

Social Indicators Research Series

---

Volume 24

---

General Editor:

ALEX C. MICHALOS

*University of Northern British Columbia,  
Prince George, Canada*

Editors:

ED DIENER

*University of Illinois, Champaign, U.S.A.*

WOLFGANG GLATZER

*J.W. Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main, Germany*

TORBJORN MOUM

*University of Oslo, Norway*

MIRJAM A.G. SPRANGERS

*University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

JOACHIM VOGEL

*Central Bureau of Statistics, Stockholm, Sweden*

RUUT VEENHOVEN

*Erasmus University, Rotterdam, The Netherlands*

This new series aims to provide a public forum for single treatises and collections of papers on social indicators research that are too long to be published in our journal *Social Indicators Research*. Like the journal, the book series deals with statistical assessments of the quality of life from a broad perspective. It welcomes the research on a wide variety of substantive areas, including health, crime, housing, education, family life, leisure activities, transportation, mobility, economics, work, religion and environmental issues. These areas of research will focus on the impact of key issues such as health on the overall quality of life and vice versa. An international review board, consisting of Ruut Veenhoven, Joachim Vogel, Ed Diener, Torbjorn Moum, Mirjam A.G. Sprangers and Wolfgang Glatzer, will ensure the high quality of the series as a whole.

*The titles published in this series are listed at the end of this volume.*

# CHALLENGES FOR QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

*Advances in quality-of-life studies, theory and research*

*Edited by*

WOLFGANG GLATZER

*Johan Wolfgang Goethe Universität,  
Frankfurt am Main, Germany*

SUSANNE VON BELOW

*Johan Wolfgang Goethe Universität,  
Frankfurt am Main, Germany*

and

MATTHIAS STOFFREGEN

*Johan Wolfgang Goethe Universität,  
Frankfurt am Main, Germany*



KLUWER ACADEMIC PUBLISHERS

DORDRECHT / BOSTON / LONDON

A C.I.P. Catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 1-4020-2890-3 (HB)  
ISBN 1-4020-2903-9 (e-book)

---

Published by Kluwer Academic Publishers,  
P.O. Box 17, 3300 AA Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

Sold and distributed in North, Central and South America  
by Kluwer Academic Publishers,  
101 Philip Drive, Norwell, MA 02061, U.S.A.

In all other countries, sold and distributed  
by Kluwer Academic Publishers,  
P.O. Box 322, 3300 AH Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

*Printed on acid-free paper*

All Rights Reserved  
© 2004 Kluwer Academic Publishers

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

Printed in the Netherlands.

## CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Acknowledgments   | 1  |
| 1. Challenges for Quality of Life<br>WOLFGANG GLATZER   | 3  |
| <b>PART I:<br/>GOAL DISCUSSIONS ON QUALITY OF LIFE</b>  |    |
| 2. Social Quality and Quality of Life<br>ALAN WALKER AND LAURENT VAN DER MAESEN   | 11 |
| 3. Bringing together the Concepts of Quality of Life<br>and Sustainability<br>MARTINA SCHÄFER, BENJAMIN NÖLTING,<br>AND LYDIA ILLGE | 13 |
| 4. Subjective Measures of Well-being in Developing Countries<br>LAURA CAMFIELD  | 33 |
| 5. Towards Enhancing the Quality of Life in Africa.<br>Challenges, Problems, and Prospects<br>PATRICK A. EDEWOR                     | 45 |
|   | 61 |

**PART II:  
MONITORING QUALITY OF LIFE** 73

6. World Database of Happiness. Continuous Register of Research on Subjective Appreciation of Life 75  
RUUT VEENHOVEN
7. Comparative Survey Questions on Quality of Life. The "Dynamic Information Centre" 91  
MICHAELA HUDLER-SEITZBERGER
8. An Evidence-Based Approach to the Construction of Summary Quality-of-Life Indices 107  
KENNETH C. LAND
9. The Social State of the Netherlands. A Model Based Approach to Describing Living Conditions and Quality of Life 125  
JEROEN BOELHOUWER AND THEO ROES
10. Biographical Analysis of Quality of Life Processes in Migration 139  
MARIA KONTOS

**PART III:  
ECONOMIC CHALLENGES FOR QUALITY OF LIFE** 151

11. Monetary Stability and Quality of Life 153  
HEINZ HERRMANN

12. Segmented Quality of Working Life. Regular vs. Non-Regular Workers in Korea 165  
BYOUNG-HOON LEE AND YOO-SUN KIM
13. Does Happiness Pay? An Exploration Based on Panel Data from Russia 179  
CAROL GRAHAM, ANDREW EGGERS,  
AND SANDIP SUKHTANKAR

**PART IV:  
CULTURAL CHALLENGES FOR QUALITY OF LIFE** 205

14. Happiness as an Expression of Freedom and Self-Determination. A Comparative Multilevel Analysis 207  
MAX HALLER AND MARKUS HADLER
15. Satisfaction with Life Domains and Salient Values for the Future. Analyses about Children and their Parents 233  
FERRAN CASAS, CRISTINA FIGUER,  
MÓNICA GONZÁLEZ, AND GERMÀ COENDERS
16. Parental Divorce and the Well-being of Adolescent Children. Changes between 1984-1999 in the Netherlands 249  
ANNA LONT AND JAAP DRONKERS
17. Belief in Values and their Perceived Realization as Determinants of Quality of Life. The Case of Kibbutz Members 271  
URIEL LEVIATAN

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>PART V:</b>   |            |
| <b>OPTIONS AND RESTRICTIONS FOR QUALITY OF LIFE</b>                        | <b>295</b> |
| 18. Quality of Life in a Divided Society                                   | 297        |
| VALERIE MØLLER   |            |
| 19. Satisfaction with Health Care Systems.<br>A Comparison of EU Countries | 311        |
| JÜRGEN KOHL AND CLAUS WENDT  |            |
| 20. The Quality of Death as a Component of Quality of Life                 | 333        |
| MARÍA-ANGELES DURÁN  |            |
| 21. Life Satisfaction: Can We Produce It?                                  | 347        |
| RICHARD A. EASTERLIN   |            |
|  |            |
| About the Authors and Editors  | 359        |

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book evolved from an international conference, which was organized by the International Society for Quality of Life Studies and carried through at the Johann Wolfgang Goethe-University in Frankfurt am Main in July 2003. This conference offered an interdisciplinary forum for presentations and discussions concerning the challenges for quality of life in the contemporary world.

Such a conference is not possible without sponsors and supporters to whom we extend our gratitude. We want to thank our university and its president Prof. Rudolf Steinberg for considerable financial and practical support, as well as the city of Frankfurt, especially its mayor Petra Roth. We gratefully obtained financial support from the association of the "Freunde und Förderer der Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität" with its president Hilmar Kopper. We also want to thank the Deutsche Bundesbank and its former president Ernst Welteke for hosting a session in the representative rooms of the German national bank, where the relationship between money, wealth, and satisfaction was discussed. Furthermore, we extend our thanks to the Hans Böckler Stiftung, represented by Erika Mezger, whose support allowed participants from Eastern European and developing countries to participate in the conference.

There was additional support by the Springer/Kluwer Academic Publishers and the Institut für Glücksforschung. Also, university institutions like the Social Science Department at the Center for North American Studies and the Center for Work, Social Security and Quality of Life gave us their assistance. Last but not least, we want to thank the many helpers who worked with us in preparing and managing the conference.

Some contributions from the conference have already been published in Social Indicators Network News, including the statements of the opening and the award sessions by the sponsors Ursula Fechter, Rudolf Steinberg and Ernst Welteke as well as by the social scientists Abbott L. Ferris, Kenneth C. Land, Don Rahtz, M. Joseph Sirgy, and Wolfgang Zapf (SINET Nr. 74 & 75). Some papers have been submitted for publication in Social Indicators Research, the Journal of Happiness Studies as well as others.

An important task for this volume was the production of the typescript, for which Matthias Stoffregen held the main responsibility. The three of us formed the editorial group which was responsible for selecting and improving the manuscripts for the conference volume. We thank our colleagues who were engaged in assisting the editorial team, and we are especially grateful for the support given to us by Maya Becker, Juliane Reitzig, Joachim Ritter and Usch Büchner.

The book is serving its purpose if it gives many readers a substantial insight into the quality of life research in recent times.

*Wolfgang Glatzer, Susanne von Below, Matthias Stoffregen*

## 16. PARENTAL DIVORCE AND THE WELL-BEING OF ADOLESCENT CHILDREN

*Changes between 1984-1999 in the Netherlands*

Anna Lont and Jaap Dronkers<sup>1</sup>

*University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands,  
and European University Institute in San Domenico di Fiesole, Italy*

### ABSTRACT

In this paper we address the question: "Have the negative correlations between particular aspects of the well-being of children and parental divorce changed during the 1984-1999 period in the Netherlands?" We used the NIBUD school-surveys of 1984, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, and 1999 to compare for every year (aspects of) the well-being of adolescents living in complete families with that of their peers living in single-mother- or single-father-families. The results indicate that there are no significant differences between single-parent families and complete families in the late 1990s compared to the situation in the 1980s. A comparison of the early and late 1990s between single-parent families and complete families also shows hardly any significant differences, except for the amount of money children received from their parents in single-parent families (get less in single-mother families than in single-father families) and the expected age children expect to leave their parental home in single-father-families (at a higher age in the 1990s), so approximating the situation in complete families.

### INTRODUCTION

To date, Dutch research on the correlations between parental divorce and the well-being of their children shows that it is not so much the divorce itself but the quarrelling that goes with divorce (both before and after) that has the greatest negative effects on the well-being of the children concerned (Bosman, 1993; Borgers, Dronkers & van Praag, 1996; Dronkers, 1996, 1997; Spruyt & de Goede, 1997; Fischer & de Graaf, 2001; for a divergent but incorrect interpretation of the research results: van Gelder, 2000). American research (Amato & Keith, 1991; Amato, 2001) mainly points in that direction too.

This Dutch research study is limited to a measurement, as precise as possible, of these effects and the mechanisms and processes involved. The question whether these effects vary in different cohorts cannot be answered by the greater part of these studies, because the data they contain almost always concerns only one cohort. However, the question on the different correlations between parental divorce and their children's well-being in the case of different cohorts is important for the interpretation of those correlations and for the relevance to be attributed to them. This article attempts to establish, for the successive generations of secondary schoolchil-

dren in the 80s and 90s of the twentieth century, how far these correlations have shifted.

The negative correlations between parental divorce and the well-being of their children can develop in two opposite directions: becoming stronger or weaker. Amato (2001, p. 362-365), in his meta-analysis on American research, found that a curvilinear relation existed between the effects of single-parent families on the well-being of their children and the decennium in which these effects were measured: These effects (good school results, behavior, psychological well-being and self-image) became less significant in the course of the 1970s and 80s, but increased again in the course of the 80s and 90s. Amato gives two possible explanations for this curvilinear relation: (1) A change in the nature of divorce, whereby recent divorces increasingly concern relationships wherein the ex-partners were only marginally (instead of extremely) unhappy in their marriage. And indeed divorces with relatively little conflict between parents are particularly hard for the children to understand, which leads to more frustration and thus to a lower well-being of the children. (2) Complete families benefited more than single-parent families from the prosperity in the 1990s, so that the latter are lagging increasingly further behind. Similar arguments are addressed by South (2001) for consideration in this connection on the possible contrasts in changes in the effect of working women on their divorce chances.

There are three reasons leading to the assumption that the negative correlations between parental divorce and the well-being of their children have diminished in the case of more recent cohorts in the Netherlands.

1. compared to the 1960s and 70s, the number of divorces involving children has markedly increased. Although it is true that this increase leveled off in the 80s and 90s, the current number of divorces certainly shows that the phenomenon of divorce involving children has become much more common and thus easier to accept. Because of the increase in acceptance, parents divorcing seem to be less stigmatized and better able to continue to be functioning parents. Moreover, children of divorced parents form much less of an exception and tend to be better accepted by their peers and even supported by them. This greater level of acceptance and support by peers seems to lessen the negative effects on their well-being.
2. The *de facto* juridical handling of divorce appears to have become more flexible in the course of the 1980s and 90s, because divorces involving children became more common and were better accepted. This might mean that there was a lower intensity of tension and conflict between partners divorcing, and that these conflicts were not fought out so much on the back of the children. Nowadays people divorce "more rationally" than before. This means that the children involved are less subject to tension and therefore that there are less negative consequences for their well-being. Moreover, there is nowadays a lot more mediation between divorcing parents instead of a lengthy court case in which the divorce is "threshed out".
3. A third possible cause of the decrease in negative correlations between parental divorce and children's well-being is the increase in "co-parenthood": Divorced parents nowadays more frequently have joint custody over their children. In this way, the parents remain in (good) contact with each other, and the children continue to see both parents and are brought up by both of

them. Moreover, upbringing by both parents becomes more effective and the well-being of the children suffers less damage.

There are, however, also three reasons leading to believe that the negative correlations between parental divorce and children's well-being have increased in the case of more recent cohorts.

1. In the second half of the twentieth century, the number of divorces involving children increased markedly. Taking for granted that the portion of bad marriages during the twentieth century remained more or less constant, this increase shows that nowadays the average divorce has different reasons than it had in the past. De Graaf & Kalmijn (2001, p. 25) show that the reasons for divorce in the second half of the twentieth century changed and also became less weighty. In the 50s, the explanation "sexual infidelity of the man" had a role in over 54 % of divorces, in the 80s only in 38 % (infidelity of the woman 35 %, resp. 28 %). The particularly weighty grounds for divorce, "physical violence", were less frequently mentioned with the passing of the decades. This could mean that the rare divorce cases in the 1960s and 70s often brought conscious relief to the children involved because divorce led to termination of an untenable situation. The more frequent divorces in the 80s and 90s, on the other hand, more often resulted in a lack of understanding and a state of confusion in the children, because they could not see the need for the divorce. The fact that they had more and more difficulty in understanding their parents' divorce could have an increasingly negative influence on the children involved in more recent divorces.
2. De Graaf and Kalmijn (2001, p. 26) also find that women in recent divorces more often use the reason of "growing apart", "lack of attention" and "not being able to talk to each other properly" than was the case in divorces during previous decades. Of the women who divorced in the period 1949-1972, 69 % named the grounds for divorce as not being able to talk, while that percentage in more recent cases of divorced women increased to 80 %. The importance for children of a good psychological relationship between their parents is certainly present, but it may have less weight than maintenance of the parental marriage, because, for children, an upbringing as undisturbed as possible is more important than a good relationship between their parents. If the number of divorces on the grounds of a bad psychological relationship increases, this means that the negative effects of an average divorce on children also increase.
3. According to De Graaf and Kalmijn (2001: 27) women more and more frequently name the grounds "former partner spends too much time at work" and the "division of housekeeping tasks" as reasons for separation. Too much work was mentioned by 8 % of women divorcing in the 1950s and 60s, compared to 28 % in divorces during the 80s; and problems concerning division of tasks were mentioned by 15 %, resp. 30 %. It may be in the children's interest for their parents to have a more emancipated relationship, but this interest may be slighter than that of their parents remaining married, because for children it is more important to have an upbringing as undisturbed as possible than a more emancipated role division between their parents. If the number of divorces on the grounds of too little emanci-

pation in the division of gender roles increases, this could mean that the negative effect of the average divorce on children increases.

It is of course possible that no changes will be found in the well-being of children in consequence of a divorce in the 1984-1999 period. This would mean that both the above-mentioned developments balance each other out.

Given these apparently contradictory developments and the current stage of research, the main question in the context of this research study is in the first place descriptive: *Have the negative correlations between certain aspects of children's well-being and parental divorce diminished during the 1984-1999 period?*

The data available allow this main question to lead to two specific sub-questions that can contribute to a better understanding of changes, or of no changes, in the negative correlations.

1. *In the 1980s and 90s, did the negative effects of single-father families on the children's well-being increase more than the effects of single-mother families on the children's well-being?* Previous Dutch research (Borgers, Dronkers & van Praag, 1996; Dronkers, 1996, 1997) showed that the well-being of children in single-mother families was negatively influenced by divorce, while that was not the case in single-father families. These authors explained this phenomenon by assuming that the fathers who after divorce had full custody of the children formed a special group. Moreover, there was more social support for the category of single-fathers than for single-mothers. However, due to a marked increase in single-father families during the 80s and 90s, the category of fathers taking care of their children became less exceptional. More fathers took on full custody of their children so that the negative consequences of divorce on their children's well-being was no longer compensated for to such a degree by their particular capacities or by extra social support.
2. *In the 1980s and 90s, were there any differences in the negative effects on the well-being of children in single-mother families depending on the mother's educational status?* In previous Dutch research (Borgers, Dronkers & van Praag, 1996) no difference was found between the well-being of children in single-mother families with a higher educated mother and the well-being of children in single-mother families with a lower educated mother, while according to American research such a difference can be found. This difference in results can be explained by the fact that in the Netherlands, until the 70s, divorce was not customary, and hence it was mostly women endowed with perseverance and intelligence (Dronkers, 2002) who were in a condition to push a divorce through. For less perseverant women the threshold was much higher: divorce procedures were difficult and unfamiliar, and they preferred not to risk it. During the 80s and 90s the category of women forming single-mother families became less selective. Since divorce had become quite normal and divorce procedures were simpler and more common, it may be assumed that divorced mothers were no longer predominantly women endowed with a high degree of perseverance and intelligence (see for an analogous argument Goode, 1962). This change in the composition of categories of divorced mothers from the viewpoint of perseverance and intelligence could be the reason why differences in well-being between children in single-mother

families with a higher educated mother and children in single-mother families with a lower educated mother increased throughout the 1980s and 90s. The selective category of divorced women in the 70s neutralized, thanks to their greater intelligence and perseverance, the difference in resources of women with a lower and higher education by comparison with complete families. Since during the 80s and 90s the category of women forming single-mother families became less selective, the difference in resources of lower and higher educated divorced women was more evident for instance in the well-being of their children.

## DATA

The article by Borgers, Dronkers en van Praag (1996) addresses the well-being of secondary schoolchildren at the beginning of the 1990s. The School Surveys used by them were, however, put together in a more or less comparable way at different times during the 80s and 90s. For this reason, these School Surveys are suitable for the purpose of answering our questions. For the present article we have been able to use data from the 1984, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996 and 1999 NIBUD<sup>2</sup> School Surveys. These School Surveys can be considered to be representative of a specific year's secondary schoolchildren from all classes and types of school education. They consist of written questionnaires distributed via the school and collected during school time. The schoolchild and the type of family he/she lives in is the independent variable. The well-being of the schoolchildren is the dependent variable. We have limited the group under study to schoolchildren of Dutch nationality in order to exclude the confusing influence of different cultures.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, we have only included schoolchildren below eighteen years of age in our research population, in order to avoid distortion caused by changes in the indexes of older students. The schoolchildren were asked to give their opinion on a great number of aspects of their lives, without, however, connecting this with the divorce of their parents. All the data we used for this secondary analysis of the NIBUD data consist therefore of the self-assessments of the schoolchildren questioned. Secondary schoolchildren orphaned of one parent were also removed from the analysis data, in order to avoid confusion between widowed/orphaned families and divorced families (see Borgers, Dronkers & van Praag, 1996).

From the questionnaires, we selected the questions providing an indication of the different aspects of schoolchildren's well-being. We had to limit ourselves to using those indicators of well-being that had been measured in a comparable manner during the 1980s and 90s. Because of these limits, the range of our indicators of well-being is not as broad as that of Borgers, Dronkers & van Praag (1996). Since the extent of conflicts between parents was only quantified during the 90s, we could not include this control variable in our analysis. For the purpose of our investigation the omission of this control variable with regard to the extent of conflicts between parents before and after divorce means that we may overestimate the decrease in negative relations between parental divorce and their children's well-being, since we cannot account for the presumed increase of 'rational' divorces during the 80s and 90s. However, if we do not find that these negative correlations have diminished, that result will not be due to the omission of control for the extent of conflicts between parents before and after divorce.

We can now analyze the following aspects of secondary schoolchildren's well-being:

- *Parents' financial contributions to the children.* It is frequently seen that in divorced families there is a greater degree of poverty (Hoff, Dronkers & Vrooman, 1997). That implies that children in divorced families have less money available than children in complete families. At the same time, divorced parents might (temporarily) devote less time and attention to their children, and compensate for this with a greater financial contribution. We are using three indicators: the amount of pocket money per week; the amount of extra money per week, divided into clothing allowance and travel allowance. These sums of money have not been adjusted for inflation or price level. Due to inflation in the 80s, this could lead to an overestimation of the rise in financial contributions from parents during this period of time.

- *Schoolchild's health problems.* The tension resulting from parental divorce (both before and after) can also have consequences on the state of health of the schoolchildren. Supervision by parents can also diminish during the divorce period, so that their health is threatened. The indicator is the number of times the student has been home on sick leave during the last month.

- *Undesired negative behavior.* The tension brought about by parental divorce (both before and after) can also have consequences on the degree of undesired negative behavior manifested by the children. Supervision by parents can also diminish during the divorce period, so that there are more opportunities for undesired negative behavior. The indicator is a scale of 10 questions to the schoolchild concerning the amount of quarrels, fights and petty criminality per year, such as vandalism and theft, etc. The Cronbach Alpha of this scale is 0.80.

- *Planning future independence and role division.* The tension caused by parental quarrelling and divorce may lead the children to want to leave their parental home earlier and to live independently in order to be no longer disturbed by the fighting and tension. Parental divorce can also cause children of divorced parents to aspire to a more emancipated domestic role division in their own relationships. Moreover, following their parents' divorce, children of divorced parents more frequently see their father and/or mother fill the role of the other parent, so that the chance of a more balanced domestic role division is more realistic. There are two indicators: (1) the age the schoolchild wishes to leave the parental home and live independently. (2) a scale of five questions concerning the future task division in upbringing and caring for children, cooking, earning money and domestic chores, whereby we have reformulated the questions in such a way that it is mostly the traditional role division of man and women that scores the highest points in this scale. The Cronbach Alpha of this scale is 0.72.

The averages, standard deviations and numbers relating to these indicators of well-being are shown in the last two rows of Table 1. In the 1984 School Survey, the variables 'bad health', 'undesired negative behavior' and 'future role division in upbringing and care of children' was not measured. For these indicators we can only establish a shorter trend, (1990-1999) instead of 1984-1999.

Differences in the well-being of secondary schoolchildren between single-parent and complete families and the possible changes that took place in the 1984-1999 period may also be caused by changes in background features. In fact, due to the increased number of divorces, the composition of the categories of divorced parents

changed, and consequently also their characteristics in relation to the category of non-divorced parents.

Table 1: Average Scores of Schoolchildren in Complete Families, Mother Families and Father Families on the Various Indicators for Well-being for the Years 1984, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, and 1999 (in Brackets the Standard Deviations)

Table 1a: Average Amount of Pocket Money per Month

|                              | 1984               | 1990               | 1992               | 1994               | 1996             | 1999               | Total            | N      |
|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------|
| Complete Family              | 46.55<br>(34.54)   | 62.03<br>(56.12)   | 49.52<br>(45.54)   | 50.34<br>(42.21)   | 49.81<br>(51.29) | 48.19<br>(41.87)   | 50.98<br>(45.61) | 59,061 |
| Single-Parent Family, Mother | 53.10**<br>(42.16) | 75.45**<br>(69.11) | 59.31**<br>(54.88) | 56.15**<br>(47.14) | 50.97<br>(35.87) | 55.63**<br>(53.13) | 58.72<br>(52.55) | 4,961  |
| Single-Parent Family, Father | 55.01**<br>(34.36) | 70.87*<br>(56.86)  | 66.10**<br>(70.30) | 63.48*<br>(52.72)  | 57.52<br>(37.09) | 56.08*<br>(47.72)  | 62.10<br>(54.61) | 882    |
| Total                        | 47.11<br>(35.16)   | 63.22<br>(57.34)   | 50.61<br>(47.01)   | 50.93<br>(42.77)   | 49.92<br>(50.33) | 48.88<br>(42.93)   | 51.72<br>(46.37) | 64,904 |
| N                            | 9,830              | 10,041             | 12,360             | 13,360             | 7,803            | 10,917             | 64,904           |        |

Table 1b: Average Amount of Clothing Allowance per Month

|                              | 1984             | 1990               | 1992              | 1994              | 1996              | 1999              | Total             | N      |
|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Complete Family              | 83.60<br>(43.04) | 113.32<br>(62.06)  | 118.84<br>(64.81) | 113.84<br>(55.91) | 98.23<br>(42.21)  | 100.74<br>(51.72) | 107.16<br>(56.74) | 19,330 |
| Single-Parent Family, Mother | 85.19<br>(44.36) | 120.36*<br>(68.74) | 122.36<br>(76.22) | 113.03<br>(58.26) | 102.03<br>(55.52) | 107.82<br>(67.19) | 111.55<br>(65.23) | 2,226  |
| Single-Parent Family, Father | 88.82<br>(46.59) | 119.89<br>(74.36)  | 122.74<br>(75.40) | 130.33<br>(65.05) | 90.94<br>(31.90)  | 101.88<br>(56.61) | 112.26<br>(65.95) | 386    |
| Total                        | 83.84<br>(43.24) | 114.20<br>(63.11)  | 118.96<br>(66.32) | 113.92<br>(66.32) | 98.56<br>(43.65)  | 101.43<br>(53.20) | 107.70<br>(57.85) | 21,942 |
| N                            | 2,668            | 4,018              | 4,502             | 4,924             | 2,547             | 3,283             | 21,942            |        |

Table 1c: Average Amount of Travel Allowance per Month

|                              | 1984             | 1990              | 1992             | 1994             | 1996             | 1999             | Total            | N     |
|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------|
| Complete Family              | 54.10<br>(49.86) | 65.07<br>(70.76)  | 49.04<br>(41.14) | 63.89<br>(58.13) | 46.72<br>(46.75) | 52.13<br>(48.41) | 57.57<br>(56.85) | 8,492 |
| Single-Parent Family, Mother | 49.11<br>(43.74) | 61.78<br>(56.20)  | 46.90<br>(37.49) | 60.14<br>(46.00) | 41.82<br>(30.67) | 61.07<br>(52.12) | 55.34<br>(47.50) | 957   |
| Single-Parent Family, Father | 50.74<br>(52.73) | 53.16*<br>(40.76) | 45.17<br>(40.37) | 65.48<br>(66.87) | 41.20<br>(18.36) | 62.50<br>(71.76) | 54.40<br>(53.15) | 181   |
| Total                        | 53.66<br>(49.47) | 64.50<br>(68.99)  | 48.70<br>(40.69) | 63.47<br>(56.96) | 46.20<br>(45.28) | 53.40<br>(49.81) | 57.29<br>(55.93) | 9,630 |
| N                            | 2,180            | 2,560             | 1,392            | 1,915            | 596              | 987              | 9,630            |       |

Table 1d: Average Age at which the Schoolchild Wishes to Leave Home

|                              | 1984            | 1990              | 1992              | 1994              | 1996              | 1999            | Total           | N      |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|
| Complete Family              | 20.76<br>(2.06) | 20.05<br>(3.33)   | 20.32<br>(2.84)   | 20.55<br>(2.81)   | 20.15<br>(2.31)   | 17.50<br>(8.92) | 19.85<br>(4.73) | 62,867 |
| Single-Parent Family, Mother | 20.63<br>(2.19) | 19.42**<br>(4.19) | 20.03**<br>(2.84) | 20.25**<br>(2.75) | 19.88**<br>(2.03) | 17.55<br>(8.52) | 19.62<br>(4.58) | 5,683  |
| Single-Parent Family, Father | 20.48<br>(2.19) | 19.05**<br>(4.83) | 20.27<br>(2.49)   | 19.85**<br>(2.53) | 18.82**<br>(1.83) | 17.56<br>(7.76) | 19.18<br>(5.12) | 981    |
| Total                        | 20.74<br>(2.08) | 19.98<br>(3.44)   | 20.29<br>(2.83)   | 20.51<br>(2.80)   | 20.12<br>(2.29)   | 17.50<br>(8.87) | 19.82<br>(4.73) | 69,540 |
| N                            | 10,598          | 11,052            | 13,275            | 15,413            | 6,132             | 13,070          | 69,540          |        |

Table 1e: Average Scale Scores on Futures Role Division as Seen by the Schoolchild

|                              | 1990           | 1992             | 1994             | 1996           | 1999             | Total          | N      |
|------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|--------|
| Complete Family              | 8.81<br>(1.32) | 8.69<br>(1.45)   | 8.62<br>(1.51)   | 8.55<br>(1.49) | 8.69<br>(1.66)   | 8.67<br>(1.50) | 54,107 |
| Single-Parent Family, Mother | 8.74<br>(1.13) | 8.53**<br>(1.27) | 8.54**<br>(1.33) | 8.45<br>(1.20) | 8.55**<br>(1.52) | 8.56<br>(1.31) | 4,867  |
| Single-Parent Family, Father | 8.78<br>(1.31) | 8.71<br>(1.31)   | 8.50<br>(1.29)   | 8.54<br>(1.47) | 8.68<br>(1.65)   | 8.66<br>(1.48) | 820    |
| Total                        | 8.80<br>(1.31) | 8.67<br>(1.43)   | 8.61<br>(1.50)   | 8.54<br>(1.47) | 8.68<br>(1.65)   | 8.66<br>(1.48) | 59,794 |
| N                            | 9,730          | 14,063           | 15,976           | 8,148          | 11,877           | 59,794         |        |

Table 1f: Average Number of Times at Home on Sick Leave during the Last Month

|                              | 1990             | 1992             | 1994             | 1996             | 1999             | Total          | N      |
|------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|--------|
| Complete Family              | 1.60<br>(1.04)   | 0.68<br>(1.98)   | 0.86<br>(2.16)   | 1.07<br>(2.32)   | 1.43<br>(5.56)   | 1.09<br>(3.04) | 53,743 |
| Single-Parent Family, Mother | 1.92**<br>(1.27) | 1.11**<br>(2.71) | 1.34**<br>(2.38) | 1.54**<br>(2.70) | 1.78**<br>(4.43) | 1.48<br>(2.85) | 4,897  |
| Single-Parent Family, Father | 1.77<br>(1.20)   | 1.02*<br>(2.51)  | 0.93<br>(2.04)   | 1.54<br>(2.37)   | 1.61<br>(3.03)   | 1.38<br>(2.43) | 819    |
| Total                        | 1.63<br>(1.07)   | 0.73<br>(2.07)   | 0.91<br>(2.18)   | 1.10<br>(2.35)   | 1.46<br>(5.44)   | 1.13<br>(3.02) | 59,459 |
| N                            | 10,193           | 13,704           | 15,305           | 8,572            | 11,685           | 59,459         |        |

Table 1g: Average Scale Scores on Undesired Negative Behavior Manifested by the School-child

|                              | 1990             | 1992            | 1994             | 1996            | 1999           | Total          | N      |
|------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|--------|
| Complete Family              | 0.62<br>(1.75)   | 0.61<br>(2.03)  | 0.53<br>(1.57)   | 0.45<br>(0.96)  | 0.93<br>(4.51) | 0.63<br>(2.48) | 44,632 |
| Single-Parent Family, Mother | 0.88**<br>(2.26) | 0.77*<br>(2.12) | 0.68**<br>(1.78) | 0.54*<br>(1.06) | 0.87<br>(2.30) | 0.75<br>(2.01) | 4,058  |
| Single-Parent Family, Father | 0.76<br>(1.55)   | 0.74<br>(2.08)  | 0.70<br>(1.49)   | 0.84<br>(1.90)  | 1.01<br>(2.56) | 0.83<br>(2.07) | 641    |
| Total                        | 0.64<br>(1.79)   | 0.62<br>(2.04)  | 0.55<br>(1.60)   | 0.45<br>(0.97)  | 0.93<br>(4.35) | 0.64<br>(2.44) | 60,247 |
| N                            | 10,916           | 13,295          | 15,716           | 8,735           | 11,585         | 60,247         |        |

Source: School Surveys 1984, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1999. \* $p < 0.01$ ; \*\* $p < 0.05$  (t-test of comparison with complete family).

This is why we check for the following variables: type of school the schoolchild attends (from lower to higher levels: lbo, mavo, havo, mbo and vwo); schoolchild's age; schoolchild's gender (women score higher); religious belief of the student (five dichotomous variables: Roman Catholic, Protestant, Reformed, Islam, other belief; no belief as a reference category); highest type of parental education (distinguished between mothers and fathers, from lower to higher: from primary school to university level). Table 2 shows how far the most important features of complete families, mother families and father families have shifted in the period from 1984 to 1999.

The education level of the father and mother were not measured in the 1984 School Survey. Therefore, we cannot take into account the parents' education level over the period 1984-1999. Only in the comparisons over 1990-1999 do we use the parents' education level as a control variable. Since in all comparisons relating to the period 1984-1999 the education level of the schoolchild was checked, we believe that the consequences of the lack of data on parental education level in the 1984-1999 comparisons is not disastrous for the purpose of identifying a possible trend.

Schoolchildren in single-mother families less often provide information on the education level of the father who left the home, while children in single-father families often do not mention the education level of the mother who left. In the multivariate comparisons relating to single-mother families we only used the education level of the mother as a control variable, while in the case of single-father families we only used the father's education level. Inclusion of the education level of both parents in the comparisons leads to distortion of results relating to single-parent families, since in that case we would have to take account only of the single-parent families in the comparisons, in which children have more frequent contact with the parent who left home, and hence are aware of his/her education level.<sup>4</sup>

Table 2: The Most Relevant Background Features of Complete families, Mother Families and Father Families during the years 1984, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, and 1999 (in Brackets the Standard Deviations)

|   | 1984           | 1990             | 1992             | 1994             | 1996             | 1999             | Total            |
|---|----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| % Mother Families                                   | 7.1            | 8.0              | 8.7              | 9.2              | 7.4              | 7.6              | 8.1              |
| % Father Families                                   | 1.3            | 1.7              | 1.6              | 0.7              | 0.5              | 2.2              | 1.4              |
| Average Type of School Complete Families            | 2.96<br>(1.33) | 2.89<br>(1.36)   | 3.06<br>(1.26)   | 3.00<br>(1.35)   | 3.20<br>(1.41)   | 3.47<br>(1.35)   | 3.07<br>(1.35)   |
| Average Type of School Mother Families              | 2.88<br>(1.33) | 2.88<br>(1.41)   | 2.95**<br>(1.29) | 2.85**<br>(1.32) | 3.24<br>(1.43)   | 3.47<br>(1.32)   | 3.01**<br>(1.36) |
| Average Type of School Father Families              | 2.92<br>(1.40) | 3.00<br>(1.36)   | 2.92<br>(1.27)   | 2.38**<br>(1.18) | 2.44**<br>(1.31) | 3.31<br>(1.38)   | 2.94**<br>(1.35) |
| Average Education Level Father in Complete Families |                | 2.74<br>(1.44)   | 3.01<br>(1.54)   | 3.08<br>(1.41)   | 3.29<br>(1.48)   | 3.24<br>(1.45)   | 3.05<br>(1.48)   |
| Average Education Level Father in Father Families   |                | 3.10**<br>(1.68) | 3.13<br>(1.60)   | 3.07<br>(1.68)   | 3.50<br>(1.69)   | 3.55**<br>(1.43) | 3.25**<br>(1.59) |
| Average Education Level Mother in Complete Families |                | 2.20<br>(.96)    | 2.46<br>(1.17)   | 2.83<br>(1.15)   | 2.97<br>(1.25)   | 3.00<br>(1.23)   | 2.69<br>(1.19)   |
| Average Education Level Mother in Mother Families   |                | 2.29**<br>(1.16) | 2.66**<br>(1.37) | 2.95**<br>(1.22) | 3.22**<br>(1.34) | 3.04<br>(1.31)   | 2.81**<br>(1.31) |
| % Roman Catholic Complete Families                  | 38             | 35               | 29               | 30               | 28               | 21               | 30               |
| % Roman Catholic Mother Families                    | 36             | 25**             | 24**             | 24**             | 21**             | 18**             | 24**             |
| % Roman Catholic Father Families                    | 37             | 24**             | 24*              | 16**             | 33               | 16               | 23**             |
| % Protestant Complete Families                      | 18             | 21               | 19               | 18               | 18               | 17               | 18               |
| % Protestant Mother Families                        | 12**           | 15**             | 11**             | 10**             | 9**              | 7**              | 10**             |
| % Protestant Father Families                        | 8**            | 19               | 13**             | 19               | 15               | 7**              | 13**             |

Source: School Surveys 1984, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1999. \* $p < 0.01$ ; \*\* $p < 0.05$  (t-test or  $\chi^2$  by comparison with complete family).

The average type of school attended by children in single-mother families was only significantly lower than the type attended by children from complete families in the years 1992 and 1994. In the years 1984 and 1990, although it was lower than was

the case for children in complete families and in the years 1996 and 1999 equivalent or even higher, the differences are not significant. The average type of school attended by children in single-father families was of a significantly lower level in the years 1994 and 1996 than was the case for children in complete families. In the years 1984, 1992 and 1999, although the level was lower than for children in complete families (and in 1990 higher), these differences are not significant. In general, the average type of school attended by children from both single-mother and -father families is of a significantly lower level than the average type of school attended by children in complete families.

The average education level of fathers in single-father families was significantly higher in the years 1990 and 1999 than the average education level of fathers in complete families. In the other years (with the exception of 1994) the average education level of fathers in single-father families was in fact higher than that of fathers in complete families, but these differences are not significant. In general, the average education level of fathers in single-father families was significantly higher than the average education level of fathers in complete families. The average education level of mothers in single-mother families was, in the years ranging from 1990 through 1996, significantly higher than the average education level of mothers in complete families. This also goes for the year 1999, but this difference is not significant. In general the average education level of mothers in single-mother families was significantly higher than the average education level of mothers in complete families.

Children in single-parent families were less often members of a Catholic or Protestant church than children in complete families. This was, however, less evident in the 1980s than in the 90s, and less evident with regard to children in single-father families than to children in single-mother families.

These results in table 2 clearly show that taking account of changed background features of the categories of divorced and not divorced parents can be important for a correct assessment of the changed effects of single-parent families on the well-being of their children.

#### DIFFERENCES IN WELL-BEING BETWEEN SCHOOLCHILDREN FROM COMPLETE AND DIVORCED FAMILIES

Table 1 shows the differences for each year in the well-being of schoolchildren in complete and divorced families. In this way we obtain a first answer to our main question.

Mothers in single-mother households gave significantly more pocket money to their children compared to parents in complete families. In 1984 children in single-mother families received  $f$  6.55 more ( $f$  53.10- $f$  46.55), in 1999 the difference was  $f$  7.44 ( $f$  58.72- $f$  50.98). No clear trend can be established in the course of years, but it can be concluded that by comparison with 1984 this difference in the amount of pocket money only increased in 1999. With regard to fathers in single-father households the result in the course of years concerning pocket money was somewhat more inconsistent, but in this category too, albeit to a lesser degree, it can be seen that a significantly higher amount of pocket money was given to the children. Here too no clear trend can be established, the differences in amount show great fluctuations in the different years.

Concerning the amount of clothing allowance and travel allowance no significant differences were found between complete families and single-mother and -father families.

The average age when a schoolchild in a single-mother family wants to live independently was significantly different in the years ranging from 1990 to 1996 than was the case for schoolchildren in complete families (0.63 year in 1990 and 0.27 year in 1996). This desire to leave the family earlier was, according to previous research, actually fulfilled: Children in divorced families left home at a younger age than children in complete families. This difference in age between children in single-mother families and children in complete families decreased from 1990 to 1996, indicating a trend specific for that time. For children in single-father families the same significant difference can be seen in the age the child considered leaving home during the years 1990 through 1996, with the exception of the year 1992 (1.00 year in 1990 and 1.33 years in 1996). However, no trend can be established between these differences through the years as it can be for children in single-mother families compared to children in complete families. The 1999 data show a deviating image with regard to the data of previous years, and this is valid for all types of family. In this year no significant differences between types of family could be found.

A more emancipated future role-division was expected significantly more often by children in single-mother households than by children in complete families during the years 1992, 1994 and 1999. This was not the case for children in single-father families compared with children in complete families.

Staying sick at home was found significantly more often for children in single-mother families than for children in complete families. The difference amounted to 0.32 in 1990 and 0.35 in 1999, and no clear increase or decrease was found in the differences in the course of years. For children in single-father households the same significant difference appears only in the year 1992 (difference: 0.34) in the frequency of staying at home on sick leave during the last month.

Undesired negative behavior was observed to a significantly greater degree for children in single-mother families than for children in complete families (difference 0.25 in 1990 and 0.09 in 1996), with the exception of the year 1999 during which data show a deviating image. It is clear that the difference in undesired negative behavior between children in single-mother families and children in complete families diminished from 1990 through 1996. In 1999 children in single-mother households manifested a lesser degree of undesired negative behavior than children in complete families. No significant difference was found with regard to children living in single-father families.

In general, we did not find a much lower degree of significant differences in the late 90s between children in single-parent families and children in complete families compared to the 80s or early 90s, but the year 1999 does appear at times to form an exception. That would make the answer to our main question negative: The negative correlations between certain aspects of the well-being of children and parental divorce appear to have hardly diminished during the period 1984-1999, with the sole positive exception of undesired negative behavior.

However, changes in background features, such as those shown partially in Table 2, may play a role, since they neutralize any possible decrease of negative effects. We shall look at this in the following paragraphs with the help of multivariate regression. We shall do this first for the indicators of well-being over the whole

1984-1999 period, and then separately for single-mother and -father families. Next, we will look at all the indicators of well-being over the 1990-1999 period, and here we can also check the education level of parents. Finally, we will check whether in the 1990-1999 period the differences in well-being between children with higher educated divorced mothers and children with lower educated divorced mothers increased.

Table 3: Effects of Mother Families and Father Families (Both by Comparison with Complete Families) on the Various Indicators for Well-being Checked for Different Background Features, in the 1984-1999 Period

| Mother Families    |              |                    |                  |                     |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|
|                    | Pocket Money | Clothing Allowance | Travel Allowance | Age Of Leaving Home |
| Mother Family      | 0.04**       | 0.01*              | -0.01            | -0.02**             |
| Year               | 0.09**       | 0.10**             | 0.07**           | -0.11**             |
| Gender             | -0.07**      | -0.03**            |                  | -0.09**             |
| Age                | 0.25**       | 0.06**             | 0.13**           | 0.11**              |
| Type of School     | -0.08**      | -0.09**            | -0.18**          | -0.08**             |
| Roman Catholic     |              |                    |                  | 0.06**              |
| Protestant         | -0.08**      | -0.07**            |                  | 0.05**              |
| Islam              | 0.04**       | 0.03**             |                  | 0.02**              |
| Other Belief       | -0.01**      |                    |                  | 0.01**              |
| Mother Family*year | n.s.         | n.s.               | n.s.             | n.s.                |
| Adjusted R2        | 0.08         | 0.02               | 0.05             | 0.05                |
| Father Families    |              |                    |                  |                     |
| Father Family      | 0.03**       | 0.02*              | -0.02            | -0.02**             |
| Year               | 0.09**       | 0.10**             | 0.06**           | -0.12**             |
| Gender             | 0.08**       | -0.03**            |                  | -0.09**             |
| Age                | 0.25**       | 0.06**             | 0.13**           | 0.11**              |
| Type of School     | -0.08**      | -0.08**            | -0.19**          | -0.09**             |
| Roman Catholic     |              |                    |                  | 0.05**              |
| Protestant         | -0.08**      | -0.08**            |                  | 0.05**              |
| Islam              | 0.04**       | 0.03**             |                  | 0.02**              |
| Other Belief       | -0.01**      |                    |                  |                     |
| Father Family*year | n.s.         | n.s.               | n.s.             | n.s.                |
| Adjusted R2        | 0.08         | 0.02               | 0.05             | 0.05                |

Source: School Surveys 1984, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1999. \*= $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*= $p < 0.01$ .

### TRENDS IN THE 1984-1999 PERIOD

In the multivariate regression analysis shown in Table 3, the variables 'type of family' (mother and father family) and 'year of investigation' are taken up regardless of whether they have a significant effect or not. The other variables are shown according to the 'stepwise' method, that is, only the variables with significant effects are shown. Finally, the variable on the interaction 'type of family\*year' gives an indication of whether there is a significant increase or decrease in the course of successive years.<sup>5</sup> The interaction variable is also only shown where it is relevant.

#### Single-Mother Families in the 1984-1999 Period

Children in single-mother families received significantly more pocket money than children in complete families, as shown in Table 3. In the course of successive years the amount of pocket money received by all children regardless of the type of family they live in increases; in 1999 children received more pocket money than in 1984, but this can be explained by the inflation during the 1980s. There is, however, no significant interaction effect, that is, there is no significant increase or decrease in the effect of single-mother families in the course of successive years on the variable 'pocket money'.

Clothing allowance for children in single-mother households was significantly higher than that of children in complete families. The amount of clothing allowance received increased significantly too for all children in the course of successive years. There is, however, no significant increase or decrease in the effect of single-mother families in successive cohorts on the variable 'clothing allowance'.

Children in single-mother households did not receive significantly less travel allowance than children in complete families. In successive years all children received significantly more travel allowance. There is no significant interaction effect of the effect of single-mother families during successive years in the variable 'travel allowance'.

Leaving home at a lower age was more desired by children in single-mother families than their peers in complete families. During the 90s all children, regardless of the type of family they belonged to, wanted to leave home earlier than children during the 80s.<sup>6</sup> There is, however, no significant increase or decrease to be seen in the effect of single-mother households in the course of successive years on the variable 'age of leaving home'.

There are, therefore, no significant differences in the late 1990s between children in single-mother families and children in complete families as compared to the 80s, if we take into account the available background features.

#### Single-Father Families in the 1984-1999 Period

Children in single-father families received significantly more pocket money than children in complete families, as shown in Table 3. There was, however, no significant interaction effect, that is, there was no significant increase or decrease in the effect of single-father households in successive years on the variable 'pocket money'.

Clothing allowance of children in single-father families was significantly higher than that of children in complete families. There was no significant increase or decrease in the effect of father families in successive cohorts on the variable 'clothing allowance'.

Children in single-father households did not receive significantly less travel allowance than children in complete families. There was no significant interaction effect on the variable 'travel allowance'.

Leaving home at a lower age was desired more by children in single-father families than by their peers in complete families. There was, however, no significant increase or decrease in the effect of single-father families in the course of years on the variable 'home-leaving age'.

There are, therefore, no significant differences in the late 1990s between children in father families and children in complete families by comparison with the early 80s, if we take account of the available background features.

#### TRENDS IN THE 1990-1999 PERIOD

In the multivariate regression analysis shown in Tables 4 and 5 the family type variable (single-mother and -father family) and year-of-investigation variable are shown, regardless of whether they have a significant effect or not. The other variables are shown according to the 'stepwise' method, that is, only the variables with significant effects are shown. Besides the interaction variable 'type of family\*year', the interaction terms 'single-mother family\*mother's education level'<sup>7</sup> and 'single-mother family\*mother's education level\*year' appear, if they are significant<sup>8</sup>. The second interaction term indicates whether there is a significant difference in well-being between children in single-mother families with a mother having a higher or lower level of education other than the normal difference in well-being between children with parents with a higher and lower education level. The third interaction term indicates whether this difference in well-being between children in single-mother families having a mother with a higher or lower level of education in successive years significantly increases or decreases. These three interaction variables are only shown where they are significant.

#### Single-Mother Families in the 1990-1999 Period

Children in single-mother families received significantly more pocket money than children in complete families, as shown in Table 4. The increase in pocket money received from 1990 to 1999 by all children, regardless of the type of family they belonged to, is not significant, as opposed to the 1984-1999 period. The effect of single-mother households on the pocket money variable, however, diminishes significantly in the course of successive years, as opposed to the 1984-1999 period. That means in this case that children in single-mother families between 1990 and 1999 received less and less pocket money as compared to children in complete families, so that the difference in the amount of pocket money received between children in single-mother families and children in complete families diminished.

Table 4: Effects of Mother Families (by Comparison with Complete Families) on the Various Indicators for Well-being Checked for Different Background Features in the 1990-1999 Period

|                                       | Pocket Money | Clothing Allowance | Travel Allowance | Age of Leaving Home | Future Role Division | At Home on Sick Leave | Negative Behavior |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Mother Family                         | 0.09**       | 0.01               | -0.00            | -0.02**             | -0.04**              | 0.03                  | 0.02              |
| Year                                  | 0.01         | -0.07**            | 0.01             | -0.08**             | 0.05**               | 0.02**                | 0.02**            |
| Gender                                | -0.08**      |                    |                  | -0.09**             |                      | 0.03**                | -0.09**           |
| Age                                   | 0.23**       | 0.06**             | 0.13**           | 0.09**              | -0.08**              | 0.02**                | -0.04**           |
| Type of School                        | -0.08**      | -0.08**            | -0.19**          | -0.09**             | -0.08**              | -0.05**               | -0.06**           |
| Mother's Education                    |              | 0.03**             |                  | -0.02**             | -0.06**              | 0.01**                | 0.02**            |
| Roman Catholic                        |              |                    |                  | 0.05**              | 0.03**               | -0.02**               | -0.04**           |
| Protestant                            | -0.08**      | -0.09**            |                  | 0.05**              | 0.09**               | -0.02**               | -0.05**           |
| Islam                                 | 0.02**       | 0.03**             |                  | 0.01*               | 0.01**               | 0.05**                | 0.03**            |
| Other Belief                          |              |                    |                  | 0.01*               |                      | 0.03**                | 0.01**            |
| Mother Family*Year                    | -0.06**      | n.s.               | n.s.             | n.s.                | n.s.                 | n.s.                  | n.s.              |
| Mother Family*Mother's Education      | n.s.         | n.s.               | n.s.             | n.s.                | n.s.                 | n.s.                  | n.s.              |
| Mother Family*Mother's Education*Year | n.s.         | n.s.               | n.s.             | n.s.                | n.s.                 | n.s.                  | n.s.              |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>               | 0.08         | 0.02               | 0.05             | 0.05                | 0.03                 | 0.01                  | 0.02              |

Source: School Surveys 1984, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1999. \* $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* $p < 0.01$ .

In single-mother households, children did not receive significantly more clothing allowance than children in complete families. There was no significant increase or decrease in the effect of single-mother families in the course of successive years on the clothing allowance variable.

There was no difference in the amount of travel allowance received by children in single-mother families and children in complete families. There is no significant interaction effect between year and single-mother family.

Leaving home at a lower age was more desired by children in single-mother families than by their peers in complete families. There is no significant interaction effect between year and single-mother family, indicating no change in this difference between 1990 and 1999.

In single-mother households, children expected a significantly less traditional role division with their future partners than their peers in complete families. There is no significant interaction effect between year and single-mother family.

Staying sick at home happened more frequently for children in single-mother families than for children in complete families. All children, regardless of the type of family they belonged to, were more frequently home on sick leave during the 90s. There is no significant interaction effect between year and single-mother family, indicating that this difference didn't change between 1990 and 1999.

Children in single-mother families manifested significantly more undesirable behavior than children in complete families. The amount of undesirable behavior manifested by all children, regardless of the type of family they belonged to, increased significantly in 1999, as compared to 1990. There is no significant interaction effect between year and single-mother family.

In general, we do not find a much less significant difference in the late 1990s between children in single-mother families and children in complete families compared to the early 1990s, when we take into account the available background features. And in this respect the answer to our main question is negative: the negative correlations between certain aspects of the well-being of children and parental divorce have, during the period 1990-1999, hardly diminished, with the positive exception of the amount of pocket money.

Nor have we found any significant difference in the well-being of children in single-mother families having a mother with a higher or lower education level, and hence no significant increase or decrease in that effect in the 1990-1999 period.

#### *Single-Father Families in the 1990-1999 Period*

Children in single-father families did not receive significantly less pocket money in comparison to children in complete families, as shown in Table 5. In the course of successive years all children, regardless of the type of family they belonged to, received a comparable amount of pocket money. However, in the course of successive years, the effect of single-father households on the pocket money variable did increase significantly. That is, children in single-father families during the 90s received more and more pocket money by comparison with children in complete families. That shows a difference when comparing it to the results from the 1984-1999 period.

Children in single-father families, compared to children in complete families, did not receive significantly more clothing allowance. There is no significant increase or decrease in the effect of single-father families in the course of successive years on the clothing allowance variable.

Children living in single-father households did not receive significantly less travel allowance than children in complete families. There is also no interaction effect between year and single-father family.

Leaving home at an earlier age was significantly more often expected by children in single-father families than by children in complete families. There was an increase in the effect of single-father families on the age at which their children wish to leave home between 1990 and 1999. That means that children in single-father households in the course of the 90s wanted to leave home at an increasingly later age.

*Table 5: Effects of Father Families (by Comparison with Complete Families) on the Various Indicators of Well-being Checked for Different Background Features*

|                                | Pocket Money | Clothing Allowance | Travel Allowance | Age of Leaving Home | Future Role Division | At Home on Sick Leave | Negative Behavior |
|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Father Family                  | -0.01        | 0.02               | -0.02            | -0.06**             | -0.01                | 0.01*                 | 0.01*             |
| Year                           | 0.00         | -0.07**            | 0.03             | -0.09**             | 0.02**               | 0.02**                | 0.03**            |
| Gender                         | -0.07**      | -0.02*             |                  | -0.09**             | -0.02**              | 0.02**                | -0.09**           |
| Age                            | 0.24**       | 0.05**             | 0.14**           | 0.09**              | -0.08**              | 0.02**                | -0.04**           |
| Type of School                 | -0.08**      | -0.09**            | -0.20**          | -0.08**             | -0.07**              | -0.05**               | -0.06**           |
| Father's Education             |              | 0.05**             | 0.04*            | -0.06**             | -0.06**              |                       | 0.02**            |
| Roman Catholic                 |              |                    |                  | 0.04**              | 0.03**               | -0.03**               | -0.04**           |
| Protestant                     | -0.08**      | -0.09**            |                  | 0.04**              | 0.09**               | -0.03**               | -0.06**           |
| Islam                          | 0.03**       |                    |                  |                     | 0.01*                | 0.06**                | 0.03**            |
| Other Belief                   |              |                    |                  |                     |                      | 0.02**                | 0.01*             |
| Interaction Father Family*Year | 0.04*        | n.s.               | n.s.             | 0.05**              | n.s.                 | n.s.                  | n.s.              |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>        | 0.08         | 0.03               | 0.05             | 0.05                | 0.03                 | 0.01                  | 0.02              |

Source: School Surveys 1984, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1999. \*= $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*= $p < 0.01$ .

Children in single-father families did not see a significantly less traditional role division in their own future relationships than children in complete families. There was no significant increase or decrease of the effect of single-father families on the variable 'future role division' in the course of successive years.

Staying home on sick leave happened significantly more frequently for children in single-father families than for their peers in complete families. There was no significant interaction effect between year and single-father family.

Undesirable negative behavior was found significantly more often for children in single-father families than for children in complete families. There was no significant increase or decrease in the effect of single-father families in the course of the 90s on the undesirable behavior variable.

In general, we did not find less difference in the late 90s between the well-being of children in single-father families and children in complete families as compared to the early 90s, if we take into account the available background characteristics. Respectively, the answer to our main question is negative: the negative correlations between certain aspects of the well-being of children and parental divorce have hardly diminished in the 1990-1999 period, with the positive exception of the amount of pocket money and the age at which children expect to leave home.

## CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

What do the above results now mean in the context of our investigation?

In the first place, it is apparent that, in general, the assumption that the negative correlations between parental divorce and the well-being of their children have diminished during the 1984-1999 period cannot be confirmed. In order to establish differences in the degree of well-being between children in single-parent families and children in complete families in the 1984-1999 period, we have had to confine ourselves to the sole well-being in terms of *financial maintenance* and the *age at which schoolchildren considered leaving home*. No significant effects were found on the basis of these indicators on the well-being of secondary schoolchildren in either single-mother or -father families in the course of successive years. There was no difference between the well-being of children in single-parent families and the well-being of children in complete families in the late 90s compared to the 80s.

Measuring the shorter trend, that is, 1990-1999, the negative correlations between parental divorce and the well-being of children change either hardly or not at all. There are, however, two indicators of well-being showing changes between the early and late 1990s. The effect of single-mother families on the pocket money variable diminished significantly during this period. Children in single-mother households received, in the course of successive years, less and less pocket money in comparison to children in complete families, so that the original difference in the amount of pocket money received between children in single-parent families and children in complete families diminished. This could point to a decrease in 'buy-off behavior' in single-mother families, caused by their paying less attention to their children and/or to compensate for the more difficult family situation. Single-mother families became more common during the 90s, because of this possible decrease in 'buy-off behavior', and in this sense became more similar to complete families.

The effect of single-father families did instead increase significantly during this period, which means that children in single-father families in the course of successive years received more and more pocket money as compared to children in complete families. This points to an increase in 'buy-off behavior' in single-father families, which came about because single fathers with custody became less exceptional in the course of the 1990s. In this sense, single-father families became more and more comparable to the old-fashioned single-mother families, where children received more pocket money than those in complete families. For single-father households there was, moreover, an increased effect in the course of successive years on the age at which children considered leaving home. This means that children in single-father families during the 90s considered leaving home at an increasingly later age than children in complete families. This could mean that children living in single-father families find life in a single-parent family more positive and therefore want to continue living at home for a longer period of time.

In the introduction we also posed two specific sub-questions. The assumption that in the 1980s and 90s the negative effects of single-father families on the well-being of their children seem to have increased to a greater degree than the negative effects of single-mother families on their children cannot be confirmed. There were no more significant negative effects in the course of successive years for children in single-father than for those in single-mother families. The category of fathers forming single-father families probably did not become more selective. We see that the

average education level of fathers in single-father families in 1999 was significantly higher than that of fathers in complete families, just as it was significantly higher in 1990.

The assumption that in the 1980s and 90s the negative effects of divorce on the well-being of children were smaller if the divorced mother had a high level of education compared to divorced mothers with a low education can also not be confirmed. Apparently, the negative marks of divorce do not depend on the amount of available educational resources of divorced mothers.

The conclusion to this research study is that the negative consequences of divorce and life in a single-parent family during the late 1990s hardly diminished in comparison to the 80s and early 90s. However, this does not necessarily mean that the trend commonly assumed does not play a role. The time span of fifteen and/or nine years may be too short to be able to set such a trend. It would be preferable if analyses could be made over a greater number of years in order to be able to establish trends over a longer period of time. In our research, we made use of all School Surveys carried out in a more or less similar way during the 80s and 90s. There are, however, no similar Dutch research data available covering longer periods of time. Moreover, the different indicators of well-being in the various School Surveys were not measured in a comparable way. This makes it harder to make comparisons over longer periods of time. Therefore, we are of the opinion that, despite these methodical restrictions, the measuring of possible changed effects of single-parent families, addressed in this article, for the moment cannot be carried out in a better way in the Netherlands.

The conclusion that the negative consequences of divorce and life in a single-parent family during the late 1990s hardly diminished compared to the 80s and early 90s has consequences in two opposing directions. In the first place, it does not support the notion that divorce can become a normal and harmless feature of a modern and enlightened society, such as was hoped during the 70s and 80s. In the second place, however, this conclusion does not support the notion that the increased number of divorces might be responsible for the rapid increase in undesired features of modern society (for example, increase in violence by young people), as the neo-conservatives now assert. The effects of divorce and the growth in the number of divorces with children are too slight for this to be feasible (see Table 2, first two rows). Above all, our analyses show that the increase in undesirable behavior in young people during the 90s (more negative behavior, more often sick, more traditional views on role division) appeared in all children regardless of the type of family they belonged to at the time.

No scapegoats or cheap and fast solutions exist for undesired features of societies, and neither can classical institutions like marriage and family be changed at will or denied without damage being caused.

## NOTES

- 1 Anna Lont is a doctoral student of pedagogy at the University of Amsterdam. She wrote this article in the context of the course on 'research experience' given by the second author, who was at the time professor of empirical sociology at the same university. Our thanks go to the NIWI, where the various School Surveys were stored, and to the NIBUD, for allowing us to use this data. Jaap Dronkers is currently professor of Social stratification and inequality at the European University Institute in San Domenico di Fiesole. Correspondence should be addressed to the second author; EUJ, Department of

- Political and Social Sciences, Via dei Roccettini 9, I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole. E-mail: jaap.dronkers@iue.it.
- 2 Data available at NIWI Amsterdam under catalogue numbers P1446, P1447, P1448, P1449, P1450 and P1495.
  - 3 That does not, however, mean that changes in correlations between single-parent family, ethnical origin and well-being of secondary schoolchildren is not interesting or important. It does, however, require a separate study, that would go beyond the scope of this article.
  - 4 Analyses not appearing in this article show that the variances within the dependent variables are smaller in the case of single-parent families whereby schoolchildren are aware of the education level of both parents.
  - 5 This interaction term is 0 in the case of a complete family, 1 in the case of a mother family in the year 1984 and 15 in the case of a mother family in the year 1999.
  - 6 This result seems contradictory to the tendency in the 80s and 90s, when adolescents in fact lived longer in the parental home. What is meant is not actual behavior but an expectancy. The decreasing age at which these schoolchildren expect to leave their parental home expresses rather their greater independence within the parental household.
  - 7 This interaction term is 0 in the case of a complete family and increases with the education level of the mother in a mother family.
  - 8 This interaction term is 0 in the case of a complete family and increases with the education level of the mother in a mother family and with the year of investigation.

#### REFERENCES

- Amato, P. R. (2001): Children of Divorce in the 1990s: An Update of the Amato and Keith (1991). Meta-analysis. *Journal of Family Psychology* 15, 355-370.
- Amato, P. R. & B. Keith (1991): Parental Divorce and Adult Well-being: A Meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53, 43-58.
- Borgers, N., J. Dronkers & B. van Praag (1996): Verschillen tussen kinderen uit twee- en eenoudergezinnen in hun welbevinden op de middelbare school. *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Opvoeding, Vorming en Onderwijs* 12, 350-365. English version in: *Social Psychology of Education* 1:147-169.
- Bosman, R. (1993): Opvoeden in je eentje. Een onderzoek naar de betekenis van het moedergezin voor de onderwijskansen van kinderen, Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Dronkers, J. (1996): Het effect van ouderlijke ruzie en echtscheiding op het welzijn van middelbare scholieren. *Comenius* 16, 131-147. English version in: *European Sociological Review* 15:195-212.
- Dronkers, J. (1997): Het effect van contact met de vader na echtscheiding op het welzijn van middelbare scholieren. *Recht der Werkelijkheid* 18, 119-137.
- Dronkers, J. (2002): Bestaat er een samenhang tussen echtscheiding en intelligentie? *Mens en Maatschappij* 77, 25-42.
- Fischer, T. & P. M. de Graaf (2001): Ouderlijke echtscheiding en de levensloop van kinderen: negatieve gevolgen of schijnverbanden? *Sociale Wetenschappen* 44, 138-163.
- Gelder, K. van (2000): Mamma, is het waar? Positieve en negatieve aspecten van het leven in een-oudergezinnen. Utrecht: Verwey-Jonker Instituut.
- Goode, W. J. (1962): Marital satisfaction and instability: A cross-cultural class analysis of divorce rates. In R. Bendix & S. M. Lipset (eds.), *Class, status, and power* (377-387) New York: The Free Press.
- Graaf, P. M. de & M. Kalmijn (2001): Scheidingsmotieven in Nederland sinds de jaren vijftig. *Sociale Wetenschappen* 44, 16-33.
- Hoff, S. J. M., J. Dronkers & J. C. Vrooman (1997): Arme ouders en het welzijn van kinderen. G. Engbersen, J. C. Vrooman & E. Snel (eds.): *De kwetsbaren. Tweede jaarrapport armoede en sociale uitsluiting*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 123-141.
- South, S. J. (2001): Time-Dependent Effects of Wives' Employment on Marital Dissolution. *American Sociological Review* 66, 226-245.
- Spruijt, E. & M. de Goede (1997): Het welbevinden van jongeren uit verschillende gezinstypen. *Comenius* 17, 99-116. English version in: *Adolescence*, 32: 897-911.

## 17. BELIEF IN VALUES AND THEIR PERCEIVED REALIZATION AS DETERMINANTS OF QUALITY OF LIFE

### *The Case of Kibbutz Members*

Uriel Leviatan  
University of Haifa, Israel

#### ABSTRACT

This paper demonstrates that "belief in personal values" – kibbutz unique social and collectivistic values – and the "perceived level of realization of these values in one's community (kibbutz)," strongly determine the level of subjective quality of life among kibbutz members. Their effect is over and above what is determined by members' satisfaction with their major domains of life ("fulfillments of aspirations and fit with abilities", "feeling of belonging", "work," "material standard of living", and "social relations"). The subjective QOL indicators are four: "satisfaction with life in general", "satisfaction with one's kibbutz life", "psychological commitment to one's kibbutz life", and a "global" indicator composed of all three. The analyses were multiple regressions which demonstrated that the "values" variables contributed about a third of the mean explained variance across the four indicators (ranging from 5 % to 31 % of the variance), while the "domains satisfaction" contributed about two thirds (with a range of 18 % to 46 %). Demographic variables (gender, age, education, and social position) played an insignificant role in explaining variance in the indicators of subjective quality of life. However, age and gender showed a conditioning position affecting the relative importance of "values" for different subgroups: "Values" were more important for males, and for some age groups, in particular the 71-80 and 51-60 age groups. "Satisfaction with one's kibbutz life" and "psychological commitment to one's kibbutz life" were also shown to serve as intervening variables between the independent variables of "values" and "domains satisfaction" and the outcome of "satisfaction with life in general". Further analyses reported in the "summary" section show that the same conclusions hold for individuals who are low in their belief in values and therefore it is suggested that the findings should be generalized into other populations.

#### INTRODUCTION

Level of need satisfaction in life domains is commonly used to explain variance in indicators of quality of life. As a consequence, research seeks to find the level of individual's need satisfaction in various domains of life and relate it to some global measure(s) of well-being, and subjective quality of life. Cummins and his research collaborators (e.g., Cummins et al., 2002) furnish an illustrative example. They question their respondents about their level of satisfaction with life domains such as (personal aspects) standard of living, health, achievement in life, safety, feeling part of community, future security; and level of satisfaction with (national aspects) the economic situation in respondents' respective society, state of natural environment,