CHAPTER 13

HIGH HOPES AND GREAT EXPECTATIONS

Seek not for everything to happen as you wish, but wish for everything to happen as it actually does, and you will be serene.

- Epictetus.

Although we sometimes may feel unhappy or dissatisfied for no apparent reason, often the feeling comes with a recognition that something is not right, or there is some state of affairs we long for that refuses to come about for us. This is hinted in several of the most valid affectometer items: everything is going right for me, I wish I could change some parts of my life, I feel my life is on the right track, and others. We now take up the fundamental proposition that the discrepancy between the way things are and the way we want them to be is the most essential cause of all degrees of unhappiness.

Consider the earlier findings in Chapter 5 that well-being is hardly affected by a person's level of income. When we conjure up the
picture of the poor person who is happy, we might immediately
guess that this person never expected to have much money, or is
not interested in it. For the rich person who is unhappy, we
may suppose this person wants still more money, or else wants
something else that money can't buy. In both cases, it is not
the amount of money that matters, but whether or not that amount
is considered satisfactory against some mental requirement -
what is sought, expected, aspired to, wished for, craved and
the like.

This idea has a long history starting at least with the
Greek philosophers. Although some trace it to Aristotle,
Barrow\(^1\) remarks, "It turns out that Epicurus was as near the
mark as anyone with his contention that degree of satisfaction
equals one's attainment divided by one's expectation." Much
later Rousseau\(^2\) said, "A conscious being whose powers were equal
to his desire would be perfectly happy. True happiness consists
in decreasing the difference between our desires and our powers,
in establishing a perfect equilibrium between the power and the
will".

Just before the turn of this century, William James\(^3\)
replaced happiness by self-esteem in the formula, as follows.

\[
\text{self-esteem} = \frac{\text{success}}{\text{pretensions}} \quad \left\{ = \frac{\text{achievements}}{\text{aspirations}} \right\}
\]

Suppose we had a scaling method that would allow us to add
up all the things you want out of life to arrive at a single
sum-of-aspirations number. Suppose this number is 100 units
whereas the sum of units for what you actually have, a sum-of-
achievements number, is only 70 units, giving you an achievement/
aspiration ratio of 70/100 or .70. You are less than satisfied and happy. 'Another person who aspires to 100 units of good things and has them all available would have a ratio of 1.00, and should be completely content.

Obviously, it is possible to have more good things available than one requires, so that a super-abundance ratio of 1.20 should be the condition for extra high self-esteem or happiness.

If this is all true, then the key to happiness is really quite simple—learn to want less than you actually have. For example, a person with 70 units of good things need only shift the aspired level down to 50 in order to have a super-happiness ratio of 1.40. But, people, it seems, do not often or easily take this approach, and prefer to struggle on trying to push the 70 units up toward an aspiration of 100 units (or whatever it is), no matter how slow their progress.

One problem with this way of putting the matter is that the good things wanted are often not "things" at all, in the material sense. Some obvious examples would be, being loved by one's family, appreciated by one's friends, in good health, successful in a work role, respected in the community, skilled at some craft or art, and so on. Early psychoanalysts saw mental requirements as a process called superego which embraces the conscience (the should-nots) and the ego-ideal (the shoulds). Since the superego is considered to be unconscious, being shaped from forgotten experiences early in our lives, we are faced with the problem of wanting states of life that we cannot name or identify. Whether it is really necessary to go to this level of analysis remains to be seen, the point here being that the concepts of "the punishing superego" and "the tyranny of the
shoulds" are other statements of the aspirations model pointed at a class of problems once called neuroses.

This notion of an ideal self, without the commitment to unconscious operations, appears also in Carl Rogers' formulation:

\[
\text{self-esteem} = \frac{\text{real self}}{\text{ideal self}}
\]

While it is apparent that the ideal self is entirely a mental construct or fantasy, Rogers' research suggests that the "real" self is also a perception. The typical research strategy here is to have the individual choose a set of adjectives to describe that person's self as it is thought to be now (the real self), and then again a set of adjectives to describe how that person would like to be (the ideal self). The more that these two sets of adjectives disagree, the larger is the gap between the real and ideal selves for that person, and the lower is the predicted level of self-esteem.

Following this formula, Rogers attempted to assess the benefits of client-centered therapy in terms of its closing the gap between, the real and ideal selves. While it may be wondered if the sorting of adjectives was fully adequate for this purpose, there was at least a statistical trend for the clients to reveal smaller real-ideal gaps after counselling than they had before. A possibly unsettling finding was that the gap was closed much more by changing the description of the real self than of the ideal self which remained highly stable through time. The possibility must be considered that some of our most basic aspirations and ideals may have the force of strong addictions.

Survey Studies

Social psychologists have also recognised the leverage power of desires and expectations in the lives of people. A pioneering and
inspiring project to open up a rational approach to human well-being is given in Hadley Cantril's report, *The Pattern of Human Concerns*. Here are the classified hopes and fears of 24,000 people from nations as rich and poor as the United States and India, as large and small as Brazil and Panama, as conflicted as Egypt and Israel, and governed by such different political systems and cultural outlooks as West Germany, Poland and Nigeria. While there are many interesting and interpretable differences among these nations, we should reflect on the remarkable consistency of the personal concerns of all peoples: a decent or improved standard of living, the welfare of children, good health for self and family, a good job or congenial work, to own a house or farm, a happy family life, peace, and to be useful to and accepted by others.

Cantril began his interviews with the question, "When you think about what really matters in your own life, what are your wishes and hopes for the future? In other words, if you imagine your future in the best possible light, what would your life look like then, if you are to be happy?" This question was followed by, "Now, taking the other side of the picture, what are your fears and worries about the future? In other words, if you imagine your future in the worst possible light, what would your life look like then?"

These two questions not only produced lists of hopes and fears, but set the stage for seeing where people placed their present lives on an 11-step scale between the best and worst they could imagine.

Here is a picture of a ladder. Suppose we say the top of the ladder (POINTING) represents the best possible life for you and the bottom (POINTING) represents the worst possible life for you. Where on the ladder (MOVING FINGER RAPIDLY UP AND DOWN THE LADDER) do you personally feel you stand at the present time? In between the rungs of the ladder
appeared the numbers from 0 through 10, from which the person chose a numbered level.

Cantril called this method the "self-anchoring striving scale" since the end-points of greatest hopes and worst were uniquely defined by each individual. Just below we will see evidence that where people place themselves on these scales agrees rather well with how satisfied they are with their lives. It may be that satisfaction ratings are also self-anchored, but in any case, Cantril’s results do bear on the analysis of well-being.

It is noteworthy that the mean self-ratings for the various countries did not show the overall-positive aura that appeared (as usual) in the ratings from the United States. The mean self-ratings in Cantril’s nations were just as often below the scale mid-point of 5.0 as they were above it. As we have already noted in Chapter 5 these differences, and those observed by Gallup, cannot be adequately explained by levels of poverty, although that is undoubtedly one factor.

Another troubling result was that the people of some of those countries, for example, the Dominican Republic, Brazil, Nigeria, Egypt, Panama and Cuba, expected to see, on average, startling gains in their personal ratings over the next five years, accompanied by almost equally large expected gains for their countries as a whole. It is difficult to think of any social, economic or political realities that could justify or fulfill such high hopes.

Recognizing that Cantril had opened up a rich vein of social meaning, the two Michigan teams asked if aspirations actually predict satisfactions
as the ancient formula promises, and whether ox not some other standard
of judgement might predict just as well or better.

Campbell, Converse and Rodgers focused on two life domains, housing
and neighborhood, to study several alternative frames of reference that
people might be using to judge their situations. To do this they
expanded Cantril's self-anchoring scale to 100 points with 00 defined as
the worst imaginable and 100 points as perfect, ideal for you. They
asked their random sample of 2164 Americans not only where they placed
their actual housing and neighborhood on this scale, but also where
they placed a number of imagined houses and neighborhoods, each one
defined by a different frame of reference. A pure aspiration level was
the rating given to the best house you could ever hope for, while the
expectations level was stated as where you will be living five years
from now. The idea that people may compare themselves with others was
tapped by the ratings given to the house or neighborhood that most of
the relatives you feel closest to live in, or that most of your friends
live in, or again what you consider the typical American house to be.
Another possibility is that people judge their situations in terms
of their own past experience, for example, the house you liked the most
of all the houses you have lived in, the house you liked least, the last
house you lived in and the house you lived in five years ago.

Since the average ratings of these different frames of reference
were almost identical for houses and neighborhoods, it does not matter
which one we look at. Figure 00 shows the average rating given to the
different kinds of houses. Study that figure now, please.
Typical American
5 years ago
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Obviously, individual people differed on how they rated any one of these ideas, including the house or neighborhood they currently lived in. Campbell's team took each respondent's own frame-of-reference rating, for example, the best house you could hope for, and subtracted from that the person's rating for this house you live in now to get a gap score for each person's aspiration level. These gap scores were then correlated with how individuals rated their current house in a different part of the interview, using an independent seven-step satisfaction rating score. This correlation was -.56, minus because people with larger gaps produced lower satisfaction ratings.

They then moved on to the next frame-of-reference, the houses that people expected to have in five years, and calculated a new set of personal gaps with actual house now. These gaps correlated with housing satisfaction at -.55, but the parallel correlation for neighborhoods was not as high (-.40). As they proceeded through the frames of reference this way the other possible gap scores became steadily worse at predicting satisfaction levels. It appeared that the best way to account for people's satisfactions in any domain of life is by the gap between what they (think they) have now and the best they can hope for, or else, where they expect to be in five years.

How people rate their houses and neighborhoods tells us little about their overall sense of well-being and we would like to know if the gap principle works as well in other domains. Some evidence collected by Andrews and Withey suggests that it does, although their method was
different. The three domains they studied were: what you are accomplishing in life, your house or apartment, and what the national government is doing. Of these three, self-accomplishment is certainly relevant to sense of well-being.

After each domain was rated on the delighted-terrible scale, it was rated again on the same scale with a specified frame of reference in mind. For example, need fulfillment was asked: thinking only of yourself and your own needs, how do you feel about what you are accomplishing in life? Social position was defined: thinking of your age and position in life, how do you feel about... Fairness was defined: with your values about what is appropriate and fair, how do you feel about...

The ratings made under these three frames of reference correlated with the general satisfaction ratings with etas in the range .70 to .77 for all three domains. The ratings given under the different frames were also correlated with each other, but each different frame added something useful to the prediction of satisfaction.

The high correlations observed here between general satisfaction in a domain and frame-of-reference satisfactions are probably exaggerated by a test-method effect, since all responses were given on the delighted-terrible rating scale. Furthermore, since all six frame questions in a given domain followed in a run after the general rating, people may have found it difficult to shift so rapidly from one frame-of-reference to the next, and tended to stick close to a particular response level.

Alex Michalos at the University of Guelph at least reduced the test-method influence by developing a separate scale of response choices for each of three different frame-of-reference ratings: how closely docs (domain X) match your aims or goals, how docs (X) compare to your all time high, and how docs (X) compare with average people of your age.
Of these three, he found that the first (goals) question was consistently the best predictor of satisfactions with as in the .60s across 14 domains that included life as a whole. His conclusion that aspirations are the most basic standards of judgment agrees with Campbell’s finding for aspirations (the best one can hope for) and perhaps also with Andrews’ and Withey’s personal needs item.

While these findings all suggest that desires are the engines of joy and sorrow, have we really pinpointed the stuff of people’s lives, or do we only have abstract words and arbitrary numbers? It is one thing to say that one’s marriage is less than ideal, and another to say what the ideal actually consists of, but unless aspirations are stated in terms of every-day choices, what will we learn about managing our lives and educating our children? This kind of question led us into three studies testing the aspirations model in terms of more concrete life choices.

The Tait Study: Aspirations in Hard Currencies

Campbell’s approach to aspirations has the virtue of getting separate numbers for the level achieved and the level desired in any domain, and using the difference between them (the gap) to predict satisfaction. But that demonstration looked only at housing and neighborhood, neither one very close to the care of people’s general happiness. Furthermore, there is a sense of unreality about assigning numbers on a 100-point scale to represent real and ideal cases. Can people define and quantify their achieved and desired levels in terms of real-life units, such as dollars, or numbers of persons, or hours of an activity?
Since our first study was limited to a sample of 35 Dunedin adults, we report the essential ideas without the usual fine points. Six domains were selected for study as being modestly or importantly connected with levels of happiness and being, by one means or another, quantifiable with everyday numbers. These were: education, income, job, friends, family activity, and husband or wife.

In each domain, subjects were first asked to give a number for their achieved position in that domain, and then to state what number they would need to be completely satisfied in that domain. For education, both numbers were years of schooling completed, and for family income they were dollars per year.

In the other four domains an index was derived from more than one question each time asked first for achieved level, and second for aspired level. The job index was covered by six topics that Harwood and Riesman had identified as factors in job satisfaction. For job prestige, the subjects first rank-ordered a set of common job names from most to least desirable and then placed their own job into the rank-order. Other job features were the number of hours worked each week, the number of friends at work, the number of hours needed to complete a day's work, the time it takes to travel to work, and the number of times the same task is repeated each day. Except for prestige and friends, these were negative measures of the job.

The friends index was defined in terms of the number of friends meeting our definition of a friend, the hours per week spent with such friends, and the number of people the respondent does not get on with (scored negatively). The family index covered the number of family members seen more than five times a year, the number "you can get along with often or all the time", and the hours per week spent in family
activities. The partner index covered "the percentage of time you are out of sorts" with the partner (negative) the number of shared interests, and the number of hours per week doing things together.

The achievement index for each domain was simply the sum of the standard scores for each achievement question in that domain, while the total achievements score was the sum of the standard scores across the six domains. This method of summing standard scores in two stages was repeated on aspiration questions to get the total aspirations score.

After all the real and ideal levels were taken, the subject also rated each of the six domains for general satisfaction on the standard delighted-terrible rating scale. These ratings were summed to get a sum-of-satisfactions score. The last questionnaire was Affectometer 1 (short form).

Results. The amount of agreement between the two outcome measures, sum of satisfactions and Affectometer 1, was lower than we might expect from these six domains, with \( r = .45 \). To find out if either outcome could be predicted from the aspiration gap model, the total achievements score was subtracted from the total aspirations for each person. The resulting gap scores yielded \( r = -.41 \) with the sum of satisfactions, and \( r = -.54 \) with well-being, both values significant beyond the .02 level. We expected the correlation to be higher with the sum of the six domain satisfactions than with general well-being, but the apparent reversal here was well within the play of sampling fluctuations and has no significance.

As expected, the more that people's desires outdistance what they perceive they have, the less satisfied and happy they are. Here the effect is brought one step closer to "reality" by using semi-objective scales of measurement. The results justified a further study, which follows.
The Collins Study: Aspirations in Hard and Soft Currencies

A question arising from the Tait study is whether the semi-objective scales for real and ideal levels merely confirm the self-anchoring scales or yield somewhat unique information. Taking income for example, does it make any difference whether actual and desired levels are stated in dollars with no upper limit on the available numbers, or in points between 00 and 100? In this study, the two methods are directly compared.

Do aspiration gaps always work in the same way, or do they have more or less impact depending on other factors? We considered two possibilities. The first was whether it makes any difference to know if people feel they are making progress and will reach their desired level or are more pessimistic about it. The score of the expected-progress question was how likely do you think it is you will reach the level that will make you feel happy in this area (domain) in the next five years with five possible choices ranging from very unlikely to very likely.

Another supplementary question was based on a version of the perceived-locus-of-control model, that is, on the question of whether people feel that events are in their own control, or are in the control of outside forces. In his PhD thesis, Graeme Dixon had explored reasons why people with an inner locus might be generally happier than people with an outer locus, and obtained a low but significant correlation between Rotter's locus of control scale and the Affectometer ($r = .33$, $df = 216$, $p < .001$), favoring inner locus.

In this study, however, we explored an attribution version of the model that was receiving attention elsewhere in studies on psychological depression. In this model, it is beneficial to attribute one's successes
to one’s self (inner locus) and one’s failures to outside forces (outer locus), whereas depressed people may tend to do the opposite, taking the blame for their failures, and no credit for their successes.

We applied this model by asking people if you do not reach or keep to the level that makes you feel happy about (name of domain) the most important reason will probably be: lack of ability, attitude or habits, luck or fate, God’s will, the fault of others, the way society works? (Check the one most important). When the respondents chose either of the first two categories they scored as internal for that domain (score = 0); otherwise, they scored as external (score = 1). Since the question asks about not reaching one’s goals, the prediction is that happier people will be more external.

Five domains emerged as ones in which we could sensibly apply both the semi-objective and self-anchoring techniques to determine current and desired levels. This restriction ruled out domains like self, marriage and family whose satisfaction scores are good guides to general happiness but are awkward to pin down to real life units. The five domains chosen were: income, activities rime, friends, physical fitness, and education. When assessed for satisfaction, the known usefulness of these domains for predicting well-being was: modest, uncertain, mixed, weak and weak, in that order. Therefore, the result to be gap predicted in this study was the sum-of-satisfactions in the same five domains, rather than well-being.

Questionnaires. Six questionnaires were given in the order: self-anchoring scales, semi-objective scales, expected progress, locus of control, satisfactions, Affectometer 1 (short form).
The self-anchoring scales were explained with an example showing a line across the page going from 00 to 100 marked off in 10s with the end points meaning the worst imaginable and perfect, ideal for you. Subjects made a small vertical slash across the line to show the points for their actual situation, and again to show the points needed to feel happy about that domain, for each domain in turn.

For the semi-objective scales, three domains were covered by a single scale each. Actual and desired family incomes were taken in dollars, friends as the number of friends meeting our definition of a friend, and education as the number of years completed, with 12 years set equal to completion of high school (7th Form in New Zealand).

Activities time (interpreted on all other questionnaires simply as amount of leisure time) was measured first by having subjects list the number of hours spent each week in each of nine categories covering different types of work and leisure time activities. To reveal their aspirations, they revised the number of hours in each category to feel happy about those hours. Achieved activity time was defined as the number of hours left unchanged between the real and ideal accounts, while aspired activity time was the sum of unchanged hours plus the larger of all-hours-added and all-hours-deleted in moving from the real to ideal state. Note that people wanting more work could get as many gap hours as people wanting more spare time.

The fitness index used three questions covering cigarettes per day, exercise times per week, and an estimate of comfortable jogging distance. When adding these together, the scores on each fitness question were converted to standard scores based on the sample mean and standard deviation. Achieved fitness was the sum of the three standard scores.
across the actual-level questions, while aspired fitness was the sum of three standard scores across the desired-level questions.

After completing the semi-objective scales, the respondents rated each domain in respect to progress expected in reaching their goals, then again, made a category judgment for each domain's locus of control, then rated their satisfaction with each domain on the seven-step delighted-terrible scale. The final questionnaire was the 48 item Affectometer I (short form).

The participants were 58 Dunedin adults, reflecting a 58% participation rate, recruited from a church club and a squash club. Although this is not a representative sample, and was biased young with a mean age of 30.2, the general independence of well-being from religiosity, physical fitness or age suggests that the results should have a fair applicability to adults more generally. Further details on the sampling procedure are given in Appendix 00.

Results: Average Levels and Gaps. The first findings to look at are the average real and ideal levels in each domain. These means are presented in Table 00 along with their gaps.

On the 100-point self-anchoring scale, achieved levels range from an average of 52 points for leisure time up to 71 points for family income. Since gaps are calculated by the rule aspirations minus achievements, the + gap in each domain means that people usually want more than they have, although this is only trivially so for number of friends,
Using the semi-objective scales, the average Dunedin parson would like nearly $4000 more income, to rearrange some 23-24 hours a week, to have about the same number of friends, to be able to jog 700 yards farther, to exercise 1-2 more times a week, and to have 1-2 more years of education. Of course, no person in the sample actually fit this statistical image.

There is an old quip that goes, "How much money does a person need to be happy?" the answer being, "A little bit more." In this case, a-little-bit-more is 27% more, bearing in mind that getting this bonus would probably not make anybody noticeably happier in the long run (Chapter 5).

**Correlations: Predicting Satisfactions.** According to the model, satisfactions should be predicted only by the gaps, not by achievements or aspirations considered alone. The most general test of the model is given by the correlations among the sum-scores rather than the scores in each domain: The bars in Figure 00 show how well each type of predictor correlates with the sum-of-satisfactions, while the shaded part-bars show the parallel correlations with well-being.

We can dispatch the well-being results with the single comment that they mirror the satisfaction results, except the relationships are much weaker; we anticipated that these domains would not be very good predictors of well-being.

---

In predicting satisfactions, the self-anchoring scales do not perform the way the model requires. Although the gap scores strongly
Table 00 (Ms 13.1)
Mean Achievements and Aspirations; Difference Gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>S-A 100-pt Scale</th>
<th>Semi-Objective Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ach</td>
<td>Asp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities/Leisure</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jog Distance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Twelve of the 50 respondents were smokers averaging 18.1 cigarettes per day and aspiring to 6.5 cigarettes, for a downward aspiration gap of 11.6 cigarettes.

b Scores above 12 reflect years of university, teachers' college, or trade/polytechnic school beyond high school.
predict: satisfactions, the achievement scores do it just as well on their own. This should make us suspicious that self-anchored gaps and achievements may be measuring the same thing, in which case they should be highly correlated with each other. Going to Appendix (00) to examine the background correlations, we discover that self-anchoring gaps correlate at \(-.74\) with their achievement component, but only \(.39\) with their aspiration component. It appears that the gaps are telling us little more than achievement levels alone.

Why should this be? Perhaps there is little difference between asking people what they desire in terms of the points they need to feel happy and the 100 points already defined as ideal, perfect for you. Even though need-to-feel-happy scores run well-below 100 points (averaging 73 points) they may be picking up the same desires, only stated less extremely than perfect-for-you. If so, the gap between the achievements and the need-to-feel-happy level is just another version of the gap from achievements to the perfect-for-you level. However, the second type of gap is already contained in the achievement scores alone—for example, an achievement level of 60 is automatically a gap of 40 points below the perfect-for-you level of 100 points.

If we now turn to the satisfaction scale, we see that the top category is feeling delighted about something, and this may be still another way of tapping the same notion of what is desired, we may reasonably conclude that self-anchoring scales are satisfaction scales, or that satisfaction scales are self-anchored, or both. This does nor in any way weaken Cantril's numerical findings but it does suggest that ordinary satisfaction ratings would have produced similar results.
The semi-objective scales do perform the way the model requires, with only the gaps being useful predictors of satisfactions. It may be argued that their correlation (−.53) is lower than the one produced by self-anchored achievements (.70), but sampling fluctuations aside, the semi-objective gaps are more meaningful as an independent explanation of satisfaction ratings. In fact, we might be justified in proposing that self-anchored achievements can be accounted for by semi-objective gaps which is modestly confirmed with \( r = -0.51 \) (Appendix 00).

Turning to the two novel predictors, progress-expected is a very significant factor in satisfactions (\( r = .44 \)), while locus of control does not reach significance. Before accepting the progress-expected as a new factor we must make sure it is not merely gap information in a new disguise, but in fact the intercorrelation of these two predictors is very modest (\( r = .33 \)) so we are assured that progress-expected is telling us something-extra. On the other hand, in light of our acquaintance with personal perceptions, we may not jump to the conclusion that progress-expected tells us the true likelihood that a person will achieve his or her goals.

**Correlations: Adaptation to Reality.** So far, we have treated achievements and aspirations as unrelated effects, as if what people want is totally unrelated to where they actually are in life. If we considered only self-anchoring scales, this notion could be allowed to stand, since the correlation between overall achievement and aspiration scores is only .31. However, when we turn to the semi-objective scales, the correlation is a striking .80, and this high connectedness also appears in the individual domains: income (.78),
activities time (.83), friends (.67), jogging distance (.79),
exercises per week (.66), cigarettes per day (.68) and education (.81).
Since achieved and aspired levels were also collected in the Hughes
Study on fitness (Chapter 7) we can see if this effect is consistently
found, which it is: jogging distance (.78), exercises per week (.69),
cigaretts per day (.93) and alcoholic drinks per week (.63).

Earlier, we said that the amount of money a person wants is a little
bit more, but we also emphasize that it is only a little bit more,
and this is equally true in other domains like activities, friends,
fitness, education and so on—presumably it applies equally well to
intelligence, sexuality, housing, health, beauty, and the quality of
family life. Here we have rather powerful evidence for the central
role given to human adaptation in happiness theory by Brickman and
by Graeme Dixon. What we want in life is closely tied to what we
have.

Does this contradict the findings for gapness? No. Although the
average desire is for a little bit more, the actual amount varies from
one person to the next and these levels—and pessimism over progress—
predict their dissatisfaction. The adaptation effect does, however,
suggest that our method of measuring gaps is crude—for example, we
treat the gap between incomes of $5,000 and $10,000 the same as the gap
between $40,000 and $45,000. Undoubtedly a ratio of achievements to
aspirations would be a better formula—if only we could say where the
zero-points really are. (Can we discover them by reasoning backward
from ratio data?)

Summary. The classic achievements/aspirations formula for
happiness is well supported by the semi-objective scales. When the
domains are close to well-being, the gaps may account for 29% of the variance (Tait), but even a more peripheral set can account for 10% (Collins). In the latter case, the power of the model is better seen in the prediction of the corresponding domain satisfactions (28%).

There is a trade-off between how central a domain is to well-being and how easy it is to objectify its properties. Particularly with domains like family, marriage and self, we cannot yet name the concrete qualities that are being judged as real and ideal.

In the Collins study, the gap effect occurs against a background of general adaptation—the situations people want are not far away from what they have, when compared to the known variety of human circumstances.

The gap model can also be demonstrated with self-anchoring scales, but the upper bound of the gap, the desired state of affairs, is given in the anchoring concept at the top end of the scale, so that no further aspired level needs to be pegged, since the achieved level then carries the basic gap information.

In addition to the sheer size of the gaps, it is important to know how optimistic people are about achieving their desired levels. But so far, it does not seem important to know whether they would ascribe future failure to themselves (inner locus of control) or to outside factors (outer locus).

The Power Study: The Properties of Good and Bad Circumstances

Our third study used the general aspirations model as a framework for trying to predict more of the variance in well-being than we had achieved in the Collins study. The first step was to replace the
fixed list of domains with a free list in which people could name any aspect of their lives they chose. This ruled out the use of semi-objective scales and required a different mode of analysis. Taking the model as true, we argued that the "good things" people see in their lives represent achievements, or aspirations fulfilled, while the "bad things" represent aspirations not fulfilled. Therefore, we should be able to explain individual differences in sense of well-being by the balance formula:

GOOD THINGS - BAD THINGS

This is related to the gap concept, but instead of measuring the discrepancy between obtained and sought-after conditions in each domain, we are looking at an overall balance of fulfilled and unfulfilled domains. Bad things, however, can be defined by either end of the gap, either as an existing state one objects to, or as an alternative state 'one- longs for. Since we did not know how people think about these things, we asked the question both ways: list all the bad things in your life and about yourself that help make you unhappy, and list all the things you would like to see added to your life that would make you happier. On the good side, we asked respondents to list all the good things in your life and about yourself that help make you happy. The balance formula actually applied was this:

GOOD THINGS - (BAD + ADD THINGS)

The initial plan was to collect the list of good things, bad things and add things, and apply this formula to the number of circumstances ("things") appearing in each of the three lists.
Of course, this way of adding and subtracting things gives a certain weight to each circumstance, which may or may not be optimal. Following this line of thought, we wondered if we could isolate some psychological properties of circumstances that would help us to understand how they become relevant to sense of well-being. In other words, we hypothesized that some gaps between achieved and desired levels are important than other gaps, depending once again on the meanings people assign them. Our strategy here was to collect eight different pieces of psychological information on each good, bad and add circumstance. For most of these supplementary dimensions, we derived an overall score using the good-bad-add formula to specify the balance on that factor. The eight new predictors were the following.

**Satisfaction Feelings.** Although we asked the respondents to list "good" and "bad" things in their lives, it was left to them to decide what things in their lives should be included. Consequently, it was likely that a measure of the feelings associated with each circumstance would be clarifying. For good and add things, they were given a choice of satisfied, pleased, or delighted, visibly scored 1, 2 or 3. For bad things the choices were dissatisfied, unhappy and terrible also scored 1, 2, 3, and the mean score for each list was put through the balance formula. For example, a person whose "good things" had a mean of 2.0 for an average feeling of pleased, a mean of 2.5 for bad things (between unhappy and terrible) and a mean of 1.5 for add things (between satisfied and pleased if added to one's life) got an overall balance score of 0.0 as follows:

$$0.0 = 2.0 - \frac{(2.5 + 1.5)}{2}$$
The mean score for each list was used instead of sums since we were interested in knowing what "feelings" added above and beyond the number of things in each list.

**Importance.** Although the Michigan studies (pp 00-00) had both found, to everybody's surprise, that getting importance ratings along with satisfaction ratings for each domain added nothing to the prediction of global well-being, it seemed worthwhile to take another look at such ratings, especially since they had proved useful (indeed, necessary) for predicting well-being from domain aspiration-fulfilment ratings in Graeme Dixon's PhD thesis.

For good things, we asked how important is this thing in making you happy with the choices slightly important, fairly important, or vary important visibly scored 1, 2 and 3. For bad things, the question was how important is this thing in making you unhappy, while for add things it was how important would this thing be to adding to your happiness, with the same three choices.

Obviously, a person should be happier if all the good things get high importance ratings, while the bad and add things have low importance, so the balance score is applied to the mean ratings of the items in each of the three personal lists.

**Think About.** It is possible that people answering a question about 'the good, bad and desired states of their lives may produce answers to suit the occasion, that is, to meet the "demand characteristic" of the survey, whether or not they have actually thought about the matter before. We do not think this is a significant problem, but as another route to pinpointing "important" circumstances, we asked the respondents to check off all the items in each list that
you think about a lot. The good-bad-add balance formula was applied to the proportion of items checked in the respective lists.

Over Two Years. A situation might also gain in importance if it has been stable over a long period of time, say over two years. In the case of good things, this would signal an area that continues to be fulfilling, while a bad thing, or a thing to be added, that has been around for a long time suggests a quality of "stuckness" or failure of adaptation that could lead to low progress-expectations (see the Collins study above--but we did not directly measure such expectations in this study.)

The question asked which things have been part of your life (add: have you been waiting to add to your life) for over two years? Again, the balance formula was applied to the proportion of items checked in the three lists,

Self-Esteem. We have seen that the achievements/aspirations formula is sometimes said to predict self-esteem rather than happiness. Although for some writers self-esteem may be the essential meaning of happiness, Certainly it has a central position as shown by the highly valid self-esteem items appearing in Affectometer 1 and 2, or in the self-efficacy domain studied by Andrews and Withey.

Our question asked which things in a list added to, subtracted from, or would add to your confidence and self respect; the proportion of items checked in each list made up the terms for the balance formula.

Fun and Enjoyment. The term "happy" conveys a somewhat bubblier, more alive, quality than the term "satisfied". This could be a matter of degree, as assumed α; the delighted-terrible scale where unhappy is below dissatisfied, end pleased and delighted are above
satisfied. But it could also be a difference in the quality of experience, corresponding to the distinction that Andrews and McKennell later proposed between the "cognitive" and "affective" aspects of well-being. Satisfaction may be a cognitive judgment that one's requirements are fulfilled, without the feeling-tone of true pleasure.

This distinction shows up in another aspect of Andrews and Withey. One of their "domains" that is a strong predictor of global well-being is the amount of fun and enjoyment you have (as measured on the delighted-terrible rating scale!). Taking up the view that this may indeed be a distinctive quality that circumstances have or lack, we asked people to check off any of their good things that add fun and enjoyment to your life and bad things that take away fun and enjoyment from your life, and add things that would add fun and enjoyment to your life. Since the result was again a yes/no decision on each circumstance listed, the balance formula was applied to the proportion of items marked yes in each list.

The next two qualities were not summarized by the balance formula, but were saved for a secondary stage of analysis.

Locus of Control. In the Collins study our probe for an effect of perceived inner/outer locus of control was not productive, but the test was far from conclusive and we tried it again. As it is usually treated in the literature (especially in depression studies), it is beneficial to believe that successes are due to one's self (inner locus), while failures should be attributed to other factors (outer locus). (That these may be misattributions is another issue.) For the good things we asked, decide whether it exists either because of you, that is, your skills, abilities, personality, efforts, attitudes...
or bodily characteristics or because of fate, God's will, or other people. and this was reduced to a choice between me or other.

Parallel questions were asked for bad and add things and the scare for each list was the number of other items (outer locus), but these were not fed into the balance formula.

Parents' Disapproval. An important question is why some people want more out of life than they can make it yield? After some reflection, we proposed, as many other might do, that when parents frequently disapprove of their children, or when their love is conditional on good behavior and meeting performance standards, they may be setting up their children to search for approval-through-success the rest of their lives...

People may not be able to remember accurately how their parents treated them in childhood, but we hoped to get a shadow of that treatment by asking how their parents are treating them now. Although we wanted to test for a property of judgmentality or conditional love and approval, we ended up asking a much simpler question for the items on each list: which of these things does your Mother disapprove of and which of these things does your Father disapprove of? Our method of scoring did not use the balance formula, but simply considered the proportion of all circumstances over all three lists that were disapproved by each parent, taking the mean of the two parent scores as a measure of total current disapproval. Admittedly, the measure is not as interesting as the idea that spawned it.

Well-Being. Before constructing their lists, that is, at the
beginning of the questionnaire, respondents filled out Affectomcter 2. This was the outcome to be predicted by [correlated with] all the different factors arising from the lists of good, bad and add circumstances.

**Results.** Our rigid plan for the analysis of the data (to minimize the number of chance findings that could arise from 'fishing' the data) was to apply the balance formula to the first seven predictors and relate them to well-being in terms of simple $R^2$s and again by multiple regression. For the regression analysis we moved stepwise from the best single predictor to the best two predictors and so on up to all seven predictors. The rule chosen in advance was to select the number of predictors giving the highest adjusted $R^2$ before the associated $F$ value started to decline. This solution produced five predictors, but upon reflection, it seemed that three predictors were all that made any real sense.

The last two predictors, locus of control and parents' disapproval, were then correlated directly with well-being by simple $R^2$s only.

Figure 00 shows the Pearson $R^2$s on the left side and the multiple regression $betas$ on the right side. In terms of the $r$ values, five of the predictors fall in a range (.17 to .26) that might be called worst-imaginable-for-us, because they are not low enough to claim a probable null effect, but neither are they high enough to account for appreciable variance or even reach significance at the .05 level.

*FIGURE 00 ABOUT HERE (MS 13.4)*

Only two of these predictors can be classified one way or the other: the simple number of things predicts well-being with $r = .35$ ($p < .01$), while importance ratings add nothing ($r = .00$) which merely
{with Affectometer 2)

\[ R = .50 \]
\[ adj. R^2 = .16 \]
confirms the original Michigan findings on importance. At this point the score is one positive result, one negative result and five useless results.

Turning to the betas on the right side, it appears at first that we can keep some predictors and cast off others, but even this is probably not correct. The simple number of things retains its strength with a beta of .35 and is supported by four other predictors to get an overall predictive power with $R = .50$. Allowing for the sample size and chance factors in the combination, the adjusted $R^2$ is .18, for a reasonably encouraging 18% of the variance in well-being.

However, the fourth predictor in the list is importance with a negative beta of -.20 which implies that it is beneficial to have unimportant good things and important bad/add things. More accurately, it is beneficial for things to be this way after taking into account the effects of the other predictors. Given the versatility of the human mind, it is possible to imagine a scenario that would produce such an odd result, but it is probably only a meaningless anomaly produced by the formulas of multiple regression. This also makes us suspicious of the last predictor, self-esteem with a beta of only .12. In fact, if we return to the simpler regression analysis using only the best three predictors, they are again number, over two years and fun and enjoyment (with betas of .34, .18, and .16, respectively) and produce $R = .45$ and adjusted $R^2 = .16$. Since we can account for 16% of the variance with three predictors versus 18% with five, the three-predictor solution is preferable for its efficiency and credibility.

We have not, however, proved that these three predictors are superior to every other combination of three predictors. When we consider how the predictors are correlated with each other (Appendix 00), we find that most of them intercorrelated with values in the
range .30 to .50, and it would only take small fluctuations among these values to lead the multiple regression to point to, say, the things people often think about, or feelings as the best supplementary predictors (after simple number).

One predictor that is almost completely independent of all the others is simple number, so we can at least be confident that number is an indispensable predictor in this set.

One oddity that occurs among the predictor intercorrelations in Appendix 00 is the high $r$ of .70 between importance ratings and feelings. This might lead us to the plausible opinion that people confuse "importance" with "goodness of feeling" and this could explain why importance ratings never add anything useful. This is probably a red-herring. It is unlikely that the Michigan studies would have overlooked a similar correlation if it existed in their data, and when we turn to the more usual way of taking importance and satisfaction ratings, as we did on the fitness-domain in the Hughes study (pages 00-00), we find an $r$ of only .17, not significant. We take our result to be a fluke.

So far, we have not considered the two remaining predictors that did not fit into the good-bad-add formula. The proportions of circumstances said to be due to outside forces (external locus) in the good, bad and add lists correlated with well-being with $r$s of only .03, -.08 and -.16, respectively. These correlations are not only trivial but are actually opposite in sign to the good-from-sic and bad-from-the-world theory of favorable attributions. As in the Collins study, when we try to apply locus of control measures directly to the domains or circumstances of people's lives, nothing happens.

The factor of parents' disapproval also did not predict well-being usefully ($r = -.02$). Since this was not a good test of the
original hypothesis about parental judgmentality, its failure in the present study is not conclusive.

**Summary.** We may be encouraged to see that people can actually name good, bad and longed-for circumstances *that* correlate with their levels of well-being. Although this was not directly a study of achievement-aspiration gaps, it agrees with the semi-objective scales in bringing happiness into contact with perceived "realities". In this case, the balance in (a) the simple number of favored and dis-favored circumstances, (b) circumstances 'lasting over two years, and (c) circumstances helping or hindering fun and enjoyment, combine to account for some 16% of the variance in well-being.

*On the* other hand, *we set* out to account for much more variance than we had succeeded in doing in the Collins study (10%), and possibly even in the very promising Tait study (29%), by letting people freely choose the domains most relevant to their happiness. This aspiration was not achieved. Although there are many points of method that might be questioned, the one that seems most compelling to us is the free listing of domains itself. In this task we are virtually asking people to be their own psychologists, that is, to correctly name the situations that most affect their affect.

Thinking back on it, we have good reason to doubt that people are very accurate in this assignment. For example, the illusory correlation studies seen in Chapter 6 demonstrated that people often give more weight to certain objective situations than they actually deserve. Also, the average importance rating that people give to a domain is not a very good indicator of its correlational importance in predicting global well-being (Chapter 5, pages 00-00). So it is likely that asking people to list freely the things in their lives that make them happy or unhappy, or would make them happier, taps
into their misattributions as much as their correct attributions.

The other main possibility, of course, is that the achievement/aspiration formula is not a complete explanation of happiness. Although ratings of aspiration-fulfilment are highly predictive of well-being for Andrews and Withey, and for Michalos, we may be cautious about high correlations arising from purely rating scale methods, where test methods effects and response sets may be working. We can say, however, that the aspirations model now joins with social support (Chapter 9) and evaluation set (Chapter 12) as being one of the three strongest models for explaining general happiness. Unfortunately, we do not yet know how these three factors overlap with each other,
PERSONAL AND SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS

For managing our lives personally, the aspirations model gives us two options, either to organize our efforts so that we achieve our foremost goals and desires, or else to abandon them and find contentment and joy in what we already have. Barrow says, "The only overall way to increase happiness is to meet or reduce expectations. ...there is nothing for it but to juggle wholesale with both sides of the equation: expectations and actualities."

While this conclusion is correct in the short run, it applies to a fixed set of aspirations that either can or cannot be fulfilled. Common experience teaches us that not long after we achieve an important aim in life, we may become restless and begin to yearn for new and grander accomplishments or accoutrements. In the achievement-oriented society it is considered worthy and even necessary for mental health to be continuously striving for new goals and setting new records. This creates a paradox—we are urged to strive and compete, while our theory tells us that this is a prescription for unhappiness.

In the long run, we cannot forever increase our achievements to fulfill an endlessly expanding set of aspirations. In the long run; the real choice is between knowing or not knowing how to be fulfilled without new achievements and advantages. We recognize that we are not really infinite, omnipotent, and immortal, but we do not know where our limits actually lie. Our fantasies and the values held up by society urge us to keep reaching out until we fall down with a thud. Eventually we must learn not to reach beyond our grasp, and this is just as true for rich and powerful people as it is for the rest of us. Perhaps more so.

Even though raising achievements is only a half-solution for
psychological well-being and for the short term only, it is the only life strategy publicly recognized in western societies. From the moment of starting school children encounter a steady flow of increasingly important gradings and marks for their verbal skills; institutional cooperation, and sports performances. Later on this will be converted to competition in work-productivity and other means for gaining financial advantage and status.

It is important for us individually to realize that status is a zero-sum game. A zero-sum game is one in which the points gained by one side exactly equal the points lost on the other, as in poker games where the money won by some players is precisely the money lost by other players. This zero-sum idea can be applied loosely to any situation where there is an overall balance of gains and losses or winners and losers.

To the extent that any human achievement is to be considered excellent, praiseworthy or high in status, it must at least be unusual, and preferably difficult and useful as well. For the few who can do some outstanding thing, there must be by definition many who cannot. For every person who has high status there must be others who have low status. Nobody can get ahead if nobody is left behind. So it follows that competition and striving for status produce as much failure as success and as much unhappiness as happiness.

This first law of status might be disputed by arguing that competitive striving at least produces overall benefits in production and technology. And so...? In western societies these luxuries and conveniences do nothing for health or happiness and are producing many negative "side effects" in the form of unemployment, resource depletion, chemical poisoning, nuclear terror, giantism,
future shock, rising aspirations and more competition. Technology and production have become one vast pre-occupation, an all-absorbing game of life that thrashes and surges like a roller coaster that nobody knows how to stop or even slow down.

Others will argue that achievements are not zero-sum because of the principle of good sportsmanship. We are not personally aware of losing or failing when others are winning and succeeding, Since we did not enter into a contest or race with the person appearing on the front on TIME Magazine this week, we have not competed and have not fallen behind in importance. But in the long term it is hard to escape the conclusion that all those famous people are important and the rest of us are not. It is possible to deceive ourselves for a while, to say that we are only competing with ourselves and nobody else, and that there are only positive points in the race, but in the long term, the illusion is difficult to maintain.

If one is "nobody" in the magazines or on television, "nobody" in the community and "nobody" even in the family, one can become desperate for recognition by others. This problem is strikingly illustrated in the case of John Hinckley who tried to handgun down President Reagan of the United States in 1980 in order to win the attention and love of a movie star he adored. This man's craziness was taking too literally the social "message" that famous people are important and important people are lovable. Undoubtedly the threat of being nobody contributes powerfully to unhappiness, craziness and crime in western societies.

There is evidence that this is so. Rudkin rank-ordered sixteen nations in terms of two kinds of competitive striving, need for achievement and need for power. Using death-rate statistics he found that achievement-oriented societies show more symptoms of
anxiety and inhibition such as ulcers and high blood pressure, while power-oriented societies show more aggression or acting out in terms of homicides, suicides and alcoholism. The United States was among the highest of all countries on all five measures of psychogenic death rates. Exxon's proud claim that "the spirit of achievement is the spirit of America" is sadly correct for millions of people who are psychologically diminished or physically injured by the pursuit of success and status. The only honest book on stress management would be titled Ambition Management—and who would buy it?

Traditionally, ambition and status striving have been restrained by the counter-values of recreation, family life, hearth and home. In the past few decades, however, "liberated" women have been moving rapidly into the work force, so that many western countries have concurrently set new records in the number of two-income families and number of people unemployed. Also concurrently, the rate of alcoholism in women is rising rapidly from a baseline that was traditionally far below the rate for men. Thus, the cultural momentum of the achieving society appears to have created a juggernaut which fewer and fewer people can escape.

Ironically, on the basis of the only available data (the Collins study) there is essentially no correlation between a person's aspiration-achievement gap and their actual level of achievement ($r = .02$, Appendix 00). In other words, the amount of over-striving is no indication of real achievement; people with realistic and modest ambitions accomplish just as much, on average, as big schemers and dreamers.
Although western people may feel that achievement for its own sake is the "natural" way of human life, eastern philosophies and religions emphasize just the opposite. In that view, the individual ego, the importance of the self; is the fundamental illusion and error which must be cast off and transcended in order to have enlightenment and serenity. Until we acknowledge our submergence into the whole process of mankind and the universe, we are condemned to a futile struggle to find meaning as individuals.

In another vein, Bateson has described the social smoothing and blunting customs in traditional Balinese society [Indonesia] that dis-allow the emergence of competition and individual egotism. There is at least a shadow of the process in New Zealand's taboo against "skiting" or putting oneself forward.

Among the constant supply of popular western books on every imaginable mode of achievement, self-improvement and fulfilment, there is almost none on the control of ambitions or expectations. Indeed, ideas of acceptance, timelessness, passive wander and non-striving appear absent in western thought outside the Greek philosophers and some tragedies of the "classical" literature. A delightful exception to this rule is The Peter Prescription\textsuperscript{18} by Dr Laurence J. Peter, the sequel to his more popular treatise The Peter Principle ("In a hierarchy every employee tends to rise to his level of incompetence."). In the second entertaining and witty book the author's wisdom is to confront us with the organizations and hierarchies that permeate our lives, become our addictions, and drive us to frustration and despair.
"Disaster plagues the man who no longer knows himself, for he has lost his special immunity to a multitude of modern ills. Prostrated in front of a television set and exposed to all manner of lies about himself, he is defenseless against the pressures that envelope him. Seized with guilt about his social, position and yearning for security, he joins the status seekers and throws himself into a fit of competition and conformity that lays waste his natural powers."

The Peter Prescription

"There are two things to aim at in life: first to get what you want; and after that, to enjoy it. Only the wisest of mankind achieve the second." L. Smith.

"To use escalation to find your maximum potential, you must climb past your level of competence and then, when you realize you are incompetent, move back down to your level of competence. Although this is theoretically possible, in practice it is extremely difficult and meets with uncommon resistance on the part of every one with an ever-onward-and-upward philosophy."

p. 70

p. 118

p. 119


4. Rogers, C.


9. Harwood & Riesman


12. Ibid.

14. Ibid.


17. An example of rising expectations for women is given on the front cover of a recent paperback, *Superwoman in Action.* "How to keep everyone happy, especially yourself. How to make the most of what you've got. How to enjoy your friends/family/home/job and how to get away from them sometimes." Inside this book from one to three pages are given to such topics as "How to be an expert; how to juggle two jobs; how to get free money; a short guide to a new career; how to enjoy being in bed; how to be a rich and clever art collector," and many others. Conran, S. *Superwoman in Action.* London: Penguin books, 1979 (N.Z. edition, adapted by Miles, S., 1980).

Appendix 00

Collins Study on Aspirations

The Collins study is reported in Chapter 13.

SAMPLE

Fifty-eight (58) Dunedin adults were recruited from a pool of 100 people invited to participate from two sources: 40 members of a church club invited at four club meetings where anonymous questionnaires and stamped return envelopes addressed to the Department of Psychology were distributed; 60 members of a squash club telephoned by random sampling of the membership list with questionnaires and envelopes delivered to home addresses. Males: females, 29:29; mean age was 30.2 with SD of 5.4. The work role distribution was: 33 with paid employment (varied), 14 housewives, 9 students, 1 unemployed, 1 retired. After clearance by the Department of Psychology Ethics Review Committee, the survey was conducted in August, 1980.
### A. Self-Anchor Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>achieved number of friends</td>
<td>58.46</td>
<td>27.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspired number of friends</td>
<td>61.02</td>
<td>23.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved leisure time</td>
<td>51.68</td>
<td>26.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspired leisure time</td>
<td>65.35</td>
<td>17.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved fitness</td>
<td>60.97</td>
<td>15.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspired fitness</td>
<td>79.26</td>
<td>12.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved education</td>
<td>69.64</td>
<td>17.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspired education</td>
<td>81.96</td>
<td>12.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved family income</td>
<td>70.87</td>
<td>17.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspired family income</td>
<td>77.57</td>
<td>19.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Semi-Objective Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>achieved number of friends</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspired number of friends</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved leisure time (hours)</td>
<td>.7505</td>
<td>27.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspired leisure time (hours)</td>
<td>98.63</td>
<td>35.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved no. of cigarettes per day</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>9.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspired no. of cigarettes per day</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved no. exercises per week</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspired no. exercises per week</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved est. running distance (yards)</td>
<td>5795</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspired est. running distance (yards)</td>
<td>3067</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved education (years schooling)</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspired education (years schooling)</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved family income ($1000s)</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspired family income ($1000s)</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>7.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Rating Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S - A gap</th>
<th>S - A asp</th>
<th>S - A ach</th>
<th>S - 0 gap</th>
<th>S - 0 asp</th>
<th>S - 0 gap</th>
<th>Ext. Locus</th>
<th>Prog. Exptd.</th>
<th>Satisfn</th>
<th>Affmtr 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As described in Chapter 13, scores for each achievement and aspiration distribution were converted to standard scores (2 scores) before summing to get overall scores (sum of five domains). The correlations are Pearson rs with decimals omitted.

S - A = self-anchoring scales
S - 0 = semi-objective scales

D. Affectometer 1 (Short): mean = 1.85; SD = .96

Correlation Matrix - Summary Variables

Note: With N = 58, r (.05) = .26 and r (.01) = .33

3Correlations of gap scores with their own achievement or aspiration scores are "incestuous correlations" (gap score depends on component scores).
Appendix 00

Power Study on Good and Bad Circumstances

The Power study is reported in Chapter 13.

SAMPLE

Complete data were obtained on 58 respondents who were among 114 people eligible by the sampling procedures, for a participation rate of 51%. Sampling of one adult per household began with a list of 19 randomly selected addresses in the Dunedin listings in the telephone directory, each of which was used as the starting point to obtain six respondents by moving to every third building to the right in sequence until six eligible respondents had been met and made their decision. In each household the survey agent requested a male in the first instance to try to reduce the imbalance of sexes. A questionnaire packet in an envelope was left with each participant and was collected at the door one week later, or by arrangement.

The male:female balance was 23:35 with an overall mean age of 39 years and an age range from 18 to 75 years old. The work role distribution was 30 with paid work, 14 housewives, 9 students, and 5 retired. The marital classification was 36 married, 12 never married, 4 separated, 4 divorced, and 2 widowed. After clearance by the Psychology Department Ethics Committee, the survey was conducted in August, 1981.
# BACKGROUND RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Affectometer 2</strong></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Predictors - Group 1 (Balance of...)**

1. Number                  | -0.03 | 4.04 | 0.06  |
2. Over 'Two Years         | 0.06  | 3.33 | 0.23  |
3. Fun and Enjoyment       | 0.10  | 3.00 | 0.17  |
4. Importance              | 0.07  | 3.57 | 0.57  |
5. Self-Esteem             | 0.01  | 2.25 | 0.00  |
6. Feelings                | 0.01  | 3.69 | 0.20  |
7. Think About             | 0.00  | 2.26 | -0.56 |

**C. Predictors - Group 2 (Proportion of)**

8. Externality on Good Things | 0.36 | 2.26 | 0.62  |
9. Externality on Bad Things | 0.46 | 3.33 | 0.09  |
10. Externality on Add Things| 0.27 | 3.32 | 1.01  |
11. Parents' Disapproval    | 0.74 | 0.85 | 1.00  |
### Intercorrelations - Predictor Group 1 (Balance Predictors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Affctmtr 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Number</td>
<td></td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Over. Two Years</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Fun and Enjoy</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Importance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Self Esteem</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Feelings</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Think About</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intercorrelations - Predictors Group 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Affctmtr 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Externality, Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Externality, Bad</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Externality, Add</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Parents' Disapprove</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>