PATERNAL COMMITMENT
AND
QUALITY OF LIFE

CATHERINE M.E. LALLY

SUPERVISOR: TOM WHELAN

Applied Research Project APY 4060
Postgraduate Diploma of Applied Psychology
Monash University, Caulfield Campus
12 November 1999
Acknowledgements

My sincerest gratitude goes to my supervisor Tom Whelan for his encouragement, support, advice, and enthusiasm, which ensured the completion of this study. Thanks also go to the members of staff of the Psychology Department at Monash University for their availability for help and advice, with special thanks to Eleonora Gullone and Simon Moss for their helpful suggestions.

I would also like to thank my family who nearly uncomplainingly put up with the time I spent on the computer; to my partner Mike, who sparked my interest in non-traditional ways of being a father, and to my sons and step-sons, who will perhaps one day find their own ways of being fathers.

And finally, thanks to all the fathers who participated in this study for their time and interest and enthusiasm for this study.
# Table of Contents

List of Tables

## Abstract

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1. Historical Overview
1.2. The Father's Role Today
1.3. Gender Stereotypes and Fatherhood
1.4. Antecedents and Barriers to Greater Involvement
1.5. Effects of Paternal Involvement
   1.5.1. Effects on Children
   1.5.2. Marital Effects
   1.5.3. Effects on Fathers
1.6. The Concept of Commitment and Involvement
1.7. Research Rationale and Aim

Chapter 2: Method

2.1. Participants
2.2. Method
2.3. Procedure

Chapter 3: Results

3.1. Measure of Commitment
3.2. Quality of Life, Social Provisions and Self-Esteem

Chapter 4: Discussion

4.1. Measure of Paternal Commitment
4.2. Paternal Commitment and Quality of Life
4.3. Social Support and Self-Esteem
4.4. Limitations and recommendations

References

Appendix A. Regression Analyses
Appendix B. Principal Components Analysis & Cronbach’s Alpha
Appendix C. Questionnaire with Explanatory Statement
List of Tables

Table 1  Frequencies of Participants' Employment Status, Highest Level of Education, Composition of Household, and Age Group of Children  25
Table 2  Frequency Statistics for Items Measuring Commitment  32
Table 3  Principal Components Analysis Explaining the Total Variance of Items Measuring Commitment  34
Table 4  Loadings of Individual Items onto the General Factor of Paternal Involvement  34
Table 5  Inter-Item Reliability Analysis Through Cronbach's Alpha for the Factor Paternal Involvement  35
Table 6  Summary of the Standard Multiple Linear Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Objective Quality of Life  38
Table 7  Summary of the Standard Multiple Linear Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Subjective Quality of Life  39
Table 8  Summary of the Multiple Linear Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Social provisions  40
Table 9  Summary of the Multiple Linear Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Self-Esteem  41
Table 10  Summary of the Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of the Variables Social provisions and Self-Esteem and Subjective Quality of Life  41
Abstract

This study explored the effects of paternal involvement on the quality of life of fathers. Data were gathered from 56 fathers who had at least one child under the age of 10 years. Respondents completed self-report measures which assessed their level of involvement in child care, proportion of contribution to the total family income, perception of social supports, level of self-esteem, as well as objective and subjective quality of life. Four main findings emerged. First, higher levels of paternal involvement together with a greater contribution to family finances were related to fathers providing lower scores on both the objective and subjective domains of the quality of life measure. Second, a greater contribution to family finances predicted a higher subjective quality of life scores. Third, a negative association was found between the level of paternal involvement and perceived social supports. That is, fathers that remained at home appeared to suffer from greater social isolation. Finally, no relationship was found between levels of involvement or of economic support and self-esteem. The positive relationship between financial responsibility and subjective quality of life suggests that the breadwinner-role still features in the paternal script. The poorer quality of life scores reported by fathers when they showed high commitment to both child care and the family finances might be attributed to role-overload. In conclusion, while the image of the involved father might be popular, the reality of being a co-parent does not appear to appeal to many men because of the associated costs in career prospects and sense of social isolation.
Chapter 1 - Introduction

Over the past 25 years increasing attention has been paid to the nature and implications of the paternal role. A growing number of publications on fatherhood have appeared in Western countries, including Australia, and it has been the subject of recent conferences and government reports (e.g., Russell et al., 1999). Critical scrutiny of fatherhood can be traced back to 1828 (Lewis, 1995), but in psychology it was Freud who drew attention to father and child relationships (Richards, 1987). Recently several investigators (e.g. Moss, 1995; Weiss, 1998) have noted that decades of social change have necessitated increased attention on fatherhood. Nonetheless, in a review of the area, Russell et al. (1999) claimed that research into fathers remains under-represented and further exploration of the paternal role is necessary to increase understanding of its impact on all family members.

The type of research required today is different from that of previous decades. As noted by Lamb (1997), it is no longer necessary for researchers to attempt to justify the importance of fatherhood. It is accepted that fathers are effectively and formatively salient. Rather than simply comparing the effects of fathers to those of mothers, research has begun to focus on the finer details and concerns of fatherhood, recognising its multidimensionality and its many indirect influences.

1.1. Historical Overview

The fatherhood construct has to be considered in the context of time and place (West, 1998). A number of American researchers have traced the changing roles of fathers in the family (e.g., Grisworld, 1993; Lamb, 1986, 1995, 1997, 1998; Pleck
& Pleck, 1997) and have observed shifts in the conceptualisation of fatherhood, where at different times, different aspects in a complex, multifaceted role, have been emphasised.

Pleck and Pleck (1997) examined how fatherhood has changed in America over the past 100 years. They attributed changes in the ideals of fatherhood to shifts in economic imperatives. For example, the breadwinner role, which is often assumed to be the dominant paternal function in Western society, was not of such importance at the turn of the century (Pleck & Pleck, 1997). In the 19th century, spouses, parents and children were relatively distant, and legally both women and children were the man's property (Richards, 1987). In the early part of this century, fathers' foremost duty was to be the moral teacher (Lamb, 1986). In the 1930s, mothers became the primary caregivers and fathers took on a more passive role (Pleck & Pleck, 1997). With the industrial revolution home and work became separate, and women came to be seen as naturally suited to nurturing. At the same time breadwinning became central to fatherhood. Griswold (1993) described breadwinning as the unifying element in fathers' lives, its obligations common to men of all classes and races, shaping their sense of self, manhood and gender. Breadwinning was supported by law, affirmed by history and sanctioned by every element in society and became synonymous with maturity, respectability, and masculinity (Griswold, 1993). The Great Depression left many men unemployed, but instead of increased involvement, they often deserted their families entirely. This indicates that money was the men's foremost goal rather than involvement in family life (Pleck & Pleck, 1997). In the 1940s and 1950s strong masculine role models were considered essential for boys so as they would not become
effeminate, or display communist or fascist tendencies (Lamb, 1986; Pleck & Pleck, 1997).

Major events, like the industrial revolution and the World Wars, had enormous impact on the structure of the Western family. The industrial revolution led to a division of labour between the sexes, creating a distinction between the private and public sphere. Conversely, the wars forced women into the workforce (Horna & Lupri, 1987; Russell, 1983). Since the Second World War the proportion of women in paid occupations has grown from about a quarter to nearly half of the entire workforce (Blau & Ehrenberg, 1997). These changes have impacted on the family structure and the social context of men as parents (Russell et al., 1999).

The attitudes of fathers towards the parenting role have changed along with the entry of women into paid employment. Pleck and Pleck (1997) noted that a new rationale for fathers being involved in their families emerged in the 1950s. That is, parenting was something to enjoy and fatherhood became "the best of men's hobbies" (p.43). Concurrent with this, however, was an increase in father-absence, due to higher divorce rates (Lewis, 1995; Pleck & Pleck, 1997). Fatherhood as a pastime and father absence both appear to be indicative of an attitude of fathering being optional.

Since the 1970s, the nurturing father ideal has become en vogue, where active parenting is considered as part of being a 'good' father. Aligned with the increased emphasis on men's position in the family, men have been encouraged to review their high personal investment in the increasingly unstable world of work (Moss, 1995). However, Russell et al. (1999) indicated that a reconsideration of
men's investment in paid work and a shift in emphasis to their position in the family, would challenge the very premises of traditionally perceived masculinity.

Recently, a new type of father image, endorsed by feminism, has emerged, the egaliatian father or the co-parent (Pleck & Pleck, 1997). According to Pleck and Pleck (1997), this new kind of father is required today since in Western countries both parents are likely to be active in the workforce due to economic pressures. This exposes mothers to role overload and makes children vulnerable to neglect. Unlike previous ideals, the co-parent does not allocate domestic and breadwinning responsibilities according to gender. Fathers may yet be socially less skilled at child rearing, but innately a father is as capable a carer as the mother.

Pleck and Pleck (1997) identified a dual function of this fatherhood ideal, the promotion of change in gender roles and the reinforcement of class distinction by serving as a sign of the more privileged classes' conception of its enlightened attitude towards fathering. Policies stating that caring and bringing up children is the responsibility of both the mother and the father, endorse this notion of equality (Moss & Brannen, 1987). Families therefore, once premised on gender differentiation, are in a process of change where gender equality is becoming a legal and moral principle (Flichler, 1997).

1.2. The Father's Role Today

Over the last three decades, women have acquired greater negotiating power through their increased financial contribution to the family. Nevertheless, this has not automatically translated into a correlation between women's paid work and men's family work (Allen & Hawkins, 1999). As noted by Eichler (1997), the division of
labour within the family is greatly "out of kilter" (p.60). Women have adopted most of the roles previously held by men and yet men have not taken on half of the tasks previously done by women. Because the move by mothers into paid work has not been mirrored by a move of fathers into unpaid work, many mothers have dual roles (Russell, 1983).

Comparing the findings of several studies exploring the effect of maternal employment, Pleck (1997) concluded that there was a substantially higher availability and direct involvement by fathers when the mother was employed. He estimated that in these families the fathers' availability for their children, expressed as a percentage of the mother's involvement, increased from 33% to 65% and their direct interaction with children rose from 20-25% to 33%. However, these figures need to be viewed with some caution, since the apparent increase in paternal involvement may merely reflect a decrease in maternal involvement due to work commitments (Lamb, 1997). Furthermore, fathers may have overestimated their level of involvement in order to appear to be good fathers, that is nurturant, involved in child care, and participating in domestic duties. This tendency for men to overestimate their involvement has been identified as a general flaw in investigations based on self-reports by fathers (e.g. Lewis & O'Brien, 1987). In order to overcome this weakness, some studies (e.g., Russell, 1983) have included data from mothers.

There are signs that the division of labour between mothers and fathers is gradually becoming more equitable. O'Brien and Jones (1995) examined the perception of fatherhood held by secondary students in London and found that young people expected fathers to be participative and emotionally involved with
their children. Similarly, Smith (1995) noted an increase in fathers' participation in infant-care tasks since the 1950s and a desire by fathers to be more involved.

Lamb, Pleck and Levine (1987) ventured that many young men, dissatisfied with the relationship they have with their own fathers, were less eager to define personal success solely through a career. Recent opinion polls seem to reflect this trend. American men from a variety of backgrounds have shown that they share a common goal, namely to be good fathers, involved with children in a caring and nurturing way (Kimmel, 1995). Similarly, in an Australian investigation, Russell et al. (1999) listed as men's greatest concerns, their changing identity, their relationships and their future role as fathers.
1.3. Gender Stereotypes and Fatherhood

Men have become more involved in the family, however as indicated, this increased responsibility has been limited. The overall proportion of families where fathers take primary responsibility for child care remains small. In the 1980s these families made up 1-2% of Australian households (Russell, 1983) and a recent report (Russell et al., 1999) showed little, if any, increase. Nfarsiglio (1995) proposed that in order for fathers to become co-parents, it is necessary that there be substantial changes in attitudes. Cultural scenarios pertaining to fatherhood will need to be revised to incorporate both fathers interpersonal and financial commitment to children, so that the notion of co-parenting will become part of the fathers’ internal script. Until then, since parenting rarely seems to be a truly negotiated task, a lack of role clarity will prevail which leads couples to resort to stereotypical gender roles, especially when there are social and economic restraints (Weiss, 1998).

The function of scripts is to enable people to conduct relationships along preprogrammed scenarios, without having to continually re-establish basic parameters (McKnight & Sutton, 1994). On an individual level, the availability of scripts provides comfort, security and efficiency, making them hard to shift. On a broader level, the ideologies informing scripts and stereotypes ought to be questioned as to whose interests they represent, thus allowing a deconstruction of the scripts and stereotypes.

In the past, changes in the parental script have been impeded by what Russell (1983) refers to as "myths" pertaining to the current state of the Western family. Such myths include the belief that the nuclear family, with the mother at home and
the father employed, is the dominant family type. In reality, there is considerable variety in the forms families take. A second myth includes the rigid sexual division between paid labour and child care being 'natural' and universal. In fact, this role division is relatively new and in many societies child care is the responsibility of the community.

Some of the most powerful stereotypes relate to people's self-perception of their gender role. In a review of the research, McKnight and Sutton (1994) noted that people often unconsciously work to maintain gender stereotypes. They proposed that stereotypes become models for gender development and the criteria against which successful growth and maturity is measured.

For the exploration of, and deconstruction of gender stereotypes, it is important to keep in mind the distinction between sex and gender. Social scientists use the term 'sex' when referring to the biological aspects distinguishing male and female, whereas 'gender' is socially constructed, referring to the cultural meanings attributed to these biological differences (Kimmel, 1995). Parenting often is understood as a gendered role (Rogers & White, 1998). Social institutions, like fatherhood, are not simply followed but are created by people and the family is instrumental in shaping such roles and thus has been described as a "gender factory" (Risman & Johnson-Sumerford, 1998: 23). In the family, the polarisation of masculine and feminine is both created and displayed. Gender has come to be regarded as a reasonable and legitimate basis for the distribution of rights, power, privilege and responsibility within the family, and rather than the partner, other members of the same gender serve as a basis of comparison (Risman & Johnson-Sumerford, 1998). These stereotyped gender roles often result in an inequality of
power, which when abused, can contribute to adverse conditions and even violence (Weiss, 1998). Weiss (1998) stressed the importance of a deconstruction of gender stereotypes in order to facilitate co-parenthood.

Lewis and O'Brien (1987) contrasted motherhood and fatherhood 'mandates' which reflect the gender stereotypes. They referred to a source from 1916, which described how the monotony and drudgery of childrearing was minimised while emphasis was given to the joys and compensations of motherhood, thus making it seem desirable. The 'fatherhood mandate', according to Lewis and O'Brien (1987), has always been a better deal, encouraging consolidation and development in the public sphere. Based on this division, the neat and tidy appearance of household and children remains a measure of good mothering (Lewis & O'Brien, 1987), whereas professional success is a positive measure for men regardless of whether or not they are fathers. In other words, the fathers identify more closely with the work role than the family role and depend upon their success in the public domain for status (Russell, 1983).

The above divisions describe stereotypical situations, to which, of course, there are many exceptions. Hood (1993), for instance, postulated that the two worlds of the private and the public sphere are a myth and ignore the experiences of many men. But despite some exceptions, it is generally the case that, although both parents have the opportunity to earn an income and be good parents, many women and only few men are responsible for both roles (Flichler, 1997). It appears that the majority of fathers are not ready to defy stereotypical role expectations.

Perhaps one of the reasons why fathers are so slow in adapting a more involved parenting role is the lack of appropriate role models (McKnight & Sutton,
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1994). Daly (1995) explored the function of role models as an important mediator in the type of role fathers adopt. In a qualitative study, Daly (1995) interviewed 32 fathers from intact families with children 6 years old and under. He found that men were experiencing difficulties in finding appropriate role models for fatherhood, and that often they could not rely on one specific model. He attributed the lack of role models not only to the changes in expectations of what fatherhood should be like, but also to the changing patterns of work and parental subsystems. Most frequently men considered their own father to be a model of some sort, but often as an example of how they did not want to be a father themselves (Daly, 1995).

1.4. Antecedents and Barriers to Greater Involvement

As noted by Russell (1987), when examining life-style issues it is important to investigate the process of adjustment, as well as the reasons why the life-style was adopted. Research has shown that men and women from non-traditional families overtly reject the patterns set by their own parents (Lewis & O'Brien, 1987). However, the lack of role models or a reference group which can serve as a point of comparison for shaping their identity, can leave men trying to adopt a less traditional style of fathering while being unprepared and uncertain about what is required of them (Daly, 1995). This lack of a clear job description makes it very difficult for men to incorporate this new fatherhood ideal (Lewis & O'Brien, 1987).

In an Australian study, Russell (1983, 1987) investigated non-traditional families with young children, in which the father had either the major responsibility for the day-to-day child care, or shared this equally with his partner. Data were gathered through interviews with both parents (N=71). Russell (1983) explored why
these families decided to allocate parental responsibilities in a non-traditional fashion, and the impact this experience had on family members. Antecedents to the change were investigated and factors found to be important were: a relatively high income; the parents had good employment potential, especially the mothers; parents were able to have flexibility in hours of employment; and certain family characteristics, such as fewer and younger children. Surprisingly, the amount of time mothers worked was not related to the fathers' level of involvement (Russell, 1983). In addition, contrary observations from American studies (e.g., Pleck & Pleck, 1997), Russell (1983) found that non-traditional fathers did not differ from more traditional fathers according to their socio-economic status. Rather, personal beliefs about parenting such as more responsible attitudes towards child care and the welfare of children, and previous experiences (e.g., attendance at pre-natal classes), were instrumental antecedents to shared-care-giving fathers.

In reporting the positive consequences of a non-traditional family structure, Russell (1983) noted that above all fathers commented on the improved relationships with their children. Mothers reported greater independence and job satisfaction, yet they felt they were losing closeness with their children. Furthermore, only about 30% of relatives, friends and neighbours were perceived as being supportive of this lifestyle choice.

One of the puzzles Russell (1983) encountered was that many fathers who had claimed to enjoy the non-traditional life-style, reverted to more traditional arrangements. Only 10 out of 27 families re-interviewed 2 years later, were in the same non-traditional family pattern. The initial enthusiasm was at odds with the
tendency for families not to maintain alternative arrangements. To date, the research has not provided an adequate explanation for this occurrence.

Russell (1983) attributed a reluctance to take on a non-traditional role to men's concepts of typical masculine behaviour. He suggested, therefore, that non-traditional fathers were different from other fathers even before they decided upon their role, that they were higher in self-esteem, independence and interpersonal sensitivity. These personal characteristics alone would not ensure someone became a non-traditional father, but together with certain family factors, would influence the decision for shared care giving.

Lamb (1997) referred to a combination of institutional and cultural barriers, as well as certain personality characteristics and a lack of motivation, as impediments to paternal involvement. He observed that there has been a considerable change in the type of tasks fathers have become prepared to do, but only a modest change in the amount of time they are prepared to invest. Lamb (1997) argued that increased motivation alone is not enough to bring about a certain amount of skills and self-confidence is also essential, as well as sensitivity to the child's needs.

Institutional practices, above all workplace policies, can act as a barrier to greater parental involvement, especially for men who are expected to assume the main breadwinning role (Lamb, 1997). In an Australian investigation, men reported their involvement in paid work to be the major barrier to being an effective parent (Russell et al., 1999). Pleck (1997) reviewed a number of studies which explored stress on fathers due to work-family conflicts, and found that stress could be alleviated through more favourable policies and practices. For example, the
availability of flexitime was found to be effective, but it was still only available to a small proportion of workers. Other institutions, such as schools, have been reported to have made little effort to include fathers (e.g., Lamb, 1997).

Another important factor which has prevented men from taking greater involvement is a lack of social support. Unlike women, men's social networks tend not to provide encouragement for fathering or the relevant resources (Pleck, 1997). Support from within the family, particularly the mother, is also crucial. Mothers and members of the extended family are not always ready to adopt changes in the family structure which break with tradition, such as the father taking primary responsibility for child care (Lamb, 1997; Pleck, 1997).

Traditionally, the unequal distribution of responsibility for children and home was explained by availability of time, economic dependency, and gender ideology (Allen & Hawkins, 1999), but with the increase in women's economic power, explanations for the maintenance of the status quo had to be sought. The lack of a collaborative arrangement in regard to home and child care has been attributed to what has been called 'maternal gatekeeping'. Allen and Hawkins (1999) define maternal gatekeeping as "the mothers' reluctance to relinquish responsibility over family matters by setting rigid standards, external validation of a mothering identity, and differentiated conceptions of family roles" (p. 199).

Through gatekeeping it is said that men's opportunities for learning and growing by caring for home and children is limited (Allen & Hawkins, 1999). Dye (1998) traced the term back to 30 years ago when women tried to enter the 'place of men', the workplace. By viewing the family as the woman's domain, the mother is not only controlling the family relationships, but expects to set standards as to how
things ought to be done (Allen & Hawkins 1999; Dye, 1998). Dye (1998) suggests that, as a consequence, our families are too much structured around women's wants and needs, and neglect those of men.

Gatekeeping, as a factor impeding greater paternal involvement, is controversial. The emphasis on gatekeeping is at odds with the notion that paternal involvement is determined by multiple factors with no one factor exerting predominant influence (Pleck, 1997). Further, Aldous, Mulligan and Bjarnason (1998) questioned the importance of gatekeeping, suggesting that children who enjoy the attention of one parent are likely to benefit also from the care of the other, whereas if one parent is less involved, the other is not likely to make up the difference.

1.5. Effects of Father Involvement

Research on paternal involvement has examined the impact of increased attention by the fathers on family members. This research can be divided into three main areas, investigations of the effects of father involvement on children, on mothers, and on the men themselves.

1.5.1. Effects on Children

Fathers' involvement has been shown to have a significant impact on the development of both boys and girls (Russell et al., 1999). Children's perceptions of the effects of substantial paternal involvement have been found to vary across culturally and socioeconomically diverse backgrounds, but mostly they have been reported to be positive and life enhancing (Russell et al., 1999). In reviewing the area, Lamb (1995, 1997) reported a range of consistent effects, including that the
children display increased cognitive competence, increased empathy, less sex-stereotyped beliefs, and a more internal locus of control.

The influence of fathers on the well-being of the child can be through direct interaction, such as through care taking, teaching and play (Lamb, 1995) or through more indirect but nevertheless substantial ways, such as economic support by which the father contributes to the rearing and well-being of the child. He can further contribute indirectly by acting as an emotional support, especially for the mother, as well as easing her workload through being involved in child-related housework. This support in turn enhances the quality of her parenting (Lamb, 1997).

As noted by Russell et al. (1999), family problems are increasingly defined in terms of a lack of involvement and insufficient support by fathers, especially when children display behaviour problems. At the same time, fathers taking additional responsibility has been regarded as a positive strategy to help address these problems (Russell et al., 1999).
1.5.2. Marital Effects

The experience of a close parent-child relationship, or the lack of it, also impacts on the marital relationship. According to Dinnerstein (cited in Hawkins, Christiansen, Sargent, & Ffill, 1995) "The process of nurturing life is the most profoundly transforming experience in the range of human possibilities. Because women have this experience and men generally don't, we live and think and love across a great gap of understanding" (p.56). Hawkins et al. (1995) noted that greater responsibility by men for nurturing children will reduce developmental incongruence between fathers and mothers; an incongruence causing many marital difficulties.

The parental role is central to the stress reported by employed mothers; a stress attributed to greater overall responsibility (e.g., McLanahan & Adams, 1989; Russell et al.,1999). This stress would be reduced by less role-overload, by more equitable distribution of home and child care. In addition, equality in paid work cannot be achieved unless men take an equal share of this unpaid work (Russell, 1983).

Some negative aspects of increased paternal involvement on the mother have also been reported. Despite the relieving of the work overload, there are likely to be significant costs given the extent of socialisation for motherhood most women experience. For example, Russell (1983) found in non-traditional or shared-we giving families 23% of mothers reported guilt about leaving children and 33% regretted the loss of contact between mother and child. Russell (1983) further reported that mothers can experience negative reactions from relatives for their lessened contact with their children.
1. 5. 3. Effects on Fathers

In more traditional family arrangements men can feel restrained by their role as it is less central than that of the mother, and envy the close relationship between the mother and child (Lewis & O'Brien, 1987). Russell (1983) observed a significant change in the father-child relationship when fathers adopted a shared-care-giving role. Extended sole responsibility made for a more realistic, less superficial relationship, which was particularly gratifying because of its expressive nature (Russell, 1983). The fathers interviewed in Russell's (1983) study reported that they and their children had become closer, had a better understanding of each other and that they enjoyed the love and affection they shared. Many fathers described this closeness, both emotional and physical, as a highly valued new dimension in their lives. Geiger (1996), who interviewed a group of fathers she called "primary care-givers" reported similar reactions. She noted that these fathers, who have reconsidered values of professional achievement in favour of parenthood, reported satisfaction with the deep involvement with their children.

Children can become a potential stimulus of men's development (Hawkins; et al., 1995). Erikson introduced the notion of generativity in his theory of personality development to reflect this reciprocal influence (Snarey, 1993). Broadly, generativity refers to the nurturing of one's offspring, a widening commitment beyond the self and care for the next generation. A failure of achieving generativity has been found to result in self-indulgence and may jeopardise adult mental health (Hawkins et al., 1995). Hawkins et al. (1995) proposed that research should be less concerned with a detailed examination of "domestic democracy" (p.53) but would gain from a greater emphasis on adult men's growth and maturity.
Despite reported benefits such as the potential for personal fulfilment through closer and richer relationships with the children, along with the positive influences on their development, fathers appear to be reluctant to move away from the more traditional role. Fathers are not likely to change to a less traditional position, unless they are able to recognise advantages for themselves (Lamb et al., 1987). As Lamb et al. (1987) warned, while increased paternal involvement can be rewarding, it should not be romanticised. There are a number of costs associated with greater paternal involvement, including the likelihood of diminished earnings and career opportunities. Other costs include possible marital friction, boredom with tedious daily chores, and social isolation from disapproving friends and relatives. Fathers who stay at home with young children often find the community and institutions are insensitive to their needs. Since these fathers are not given the support women offer each other, they become even more socially isolated than women in the same situation (Russell, 1987). Greif and DeMaris (1995), who studied single fathers with custody of their children, noted that most were suffering from loneliness and a low sense of personal worth.

In summary, increased commitment to parenting has been found to have a complex array of effects on fathers. These include positive effects such as personal fulfilment (Greif, 1995; Russell, 1983, 1987), but also negative effects such as increased stress, loneliness and low self-esteem (Lamb, 1987). It would be of interest for future studies to explore whether the positive developmental factors balance or outweigh the stresses associated with looking after young children in an unpaid capacity and whether they outweigh the costs of defying stereotypical expectations. In particular, investigations could examine the effect of paternal
involvement on the quality of life of fathers. A search of the literature has indicated
that no investigation has examined the influence of father involvement on quality of
life. A general measure would be valuable as it could examine a wide range of
dimensions such as changes in close relationships, standing in the community,
productivity and the level of material well-being (Cummins, 1997).
1.6. The Concepts of Commitment and Involvement

Investigators have used a wide range of approaches to operationalise the construct of commitment to fatherhood. For example, Russell (1983) interviewed fathers about what they did on a day-to-day basis, and distinguished between four types of fathers in intact families: the uninterested/unavailable father, whose involvement is minimal; the traditional father, whose primary function is that of the breadwinner and decision-maker; the 'good' father, who is much more actively involved in the care of his children but remains the mother's helper; and the non-traditional/highly participant father, who takes on independent responsibility for the majority of child care and related tasks. Similarly, Lamb et al. (1987) distinguished between three dimensions of involvement: engagement or interaction, consisting of direct care giving or interaction through play; accessibility to the child while engaged in other tasks; and responsibility, that is knowing what the child needs and making decisions on this basis.

Although valuable in that they distinguish between different types of fathering, both of these approaches to operationalise paternal involvement fail to fully account for the various ways fathers can be involved with their children. In particular, they tend not to include the more indirect, but nevertheless substantial, ways fathers influence their children's well-being, such as through their economic support.

Doherty, Kouneski and Erickson (1998) identified a relationship between motivation for paternal commitment and real or perceived success as a breadwinner. Successful performance in the provider role, as is the stereotype, is considered indicative of fathers being committed to their families. Commitment to both child
care and breadwinning manifest a sense of responsibility. Professional success can enhance a sense of competence and boost self-esteem, making fathers more open to increased involvement, Doherty et al. (1998), who criticised much of the research into fatherhood for having stressed father involvement, while ignoring the economic support fathers give their families. They saw a father's success as provider to be tied to the quality of his fathering, especially as disparities in the earning-power of men and women have yet to disappear (Doherty et al., 1998).

It has further been suggested that to exclude economic support from 'involved' fatherhood made the concept "mother-defined", that is, the involvement construct based on forms of involvement traditionally shown by mothers (Pleck, 1997). Research has tended to compare mothers' and fathers' respective levels of involvement with mothering as the benchmark for fathering (Doherty et al., 1998). Dye (1998) reported that men were uncomfortable with the feminisation of the fathering role, as reflected in the notion of being the mother's helper or the 'male mother'. The shift in maternal employment may mean that economic support becomes just as important to motherhood as fatherhood and so should be included in all measurements of parental commitment.

A further limitation with the typical methods of categorising types of fathers was identified by Pleck (1997) who noted that emphasis was generally placed on the amount, not the kind, of fathering men perform. A simple time measure of combined housework and child care is inadequate since increased time spent at home has been reported not to automatically lead to better parenting, particularly in the case of unemployed fathers (Pleck, 1997).
A final limitation relates to the reliance of researchers on interview data (e.g., Cohen, 1993; Daly, 1995; Geiger, 1996; Rogers & Mente, 1998; Russell, 1982, 1983, 1987). These descriptive studies of paternal involvement have yielded a wealth of information. Nonetheless, they are prone to subjective bias and due to problems of reliability, have limited generalisability.

In summary, a range of problems in operationalising paternal involvement have been identified. These include an overemphasis of the amount of time spent with the children and a failure to include economic support. Not only should measures be expanded to include financial contribution to the family, they should assess both the amount and the quality of child care tasks performed. In addition, the basis of comparison should not be maternal involvement, rather measures should allow for the fathers' uniqueness in how the role should best be fulfilled.

1.7. Research Rationale and Aims

With the increasing number of families where both parents are in the paid work force, the question arises of who takes care of the children (Hayes, Nielsen-Hewett, & Warton, 1999). In order to encourage men to become more committed to the parenting role, an identification of the advantages greater involvement has for them could be of benefit (Lamb et al., 1987). This may be especially important as parenting has traditionally not been central to the male role as mothering has for women. If men are expected to make sacrifices in the work domain, where traditionally they have measured their success and gained status, fatherhood might have to offer them comparable scope for achievement and rewards.
Literature investigating the impact increased involvement has on men, has indicated positive and negative effects. It has been suggested that greater involvement with parenting is of benefit to the fathers' adult development and emotional well-being (e.g., Snarey, 1993). In addition, it has been reported that close family relationships can provide men with a greater sense of personal fulfilment (e.g., Geiger, 1996; Russell, 1983). On the other hand, investigations (e.g., Greif & DeMaris, 1995; Lamb, 1987; Russell, 1983, 1987) have reported that paternal involvement can have negative consequences for the subjective well-being of fathers, for example a decrease in self-esteem and social support.

The present study explored the overall effects of paternal involvement on men's lives. Whereas previous investigations have generally relied on descriptive methods, standardised measures were used. A measure was designed which incorporated both active involvement with children and the amount of economic support men give their families. Rather than restricting fathers to categories, such a measure allowed for an investigation of fathers' levels of commitment on a continuum. Furthermore, it enabled the exploration of interactions between levels of involvement and levels of fulfilment of the more traditional breadwinner role, measured by estimates of the level of financial contribution.

The primary aim of the present study was to examine the relationship between levels of paternal involvement, levels of financial contribution and quality of life. Given the lack of studies which have investigated fatherhood and quality of life, no specific hypotheses were proposed.

A secondary aim was to explore the potential negative effects of extensive paternal involvement. The relationship between levels of involvement and
proportion of financial contribution were assessed in regard to self-esteem and social support. Research has indicated a decrease in self-esteem and social support for fathers who spend extensive time caring for their children (e.g., Greif & DeMaris, 1995; Russell, 1983). On this basis, it is hypothesised that a decrease of both self-esteem and social support will be related to increased levels of involvement. On the other hand, a positive linear relationship between self-esteem and the proportion of financial support is expected, since men typically have depended upon success in the public domain for status and success (e.g., Russell, 1983).

Finally, the present study aimed to examine the relationship between quality of life, self-esteem and social support. This part of the investigation was primarily intended to confirm the validity of the finding of this study. Previous investigations (Cummins, 1997) have reported significant positive relationships between these variables. This part of the investigation was primarily intended to confirm the validity of the finding of this study. Therefore, it is hypothesised that both self-esteem and social support will have a significant positive relationship with quality of life.
Chapter 2 - Method

2.1. Participants

Participants were fathers with at least one child under the age of 10 years. A convenience sampling method was employed in order to obtain a representation of both highly involved and less involved fathers. Recruitment took place in three ways. The highly involved fathers were contacted through father-child playgroups. Fathers from these groups also identified fathers of their acquaintance who were in a similar situation. The less involved group of fathers were selected through a large accounting and auditing firm. One of the partners was briefed about the research project and asked to pass questionnaires on to suitable members of staff. Finally, a more general group of fathers was obtained through children's sport teams. These fathers were approached at sporting events and invited to participate. Most of the recruitment took place in Melbourne's bayside suburbs.

Approximately 90 questionnaires were distributed, 56 were returned, leaving a response rate of approximately 62%. The majority of participants were born in Australia (n=41), the second largest group in Great Britain (n=9), and the remainder born in a variety of countries including Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, South Africa, New Zealand and Sudan. Participants ranged in age from 27 to 55 years, with a mean age of 40.57 years (SD=5.98).

Data were collected concerning the education level and employment status of participants, the composition of participants households and the age groups of their children. Frequencies and percentages are presented in Table 1.
Table 1

*Frequencies of Participants’ Employment Status, Highest Level of Education Completed, Composition of Household and Age Group of Children (N=56)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employed</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete secondary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade certificate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composition of the household</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother/Father/Children</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Step-parent/Children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step-children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother/Father/Only child</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent/Only child</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent/Children</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children’s age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All school-aged</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more child</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>younger than school-age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from Table 1, participants were mostly in full-time employment (69.6%), and tertiary educated (55.3%). The largest proportion of fathers (73.2%) were members of a traditional family with both biological parents living at home. A total of 14.3% of fathers were single parents. Two groups of children were formed based on the reported ages of children; families with school age children and families with at least 1 child of pre-school age. More than half of the fathers (58.9%) had at least one child who was younger than school age. The number of children in each family ranged from 1 to 5, at an average of 2.43.

2.2. Materials

The participants were asked to complete 5 questionnaires. These included a demographic information questionnaire and a measure of commitment, both of which were designed for this study. These 2 measures were followed by the Quality of Life Scale, the Social Provisions Scale and the Self-Esteem Inventory.

Demographic Information

The first 6 questions sought demographic information (see Appendix C). Respondents were asked to indicate their age, country of birth, employment status, level of education reached, size and composition of the household, and the number and ages of their children.

Measure of Commitment

This measure consisted of 8 questions which assessed the level of parental involvement. These items were based on interview questions used in qualitative research conducted by Russell (1983) and Lamb et al. (1987). The self-report scale was designed to assess the level of paternal involvement. Respondents were asked
to indicate their level of parental responsibility by estimating the number of hours per week they were available to their children when they were awake; they were solely responsible for their children; they spent preparing meals or feeding their children; they were involved in your children's playtime, sport and leisure; and they spent on helping with school work. For the next 3 questions participants were asked to provide an estimate in terms of their proportion of responsibility: for looking after children when they were sick; for household tasks (Le, washing, cleaning); and for making a financial contribution you make to the family's income.

The final item asked fathers to complete the following item: "Would you prefer to be solely responsible for your children... ", by selecting a rating from a 5-point Likert type scale which ranged from 1 = *much more often* to 5 = *much less often*.

**Comprehensive Quality of Life Scale - Adult, ComQol-AS** (Cummins, 1997)

Although quality of life has been described as an "elusive construcC (Cummins, McCabe, Romeo, & Gullone, 1994:372), a comprehensive scale, the ComQoPAS, has recently been developed in Australia. This measure is a 35-item multidimensional scale, which defines quality of life in terms of 7 domains; material well-being, health, productivity, intimacy, safety, place in community, and emotional well-being. The scale has 2 axes separating quality of life into an objective measurement (i.e., culturally relevant measures of objective well-being) and subjective measurement (i.e., domain satisfaction weighted by the importance of the domain to the individual).
For the objective axis, the questionnaire contains 3 culturally-relevant items for each domain. For example, to assess the intimacy domain the questions are: 'How often do you talk with a close friend?', "If you are feeling sad or depressed, how often does someone show that they care for you?", "If you want to do something special, how often does someone else want to do it with you?". Answers are indicated on a Likert type scale from 1=Almost never to 5= Almost always. An average score for each domain is obtained, and the average of these domain scores makes up the individual's score for objective quality of life (OQOL).

The subjective axis indicates subjective quality of life (SQOL). Scores on this axis are comprised of a rating of each domain in terms of importance and satisfaction. Importance is assessed by a question for each domain. For example: "How important to you are the things you own?". Participants provide an answer by indicating the level of importance on a Likert type scale ranging from 1 =not important at all to 5 =could not be more important. Satisfaction is similarly assessed by a question for each domain, for example: "How satisfied are you with the things you own?". Participants answer by indicating the level of satisfaction on a Likert type scale from 1 =terrible to 7=delighted. The satisfaction scores for each domain are weighted by the importance score through multiplication. The average of all these product scores makes up an individual's score of subjective quality of life. In the present study, to reduce the number of variables for analysis, only the total scores subjective quality of life and objective quality of life were used.

The ComQol-AS is reported to be psychometrically sound with Cronbach's alpha for internal-consistency estimates of reliability recorded as 0.64 for the 21 items of the objective sub-scale (Cummins, 1997). Reliability was further tested by
Cummins (1997) through multiple regressions using the 7 domains to predict total objective quality of life (all significant at $p<.001$) and total subjective quality of life (all except Health significant at least at $p<.001$). Test-re-test reliability has indicated stability for both objective quality of life ($r=.86$) and subjective quality of life ($r=.84$) (Cummins, 1997). The test manual (Cummins, 1997) lists several comparisons with other scales which attest the validity of each domain of the ConiQoPA5.

**Social Provisions Scale, SP** (Russell & Cutrona, 1984)

This scale consists of 24 items. It was developed to assess 6 relational provisions identified by Weiss (1974; cited in Cutrona, 1984); attachment, social integration, opportunity for nurturance, reassurance of worth, reliable alliance, and guidance. This scale assesses the extent to which participants perceive their social relationships to supply each of these provisions. Each provision is assessed by 4 items, 2 describing the presence and 2 the absence of the provision, for example: "Other people do not view me as competent"; "I do not think other people respect my skills and abilities"; "I have relationships where my competence and skill are recognised"; "There are people who admire my talents and abilities". Participants indicate on a Likert-scale ranging from $1=\text{disagree}$ to $4=\text{strongly agree}$ the extent to which the statement is applicable to their current situation. Only the total social support score is formed by summing the 6 individual provision scores. To reduce the number of variables for analysis, only the total score was used in the present study.

The scale has been reported to be reliable with Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the total social provisions score recorded as .84 (Cutrona, 1984). Inter-item
correlations between items measuring the same provision were found to range from .33 to .56 and a test-retest reliability of the total score of .55 over a 6 month period (Cutrona, 1984). The range from .03 to .07 is considered optimal for intercorrelations, if redundancy is to be avoided (Mine, 1979; cited in Cummins, 1997). Baron, Cutrona, Hicklin, Russell and Lubaroff (1990) reported that several studies provide evidence for the validity of the scale.
Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory - Adult Form, SEI (Coopersmith, 1975)

This self-esteem inventory measures personal judgement of worthiness toward the self in social, family and personal areas (Meager & Milgrom, 1996). Self-esteem is defined as expressing an attitude of approval or disapproval and indicating the extent to which a person believes himself or herself capable, significant, successful, and worthy (Coopersmith, 1987). The short form of the adult scale, which was normed on an American population (Coopersmith, 1987), was used in this study. It consists of 25 items, for example: "I'm a lot of fun to be with" or "I often wish I were someone else", which can be answered by indicating one of two choices, 1 = like me or 0 = unlike me. The total self-esteem score consists of the sum of all answers.

The inventory has been found to be reliable with a Kuder-Richardson reliability estimate for the short form of .74 for males (Coopersmith, 1987). Coopersmith (1987) refers to numerous studies which compare the scale with other related measures that support the scale's construct validity.

2.3. Procedure

The procedure employed in this study was compliant with the guidelines set by the Monash University committee on Ethics in Research on Humans. Questionnaires with a covering explanatory statement, describing the nature and purpose of the study, were distributed to all participants over a 2 month period. In several instances the researcher was available to participants for discussion of issues concerning paternal involvement. Participants had the option of completing the questionnaires immediately and returning them to the researcher or of completing the measures at their leisure and returning them using a stamped and addressed envelope. In both
cases the anonymity of participants was safeguarded by completed questionnaires being returned in sealed envelopes. Completed questionnaires were collated, scored and the data was recorded.
Chapter 3 - Results

3.1. Measure of Commitment

Results were obtained from the 8 items which measured different aspects of parental commitment. These included estimates of the number of hours per week of availability to the children and of sole responsibility for the children, as well as the number of hours per week spent on feeding and food preparation, and on play, leisure and assistance with schoolwork. Furthermore, estimated proportions of responsibility for sick children, of responsibility for household tasks and for financial contribution were reported. Means, standard deviations, as well as minimum and maximum for each item are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

*Frequency Statistics for Items Measuring Commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No. of fathers</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability (Hrs/week)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41.24</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24.48</td>
<td>35.65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding/meals (Hrs/week)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play/leisure</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwork (Hrs/week)*</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for sick children %</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>29.86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for household tasks %</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38.64</td>
<td>31.63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial contribution %</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70.70</td>
<td>32.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For subsequent analyses the 2 items measuring assistance with schoolwork and time spent on play and leisure were combined, as they appeared to measure a similar kind of involvement.
As can be seen from Table 2, the wide variability indicates that fathers with high and with low involvement were represented in the sample. The item measuring satisfaction with sole responsibility indicated that 50% of fathers wished to remain the same, 32.9% wished to be somewhat more often, 8.9% much more often and 7.1% somewhat less often solely responsible for their children.

Prior to analysis, the variables were assessed for accuracy of data entry. Three fathers were found to have failed to complete 1 item each. As recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (1996), cases with missing data were allocated the group mean for that item. All obtained item scores were standardised to Z-scores. Z-scores were then checked for outliers (Z > 3). In 4 cases, due to outliers, the Z-score was truncated to 3. Truncation was considered appropriate as the scores were found to be high but did not appear to pertain to a separate population. Finally, data were checked to ensure that assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and singularity were not violated.

In order to assess the validity of combining items into a measure of involvement, a standard principal components analysis was performed. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (1996), exploratory factor analyses are used to describe and summarise data by grouping together items that are correlated. Usually performed in the early stages of research, they provide a tool for consolidating variables and generating hypotheses about underlying processes (Tabachnick & Fiddell, 1996). The sample size was small, but as noted by Tabachnick and Fidell (1996), in the case of strong, reliable correlations and few, distinct factors small samples may be adequate. The total variance explained by the underlying general factor is presented in Table 3.
Table 3

*Principal Components Analysis Explaining the Total Variance of Items Measuring Commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>59.01</td>
<td>59.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employing a minimum eigenvalue of 1 as a criterion (Tabachnick & Fiddell, 1996), only 1 principal component was identified through principal components analysis. This factor was interpreted as a dimension of paternal involvement. Table 3 indicates that this component accounted for 59.01% of the variance. The loadings of individual items on this factor were determined and are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

*Loadings of Individual Items onto the General Factor of Paternal Involvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole responsibility</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal preparation/Feeding</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for sick children</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for housework</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play/Help with schoolwork</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of financial contribution</td>
<td>-.767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated in Table 4, items loaded with consistent strength onto the general factor. The item "Please estimate the proportion of financial contribution you make to the family's income" has an inverse relationship with the factor. That is, with an increase in the proportion of financial contribution, the level of involvement tended to decrease. As recommended by Tabachnick and Fiddell (1996), in order to examine the internal consistency of the involvement factor a Cronbach's Alpha was calculated. The coefficients are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

*Inter-Item Reliability Analysis Through Cronbach's Alpha for the Factor Paternal Involvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlated Item-total</th>
<th>Corrected Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole responsibility</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal preparation/Feeding</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for sick children</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for housework</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play/Help with schoolwork</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of financial contribution</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Coefficients for 7 items Alpha

= .62

As can be seen from Table 5, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the involvement factor is .62. This suggests that the measure has satisfactory internal
consistency. None of the items can be considered redundant, since the alpha coefficients all fall into the optimal range of .03 to .07 (Mine, 1979; cited in Cummins, 1997). Inspection of the alpha coefficients when were deleted reveals that if the item which examined the proportion of financial contribution was deleted, internal consistency of the factor would increase from .62 to .85. The omission of any other item would decrease the alpha coefficient. Based on these results, all items except the proportion of financial contribution were combined as the sum of Z-scores to form a measure of involvement or as a dimension of paternal commitment. The item measuring the proportion of financial contribution was treated as a separate measure or dimension of paternal commitment. For all remaining analyses paternal commitment was comprised of two dimensions, involvement and financial contribution.

3.2. Quality of Life, Social Provisions and Self-esteem

The relationship between the level of Paternal involvement and the proportion of the father's financial contribution and quality of life was investigated. Relationships between the independent variables involvement and financial contribution were explored separately for objective and subjective quality of life as the dependent variables. Similarly, multiple regression analyses were carried out for the dependent variables social provisions and self-esteem. Regression techniques are recommended by Tabachnick and Fiddell (1996) to explore relationships in observational and survey studies. In order to explore possible interactions between the independent variables, in each of the analyses a third variable consisting of the product of the independent variables was formed.
Prior to analyses, data were screened for accuracy of data entry and for outliers. In 7 cases fathers were found to have not completed all items, these cases of missing data were eliminated listwise. Of these cases, 4 were found in the self-esteem measure, 1 in the social provisions scale and 2 in the scale for objective quality of life. Assumptions of normality, linearity, homoscedasticity and independence of residuals were tested and found to be met, with the exception of the variable product of paternal involvement and financial contribution which was found to be skewed and kurtoid. A decision against using transformations was made on the basis that they can complicate interpretations, and F-tests are considered to be robust to violations of normality (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). The ratio of cases to variables was considered satisfactory given Tabachnick and Fidell's (1996) recommendation of M-550+8 times the number of variables.

The results of the multiple regression analysis carried out to explore the relationship between the independent variables involvement, financial contribution, as well as the product of these variables, and objective quality of life (W-54) are displayed in Table 6.

Table 6

*Summary of the Standard Multiple Linear Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Objective Quality of Life*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>-4.17</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial contribution</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product of paternal involvement and financial contribution</td>
<td>-3.49</td>
<td>-A9</td>
<td>-2.70**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R2=.16*
The regression was significantly different from zero, $F(3, 47) = 2.97$, $p<.05$. As can be seen from Table 6, the only independent variable to be a significant predictor of objective quality of life was the variable made of the product of levels of involvement and proportion of financial contribution ($t = -2.70$, $p<.01$). Observation of the unstandardised regression coefficient $B$ indicates that there is an inverse relationship between the product variable and quality of life. That is, as the proportion of financial contribution increases, the inverse relationship between involvement and quality of life is enhanced. Altogether 16% (adjusted 11%) of the variability of objective quality of life was predicted by the scores on the independent variables.

A second multiple linear regression analysis was performed between subjective quality of life ($N=56$) as the dependent variable and paternal involvement, proportion of financial contribution and the product of the two as independent variables. The results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7
*Summary of the Standard Multiple Linear Regression Analyses of Variables Predicting Subjective Quality of Life*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Involvement</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of financial contribution</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1.96*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Product of paternal involvement $-0.70$ $0.29$ $-2.43*$

and financial contribution

$R = 0.20^2$

Adjusted $R^2 = 0.15^2$

$p < 0.05$

As can be seen in Table 7, the regression was significantly different from zero, $F(3, 49) = 4.08$, $p < 0.05$. Two of the independent variables were found to be significant predictors of subjective quality of life; proportion of financial contribution ($t = -1.96$, $p < 0.05$) and the product variable ($t = -2.43$, $p < 0.05$). Observation of the $B$ coefficients indicates that there is a positive linear relationship between the proportion of financial contribution and subjective quality of life, but that this relationship becomes inverse when financial contribution and involvement increase together. Altogether $20\%$ (adjusted $15\%$) of the variability of subjective quality of life was predicted by the scores on the independent variables.

A third standard multiple linear regression analysis was carried out to investigate whether the availability of social provisions ($AT = 55$) could be predicted from the level of involvement, the proportion of financial contribution, or the product of the two independent variables. The results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

| Summary of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of Variables Predicting Social Provisions |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Independent variables           | $B$ | $\beta$ | $t$ |
| Paternal Involvement            | $-1.33$ | $-0.48$ | $-2.44*$ |
| Proportion of financial contribution | $-0.52$ | $-0.04$ | $-0.25$ |
| Product of paternal involvement | $-1.02$ | $-0.49$ | $-3.00**$ |
and financial contribution

\[ R^2 = .18^* \]

\[ \text{adjusted } R^2 = .13^* \]

\( p < .05, **p < .01 \)

The regression was significantly different from zero, \( F(3, 48) = 3.62, p < .05 \). As can be seen in Table 8, two variables were found to be significant predictors of the availability of social provisions, the level of involvement (\( t = -2.44, p < .05 \)) and the product variable (\( t = 3.00, p < .01 \)). Observation of the B coefficients indicates that the relationship between criterion and predictors is in both cases inverse. Altogether 18% (adjusted 13%) of the variability of social provisions was predicted by the independent variables.
To investigate whether paternal involvement and proportion of financial contribution were predictors of self-esteem (N=52), on their own or in interaction, a fourth multiple linear regression analysis was performed. The results are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Summary of Multiple Linear Regression Analyses of Variables Predicting Self-Esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>ß</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Involvement</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of financial contribution</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product of paternal involvement and financial contribution</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .09
adjusted R² = .02

p<.05, **p <.01

Table 9 shows that the regression was not significantly different from zero, F (3, 45) = 1.40, p>.05. No significant predictors for self-esteem were found.

Altogether only 9% (adjusted 2%) of the variability in self-esteem was predicted.

A final multiple linear regression was conducted to explore the relationship between the participants subjective quality of life score and their scores for social provisions and self-esteem. The results are presented in Table 10.
Table 10

Summary of the Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Of the Variables Social Provisions and Self-esteem and Subjective Quality of Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Provisions</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3.83***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .35***$

adjusted $R^2 = .33***$

p<.05, **p<.01, p<.001

As can be seen from Table 10, the regression was significantly different from zero, $F(2,48)=13.15$, p<.001. Only social provisions were found to be a significant predictor of subjective quality of life ($t=-3.83$, p<.001). Together the two variables accounted for 35% (adjusted 33%) of the variability of subjective quality of life.
Chapter 4 - Discussion

The present study had three aims. The primary aim was to examine the relationship between paternal commitment, measured as levels of involvement and levels of economic support, and quality of life. It was found that increased levels of involvement combined with increased levels of financial contribution were predictive of a decrease in both objective and subjective quality of life. However, when the amount of economic contribution was considered on its own, it was found to be a predictor of subjective but not objective quality of life. A secondary aim was to explore the negative effects of paternal involvement. Specifically, the relationship between father involvement, social support and self-esteem were investigated. As hypothesised, higher levels of involvement alone and in combination with economic support was found to predict a decrease in social support. Contrary to predictions, however, no predictors for self-esteem were found. The third aim was to examine the relationship between quality of life, social support and self-esteem. This part of the investigation was primarily intended to confirm the validity of the finding of this study. In the case of social support the relationship was found to be positive, as predicted. For self-esteem, on the other hand, contrary to predictions, no significant relationship was found.

4.1. The Measure of Paternal Commitment

Before conducting analyses, consideration was given to the operationalisation of paternal commitment. When assessing the validity of collapsing individual items measuring different types of father-child interactions and types of child care into a single measure of involvement, item scores from this scale were found to load on a
single factor with a high level of internal consistency. One item, however, showed an inverse relationship with the factor and its omission improved the factor's reliability estimate. On the basis of these findings it was decided that this item was indicative of another dimension of paternal commitment and could thus be used as a separate independent variable. It was therefore considered legitimate to operationalise for this study paternal commitment in terms of two dimensions, economic support and involvement. Overall, this bi-axional scale makes it possible to include the breadwinner role in the study of paternal commitment. It had been recommended (e.g. Pleck, 1997) that the economic support fathers give their families should be incorporated in the construct of paternal commitment.

The use of this scale has other advantages over previous studies (e.g., Lamb, 1987; Russell, 1983), in as much as it allowed for paternal involvement to be studied on a continuum, as well as in interaction with the provider role. No information is lost through categorisation of participants, and individual combinations of levels of both involvement and breadwinning can be explored. The exploration of these combinations is particularly pertinent for today's families where frequently both parents are in paid employment. A further advantage is the simplicity and time efficiency of administration and scoring of such a measure of paternal commitment.

4.2. Paternal Commitment and Quality of Life

The main aim of this study was to explore the relationship between two dimensions of paternal commitment, involvement and economic contribution, and quality of life. It was found that an inverse relationship between paternal involvement and both
objective and subjective quality of life was enhanced when the proportion of economic contribution increased. In other words, fathers' quality of life, both subjective and objective, were low when a high level of involvement in child care was combined with a high proportion of economic contribution. This suggests that fathers experienced a role-overload that was detrimental to their quality of life. This would support many of the findings reported in a review by Pleck (1997), where the stress of the combination of work and family roles led fathers to experience high levels of stress. Much of this stress was attributed to fathers being unable to honour work commitments due to their child care obligations, and this was observed to manifest in poor health and diminished well-being (Pleck 1997).

In the past, stress on mothers' psychological well-being due to demands of work and parenting have been emphasised (McLanahan & Adams, 1989). It appears that today's fathers experience similar stresses and that men, not just women, need to balance work and family commitments (Mell, 1995). According to McLanahan and Adams (1989), these negative effects, resulting from the dual role of parenting and working, have become more pronounced over recent decades. When they examined trends in the effect of children on their parent's psychological well-being, which included measures of quality of life, they found that changes in employment and marriage status were associated with a decline in well-being for women.

It has to be borne in mind that, although significant, the dimensions of paternal commitment investigated only accounted for a small proportion of the variability of quality of life (16% for objective, 20% for subjective quality of life). Quality of life is a complex construct (Cummins et al., 1994) and it is likely that parenting is just one of the many possible contributors. The importance of this
contributor for mothers, however, has been acknowledged. In studies concerned with the psychological well-being of mothers, the parental role was found to be central to the stress they reported (Russell et al., 1999).

The findings in the present study were complicated by the inclusion of a proportion of single fathers. These fathers typically indicated high paternal involvement. In their case, however, other factors may have contributed more powerfully to the lowering of quality of life than simply paternal involvement. For example, these fathers may have been experiencing less satisfaction in close personal relationships than fathers who were in a couple. The stressors of single fathers could have included ongoing tensions with the children's mother, difficulties in fulfilling parental obligations and problems forming a new relationship. Furthermore, these fathers may have had stressors associated with living in a single income family and with having the sole responsibility for household tasks. It is recommended that in future studies of paternal commitment and its implications for fathers, single fathers be examined as a separate group.

The observed positive relationship between the proportion of financial contribution and subjective quality of life, can be explained through the breadwinner role remaining a central part of the paternal stereotype (Griswold, 1993). Uwis and O'Brien (1987) referred to socially constructed motherhood and fatherhood mandates, which emphasised fulfilment gained through motherhood for women and through professional success for men. These mandates have been in place for so long in Western societies that they have become internalised without having been questioned. The benefits of stereotypical role behaviour are implicitly accepted without substantiation. Furthermore, in the complex system of stereotypes, beliefs
and attributions (Augustinos & Walker, 1995), evaluations are not made on merit alone, but are strongly coloured by behavioural expectations. It has been widely acknowledged that people, through schematic processing, end up seeing what they expect to see (McKnight & Sutton, 1994). The relationship between financial contribution and subjective quality of life, the association of a high level of economic contribution with perceived benefits, may well be influenced by the traditional link between the provider role and patriarchal privileges (Lewis & O’Brien, 1987). In the present investigation, the positive relationship between economic support and subjective quality of life may therefore be due to a stereotypical outlook of men believing that the time and energy on earning an income is worthwhile and will be rewarded through an increase in quality of life. On this premise, the increased level of subjective quality of life can be interpreted as a self-fulfilling prophecy. This explanation of the results seems especially likely as no relationship was found between economic contribution and objective quality of life. For a deconstruction of gender stereotypes, as advocated by Weiss (1998), the discovery of possible fallacies, such as success as a breadwinner equating to maturity, respectability and masculinity, would be of great importance.

The exploration of social provisions appears to substantiate the findings regarding quality of life. In accordance with the findings of previous studies assessing the construct validity of quality of life (Cummins, 1997), a relationship between subjective quality of life and social support was found.

4.3. Social Support and Self-Esteem
An inverse relationship was found between social provisions and both the involvement and the product variable. In other words, a decrease in the availability of social support, associated with high paternal involvement, did not change when fathers were also responsible for a high proportion of the financial contribution to the family's income. It appears that the lack of social support was an important problem for highly involved fathers (e.g., Greif & DeMaris, 1995; Lamb, 1987; Pleck, 1997; Russell, 1983). Furthermore, this problem did not appear to be alleviated by fathers having some social contact at the work place. These findings seem to be in accordance with several studies presented by Pleck (1997), which have reported that fathers who attempted to balance careers with responsibilities at home received limited support. Relationships with work colleagues may, in fact, add to the stress when colleagues fail to acknowledge the conflicting priorities some of the fathers have to juggle (Pleck, 1997). Furthermore, time and possibilities to extensively pursue friendships and social interaction may not be available to the fathers who have high commitments to both family and career. Also the fact that fatherhood is not really a "man's topic prevents men from talking about their role as fathers. Oherson (1995), for example, reported that fathers only talked about their paternal role approximately once a month. This may severely limit the possibilities for involved fathers to talk about and explore what takes up a considerable proportion of their time and energy.

No relationships between paternal involvement, financial contribution and self-esteem were found. This could indicate that the link between fathers' self-esteem and the stereotypical role of the breadwinner, as suggested by previous studies (e.g., Griswold, 1993), has weakened. However, the findings in regard to
self-esteem ought to be viewed with caution. They are contradictory to the relationship observed between financial support and subjective quality of life, which appeared to indicate persisting stereotypes. Furthermore, in the validity studies for the Comprehensive Quality of Life scale, Cummins (1997) reported a strong association between self-esteem and subjective quality of life. There are no clear explanations for this lack of association in the present investigation. Further studies with larger sample sizes are required to establish the present study's findings.

4.4. Limitations and recommendations

There are a number of limitations to this exploratory study. Paternal involvement was assessed using a scale developed for the study. The size of the sample used to determine the dimensions of the scale was small. As a result, the stability of the results is uncertain. Further investigations with considerably larger samples are required to determine the psychometric properties of the scale. Additionally, it has to be understood that the involvement scale provided a quantitative measure, no inferences regarding the quality of involvement can be made. It was considered appropriate to measure involvement in terms of time spent on various tasks, as the focus of the study was on the implications of how fathers spent their lives, either involved with their f-ies or dedicated to their careers. Further to this, inherent in the notion of the co-parent, is the idea of a time commitment such that fathers contribute equally to child care tasks. Amount of time, more specifically shortage of time, can also be considered one of the main stressors of the dual role. Nevertheless, future studies, especially those concerned with the effects of paternal
commitment on children, require a measurement of involvement which includes an assessment of the quality of this involvement.

Overall, this study seems to be only partially consistent with studies which have identified the negative effects children can have on their parents' psychological wellbeing. McLanahan and Adams (1989) had examined trends in the effect of children on their parent's psychological well-being, which included an assessment of quality of life. Reviewing the developments between 1957 and 1976, they indicated these effects had become more pronounced over recent decades. Similarly, they reported the perceived benefits of parenthood to have declined. Fathers in the present study were only found to experience a decrease in quality of life when a high level of involvement was combined with a corresponding high proportion of financial contribution to the family's income.

Despite the reported issues relating to dual roles, the satisfaction reported by highly involved fathers (e.g., Russell, 1983), and the indication by the 40% of fathers in this sample, that they would like to increase their amount of sole responsibility should not be overlooked. No positive relationship between quality of life and increased paternal involvement was found. The high proportion of fathers, however, who wish for more time with their children on their own, suggests that some benefits of parenting, especially those of a very close father-child relationship, seem to elude the quality of life measure. Perhaps future studies of fatherhood should concern themselves more with fathers' personal growth and maturity, as suggested by Hawkins et al. (1995).

There is a strong possibility, especially in regard to attitudes of fathers towards the value of the parental role, that the recruitment method of approaching
fathers in the company of young children, affected the findings. Furthermore, as the study was correlational in design, no causal inferences can be made. To gain greater insight both into quality of life and social support much larger sample sizes are to be recommended. Thereby an investigation of individual domains and provisions would be possible, whereas in the present study only the total scores were used.

In conclusion, the role of the co-parent is not without associated problems. What became apparent was the problem of role overload for fathers, similar to that experienced by women. Associated with increased involvement was also the paucity of social support. The social changes in the Western world over the last 50 years, such as increased marital instability and the economic necessity of dual incomes (Jamrozik & Adams, 1996), may well mean that dual roles will become a reality for many fathers. For co-parenting to become more appealing to men, greater effort is required to develop social support structures for stay at home fathers and to enable men to balance work and family commitments more effectively.
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Appendix A - Regressions

Variables Entered/Removed a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>product of total commitment and financial contribution, Zscore(MONEY) proportion of financial c, paternal involvement (sum of z-scores)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. All requested variables entered.
b. Dependent Variable: TOTALQOL

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.399a</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.3723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), product of total commitment and financial contribution, Zscore(MONEY) proportion of financial c, paternal involvement (sum of z-scores)

ANOVA b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>2.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6.514</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.747</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), product of total commitment and financial contribution, Zscore(MONEY) proportion of financial c, paternal involvement (sum of z-scores)
b. Dependent Variable: TOTALQOL
Coefficients a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardised Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.676</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>53.09</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-4.173E-02</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.347E-02</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3.488E-02</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.489</td>
<td>-2.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TOTAWOL

Regression

Variables Entered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>product of total commitment and financial contribution, Zscore(MONEY) proportion of financial c, paternal involvement (sum of z-scores)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. All requested variables entered.
b. Dependent Variable: QOL total lxS % scale max

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.447a</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>9.2313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), product of total commitment and financial contribution, Zscore(MONEY) proportion of financial c, paternal involvement (sum of z-scores)
### ANOVAb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1043.857</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>347.952</td>
<td>4.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>4175.633</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>85.217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5219.489</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), product of total commitment and financial contribution, Zscore(MONEY) proportion of financial c, paternal involvement (sum of z-scores)
b. Dependent Variable: QOL total lxs % scale max

### CoefricienteM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardised Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>67.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.000</td>
<td>paternal involvement (sum -217 of z-scores)</td>
<td>-.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zscore(MONEY)</td>
<td>-1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proportion of financial c product of total commitment and financial contribution</td>
<td>1.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: QOL total lxs % scale max

### Regression

### Variables Entem&Removedb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>product of total commitment and financial contribution, Zscore(MONEY) proportion of financial c, paternal involvement (sum of a z-scores)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. All requested variables entered.
b. Dependent Variable: total social provosions
**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.429a</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>10.8865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), product of total commitment and financial contribution, Zscore(MONEY) proportion of financial c, paternal involvement (sum of z-scores)

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>428.699</td>
<td>3.617</td>
<td>.020a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>118.515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), product of total commitment and financial contribution, Zscore(MONEY) proportion of financial c, paternal involvement (sum of z-scores)
b. Dependent Variable: total social provisions

**Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardised Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.335</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>-.484</td>
<td>-2.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.515</td>
<td>2.102</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.024</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>-.485</td>
<td>-2.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>paternal involvement (sum of z-scores)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zscore(MONEY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proportion of financial c product of total commitment and financial contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: total social provisions

**Regression**
Variables Entered/Removed b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>Variables Removed</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>product of total commitment and financial contribution, Zscore(MONEY) proportion of financial c, paternal involvement (sum of z-scores)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. All requested variables entered.
b. Dependent Variable: total self esteem

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.292a</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>7.3643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), product of total commitment and financial contribution, Zscore(MONEY) proportion of financial c, paternal involvement (sum of z-scores)

ANOVAb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression Residual Total</td>
<td>227.521 2440.479 2668.000</td>
<td>3 45 48</td>
<td>75.840 54.233</td>
<td>1.398 .256a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), product of total commitment and financial contribution, Zscore(MONEY) proportion of financial c, paternal involvement (sum of z-scores)
b. Dependent Variable: total self esteem

Coefficientsm 63

Standardized

Unstandardized Coefficient

Coef.icio-nfQ- Q

Model B Std. Error Beta t Sig.

1 (Constant) 19.877 1.324 15.016 .000
paternal involvement (sum of z-scores) 
Zscore(MONEY) proportion of financial contribution and financial .187 .247 .140 .756 

a. Dependent Variable: total self esteem

Regression

b

Variables Entered Removed Method
Model total self esteem, total social provisions 
a

a. All requested variables entered.
b. Dependent Variable: QOL total IxS % scale max

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Square Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.595a</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), total self esteem, total social provisions

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1604.838</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>802.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2928.277</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4533.115</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), total self esteem, total social provisions
b. Dependent Variable: QOL total IxS % scale max
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCZM-i^nte 1</td>
<td>Model 1 Std. Error 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total social provisions</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total m</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.67-17~c7uc,2</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.77e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: QOL total lxS % scale max
Appendix B 65
Principal Components Analysis & Cronbach’s Alpha

Communalities

Initial Extraction
Zscore(AVAIL) aUa-ilability  1.000  .662
hrs/Week
Zscore(RESPONS)  1.000  .674
responsibility hrs/week
Zscore(FEED)
feedingimeal preparation h  1.000  .706

Zscore(SICK)  1.000  .678
responsibility for sick ch
Zscore(HOUSE)  1.000  .475
responsibility for househ
Zscore(PLAY2)  1.000  .348
ply-schoolwork combined
Zscore(MONEY)  1.000  .588
1 proportion of financial c  1

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Total Variance</th>
<th>% Of Cumulative</th>
<th>% Total Variance</th>
<th>% of Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.131</td>
<td>59.010</td>
<td>4.131</td>
<td>59.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>14.009</td>
<td>59.010</td>
<td>73.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>8.138</td>
<td>81.157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>7.266</td>
<td>88.423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>5.058</td>
<td>93.481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>3.571</td>
<td>97.052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>2.948</td>
<td>100.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Component MatrIO

Compone

Zscore(AVAIL) availability .814
hrs/week
Zscore(RESPONS) .821
responsibility hrsA~k
Zscore(FEED)
feeding/meal preparation h .840
Zscore(SICK) .823
responsibility for sick eh
Zscore(HOUSE) .689
responsibility for househ
Zscore(PLAY2) .590
ply-schoolwork combined
Zscore(MONEY) -.767
proportion of financial c

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. a. 1 components extracted.

Reliability

Method 2 (covariance matrix) will be used for this analysis
R E L I A B I L I T Y

A N A L Y S I S   S C A L E   ( A L P H A )

Mean   Std Dev   Cases

1. ZAVAIL  -.0679  .9325  53.0
2. ZRESPONS  -.0367  .9313  53.0
3. ZFEED  -.0621  .7612  53.0
4. WICK  -.0332  .9903  53.0
5. ZHOUSE  .0103  1.0100  53.0
6. ZPLAY2  -.0455  .8826  53.0
7. ZMONEY .0270  1.0027  53.0

Correlation Matrix

ZAVAIL

ZRESPONS  ZFEED  ZSICK  ZHOUSE

ZAVAIL  1.0000
ZRESPONS  .5679  1.0000
ZFEED  .6981  .5429   1.0000
ZSICK  .5351  .7053  .6405   1.0000
ZHOUSE  .3536  .5677  .5058   .5528  1.0000
ZPLAY2  .5524  .2514  .5030  .3037  .2308
ZMONEY  -.5536  -.6115  -.4911  -.4862  -.5925

ZPLAY2   1.0000
ZMONEY -.3250   1.0000

N of Cases =  53.0

N of Statistics for  Mean  Variance  Std Dev  Variables
Scale  -.2079  12.9941  3.6047  7
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### RELIABILITY ANALYSIS SCALE (ALPHA)

Item-total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Corrected</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Item-Squared</th>
<th>Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Total Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Correlation if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZAVAIL</td>
<td>-.1400</td>
<td>8.6187</td>
<td>0.6403</td>
<td>0.6315</td>
<td>0.4715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRESPONS</td>
<td>-.1713</td>
<td>8.7306</td>
<td>0.6171</td>
<td>0.6232</td>
<td>0.4806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZFEED</td>
<td>-.1459</td>
<td>8.9846</td>
<td>0.7517</td>
<td>0.6276</td>
<td>0.4625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICK</td>
<td>-.1748</td>
<td>8.0874</td>
<td>0.6970</td>
<td>0.6037</td>
<td>0.4402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZHOUSE</td>
<td>.2182</td>
<td>9.1449</td>
<td>0.4631</td>
<td>0.4933</td>
<td>0.5332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZPLAY2</td>
<td>-.1624</td>
<td>9.8494</td>
<td>0.4270</td>
<td>0.3489</td>
<td>0.5515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZMONEY</td>
<td>-.2350</td>
<td>17.6564</td>
<td>-.6726</td>
<td>.5235</td>
<td>.8537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Coefficients 7 items

Alpha = 0.6188

Standardized item alpha = 0.6531
Date 10.5.1999

Project Tide: Fatherhood and its implications for men's lives

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY Caulfield/Peninsula Section

My name is Catherine Goldner and I am doing research under the supervision of Thomas Whelan, a lecturer in the Department of Psychology. The research project is a major component towards a Postgraduate Diploma of Applied Psychology at Monash University.

Over the previous three decades the Australian family structure has undergone substantial changes. These changes have been observed to have important implications for both children and parents. Much has been written about fatherless families. More recently the emphasis has shifted to a reassessment of the paternal role.

A recent conference identified the need for a father-friendly environment. In order to better support non-traditional fathers, greater insight into the nature of the co-parent is essential. To date, few objective investigations of this minority group have been conducted. This research is aimed at providing information about the impact of both traditional and non-traditional fatherhood on the lives of men.

I am looking for fathers of 18 years or older, with at least one child under the age of 10. These fathers will be asked to fill in a questionnaire regarding their current life situation. The completion of this questionnaire should take no more than 20 minutes. The nature of the questions is not likely to be in any way distressing.

The completed questionnaires can be forwarded to me in sealed, reply paid, envelopes. In this way complete anonymity of participants will be ensured, as there is no information sought which would make participants in any way identifiable. Only my supervisor and I will have access to this data which will be stored for five years as prescribed by the university regulations.

Participation in this research project is entirely voluntary. For any concerns I can be contacted through the Department of Psychology, Monash University, Caulfield Campus (Ph. 9903 2691). Research findings can be made available upon request to the same department as from November.

Should you have any complaint concerning the manner in which this research (Project 9W188) is conducted, please do not hesitate to contact The Standing Committee on Ethics in Research on Humans at the following address:

The Secretary
The Standing Committee on Ethics in Research on Humans
Monash University
Wellington Road
Clayton Victoria 3168
Telephone (03) 9905 2052Fax (03) 9905 1420

Thank you. (~i"
The feminine Catherine Goldner S

PO BOX 197, CAULFIELD EAST, MELBOURNE, VICTORIA, 3145, AUSTRALIA
FAX: (61) (3) 9903 2501 TELEPHONE: (03) 9903 269 1; 9903 2740
Questionnaire

This questionnaire consists of five sections of questions regarding your current life situation. Please answer all questions by either ticking the box that you feel describes you best or by completing the response.

1. What is your Date of Birth? ... / ... L.

What is your country of birth?

3. What is the highest level of education you have completed? 11 Incomplete secondary school 11 Trade-certificate 11 Diploma 13 Degree D Post-graduate degree 11 Other, please specify

4. What is your current employment situation? 11 Full-time employment 11 Part-time employment 13 Unemployed

5. Which best describes your household?  
   Cl Mother, father, brother(s) and/or sister(s)  
   Cl Parent, step-parent, brother(s) and/or sister(s)  
   11 Parent, step-parent, brother(s) and/or sister(s), step-brother(s) and/or step-sister(s)  
   11 Mother, father, only child  
   Cl Parent, step-parent, only child  
   11 Single parent only child  
   D Single parent, brother(s) and/or sister(s)

6. How many children do you have?

Please indicate their ages: .................

7. Please indicate your level and nature of parental responsibility by estimating the number of **hours per week** you spend on the following tasks:
   For how many hours per week are you available to your children when they are awake?

How many hours per week are you solely responsible for your children?  
How many hours per week do you spend preparing meals or feeding them?  
For how many hours per week are you involved in your child/children's playtime, sport and leisure?  
How many hours per week do you spend on helping with school work?

8. Would you prefer to be solely responsible for your child/children 11 much more often
Cl somewhat more often
(1 remain the same
[1 somewhat less often
[3 much less often

9. To what extent are you responsible for looking after children when they are sick?
   ...... %

10. Please estimate the extent of your responsibility for household tasks, i.e. washing,
    cleaning ..... %

11. Please estimate the proportion of financial contribution you make to the family's
    income: ..... %
Section 1
This section asks for information about various aspects of your life. Please tick the box that most accurately describes your situation.

1.a) Where do you live?
   • house 13 Do you own the place where you live or do
   • flat or apartment Cl you rent?
   • room (e.g. in a hostel) 13 Own 11 Rent 1

b) How many personal possessions do you have compared with other people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More than almost anyone</th>
<th>More than most people</th>
<th>About average</th>
<th>Less than most people</th>
<th>Less than almost anyone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 What is your household gross annual income before tax?

Less than $10,999 13
$11,000 - $25,999 1
$26,000 - 40,999 11
$41,000 - $55,999 E]
More than $56,000 E]

2.a) How many times have you seen a doctor over the past 3 months?

None 1-2 3-4 (about once a month)

5-7 8 or more (about every (about ~ a two weeks) week or more)

11 11 c] 1:1 1:1

b) Do you have any disabilities or medical conditions? (eg. visual, bearing, physical, health, etc.)?

Yes 1:1 No 1:1

If "yes" please specify:
Name of disability or medical condition e.g. Visual Diabetes Epilepsy

Extent of disability or medical condition Require glasses for reading Require daily injections Require daily medication
c) What regular medicine do you take each day?

If none tick box Cl or Nanne(s) of medication:

3.a) How many hours do you spend on the following each week? (Average over the past 3 mouths)

Hours paid work 0 Ell-10 E] 11-20 E] 21-30 [1 31-40+11

Hours formal education 0 111 - 10 11

11-20 11 21-30 [1 31-40+0

Hours unpaid child care 0 Cl 1 - 10 Cl 11-20 Cl 21-30 11 31-40+

b) In your spare time, how often do you have nothing much to do?

Almost always Usually Sometimes Not usually Almost never

11 11 11 11 11

c) On average how many hours TV do you watch each day?

Hours per day

None 1-2 3-5 6-9 10 or more

11 11 11 11 11

4a) How often do you talk with a close friend?

Daily Several times Once a week Once a month Less than a week

Cl 11

13

11

once a month

Cl

b) If you are feeling sad or depressed, how often does someone show they care for you?

Almost always Usually Sometimes Not usually Almost never

13 11 11 11 11
c) If you want to do something special, how often does someone else want to do it with you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Not usually</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Almost always: 11
Usually: 11
Sometimes: 11
Not usually: 13
Almost never: 13

5. How often do you sleep well?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Almost always: 11
Usually: 11

b) Are you safe at home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Not usually</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sometimes: 11
Not usually: 11
Almost never: 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Not usually</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Almost always: 1:1
Usually: 11
Sometimes: 11
Not usually: 11
Almost never: 11

How often are you worried during the day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Almost always: 11
Usually: 11
Sometimes: 11
Not usually: 11
Almost never: 11

6a) Below is a list of leisure activities. Indicate how often in an average month you attend or do each one for your enjoyment (not employment).

**Activity**

1. Go to a club/group/society
2. Go to a hotel/bar/pub
3. Watch live sporting events (not TV)
4. Go to a place of worship
5. Chat with neighbours
6. Eat out
7. Go to a movie
8. Visit family or friends
9. Play sport or go to a gym
10. Other, please describe

**Number of times per month**
b) Do you hold an unpaid position of responsibility in relation to any club, group, or society?

Yes 11    No D

If "yes", please indicate the highest level of responsibility held:

Committee Member
Committee Chairman/Convenor
Secretary/remuner
Group President, Chairman or Convenor [1

efflow often do people outside your home ask for your help or advice?

Almost always  Usually  Sometimes  Not usually  Almost never

11 13 13 13

7. afflow often can you do things you want to do?

Almost always  Usually  Sometimes  Not usually

11 11 11 13

b) When you wake up in the morning, how often do you wish you could stay in bed all day?

Almost always  Usually  Sometimes

11 11 13

Not usually  Almost never

11

c) How often do you have wishes that cannot come true?

Almost always  Usually  Sometimes  Not usually

13 11 11

11
Almost never
11
SECTION 2: How important are each of the following life areas for you? Please answer by ticking the appropriate box for each question. There are no right or wrong answers. Please choose the box that best describes how important each area is to you. Do not spend too much time on any one question.

1. **How important to you are the things you own?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Could not be more</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **How important to you is your health?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Could not be more</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **How important to you is what you achieve in life?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **How important to you are close relationships with your family or friends?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Could not be more</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **How important to you is how safe you feel?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Could not be more</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **How important to you is doing things with people outside your home?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Could not be more</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Slightly important</th>
<th>Not important at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 How important to you is your happiness?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Could not be more important</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly important</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important at all</td>
<td>EJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3: How SATISFIED are you with each of the following life areas? There are no right or wrong answers. Please tick the box that describes how satisfied you are with each area.

1. How satisfied are you with the things you own?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delighted</th>
<th>Pleased</th>
<th>Mostly satisfied</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Mostly dissatisfied</th>
<th>Unhappy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How satisfied are you with your health?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delighted</th>
<th>Pleased</th>
<th>Mostly satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E]</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How satisfied are you with what you achieve in life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delighted</th>
<th>Pleased</th>
<th>Mostly satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How satisfied are you with your close relationships with family or friends?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delighted</th>
<th>Pleased</th>
<th>Mostly satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delighted</th>
<th>Pleased</th>
<th>Mostly satisfied</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Mostly dissatisfied</th>
<th>Unhappy</th>
<th>Terrible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>E] 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **How satisfied are you with how safe you feel?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delighted</th>
<th>Pleased</th>
<th>Mostly satisfied</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly unhappy</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **How satisfied are you with doing things with people outside your home?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delighted</th>
<th>Pleased</th>
<th>Mostly satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>dis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **How satisfied are you with your own happiness?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delighted</th>
<th>Pleased</th>
<th>Mostly satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mostly dissatisfied</td>
<td>Unhappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 4: How good is your current relationship with friends, family members, co-workers, community member and so on. There are no right or wrong answers, please tick the box that is most appropriate for you.

1. There are people I can depend on to help me if I really need it.
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Agree  Strongly agree
   11  11  13  11

2. I feel that I do not have close personal relationships with other people
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Agree  Strongly agree
   11  11  11  11

3. There is no one I can turn to for guidance in times of stress
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Agree  Strongly agree
   13  11

4. There are people who depend on me for help
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Agree  Strongly agree
   11  11  11  11

5. There are people who enjoy the same social activities I do
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Agree  Strongly agree
   11  11

6. Other people do not view me as competent
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Agree  Strongly agree
   11  11  11  13

7. I feel personally responsible for the well-being of another person
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Agree  Strongly agree
   11  11  11  13

8. I feel part of a group of people who share my attitudes and beliefs
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Agree  Strongly agree
   11  11  11  11

9. I do not think other people respect my skills and abilities
   Strongly disagree  Disagree  Agree  Strongly agree
   11  11  11  11

10. If something went wrong, no one would come to my assistance
    Strongly disagree  Disagree  Agree  Strongly agree
    11  11  11  11
11.1 have close relationships that provide me with a sense of emotional security and well-being
   Strongly disagree Disagree Agree

Agree

12. There is someone I could talk to about important decisions in my life
   Strongly disagree Disagree Agree
   11 11 11

   Strongly agree
   11

13. I have relationships where my **competence and skill are recognised**
   Strongly disagree Disagree Agree
   11 11 11

14. There is no one who shares my interests and concerns
   Strongly disagree Disagree Agree
   13 11 13

   Strongly agree
   11

   Strongly agree
   13
15. There is no one who really relies on me for their well-being
   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly agree |
   | 11                | 11       | 11    | 11             |

16. There is a trustworthy person I could turn to for advice if I were having problems
   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree |
   | 13                | 1:1      | 11    |

17. I feel a strong emotional bond with at least one other person
   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree |
   | 11                | 11       | 11    |

18. There is no one I can depend on for aid if I really need it
   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree |
   | 11                | 11       | 13    |

19. There is no one I feel comfortable talking about problems with
   Strongly agree
   11
   Strongly agree
   11
   Strongly agree
   11

20. There are people who admire my talents and abilities
   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree |
   | 11                | 11       | 11    |

21. I lack a feeling of intimacy with another person
   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree |
   | 13                | 11       | 11    |

22. There is no one who likes to do the things I do
   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree |
   | 11                | 11       | 11    |

23. There are people I can count on in an emergency
   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree |
   | 11                | 11       | 11    |

24. No one needs me to care for them
   11

   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Agree |
   | 11                | 11       | 11    |

   Strongly agree 11
Strongly agree
  11

Strongly agree 11

Strongly agree
  11

Strongly agree
  11
SECTION 5: Please indicate on the following statements how you usually feel by ticking the box that describes you best. There are no right or wrong statements.

Like  Unlike
   me    me


Things usually don't bother me.
I find it very hard to talk in front of people.
There are lots of things about myself I'd change if I could.
I can make up my mind without too much trouble.
I'm a lot of fun to be with.
I get upset easily at home.
It takes me a long time to get used to anything new.
I'm popular with persons my own age.
My family usually considers my feelings.
I give up very easily.
My family expects too much of me.
It's pretty tough to be me.
Things are all mixed up in my life.
People usually follow my ideas.
I have a low opinion of myself
There are many times when I would like to leave home.
I feel often upset with my work.
I'm not as nice looking as most people.
If I have something to say, I usually say it.
My family understands me.
Most people are better liked than I am.
I usually feel as if my family is pushing me.
I often get discouraged with what I am doing.
I often wish I were someone else.
I can be depended on.