

The concurrent criterion validity of the Family Daily Hassles Inventory, the second objective, was addressed by correlating scores of the two daily hassles measures, the Family Daily Hassles Inventory and the Daily Hassles Scale. The third objective, an investigation of the construct validity of Family Daily Hassles Inventory, was assessed by correlating the scores from the Family Daily Hassles

TABLE 1: Descriptive Statistics of All Variables and Correlations Between the Family Daily Hassles Inventory and the Daily Hassles Scale and Brief Symptom Inventory

	<i>Correlation</i>				
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Daily Hassles Scale</i>	<i>Brief Symptom Index</i>
Family Daily Hassles Inventory: time and energy	64	13	30-92	.36*	.22*
Family Daily Hassles Inventory: negative influence	34	13	10-88	.45*	.35*
Family Daily Hassles Inventory: positive influence	63	17	31-110	.26*	-.07
Daily Hassles Scale	115	20	81-172		
Brief Symptom Inventory	82	26	48-178		

* $p < .05$.

Inventory with the score from the Brief Symptom Inventory. Because all of the indices were measured at the interval level, Pearson's product-moment correlational analyses were performed, and the $p < .05$ level was used to indicate statistical significance.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Of the variables representing dimensions of the Family Daily Hassles Inventory, the means for time and energy ranged from a low of 1.96 (outside home repairs) to a high of 4.59 (relationship with children), means for negative influence ranged from 1.46 (outside home repairs) to 2.41 (family financial matters), and means for positive influence ranged from 2.05 (transportation and traffic) to 4.66 (relationship with children). The means of the 48 items from the Daily Hassles Scale ranged from a low of 1.68 (financial care for someone who does not live with you) to a high of 2.93 (housework). The lowest mean for the 48 Brief Symptom Inventory items was 1.21 (feeling afraid of open spaces) and the highest was 2.58 (feeling tense or keyed up). All of the variables were normally distributed; none showed significant skewness or kurtosis. The means and standard deviations of the indices are depicted in Table 1.

From the principal components analyses of each dimension of daily hassles, one strong factor emerged with eigenvalues of 4.16 for

TABLE 2: Principal Component Analyses of the Family Daily Hassles Inventory (n = 140)

	<i>Hassles</i>		
	<i>Time and Energy</i>	<i>Negative Influence</i>	<i>Positive Influence</i>
Child care	—	.51	.31
Pet care	—	.45	—
Household chores and meal preparation	.40	.69	.56
Errands	.47	.62	.53
Inside home repairs	.58	.60	.54
Outside home repairs	.63	.59	.54
Housing	.57	.44	.50
Car care	.57	.54	.66
Transportation and traffic	.46	.65	.44
Family financial matters	.47	.60	.57
Work duties	.44	.49	.56
Work environment	.53	.45	.58
Use of leisure time	.44	.59	.51
Community involvement	—	.60	.45
Relationship with spouse	—	.39	—
Relationship with children	—	.61	—
Relationship with parents	.52	.49	.37
Relationship with in-laws	.36	.50	.39
Relationship with brothers and sisters	—	.64	.39
Relationship with friends	.47	.53	.43
Relationship with neighbors	.44	.56	.52
Relationships at work	.43	.50	.51

the time and energy dimension, 6.68 for the positive influence dimension, and 4.87 for the negative influence dimension, although eigenvalues higher than unity were identified for each dimension. The factor loadings of the time and energy dimension items ranged from .14 (pet care) to .63 (outside home repairs) and explained variance of 19%. The factor loadings of the negative influence dimension items ranged from .39 (relationship with spouse) to .69 (household chores and meal preparation) and explained variance of 30%. The factor loadings of the positive influence dimension items ranged from .22 (pet care) to .66 (car care) and explained variance of 22% (see Table 2). Overall, these results indicate adequate consistency for a measure as broad as daily hassles, although some of the items, particularly for the time and energy dimension, loaded low (< .30). Even with low factor loadings, the results compare favorably to other

principal components analyses of daily hassle assessments. Using a 56-item version of the Hassles Scale, Chan and Lee (1992) reported an R^2 of 18.3, and our own principal components analysis of the Daily Hassles Scale yielded an eigenvalue of 10.98, an R^2 of 22.9, and factor loadings from .17 to .66.

A comparison of the factor loadings of the 22 items across the dimensions of this preliminary investigation indicated that all of the items loaded substantially ($> .30$) on at least one dimension, indicating that all items may be retained in the matrix-style inventory. For the time and energy dimension, six items loaded somewhat low ($< .30$): child care, pet care, community involvement, relationships with spouse, relationships with children, and relationships with siblings. In contrast, none of the items of the negative influence dimension loaded low. For the positive influence dimension, three items loaded low: pet care, relationships with spouse, and relationships with children. Interestingly, the items with the highest and most consistent factor loadings across dimensions were items that did not relate to family members, including pets. Rather, these items represented household responsibilities and relationships with friends and relationships at work. It may be that the dimensionality of daily hassles is more important with items about family members.

The results of the reliability analyses of the three dimensions indicate good internal consistency, as Cronbach's alpha ranged from .77 (time and energy) to .88 (negative influence). In addition, the value of Cronbach's alpha would not have been increased if an item was removed from any of the dimensions. The estimates of reliability in the current study compare favorably to one reported from the Daily Hassles Scale ($\alpha = .71$) by Lu (1991). Coupled with the results of the principal components analyses, these findings lend empirical support to the reliability of the Family Daily Hassles Inventory, which was the first objective of the current study. In addition, the results from this preliminary investigation of the Family Daily Hassles Inventory suggest that none of the items should be removed from the assessment as the reliability would not have been improved with the deletion of any of the items including those that had low factor loadings.

With respect to the second objective, all of the correlations between the three Family Daily Hassles Inventory scores and the Daily Hassles Scale score were statistically significant (see Table 1), indicating that the Family Daily Hassles Inventory may have concurrent validity when the Daily Hassles Scale is the criterion. The strongest correlation

($r = .45$) was between the negative influence dimension of the Family Daily Hassles Inventory and the Daily Hassles Scale. This finding is not surprising, considering that daily hassles in the Daily Hassles Scale are presented as a *hassle*, a term that has a negative connotation. Although the correlations between Family Daily Hassles Inventory time and energy and positive influence and Daily Hassles Scale are somewhat low (.26 and .36, respectively), they may provide further evidence for the dimensionality of daily hassles, as Reich et al. (1988) and Gruen et al. (1988) have also reported low correlations ($r = .12$ and .24, respectively) between hassles frequency and intensity using the Hassles Scale and Daily Hassles Scale. The relative modesty of these correlations may not be all that surprising given that the two instruments approach the measurement of daily hassles from different perspectives, individual versus family.

Two of the three correlations between the Family Daily Hassles Inventory scores and the Brief Symptom Inventory score were, as expected, moderately statistically significant (see Table 1). The variables representing the time and energy and the negative influence of daily hassles were positively related to the Brief Symptom Inventory score. The score from the positive influence of daily hassles was not, however, significantly correlated with the score from the Brief Symptom Inventory. These findings indicate that the Family Daily Hassles Inventory may have construct validity with the Brief Symptom Inventory in the hypothesized relationship between stressors and health, which was the third objective of the present study. The correlations between the scores from the Family Daily Hassles Inventory and the Brief Symptom Inventory score compare favorably with correlations reported in previous research between measures of daily hassles and health status, which, as reviewed earlier, ranged from quite low (.03) to quite high (.75).

CONCLUSIONS

Further exploration of the independence of dimensions of daily hassles is needed as well as the relationship between the positive influence of daily hassles and health status. Daily hassles make up much of the stuff of family members' day-to-day lives. The past practice of measuring daily events as either a hassle (negative) or an uplift (positive) may overlook the duality inherent in the daily tasks and situations that confront families. In addition, time and energy expended

in dealing with daily events truly represent an investment, constituting the degree to which family members immerse themselves in coping with them.

There are, of course, limitations to the current research project. Limitations include a nonprobability sampling procedure and a low response rate. The sample was also overrepresented by middle to high socioeconomic status mothers. Another limitation is that the larger study targeted a specific segment of the population: families with school-aged children. These limitations restrict the generalizability of the present study. To increase generalizability, future studies should include participants from additional segments of the population.

Measurement involves both theoretical and empirical considerations (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). The results of this preliminary study indicate that the Family Daily Hassles Inventory scores may be reliable and valid for use as a measure of daily hassles. Future studies are needed to replicate the current one as well as to verify the criterion validity of the Family Daily Hassles Inventory in relation to other stressors, such as life events, both within and across time. The current study did not investigate the relationships between daily hassles and other stressors and between other stressors and health outcomes, nor did it include the construct or measurement of mediating resources. Further reliability analyses, such as test-retest, alternative form, and split-half, are also needed. As more studies are conducted, the retention of items with consistent low factor loadings will also need to be addressed.

When compared with the popular Daily Hassles Scale, the Family Daily Hassles Inventory may offer three refinements: (a) a family-focused assessment that is not confounded with other stress constructs (e.g., stressors and health), (b) a shorter assessment (22 items compared with 53), and (c) an assessment that better takes into account the dimensions of daily hassles. Thus, for researchers and practitioners alike, the Family Daily Hassles Inventory may provide an alternative in the measurement of stressors.

APPENDIX
The Family Daily Hassles Inventory

The following is a list of relationships and aspects of day-to-day family living common to most people. Sometimes these are positive, sometimes they are negative, and sometimes they are a combination of both. Please think about each of these items in terms of your own life:

In Column A, indicate how much *time and energy* your family involves in each item.

In Column B, indicate how much *negative influence* each item has on your family's day-to-day life.

In Column C, indicate how much *positive influence* each item has on your family's day-to-day life.

Please use the following scale as you describe the nature of each item's impact on you:

- 1 = None
- 2 = Slight
- 3 = Moderate
- 4 = A lot
- 5 = A great deal
- X = Not applicable

Example: If child care takes a lot of time and energy but is a positive influence in your family's life, you might put a "4" in Column A, a "1" in Column B, and a "5" in Column C. If an item is not applicable to your family (for instance, if you are not employed for pay), put an "X" in Column A and go on to the next item.

<i>Item</i>	<i>A. Time/Energy Involvement</i>	<i>B. Negative Influence</i>	<i>C. Positive Influence</i>
Child care	4	1	5

(continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

<i>Item</i>	<i>A. Time/Energy Involvement</i>	<i>B. Negative Influence</i>	<i>C. Positive Influence</i>
Child care			
Pet care			
Household chores and meal preparation			
Errands			
Inside home repairs			
Outside home repairs			
Housing			
Car care			
Transportation and traffic			
Family financial matters			
Work duties			
Work environment			
Use of leisure time			
Community involvement			
Relationship with spouse			
Relationship with children			
Relationship with parents			
Relationship with in-laws			
Relationship with brothers/sisters			
Relationship with friends			
Relationship with neighbors			
Relationships at work			

REFERENCES

- Banez, G. A., & Compas, B. E. (1990). Children' and parents' daily stressful events and psychological symptoms. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 18*, 591-605.
- Barnett, R. C., & Rivers, C. (1996). *She works, he works: How two-income families are happier, healthier, and better off*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Blankstein, K. R., Flett, G. L., & Koledin, S. (1991). The brief college student hassles scale: Development, validation, and relation with pessimism. *Journal of College Student Development, 32*, 258-264.

- Boss, P. (1987). Family stress. In M. B. Sussman & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Handbook of marriage and the family* (pp. 695-723). New York: Plenum.
- Boss, P. (1988). *Family stress management*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Burr, W. (1973). *Theory construction and the sociology of the family*. New York: John Wiley.
- Carmines, E. G., & Zeller, R. A. (1979). *Reliability and validity assessment*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Chamberlain, K., & Zika, S. (1990). The minor events approach to stress: Support for the use of daily hassles. *British Journal of Psychology*, *81*, 469-481.
- Chan, D. W., & Lee, H. B. (1992). Hassles, life events, and health status among Chinese college students in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Psychosomatics*, *39*, 44-55.
- Compas, B. E., & Williams, R. A. (1990). Stress, coping, and adjustment in mothers and young adolescents in single and two-parent families. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *18*, 525-545.
- DeLongis, A., Coyne, J. C., Dakof, G., Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1982). Relationship of daily hassles, uplifts, and major life events to health status. *Health Psychology*, *1*, 119-136.
- DeLongis, A., Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1988). The impact of daily stress on health and mood: Psychological and social resources as mediators. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 486-495.
- Derogatis, L. R. (1977). *S.L.-90: Administration, scoring & procedures manual—I*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.
- Derogatis, L. R., Lipman, R. S., Rickels, K., Uhlenhuth, E. H., & Covi, L. (1974). The Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL): A measure of primary symptom dimensions. In P. Pichot (Ed.), *Psychological measurement in psychopharmacology: Modern problems in pharmacopsychiatry* (Vol. 7, pp. 79-110). Basel, NY: Karger.
- Derogatis, L. R., & Melisaratos, N. (1983). The brief symptom inventory: An introductory report. *Psychological Medicine*, *13*, 595-605.
- Dohrenwend, B. P., & ShROUT, P. E. (1985). "Hassles" in the conceptualization and measurement of life stress variables. *American Psychologist*, *40*, 780-785.
- Dohrenwend, B. S., Dohrenwend, B. P., Dodson, M., & ShROUT, P. E. (1984). Symptoms, hassles, social supports, and life events: Problem of confounded measures. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *93*, 222-230.
- Fitzsimmons, V. S., Hira, T. K., Bauer, J. W., & Hafstrom, J. L. (1993). Financial management: Development of scales. *Journal of Family and Economics Issues*, *14*, 257-274.
- Flannery, R. B. (1986). Major life events and daily hassles in predicting health status: Methodological inquiry. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *42*, 485-487.
- Gruen, R. J., Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1988). Centrality and individual differences in the meaning of daily hassles. *Journal of Personality*, *56*, 743-762.
- Hill, R. (1949). *Families under stress*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hobfoll, S. E., & Spielberger, C. D. (1992). Family stress: Integrating theory and measurement. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *6*, 99-112.
- Holm, J. E., & Holroyd, K. A. (1992). The Daily Hassles Scale (revised): Does it measure stress or symptoms? *Behavioral Assessment*, *14*, 465-482.
- Kanner, A. D., Coyne, J. C., Schaefer, C., & Lazarus, R. S. (1981). Comparison of two modes of stress measurement: Daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *4*, 1-39.
- Kinney, J. M., & Stephens, M. A. P. (1989). Caregiving hassles scale: Assessing the daily hassles of caring for a family member with dementia. *The Gerontologist*, *29*, 328-332.

- Kohn, P. M., Lafreniere, K., & Gurevich, M. (1991). Hassles, health, and personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 478-482.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1984). Puzzles in the study of daily hassles. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 7*, 375-389.
- Lazarus, R. S., DeLongis, A., Folkman, S., & Gruen, R. (1985). Stress and adaptational outcomes: The problem of confounded measures. *American Psychology, 40*, 770-779.
- Lee, J. L. (1986). *Influence of daily routine on stress pile-up and families*. Unpublished master's thesis, Iowa State University, Ames.
- Lu, L. (1991). Daily hassles and mental health: A longitudinal study. *British Journal of Psychology, 82*, 441-447.
- Luchetta, T. (1995). Parental and work role salience, everyday problems, and distress: A prospective analysis of specific vulnerability among multiple-role women. *Woman's & Health, 22*, 21-50.
- McCubbin, H. I., Joy, C. B., Cauble, A. E., Comeau, J. K., Patterson, J. M., & Needle, R. H. (1980). Family stress and coping: A decade review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42*, 125-141.
- McCubbin, H. I., & Patterson, J. M. (1983). The family stress process: The double ABCX model of adjustment and adaptation. In H. I. McCubbin, M. Sussman, & J. Patterson (Eds.), *Social stress and the family: Advances and developments in family stress theory and research* (pp. 7-37). New York: Haworth.
- Norton, R. (1983). Measuring marital quality: A critical look at the dependent variable. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45*, 141-152.
- Pearlin, L. I. (1989). The sociological study of stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 30*, 241-256.
- Pearlin, L. I., Menaghan, E. G., Lieberman, M. A., & Mullan, J. T. (1981). The stress process. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 22*, 337-356.
- Reich, W. P., Parrella, D. P., & Filstead, W. J. (1988). Unconfounding the hassles scale: External sources versus internal responses to stress. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 10*, 19-31.
- Roberts, S. (1995). Applicability of the goodness-of-fit hypothesis to coping with daily hassles. *Psychological Reports, 77*, 943-954.
- Rowlinson, R. T., & Felner, R. D. (1988). Major life events, hassles and adaptation in adolescence: Confounding in conceptualization and measurement of life stress and adjustment revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 432-444.
- Selye, H. (1974). *Stress without distress*. New York: Lippincott and Crowell.
- Thoits, P. A. (1994). Stressors and problem solving: The individual as psychological activist. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 35*, 143-159.
- Weinberger, M., Hiner, S. L., & Tierney, W. M. (1987). In support of hassles as a measure of stress in predicting health outcomes. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 10*, 19-31.
- Wheaton, B. (1994). Sampling the stress universe. In W. R. Avison & I. H. Gotlib (Eds.), *Stress and mental health: Contemporary issues and prospects for the future* (pp. 77-114). New York: Plenum.
- Zarski, J. J. (1984). Hassles and health: A replication. *Health Psychology, 3*, 243-251.