

Cross-cultural Quality Of Life among Persians

Elham Foroughi

(B.A., Grad.Dip in Applied Psychology)

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award
of Master of Clinical Psychology.

School of Psychology
Deakin University (Burwood)

October 1995

Deakin University
School of Psychology
Master of Clinical Psychology Candidate Certificate

I am the author of the thesis entitled "Cross-cultural Quality Of Life among Persians" submitted for the Master of Clinical Psychology and I agree to grant the Master of Clinical Psychology co-ordinator of the school of psychology permission to make this thesis available for consultation, loan, or photocopying in whole or in part.

Signed Elham Foroughi
Elham Foroughi

Date 26/10/15

Deakin University
School of Psychology
Ethics Summary Statement

Project Number : EC-H 161194

Project Title : Cross-Cultural Quality of Life among Persians

We the undersigned declare that the above-named research project has been completed as described in the Application for Ethics Approval and in accordance with the ethics guidelines of Deakin University.

Researcher's Name : Elham Foroughi

Signed Elham Foroughi Date 26/10/95

Supervisor's Name : R.A. Cummins

Signed RA Cummins Date 26/10/95

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend my gratitude for the supervision, constant encouragement and support provided by Dr Robert Cummins. The efforts of Professor Nassefat of Tehran university in assisting in translation of the questionnaires is also acknowledged. I would also like to thank the many people who assisted in distributing and collecting of the questionnaires.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page Number
Tables	vi
Abstract	vii
Introduction	1
Method	6
Participants	6
Materials	6
Procedures	7
Results	8
Discussion	13
References	18
Appendix A Open-ended Quality of life and demographics	22
Appendix B Comprehensive Quality of Life Scale (ComQol)	24
Appendix C Social Integration Scale (SIS)	33
Appendix D Social support questionnaire (SSQ)	38
Appendix E Ethics Approval, Plain language statements and informed consent forms.	43
Appendix F Translated Persian version of all questionnaires	47

TABLES

- Table 1: Comparative percentages of terminology to describe a high and low QOL
- Table 2: Descriptive data for social integration of the Persian-Australian sample and comparative data of Greek-Australian social integration drawn from Yiolitis (1994)
- Table 3: Descriptive data for QOL and Social support
- Table 4: Standard Multiple Regression for predicting Subjective QOL for each sample group

ABSTRACT

The current study investigated quality of life cross-cultural differences amongst Persian immigrants to Australia, Australians and Persians residing in Iran. The mediating role of social support on life quality was also examined. A total of three hundred and thirty subjects were recruited from the three samples. The most significant finding was that despite the fact that Objective QOL was significantly different across the three groups with Persians obtaining the lowest mean score, no such differences were observed for Subjective QOL. In addition, no relationship was found between social integration and years of residence in Australia with Subjective QOL suggesting that the experience of social integration remains independent of life quality for Persian immigrants. However subjects migrating at an older age reported lower subjective QOL. Finally, an investigation into the impact of social support and life quality revealed surprising findings, with a positive relationship between subjective support for the Australian and Persian sample, however no such relationship was found for the Persian-Australians. Limitation of the present study were considered and recommendations for designs of future research were also suggested.

INTRODUCTION

The term culture has been defined in various ways, but it is most commonly used to refer to the acquired knowledge that people use to interpret experiences and guide social behaviour (Kuyken, Hudelson, Sartorius & Orley, 1994). As suggested by Festinger (1954), in order to evaluate their quality of life (QOL), people constantly rely on social comparisons with other people. They also tend to compare themselves with others who are similar, rather than different, thereby identifying with friends, family and others of comparable race, income, occupation or culture. Therefore at a sociocultural level, people assess and interpret their experiences by comparing themselves to their own society's norms and expectations.

Various theories have been proposed to explain the process of these comparisons. Among the most notable is 'Social identity' theory. According to this model people will identify with their group if they share the same social categorisation, for instance, a common label such as being sick, disabled or belonging to a particular ethnic group. Skevington (1994) claims that this concept of intergroup relations becomes particularly relevant in international comparisons among different sects, tribes, and religious groups. Therefore the cultural norms influence the individual's judgment about their perceived life quality. Saxena (1994) supports this contention by arguing that quality of life cannot be viewed in isolation from culture and an inquiry into perception of individuals of their own position in life must be carried out in the context of the culture and value system in which they live in.

For the present study, Quality of life has been defined as follows 'Quality of life is both objective and subjective, each axis being the aggregate of seven domains; material well-being, health, productivity, intimacy, safety, place in the community, and emotional well-being. Objective domains comprise culturally relevant measures of objective well-being. subjective domains comprise domain satisfaction weighted by their importance to the individual' (Cummins, 1995, p.19). The 'Comprehensive Quality of Life Scale' (Cummins, 1993) which will be employed in the present study, has also been derived from this definition.

While a large literature exists on QOL, few studies have been conducted in non-Western countries (Ying, 1992). One such study comparing levels of subjective well-being amongst various countries has found that, the Danes,

Swedes, Swiss, Norwegians, Dutch, Irish and Australians have reported high levels of well-being, whereas the Japanese, Greeks, Italians, Spanish and French people have reported lower levels (Heading & Wearing, 1992). The authors have put forward several tentative explanations for these observed differences, amongst which were the level of democracy, affluence, equality and cultural norms as mediating variables which impact on life quality.

The study by Nathawat and Mathur (1993) has provided an interesting example of the interaction of culture on life quality. Conducted in India, the authors reported better marital adjustment and subjective well being for working women than for housewives. This is in contrast to studies in Western cultures which have indicated that tension between work and family affect marital happiness negatively (Cooke & Rousseau, 1984). Therefore it appears that the role assumed by the woman may impact differently on life quality depending on the woman's cultural background.

In order to establish a 'gold standard'; or a reference point which could form the basis of comparisons between empirical studies a common statistics has been formulated by Cummins (1994). By employing the 'percentage of scale maximum' (%SM) which expresses a score as a percentage of the maximum scale score, each data set can be converted into a common statistics in order to allow comparison across samples. Comparing normative data from large scale surveys, conducted in western countries, the author has reported that, despite the use of very different methodologies, the combination of data from these unrelated studies into life satisfaction has produced a mean of 74.80 %SM and a standard deviation of just 2.87.

This finding supports the general trend, that most members of almost all sections of the community give themselves rating above the average point on quality of life scales (Boucher & Osgood, 1969; Golding, 1954; Heady and Wearing, 1992), which indicate that QOL data are not normally distributed but negatively skewed. Overall, based on these findings, Cummins (1994) proposes the working hypothesis that; the life satisfaction gold standard should be considered as lying within the range 70-80 %SM. In this study, only one group, consisting of those with higher than average income, yielded a score lying above this range, indicating that as reported by Adler, Boyce, Chesney, Cohen, Folkman, Kahn and Syme (1994) socio-economic statuses predicts significant variance within QOL.

The comparison of data from countries other than those used to construct the gold standard demonstrate that their %SM values tend to lie below the normative range. For example, the %SM for Indian women ranged between 57.7 and 62.2 (Nathawat & Mathur, 1993) and for the retired Zulu (Moller, 1988) the range was between 34.0 and 43.3. These findings may be due to the influence of cultural factors on responding to the quality of life measures or alternatively it may reflect a relatively lower standard of living. The explanations offered at this stage are speculative in nature (Cummins, 1994).

Besides the international cross-cultural QOL studies, cultural differences can also be investigated by comparing QOL of immigrants in comparison to their host culture (Rogler, 1994). This is particularly relevant to the Australian multicultural society. One in eight Australians were born in a non-English speaking country where a substantially different set of cultural values prevail (Jupp, 1989).

Immigration constitutes a major sociocultural change which markedly influences people's attitude, behaviour and overall subjective experience of life. QOL comparisons amongst immigrants in different countries has indicated that they generally report a lower QOL compared to the rest of the population. For example, studies of ethnic adolescents in the Netherlands (Verkuyten, 1986;1994), compared with the rest of the general Dutch population, indicated that the ethnic population scored significantly lower. Similar findings were reported by Ortiz and Arce (1986), who reported lower objective and subjective life quality for Mexican-Americans compare with the American normative sample.

In contrast to the above findings, Ying (1992) investigated variables that predicted life satisfaction in a group of Chinese immigrants to America and reported life satisfaction levels comparable to that of Chinese-American born. Similar data have been reported by Yiolitis (1994), who found no significant differences between the Greek-Australian and a Victorian normative sample on QOL scores.

As possible sources of explanation for these conflicting findings, social integration, age at migration and years of residence have been identified as mediating variables that influence QOL amongst ethnic minority groups (Steinkamp & Kelly, 1987; Cooper, Okamura & Gurka, 1992; Angel & Angel, 1992; Cohen & Wills, 1985). Social integration has been defined as the level of participation in a variety of activities outside the home, including shopping, leisure activities and visiting friends. For example, Lang, Munoz, Bernal and Sorenson (1982) examined the concept of integration among a Latino community in America, and

reported that higher levels of acculturation were found to be associated with better psychological adjustment measured by experiences of positive affect. Similarly, although studies consistently show that black Americans score significantly lower than their white counterparts on well-being scales, it was found black Americans who were highly socially integrated reported comparable scores to white Americans on psychological well-being (Holahan, Betak, Spearly & Chance, 1985). Yiolitis (1994) also reported a significant positive relationship between the objective integration and QOL of Greek-Australians. Despite such findings, reported by numerous studies, other researchers such as Verkuyten (1986) have found no evidence in support of a positive relationship between social integration and QOL.

A further factor influencing the well-being of immigrants is age at migration which has been found to be negatively related to QOL. According to Angel and Angel's (1992) study of Hispanic-Americans, older age at migration leads to long-standing problems in adapting to the new environment and this influences QOL adversely. In addition to this, another variable, namely, years of residence in the country, also needs to be addressed since this has been found to be positively related to psychological well-being (Cohen & Wills, 1985). Consequently age at migration and number of years of residence may be viewed as confounding variables which influence QOL through their impact on social integration; younger age allows better adaptation to the new environment while, longer residence in a country provides the opportunity for better social integration.

A further variable which has a significant bearing on the QOL of all groups, but particularly immigrants, is social support. For the present study the subjective definition offered by Cobb (1976) has been adopted. Social support is defined as "information leading the subject to believe that he is cared for and loved, esteemed and a member of a network of mutual obligations"(p-300). Thus support exists only if it leads to certain belief in the recipient indicating that it is reciprocal in nature. Although the precise role that social support assumes when influencing quality of life is unclear, the bulk of research findings in this area suggest that social support has a positive impact on life quality (e.g. Longfellow, 1979 ; House, 1981; Moos & Moos, 1983), while non-supportive and negative social ties have a negative impact on well-being (Hodges, 1974; Rook, 1984).

The presence of social support has been related to lower levels of distress, depression and improved adaptation to particularly stressful circumstances such as assuming the role of motherhood, adaptation to an incapacity such as a hearing loss, having a functional psychosis, or loss of a job in the general population

(Bloom, Fobair, Spiegel, Varghese & Hoppe, 1991). Social support has also been recognised to have a significant impact on the life quality of ethnic groups and the loss of social network support, as a result of migration, has been reported amongst the etiological factors that have been related to maladjustment in migrants. Therefore research on this area has found a positive relationship between social support and QOL, in both the general population and the ethnic populations.

In regards to the impact of social support on cross-cultural QOL, only few studies have been conducted. In an international social survey conducted in seven countries, it was found that higher levels of social support were positively related to higher levels of national subjective well-being (Heading & Wearing, 1992). However another cross-cultural study highlights the need to consider this mediating role within a cultural context. In a study of Japanese and Australian residents, a high negative correlation was found between loneliness and life satisfaction in Australian subjects, with a much smaller negative relationship observed among the Japanese. This suggests that loneliness in Japanese subjects appears to remain largely independent of general life satisfaction (Schumaker, Shear, Monfires & Groth-Marnat, 1993). Therefore it would appear that the degree of the mediating influence of social support on QOL may be influenced by the cultural context of the society.

Overall, very little cross-cultural research has been done in this area despite the fact that such comparisons could offer new insight into the social factors that contribute to perceived quality of life. The studies, that are available, however, suggest that the relationship between various social indicators and quality of life do not necessarily hold across different cultures, more especially from Western to non Western societies. Thus it seems likely that the culture into which the individual is socialised influences the individual's perceived quality of life as measured by Western scales.

The aim of this study is threefold; firstly, to examine whether cross-cultural QOL differences are evident in the Persians and Australians. Secondly to examine some of the possible mediating variables between QOL and ethnicity in Persian immigrants. Finally the mediating role of social support on subjective QOL will be examined.

METHOD

Participants

The sample for this study consisted of three groups; 50 Persian immigrants from Iran (25 males and 25 females), 58 Australians (30 males and 28 females) and 222 Persians residing in Iran (127 males and 95 females). In order to distinguish these groups the Persian immigrants will be referred to as Persian-Australians, while those residing in Iran will be called Persians.

The Persian-Australians' age on arrival in Australia ranged from 2 to 60 years (Mean=20.18±11.93), while the number of years of residence in Australia varied from 1 to 17 (Mean=9.84±3.72).

Materials

All subjects were required to complete three questionnaires. An open-ended quality of life questionnaire (O-QOL), the Comprehensive Quality of Life Scale (ComQol), and the Social Support Questionnaire (SSQ). In addition the Social Integration Scale (SIS), was employed in order to assess the level of social integration amongst the Persians-Australians.

The O-QOL was constructed for the purpose of this study. It consisted of three questions, requiring the respondents to consider, and then define, what quality of life meant to them, and then to identify the three most essential things that they believed are needed to lead a high quality life, and three things that constantly reduce life quality.

The Comprehensive Quality of Life Scale (ComQol)(Cummins, 1993) assesses objective and subjective QOL. Subjective QOL is calculated by scoring and multiplying responses to five point likert scale of Importance (score range 1 to 5) by satisfaction (score range -4 to +4) on seven life domains; Material well-being, Health, Productivity, Intimacy, Safety, Place in the community and Emotional well-being. Objective domain scores are derived by summing three item scores within each domain.

The Social Support Questionnaire (SSQ) is a modified short version of the Perceived Support Network Inventory (Oritt, Paul & Behrman, 1985), and assesses the total Satisfaction (score range 1 to 7) and total Importance (score range

1 to 5) of the social support provided by the individual's social network. A total Subjective score for the nominated support network can be calculated by multiplying the satisfaction by importance score. The SSQ also measures the amount of reciprocity of the support and the level of conflict with the persons providing the support, measured on a 5 point likert scale.

The social Integration Scale (SIS) (Yiolitis & Cummins, 1994), measures the social integration level of individuals belonging to an ethnic minority. This 27 item scale was administered to the Persian-Australian sample in order to investigate two types of integration; with individuals of the same background (Persian Integration) and with individuals who are not of the same ethnic background (Non-Persian Integration). The scale also provides Objective and Subjective integration scores.

All measures employed in the present study have been reported to have adequate psychometric properties.

Procedures

Sixty questionnaires were distributed through the Persian-Australian community using informal social links. Of these 50 were returned completed. The Australian Participants were recruited from a normative sample currently involved in a longitudinal quality of life study carried out by Deakin University. One hundred and twelve questionnaires were distributed by post and 58 completed packages were returned.

The Persian sample in Iran consisted of two groups; a university student sample and general population sample. Translated questionnaires were distributed to the first year psychology students at a Teheran university during class sessions. Since the questionnaires were completed during class, a 100% response rate (n=108) was achieved. Members of the general population were recruited by a large number of people who distributed the questionnaires amongst their friends, colleagues and relatives. Of these, 118 of the 145 Questionnaires distributed were returned.

Comparative Greek-Australian data has been incorporated into the current study from a recently completed study by Yiolitis (1994), consisting of a sample of 116 adults of Greek origin residing in North-Western suburbs of Melbourne.

RESULTS

In response to the open-ended Quality of life questions, 475 different terms were identified by the three sample groups in defining quality of life. The terms identified as the most essential for leading a life of high quality (HQOL) and those most important in constantly reducing life quality (LQOL), were broadly classified and formed 14 different categorises. Each term was classified according to whether or not it could be placed within one of the categories equivalent to the seven life domains of ComQol and by generating additional categories for the remaining items. The comparative data are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparative percentages of terminology to describe a high and low QOL.

QOL Categories	Persian-Australian		Australian		Persian	
	HQOL	LQOL	HQOL	LQOL	HQOL	LQOL
Education	6.5	00			10.6	3.0
*Productivity	4.3	9.3	3.7	5.8	6.9	9.5
*Material well-being	6.5	9.3	9.3	7.7	10.6	10.0
Personality factors	10.9	9.3	1.9	5.8	11.5	15.4
*Health	19.6	14.0	5.4	28.8	18.0	12.4
*Emotion	10.9	14.0	11.1	15.4	5.1	7.5
Freedom	6.5	00	00	00	.5	00
*Intimacy	8.7	32.6	38.9	9.6	18.4	23.9
*Safety	4.3	00	00	00	00	.5
Spirituality	21.7	2.3	3.7	00	10.7	7.0
*Community	00	4.7	00	23.1	2.8	5.0
Culture	00	2.3	00	00	5.0	00
Government	00	2.3	00	00	00	.5
Bad luck	00	00	00	15.4	00	5.5

Note: (a) Personality factors=various positive or negative personal attribution such as being clever.

(b) * denotes the ComQol domains.

Table 1 indicates that, for the Persian-Australian sample, the most frequent (HQOL) response was in the category of spirituality (21.7), whilst for both the Australian and Persians Intimacy was the category most nominated (38.9,18.4 respectively). For the terms identified as the most important in constantly reducing life quality (LQOL), the Persian-Australian and Persian samples identified a lack of intimacy as their most common concern (32.6 and 23.9 percent respectively), while in the Australian sample the highest percentage (28.8) was obtained for ill health.

Before proceeding to the major statistical analyses, group differences between Persian students and the Persian general population samples were tested by a One Way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) using subjective QOL, Objective QOL, subjective support, reciprocity of support, and conflict with support givers. This was not significant (Pillai's $F(5,195)=.019$, N.S.). Accordingly the two groups were collapsed to form the Persian sample.

Descriptive statistics on the Social Integration Inventory (SIS), the Comprehensive Quality of Life (ComQol), social Support Questionnaire (SSQ) are presented in the following Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2. Descriptive data for social integration of the Persian -Australian sample and comparative data of Greek-Australian social integration drawn from Yiolitis (1994).

Variable	Persian-Australians		Greek-Australians	
	Mean±SD	%SM	Mean±SD	%SM
OBJECTIVE				
Persian Integration	3.95±.90	73.75	3.65±.67	66.3
Non-Persian Integration	4.19±.80	79.74	3.43±.83	60.8
IMPORTANCE				
Persian Integration	3.82±.74	70.5	3.88±.72	72.0
Non-Persian Integration	3.81±.96	70.25	3.47±.86	66.8
SATISFACTION				
Persian Integration	3.46±.90	61.5	3.98±.60	74.5
Non-Persian Integration	3.77±.55	69.25	3.67±.60	66.8
SUBJECTIVE (IMP*SAT)				
Persian Integration	9.6±.62	-	8.49±2.99	-
Non-Persian Integration	9.99±5.97	-	5.78±4.00	-
TOTAL INTEGRATION				
Objective	4.07±.63	76.75	3.54±.50	63.5
Subjective	19.64±7.48	-	14.23±5.34	-

Ten independent t-tests were performed between the Persian-Australian and Greek-Australian samples comparing the data presented in Table 2. Setting alpha at .01, no significant differences were observed between the two samples on any measure.

Table 3. Descriptive data for QOL and Social Support.

	Persian -Australians (n=50)			Australians (n= 58)			Persians (n= 222)		
	M	SD	%SM	M	SD	%SM	M	SD	%SM
Quality Of Life									
Total Objective	72.69 ± 7.11		61.53	74.91 ± 10.05		64.17	60.94 ± 7.47		55.18
Total Satisfaction	36.77 ± 5.39		70.88	38.19 ± 5.92		74.26	37.89 ± 5.87		73.54
Total Subjective	65.00 ± 26.11		71.80	69.67 ± 25.12		73.56	74.16 ± 30.28		75.24
Social Support									
Total subjective	20.56 ± 7.43		-	22.89 ± 5.49		-	23.13 ± 6.36		-

A MANOVA was carried out to determine group differences on Objective QOL, Subjective QOL, Satisfaction QOL and subjective-Support. Pillai's criterion was significant $F(8, 612)=23.48, p<.001$. Subsequent Univariate analysis of variance (ANOVAS) and Scheffe procedures indicated that the differences were restricted to Objective QOL $F(2,321)=96.05, p<.001$ where the Persian and Australian groups had a higher score than the Persians.

In order to determine which of the seven domains of Objective QOL best predicted membership into one of the three nationality groups, a Discriminant Function Analysis was executed. Two discriminant functions were calculated producing a combined $X^2(14)=444.67, p <.001$ which together accounted for 93.56% of between-group variability. With the first discriminant function removed, there was still a reliable relationship between the groups and the predictor, $X^2(6)=51.87, p<.001$ and could explain 6.4% of variance in the three groups.

Function 1 separates the Persians from the Persian-Australians and Australians. The highest correlating variables with Function 1 are Community ($r=.69$) and Emotion ($r=.66$). These are therefore the best predictors for membership into the Persian group. The comparative mean scores for the Persian, Persian-Australian and Australians are 3.25, 8.04, 7.02 for Community and 6.15, 9.62, 10.95 for Emotional well-being respectively.

Function 2 separates subjects in the Australian group from the Persian and Persian-Australians group. The highest correlating variable with Function 2 is Safety ($r=.60$) and Material well-being ($r=.37$). The comparative mean scores for the Australian, Persian-Australian and Persians are as follows 12.78, 10.73 , 10.51 for safety and 9.26, 10.39, 8.51 for Material well-being respectively.

A Spearman correlation was executed to investigate the hypothesis that Age at migration will be negatively related to Subjective and Objective QOL. The relationship between Objective QOL and Age at migration, was found to be not significant ($r=-.22$, N.S.), while a significant negative relationship was found between subjective QOL and Age at migration ($r=-.33$, $p<.05$). A spearman's correlation analysis was also carried out in order to examine the hypothesis that Years of residence in Australia will be positively related to subjective QOL. No significant correlations were found between these two variables ($r=-.02$, N.S.).

In order to assess the relationship between the Persian-Australians subject's Subjective QOL and their level of Social Integration, a Standard Multiple Regression was performed with 'subjective QOL' as the dependent variable and subjective Persian, subjective non-Persian, objective Persian and objective non-Persian integration as independent variables. R for regression was not significantly different from zero, ($F(4,43)=2.25$, N.S.), indicating that these variables do not significantly contribute to the prediction of Subjective QOL.

In order to investigate the hypothesis that social support will be positively related to Subjective QOL correlations between Subjective-support, reciprocity of the support and the level of conflict with the persons offering the support, and Subjective-QOL were obtained for each sample group.

For the Persian-Australian sample a significant positive relationships were observed between reciprocity with subjective QOL ($r=.34$, $p<.05$). For the Australian group significant positive correlations were found between Subjective support ($r=.44$, $p<.01$), and reciprocity($r=.41$, $p,.01$) with Subjective QOL.

The Persian sample also demonstrated significant positive relationships between Subjective support ($r=.33$, $p<.001$) and reciprocity ($r=.29$, $p<.001$) with Subjective-QOL. In addition to these a significant negative relationship was found between the level of conflict and subjective QOL ($r=-.26$, $p<.001$).

In addition to investigating the hypotheses, further analyses were carried out in order to determine if any of the variables under investigation can significantly contribute to the prediction of Subjective QOL in each sample group. For each sample group, variables that were found to significantly correlated with Subjective QOL were selected as independent variables. It was decided to further investigate the differences observed on Objective QOL by including this variable into the regression equation as an independent variable. Three Standard Multiple Regression analyses were performed and the results for each sample group are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Standard Multiple Regression for predicting Subjective QOL for each sample group.

Variable	B	β	Sr ²
<u>Persian-Australian</u>			
Reciprocity	15.59**	.42	.16
Migration age	-.86**	-.39	.14
Objective QOL	-.47	-.13	-
		R=.51**	R ² =.25 adjusted R ² =.21
<u>Australian</u>			
Reciprocity	5.9	.17	-
Objective QOL	1.2**	.49	.23
Subjective Support	1.4**	.32	.08
		R=.69 **	R ² =.48 adjusted R ² =.46
<u>Persian</u>			
Conflict	-6.5**	-.15	.02
Objective QOL	1.5**	.38	.13
Subjective Support	1.1**	.23	.04
Reciprocity	-.52	.01	-
		R=.52**	R ² =.27 adjusted R ² =.26

**p<.01

For the Persian-Australian sample a Multiple Regression was performed with subjective QOL as the dependent variable and objective QOL, age at arrival to Australia reciprocity of Social support as the independent variables. Overall 25 percent (21% adjusted) of the variability in subjective QOL is associated with the variance in the three independent variables and the regression is significantly different from zero $F(3,41)=4.78$, $p<.01$. Two of the three independent variable

namely; Age at arrival to Australia ($sr^2 = .14$) and reciprocity of Social support ($sr^2 = .16$) significantly contribute to the prediction of subjective-QOL each explaining 14 % and 16% of variance in this variable , while the third independent variable Objective QOL does not significantly contribute to the prediction of Subjective QOL.

In order to predict Subjective QOL amongst the Australian sample a regression analysis was carried out with Objective QOL, subjective support and reciprocity of Support as the independent variables. For the Australian sample 48 percent (46% adjusted) of the variability in Subjective-QOL is associated with the variance in the three independent variables. The regression was also significantly different from zero $F(3,53)=16.64$ $p<.001$. Of the independent variables Objective-QOL score ($sr^2=.23$) and Subjective Support ($Sr^2=.08$) were found to be significant predictors of Subjective-QOL each explaining 23% and 8% of variance in this variable.

For the Persian group, R for regression was significantly different from zero, $F(4,196)=18.44$ $p<.001$ and altogether 27 percent (26% adjusted) of the variability in the subject's Subjective-QOL scores obtained, was predicted by Objective QOL, Subjective support, reciprocity and conflict, as independent variables. In the Persian sample three of the four independent variables namely, Objective QOL and Subjective support and conflict were found to contribute significantly to the prediction of Subjective QOL at the $p<.01$. Objective QOL ($sr^2 =.13$) explaining 13 percent of the variance, while subjective support ($sr^2 =.04$) and Conflict ($sr^2 =.02$) account for only 4% and 2% of the variability in subjective-QOL.

DISCUSSION

In contrast to past studies that solely rely on quantitative self-report instruments of QOL, the present study incorporated a qualitative approach through the use of open-ended questions. The aim was to establish what this concept meant to each person in different cultures and to examine the degree of congruence with the responses to the ComQol life domains. For the Persian-Australian sample, the most frequent area which people reported as enhancing QOL was spirituality, whilst for both the Australian and Persians intimacy was the category most nominated. For the terms identified as the most important in constantly reducing life quality, the

Persian-Australian and Persian sample primarily nominated a lack of intimacy while the Australian sample nominated ill health. Although the results overall suggest remarkable consistency with domains assessed by the ComQol, it is interesting to note the emergence of the category of spirituality as a possible new domain which may have particular relevance when assessing life quality in the Persian culture.

With regard to Subjective QOL, cross-cultural differences do not appear to be present. The %SM for QOL satisfaction ranged from 70.88 for the Persian-Australians, 74.26 for Australians, and 73.54 for the Persian sample which all lie within the hypothesised gold standard range of 70-80 %SM (Cummins, 1994). This finding is contradictory to the lower %SM obtained by other non-Western samples such as the Nathawat et al's (1993) Indian women and retired Zulus (Moller, 1988). Also in contrast to previous research on life quality of migrants (Verkuyten, 1986; Ortiz & Arc, 1986) which have found a lower QOL compared to societal norms, no such differences were obtained in this study. However this finding concurs with more recent research (Ying, 1992; Yiolitis, 1994) which has found no evidence of cross-cultural QOL differences between the immigrants and the rest of the population. This finding perhaps can be explained by the multicultural composition of the Australian society, which is very accommodating to immigrants compare to other countries, and thereby reducing the stress associated with migration which would otherwise reduce their life quality.

Despite the absence of Subjective QOL differences, significant objective QOL group differences were observed across the three sample such that the Australian and the Persian-Australian samples obtained significantly higher score than the Persians, particularly in the domains of community and emotional well-being. This finding was not surprising and is consistent with the lower standard of living and objective living conditions in Iran. However it is interesting to note that, in contrast to previous findings (Adler et al, 1994 ; Cummins, 1994) the results suggest despite very different objective circumstances, the three sample groups experience similar subjective QOL. These findings may be due to the influence of cultural factors on responding to the quality of life measures or alternatively it may reflect the significantly different referent points each culture is employing in order to achieve a satisfying equilibrium state. The Persians are living in a post-war atmosphere which may promote down-ward comparison to the difficult conditions they have endured and therefore to the standards which are rated less favourably than their current life conditions.

Although previous studies have reported significant positive correlations between social integration and Subjective QOL (e.g Cooper et al., 1992) no such relationships was found in the current study. The results are, however, in agreement with Verkuyten's (1986) findings that social integration does not have a mediating effect on life quality of ethnic minorities and are also in part consistent with Yiolitis' (1994) finding that subjective integration was not associated with the Greek-Australian's subjective QOL. For the Greek-Australians however a significant positive relationship was found between objective integration and Subjective life quality. The results of this study suggest that for the Persian migrant the subjective and objective experience of social integration appear to remain independent of their Subjective QOL. This perhaps reflects the failure of the Social Integration Scale to encompass all aspects of social integration relevant to the Persian culture.

The hypothesis that 'Age at migration ' will be negatively related to life quality was partly supported. The relationship between Objective QOL and age at migration was not significant, while a negative relationship was found between this variable and Subjective QOL. Furthermore, this variable was found to be a significant predictor of Subjective QOL accounting for 14% of the variance in this variable. This is consistent with findings reported by Angel and Angel (1992) who argue that older migrants experience more difficulty in re-establishing their social networks, and this influences subjective QOL adversely. For Greek-Australians, age at migration was not found to be related to Subjective QOL. In contrast a significant negative relationship was found between age at migration and Objective QOL such that subjects who migrated to Australia after the age of 22 experienced a significantly lower Objective QOL than those who were either born in Australia or migrated before they were 9 years old (Yiolitis, 1994). These combined results indicate that, for the Persian and Greek immigrants, Age at migration takes on a different role in relation to QOL. A plausible explanation is that the Persian immigrants lose the status associated with aging, respect and wisdom in Persian culture, as a result of migration , and this leads to lower Subjective QOL. Alternatively, this may reflect the limited opportunity available to the older Persians, compared to Greek migrants, for successfully adapting to the new culture and re-establishing social networks due to the very small population of Persian-Australians in Melbourne. This process of re-establishment has been viewed as important in enhancing Subjective QOL (Angel et al., 1992).

The third mediating variable on Subjective QOL amongst the Persian immigrants, was considered to be 'Years of residence' in Australia and was

expected to be positively related with Subjective QOL. In contrast to findings of Cohen and Wills (1983) the result of the present study did not reveal a positive relationship between these two variables suggesting that the Subjective QOL of older migrants, will not significantly increase with increased length of time of residence in Australia. However these results are in accordance with Yiolitis (1994) who also reported no significant relationship between these two variables in the Greek-Australian sample. In the Persian sample this may reflect the nature of forced migration to Australia by many of the immigrants which would undoubtedly interfere with the process of adjustment to a new culture and environment.

From the findings of the current study, the hypothesis that subjective support will positively impact on subjective life quality was supported amongst the Australian and Persian groups and is in agreement with previous studies (Longfellow, 1979 ; Moos & Moos, 1983 ; Rook, 1984). However it is unclear why this relationship was not observed for the Persian-Australians. The absence of a positive relationship for this sample group, although surprising, is however in accordance with the proposition put forward by Schumaker et al. (1993) which suggests that the impact of social support varies across cultures and can remain independent of subjective life quality. For the Persian-Australians reciprocity of support was found to significantly contribute to the prediction of Subjective QOL explaining 16% of the variance in this variable. This findings suggest that perhaps for the Persian immigrants in a foreign country the security of a reciprocal social support system is more important than the subjective experience of this support.

In considering the common components of social support that impact on Subjective QOL, reciprocity of support was significant across the three sample groups. A negative association was found between conflict with support givers and Subjective QOL in only the Persian sample thereby providing partial support for the previous research findings that negative social ties detract from subjective well-being (Hodges, 1974; Rook, 1984). A plausible explanation with regard to the lack of such relationship amongst the other two sample groups is that, in the context of the family orientated Persian culture, negative social ties have graver significance and adverse impact on Subjective QOL.

In attempting to explain which variables significantly contributed to Subjective QOL for the Australians and Persians, Objective QOL was found to be the most notable predictor of Subjective life quality explaining 23% and 13% of the variance receptively . In addition, and as mentioned before, age at migration and reciprocity of support were significant predictors of life quality amongst the

Persian-Australians. The results overall indicated that, in each group, a different set of variables contribute to the prediction of Subjective QOL and account for varying degrees of variability in this measure. This suggests that perhaps the relationship between various social indicators and quality of life are not consistent across different culture groups. The explanation regarding these observed differences remain speculative in nature and further research is needed in order to clarify the precise nature of these relationships.

Although the current study provides interesting findings in relation quality of life cross cultural differences, its lack of generalizability appears to be its major limitation. Therefore the conclusions drawn from the present study are limited. Furthermore since relatively few QOL studies have been conducted in non-Western countries and comparative data do not exist for the Persian sample, more research is needed before any conclusion regarding the observed results in this sample group can be drawn.

Given the present findings of no significant relationship between social integration and the Persian-Australian's life quality, future research should explore the nature of this relationship in order to determine any possible confounding variables which may be more salient in influencing QOL. Hence more research is needed in order to gain insight into the immigrant's experience of social integration and adjustment to the host culture. Qualitative research whereby immigrants are asked to report factors that facilitated or obstructed their level of adjustment to the new environment, through open-ended questions, might be an interesting and appropriate approach for future research.

On a positive note, the results of the present study provided insight into understanding what the concept of QOL meant to people from a non-Western country. A remarkable degree of consistency was observed between how quality of life was measured and how it was defined by the Persians, indicating that the QOL measure employed was also valid in this culture. Due to the emergence of spirituality as a domain for the Persian culture, it is suggested that future cross-cultural research incorporate this domain in their measures of life quality.

REFERENCES

- Adler, N.E., Boyce, T., Chesney, M.A., Cohen, S., Folkman, S., Kahn, R.L., & Syme, S.L. (1994). Socioeconomic status and health: The challenge of the gradient. American Psychologist, 49(1), 15-20.
- * ✓ Angel, J.L., & Angel, R.J. (1992). Age at migration, social connections and well-being among elderly Hispanic. Journal of Aging and Health, 4, 480-499.
- * ✓ Bloom, J.R., Fobair, P., Spiegel, D., Cox, R.S., Varghese, R.S., & Hoppe, R. (1991). Social Supports and the Social Well-Being of Cancer Survivors. Advances in Medical Sociology, 2, 95-114.
- Boucher, J., & Osgood, C.E. (1969). The Pollyannas hypothesis. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behaviour, 8, 1-8
- Cobb, S. (1976). Social Support as a Moderator of Life Stress. Psychosomatic Medicine, 38(5), 300-314.
- * ✓ Cohen, S., Wills, T.A. (1985). Stress, Social Support and the Buffering Hypothesis. Psychological Bulletin, 98(2), 310-357.
- Cooke, R.A. & Rousseau, D.M. (1984). Stress and Strain From Family Roles and Work Role Expectations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 252-260.
- * ✓ Cooper, H., Okamura, L., & Gurka, V. (1992). Social activity and subjective well-being. Personality Individual Differences, 13(5), 573-583.
- Cummins, R.A. (1993). Comprehensive Quality of Life Scale (ComQol) (4th ed.). School of Psychology, Deakin University.
- * ✓ Cummins, R.A. (199⁵~~4~~). On the Trail of the Gold Standard for Subjective Well-Being. Social Indicators Research, 35, 179-200

- ✓ Cummins, R.A. (199⁶). Assessing Quality of Life for People with Disabilities. In R.I. Browns (Ed.), Quality of Life for Handicapped People. London: Chapman & Hall. (*in press*).
- ✓ Festinger, L. (1954). A Theory of social comparison processes. Human Relations, 7, 117-140.
- Goldings, M.J. (1954) On the avowal and projection of happiness. Journal of Personality, 23, 30-47.
- ✓ Heady, B., & Wearing, A. (1992). Understanding Happiness: A theory of subjective well-being. Melbourne : Longmanshire.
- ✗ ✓ Hodges, B. (1974). Effects of valance on relative weighting in impression formation. Journal of Community Psychology, 13, 378-381.
- ✗ Holahan, C.J., Betak, J.F., Spearly, J.L., & Chance, B.J. (1983). Social integration and mental health in a biracial community. American Journal of Community Psychology, 11(3), 301-311.
- House, J.S., Robbins, C. & Metzner, H.L. (1982). The Association of Social Relationships and Activities With Mortality: Perspective Evidence from the Tecumesch Community Health Study. American Journal of Epidemiology, 116, 123-140.
- ✓ Jupp, J. (1989). The challenge of diversity: Policy options for a multicultural Australia. Canberra : Australian Government Publishing.
- ✓ Kuyken, W., Orley, J., Hudelson, P. & Sartorius, N. (1994). Quality of Life Assessment Across Cultures. International Journal of Mental Health, 23(2), 5-27.
- ✓ Lang, J.E., Munoz, R.F., Bernal, G. & Sorenson, J.L. (1982). Quality of Life and Psychological Well Being in A Bicultural Latino Community. Hispanic Journal of Behavioural Sciences, 4(4), 433-450.

- * ✓ Longfellow, C. (1979). Divorce in Context: Its Impact on Children's in G. Levinger & O.C. Moles. (Eds.) Divorce and Separation: Context, Causes and Consequences. New York: Basic Books.

- ✓ Moller, V. (1988). Quality of life in retirement : A case study of Zulu return migrants. Social Indicators Research, 20, 309-351.

- * ✓ Moos, R.H. & Moos, B.S. (1983). Adaptation and the Quality of Life in Work and Family Settings. Journal of Community Psychology, 11, 158-170.

- ✓ Nathawat, S.S. & Mathur, A. (1993). Marital Adjustment and Subjective Well- Being in India Educated Housewives and Working Women. The Journal of Psychology, 127(3), 353-358.

- * ✓ Oritt, E.J., Paul, S.C.& Behrman, J.A.(1985). Perceived social network Inventory. Journal of Community Psychology, 13, 565-581.

- * ✓ Ortiz, V., Arce, C.H. (1986). Quality of life among persons of Mexican descent. In F.M.Andrews (ed.). Research on the quality of life. University of Michigan Research centre : Ann Arbour, pp 171-191.

- ✓ Rogler, L, H. (1994). International migration: A frame work for directing research. American Psychologist, 49, 701-708.

- * ✓ Rook, K.S. (1984). The negative side of social interactions: Impact on psychological well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46(5), 1097-1108.

- ✓ Saxena, S. (1994). Quality of life assessment in cancer patients in India: cross-cultural issues. In J.Orley & W.Kuyken (Eds.). Quality of life assessment : International perspectives. London : Springer-Verlag.

- * ✓ Schumaker, J.F., Shear, J.D., Monfries, M.M. & Groth-Marnat, E. (1993). Loneliness and Life Satisfaction in Japan and Australian. The Journal of Psychology, 127(1), 65-71.

- ✓ Skevington, S.M. (1994). Social Comparisons In Cross-Cultural Quality of Life Assessment. International Journal of Medical Health, 23(2), 29-47.
- ✓ ✓ Steinkamp, M.W., & Kelly, J.R. (1987). Social integration, leisure activity, and life satisfaction in older adults: activity theory revisited. International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 25(4), 293-306.
- ✠ ✓ Verkuyten, M. (1986). The impact of ethnic and sex differences on happiness among adolescents in Netherlands. The Journal of Social Psychology, 126, 259-260.
- ✠ ✓ Verkuyten, M. (1994). Ethnic self identification and psychological well-being among minority youth in the Netherlands. International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 5, 19-34.
- ✓ ✓ Ying, Y. (1992). Life Satisfaction Among San Francisco Chinese-Americans. Social Indicators Research, 26, 1-22.
- Yiolitis, L. (1994). An investigation into the effect of social integration, stress, Age at migration, and years in Australia on the Quality Of Life of Greek - Australians. Unpublished thesis.
- ✠ ✓ Yiolitis, L. & Cummins, R.A. (1994). Social Integration Scale (SIS). School of Psychology, Deakin University.

QUALITY OF LIFE QUESTIONNAIRE

Quality of life has a different meaning for each person. Some things important to some people, may not be considered important to others. Therefore what makes a high quality of life is different for each person. When answering the following questions think about **what they mean to you**. There are no right or wrong answers.

1. What does quality of life mean to you?

2. What do you consider to be the three most essential things you need to lead a high quality of life?

1 _____

2 _____

3 _____

of these which one is the most important to you? _____

3. What three things constantly reduce your quality of life?

1 _____

2 _____

3 _____

of these which one has the most effect ? _____

Demographic Data

Please answer the following questions about yourself.

1. Where were you born? _____

(If you were born in Australia please go to question 5 otherwise please continue).

2. How old were you when you came to Australia? _____

3. How long have you lived in Australia? _____

4. If you are from a non-English speaking background, how would you rate your **English proficiency**?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fluent	Good	Intermediate	Basic	Almost none

5. What is your religious affiliation;

a) Catholic

b) Anglican

c) Moslem

d) Baha'i Faith

e) Jewish

e) Other (please specify) _____

6. Which of the following best describes your current relationship status?

a) Single

b) De-facto

c) Married

d) Separated/divorced

e) Widowed

Appendix B

ComQol-4

Your name

(Please print)

Date of Birth

____/____/____

Day Month Year

Sex (circle one)

male

female

SECTION 1: This section asks for information about various aspects of your life. Please mark the box that most accurately describes your situation.

1 a) What is your personal or household (whichever is most relevant to you) gross annual income before tax?

Less than \$10,999	<input type="checkbox"/>	\$41,000 - \$ 55,999	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$11,000 - \$25,999	<input type="checkbox"/>	More than \$56,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$26,000 - \$40,999	<input type="checkbox"/>		

b) Where do you live?

A house, flat or apartment of :

- High quality
- Medium quality
- Low quality
- or Hostel

Which best describes who you live with:

- alone, family, close friend
- 1 or 2 acquaintance(s)
- 3 or more acquaintances

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

More than almost anyone	More than most people	About average	Less than most people	Less than almost anyone
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2 a) How many times have you been to the doctor over the past 3 months?

Number of times _____

b) Do you have any disabilities or medical conditions? (e.g. visual, hearing, physical, health, etc.).

Yes No

If "yes please specify:

Name of disability
or medical condition

Extent of disability
or medical condition

e.g. Visual
Diabetes

Require glasses for reading
Require daily injections

c) What regular medication do you take each day?

If none tick box

OR

Name(s) of medication

3 a) How many hours paid work, formal education, or unpaid child care do you do each week? (Average over past 3 months)

Hours paid work _____ Hours formal education _____

Hours unpaid child care _____

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

Almost
always

Usually

Sometimes

Not usually

Almost
never

- c) Over the past week, list the most productive things you have done. These can include anything you have made, collected, performed, created, mended, or any voluntary work.

None (tick)

OR

Description

Over how many days in the week did this happen?

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

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

Daily	Several times a week	Once a week	Once a month	Less than once a month
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 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
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Almost always	Usually	Sometimes	Not usually	Almost never
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5 a) How often do you sleep well?

Almost always	Usually	Sometimes	Not usually	Almost never
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

b) Is your home a safe place to be?

Almost always	Usually	Sometimes	Not usually	Almost never
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

c) How often do you feel worried or anxious during the day?

Almost always	Usually	Sometimes	Not usually	Almost never
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6 a) Below is a list of activities. Indicate how often in an average month you do each one.

<u>Activity</u>	Number of times per month
(1) Clubs/groups/societies (please provide the name <u>as well</u> <u>as</u> the number of times you attend each month).	_____ _____
(2) Hotel/Bar	_____
(3) Watch live sporting events (Not on TV)	_____
(4) Church	_____
(5) Chatting with neighbours	_____
(6) Restaurant	_____
(7) Movies	_____
(8) Other (describe)	_____ _____

b) Do you hold a position of responsibility in relation to any club, group, or society?

Yes No

If yes, please describe.

c) How often do people outside your home ask for your help or advice?

Almost every day	Quite often	Sometimes	Not often	Almost never
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7 a) How often can you do the things you really want to do?

Almost always	Usually	Sometimes	Not usually	Almost never
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Almost always	Usually	Sometimes	Not usually	Almost never
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Almost always	Usually	Sometimes	Not usually	Almost never
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SECTION 2: How **IMPORTANT** are each of the following
life areas to you?

Please answer by placing a (X) in 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?

Could not be more important	Very important	Somewhat important	Slightly important	Not important at all
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. How **Important to you** is YOUR HEALTH?

Could not be more important	Very important	Somewhat important	Slightly important	Not important at all
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. How **Important to you** is WHAT YOU ACHIEVE IN LIFE?

Could not be more important	Very important	Somewhat important	Slightly important	Not important at all
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. How **Important to you** are CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS WITH YOUR FAMILY OR FRIENDS?

Could not be more important	Very important	Somewhat important	Slightly important	Not important at all
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. How **Important to you** is HOW SAFE YOU FEEL?

Could not be more important	Very important	Somewhat important	Slightly important	Not important at all
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. How Important to you is DOING THINGS WITH PEOPLE OUTSIDE YOUR HOME?

Could not be more
important

Very
important

Somewhat
important

Slightly
important

Not important
at all

7. How Important to you is YOUR OWN HAPPINESS?

Could not be more
important

Very
important

Somewhat
important

Slightly
important

Not important
at all

Appendix C
Social Integration Scale

Community Questionnaire

Please rate the following statements by placing an 'X' in the response category that best describes you.

1. I talk with people of non-Persian background.

Many times
a day

A few times
a day

About once
a day

Once every
few days

Not often/
never

2. I participate in community groups, where there are mainly people of a non-Persian background, for example, the local tennis club.

About once
a day

About once
a week

About once
a month

Occasionally

Not often/
never

3. I use the English language.

Many times
a day

A few times
a day

About once
a day

Once every
few days

Not often/
never

4. I feel integrated into my community.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Undecided

Agree

Strongly Agree

5. It is important to me that I talk to people who are of a non-Persian background.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Undecided

Agree

Strongly Agree

6. It is important to me that I participate in community groups, where there are mainly people of a non-Persian background.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Undecided

Agree

Strongly Agree

7. It is important to me to use the English language.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly Agree

8. It is important to me that I am integrated into my neighbourhood community.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly Agree

9. I am satisfied with the amount of time I spend talking to people of a non-Persian background.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly Agree

10. I am satisfied with attending community groups, where there are mainly people of a non-Persian background.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly Agree

11. I am satisfied with my use of English language.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly Agree

12. I am satisfied with my level of integration, into the community.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly Agree

13. I talk with people who are of a Persian background.

Many times a day A few times a day About once a day Once every few days Not often/never

14. I participate in the community groups, where there are mainly people of Persian background, for example , the local Persian social Club.

About once
a day

About once
a week

About once
a month

Occasionally

Not often/
never

15. I use the Persian language

Many times
a day

A few times
a day

About once
a day

Once every
few days

Not often/
never

16. It is important to me that I talk to people who are of a Persian background.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Undecided

Agree

Strongly Agree

17. It is important to me that I participate in community groups, where there are mainly people of a Persian background.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Undecided

Agree

Strongly Agree

18. It is important to me that I use the Persian language.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Undecided

Agree

Strongly Agree

19. I am satisfied with the amount of time I spend talking to people who are of a Persian background.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Undecided

Agree

Strongly Agree

20. I am satisfied with attending community groups, where there are mainly people of a Persian background.

 Strongly Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly Agree

21. I am satisfied with my use of the Persian language.

 Strongly Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly Agree

IF YOU ARE CURRENTLY EMPLOYED OR WORK IN A VOLUNTARY ORGANISATION PLEASE CONTINUE THE QUESTIONNAIRE, OTHERWISE PLEASE STOP HERE.

22. I work with people of a non-Persian background.

 Always Mostly Sometimes Rarely Never

23. It is important to me that I work with people who are of non-Persian background.

 Strongly Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly Agree

24. I am satisfied with working with people who are of non-Persian background.

 Strongly Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly Agree

25. I work with people who are of a Persian background.

 Always Mostly Sometimes Rarely Never

26. It is important to me that I work with people who are of a Persian background.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Undecided

Agree

Strongly Agree

27. I am satisfied with working with people who are of a Persian background.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Undecided

Agree

Strongly Agree

Thank you for your participation

Social support Questionnaire

Imagine that you need help or support from someone due to some unexpected happening.

Write the first name of all the people (up to a maximum of five names) you could go to for help and support.

	FIRST NAME
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

What is your **relation** to each person you have nominated above. The person can be a family member such as a sister, brother etc or a friend (please keep in mind the order of the first table throughout the whole questionnaire).

	RELATION
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

Now think about the first person in your table, and answer the following questions about that person, by placing a (X) in the appropriate box for each question.

1. How **important** to you is the support and help this person gives to you?

Could not be more important Very important Some what important Slightly important Not important at all

2. How **satisfied** are you with the support or help this person provides for you?

Delighted Pleased Mostly satisfied Mixed Mostly dissatisfied Unhappy Terrible

3. Do you give this person support or help?

Almost always Usually Sometimes Not usually Almost never

4. Do you have serious conflicts with this person?

Almost always Usually Sometimes Not usually Almost never

Now think about the second person in your table, and answer the following questions about that person, by placing a (X) in the appropriate box for each question.

1. How **important** to you is the support and help this person gives to you?

Could not be more important Very important Some what important Slightly important Not important at all

2. How **satisfied** are you with the support or help this person provides for you?

Delighted Pleased Mostly satisfied Mixed Mostly dissatisfied Unhappy Terrible

3. Do you give this person support or help?

Almost always Usually Sometimes Not usually Almost never

4. Do you have serious conflicts with this person?

Almost always Usually Sometimes Not usually Almost never

Now think about the third person in your table, and answer the following questions about that person by placing a (X) in the appropriate box for each question.

1. How important to you is the support and help this person gives to you?

Could not be more important Very important Some what important Slightly important Not important at all

2. How satisfied are you with the support or help this person provides for you?

Delighted Pleased Mostly satisfied Mixed Mostly dissatisfied Unhappy Terrible

3. Do you give this person support or help?

Almost always Usually Sometimes Not usually Almost never

4. Do you have serious conflicts with this person?

Almost always Usually Sometimes Not usually Almost never

Now think about the fourth person in your table, and answer the following questions about that person, by placing a (X) in the appropriate box for each question.

1. How **important** to you is the support and help this person gives to you?

Could not be more important Very important Some what important Slightly important Not important at all

2. How **satisfied** are you with the support or help this person provides for you?

Delighted Pleased Mostly satisfied Mixed Mostly dissatisfied Unhappy Terrible

3. Do you give this person support or help?

Almost always Usually Sometimes Not usually Almost never

4. Do you have serious conflicts with this person?

Almost always Usually Sometimes Not usually Almost never

Now think about the fifth person in your table, and answer the following questions about that person, by placing a (X) in the appropriate box for each question.

1. How **important** to you is the support and help this person gives to you?

Could not be more important Very important Some what important Slightly important Not important at all

2. How **satisfied** are you with the support or help this person provides for you?

Delighted Pleased Mostly satisfied Mixed Mostly dissatisfied Unhappy Terrible

3. Do you give this person support or help?

Almost always Usually Sometimes Not usually Almost never

4. Do you have serious conflicts with this person?

Almost always Usually Sometimes Not usually Almost never

Faculty of Health & Behavioural Sciences
Dean's Office, Geelong Campus

☎ 7-2384
Fax 7-2012
E-mail jennyl

Memorandum

To: Associate Professor R. Cummins
School of Psychology (B)

From: Secretary
Faculty Ethics Subcommittee

Date: 7 February, 1995

Project
EC- H 161/94 Quality of life: a cross-cultural study

Thank you for the response to my memo.

The project is **recommended for approval** and the application is now proceeding to the Deakin University Ethics Committee for ratification - in the absence of any further advice, the project may commence.

As supervisor you are responsible for secure storage and retention of all data pertaining to this project for the minimum of **two** years after completion. You are requested to comply with this requirement.



Jenny Luscombe

**DEAKIN UNIVERSITY
PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT**

Quality of life studies have now been undertaken in most western industrialised countries. The aim of this project is to investigate quality of life in people from western and non-western countries and to examine any differences in reported life quality in these cultures.

This study also looks at the influence of social support and integration of people into their community in determining their life quality. Another aim is to establish what the concept of 'Quality of life' means to each person.

This study is being undertaken as part of Master of Clinical Psychology Course by Elham Foroughi under the supervision Dr Robert A.Cummins.

You are invited to participate in this study. If you agree to participate you will be asked to complete questionnaires containing a number of statements related to quality of life, integration and social support.

The questionnaires will take approximately 40 minutes of your time. Information about you such as your name will not be recorded anywhere on the questionnaire so the data that you provide will be completely anonymous.

You are free to withdraw from this study at any time .

Any enquires regarding this project can be addressed to :

Ms Elham Foroughi
Master Of Clinical Psychology
Deakin university
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood 3125

Dr Robert A. Cummins
School of Psychology
DeakinUniversity
221 Burwood Highway
Burwood 3125
TEL : (03) 244-6859

ETHICS COMMITTEE
DEAKIN UNIVERSITY
CONSENT FORM

I, _____ of _____

hereby consent to take part in the **SOCIAL SUPPORT AND QUALITY OF LIFE** study being conducted by Elham Foroughi under the supervision of Dr Robert A. Cummins, Deakin University.

I acknowledge that

1. Upon receipt, my questionnaire will be coded and my name and address kept separately from it.
2. Any information that I provide will not be made public in any forms that could reveal my identity to an outside party ie. that I will remain **fully anonymous**.
3. I understand that the aggregated results will be used for research purposes and may be reported in scientific journals.
4. Individual results **will not** be released to any person except at my request at my request and on my authorisation.
5. I have been informed that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time and to withdraw any data supplied.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix E

دانشجوی گرامی:

پرسشنامه‌هایی که در دست دارید برای تحقیق درباره عقاید و نظرات مردم نسبت به کیفیت زندگی و میزان رضایت افراد از شرایط زیستی خودشان تهیه شده است. این تحقیق که برای تهیه پایان نامه دکتری اینجانب در دانشگاه دیکن استرالیا تهیه شده است در آن کشور و در ایران اجراء می‌شود. اجرای برنامه در ایران زیر نظارت موسسه روانشناسی دانشگاه تهران قرار دارد.

از شما خواهشمندم دو پرسشنامه ضمیمه تحت عنوان "پرسشنامه کیفیت زندگی" و "پرسشنامه حمایت اجتماعی" را به ترتیب مطالعه کنید و پاسخهای خود را در باره یک یک سؤالیهای این دو پرسشنامه به ترتیب بنویسید. البته سعی خواهید کرد در هر موضوعی احساس حقیقی و مورد علاقه خودتان را بیان کنید.

نظر به اینکه در این تحقیق فقط از نتایج کلی بصورت جمعی استفاده خواهد شد نیازی به نوشتن نام و مشخصات فردی نیست و از این جهت اطمینان داشته باشید که مطالب پرسشنامه به هیچ صورت دیگری مورد استفاده قرار نخواهد گرفت.

از همکاری شما و صرف وقتتان برای انجام این پژوهش تشکر می‌کنم و برای شما آرزوی موفقیت دارم.

الهام فروغی

به نام خدا

خانم/آقای گرامی:

پرسشنامه‌هایی که در دست دارید برای تحقیق درباره عقاید و نظرات مردم نسبت به کیفیت زندگی و میزان رضایت افراد از شرایط زیستی خودشان تهیه شده است. این تحقیق که برای تهیه پایان نامه دکتری اینجانب در دانشگاه دیکن استرالیا تهیه شده است در آن کشور و در ایران اجراء می‌شود.

از شما خواهشمندم دو پرسشنامه ضمیمه تحت عنوان "پرسشنامه کیفیت زندگی" و "پرسشنامه حمایت اجتماعی" را به ترتیب مطالعه کنید و پاسخهای خود را در باره یک یک سؤالهای این دو پرسشنامه به ترتیب بنویسید. البته سعی خواهید کرد در هر موضوعی احساس حقیقی و نظر شخصی خودتان را بیان کنید.

نظر به اینکه در این تحقیق فقط از نتایج کلی به صورت جمعی استفاده خواهد شد نیازی به نوشتن نام و مشخصات فردی نیست و از این جهت اطمینان داشته باشید که مطالب پرسشنامه به هیچ صورت دیگری مورد استفاده قرار نخواهد گرفت.

از همکاری شما و صرف وقتتان برای انجام این پژوهش تشکر می‌کنم و برای شما آرزوی

موفقیت دارم.

تهران - دیماه ۱۳۷۳

الهام فروغی

پرسشنامه کیفیت زندگی

بخش ۱

کیفیت زندگی برای هر شخص معانی متفاوتی دارد. بعضی چیزها برای بعضی اشخاص مهم است در صورتیکه ممکن است افراد دیگر چنین اهمیتی به این چیزها ندهند. بدین صورت عواملی که کیفیت زندگی به آنها بستگی دارد برای هر شخص فرق می‌کند. وقتی که سؤالهای زیر را جواب می‌دهید به مفهوم هر سؤال در ارتباط با خودتان فکر کنید و پاسخ دهید.

۱- کیفیت زندگی برای شما چه معنا دارد؟.....

.....

.....

۲- به نظر شما کیفیت زندگی به چه چیزهایی بستگی دارد. لطفاً سه چیز را که از نظر شما بالاترین اهمیت را دارند به ترتیب اهمیت بنویسید.

..... اول

..... دوم

..... سوم

۳- حال سه چیز که کیفیت زندگی را کاهش می‌دهند به ترتیب بیان کنید، به نحوی که اولی موثرترین عامل منفی در کیفیت زندگی باشد.

..... اول

..... دوم

..... سوم

۴- خواهشمندیم مقدار وقتی را که روزانه و به طور متوسط برای کارهای عادی خود، ساعات تحصیل در دانشگاه، مطالعه در کتابخانه و منزل، رسیدگی به کارهای خانگی و غیره صرف می‌کنید با گذاشتن علامت در جای مناسب مشخص کنید:

کمتر از ۳ ساعت بین ۱۰ تا ۱۳ ساعت

بین ۳ تا ۵ ساعت بین ۱۳ تا ۱۶ ساعت

بین ۵ تا ۷ ساعت بیشتر از ۱۶ ساعت

اگر قسمتی از برنامه فوق به کار شغلی و با درآمد اختصاص دارد لطفاً مقدار وقت آن را نیز بنویسید ساعت.

۵- آیا اتفاق می افتد که احساس کنید هیچ کاری و برنامه‌ای ندارید و کاملاً آزاد و بیکار هستید؟

تقریباً همیشه	معمولاً	بعضی اوقات	معمولاً نه	تقریباً هیچوقت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۶- بهترین کارهای سازنده و با ارزش را که در هفته گذشته انجام داده‌اید را به صورت فهرست بنویسید. این کارها می‌توانند شامل هر فعالیت از قبیل ساختن، تعمیر کردن، تنظیم و ترتیب اشیاء، یا هر کار داوطلبانه‌ای باشد که انجام داده‌اید.

<u>نوع کار</u>	<u>چند روز در هفته به این کار مشغول بوده‌اید</u>
.....
.....
.....

اگر در هفته گذشته چنین موردی پیش نیامده است علامت بگذارید

۷- هر چند وقت با یک دوست نزدیک صحبت می‌کنید؟

روزانه	چندین بار در هفته	یکبار در هفته	یکبار در ماه	کمتر از یکبار در ماه
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۸- اگر احساس دلتنگی و افسردگی کنید آیا کسی از شما احوالپرسی و پشتیبانی می‌کند؟

تقریباً همیشه	معمولاً	بعضی اوقات	معمولاً نه	تقریباً هیچوقت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۹- در انجام کارهای مورد علاقه و دلخواهتان آیا شخص دیگری هم هست که با شما در آن کار همراهی و مشارکت کند؟

تقریباً همیشه	معمولاً	بعضی اوقات	معمولاً نه	تقریباً هیچوقت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۱۰- آیا از کیفیت خوابتان راضی هستید؟

تقریباً همیشه	معمولاً	بعضی اوقات	معمولاً نه	تقریباً هیچوقت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۱۱- آیا خانه خود را محل امنی برای زندگی می‌دانید؟

تقریباً همیشه	معمولاً	بعضی اوقات	معمولاً نه	تقریباً هیچوقت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۱۲- آیا اتفاق می‌افتد در خود احساس نگرانی و دلواپسی کنید؟

تقریباً همیشه	معمولاً	بعضی اوقات	معمولاً نه	تقریباً هیچوقت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۱۳- در فهرست پائین نمونه‌هایی از سرگرمیها و فعالیتهای اجتماعی درج شده‌اند. لطفاً معین کنید در یک ماه به طور

متوسط چند بار در هر یک از آنها شرکت می‌کنید؟

تعداد دفعات آنها در یک ماه

فعالیت

..... (۱) فعالیت در انجمن‌ها و گروههای اجتماعی، صرف وقت در باشگاهها

..... (۲) تماشای مسابقه ورزشی در تلویزیون و به طور زنده

..... (۳) حضور در مساجد و مجالس مذهبی برای
انجام فرایض؛ شرکت در مراسم عبادی اجتماعی

..... (۴) دیدو بازدید و گفتگو با همسایگان

..... (۵) رستوران، غذاخوری، هتل

..... (۶) سینما

..... (۷) موارد دیگر (لطفاً شرح دهید)

۱۴- آیا در گروهها و سازمانهای اجتماعی از قبیل انجمنها، باشگاهها و غیره سمت یا مسئولیتی بر عهده دارید؟

خیر بلی

اگر بلی، لطفاً شرح دهید.

.....
.....

۱۵- آیا اتفاق می افتد که در وقت بیداری صبح آرزو کنید که می توانستید تمام روز در رختخواب بمانید؟

تقریباً همیشه	معمولاً	بعضی اوقات	معمولاً نه	تقریباً هیچوقت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۱۶- چقدر اتفاق می افتد که احساس کنید خواسته ها و آرزوهای شما نمی توانند عملی شوند؟

تقریباً همیشه	معمولاً	بعضی اوقات	معمولاً نه	تقریباً هیچوقت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

بخش ۲

خواهشمندیم در سؤالهای پائین درجه اهمیت امور مختلف را آنطور که احساس می کنید بیان

دارید. پاسخ خود را با گذاشتن علامت در جای مناسب مشخص کنید.

۱- اشیاء شخصی که به شما تعلق دارند تا چه اندازه برای شما مهم هستند؟

بسیار زیاد	زیاد	تا اندازه ای مهم	کم اهمیت	بکلی بی اهمیت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۲- سلامتی شما برایتان چقدر مهم است؟

بسیار زیاد	زیاد	تا اندازه ای مهم	کم اهمیت	بکلی بی اهمیت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۳- دست آوردها و موفقیتها برایتان چقدر برای شما مهم هستند؟

بسیار زیاد	زیاد	تا اندازه ای مهم	کم اهمیت	بکلی بی اهمیت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۴- ارتباط نزدیک با خانواده و دوستان تا چه اندازه‌ای برای شما مهم است؟

بسیار زیاد	زیاد	تا اندازه‌ای مهم	کم اهمیت	بکلی بی‌اهمیت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۵- احساس امنیت چقدر برای شما مهم است؟

بسیار زیاد	زیاد	تا اندازه‌ای مهم	کم اهمیت	بکلی بی‌اهمیت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۶- حفظ ارتباط با اشخاص بیرون از خانواده چقدر برای شما مهم است؟

بسیار زیاد	زیاد	تا اندازه‌ای مهم	کم اهمیت	بکلی بی‌اهمیت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۷- خوشبختی خودتان چقدر برایتان اهمیت دارد؟

بسیار زیاد	زیاد	تا اندازه‌ای مهم	کم اهمیت	بکلی بی‌اهمیت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

بخش ۳

حال درجه رضایت را که دربارهٔ امور فوق احساس می‌کنید بیان دارید.

۱- از اشیاء شخصی که به شما تعلق دارند تا چه اندازه‌ای راضی هستید؟

بسیار راضی	راضی	نسبتاً راضی	بینابین	نسبتاً ناراضی	ناراضی	بسیار ناراضی
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۲- تا چه اندازه از سلامتی خود رضایت دارید؟

بسیار راضی	راضی	نسبتاً راضی	بینابین	نسبتاً ناراضی	ناراضی	بسیار ناراضی
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۳- تا چه اندازه از دستاوردها و موفقیت‌هایتان در زندگی رضایت دارید؟

بسیار راضی	راضی	نسبتاً راضی	بینابین	نسبتاً ناراضی	ناراضی	بسیار ناراضی
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۴- تا چه اندازه از روابط نزدیک که با خانواده و دوستان دارید رضایت دارید؟

بسیار راضی	راضی	نسبتاً راضی	بینابین	نسبتاً ناراضی	ناراضی	بسیار ناراضی
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۵- تا چه اندازه از احساس امنیتی که می‌کنید راضی هستید؟

بسیار راضی	راضی	نسبتاً راضی	بینابین	نسبتاً ناراضی	ناراضی	بسیار ناراضی
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۶- تا چه اندازه از روابطتان با اشخاص بیرون از خانواده رضایت دارید؟

بسیار راضی	راضی	نسبتاً راضی	بینابین	نسبتاً ناراضی	ناراضی	بسیار ناراضی
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۷- تا چه اندازه از میزان خوشبختی خودتان رضایت دارید؟

بسیار راضی	راضی	نسبتاً راضی	بینابین	نسبتاً ناراضی	ناراضی	بسیار ناراضی
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

بخش ۴

در این بخش اطلاعاتی درباره جوانب گوناگون زندگیتان سؤال می‌شود. لطفاً مربعی را

علامت بزنید که دقیقاً موقعیت شما را توصیف می‌کند.

۱ - میزان درآمد ماهیانه خانواده پدری شما که برای هزینه‌های خود در اختیار دارند (هرکدام بیشتر برای شما تقریباً چقدر است؟

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> کمتر از ۱۰ هزار تومان | <input type="checkbox"/> بین ۴۰ تا ۶۰ هزار تومان |
| <input type="checkbox"/> بین ۱۰ تا ۲۵ هزار تومان | <input type="checkbox"/> بیشتر از ۶۰ هزار تومان |
| <input type="checkbox"/> بین ۲۵ تا ۴۰ هزار تومان | |

۲ - مقدار اشیاء شخصی و دارائیهای اختصاصی خودتان را در مقایسه با همگنان و گروه اجتماعی هم‌تراز خود چگونه ارزیابی می‌کنید؟

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| بیشتر از تقریباً | بیشتر از اغلب | در حدود میانگین | کمتر از اغلب | کمتر از تقریباً |
| هرکسی | مردم | | مردم | هرکسی |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

۳ - در حال حاضر کجا زندگی می‌کنید:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> در خانه پدری | <input type="checkbox"/> با یک یا دو نفر دوست و آشنا |
| <input type="checkbox"/> در خانه شخصی و تنها | <input type="checkbox"/> با ۳ نفر یا بیشتر از آشنایان |
| <input type="checkbox"/> با همسر و فرزندانم | <input type="checkbox"/> خوابگاه دانشگاهی |

وضع دیگر لطفاً بیان کنید.....

کیفیت مسکن خود را چگونه ارزیابی می‌کنید؟

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> کیفیت عالی | <input type="checkbox"/> کیفیت متوسط | <input type="checkbox"/> کیفیت بد |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

۴ - در ظرف ۳ ماه گذشته چند بار به پزشک مراجعه کرده‌اید؟..... بار

۵ - آیا از لحاظ وضع مزاجی و مسائل بهداشتی از قبیل سلامت عمومی، بینائی، شنوائی و غیره نگرانی یا مشکلی دارید.

- | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> بلی | <input type="checkbox"/> خیر |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|

اگر بلی لطفاً موارد نگرانی را نام ببرید و معین کنید هر مورد میزان ناراحتی و نوع مراقبت که نیاز دارید چقدر است. به دو مثال فرضی پائین برای نوع مراقبت مناسب با ناراحتی معین توجه کنید.

بینائی احتیاج به عینک برای خواندن

بیماری قند احتیاج به آمپول زدن روزانه

میزان نیاز به مراقبت و غیره

نام ناراحتی یا نگرانی بهداشتی

.....

.....

.....

.....

پرسشنامه حمایت اجتماعی

تصور کنید در اثر یک اتفاق غیر منتظره به کمک یا حمایت دیگران احتیاج پیدا می‌کنید. حداکثر ۵ نفر را در نظر بگیرید که شما احتمالاً برای دریافت کمک و رفع نیازمندی خود به آنان مراجعه خواهید کرد. این پنج نفر را با نوشتن نسبتی که با شما دارند (مثلاً پدر، مادر، همسر، فرزند، دوست، همسایه، همکار و غیره) در جدول پائین مشخص کنید.

نسبت با اشخاص	
	۱
	۲
	۳
	۴
	۵

حال توجه کنید که کمک و پشتیبانی که ما از اطرافیان خود انتظار داریم می‌توانند هر یک از وضعیتهای زیر را دربر گیرند:

- حمایت معنوی: مثلاً شخصی به عقاید و احساسات شما گوش دهد و به شما آشکارا محبت نشان بدهد.
 - حمایت مادی: از قبیل دادن وام، امانت دادن اشیاء شخصی خود برای استفاده شما و غیره.
 - راهنمایی و دادن اطلاعات: راهنمایی مفید یا کمک به شما برای پیدا کردن منبع اطلاعات مورد نیاز.
 - کمک عملی: از قبیل همراهی برای انجام کارهای خانگی یا تکالیف درسی و شغلی و مانند اینها.
 - راهگشائی اجتماعی: از قبیل شرکت دادن در یک فعالیت دلخواه، عضویت در یک گروه اجتماعی و غیره.
- اینک در جدول پائین بیان کنید هر یک از افرادی که در بالا در نظر گرفتید در کدام یک از این زمینه‌ها می‌توانند به شما کمک بدهند.

برای هر فرد هر چند زمینه را مناسب می‌دانید با علامت × مشخص کنید.

اگر برای کسی بیش از یک زمینه کمک در نظر می‌گیرید، موردی که اهمیت و فایده بیشتر خواهد داشت با دو علامت × مشخص کنید.

نوع کمک و پشتیبانی					
افراد	حمایت معنوی	حمایت مادی	راهنمایی و اطلاعات	کمک عملی	راهگشائی اجتماعی
۱					
۲					
۳					
۴					
۵					

حالا درباره اولین شخص در جدولتان فکر کنید و سؤالهای زیر را درباره آن شخص با گذاشتن یک علامت (X) در جای مناسب برای هر سؤال جواب بدهید.

۱- برای شما این حمایت و کمک که این شخص فراهم می‌کند چقدر اهمیت دارد؟

بسیار زیاد زیاد تا اندازه‌ای مهم کم اهمیت بکلی بی‌اهمیت

۲- تصور می‌کنید کمک مورد انتظار از این شخص تا چه حد رضایت شما را فراهم خواهد کرد؟

بسیار راضی راضی نسبتاً راضی بینابین نسبتاً ناراضی ناراضی بسیار ناراضی

۳- آیا در وضعیتهای مشابه شما به این شخص کمک و پشتیبانی را که انتظار دارید خواهید رسانید؟

تقریباً همیشه معمولاً بعضی اوقات معمولاً نه تقریباً هیچوقت

۴- آیا شما با این شخص مشکل یا درگیری جدی دارید؟

تقریباً همیشه معمولاً بعضی اوقات معمولاً نه تقریباً هیچوقت

حالا درباره دومین شخص در جدولتان فکر کنید و سؤالهای زیر را درباره آن شخص با گذاشتن یک علامت (x) در جای مناسب برای هر سؤال جواب بدهید.

۱- برای شما این حمایت و کمک که این شخص فراهم می‌کند چقدر اهمیت دارد؟

بسیار زیاد	زیاد	تا اندازه‌ای مهم	کم اهمیت	بکلی بی‌اهمیت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۲- تصور می‌کنید کمک مورد انتظار از این شخص تا چه حد رضایت شما را فراهم خواهد کرد؟

بسیار راضی	راضی	نسبتاً راضی	بینابین	نسبتاً ناراضی	ناراضی	بسیار ناراضی
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۳- آیا در وضعیتهای مشابه شما به این شخص کمک و پشتیبانی را که انتظار دارید خواهید رسانید؟

تقریباً همیشه	معمولاً	بعضی اوقات	معمولاً نه	تقریباً هیچوقت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۴- آیا شما با این شخص مشکل یا درگیری جدی دارید؟

تقریباً همیشه	معمولاً	بعضی اوقات	معمولاً نه	تقریباً هیچوقت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

حالا درباره سومین شخص در جدولتان فکر کنید و سؤالهای زیر را درباره آن شخص با گذاشتن یک علامت (x) در جای مناسب برای هر سؤال جواب بدهید.

۱- برای شما این حمایت و کمک که این شخص فراهم می‌کند چقدر اهمیت دارد؟

بسیار زیاد	زیاد	تا اندازه‌ای مهم	کم اهمیت	بکلی بی‌اهمیت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۲- تصور می‌کنید کمک مورد انتظار از این شخص تا چه حد رضایت شما را فراهم خواهد کرد؟

بسیار راضی راضی نسبتاً راضی بینابین نسبتاً ناراضی ناراضی بسیار ناراضی

۳- آیا در وضعیتهای مشابه شما به این شخص کمک و پشتیبانی را که انتظار دارید خواهید رسانید؟

تقریباً همیشه معمولاً بعضی اوقات معمولاً نه تقریباً هیچوقت

۴- آیا شما با این شخص مشکل یا درگیری جدی دارید؟

تقریباً همیشه معمولاً بعضی اوقات معمولاً نه تقریباً هیچوقت

حالا درباره چهارمین شخص در جدولتان فکر کنید و سؤالهای زیر را درباره آن شخص با گذاشتن یک علامت (x) در جای مناسب برای هر سؤال جواب دهید.

۱- برای شما این حمایت و کمک که این شخص فراهم می‌کند چقدر اهمیت دارد؟

بسیار زیاد زیاد تا اندازه‌ای مهم کم اهمیت بکلی بی‌اهمیت

۲- تصور می‌کنید کمک مورد انتظار از این شخص تا چه حد رضایت شما را فراهم خواهد کرد؟

بسیار راضی راضی نسبتاً راضی بینابین نسبتاً ناراضی ناراضی بسیار ناراضی

۳- آیا در وضعیتهای مشابه شما به این شخص کمک و پشتیبانی را که انتظار دارید خواهید رسانید؟

تقریباً همیشه معمولاً بعضی اوقات معمولاً نه تقریباً هیچوقت

۴- آیا شما با این شخص مشکل یا درگیری جدی دارید؟

تقریباً همیشه	معمولاً	بعضی اوقات	معمولاً نه	تقریباً هیچوقت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

حالا درباره پنجمین شخص در جدولتان فکر کنید و سؤالهای زیر را درباره آن شخص با گذاشتن یک علامت (x) در جای مناسب برای هر سؤال جواب بدهید.

۱- برای شما این حمایت و کمک که این شخص فراهم می‌کند چقدر اهمیت دارد؟

بسیار زیاد	زیاد	تا اندازه‌ای مهم	کم اهمیت	بکلی بی‌اهمیت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۲- تصور می‌کنید کمک مورد انتظار از این شخص تا چه حد رضایت شما را فراهم خواهد کرد؟

بسیار راضی	راضی	نسبتاً راضی	بینابین	نسبتاً ناراضی	ناراضی	بسیار ناراضی
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۳- آیا در وضعیتهای مشابه شما به این شخص کمک و پشتیبانی را که انتظار دارید خواهید رسانید؟

تقریباً همیشه	معمولاً	بعضی اوقات	معمولاً نه	تقریباً هیچوقت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

۴- آیا شما با این شخص مشکل یا درگیری جدی دارید؟

تقریباً همیشه	معمولاً	بعضی اوقات	معمولاً نه	تقریباً هیچوقت
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

※ لطفاً به سؤالات زیر درباره خودتان جواب دهید

سال تولد

جنسیت مذکر مؤنث

وضعیت تأهل:

مجرد

متأهل

جدا شده / طلاق

بیوه

از همکاری شما سپاسگذارم